

On Time Advisory Committee Comment List

Lake Illiamna AC1
Naknek-Kvichak AC2
Nushagak AC3
Lower Bristol Bay AC4
Northern Norton Sound AC5
Southern Norton Sound AC6
Togiak AC7

LAKE ILIAMNA Fish & Game Advisory Committee

RANDY ALVAREZ - Chairman 907-439-1555
I610616, AK 99613

Comments from Advisory Committee meeting
Oct. 8, 2012 6 OF 9 members present

Comments for BRISTOL BAY Finfish

Proposal #3

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

REASON: Biologist SAID barbless hooks
did not show any less mortality

Proposal #4

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

REASON: Subsistence salmon harvesters
take care of their fish at the waters
edge and discard their fish waste back
into the water

Proposal #9

NO ACTION but will take part in
A subcommittee

Proposal # 10

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 15

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 16

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

REASON: It would affect allocation as some sites can remain in the water all tide.

Proposal # 17

Vote 6-0, 6 support - 0 opposed

We would like this to be Bay wide

Proposal # 18

Vote 6-0, 6 support - 0 opposed

REASON: NAVIGATION should not be blocked

Proposal # 19

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 20

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 21

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 23

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 24

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 25

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 32

Vote 1-5, 1 support - 5 opposed

REASON: The committee feels boats are big enough to accommodate processing

The 1 in support did not

Proposal # 33, 34, 35

NO ACTION because of # 32

Proposal # 36

Vote 6-0, 6 support - 0 opposed

REASON: allowing 2 permits AND 200 fathoms of gear relieves pressure. Less boats and gear in the water.

Proposal # 37, 38

NO ACTION because of # 36

Proposal # 39

vote 6-0, 6 support - 0 opposed

Proposal # 40

NO ACTION because of # 39

Proposal # 41

Vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 42

NO ACTION because of # 41

Proposal # 44

vote 6-0, 6 support - 0 opposed

Proposal # 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54

NO ACTION because of # 44

Proposal # 55

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 56

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

IF passed the N/K district should be the SAME

Proposal # 57

vote 6-0, 6 support - 0 opposed

Proposal # 58

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 59, 60, 61

NO action because of #58

Proposal # 62

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 63

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Reason: set gillnet is fishing more than drift net already AND is having difficulty keeping up. More allocation to set gillnet would result in drift net having to stand down from fishing AND probably in over escapement

Proposal # ~~64~~, 65

NO action because of # 63

Proposal # 67

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 68

vote 1-5, 1 support - 5 opposed

minority vote feels this would help the local economy AND put more people to work

Proposal # 69

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 70

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 71

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 72

no action because of # 71

Proposal # 73

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 76

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Proposal # 77

vote 0-6, 0 support - 6 opposed

Iliamna Advisory Committee Meeting

October 10th 2012

Meeting called to order at 11:30 AM
Fish and Game office in King Salmon, AK

Members present – George Alexie, Senifont Shugak, Greg Anelon, John Nielson,
Randy Alvarez, Lyle Wilder
Members absent – Tinney Hedlund, Tim Anelon, Jim Tilley

Lyle Wilder volunteered to keep notes for the meeting. Slim Morstad, fish biologist gave a rundown on the previous commercial fishing season and projections for the coming season. Expected to be similar to the 2012 season. Discussion on the King runs in Cook Inlet, Bristol Bay, and the Yukon.

Fish proposals – Herring, discussion on which proposals to comment on due to proximity and knowledge of area.

Herring proposals

#10 – Herring – asking for ½ of the tonnage to be allotted to Dutch Harbor, Discussion and Randy Alvarez expressed opinion that it was not a good idea. Board decides not to comment on proposal

#11 – no comment

#12 – no comment

Gillnet proposals

#15 – proposal adopted Lyle moves, SJ seconds –
0/6 – proposal **fails**

If passed some set nets would be consistently fishing this would make allocation impossible and the committee doesn't want to see gear have the ability to be left in the water 24 hours a day.

#16 – proposal adopted Lyle moves, John seconds
0/6 – proposal **fails**

#17 – proposal adopted Greg moves, John seconds
Greg moves to amend proposal to apply to all set net sites throughout Bristol Bay not just the Nushagak.
6/0 – **amendment passes**
6/0 – amended proposal **passes**

#18 – proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds
6/0 – proposal **passes**

#19 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

Department is opposed to proposal, as it could potentially allow excessive escapement, AC agrees.

0/6 – proposal **passes**

#20 – proposal adopted, Lyle moves, SJ seconds
proposal would close area to set net fishing
0/6 – proposal **fails**

#21 – proposal adopted, SJ moves, Lyle seconds

Markings required are already sufficient.

0/6 – proposal **fails**

#22 – no comment

#23 - proposal adopted, Greg moves, John seconds
0/6 – proposal **fails**

#24 - proposal adopted, Greg moves, John seconds
0/6 – proposal **fails**

#25- proposal adopted, Greg moves, SJ seconds
0/6 – proposal **fails**

#26 – no comment

#31 – no comment

#32 - **commenting on #32 for #32 through #35**

proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

Discussion over boat length setting upper limits or no limits on boat size.

Discussion on quantity of fish verses quality and longer boats allowing for a better quality. Discussion on changing limits unfair advantage for some fishermen.

Argument for: A vessel increase would allow for more room.

Argument against: If this were to pass fishermen Bay wide would have to increase their vessels to be competitive. The expense would too extreme to stay in the fishery. Fishermen from the Lake Area and throughout Bristol Bay are the average fishermen and if the vessel length were to increase it would push out even more fishermen than have already left fishery due to high costs over the past forty years.

1/5 – proposal **fails**

#36 – **commenting on #36 for #37 and #238**

proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

6/0 – proposal **passes**

The AC feels that if setnetters can own and operate two permits, drifters should also have this option. This would also allow for more gear to be removed from the water and lessen the amounts of boats fishing.

#38 – no comment

#39 - **commenting on #39 for #39 and #40**

proposal adopted, Greg moves, Lyle seconds

6/0 – proposal **passes**

#41- **commenting on #41 for #41 and #42**

proposal adopted, Greg moves, Lyle seconds

0/6 – proposal **fails**

Dual permits allow for more gear to be removed from the water and lessen the amounts of boats fishing.

#43 – no comment

#44 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

6/0 – proposal **passes**

The system is working and if it were to be repealed setnetters would still operate these permits, it just allows for more flexibility from the permit owner. Dual setnet permits allow for more productivity and profitability on poor seasons

#45 - #54 – no action because of the action taken on #44

#55 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

0/6 – proposal **fails**

This would take up more room where there is none available in the area where setnetters are presently allowed to fish. The Board would have to change the regulations to allow setnetters to go out farther from the high water mark and this would potentially create conflicts between set and drift fishermen.

#56 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

0/6 – proposal **fails**

This would create too much competition in the Naknek district.

#57 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

6/0 – proposal **passes**

#58 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

0/6 – proposal **fails**

#59-61 – no action due to proposal #58

#62 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

0/6 – proposal **fails**
#63 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds
0/6 – proposal **fails**

Setnetters over the last few years have been fishing almost continuously and still have had issues reaching their allocation. An increase to their allocation would only take away fishing time from the Drift fleet. This could potentially allow for over escapement issues within the river drainages if the fleet was too restricted by the allocation plan.

#64-#65 – no action due to #63
#66 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, John seconds
0/6 – proposal **fails**

The allocation protects the Kvichak setnetters and allows for more distribution of the catch between gear types.

#67 - proposal adopted, Greg moves, SJ seconds
the department is opposed to this proposal
0/6 – proposal **fails**
#68 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds
1/5 – proposal **fails**

For: Levelock is a small community where there is not much economic prospects, fishing is the main source of income. Allowing for an inriver fishery effort from the community could increase.

Against: The fishery in river could lower quality as the tenders would have farther to travel, may hold fish longer and the quality of in river caught fish is lower than those caught in salt water.

#69 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds
0/6 – proposal **fails**
#70 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds
0/6 – proposal **fails**
#71- proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds
0/6 – proposal **fails**

In the AC's opinion fishing in river is the last resort, when fishing in river the quality of the product drops. It should be kept as a tool by the Department to manage with. If the setnetters are allowed more area to fish in, it could potentially bring in more effort shifting the allocation unequally.

#72 – no action due to #71

#73 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

0/6 – proposal **fails**

#74 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

0/6 – proposal **fails**

#77 - proposal adopted, Greg moves, John seconds

0/6 – proposal **fails**

The Department needs to be able manage by run strength not by a constricted preset schedule in order to protect the rivers from over escapement issues.

Sport Fish proposals

Craig on teleconference from Dillingham listening in and commenting on meeting and proposals

#3 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

Craig commented that barbs haven't been proven to appreciably effect longevity of fish. Scott comments that it may be difficult to enforce.

0/6 – proposal **fails**

#4 - proposal adopted, Lyle moves, Greg seconds

0/6 – proposal **fails**

#9 – If a sub committee is formed then we would request to be involved in the talks or the ground rules.

no action at this time based on comments

No Contact with Lem Butler, game biologist, he is out of the office so we will postpone the game proposals until January of February. Further discussion on the 2013 commercial fishing season

APPENDIX C

~~Page 02~~

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Date: 10/17/2012

Page 1 of 4

ADVISORY COMMITTEE NAME: NAR/KVI

Location (City, town, village): NANNEK, AK

Members Present: SONNY ZELAN, RICHARD WILSON, RALPH ZIMIN, HOWARD NELSON, BRIAN CATO, RYAN WILSON, FRED PIKE, EVERETT THOMPSON

Members Absent: JOE KLUTSCH, JOEY KLUTSCH, MARC WATSON
ALT. KEN PULICE

Members Excused: _____

QUORUM PRESENT: YES NO

ADF&G Staff Present: JASON DYE - SCOTT QUIST
SLIM MORSTAD ADFG, JOE WITTOP
PROTECTION, VINCE WEBSTER BAF

Time meeting called to order 9:00 AM / PM

Old Business and New Business: - Use additional pages

Time Meeting Adjourned 10:10 AM / PM

Signature:


Committee Secretary

APPENDIX C
Page 2 of 6

~~SECRET~~

ADVISORY COMMITTEE NAR/KVI

DATE 10/17/2012

Name	Name
FRED PIKE	NARNEK
Byron Willson	NARNEK
VINCE WEBSTER	KING SALMON
Howard Nelson	Noknek
Slim	ADFG
Richard Wise	NARNEK
Brian Cato	King Salmon
Mary West	King Salmon
Wili By	NARNEK
Sp. White	Noknek
Everett Thompson	Noknek
Ralph Zimier	King Salmon
Lakota Lou Thompson	Noknek
Scott Quist	AWT
Jason Dye	ADFG

NAKNEK/KVICHAK A.C. MINUTES

October 17,2012

The meeting was called to order by William “Sonny” Regan at 7PM.

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Richard Wilson and 2nd by Fred Pike. Corrections and additions to the agenda were as follow: Nak/Kvi was inserted in place of Lake Iliamna in the title, fish was inserted in place of game under new business, BOF work session report and BOF general process, was added under new business.

Motion carried 8-0.

Motion to approve the minutes of February 2, 2012 was made by Fred Pike, 2nd by Ryan Willson. **Motion carried 8-0.**

Board of Fish Work Session Report- Fred Pike attended the meeting Oct. 9-11, 2012, held in Anchorage at the Egan Center. The first day consisted of Election of Officers, reports from standing committees and task force reports, new assignments for these same committees for 2012-2013, BOF procedural changes and Record Copies (RC’s) number of pages allowed (changed from 10 to 5) single sided.

Oct. 10 dealt with reports from ADFG as follows: status of Chinook Salmon Research Plan, new escapement goals of rivers systems in the state, stocks of concern, and Yukon Emergency Regulation. CFEC reported on the general implications of permit stacking. The remainder of the day dealt with the 21 ACR’s (agenda change requests) of which four were approved to be taken up, the others either failed or no action was taken on them. From these ACR’s seven board generated proposals will come forth in the future. The final half day was spent on WASSIP (Western Alaska Salmon Stock Identification Project). The scientific panel took the audience through the various processes involved in this report which will be available online November 19,2012.

Board of Fish Process- Vince Webster, BOF member gave the AC committee and audience a run down on the board process.

Escapement goals- Slim Morstad (ADFG com fish) gave a brief report on the reason for the proposed escapement goals in Bristol Bay. ADFG are required by law to manage for maximum sustained yield (MSY). Proposed changes to escapement for each river is as follows: Naknek 900,000- 2,000,000, Egegik 900,000-2,000,000, Ugashik 600,000-1,400,000, Wood 800,000-1,800,000, Nushagak 400,000-900,000, Igushik 200,000-420,000. The Kvichak and Togiak escapement goals remain unchanged.

Slim stated that his management practices will not change. Everett Thompson questioned what would happen in the future under new management. **A motion was made by Everett Thompson and 2nd by Fred Pike to apprise the BOF of our concern about increasing the escapement goal in the Naknek River. Motion carried 8-0.** Managing for and OEG would be more acceptable.

Fin-fish Proposals:

1 Motion by Ryan Willson, 2nd by Richard Wilson, after discussion a friendly **amendment** was made by Brian Cato, 2nd by Ryan Willson to **include the Naknek River** in this proposal. **Amendment carried 8-0, Main Motion 8-0**

3 Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd by Ryan Willson ; barb-less hooks were discussed and after Jason Dye, ADFG sports fish, stated that there was not any significant difference in the mortality of fish using barb-less hooks vs. barbed hooks the question was called for.

Motion Failed 0-8

4 Motion by Fred Pike, 2nd by Ryan Willson: it was felt that though the intent was good the proposal was written in such a way as to lend to confusion and unnecessary protection problems.

Motion Failed 0-8

9 Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd by Richard Wilson: we are in agreement that the fishing on the Naknek River has gotten to a point that has become hard to handle. It is evident with the number of closed fishing lodges, but the proposal does not speak to a definite plan.

No Action.

11 Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd by Ryan Willson: We are opposed to this as it will allow the seine fleet an opportunity of unlimited harvest (more than the 70/30 split).

Motion Failed 0-8

15 Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd by Brian Cato: set nets fish at sites other than register sites. This will create more gear conflict.

Motion Failed 0-8

16 Motion by Fred Pike, 2nd by Everett Thompson: this proposal will allow set nets to fish during closed periods.

Motion Failed 0-8

17 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd by Everett Thompson: this proposal will close a loop-hole that was not anticipated when permit stacking was allowed.

Motion Carried 8-0

19 Motion by Fred Pike, 2nd by Richard Wilson: this would eliminate drift fishing in the inside waters of Ugashik Bay.

Motion Failed 0-8

20 Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd by Richard Wilson: this would restrict set nets in open fishing waters.

Motion Failed 0-8

21,22 Motion by Ryan Willson, 2nd Everett Thompson: ridiculous .

Motion Failed 0-8

23 Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Brian Cato: would create a nightmare for protection, ghost nets.

Motion Failed 0-8

24 Motion Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson, more gear conflicts!

Motion Failed 0-8

25 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Ralph Zimin: possible escapement problems for the Nushagak, sport fish problems.

Motion Failed 0-8

26-30 No Action

31 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Ryan Willson: would create problems as reported by Scott Quist, ADFG Protection.

Motion Failed 0-8

32-35 Motion by Brian Cato, 2nd by Everett Thompson: This has been thoroughly discussed for the past 30 years!

Motion Failed 1-7 One individual supports a 36 foot limit.

36,37,238 Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson: this is more beneficial to non- Bristol Bay watershed residents as the economic capabilities are greater and may further work to take away permits from the Bristol Bay region.

Motion Failed 1-7 One individual owns two drift permits and therefore in support.

39,40 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Fred Pike: harvesting potential increases with the amount of gear in use, potentially intercepting more fish bound for the Kvichak River.

Motion Failed 1-7 If you are fishing another district that should be okay.

41,42 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Everett Thompson: The ability to have two permit holders onboard and allow 200 fathoms of gear was put in place as a matter of economics and to take a portion of gear out of the water. It has worked successfully and can continue to do the same.

Motion Failed 0-8

43 No Action

44-54 Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson: allowing set net permits to be stacked has made set net operations a viable means of earning a living.

Motion Carried 8-0

55 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Ryan Willson: this would create additional gear conflicts between not only drift but other set net operations.

Motion Failed 0-8

56 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd by Ralph Zimin: Very few fish are harvested prior to June 25th. It is not a problem for the department.

Motion Failed 1-7 minority opinion would like to requiring registration for all districts prior to fishing.

57 No Action

58-61 Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson: the general district has been tried previously, with the WASSIP report coming out soon we would like to see these results prior to any changes, the department felt that the general district did not accomplish what it intended to do, and has the potential to have a damaging effect.

Motion Failed 1-7 minority opinion fished the general district and enjoyed the open area.

62 No Action

63-65 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Ryan Willson: when formed historic catch figures were used to develop the allocations, the allocation plans have worked most of the time as is,

Motion Failed 0-8

66 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Brian Cato: allocation plans gives managers the ability to fish the two groups at different times, which aids in management.

67 Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson: This would tie management's hands by creating mandatory fishing periods.

Motion Failed 0-8

68 No Action

69 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Everett Thompson: though well intended it may create unforeseen circumstances, legal issues.

Motion Failed 0-8

70 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Howard Nelson: this is un-needed complication of management for such a little used area.

Motion Failed 0-8

71,72 Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson: this area would be open to all set net permit holders who could come from other districts without re-registering or waiting creating a management nightmare.

Motion Failed 1-7 minority opinion felt this would allow for people to make a living.

73 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Ryan Willson: proposal speaks to quality but the intention of management is to harvest as many fish as possible when restricted to the NRSWA.

Motion Failed 0-8

76 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Everett Thompson: this takes away tools form management making it more difficult to prosecute the fishery.

Motion Failed 0-8

201 Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Ralph Zimin: WASSIP report important to this issue.

Motion Carried 8-0

202 Motion by Ryan Willson, 2nd Richard Wilson: WASSIP report important to this issue.

Motion Carried 8-0**203 No Action****BOF generated proposal on Chinook- No Action**

We will try and schedule our next meeting for January 10 or 11, 2013. The agenda will include: elections (4 three year terms; Fred Pike, William “Sonny” Regan, Everett Thompson, Marc Watson), BOG proposals, representative for Area M meeting.

The meeting was adjourned by general consensus at 10:10PM

Respectfully Submitted by,

Fred Pike, Nak/Kvi AC secretary

AC members: Co-Chairs Sonny Regan (2012), Everett Thompson (2012), secretary Fred Pike (2012), Marc Watson (2012), Joe Klutsch (2013), Joey Klutsch (2013), Richard Wilson (2013), Ryan Willson (2014), Ralph Zimin (2014), Howard Nelson (Levelock Rep), Alternates: Ken Pulice (2013), Brian Cato (2014).

THESE MINUTES PROVIDED COURTESY OF THE F/V SPIKE

October 20, 2012

Susie Jenkins-Brito
Memo to ADFG Board Support
Dillingham, AK

Re: AC materials

Susie,

Some of our AC members are not receiving AC information could you check with the names at the bottom of our AC minutes. Members and Alternates are listed as well as the year their term expires. If you have any questions or need further information you may contact me at fvspike@yahoo.com. I have turned in all of the required elections forms; they may have gone to Alissa Joseph in Bethel.

Thank you for your help in conducting our meetings!

Fred Pike
Nak/Kvi secretary

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES
DECEMBER 4–12, 2012
BRISTOL BAY FINFISH

Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee Comments

Bristol Bay Subsistence (1 proposal)

PROPOSAL 1 **ACTION: As Amended – Support - Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Allow for a weekend subsistence schedule in the Nushagak District.
AMENDMENT: Include the Naknek River
DISCUSSION: Motion by Ryan Willson, 2nd by Richard Wilson, after discussion a friendly amendment was made by Brian Cato, 2nd by Ryan Willson to **include the Naknek River** in this proposal. **Amendment carried 8-0**

Bristol Bay Sportfish (8 proposals)

PROPOSAL 2 **ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Increase nonretention, no bait waters of the Nushagak River.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd by Ryan Willson; barb-less hooks were discussed and after Jason Dye, ADFG sports fish, stated that there was not any significant difference in the mortality of fish using barb-less hooks vs. barbed hooks the question was called for.

PROPOSAL 4 **ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Prohibit putting fish parts in water where use of bait is prohibited.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Motion by Fred Pike, 2nd by Ryan Willson: it was felt that though the intent was good the proposal was written in such a way as to lend to confusion and unnecessary protection problems.

PROPOSAL 9 **ACTION: No Action**
DESCRIPTION: Limit guided access to rivers.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd by Richard Wilson: we are in agreement that the fishing on the Naknek River has gotten to a point that has become hard to handle. It is evident with the number of closed fishing lodges, but the proposal does not speak to a definite plan.

Bristol Bay Herring (5 proposals)

PROPOSAL 11

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Remove the necessity for maintaining catch percentages between gear groups inseason by emergency order (EO).

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd by Ryan Willson: We are opposed to this as it will allow the seine fleet an opportunity of unlimited harvest (more than the 70/30 split).

Bristol Bay Salmon (73 proposals)

Fishing Gear Specifications and Operations (11 proposals)

PROPOSAL 15

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow set gillnet anchors and running lines at registered sites to remain in the water during closed periods.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd by Brian Cato: set nets fish at sites other than register sites. This will create more gear conflict.

PROPOSAL 16

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow set gillnet gear to remain in place between fishing periods on consecutive tides.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Fred Pike, 2nd by Everett Thompson: this proposal will allow set nets to fish during closed periods.

PROPOSAL 17

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: In the Nushagak District, prohibit a permit holder from operating a set gillnet seaward of another set gillnet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd by Everett Thompson: this proposal will close a loop-hole that was not anticipated when permit stacking was allowed.

PROPOSAL 19

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Restrict drift gillnet gear from fishing within 1,000 feet from the mean high-tide line.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Fred Pike, 2nd by Richard Wilson: this would eliminate drift fishing in the inside waters of Ugashik Bay.

PROPOSAL 20

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow only historical set gillnet sites on the outside beaches of Ugashik District.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd by Richard Wilson: this would restrict set nets in open fishing waters.

PROPOSAL 21 **ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Require name of permit holder on stationary gear.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Motion by Ryan Willson, 2nd Everett Thompson: ridiculous .

PROPOSAL 22 **ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Change marking requirement from six inches to twelve inches in height.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Motion by Ryan Willson, 2nd Everett Thompson: ridiculous .

PROPOSAL 23 **ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Remove the drift gillnet marking requirement that a cork must be marked every 10 fathoms and mark only at each end of the drift gillnet with vessel ADF&G number.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Brian Cato: would create a nightmare for protection, ghost nets.

PROPOSAL 24 **ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Allow seine nets in Bristol Bay for permit holders who hold two Bristol Bay drift gillnet permits.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Motion Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson, more gear conflicts!

PROPOSAL 25 **ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Create a new troll fishery for coho salmon outside commercial fishing districts of Bristol Bay.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Ralph Zimin: possible escapement problems for the Nushagak, sport fish problems.

Closed Waters (4 proposals)

PROPOSAL's 26 – 30 **ACTION: NO Action**

Vessels (5 proposals)

PROPOSAL 31 **ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Allow vessels with permanent markings to be exempt from dual marking requirements when vessel is used in more than one salmon fishery.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Ryan Willson: would create problems as reported by Scott Quist, ADFG Protection.

PROPOSAL's 32-35

ACTION: Opposed – 7 Oppose 1 Support

DESCRIPTION: Increase vessel length up to 42 feet in length based on vessel processing capabilities.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Brian Cato, 2nd by Everett Thompson: This has been thoroughly discussed for the past 30 years! One individual supports a 36 foot limit.

Permit Stacking (20 proposals)

PROPOSAL's 36, 37, 38, 238

ACTION: Opposed – 7 Oppose 1 Support

DESCRIPTION: Allow one permit holder who owns two drift gillnet permits 200 fathoms of drift gillnet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson: this is more beneficial to non-Bristol Bay watershed residents as the economic capabilities are greater and may further work to take away permits from the Bristol Bay region. One individual owns two drift permits and therefore in support.

PROPOSAL's 39, 40

ACTION: Opposed – 7 Oppose 1 Support

DESCRIPTION: Allow dual drift gillnet permit holders 200 fathoms in other districts when Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSWA) is open.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Fred Pike: harvesting potential increases with the amount of gear in use, potentially intercepting more fish bound for the Kvichak River.

Motion Failed 1-7 If you are fishing another district that should be okay.

PROPOSAL's 41, 42

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Disallow permit stacking in Bristol Bay.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Everett Thompson: The ability to have two permit holders onboard and allow 200 fathoms of gear was put in place as a matter of economics and to take a portion of gear out of the water. It has worked successfully and can continue to do the same.

PROPOSAL 43

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Disallow additional drift gillnet gear for dual permit vessels in the Togiak District.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL's 44 – 54

ACTION: Support – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson: allowing set net permits to be stacked has made set net operations a viable means of earning a living.

PROPOSAL 55

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow two set gillnet permit holders to fish 100 fathoms on a single site.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Ryan Willson: this would create additional gear conflicts between not only drift but other set net operations.

Registration and Reregistration (1 proposal)

PROPOSAL 56

ACTION: Opposed – 7 Oppose 1 Support

DESCRIPTION: Prior to June 25, if a drift gillnet permit holder intends to fish in either the Ugashik or Egegik district they must be registered for that district.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd by Ralph Zimin: Very few fish are harvested prior to June 25th. It is not a problem for the department.

Motion Failed 1-7 minority opinion would like to requiring registration for all districts prior to fishing.

Bristol Bay Management Plans (31 proposals)

Genetics (1 proposal)

PROPOSAL 57

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Placeholder for possible regulatory changes based on results from Western Alaska Salmon Stock Identification Project (WASSIP).

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

General District (4 proposals)

PROPOSAL's 58-61

ACTION: Opposed – 7 Oppose 1 Support

DESCRIPTION: Open General District.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson: the general district has been tried previously, with the WASSIP report coming out soon we would like to see these results prior to any changes, the department felt that the general district did not accomplish what it intended to do, and has the potential to have a damaging effect.

Motion Failed 1-7 minority opinion fished the general district and enjoyed the open area.

Bristol Bay Restructuring Plan and Process (1 proposal)

PROPOSAL 62

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Develop a process for addressing future proposals deemed as Bristol Bay salmon industry restructuring proposals.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Bristol Bay Allocation Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL 63, 64, 65

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Increase set gillnet allocation in Nushagak, Naknek-Kvichak, Egegik and Ugashik districts.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Ryan Willson: when formed historic catch figures were used to develop the allocations, the allocation plans have worked most of the time as is,

Naknek-Kvichak Management and Allocation Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL 66

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Remove set and drift gillnet allocations.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Brian Cato: allocation plans gives managers the ability to fish the two groups at different times, which aids in management.

PROPOSAL 67

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Stagger fishing periods throughout run.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson: This would tie management's hands by creating mandatory fishing periods.

PROPOSAL 68

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Open a new set gillnet fishery at Levelock when Kvichak River reaches minimum escapement.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Alagnak River Special Harvest Area Management Plan (2 proposals)

PROPOSAL 69

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Open Alagnak River Special Harvest Area (ARSHA) to set gillnets when the Kvichak Section is open.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Everett Thompson: though well intended it may create unforeseen circumstances, legal issues.

PROPOSAL 70

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Change the allocation plan in the Alagnak River Special Harvest Area (ARSHA) to 84% drift and 16% set.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Howard Nelson: this is un-needed complication of management for such a little used area.

Naknek River Special Harvest Area Management Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL 71, 72

ACTION: Opposed – 7 Oppose 1 Support

DESCRIPTION: Open the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) to set gillnet gear when the Naknek River escapement goal is met.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Everett Thompson, 2nd Richard Wilson: this area would be open to all set net permit holders who could come from other districts without re-registering or waiting creating a management nightmare.

Motion Failed 1-7 minority opinion felt this would allow for people to make a living.

PROPOSAL 73

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Limit the amount of gillnet on board a drift vessel to 75 fathoms in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA).

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Ryan Willson: proposal speaks to quality but the intention of management is to harvest as many fish as possible when restricted to the NRSHA.

Nushagak-Mulchatna King Salmon Management Plan (4 proposals)

PROPOSAL 76

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Restrict commercial fishing to no more than 3 tides in a 48-hour period and fishing time may not exceed 24 hours in length.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Motion by Richard Wilson, 2nd Everett Thompson: this takes away tools form management making it more difficult to prosecute the fishery.

Supplemental Proposals

PROPOSAL 239

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Limit sport and guided sport fishing for king salmon in the Nushagak River drainage, excluding the Wood River drainage, to unbaited, single-hook, artificial lures from May 1 through July 31.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Nushagak ADFG Advisory Committee Meeting

November 1 & 2, 2012

Dillingham City Council Chambers

Minutes

I. Call To Order: 9:09 AM

II. Roll Call: Present in chambers

Hans Nicholson – Chair

Frank (Woodsy) Woods – Dlg Vice-Chair

Dan Dunaway – Dlg Secretary

Robin Samuelson – Dlg

Chris Carr – Portage Cr.

Jonathan Forsling – Togak

Glen (Skin) Wysoki – Koliganek

Peter Christopher New Stuyahok

Joe Chythlook – Dlg

Louie Alakyak – Manokotak-

Joe Kazimirowicz – Ekwok

Attending by phone:

Lloyd (Tom) O'Connor – Dlg

Joe Wassily - Clark's Point – joined meeting at 1:03 PM

III. Seat Village Representatives

Joe C moved, Frank W 2nd to seat Village Reps. Adopted by unanimous consent.

IV. Approve Agenda:

Joe C move, Frank W 2nd to adopt agenda. Chair suggests altering agenda to skip Area M proposals for another meeting after Nov. 19 when the WASSIP results are available.

Adopted as amended by unanimous consent.

V. Approve Minutes of March 20 meeting:

Robin S. moved, Jon F 2nd. Adopted by unanimous consent.

VI. Introductions: All people in attendance introduced themselves and who they represented. **(See Sign-in sheet attached).**

Chair introduced & welcomed Susan Jenkins-Brito, the new ADFG Board Support Coordinator for SW Alaska Region. Susan outlined her background and experience with ADFG, and current activities related to her Board Support position. She also pointed out that all Board Support positions are currently filled after some extensive vacancies. Several AC members expressed relief and approval that Boards is fully staffed. There were observations that Ms Brito seems to have hit the ground running and has already shown a lot of productive effort and public support.

VII. ADFG Staff Reports:

Commercial Fish

Area Commercial Biologist Tim Sands presented his report on **Togiak Herring**: Main points were: 16 seiners, 18 gillnetters. At some point the gillnetters plugged their tenders. There was a lot of bad weather. The seiners were shut down for 1.5 days to help get the harvest allocations balanced with the gillnetters. ADFG closed seine fleet May 22 because processors stopped gillnetters – and to balance allocation. ADFG never restricted harvest by gear type after May 23 as no processors were plugged or stopped by 1 gear type. By the end of the season seiners had harvested 86.6% of their quota, gillnetters 63.67 % of that quota. Word is the price was better than expected and final value may be about \$4 million. For 2013 ADFG forecasts there will be 30,000 tons available for harvest. There were a number of comments and questions on how ADFG managed the for the allocation, how the forecast is developed, expected actual 2013 harvest. Tim outlined past and present herring management budget – explained that as value of harvest has declined, so had mgt budget.

Salmon: Nushagak red return since 1988 and lowest escapement since 1977. Using the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA) allow more harvest while achieving the minimum escapement goal . Age composition of the return was discussed as well as various forecasting models.

Nushagak Kings: Planned to fish only if escapement info allowed, no directed king openings and waited for red openers until 100K reds escaped into the Wood R. Unusual early Wood R. red run and few early commercial openings resulted in achieving the Nushagak R king esc. goal by the end of July – a rarity for king stocks across Alaska.

Sands related day-by-day Wood R red escapement and management decisions starting June 25 onward. Escapement was unusually low. Regulations direct when to open for set-nets and they can serve as a test fishery. ADFG decided to go for the low end of the escapement goal to balance some of the huge escapement of previous years and for economic benefits to fleet. The slow escapement caused Sands to have short openings. At the end of the season drift netters produced 67% of the catch, below allocation. Frequently the drift fleet had slightly exceeded its allocation – this year the situation was reversed.

Pink Fishery: Effort was strong catch was about 960K pinks caught and escapement was large; 100,000 coho caught and estimated 300,000 escaped into the Nushagak R. The general program of openings was discussed. Fishing time had to be restricted to protect coho escapement. The sonar ran into August allowing management decisions and escapement estimates. With the very cold spring of 2012 ADFG is uncertain what to expect for the 2014-15 returns. A federal survey of juvenile salmon in the Bering Sea in 2009 found low numbers.

There was a Q&A and comments. Sands discussed some juvenile king feeding research, how recent wet summers might affect juv salmon. One comment that the short openings were hard on the drift fleet. Peter Christopher observed that in the 50's & 60's there was lots more snow in the area, lots of high water and there weren't problems with salmon

back then. Concerns were expressed about Bering Sea trawl by-catch. There was a question if any studies have been done on under-ice predation on juvenile salmon and wondered at the large number of large Dolly Varden caught during the salmon fishery.

There was a discussion on the tide stage at the start of openings, especially in the WRSWA. Sands offered that catches this year might have been reduced in the WRSWA as the low numbers running had most fish close to the banks and not scattered all across the river as in some past seasons. Sands emphasized several times that in the last 10 years the Nushagak fishery has experienced some of the highest returns ever recorded and that a more historically “normal” run would seem poor by comparison; “we can’t expect to have a 7 million harvest every season”.

Another comment was that of wide variety of regulations to the fishery over the years, the recent gear allocation might be the most significant and have a significant impact; the AC should take action on this aspect.

There was a question as to how there was such a large coho escapement. Sands explained that he had 12 hour openers as that was what he understood the processors could manage, that the openers were targeting pinks, the processors wanted pinks not coho and were encouraging fishers to use smaller mesh pink nets. Then the processors left by Aug. 8 while the sonar counter continued until August 15 or so – counting more fish.

Sands pointed out that the gear allocation plan is a real help to him, allows him to have a few openings that can be expected to be of low impact. Without the allocation plan he couldn’t open one gear type at a time and it would make the district much harder to manage.

12:00 Noon Lunch Break.

1:03 Meeting resumed. Joe Wassily, rep for Clarks Point joins by teleconference. More salmon fishery discussion.

There was a question about the ADFG’s revisions to the king and red escapement goals in Bristol Bay. Sands explained that in the case of sockeye, the Dept had analyzed their historic collections of scale samples genetically and had used the data to revise their brood tables and hence their escapement goals. Generally the central point of the goals didn’t change much but the lower and upper ends tended to move, some stocks more than others and frequently the upper escapement goal went up quite a bit. In the case of Nushagak kings, the escapement counts are now done with a Didson sonar that counts differently and more fish (but not all) and is set up to count a larger portion of the river’s width – but not all of it. So old Nush. King Esc. goals were converted from Bendix numbers to Didson numbers after running the two systems side by side to develop a conversion model. ADFG feels Didson counts better but not all fish, just a higher proportion of them, especially kings that are thought in some cases to swim along the bottom in the middle of the river. The Bendix machines are now “dead” gone and no longer useable. Sands said to get the very best assessment of the Didson’s effectiveness requires a huge expensive mark recapture study with weirs on main tributaries and a lot of personnel etc.

Sands explained that ADFG is required to review their escapement goals every 3 yrs to meet the directive of determining “what number of spawners is needed to produce the maximum sustainable harvest”. He said he had just received the table of revised and update escapement goals.

A discussion of the meaning of BEG - Biological Escapement Goal vs SEG- Sustainable Escapement Goal. Sands says it is difficult to set a BEG where there is a mixed stock harvest.

Robin S said these new numbers means we'll have to fix the trigger numbers in the Nushagak Chinook Salmon Mgt Plan. Sands indicated a place-holder proposal had been submitted by ADFG [74]. Sands added his concern, that as written, the “king plan” might require closures to subsistence users yet the commercial fishery could remain open. He inquired if a adding the option for a mesh restriction to the subsistence fishery would be an acceptable approach.

There was a discussion on the meaning of OEG- Optimum Escapement Goal and how it can be used.

Sands discussed counting towers vs sonar counters and why ADFG doesn't put sonars into the Wood, Igushik and Togiak Rivers. The towers work well. When sonar was tried on the lower reaches of the Togiak there were apportionment problems and other difficulties.

Robin S said he wanted to make a motion on the proposed new escapement goals.

MOTION

Robin Samuelson moved that under sockeye salmon management, the AC oppose ADFG's new escapement goals for the Igushik, Wood, Nushagak rivers. Frank Woods 2nd.

In discussion there were numerous complaints of the lateness of ADFG's suggested new goals. Robin expressed concern for the apparent significant changes to the escapement goals. He thinks ADFG should vet the information more completely, that other AC's have expressed their concerns even opposition, and therefore he is opposed to the Departments new goals. We should go for OEGs instead. Kurt A asked who sets OEGs. Sands: BOF. Other comments: these new goals could really hurt fishermen in these recent poorer season. We don't believe putting more fish up the rivers will help. ADGS needs to take more time and do more analysis. Robin Samuelson requested a letter from ADFG explaining the process for the new goals. We need more time and would like more input.

Sands regretted not having more information to explain the new goals but said a large committee, possibly including fisheries scientists from the Univ. Washington participated, reviewed data and conclusions. It wasn't done lightly.

Someone commented we get micromanaged while Area M doesn't have to meet the standards anywhere near those imposed on Bristol Bay fisheries.

Adopted unanimous.

Troopers FWP

Due his flight schedule Trooper Scott Quist was invited to give his report before the remaining ADFG staff.

Trooper Scott Quist, now based in King Salmon presented some information on the FWP activities and wanted to speak to 4 proposals.

The 2012 summer fisheries enforcement program was very similar to the previous several years. FWP continues to work to have crew and equipment positioned at key points and times throughout the season. There were 18 troopers and 11 civilian workers deployed for a total of slightly less than 10,000 man-hours of work. Patrol vessels Stimson and Woldstad were used. A total of 4,800 contacts were made, 280 warnings issued, 218 citations issued, 615 vessel boardings of which 106 were in the Nushagak District. FWP vessels also coordinated with the Coast Guard for courtesy checks and inspections.

Quist said there were no significant or out-of-the ordinary issues found. Common violations were boundary violations, especially on the Johnson Hill line and the south boundary of the Nushagak.

To a question of measuring nets Quist explained that he was aware of rumors of nets of illegal depths, that they measure net depth at midpoints as well as at the ends and so far haven't found any violations despite ongoing rumors.

Sport & Subsistence Fishing Enforcement: FWP personnel assigned to sport fishing enforcement made 1,700 sport contacts, issued 65 warnings and 45 citations. Though a person in attendance expressed concern that enforcement cited a subsistence user, Mr. Quist was unfamiliar with the situation and was unaware of any other enforcement issues related to subsistence fishing.

FWP comments on Proposal 23 cork marking: FWP Opposes 23 as it could be too easy to remove 1 or 2 corks at the ends of nets and leave a "ghost net" to fish. FWP worked hard to get the current marking rule, believes its a good one and hope it stays in place.

A fisher asked Quist about discretion officers have regarding enforcement of net lighting, boundary line, and definition of drift net fishing regulations. Complained that in the WRSHA fishery, a drift boat was clearly fishing for an extended time while grounded and that officers present seemed to ignore the situation. A trooper reprimanded a fisherman for a net light that wasn't shining due to conditions insufficient to activate the on switch – though it was shown the light was functioning and would activate once it was dark enough. Quist said he was unaware of the situation and would look into it.

FWP comments on Proposal 31 dual set / drift boat markings: Quist explained if a boat is used for set netting, FWP really needs it to be marked with the set net permit number and marks must clearly identify the permit used, as well a properly marked for drift fishing. This is an occasional problem for some B Bay boats that are also used for drift fishing.

FWP comments on Proposals 32-35 Vessel length & refrigeration: Quist said FWP saw serious enforcement problems if its related to the equipment onboard. Equipment may or may not work or be used, would require boarding to know the situation.

FWP comments on Proposals 58-61 General District: FWP has concerns how boundaries might be drawn and if adopted hopes boundaries are straight easy to identify, not curved. It should be easy to comply and enforce.

Trooper Quist departed the meeting shortly after giving his presentation.

ADFG Commercial Fisheries Staff Reports Continued:

Matt Jones, Nushagak / Togiak assistant area biologist: Togiak Salmon 2012. For much of the season the water was high but did not affect tower counts. Total Togiak run was 10% above forecast of 750,000 for a count of 829,000 sockeye. Harvest was 626,000 above the 20 yr average of about 500,000. There was an increase in drift effort compared to recent seasons. About 203,000 sockeye were counted at the tower, slightly above the escapement goal. The king harvest was 4,600 fish, well below the 20 yr avg of 8,500 and the 2012 coho take was 13,000 fish. Catch Per Unit Effort for coho was good. A total of 72 drift permits participated in the Togiak salmon fishery. The set net permit count wasn't available. Mr. Jones pointed out that at the last BOF meeting there was a proposal to terminate the Super Exclusive status of the Togiak fishery but that it was not adopted.

There was a question regarding the status of Kulukuk kings. Com. Fish staff pointed out they have concerns and therefore don't open the area commercially. Sport Fish biologist Dye said guide log book data shows an estimated 204 angler days in the drainage, and a total sport harvest of 8 kings. Dye also said that the Kulukuk sport fishery is not big enough to produce useful data in the Statewide Sport Fishing Harvest Survey.

Bristol Bay Sport Fisheries presentation, Area Biologist Jason Dye:

Mr. Dye handed out a graph of the Nushagak king and coho sport management for the seasons 2010 through 2012 as well as copies of the Nushagak River Management Plans for chinook and coho salmon. Dye provided a briefing on the management actions taken in the sport fishery for the 2012 king season. June 28 the seasonal and daily bag limits were reduced due to low sonar counts. Statewide low returns of king salmon added to the Dept.'s cautious management on the Nushagak R. By July 2 escapement improved and the seasonal bag limit was restored to 4 kings; on July 7 the daily limit was restored to the normal 2 over 28 inches. The 2012 sonar count was 107,786 kings, and rough estimate of total run is about 136,000 kings (Bendix equivalent), the biggest total run since 2006. The very slow sockeye escapement into the Wood R. and cautious management of the commercial fishery appears to have greatly aided the strong escapement of Nushagak chinook – one of the very few good 2012 king runs statewide.

A sport fishing guide expressed frustration that ADFG Sport Fish cannot issue Emergency Orders during a weekend. Weekend clients coming from Anchorage are a key to his business and he wished the restoration of bag limits could have been done more quickly and as soon as the sonar counts were available. He went on to say that 4 days in the peak period of the Nushagak king run can make all the difference to his business.

To a question on sport catch (fish released + kept) and harvest (fish kept) of Nushagak kings, Dye said the 2012 data won't be available until spring 2013 but recent historic catch averages 35,000 to 40,000 kings and harvest has been about 6,000 kings killed. Dye said based on a Kenai River study the mortality on kings released by sport anglers might be around 3,000 fish.

At this, Dye explained that during the October 2012 Board of Fish workshop, the board decided to submit a proposal to restrict the Nushagak king fishery to single hooks and prohibit use of bait from May 1 to July 31.

At the time of this discussion the full text of the proposal was not yet available from the State. Ms Brito said she'd been told the proposal was supposed to be on the ADFFG website by November 4.

Some in attendance expressed disappointment at the short notice and unavailability of the Board generated proposal.

Dye then mentioned that ADFG Sport and Commercial divisions are working together on a study to assess the number of kings not counted by the new Didson sonar. The new sonar does not cover the entire width of the river / river bottom.

Motion: Chris Carr moved, Jon Forsling 2nd : to oppose the new numbers recommended by ADFG in their process to update the SEGS for Nushagak River chinook, chum, coho and pink salmon. **Motion carried unanimous.**

ADFG Bristol Bay Subsistence presentation. Ted Kreig:

Ted said his office is working on collecting and summarizing the 2012 season subsistence data and that it isn't done yet, please send or call in your salmon information asap. He encourages people to provide the most accurate information possible, date, location catch and species. Sarah Evans continues work on the Togiak subsistence spawn on kelp study and hope to have the report read by the December BOF meeting.

USFWS Togiak Refuge, Andy Aderman wildlife biologist.

This presentation was taken at this time to allow biologists to resume field work. Andy discussed the Nushagak Peninsula caribou herd: The herd seems in good shape, 86 animals taken during the 2011-12 hunt, 2 in the fall remainder in late winter, 3rd highest harvest since hunting began, 120 permits issued, Togiak took 15; population estimated to be 859 in fall of 2011.

So far in 2012-13 season, 902 animals counted, 30 hunt permits were designated for this fall, 26 were issued 9 animals killed so far. The refuge expects to issue more permits this year than last as the herd goal is 750 animals. The unused permits issued this fall are good thru the spring 2013 portion of this season. The fall hunt runs August- September and the winter spring hunt runs from November thru March – essentially the “old season dates”.

There was a short discussion of the Kilbuk caribou, that they use the northerly portions of the Togiak Refuge but aren't known to mix with the transplanted animals that make up the Nushagak Peninsula herd.

ADFG Board Support presentation Susan [Susie] Jenkins-Brito:

Susie spoke a little of her background, is now the Board Support Coordinator for SW Alaska, all Board Support positions are filled statewide for the first time in a while.

Brito apologized that she hadn't sent out previous meeting minutes or packets to all AC members as she was missing addresses, phone numbers, email address and even names of who sat on the committee from some communities. During the vacancy of her position, and the Bethel position, a lot had been lost or changed. She has attended training, dug thru local and Juneau files and consulted with people previously filling the position to reconstruct membership lists, term expirations etc. Its been a big job and she thanked all who have helped her.

Several AC members thanked her for her hard work, acknowledged that they were aware of her extensive activities during the short time she has been on board. AC members also expressed their approval and relief that Board Support is fully staffed, especially in time for the important coming Board meetings.

Brito went on to remind all present that written comments for the December Bristol Bay BOF meeting are due in Juneau or her Dillingham office November 19 to be published in the "BOF BOOK". She said that written comments can be submitted right up to when the Board addresses a proposal but they won't be published in The Book. Brito said all BOF members will be issued iPads for this coming meeting to assist them in their work.

WASSIP: Brito: the complete WASSIP genetic salmon study is supposed to be released Nov 19. A place-holder proposal has been inserted into the proposal books to allow the information to be used in regulations formation. While WASSIP will be discussed in the Bristol Bay meeting, it is expected that most of the data, discussion and actions will be done during the Area M portion of the BOF meeting.

OTHER AGENCIES

BBNA – Bristol Bay Native Association: No formal presentation. The various BB groups are planning to send a group of people to the Board of Fish meeting in Naknek i early Dec. Contact BBEDC office if you want to go.

Choggiung Ltd: Rick Tennyson Chog. Land manager attended the meeting as their representative but had no report.

USFWS Togiak National Wildlife Refuge: Superintendent Paul Leidberg announced that he planned to retire in a couple months and thanked the AC for working with Refuge staff on various issues. He announced that his assistant, Tevis Underwood would be acting head

while a new person is recruited for the top spot. Several present expressed their appreciation of how Leidberg had worked with local communities and other agencies in a congenial and constructive manner.

Federal Subsistence, Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council report, Dan Dunaway:

Dunaway sits on the BBRAC as well as Nushagak AC. He discussed the RAC actions at their October 24-25 meeting: Reviewed and approved the current the Tribal Consultation policy document; voted to approve FP13-12 Chignik subsistence methods and means and FP13-13 approved, opening some currently closed areas in Chignik for subsistence after extensive and somewhat contentious discussion between the 2 reps from the Chignik area; Review and approved the draft MOU between the Federal and State governments for subsistence, reviewed RAC charter, received agency reports, welcomed attendance and comments from FSB chair Tim Towarak, encouraged members and audience to bring up potential fisheries studies for federal funding.

AC member Frank Woods mentioned that it would be nice to get a joint AC(s) / RAC(s) meeting to discuss and coordinate caribou season where the range of the herd covers a wide area. It might be easier to keep regulations consistent for large areas.

3:30 PM Brief break

PROPOSAL REVIEW AND DISCUSSIONS, BOF Proposal book 2012/2013

Proposal 1 Allow for a weekend subsistence schedule in the Nushagak District:

Robin S move Chris C 2nd.

Many locals have M-F 8-5 jobs. The current 3 day per week schedule from July 2-17 is a burden as there is no full weekend day open. Its very hard for people to tend their gear under the schedule, especially with the tide cycles. Current three day per week schedule is 9AM Mon- 9 AM Tues, 9AM Wed-9AM Thurs, and 9AM Fri-9AM Sat. This proposal seeks only to change the Fri-Sat period to 9AM Saturday to 9 AM Sunday. NO change to gear length.

Support Unanimous.

Proposal 2 Special Provisions, seasons, bag, possession, size limits, methods and means in Bristol Bay. Enlarge nonretention and no bait area for rainbow trout in upper Nushagak drainage.

Robin S move Joe C. 2nd.

Current regulations in Nushagak R. upstream of Harris Cr were to address concerns for rainbow trout where a new guide operations had significantly increased effort catch and harvest in the area. But above the area, regulations were left liberal for the few locals who used the area. One attendee reminded the AC that the special rainbow trout regulations Bay-wide had been done using criteria set out in the Bristol Bay Rainbow Trout Management Plan. Concerns remain for upriver villagers who might want to harvest a fish

or two while in the area of the proposal. There was some discussion of amending the proposal but none motions.

Opposed Unanimous

Proposal 3 Special Provisions, seasons, bag, possession, size limits, methods and means in Bristol Bay. Require barbless hooks in unbaited single hook, artificial fly waters... .

Frank W move Robin S 2nd

Sport Fish, Dye, pointed out there is only one such designated water in the Nushagak AC area – the Agulukpak River. When asked what ADFG’s position is on barbless hooks, Dye explained analysis shows limited to no biological advantage to barbless hooks while enforcement can be problematic.

Opposed Unanimous

Proposal 4 Methods and means in general provisions- Finfish. Prohibit putting fish parts in water where use of bait is prohibited...

Frank W move Glen W. 2nd.

ADFG Dye, said this may be more of an issue on the east side of Bristol Bay and addresses what is known as chumming and thought it mainly pertained to throwing out salmon eggs. Places like Igiugig, Alagnak or Naknek rivers. Dunaway said he wondered if it would be enforceable. What if a kid is fishing downstream of a cleaning table, or if one angler unknowingly is fishing below someone cleaning fish? How far below a subsistence cleaning table would it be illegal to fish under this regulation? ADFG Brito said that at another AC meeting Troopers suggested enforcement could be difficult.

Opposed Unanimous

Proposal 5 Robin S. suggested no action as not addressing Nush AC area.

No Action

Proposal 6 Special provisions, seasons, bag, possession, size limits, methods and means in Bristol Bay. Clarify king salmon bag limit in waters from Cape Constantine and C. Newenham.

Robin S move Joe C. 2nd.

ADFG Dye explained that this addressed an oversight in the current Codefied regulations from when they removed the regulation matrix and to match the original intent of the BOF actions; Props 7&8 also address this issue but 6 covers the waters more completely. Frank W. said he’d support if bag limit for Togiak was reduced to 1. Jon Forsling from Togiak said the Togiak AC took no action on 6&7 and amended #8 to add all waters described in this proposal. Consensus was that Prop 6 is mainly House Keeping but could follow Togiak’s lead.

Opposed Unanimous

Proposal 7 No Action see Prop 6 and 8

Proposal 8 Special provisions, seasons, bag, possession, size limits, methods and means in Bristol Bay. Reduce king salmon bag limit in the Togiak and Kulukuk rivers

Frank W move Robin S 2nd.

Amendment Jonathan F. moved, Frank W 2nd: amend to add all waters described in Proposal 6. **Amendment Supported Unanimously**

See discussion in Prop 6. And

Dunaway asked what sport king catch and harvest and king escapement is for this area. Dye, very low esp Kulukuk. Togiak average of 956 sport harvest, with a sport catch of 6,762. Dye noted sport effort has been declining. Com. Fish, Matt said the Togiak king escapement has not been strong and is a source of concern. Subsistence users of Togiak concerned about all non subsistence take of kings.

Final Support Unanimous as amended.

Proposal 9 Special provisions, seasons, bag, possession, size limits, methods and means in Bristol Bay. Limit guide access to rivers....

Frank W move Robin S 2nd.

Dan D. said proposer needs a better more thought-out proposal before trying to apply for the whole of Bristol Bay and needed to be more clear if he only meant for the Naknek R. Chris C. this limits up-and-coming guide opportunities tho it might help local nonguided anglers. Reminded meeting of the balloon effect. Hans agreed with Chris. Peter C. said he wanted to show support for Naknek locals who are concerned for their king stocks. Frank W said the whole fish guiding industry is getting more restricted and displaced and he supports Chris Carr's concerns.

Oppose Unanimous .

BOF Proposal [finally listed as 239] Special provisions, seasons, bag, possession, size limits, methods and means in Bristol Bay. Limit sport and guided sport fishing for king salmon in the Nushagak R. drainage excluding the Wood R to unbaited, single-hook, artificial lures from May 1 – July 31.....

Before there was any motion, there was a long spirited discussion . Chris Carr (Nushagak fishing guide and boat rentals, services) was quick to object to the bait restriction but might support the hook restriction. Locals use bait. Prohibition of bait would eliminate any sort of scent.

ADFG was uncertain whether single hooks would significantly affect mortality rates but might reduce handling / release injuries.

Rick Tennyson said he would be supportive of the hook restrictions but not the bait prohibition.

Joe C said we could make a motion to support Chris C.'s position. Chris Carr 2nd.

Robert H. asked if there was any data on the efficiency of bait, bait + single hook vs bait + treble hook. He then brought up the Fish Alaska Magazine article that claimed 80-100/ day kings caught. Can you just prohibit bait for guided anglers?

Chris Carr said the sport fishery has changed and effort / catch is greatly reduced, far fewer anglers, lodges, guides on the river. Cancelling bait will have a significant impact on boat rentals other service providers on the river and in Dillingham, possibly Naknek. He said with the existing King Plan we already have lots of rules to protect Nushagak kings: keep caught fish in the water, daily and seasonal bag limits, lowest jack bag limit in the state, a very cautious and restrictive plan with numerous triggers.

Ken Wilson asked how this would affect the locals and small guides in Ekwok. While Ekwok locals may use sport gear its more like subsistence for them if they don't want to use a net.

There was a comment that its frustrating the BOF chose to make this proposal with short notice and the exact text isn't available to the AC.

Joe K. Ekwok AC rep. agreed with Chris Carr, allow bait, I'm one of those new young local guys trying to start a guide business.

Robert Heyano, why then is the Nushagak R one of the last places in Alaska where bait can be used for kings?

ADFG Dye, other rivers around Bristol Bay often have bait prohibitions to protect rainbow trout – Naknek, Alagnak and those rivers have much smaller king runs.

4:30 PM Chair asked to table the discussion until the actual proposal language might be available tomorrow. [SEE RESUMED PROPOSAL 239 DISCUSSION AND ACTION FURTHER IN MINUTES].

Tim Sands ADFG departed meeting.

Proposal 10 Bristol Bay Herring Management Plan. Allow unharvested Togiak stocks to be reallocated to Dutch Harbor Food & Bait....

Robin S move Frank W 2nd.

Robin: The DH F&B fishery harvests other stocks besides the Togiak Herring. He is opposed as they are just trying to take more herring from Togiak.

Jon F: Togiak AC opposed this, taking more from Togiak, keep local harvest local, the local village has partnered with a fish company and hopes to be buying herring and spawn-on-kelp in Togiak in a couple years. He said this proposal raised very strong feelings in Togiak where spawn on kelp is a subsistence concern as well as commercial one.

Oppose Unanimous

Proposal 11 Bristol Bay Herring Management Plan. Remove the necessity for maintaining the herring catch allocations among gear types by EO....

Robin S move Frank W 2nd.

A very long and wide ranging discussion ensued. Robert Heyano, author was asked to explain. He said he was trying to write a proposal that would in his view, replicate what ADFG actually does in-season vs his understanding of the directions in the plan. He said 2012 season was an example where he felt ADFG should have restricted the seine harvest earlier and not let them get so far ahead on the catch vs the gillnetters allocation.

Someone said the 2012 season problems may partly have been a processor situation.

Robert said there needs to be some wording to address processing capacity and to reflect what ADFG is actually doing. He feels ADFG is not following the plan as he understands it. He didn't want to totally remove the 70/30 allocation.

Frank W: ADFG needs to clarify their management system.

Hans N: Maybe managers need to be more aware. Asked about how the fishery boundary was extended to "the reef" but still made no fish available to the gillnetters. If this proposal was enforced, it would assure more opportunity for gillnetters. He is concerned the current plan puts little pressure on ADFG to assure the harvest allocations are reached by each gear group.

Robert H: The Plan makes allocation mandatory but if fish aren't in Kulukuk where the gillnetters like to be, and are available to the seiners elsewhere, the seiners get a big head start. Its not a processor issue at the start but when they become plugged it becomes one. He doesn't like that ADFG has the latitude to get outside of the plan and where the allocations get out of balance.

Curt A: Last season, would the seiners have had to sit on the hook for a couple days if this proposal had been in effect?

Hans: it would open the door for seiners to take 50% of the quota and leave the gillnetters out in the cold.

Robert H: NO, my proposal says until they reach 50% of the quota of 70/30. Keep both gears. He repeated that he would like to see the plan language reflect what ADFG really does now. They let seiners keep fishing even where there's no fish for gillnetters, then try to catch up late in the season when fish size and ripeness is more variable.

4:55 PM Meeting recess

November 2, 2012, 9:03 Dillingham City Hall, meeting resumes.

On teleconference phone, Joe Wassily, Tom O'Connor.

On site: Curt Armstrong, Louie Alakyak, Joe Chythlook, Hans Nicholson, Peter Christopher, Jon Forsling, Joe Kazimirowicz, Frank Woods, Dan Dunaway, Chris Carr, Glen Wysoki.

Robin Samuelson arrived 9:07 before any action.

ADFG Staff present Tim Sands.

Resume discussion on Proposal 11:

ADFG Tim Sands explained how the Dept manages the Togiak herring fishery to achieve the 70/30 gear allocations. He understands Proposal 11 would removed the 50% trigger from the current plan.

There was more discussion on processors, whether gillnetters would have the opportunity to achieve their allocation. Some feel the current management plan is the only assurance that gillnetters get even some fishing time. The fishery is more market driven than anything. Also in recent seasons the poor weather favors the seiners over the gillnetters.

There was some discussion of would it be possible to make a regulation requiring processors to buy gillnet fish. Several doubted that it would be legal to try this avenue.

The old days of A and B fleets of gillnetters and how there used to be very strong markets, lots of gillnetters and seiners. Now with a reduced market and very limited processing capacity, the processors control the fishery.

Final Action Proposal 11:

Opposed 13 Oppose, 1 Abstain

Proposal 12 **Bristol Bay Herring Management Plan.** Change Togiak Herring gear allocation to 50 /50

Frank W move Jon F 2nd.

Frank W Moved, Jon F 2nd: amend percentages in the proposal from 50/50 to 35/65.

Amendment Adopted 12 Support, 3 Opposed.

Togiak AC amended and supported as amended. The community of Togiak is very concerned about the herring and so submitted a variety of proposals from total closure to moderate changes to current management. Some feel the fishery is bad for the ecosystem and contributes little to the local economy.

Robin S. Opposes proposal, few locals participate, processor driven fishery, creating an allocation battle.

General discussion that a 50/50 split has been sought since 1980 without success. If successful it might help local fishermen. Someone suggested making fishery Super Exclusive.

A member of the audience pointed out that the herring fishery is only allowed to take 20% of the biomass, far less than for salmon and that environmental concerns by Togiak don't seem reasonable. He believes the proposal would hurt locals more than help.

The chair pointed out that going from 30% to 50% is radical, look at the difficulty we had in 2001 going from 25% to 30%. He has doubts for 50%, how about asking for 35%?

Final Oppose As Amended 6 Support, 7 Oppose, 1 Abstain

Proposal 13 **Bristol Bay Herring Management Plan.** Close Togiak herring fishery through 2016...

Frank W move Jon F 2nd

Dan D asked if closing the Togiak fishery would open the quota to the Dutch Harbor Food & Bait fishery.

Pete C expressed environmental concerns for Togiak, close herring, no outside industry support Togiak people.

Jon F said some in Togiak feel the herring is worth more to leave in the water, have subsistence & environment concerns.

Audience comment: closing the fishery for a while will kill all your markets, its a big mistake. Its not the market its the processors that are the problem.

Audience comment: I would like the minutes to reflect that it appears Togiak is sending conflicting messages. We just heard Togiak is working with a fish processor and plans to start buying herring in the next year or two. And here they say they want to shut down the state's largest herring fishery? I can't believe you guys!

Chris Carr said closing the fishery is a bad idea and he is opposed.

First Vote Support Support 8 Support, Opposed 6.

Short Break

In early discussion on Proposal 14, Frank W who initially voted in the affirmative above, **moved to reconsider Proposal 13** . Chris C 2nd.

Motion to reconsider 13 passed 12 Support, 2 Opposed.

Final vote on proposal 13 as written.

Opposed on reconsideration, 3 Support, 11 Opposed

Proposal 14 Closed waters in Bristol Bay Area. Extend closed waters area in Togiak Bay.....

Jon F move Frank W F 2nd.

An extended discussion: Ask for what you want of the BOF, doing otherwise risks all credibility. BBNA staff explained that this proposal, while directed toward the commercial fishery, seeks to address a subsistence issue where Togiak residents are having concerns for their spawn-on-kelp subsistence harvest.

Jon F moved and then withdrew an amendment to only close the described waters to seiners.

There was a discussion as to whether the area is over exploited. Locals used to load skiffs with lots of spawn on kelp in a short time.

Robin S. Moved, Joe C 2nd: Amend to move the closed waters boundary line such that it passes from the regulatory marker at the east side of Ungalikthluk Bay to Quigmy River outlet.

More discussion of various boundaries.

Frank W. Moved to change the proposal from a Commercial fishery proposal to a Subsistence. There is supposed to be new subsistence data available at the BOF meeting. **Motion DIED** for lack of second.

Robin spoke to his motion that there used to be a lot kelp closer to Togiak.

Glen W said we need to help the subsistence users of herring spawn-on-kelp.

Chair emphasized that the intent of this proposal and amendment is to provide a subsistence are for roe on kelp.

Robin's Amendment Adopted 13 Support, 1 Opposed.

Final Support 14 as amended, 11 Support, 3 Opposed

Proposal 15 Gillnet specifications and operations. Allow set net anchors and running lines at registered sites to remain in the water during closed periods...

Robin S. move Frank W F 2nd.

Tom O. set netter is opposed as there are a lot of the Igushik sites that are not leased and this would be a hardship.

Robin, there may be other sites not leased in the Nushagak district.

Oppose, Unanimous

Proposal 16 Gillnet specifications and operations. Allow set net gear to remain in the place during closed periods...

Robin S. move Frank W F 2nd.

There is no such regulation in the Nushagak district. This may refer to the Naknek Special Harvest Area.

Curt or it may be in the Kvichak where set nets have to be pulled on a closure only to have it re-open just 2 hours later. But I know how to get my nets in and out.

Too generic,- as written applies bay-wide.

Oppose, Unanimous

Proposal 17 Gillnet specifications and operations. In the Nushagak District, prohibit a permit holder from operating a set gillnet seaward of another set gillnet ...

Dan D. move Robin S. F 2nd..

Tom O. said he supported it as a set netter.

ADFG Tim Sands explained the situation how one set net might be placed seaward of another set net.

Support, 13 Support, Opposed 1

Proposal 18 Gillnet specifications and operations. Shorten the distance a set net can be set from the high-tide mark in the Ugashik District...

Robin S. move Joe C. 2nd. **No Action by consensus**

Proposals 19, 20 No Action by consensus

Proposal 21 Identification of gear. Require name of permit holder on stationary gear...

Robin S., Move Joe C. 2nd.

ADFG Tim pointed out that this is already in the statewide regulations for set net gear and name is required on buoys. Several set netters said they do it already.

Jon F. we do this in Togiak.

Oppose, Unanimous

Proposal 22 Identification of gear. Change height of marks...

Joe C. Move, Robin S. 2nd.

General agreement that current system is good enough.

Oppose, 1 Support, 13 Opposed

Proposal 23 Identification of gear. Identification markings on driftnet corks...

Robin S., Move Joe C. 2nd.

Several opposed based on the Troopers opposition and concern for potential of easily dropped ghost nets.

There was quite a bit of discussion about the current practice there may be several different numbers on a single net if its been sold, loaned or shared among fishers. How can FWP prove who belongs to a net or is actually fishing it if they find one with multiple numbers? What if a fisher arbitrarily puts someone else's number on a net and leaves it out to get them in trouble?

Curt A. Moved, Frank W 2nd to amend: amend proposal to require marking each shackle of gear for both set and drift nets.

Amendment Opposed 2 Support, 12 Oppose

There was a discussion whether the amendment should clarify what constituted a full shackle of gear, 200f, 100f, 50, 25?.

Discussion pointed out that current regulations require marking every xx fathoms regardless of shackle length or other description.

Its not that hard to mark the corks.

Final Prop 23 as originally written Opposed, 2 Support, 12 Opposed.

12:25 Lunch Recess

1:30 Resume meeting.
Sport Fishing

Proposal 239 put back on table by unanimous consent.

**** RESUME discussion from page 12:

BOF Proposal [239] Special provisions, seasons, bag, possession, size limits, methods and means in Bristol Bay. Limit sport and guided sport fishing for king salmon in the Nushagak R. drainage excluding the Wood R

Chris C. Move, Glen & Robin 2nd.

Right after lunch Brito announced that the much anticipated final wording of the BOF generated proposal to restrict bait and hooks on the Nushagak drainage king fishery was still not posted for the public.

Chris Carr: this just isn't sufficient public notice prior to the December meeting; nobody knows about it.

ADFG confirmed they have the power to restrict bait in the king fishery, only under the terms of the Nushagak Chinook Salmon Management Plan.

Chris C. The sport fishery is a real economic boost to the area and provides economic opportunities for locals who don't have commercial permits. Supports the single hook portion but no prohibition of bait.

There was much concern / frustration expressed regarding the unavailable language of the actual BOF generated proposal.

Chris C Move, Robin S 2nd: **Amend proposal to only restrict tackle to barbless single hooks. Remove all references prohibiting bait.**

Amendment Adopted, 12 Support, 1 Opposed

A lodge operator in the audience expressed concern how the proposal would impact the villagers in Ekwok, New Stuyahok, Koliganek who may use sport gear but consider themselves using it for subsistence. Advocated if anything is adopted it should only apply downriver from Ekwok, maybe just downstream from the Iowithla R. That's where the problem is.

Final on 239 Support as amended: 12 support, 2 opposed.

Back To Commercial Proposals

Proposal 24 Gear. Allow use of seines in Bristol Bay...

Robin S. Move, Chris C. 2nd.

Don't add a new gear group.

Curt A said he would support on the basis that its a fish quality issue.

Oppose, 1 Support, 13 Opposed

Proposal 25 Create a Bristol Bay coho salmon troll fishery.

Robin S. Move, Joe C. 2nd.

Robin opposes on basis that coho fishery is just coming back, don't add a gear group.

Dan D opposes as this would likely occur on mixed stocks as well as adding a new gear group.

Opposed Unanimous

Proposal 26 Closed Waters. Amend closed waters in Togiak District...

Robin S. Move, Chris C. 2nd.

ADFG has concerns for the coordinates listed in the proposal; they aren't right for the area described. **No Action by consensus**

Proposal 27 Closed Waters. Change boundary description for closed waters at mouth of Igushik R... Joe C. Move, Robin S. 2nd.

ADFG has been doing EOs to address the issue. This would put boundary back to old Marker site, would allow an historically occupied set net site that may have been inadvertently excluded when Dept went to GPS boundaries.

Support Unanimous

Proposal 28 Closed Waters. Change closed waters at mouth of Togiak R. in Togiak District... Robin S. Move, Chris C. 2nd.

ADFG; correcting a marker issue. The new [gps?] boundary line accidentally opened more area near mouth of Togiak R. ADFG has been addressing w EOs each season.

House keeping.

Support Unanimous

Proposal 29 Closed Waters. Create buffer zone at mouth of Togiak R. .to protect kings only... Robin S. Move, Chris C. 2nd.

Jon, Togiak seeks to move the commercial fishing away from the mouth of the Togiak R during the king season to assist escapement and subsistence. Only for protection of kings.

Longitude cited in proposal appear to be a typo mistake; should read 160 degrees NOT 161.

Jon F Move, Joe C 2nd: Amend: make closure effective through June 30.

Support Amendment Unanimous.

As amended more accurately addresses location and time of concern while not unduly restricting the fishery for the remainder of the season.

Support as amended, Unanimous

Proposal 30 Landing Requirements: Allow set net caught salmon to be transported through Snake River Section....

Robin S. Move, Glen w. 2nd.

Tom O. explained that he thought the proposer seeks a safer route to transport Igushik caught fish, to be used occasionally.

Some expressed concerns there might be inaccurate reporting of catch area.

ADFG expressed no concerns as they have not allowed a permit holder to register in 2 areas of the district.

Several commented that this one individual is the sole advocate and most others have done fine without this option. One comment; what about safety/ In bad weather that can be a dangerous place?

Oppose, 4 Support 10 Opposed

Proposal 31 Vessel ID. Exempt vessels from permanent dual marking.....

Robin S. Move, Chris C. 2nd.

ADFG indicated this would probably create an enforcement issue.

Troopers said they opposed this.

There was speculation that the author may participate in drift and set fishing.

Opposed, Unanimous

Proposal 32 Vessel specifications and operation. Increase vessel length to 42 feet if processing.....

Robin S. Move, Joe C. 2nd.

Chair thought he heard that Troopers were neutral on vessel length for the Bay but supports enforcement concerns that the equipment portion of this plan would be very problematic. Also, we already have huge new boats that are 32 Long and 18.5 wide fully capable of carrying plenty of equipment.

Robin opposed to longer boats due to local economic & capitalization limitations and difficulties local smaller boats would have around much larger boats in the congested fisheries along the lines. He recalled the intimidation and collision/ damage problems back when boat bow lengths were allowed to stretch beyond the 32 foot limit.

A handout showing the Bristol Bay Native Association resolution(s) opposing this proposal.

Opposed, Unanimous

Proposal 33 Vessel specifications and operation. Increase vessel length to 36 or 39 feet if processing with equipment is present

Robin S. Move, Chris C. 2nd.

Opposed Unanimous Given action taken in 32.

Proposal 34 Vessel specifications and operation. Increase vessel length to 36.....

Robin S. Move, Chris C. 2nd

A member of the audience advocated for 36 feet so it would be easier to carry ice and have a good payload of fish. I've quit icing due to loss of payload.

Curt supports 36 feet, always wondered why 32 foot was established. We already have a huge disparity of boat sizes from the little Rawsons to these huge new boats. What about trying it for 3 years with a sunset clause?

Several other AC members disagreed and said its been shown that icing, chilling, and bleeding can be done economically on current 32 foot boats.

Opposed, 1 Support, 13 Opposed

Proposal 35 Vessel specifications and operation. Increase vessel length to over 32 feet..... Robin S. Move, Chris C. 2nd.

Robin, I'm opposed for same reasons as #34.

Joe C. I'm opposed as we have been discussing.

Opposed, 1 Support, 13 Opposed

Proposals 36, 37, 38 Requirements & Specs for using 200 f nets..... Allow a single permit holder who holds 2 drift permits to fish 200 fathoms.....

Robin S. Move as a block, Frank W. 2nd.

One in the audience supports this idea while several others were vocally opposed.

Audience: fishing 200f lowers quality of fish at the outer end of the net from dragging.

Audience: Another supporter said that set netters are doing it let the drifters and it would reduce effort.

Curt A. I support the current dual permit system and have experience with it working as it was intended.

Frank W expressed his opposition of any the dual permit systems current or proposed.

A roll call vote was requested.

Curt Armstrong -N

Louie Alakyak - N

Joe Kazimirowicz - N

Dan Dunaway - N

Jon Forsling - N

Joe Chythlook - N

Peter Christopher -N

Chris Carr - N

Glen Wysoki - N

Tom O' Connor - N

Joe Clark - N

Frank Woods - N

Robin Samuelson - N

Hans Nicholson - N

Final Props 36, 87, 38 Opposed, Unanimous.

Proposal 39, 40 Requirements & Specs for using 200 f nets..... . Allow dual drift boats to use 200 f when the NRSHA opens.

Robin S. Move as a block , Joe C. 2nd.

Robin said he is opposed.

Hans is opposed.

ADFG says the current regulation was designed to keep all D boats from converging on the Nushagak when the NRSHA opens.

Opposed, Unanimous

3:05 PM Louie Alakyak departs meeting.

Proposal 41, 42 Requirements & Specs for using 200 f nets..... . DIS-Allow dual drift permit stacking.....

Robin S. Move as a block , Chris C. 2nd.

Frank Woods explained he is opposed to how the D Permit stacking system has worked out. He doesn't think it worked out like anticipated. Seems like it helped nonlocals more than locals.

Curt A sais he has see the D permit work as intended and he is in support.

Robin supports this; he has 2 permits and thinks it worked well last season where there weren't many fish. But outsiders are really taking advantage of the opportunity. He would like to go back to 3 nets per boat.

A member of the audience said this is the one of the few ways to help a new local person work into the fishery.

Comment: there are no set net permits on the market because of allowing double ownership.

If we end D permits lot of folks will just keep the permit and buy a boat, might enlarge the fleet.

Supported, 10 support, 3 oppose.

Proposal 43 Requirements & Specs for using 200 f nets..... . DIS-Allow dual drift permit stacking In Togiak

Robin S. Move, Chris C. 2nd.

Jon, Togiak AC adopted this; Togiak has a small run; when the district opens to other boats (super exclusive period ends) the incoming D boat overwhelm the locals in their mostly small boats. Jon feels Nush AC should support this given the action on proposals 41 & 42.

If this proposal is opposed then we should make the transfer date in August.

There are 90 locally held drift permits & 90 locally held set net permits.

Supported, 11 Support, 0 Oppose, 2 Abstain.

Proposals 44-54 Gillnet specifications and operations..... Repeal sunset clause for dual set net permits.....

Chirs C. Move as a block, Frank W. 2nd.

This would make dual permits /permit stacking permanent.

To oppose it would restore regulations to the 2009 situation.

Curt A. This has not worked as intended and he favors going back to the way it was. If this were to pass it would make it harder to retain the status quo with the drifters and their dual permit status.

Glen, keep in mind where this came from. It was supposed to help locals but it hasn't. It backfired.

Hans agrees. Some set net operations have become gigantic and they overwhelm the locals.

Audience comment: Vote carefully, a yes vote keeps the double permit system; Not meant to do away with the double set permits.

Jon F. Togiak AC opposed this proposal.

Opposed, 0 Support, 12 Oppose, 1 Abstain.

Proposal 55 Gillnet specifications and operations..... Allow 2 set net permits holders to fish 100 f on a single site.....

Frank W. Move, Robin S. 2nd.

This currently isn't allowed anywhere and shouldn't be.

Opposed, Unanimous.

Proposal 56 Registration and re-registration..... Registration required for Ugashik and Egegik

Frank W. Move, Robin S. 2nd.

This proposal seeks to remove rule that allows boats to move around in the early fishery..

Intent of current regulation was to eliminate foregone harvest in early weeks.

Has not worked well, disruptive.

Support, Unanimous

Proposal 57 Regulatory changes and or management plans pertaining to chum and sockeye salmon in the Bristol Bay Area. Placeholder proposal for possible regulations changes related to WASSIP results.....

No Action at this time. Wait for Nov 19 release.

No information available until November 19, same day as comment deadline.

People can propose regulation changes individually and submit to BOF.

Note to Board of Fisheries: The Nushagak Advisory Committee is dismayed that the WASSIP results are not available to ACs or the public until it is too late to make constructive and timely comments.

Proposals 58, 59, 60, 61 Fishing districts and sections..... Create two new general districts / create general district

Robin S. Move as a block, Joe C. 2nd.

Robin, opposed due to historic problems and due to anticipated data from WASSIP. Would be inconsistent to support when we expect to request WASSIP based restrictions , terminal fisheries, for Alaska Peninsula fisheries.

We finally have good district boundaries and don't want to create local mixed stock, non-terminal fishery.

FWP said they were concerned they'd need way more assets and clearly defined boundaries for proper enforcement.

Oppose, Unanimous.

Proposal 62 Restructuring process. Develop a process for addressing future proposals deemed as Bristol Bay salmon industry restructuring

Robin S. Move, Chris C. 2nd..

Frank: We need a guide to deal with "restructuring proposals".

Hans: currently there is not a clear process to identify and deal with restructuring proposals.

Joe C.: BBNA has provided us with a copy of a resolution supporting this proposal.

Robin: BBEDC did due diligence on this proposal. The BOF may not have taken all issues into account when restructuring, such as economic effects on watershed communities.

Support, Unanimous

Proposals 63, 64, 65 Bristol Bay Commercial Set & Drift sockeye salmon management and allocation plan Increase percentage allocated to set net harvest....[by various amounts]..

Robin S. Move as a block, Chris C. 2nd..

Robin opposed as original allocations base on historic take before allocation. While some were originally opposed to the allocation, now they feel its brought stability to fisheries. He

feels the system is work. We could seek to remove the allocations but doesn't seem a good route.

Audience comment: One real problem is that when instituted, Igushik was given 6% of the whole Nushagak harvest when in reality they only ever fished one stock – the Igushik run. This hurt Nushagak drifters and needs to be fixed.

Pete C.: I've always been against this allocation. Doesn't make sense. Set netters are making it every year but it hurts drifters. Drifters only got 63% this year; just do away with allocation.

Audience comment: I (drifter) probably lost \$30,000 since the allocation came. I used to get a few drift periods in Igushik early in the season. Now we can only get there late in the season. I object to Igushik [set??] fishing 24/7 trying to get their allocation.

ADFG: When asked Tim Sands said in most seasons the set netters usually don't quite get their allocation.

Robin agrees that Igushik might have been given too much of an allocation.

There were several comments that late in the season, drifters get shut down waiting for the set netters to catch up on their allocation but with a lot of set netters out of the fishery, those remaining can't catch enough fish to fill the allocation.

Dan asked if the coming WASSIP data might be used to address Igushik allocation and historical harvest?

ADFG – Sands has doubts the study has fine enough resolution to tease out Igushik fish from other Nushagak District stocks.

Final on 63, 64, 65 Oppose, Unanimous

**** Sometime in the course of discussing the previous several proposals, 3 AC representatives had to depart for their plane or left teleconference for other business. Approximately 3:30- 3:45 pm Eleven AC reps remained to participate.

Proposal 66 Naknek-Kvichak Dist drift / set allocation plan Remove set and drift allocations.....

Frank W. Move, Joe C. 2nd.

Curt, a Kvichak set net operator is afraid to totally do away with the allocation even though some years things "feel out of whack". Allocations may need tweaking but don't throw it all out.

ADFG – This isn't a tool to address bay-wide issues – doubtful this one could be amended to add Nushagak allocation issues.

Robin (drifter) has heard complaints that the Kvichak section has essentially become a set net only fishery and he supports this proposal.

Support, 6 Support, 3 Oppose, 2 Abstain

Proposal 67 **Naknek-Kvichak Dist drift / set allocation plan** Stagger fishing periods through run...

No Action based on action on 66

Proposals 68, 69 **Naknek-Kvichak Dist management and drift / set allocation plan / Alagnak River Special Harvest Area.....**

No Action, leave this to Naknek-Kvichak AC

Proposals 74 & 78 **Nushagak-Mulchatna King Salmon Mgt. Plan.** Revise king salmon reference and trigger points. / **Wood River Sockeye Special Harvest Area Plan** Revise sockeye salmon reference and trigger points

ADFG Tim, explained these proposals are designed to revise the reference and trigger points based on the new Didson Sonar counter numbers since the current regulations use the old Bendix sonar counts. The two systems produce different numbers but ADFG is will be recommending Didson numbers that should be net neutral for these proposals.

The chair expressed concern about the Didson numbers being higher than the old Bendix ones. He went on to say that we could oppose, support the proposal or authorize a subcommittee to work with ADFG to insert Didson numbers in these proposals when numbers are available from ADFG.

AC Consensus to form and authorize a subcommittee:

Chair delegated Robin Samuelson, Dan Dunaway, Frank Wood, Joe Chythlook for the subcommittee.

All other AC members are welcome to attend and participate.

The subcommittee meeting will be announced publicly and public is welcome to attend.

Proposal 75 **Nushagak-Mulchatna King Salmon Mgt. Plan.** Increase king escapement into the Nushagak R. by restricting the drift fleet.....

Robin S. Move, Frank W. 2nd..

Chair is opposed to this based on the existing plan. Robin, commercial and subsistence fishers are already taking a hit. The commercial fishery has had no directed king openers recently. If more conservation is needed limit the days in the sport fishery. He feels the sport fishery is not bearing its share of the burden of conservation. We need hard numbers from the sport fishery.

Choggiung Land Manager spoke to their records for land use in the main part of the sport fishery: In 2007 the peak year, they had 10,000 man-use days. It has declined since then to about 4,500 man-use days. There is a considerable decline in activity around the lower river fishery.

Chris C. pointed out that guides must maintain a detailed log book and submit data regularly. Sport anglers have been frequently restricted in-season in recent years.

Oppose, Unanimous

Proposal 76 Fishing Periods. Restrict commercial fishing to no more than 3 tides in a 48 hour period Frank W. Move, Glen W. 2nd..

Talks about Naknek area but as written could apply Bay-wide.

Proposal is ridiculous and overlooks extensive management practices, regulations and protections already in place.

Oppose, Unanimous

Proposal 77 Nushagak-Mulchatna King Salmon Mgt. Plan. Restrict [Nushagak] commercial fishing to no more than 12 hours in any 24 hour period.....

Robin S. Move, Frank W. 2nd..

Comments: Commercial fishers have already taken drastic measures and the sport fishery should be limited now.

Dan suggested to amend 77 to use a proposal from the last BOF cycle that had a more reasonable option to put the commercial fishery into the WRSWA under certain circumstances to protect kings when needed and to provide harvest on Wood R sockeye.

Robin emphatically unwilling to see ANY more restrictions to the commercial fishery.

Oppose, Unanimous

Proposal 79, 80 Wood River Sockeye Special Harvest Area Mgt. Plan. Allow separate drift and set periods in the WRSWA, remove all set gear when closed.

Frank W. Move as block, Glen W. 2nd..

Glen thinks this is a good idea.

Audience comment: A good tool to adjust allocations, hope it passes.

ADFG We need more language in it to address allocation and rotations. Needs to be spelled out for managers, including tide stage for openers.

Could provisionally approve and put into the subcommittee for refining.

Put into the subcommittee and invite Tom O'Connor as a member.

To Subcommittee.

4:55 PM Robin Samuelson departed meeting.

Proposal 81 Wood River Sockeye Special Harvest Area Mgt. Plan. Allow up to 150 fathoms on board drift boat in the WRSWA.

Chris C. Move, Frank W. 2nd..

There was a discussion of the practice of rotating nets.

Some oppose, some support the practice of net rotation.

When ADFG opens WRSWA, the intent is to catch most of the fish.

Net rotation is common in Naknek Special Harvest Area

This proposal seems to align the WRSWA with practices allowed in NRSWA.

Support 8 Support, 1 Oppose

5: 10 Upriver Village Reps depart for their plane: Joe Kazimirowicz, Peter Christopher, Glen Wysoki.

Alternate AC rep Ken Wilson was seated to participate for the remainder of the meeting. Total AC reps participating 8-9.

Proposal 82 Wood River Sockeye Special Harvest Area Mgt. Plan. Allow up to 200 fathoms on board in the WRSHA. Chris C. Move, Frank W. 2nd.

As long as nets are bagged.

Allow boats to quickly transition to and from WRSHA.

Support Unanimous

Proposal 83 Wood River Sockeye Special Harvest Area Mgt. Plan. When there is an opener in WRSHA allow set netters to remain in the Nushagak District with only 25 fathoms of net.

Chris C. Move, Curt A. 2nd..

Not every set netter can get into or participate in the WRSHA.

This would reduce congestion in WRSHA.

Reduced set gear in Nushagak Dist offers some protection to fish out there.

This may help set netters catch up on their Nush Dist. allocation.

Allowing set netters to remain in the Nushagak Dist. might extend the need for using the WRSHA.

Curt: This was partly written to help keep some set net markets open: One processor [Ekuk?] has few tenders and depends on nearby set netters for product. In past when all of the fishery went into the WRSHA, they didn't have fish to process – can't stay open in those conditions.

Dan supports, recalls the market discussion when this proposal was written and doesn't recall any major objections from ADFG.

Oppose 3 Support, 4 Oppose 1 Abstain

Proposal 84 Wood River Sockeye Special Harvest Area Mgt. Plan. Allow dual set netters to have up to 50 f on board and fish 2 sites in the WRSHA.

Frank w Move, Jon F. 2nd..

Frank is opposed, its already too congested and would make things worse. Drifters can't use dual option in WRSHA, set netters should not be allowed to either.

Oppose, Unanimous

Proposals 85, 86 Togiak River King Salmon Mgt. Plan. Create a Togiak River King Mgt Plan similar to the Nushagak River King plan.

Frank w Move as a block, Jon F. 2nd.

Brito, as written proposal is too vague for BOF to address.

Jon, Togiak AC adopted.

ADFG Jones: Dept. is likely to oppose and suggest Togiak AC invite all user groups to work out a plan.

ADFG Jones: Dept. opposes as it has no in-season stock enumeration system to enable or support such a plan.

The Nushagak AC sympathizes but takes no action at this time.

One rep had an additional concern: there has been no "Amount Needed for Subsistence" established.

No Action

Proposal 87 Togiak District Salmon Mgt. Plan. Change the waiving period to July 24 if escapement is projected to exceed 175,000 sockeye before July 27.

Frank w Move, Joe C. 2nd..

Designed to align transfer waiver date with the 3 days of protection added at last BOF meeting when transfer period was moved from June 21 to 24.

Essentially a house keeping proposal to fix and oversight.

Support, Unanimous

--- Bristol Bay Fishery Proposal work completed for this meeting. ---

Other Business:

Board Support: Brito announced that late afternoon, the Dept of Law had publicly posted the legal notice of the Board of Fish generated Proposal to restrict hooks and bait on the Nushagak drainage: Proposal 239 Online.

Joint Board Proposals Due

Brito quickly explained that the Joint Board is reviewing the process for removal of members for cause beyond what is in Roberts Rules.

Proposals can be submitted for restructuring Advisory Committees – submission deadline ins November 30, 2012.

Old Business

Moose Management Plan presentation, signing.

USFWS Togiak Refuge Biologist Pat Walsh briefly discussed the history of the Moose Management Plan for the Togiak Refuge. Substantial work completed in 2004 but stalled at

the draft stage without getting signed by all agencies and groups. Since then, moose management has followed the draft plan, the moose population has grown and spread substantially and the draft needs revision, updated data and thresholds reviewed. It is out of date. It would be good to complete the signing of the 2004 draft, then begin the revision and updating with all parties participating. The Nushagak AC is invited to provide a representative to a work meeting in December.

The hope is to get the plan caught up and fully signed in a reasonable time.

Frank Wood asked for consensus of the AC to allow chair to sign the draft plan and move ahead on revision. **Approved by consensus.**

Date of Next Meeting

November 20, day after the WASSIP materials are available for review.

To develop positions on Area M and Game Proposals.

Brito will advertise. Meeting.

The Nushagak AC might be able to have 2 more meetings, the November one and one in January?? For Area M, Game, and statewide proposals.

Announcements:

Board of Game meeting is the first week of February 2013.

BOG proposal deadline is January 18, 2012.

Board of Fish Area M meeting is the last week of February 2013, first week of March 2013.

BOF , M meeting comments due February 12, 2013.

BBEDC will be offering a training meeting to understand the WASSIP data.

Adjourn 5:57 November 2, 2012

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES
DECEMBER 4–12, 2012
BRISTOL BAY FINFISH

Comments from the Nushagak Advisory Committee

(Please note changes in total calculated votes of AC members is due to fluctuation of attendance throughout meeting)

Bristol Bay Subsistence (1 proposal)

PROPOSAL 1

ACTION: Support - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow for a weekend subsistence schedule in the Nushagak District.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Many locals have M-F 8-5 jobs. The current 3 day per week schedule from July 2-17 is a burden as there is no full weekend day open. It's very hard for people to tend their gear under the schedule, especially with the tide cycles. Current three day per week schedule is 9AM Mon- 9 AM Tues, 9AM Wed-9AM Thurs, and 9AM Fri-9AM Sat. This proposal seeks only to change the Fri-Sat period to 9AM Saturday to 9 AM Sunday. NO change to gear length.

Bristol Bay Sportfish (8 proposals)

PROPOSAL 2

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Increase nonretention, no bait waters of the Nushagak River.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Current regulations in Nushagak R. upstream of Harris Cr were to address concerns for rainbow trout where a new guide operations had significantly increased effort catch and harvest in the area. But above the area, regulations were left liberal for the few locals who used the area. One attendee reminded the AC that the special rainbow trout regulations Bay-wide had been done using criteria set out in the Bristol Bay Rainbow Trout Management Plan. Concerns remain for upriver villagers who might want to harvest a fish or two while in the area of the proposal. There was some discussion of amending the proposal but no motions.

PROPOSAL 3

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Require barbless hooks in unbaited, single-hook, artificial fly waters.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Sport Fish, Dye, pointed out there is only one such designated water in the Nushagak AC area – the Agulukpak River. When asked what ADFG's position is on barbless hooks, Dye explained analysis shows limited to no biological advantage to barbless hooks while enforcement can be problematic.

PROPOSAL 4**ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit putting fish parts in water where use of bait is prohibited.**AMENDMENT:**

DISCUSSION: ADFG Dye, said this may be more of an issue on the east side of Bristol Bay and addresses what is known as chumming and thought it mainly pertained to throwing out salmon eggs. Places like Igiugig, Alagnak or Naknek rivers. Dunaway said he wondered if it would be enforceable. What if a kid is fishing downstream of a cleaning table, or if one angler unknowingly is fishing below someone cleaning fish? How far below a subsistence cleaning table would it be illegal to fish under this regulation? ADFG Brito said that at another AC meeting Troopers suggested enforcement could be difficult.

PROPOSAL 5**ACTION: NO ACTION**

DESCRIPTION: Decrease coho salmon bag limit to one in the Ugashik, Dog Salmon, and King Salmon rivers. *(This proposal will be addressed in both the Bristol Bay and AK Pen/Aleutian Island meetings.)*

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Robin S. suggested no action as not addressing Nush AC area.

PROPOSAL 6**ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous**

DESCRIPTION: Clarify king salmon bag limit between Constantine and Newenham.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: ADFG Dye explained that this addressed an oversight in the current Codefied regulations from when they removed the regulation matrix and to match the original intent of the BOF actions; Props 7&8 also address this issue but 6 covers the waters more completely. Frank W. said he'd support if bag limit for Togiak was reduced to 1. Jon Forsling from Togiak said the Togiak AC took no action on 6&7 and amended #8 to add all waters described in this proposal. Consensus was that Prop 6 is mainly House Keeping but could follow Togiak's lead.

PROPOSAL 7**ACTION: NO ACTION due to Action on 6, 8****AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:****PROPOSAL 8****ACTION: Support Unanimous as Amended**

DESCRIPTION: Reduce king salmon bag limit in the Togiak and Kulukak rivers.

AMENDMENT: Jonathan F. moved, Frank W 2nd: amend to add all waters described in Proposal 6. **Amendment Supported Unanimously**

DISCUSSION: See discussion in Prop 6. And Dunaway asked what sport king catch and harvest and king escapement is for this area. Dye, very low esp Kulukuk. Togiak average of 956 sport harvest, with a sport catch of 6,762. Dye noted sport effort has been declining. Com. Fish, Matt said the Togiak king escapement has not been strong and is a source of concern. Subsistence users of Togiak concerned about all non subsistence take of kings.

PROPOSAL 9**ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous**

DESCRIPTION: Limit guided access to rivers.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Dan D. said proposer needs a better more thought-out proposal before trying to apply for the whole of Bristol Bay and needed to be more clear if he only meant for the Naknek R. Chris C. this limits up-and-coming guide opportunities tho it might help local nonguided anglers. Reminded meeting of the balloon effect. Hans agreed with Chris. Peter C. said he wanted to show support for Naknek locals who are concerned for their king stocks. Frank W said the whole fish guiding industry is getting more restricted and displaced and he supports Chris Carr's concerns

Bristol Bay Herring (5 proposals)

PROPOSAL 10

ACTION: Oppose – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow unharvested herring stocks in the Togiak District to be reallocated to the Dutch Harbor food and bait fishery.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Robin: The DH F&B fishery harvests other stocks besides the Togiak Herring. He is opposed as they are just trying to take more herring from Togiak.

Jon F: Togiak AC opposed this, taking more from Togiak, keep local harvest local, the local village has partnered with a fish company and hopes to be buying herring and spawn-on-kelp in Togiak in a couple years. He said this proposal raised very strong feelings in Togiak where spawn on kelp is a subsistence concern as well as commercial one.

PROPOSAL 11

ACTION: Opposed – 13 opposed 1 abstained

DESCRIPTION: Remove the necessity for maintaining catch percentages between gear groups inseason by emergency order (EO).

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: A very long and wide ranging discussion ensued. Robert Heyano, author was asked to explain. He said he was trying to write a proposal that would in his view, replicate what ADFG actually does in-season vs his understanding of the directions in the plan. He said 2012 season was an example where he felt ADFG should have restricted the seine harvest earlier and not let them get so far ahead on the catch vs the gillnetters allocation.

Someone said the 2012 season problems may partly have been a processor situation.

Robert said there needs to be some wording to address processing capacity and to reflect what ADFG is actually doing. He feels ADFG is not following the plan as he understands it. He didn't want to totally remove the 70/30 allocation.

Frank W: ADFG needs to clarify their management system.

Hans N: Maybe managers need to be more aware. Asked about how the fishery boundary was extended to "the reef" but still made no fish available to the gillnetters. If this proposal was enforced, it would assure more opportunity for gillnetters. He is concerned the current plan puts little pressure on ADFG to assure the harvest allocations are reached by each gear group.

Robert H: The Plan makes allocation mandatory but if fish aren't in Kulukuk where the gillnetters like to be, and are available to the seiners elsewhere, the seiners get a big head start. Its not a processor issue at

the start but when they become plugged it becomes one. He doesn't like that ADFG has the latitude to get outside of the plan and where the allocations get out of balance.

Curt A: Last season, would the seiners have had to sit on the hook for a couple days if this proposal had been in effect?

Hans: it would open the door for seiners to take 50% of the quota and leave the gillnetters out in the cold.

Robert H: NO, my proposal says until they reach 50% of the quota of 70/30. Keep both gears. He repeated that he would like to see the plan language reflect what ADFG really does now. They let seiners keep fishing even where there's no fish for gillnetters, then try to catch up late in the season when fish size and ripeness is more variable.

ADFG Tim Sands explained how the Dept manages the Togiak herring fishery to achieve the 70/30 gear allocations. He understands Proposal 11 would removed the 50% trigger from the current plan.

There was more discussion on processors, whether gillnetters would have the opportunity to achieve their allocation. Some feel the current management plan is the only assurance that gillnetters get even some fishing time. The fishery is more market driven than anything. Also in recent seasons the poor weather favors the seiners over the gillnetters.

There was some discussion of would it be possible to make a regulation requiring processors to buy gillnet fish. Several doubted that it would be legal to try this avenue.

The old days of A and B fleets of gillnetters and how there used to be very strong markets, lots of gillnetters and seiners. Now with a reduced market and very limited processing capacity, the processors control the fishery.

PROPOSAL 12 ACTION: As Amended: Opposed - 7 Oppose 6 Support 1 Abstain

DESCRIPTION: Split the Togiak District herring sac roe quota allocated to seine and gillnet gear 50/50.

AMENDMENT: Frank W Moved, Jon F 2nd: amend percentages in the proposal from 50/50 to 35/65.

Amendment Adopted 12 Support, 3 Opposed.

DISCUSSION: Togiak AC amended and supported as amended. The community of Togiak is very concerned about the herring and so submitted a variety of proposals from total closure to moderate changes to current management. Some feel the fishery is bad for the ecosystem and contributes little to the local economy.

Robin S. Opposes proposal, few locals participate, processor driven fishery, creating an allocation battle.

General discussion that a 50/50 split has been sought since 1980 without success. If successful it might help local fishermen. Someone suggested making fishery Super Exclusive.

A member of the audience pointed out that the herring fishery is only allowed to take 20% of the biomass, far less than for salmon and that environmental concerns by Togiak don't seem reasonable. He believes the proposal would hurt locals more than help.

The chair pointed out that going from 30% to 50% is radical, look at the difficulty we had in 2001 going from 25% to 30%. He has doubts for 50%, how about asking for 35%?

PROPOSAL 13**ACTION: Opposed: 11 Opposed 3 Support****DESCRIPTION:** Close the Togiak herring sac roe fishery through 2016.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** Dan D asked if closing the Togiak fishery would open the quota to the Dutch Harbor Food & Bait fishery.

Pete C expressed environmental concerns for Togiak, close herring, no outside industry support Togiak people.

Jon F said some in Togiak feel the herring is worth more to leave in the water, have subsistence & environment concerns.

Audience comment: closing the fishery for a while will kill all your markets, its a big mistake. Its not the market its the processors that are the problem.

Audience comment: I would like the minutes to reflect that it appears Togiak is sending conflicting messages. We just heard Togiak is working with a fish processor and plans to start buying herring in the next year or two. And here they say they want to shut down the state's largest herring fishery? I can't believe you guys!

Chris Carr said closing the fishery is a bad idea and he is opposed. Chris Carr said closing the fishery is a bad idea and he is opposed.

First Vote Support Support 8 Support, Opposed 6.

In early discussion on Proposal 14, Frank W who initially voted in the affirmative above, **moved to reconsider Proposal 13** . Chris C 2nd.

Motion to reconsider 13 passed 12 Support, 2 Opposed.Final vote on proposal 13 as written.**Opposed on reconsideration, 3 Support, 11 Opposed****PROPOSAL 14****ACTION: As Amended: Support: 11 Support 3 Opposed****DESCRIPTION:** Extend the closed waters area in Togiak Bay.**AMENDMENT:** Move the closed waters boundary line such that it passes from the regulatory marker at the east side of Ungalikthluk Bay to Quigmy River outlet.**DISCUSSION:** An extended discussion: Ask for what you want of the BOF, doing otherwise risks all credibility. BBNA staff explained that this proposal, while directed toward the commercial fishery, seeks to address a subsistence issue where Togiak residents are having concerns for their spawn-on-kelp subsistence harvest.

Jon F moved and then withdrew an amendment to only close the described waters to seiners.

There was a discussion as to whether the area is over exploited. Locals used to load skiffs with lots of spawn on kelp in a short time.

Robin S. Moved, Joe C 2nd: Amend to move the closed waters boundary line such that it passes from the regulatory marker at the east side of Ungalikthluk Bay to Quigmy River outlet.

More discussion of various boundaries.

Frank W. Moved to change the proposal from a Commercial fishery proposal to a Subsistence. There is supposed to be new subsistence data available at the BOF meeting. **Motion DIED** for lack of second.

Robin spoke to his motion that there used to be a lot kelp closer to Togiak.

Glen W said we need to help the subsistence users of herring spawn-on-kelp.

Chair emphasized that the intent of this proposal and amendment is to provide a subsistence are for roe on kelp.

Robin's Amendment Adopted 13 Support, 1 Opposed.

Bristol Bay Salmon (73 proposals)

Fishing Gear Specifications and Operations (11 proposals)

PROPOSAL 15 **ACTION: Oppose - Unanimous**

DESCRIPTION: Allow set gillnet anchors and running lines at registered sites to remain in the water during closed periods.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Tom O. set netter is opposed as there are a lot of the Igushik sites that are not leased and this would be a hardship.

Robin, there may be other sites not leased in the Nushagak district.

PROPOSAL 16 **ACTION: Oppose – Unanimous**

DESCRIPTION: Allow set gillnet gear to remain in place between fishing periods on consecutive tides.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: There is no such regulation in the Nushagak district. This may refer to the Naknek Special Harvest Area.

Curt or it may be in the Kvichak where set nets have to be pulled on a closure only to have it re-open just 2 hours later. But I know how to get my nets in and out.

Too generic,- as written applies bay-wide.

PROPOSAL 17 **ACTION: Support: 13 Support 1 Opposed**

DESCRIPTION: In the Nushagak District, prohibit a permit holder from operating a set gillnet seaward of another set gillnet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Tom O. said he supported it as a set netter.

ADFG Tim Sands explained the situation how one set net might be placed seaward of another set net.

PROPOSAL 18 **ACTION: No Action by Consensus**

DESCRIPTION: Shorten the distance that a set gillnet can be set from the high-tide mark from 1,000 feet to 600 feet.

AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 19

ACTION: No Action by Consensus

DESCRIPTION: Restrict drift gillnet gear from fishing within 1,000 feet from the mean high-tide line.

AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 20

ACTION: No Action by Consensus

DESCRIPTION: Allow only historical set gillnet sites on the outside beaches of Ugashik District.

AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 21

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Require name of permit holder on stationary gear.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: ADFG Tim pointed out that this is already in the statewide regulations for set net gear and name is required on buoys. Several set netters said they do it already.

Jon F. we do this in Togiak.

PROPOSAL 22

ACTION: Opposed: 13 Opposed 1 Support

DESCRIPTION: Change marking requirement from six inches to twelve inches in height.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: General agreement that current system is good enough.

PROPOSAL 23

ACTION: As Written: Opposed- 12 Opposed 2 Support

DESCRIPTION: Remove the drift gillnet marking requirement that a cork must be marked every 10 fathoms and mark only at each end of the drift gillnet with vessel ADF&G number.

AMENDMENT: Curt A. Moved, Frank W 2nd to amend: amend proposal to require marking each shackle of gear for both set and drift nets.

Amendment Opposed 2 Support, 12 Oppose

DISCUSSION: Several opposed based on the Troopers opposition and concern for potential of easily dropped ghost nets.

There was quite a bit of discussion about the current practice there may be several different numbers on a single net if its been sold, loaned or shared among fishers. How can FWP prove who belongs to a net or is actually fishing it if they find one with multiple numbers? What if a fisher arbitrarily puts someone else's number on a net and leaves it out to get them in trouble?

Amendment Discussion: There was a discussion whether the amendment should clarify what constituted a full shackle of gear, 200f, 100f, 50, 25?.

Discussion pointed out that current regulations require marking every xx fathoms regardless of shackle length or other description.

It's not that hard to mark the corks.

PROPOSAL 24 **ACTION: Opposed – 13 Oppose 1 Support**
DESCRIPTION: Allow seine nets in Bristol Bay for permit holders who hold two Bristol Bay drift gillnet permits.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Don't add a new gear group.
Curt A said he would support on the basis that its a fish quality issue.

PROPOSAL 25 **ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Create a new troll fishery for coho salmon outside commercial fishing districts of Bristol Bay.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Robin opposes on basis that coho fishery is just coming back, don't add a gear group. Dan D opposes as this would likely occur on mixed stocks as well as adding a new gear group.

Closed Waters (4 proposals)

PROPOSAL 26 **ACTION: No Action by Consensus**
DESCRIPTION: Amend closed waters in Togiak District from June 1 to June 30 for king salmon conservation.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 27 **ACTION: Support – Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Change regulatory boundary descriptions for closed waters at the mouth of Igushik River.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: ADFG has been doing EOs to address the issue. This would put boundary back to old Marker site, would allow an historically occupied set net site that may have been inadvertently excluded when Dept went to GPS boundaries.

PROPOSAL 28 **ACTION: Support - Unanimous**
DESCRIPTION: Change regulatory boundary descriptions for closed waters at the mouth of the Togiak River.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: ADFG; correcting a marker issue. The new [gps?] boundary line accidentally opened more area near mouth of Togiak R. ADFG has been addressing w EOs each season.
Housekeeping.

PROPOSAL 29 **ACTION: As Amended: Support - Unanimous**

DESCRIPTION: Create a buffer zone closed to commercial drift gillnet fishing at the mouth of the Togiak River.

AMENDMENT: Longitude cited in proposal appear to be a typo mistake; should read 160 degrees NOT 161.

Jon F Move, Joe C 2nd: Amend: make closure effective through June 30.

Support Amendment Unanimous.

DISCUSSION: Jon, Togiak seeks to move the commercial fishing away from the mouth of the Togiak R during the king season to assist escapement and subsistence. Only for protection of kings.

Longitude cited in proposal appear to be a typo mistake; should read 160 degrees NOT 161.

Jon F Move, Joe C 2nd: Amend: make closure effective through June 30.

Support Amendment Unanimous.

As amended more accurately addresses location and time of concern while not unduly restricting the fishery for the remainder of the season.

Support as amended, Unanimous

Landing Requirements (1 proposal)

PROPOSAL 30

ACTION: Opposed – 10 Opposed 4 Support

DESCRIPTION: Allow set gillnet vessels to transport salmon through the Snake River Section provided they have no gear on board the vessel.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Tom O. explained that he thought the proposer seeks a safer route to transport Igushik caught fish, to be used occasionally.

Some expressed concerns there might be inaccurate reporting of catch area.

ADFG expressed no concerns as they have not allowed a permit holder to register in 2 areas of the district.

Several commented that this one individual is the sole advocate and most others have done fine without this option. One comment; what about safety/ In bad weather that can be a dangerous place?

Vessels (5 proposals)

PROPOSAL 31

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow vessels with permanent markings to be exempt from dual marking requirements when vessel is used in more than one salmon fishery.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: ADFG indicated this would probably create an enforcement issue.

Troopers said they opposed this.

There was speculation that the author may participate in drift and set fishing.

PROPOSAL 32

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Increase vessel length up to 42 feet in length based on vessel processing capabilities.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Chair thought he heard that Troopers were neutral on vessel length for the Bay but supports enforcement concerns that the equipment portion of this plan would be very problematic. Also, we already have huge new boats that are 32 Long and 18.5 wide fully capable of carrying plenty of equipment.

Robin opposed to longer boats due to local economic & capitalization limitations and difficulties local smaller boats would have around much larger boats in the congested fisheries along the lines. He recalled the intimidation and collision/ damage problems back when boat bow lengths were allowed to stretch beyond the 32 foot limit.

A handout showing the Bristol Bay Native Association resolution(s) opposing this proposal.

PROPOSAL 33

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Increase vessel length to 36 feet if vessel chills catch and 39 feet if the vessel processes and freezes catch.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Based on Action Taken on 32

PROPOSAL 34

ACTION: Opposed – 13 Oppose 1 Support

DESCRIPTION: Increase vessel length up to 36 feet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: A member of the audience advocated for 36 feet so it would be easier to carry ice and have a good payload of fish. I've quit icing due to loss of payload.

Curt supports 36 feet, always wondered why 32 foot was established. We already have a huge disparity of boat sizes from the little Rawsons to these huge new boats. What about trying it for 3 years with a sunset clause?

Several other AC members disagreed and said its been shown that icing, chilling, and bleeding can be done economically on current 32 foot boats.

PROPOSAL 35

ACTION: Opposed – 13 Opposed 1 Support

DESCRIPTION: Increase vessel length over 32 feet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Robin, I'm opposed for same reasons as #34.

Joe C. I'm opposed as we have been discussing.

Permit Stacking (20 proposals)

PROPOSAL 36, 37, 38

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow one permit holder who owns two drift gillnet permits operate 200 fathoms of drift gillnet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: One in the audience supports this idea while several others were vocally opposed.

Audience: fishing 200f lowers quality of fish at the outer end of the net from dragging.

Audience: Another supporter said that set netters are doing it let the drifters and it would reduce effort.

Curt A. I support the current dual permit system and have experience with it working as it was intended.

Frank W expressed his opposition of any the dual permit systems current or proposed.

A roll call vote was requested.

Curt Armstrong -N

Dan Dunaway – N

Peter Christopher -N

Louie Alakyak - N

Jon Forsling – N

Chris Carr - N

Joe Kazimirowicz – N

Joe Chythlook - N

Glen Wysoki - N

Tom O' Connor - N

Joe Clark – N

Frank Woods - N

Robin Samuelson - N

Hans Nicholson - N

PROPOSAL 39, 40

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow dual drift gillnet permit holders 200 fathoms in other districts when Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) is open.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Robin said he is opposed.

Hans is opposed.

ADFG says the current regulation was designed to keep all D boats from converging on the Nushagak when the NRSHA opens.

PROPOSAL 41

ACTION: Support – 10 Support 3 Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Disallow permit stacking in Bristol Bay.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Frank Woods explained he is opposed to how the D Permit stacking system has worked out. He doesn't think it worked out like anticipated. Seems like it helped nonlocals more than locals.

Curt A said he has seen the D permit work as intended and he is in support.

Robin supports this; he has 2 permits and thinks it worked well last season where there weren't many fish. But outsiders are really taking advantage of the opportunity. He would like to go back to 3 nets per boat.

A member of the audience said this is the one of the few ways to help a new local person work into the fishery.

Comment: there are no set net permits on the market because of allowing double ownership.

If we end D permits lot of folks will just keep the permit and buy a boat, might enlarge the fleet.

PROPOSAL 42

ACTION: Support – 10 Support 3 Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Disallow additional gear for vessels with two drift gillnet permits.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Frank Woods explained he is opposed to how the D Permit stacking system has worked out. He doesn't think it worked out like anticipated. Seems like it helped nonlocals more than locals.

Curt A said he has seen the D permit work as intended and he is in support.

Robin supports this; he has 2 permits and thinks it worked well last season where there weren't many fish. But outsiders are really taking advantage of the opportunity. He would like to go back to 3 nets per boat.

A member of the audience said this is the one of the few ways to help a new local person work into the fishery.

Comment: there are no set net permits on the market because of allowing double ownership.

If we end D permits lot of folks will just keep the permit and buy a boat, might enlarge the fleet.

PROPOSAL 43

ACTION: Support – 11 Support 0 Oppose 2 Abstain

DESCRIPTION: Disallow additional drift gillnet gear for dual permit vessels in the Togiak District.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Jon, Togiak AC adopted this; Togiak has a small run; when the district opens to other boats (super exclusive period ends) the incoming D boat overwhelm the locals in their mostly small boats. Jon feels Nush AC should support this given the action on proposals 41 & 42.

If this proposal is opposed then we should make the transfer date in August.

There are 90 locally held drift permits & 90 locally held set net permits.

PROPOSAL's 44-54

ACTION: Opposed – 12 Oppose 1 Abstain

DESCRIPTION: Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Chirs C. Move as a block, Frank W. 2nd.

This would make dual permits /permit stacking permanent.

To oppose it would restore regulations to the 2009 situation.

Curt A. This has not worked as intended and he favors going back to the way it was. If this were to pass it would make it harder to retain the status quo with the drifters and their dual permit status.

Glen, keep in mind where this came from. It was supposed to help locals but it hasn't. It backfired.

Hans agrees. Some set net operations have become gigantic and they overwhelm the locals.

Audience comment: Vote carefully, a yes vote keeps the double permit system; Not meant to do away with the double set permits.

Jon F. Togiak AC opposed this proposal.

PROPOSAL 55

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow two set gillnet permit holders to fish 100 fathoms on a single site.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: This currently isn't allowed anywhere and shouldn't be.

Registration and Reregistration (1 proposal)

PROPOSAL 56

ACTION: Support – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Prior to June 25, if a drift gillnet permit holder intends to fish in either the Ugashik or Egegik district they must be registered for that district.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: This proposal seeks to remove rule that allows boats to move around in the early fishery..

Intent of current regulation was to eliminate foregone harvest in early weeks.

Has not worked well, disruptive.

Bristol Bay Management Plans (31 proposals)
Genetics (1 proposal)

PROPOSAL 57

ACTION: No Action At this Time

DESCRIPTION: Placeholder for possible regulatory changes based on results from Western Alaska Salmon Stock Identification Project (WASSIP).

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Note to Board of Fisheries: The Nushagak Advisory Committee is dismayed that the WASSIP results are not available to ACs or the public until it is too late to make constructive and timely comments.

General District (4 proposals)

PROPOSAL's 58, 59, 60, 61

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Open General District

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Robin S. Move as a block, Joe C. 2nd.

Robin, opposed due to historic problems and due to anticipated data from WASSIP. Would be inconsistent to support when we expect to request WASSIP based restrictions, terminal fisheries, for Alaska Peninsula fisheries.

We finally have good district boundaries and don't want to create local mixed stock, non-terminal fishery.

FWP said they were concerned they'd need way more assets and clearly defined boundaries for proper enforcement.

Bristol Bay Restructuring Plan and Process (1 proposal)

PROPOSAL 62

ACTION: Support - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Develop a process for addressing future proposals deemed as Bristol Bay salmon industry restructuring proposals.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Frank: We need a guide to deal with "restructuring proposals".

Hans: currently there is not a clear process to identify and deal with restructuring proposals.

Joe C.: BBNA has provided us with a copy of a resolution supporting this proposal.

Robin: BBEDC did due diligence on this proposal. The BOF may not have taken all issues into account when restructuring, such as economic effects on watershed communities.

Bristol Bay Allocation Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL's 63, 64, 65

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Increase set gillnet allocation in Nushagak, Naknek-Kvichak, Egegik and Ugashik districts.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Robin S. Move as a block, Chris C. 2nd..

Robin opposed as original allocations base on historic take before allocation. While some were originally opposed to the allocation, now they feel its brought stability to fisheries. He feels the system is work. We could seek to remove the allocations but doesn't seem a good route.

Audience comment: One real problem is that when instituted, Igushik was given 6% of the whole Nushagak harvest when in reality they only ever fished one stock – the Igushik run. This hurt Nushagak drifters and needs to be fixed.

Pete C.: I've always been against this allocation. Doesn't make sense. Set netters are making it every year but it hurts drifters. Drifters only got 63% this year; just do away with allocation.

Audience comment: I (drifter) probably lost \$30,000 since the allocation came. I used to get a few drift periods in Igushik early in the season. Now we can only get there late in the season. I object to Igushik [set??] fishing 24/7 trying to get their allocation.

ADFG: When asked Tim Sands said in most seasons the set netters usually don't quite get their allocation.

Robin agrees that Igushik might have been given too much of an allocation.

There were several comments that late in the season, drifters get shut down waiting for the set netters to catch up on their allocation but with a lot of set netters out of the fishery, those remaining can't catch enough fish to fill the allocation.

Dan asked if the coming WASSIP data might be used to address Igushik allocation and historical harvest?

ADFG – Sands has doubts the study has fine enough resolution to tease out Igushik fish from other Nushagak District stocks.

Naknek-Kvichak Management and Allocation Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL 66

ACTION: Support – 6 Support 3 Oppose 2 Abstain

DESCRIPTION: Remove set and drift gillnet allocations.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Curt, a Kvichak set net operator is afraid to totally do away with the allocation even though some years things “feel out of whack”. Allocations may need tweaking but don't throw it all out.

ADFG – This isn't a tool to address bay-wide issues – doubtful this one could be amended to add Nushagak allocation issues.

Robin (drifter) has heard complaints that the Kvichak section has essentially become a set net only fishery and he supports this proposal.

PROPOSAL 67 **ACTION: No Action based on Action take on 66**
DESCRIPTION: Stagger fishing periods throughout run.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 68 **ACTION: No Action**
DESCRIPTION: Open a new set gillnet fishery at Levelock when Kvichak River reaches minimum escapement.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

Alagnak River Special Harvest Area Management Plan (2 proposals)

PROPOSAL 69 **ACTION: No Action**
DESCRIPTION: Open Alagnak River Special Harvest Area (ARSHA) to set gillnets when the Kvichak Section is open.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 70 **ACTION: No Action**
DESCRIPTION: Change the allocation plan in the Alagnak River Special Harvest Area (ARSHA) to 84% drift and 16% set.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

Naknek River Special Harvest Area Management Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL 71 **ACTION: No Action**
DESCRIPTION: Open the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) to set gillnet gear when the Naknek River escapement goal is met.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 72 **ACTION: No Action**
DESCRIPTION: Open the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) to set gillnet gear when the Naknek Section is open.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 73 **ACTION: No Action**
DESCRIPTION: Limit the amount of gillnet on board a drift vessel to 75 fathoms in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA).
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

Nushagak-Mulchatna King Salmon Management Plan (4 proposals)

PROPOSAL 74 **ACTION: Pending**

DESCRIPTION: Revise king salmon reference points.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: ADFG Tim, explained these proposals are designed to revise the reference and trigger points based on the new Didson Sonar counter numbers since the current regulations use the old Bendix sonar counts. The two systems produce different numbers but ADFG is will be recommending Didson numbers that should be net neutral for these proposals.

The chair expressed concern about the Didson numbers being higher than the old Bendix ones. He went on to say that we could oppose, support the proposal or authorize a subcommittee to work with ADFG to insert Didson numbers in these proposals when numbers are available from ADFG.

AC Consensus to form and authorize a subcommittee:

Chair delegated Robin Samuelson, Dan Dunaway, Frank Wood, Joe Chythlook for the subcommittee.

All other AC members are welcome to attend and participate.

The subcommittee meeting will be announced publicly and public is welcome to attend.

PROPOSAL 75

ACTION: Opposed – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Increase king salmon escapement in the Nushagak River by restricting the drift gillnet fleet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Chair is opposed to this based on the existing plan. Robin, commercial and subsistence fishers are already taking a hit. The commercial fishery has had no directed king openers recently. If more conservation is needed limit the days in the sport fishery. He feels the sport fishery is not bearing its share of the burden of conservation. We need hard numbers from the sport fishery.

Choggiung Land Manager spoke to their records for land use in the main part of the sport fishery: In 2007 the peak year, they had 10,000 man-use days. It has declined since then to about 4,500 man-use days. There is a considerable decline in activity around the lower river fishery.

Chris C. pointed out that guides must maintain a detailed log book and submit data regularly. Sport anglers have been frequently restricted in-season in recent years.

PROPOSAL 76

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Restrict commercial fishing to no more than 3 tides in a 48-hour period and fishing time may not exceed 24 hours in length.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Talks about Naknek area but as written could apply Bay-wide.

Proposal is ridiculous and overlooks extensive management practices, regulations and protections already in place.

PROPOSAL 77

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Restrict commercial fishing to no more than 12 hours of commercial fishing in any 24-hour period and no commercial fishing on consecutive high tides if there has been any sport fishing restrictions placed on the Nushagak.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Comments: Commercial fishers have already taken drastic measures and the sport fishery should be limited now.

Dan suggested to amend 77 to use a proposal from the last BOF cycle that had a more reasonable option to put the commercial fishery into the WRSWA under certain circumstances to protect kings when needed and to provide harvest on Wood R sockeye.

Robin emphatically unwilling to see ANY more restrictions to the commercial fishery.

Wood River Special Harvest Area Management Plan (7 proposals)

PROPOSAL 78

ACTION: Pending

DESCRIPTION: Revise sockeye salmon escapement reference points.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: ADFG Tim, explained these proposals are designed to revise the reference and trigger points based on the new Didson Sonar counter numbers since the current regulations use the old Bendix sonar counts. The two systems produce different numbers but ADFG is will be recommending Didson numbers that should be net neutral for these proposals.

The chair expressed concern about the Didson numbers being higher than the old Bendix ones. He went on to say that we could oppose, support the proposal or authorize a subcommittee to work with ADFG to insert Didson numbers in these proposals when numbers are available from ADFG.

AC Consensus to form and authorize a subcommittee:

Chair delegated Robin Samuelson, Dan Dunaway, Frank Wood, Joe Chythlook for the subcommittee.

All other AC members are welcome to attend and participate.

The subcommittee meeting will be announced publicly and public is welcome to attend.

PROPOSAL 79, 80

ACTION: Pending

DESCRIPTION: Allow separate drift and set gillnet fishing periods in the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSWA)

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Frank W. Move as block, Glen W. 2nd.

Glen thinks this is a good idea.

Audience comment: A good tool to adjust allocations, hope it passes.

ADFG We need more language in it to address allocation and rotations. Needs to be spelled out for managers, including tide stage for openers.

Could provisionally approve and put into the subcommittee for refining.

Put into the subcommittee and invite Tom O'Connor as a member.

PROPOSAL 81**ACTION: Support – 8 Support 1 Oppose****DESCRIPTION:** Allow up to 150 fathoms on board a drift gillnet vessel when fishing in the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA).**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** There was a discussion of the practice of rotating nets.

Some oppose, some support the practice of net rotation.

When ADFG opens WRSHA, the intent is to catch most of the fish.

Net rotation is common in Naknek Special Harvest Area

This proposal seems to align the WRSHA with practices allowed in NRSHA.

PROPOSAL 82**ACTION: Support - Unanimous****DESCRIPTION:** Allow dual drift gillnet vessels to have up to 200 fathoms on board in the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA).**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** As long as nets are bagged.

Allow boats to quickly transition to and from WRSHA.

PROPOSAL 83**ACTION: Opposed – 4 Oppose 3 Support 1 Abstain****DESCRIPTION:** When the Nushagak District is closed and the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA) is open, allow set gillnet permit holders to remain in the Nushagak District with 25 fathoms of gear.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** Not every set netter can get into or participate in the WRSHA.

This would reduce congestion in WRSHA.

Reduced set gear in Nushagak Dist offers some protection to fish out there.

This may help set netters catch up on their Nush Dist. allocation.

Allowing set netters to remain in the Nushagak Dist. might extend the need for using the WRSHA.

Curt: This was partly written to help keep some set net markets open: One processor [Ekuk?] has few tenders and depends on nearby set netters for product. In past when all of the fishery went into the WRSHA, they didn't have fish to process – can't stay open in those conditions.

Dan supports, recalls the market discussion when this proposal was written and doesn't recall any major objections from ADFG.

PROPOSAL 84**ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous****DESCRIPTION:** Allow dual set gillnet permit holders to have up to 50 fathoms of gear on board and fish two sites with up to 25 fathoms at each site.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** Frank is opposed, its already too congested and would make things worse. Drifters can't use dual option in WRSHA, set netters should not be allowed to either.

Togiak River Salmon Management Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL 85, 86

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Create a Togiak River king salmon management plan similar to Nushagak River plan.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Frank w Move as a block, Jon F. 2nd.

Brito, as written proposal is too vague for BOF to address.

Jon, Togiak AC adopted.

ADFG Jones: Dept. is likely to oppose and suggest Togiak AC invite all user groups to work out a plan.

ADFG Jones: Dept. opposes as it has no in-season stock enumeration system to enable or support such a plan.

The Nushagak AC sympathizes but takes no action at this time.

One rep had an additional concern: there has been no “Amount Needed for Subsistence” established.

PROPOSAL 87

ACTION: Support - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Change the waiving period to July 24 if escapement goal is projected to exceed 175,000 before July 27.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Designed to align transfer waiver date with the 3 days of protection added at last BOF meeting when transfer period was moved from June 21 to 24.

Essentially a house keeping proposal to fix and oversight.

Supplemental Proposals

PROPOSAL 238

ACTION: See Action on 36, 37, 38

DESCRIPTION: Allow one permit holder who owns two drift gillnet permits to use 200 fathoms drift gillnet gear, and operate the gear from a single vessel.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 239

ACTION: As Amended: Support – 12 Support 2 Oppose

DESCRIPTION: Limit sport and guided sport fishing for king salmon in the Nushagak River drainage, excluding the Wood River drainage, to unbaited, single-hook, artificial lures from May 1 through July 31.

AMENDMENT: Chris C Move, Robin S 2nd: **Amend proposal to only restrict tackle to barbless single hooks. Remove all references prohibiting bait.**

Amendment Adopted, 12 Support, 1 Opposed

DISCUSSION: Before there was any motion, there was a long spirited discussion . Chris Carr (Nushagak fishing guide and boat rentals, services) was quick to object to the bait restriction but might support the hook restriction. Locals use bait. Prohibition of bait would eliminate any sort of scent.

ADFG was uncertain whether single hooks would significantly affect mortality rates but might reduce handling / release injuries.

Rick Tennyson said he would be supportive of the hook restrictions but not the bait prohibition.

Joe C said we could make a motion to support Chris C.'s position. Chris Carr 2nd.

Robert H. asked if there was any data on the efficiency of bait, bait + single hook vs bait + treble hook. He then brought up the Fish Alaska Magazine article that claimed 80-100/ day kings caught. Can you just prohibit bait for guided anglers?

Chris Carr said the sport fishery has changed and effort / catch is greatly reduced, far fewer anglers, lodges, guides on the river. Cancelling bait will have a significant impact on boat rentals other service providers on the river and in Dillingham, possibly Naknek. He said with the existing King Plan we already have lots of rules to protect Nushagak kings: keep caught fish in the water, daily and seasonal bag limits, lowest jack bag limit in the state, a very cautious and restrictive plan with numerous triggers.

Ken Wilson asked how this would affect the locals and small guides in Ekwok. While Ekwok locals may use sport gear its more like subsistence for them if they don't want to use a net.

There was a comment that its frustrating the BOF chose to make this proposal with short notice and the exact text isn't available to the AC.

Joe K. Ekwok AC rep. agreed with Chris Carr, allow bait, I'm one of those new young local guys trying to start a guide business.

Robert Heyano, why then is the Nushagak R one of the last places in Alaska where bait can be used for kings?

ADFG Dye, other rivers around Bristol Bay often have bait prohibitions to protect rainbow trout – Naknek, Alagnak and those rivers have much smaller king runs.****Break in Discussion***

***Right after lunch Brito announced that the much anticipated final wording of the BOF generated proposal to restrict bait and hooks on the Nushagak drainage king fishery was still not posted for the public.

Chris Carr: this just isn't sufficient public notice prior to the December meeting; nobody knows about it.

ADFG confirmed they have the power to restrict bait in the king fishery, only under the terms of the Nushagak Chinook Salmon Management Plan.

Chris C. The sport fishery is a real economic boost to the area and provides economic opportunities for locals who don't have commercial permits. Supports the single hook portion but no prohibition of bait.

The was much concern / frustration expressed regarding the unavailable language of the actual BOF generated proposal.

Chris C Move, Robin S 2nd: **Amend proposal to only restrict tackle to barbless single hooks. Remove all references prohibiting bait.**

Amendment Adopted, 12 Support, 1 Opposed

A lodge operator in the audience expressed concern how the proposal would impact the villagers in Ekwok, New Stuyahok, Koliganek who may use sport gear but consider themselves using it for subsistence. Advocated if anything is adopted it should only apply downriver from Ekwok, maybe just downstream from the Iowithla R. That's where the problem is.

Final on 239 Support as amended; 12 support, 2 opposed.

Nushagak ADFG, AC Subcommittee Meeting

November 16, 2012

Alaska Dept. Fish & Game Office, Dillingham

Minutes Subcommittee

I. Call To Order: 1:03 PM

II. Attendance

Subcommittee members on site:

Frank (Woodsy) Woods – Designated Sub Com Chair

Dan Dunaway Dlg Secretary

Lloyd (Tom) O'Connor – Dlg

Subcommittee members not present:

Robin Samuelson – Dlg

Joe Chythlook – Dlg

ADFG Staff present

Tim Sands Com Fish

Matt Jones Com Fish

Jason Dye Sport Fish

Susie Jenkins-Brito Boards Support

Greg Buck Com Fish Research Biologist - by phone

Other Attendees

Glen (Skin) Wysoki – Nushagak AC member Koliganek - by phone

Bud Hodson lodge owner – by phone

David Nicholson local public

III. Discussion.

Susie B handed out several items provided by ADFG designed to aid the subcommittee in the meeting:

Table: Comparison of total run, commercial, subsistence, and sport harvests, in-river sonar estimates, and escapement for king salmon, Nushagak River drainage 1989-2012.

Texts of proposals 74, 78 showing new ADFG recommended numbers and current numbers that would be replaced. The first time the ADFG recommended numbers had been available for this proposal was Nov. 15. Tim explained that there's a slight chance that ADFG is continuing its review of their work and they might make small changes to the numbers by the time of the BOF meeting.

Frank W opened the meeting by listing the proposal the subcommittee was delegated to review 74, 78, 79, 80.

Frank invited Greg Buck of ADFG to explain the new Nushagak sonar, counts, calculations etc. related to the Nushagak kings and proposal 74.

Greg Buck Report

Buck explained the recent changes in sonar equipment at the Nushagak site. Bendix was very old technology and totally worn out; was a black box; didn't reach very far out into the river; couldn't be error checked; and the builder has passed away. The new is Didson equipment counts differently; reaches farther into the river; can store counts in a manner that allows review and error checking, more easily serviced; tends to count more fish, especially king salmon than the Bendix.

Neither system counts the full river. ADFG has been working on the transition for several years and used both systems side-by-side for some years.

Buck explained that Susanne Maxwell wrote an exhaustive report on five ADFG sonar sites where Bendix equipment was switched to Didson. It is accessible online at the ADFG She made count comparisons and developed correlation between the raw sonar counts for each brand and developed "correction factors" for each species.

Generally the Didson counts more fish than Bendix, especially for kings in part because the Didson counts farther off shore where kings tend to swim.

Corrections vary by species and factors for the Nushagak are:

For 1 chum counted by Bendix, the Didson will count 1.27

Reds: 1.11,

Kings: 2.08

At the Nushagak site ADFG began applying correction factors to the sonar counts in 2010

For the last several years ADFG has had to convert Didson counts to Bendix equivalents to be able to assess compliance with the Bendix derived numbers in some management plans. All the calculations back and forth gets pretty confusing.

ADFG is in the process of expanding the corrections for a river-wide correction factor.

In addition they are applying the Didson equivalent counts to their brood tables to review their escapement goals.

All of this will be in a report that just went to publication that is expected to be available by the Dec. BOF meeting. Not sure if it will be in the Data Series or Manuscript Series.

In response to some questions from attendees: The sonars work in 4 strata. 90% of reds and 80% of chums are counted in the inshore strata. Very predictable. The kings are different, tend to be more off shore but how far off shore may vary across the season.

Proposal Review and Discussion

Proposal 74

Tim Sands presented proposal 74 and referred to the new handout where ADFG has inserted the ADFG best recommendations for the Nushagak King Salmon Management Plan (Plan).

He briefly outlined the history of the Plan. Main Plan adopted in early 90's, some changes followed but none really major. One change to ADFG's management system was moving from a single point escapement goals to an escapement goal Range in 2000's. For Nushagak kings the range was set at 40,000 to 80,000 king salmon Bendix count. But the Plan was not changed in any way to address the new goal.

These recommendations reflect the recommended Didson counts and will get away from trying to back calculate to Bendix numbers now written in the plan.

ADFG's goal was to insert NET NEUTRAL numbers, expecting no REAL change to the escapement levels and have no different effects to fishery or management.

Sands explained that the correction factors can't be applied linearly, its not good science to just apply the correction factor to each Bendix trigger number in the Plan.

In part this is due to the changed MSY that came out with the revisions to the brood tables, as well as the new Didson counter effects.

Sands reiterated that there is a small chance that ADFG may suggest slightly different Didson numbers at the BOF meeting.

Sands went through the Plan handout with the new numbers {new Didson number **bold underlined** and current [Bendix number to be replaced in brackets] listed below:

plan lines:

(b)(1) **95,000** [75,000].....

(b)(1)(A)**55,000-120,000** [65,000].....

(c)**95,000** [75,000].....

(d) **55,000** [40,000]..... **95,000** [75,000].....

(d)(2)**70,000** [55,000] but less than **95,000** [75,000].....

(d)(3) **70,000** [55,000]..... **55,000** [40,000].....

(e)**55,000** [40,000].....

Glen W: Why change numbers now? why not try system for a few years.

Sands: You might not have heard us since you're on the phone but ADFG has been running the new system for a few years and we find we count a little more than 2 times as many kings with the Didson.

Buck: ADFG started in 2006. For the last couple years we have been converting our new (Didson) counts to the equivalent of the old Bendix.

Glen: Oh ok I understand.

Sands went on to say the new escapement goal has a lower bottom end than the old one.

ADFG's calculations lower the lower end (from Bendix numbers) and kind of raises the upper end based on their MSY analysis and Bendix numbers.

Looking back ADFG did not do in-season conversions (to Bendix) conversions for the years 2006-2008 - just afterward.

This (2102) season, the king run was late, there a possibility the way it came in , IF ADFG had been operating with these recommended Didson numbers, there might not have been any sport fishery restrictions OR the mesh restrictions on the commercial fishery.

Hodson: the new numbers seem to show a progression. Why?

Dye: mainly due to the escapement goal range where the old Plan had no range.

Buck: Remember we can't scale the 2.08 conversion factor to these new trigger numbers, and this gets back to our revised calculation of MSY. Again like Tim said its not linear, it is affected by our confidence intervals around our estimates, as well as our recalculated brood tables. It is pretty complicated.

Woods: can you explain again, especially the bottom end?

Out of this discussion ADFG explained bottom line is these numbers are our best estimate of what it takes to have a Net Neutral effect on the Plan. We didn't try to make any changes.

Hodson: Has ADFG tried any what-if with the prior seasons using the new numbers?

Dye: The escapement goal would have been exceeded for most years except 2007 to 2010. But all of this is speculative post seasonally and we can't take into consideration how this season would have looked day-by-day in-season. It would be hard and very time consuming to try that exercise. For 2007 & 2010 looking back, we might not have met the escapement goals - those seasons really were quite similar. They look different in the table because of the different equipment; footnote (f) says the 2007-09 counts are Didson counts, and the 2010-12 counts are Didson counts converted to Bendix equivalent. But 2007 and 2010 escapement counts are really essentially the same.

At this point the Subcommittee [SC] had enough discussion on proposal 74.

ACTION

Woods asked what the SC wanted to do.

Dunaway said from the minutes it wasn't clear how much authority was delegated to us; act to support or oppose it? come up with recommendations for the full AC or what?

O'Connor suggested the best bet was for each SC member to report their individual recommendations back to the full AC during the November 20 meeting in Dillingham.

The SC agreed with O'Connors's approach.

Proposal 78

Sands explained ADFG reason for submitting this proposal. Reviewed the printed copy with the new numbers inserted in **bold**.

(c)(1)(A)minimum escapement goal of **400,000** [340,000] sockeye
400,000 [340,000] fish;

(c)(1)(B)for an optimal escapement goal of at least **275,000** [235,000]
sockeyewill be less than**275,000** [235,000] fish;

(c)(1)(C)minimum biological escapement goal of **400,000** [340,000]
sockeye to the Nushagak R.....;

(c)(1)(D) optimal escapement goal of at least **275,000** [235,000] sockeye
will be less than **275,000** [235,000] sockeye

Sands explained how the new numbers were calculated. Genetics were used to redo the brood tables for MSY as well as the adjustment factor of 1.11 for changing from Bendix to Didson sonar counters. As written these numbers adds more fish to the minimum by a very small amount.

He stressed that the goal as in the king plan was to be NET NEUTRAL.

He said there is one other part: Since the escapement goal changes, this changes section (c)(1)(D)(3) of the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA) as to when he can re-open the WRSHA along with the commercial District to harvest surplus fish. The numbers go up from 1.1 to 1.3 and the 1.4 goes to 1.7 million fish;

(c)(1)(D)(3)...when the escapement of sockeye salmon into the Wood R. exceeds **1,300,000** [1,100,00] fish and the escapement is projected to exceed **1,700,000** [1,400,000] fish.

There was some confusion on how ADFG got these numbers.

Sands explained that it due to the new MSY analysis that used genetic analysis from historic scale samples compared to the ADFG genetic baseline database, revised the brood tables all to more accurately reconstruct total run and total return per spawner. This analysis showed the Wood River stocks were slightly larger than previously thought while the Igushik and Nushagak returns appeared to be somewhat smaller. Its only since the genetic database has become available that this aspect was incorporated into the MSY calculations.

Dan asked if there were several really big, or really small runs in a short period, would this change the spawner- recruit relation and MSY?

Sands: yes it could but the Wood R. data set goes back to 1956 so it should be pretty stable. Yes unusual size runs, good or poor productivity could change MSY. The Nushagak, only being counted since the early 80's has a shorter data set and might be more sensitive, same for Igushik.

O'Connor: Is fish catch / passage at Ekuk very sensitive to the Wood R. Counts? How do the new counts affect the forecast for OEG?

Buck: the models don't change much, the model is really strong. If anything the forecast should improve now with the better counts by Didson, and the new genetics should help too - better measure of total run than could be done before.

There was a discussion about the million fish trigger point used throughout the WRSOA Plan. Tim, ADFG decided to leave it alone in the proposal. The discussion covered raising or lowering that million fish trigger: The AC could raise it if they want, to 1.5 or whatever. But there could be consequences.

Some participants misunderstood the genetic analysis for Wood River MSY versus the WASSIP project. Sands clarified that the two are separate, but the database and techniques needed for WASSIP allowed this new analysis for Wood R.

Sands continued that the escapement goal is based on the MSY.

Woods was concerned that the new numbers offered by ADFG could mess up the Nushagak sockeye fishery.

Sands reiterated that the new numbers are supposed to be NET NEUTRAL. The slight changes are from better analysis of passed escapements.

Woods said he still had reservations.

Sands said there could be a new section to allow fishing in the WRSOA and the District. The AC can argue trigger points as they are allocative and that's out of ADFG range, but the MSY and escapement goals are the biologists' responsibility.

O'Connor asked how the 2012 res fishery might have played out under the new numbers.

Sands - not much different than it did I think. Might not have had that early set net only opening.

Sands- the Earlier we can go into the WRSOA, the earlier we can get out. The later we go into the WRSOA, the harder it is to get out of there, if at all.

O'Connor wished for more tools, smaller mesh, anything to stay out of the WRSOA.

Sands - I'm limited to what is allowed in the book.

More discussion on small mesh, any other likely alternative tools. Small mesh could be nice on years of small fish like a couple years ago.

Sands- you can put anything like that into the plan, just be VERY SPECIFIC in every detail, how when etc. The more details the better.

Woods asked Dan to be sure to note the above.

Brito suggested if there was a desire to add an amendment to this WRSOA proposal do to SOON, have it formatted. We're so close to the comment deadline and the more complete the better chance it has to get in "the Book".

Long discussion.

Hodson: remember the BOF has the legal ability to change the proposal any way they want BUT they are aware of the concept of legal notice versus practical notice.

Dan suggests coming to the Nov. 20 AC meeting fully prepared with complete amending language worked out.

This concluded the discussion on proposal 78.

Proposal 79

A general discussion over the problems when the WRSHA is active.

Trooper Burk said FWP will try to enforce mesh regulations. To a suggestion of making corridors for the different gear groups would be very problematic. Don't go there please.

Sands: There are 2 reasons for going into the WRSHA:

- 1 - protect the smaller Nushagak red run.
- 2 - slow down/stop excessive red escapement into the Wood R.

Several agreed that there is a real issue with getting sites, the congestion and unruly behavior. What about alternating gear groups?

Sands: in big years (scenario 2) the set nets can't catch enough of the fish to effectively reduce the escapement.

O'Connor: but if you don't get one of the first sites its not worth going. This proposal might help.

Sands: 79 is too vague and doesn't dial it in well.

Woods: why not mirror the Naknek Special Harvest area practice? They do 3:1 or something what about triggers?

Sands: Don't make triggers, they could put you into the WRSHA late and remember the later you go in the longer you'll be there. Its better for me to have room to go in early like July 1 or 2.

Woods: what about tying 78 & 79 together? Modify the 340,000 / 400,000 trigger?

Dan: Stay with the ADFG recommendations. Any other numbers become shots in the dark, we need to see how their best numbers work.

Sands: summarized the discussion, and reiterated that with only set gear too many fish get by in the WRSHA, they don't have the fishing power.

Glen spoke up: I have an idea. We could have both gears in the water but cut the WRSHA in half at the Muklung or so and gear types would rotate 2 tides in each half. One tide each place is too much hassle, and fuel.

Sands asked are there tides or tide stages where the drifters couldn't or wouldn't go up or get out of the upper section?

O'Connor thought the set nets would be willing to take the big tides in the upper section.

Sands: sounds possible but you need to dial in ALL the details. Which tides for which groups, what about getting stuck at low tide in upper section. The more clear cut and detailed the better

Glen, Frank you're a drifter what do you think?

Woods, I've fished the upper end and it can be good. I think I've been up there in pretty low tides. But I'd probably prefer to have drifters in the upper section on the higher tide of the day.

Hodson I'm signing off thanks. 2:35 pm

Brito, thanks Bud, if you want to tune into the November 20 meeting use the same number and pass code.

Woods suggested doing a summary of the material covered:

Proposal 74: Woods is ok with the ADFG numbers for kings. O'Connor and Dan generally agree.

Proposal 78: O'Connor - going cautious in the early season, I'm good with that. Ekuk set netters don't target kings for the most part anyway.

Glen the talk helped to clarify the issue. The old system seemed to work fine.

Buck, in response to Glen: ADFG would have liked to have more side-by-side seasons with both brands of equipment but the Bendix stuff was really old and just wouldn't run anymore. Bendix was a "black box" a bi-plane while the Didson is like the space shuttle.

Glen what if we waited 3 more years before changing?

Buck: we already have 3 years and we can't go back.

Brito: Buck, I think that video from the ADFG information Center might be really helpful, could you bring it for the BOF meeting? Oh and an old Bendix unit is at the Sam Fox museum here in Dillingham.

Back to Proposal 78 summary:

will be Didson only now. There is a 1.1 conversion from Bendix to Didson on reds.

For reds don't mess with the difference.

Woods disagrees with any change to the Nushagak goals. Prefer to have an OEG, as I'm just not comfortable with the new ADFG numbers.

Dan, these numbers & goals have been reviewed/ revised before. Like Tim said, ADFG sought to change the MSY last board cycle and it was stopped. I'm concerned if we keep

doing this it could cause us to veer too far away from what good science says management should do. Then where will we be?

Sands: yes but in 2006 ADFG recommended higher escapement goals base on the old standard analysis and it was stopped. These new recommendations come with significantly new analyses and data.

Woods concerned that there hasn't been enough time for the public to digest, understand, react to all this information.

Sands: go ahead and propose an OEG, develop a strong rationale for the OEG. You better be ready to explain how you got it. If there's not a substantial change ADFG might not object. But if you want something like 2 million, then ADFG is likely to firmly object. Don't forget the "law of unintended consequences" either and how an OEG might turn out in the long term. Don't go too high.

The 2006 and 2007 Nushagak R. red escapements were discussed and how those escapements appear to be affecting productivity and returns. In 2006 the escapement was 548K and 518 in 2007. Probably there was a good run to the Nushagak.

In 2002 only 316K produced 2 million. Total run to the Nushagak District 2006 was 2.69 million and in 2007 2.06 million.

ADFG's analysis of BEG and MSY is what we believe is sustainable. Going to an OEG is ok once in a while but not all the time.

The higher you set the bar could delay protective actions putting the fleet into the WRSWA, the harder it might be to recover. If you make the bar lower, you might squeak by without going into the WRSWA.

Woods: at this point there is too much info to sort out a recommendation for an OEG. I'm ok with the Didson adjustment but not with the brood table analysis. Especially adding in that 25,000 fish to go to 400,000. That's a whole day of fish isn't it?

Sands: That's a whole day of fish on the 28th of June.

A discussion of the progress of the 2011 early season ensued.

This lead to a discussion of where the Old OEG came from.

Sands explained in very close detail how brood tables are developed and used while showing an example.

O'Connor said it was very helpful to hear this detailed explanation of brood tables.

Sands added that the life history of the Nushagak sockeye salmon may be more vulnerable to seasonal water level changes and temperatures since a large proportion are river and slough spawners instead of lake spawners. More often affected by entrapment in sloughs and freeze down, scouring in high water events etc.

Glen Wysoki signed off 3:39

The 2012 Wood R. red run came from large escapements, 4 million in 2006 and 1.5 million in 2007, 1.7 in 2008. Good escapement but not that good of returns. But there's a lot of people thinking that the very cold springs during smolt out-migration is the likely major culprit.

22% of the Nushagak red runs were 1.4 age fish, over 200,000 fish were of age 1.4. and over 200,000 were 1.2 age. a

Sands: one more time, you can ask for an OEG, ADFG had to put in a neutral number. There is probably a bit of room for negotiation if you have a good rationale for whatever number is chosen.

End of the second discussion about new escapement goals and MSY.

Discussion turned to enforcement and the problems in the WRSHA and how the idea of splitting the area into 2 parts.

Trooper Burk, the WRSHA takes up LOTS of staff to manage and it gets really ugly. Some guys are packing guns and it's not good. Would love to see a real solution to reduce the problem. Surely a lottery could be done somehow. DNR won't lease sites. The little guy or professional business fisherman doesn't have a chance at the good sites with the big operations and aggressive guys doing the 1 fathom net thing and such.

Dan asked who would have authority to run a lottery.

Some think ADFG could. Could do it pre-season. Or before openers. Might be best to do from Juneau so no one locally could have the appearance of unfair practices.

A discussion of what constituted keeping an active set net site vs abandoning a site. Troopers view that if all gear is removed at a closure the site is abandoned. Some set netters thought that as long as they fished a site every opener then it remained theirs.

More talk about enforcing the 2 part WRSHA and alternating gear type from one to the other.

Trooper Burk encouraged members to get all the details into the proposal or amendment. Likely that FWP might need to double their manpower and if the District was open at the same time it might put really heavy demands on Troopers. But WRSHA needs some sort of resolution.

Bring this to the full AC on Tuesday, Nov. 20.

IV Adjourn 3:54PM November 16, 2012

**Lower Bristol Bay AC Meeting
Minutes November 5, 2012 11:00 am
Teleconference/Face to Face in Port
Heiden, AK**

Meeting called to order at 11:20 am
by Susie Jenkins-Brito

Roll Call:

Kim Rice

Tom Bursch

Tracy Vrem

Eric Beeman

Bob Dreeszen

Hattie Albecker

Mark Kosbruk

Tim Enright

John Bragg

Roland Briggs

Mitch Seybert

Myra Olsen

Eddie Clark (called in around 12 pm)

Staff and Guests:

Susie Jenkins-Brito, ADF&G Support

Jason Dye, ADF&G

Chuck McCallum, Lake and Peninsula
Borough Fisheries Advisor

Joe Whitkop, F&W Troopers

Victoria Briggs, Ugashik resident

Paul Salomone, ADF&G

Frank Woods, BBNA

Ted Krieg, ADF&G

Gayla Woods, BBNA

Motion to Adopt Agenda By Hattie, 2nd By Myra Olsen

All in favor. 0 – opposed.

Motion to Table Minutes from Oct 31, 2012 meeting by Myra. 2nd by Roland.

All in favor. 0 – opposed.

Staff Reports:

Paul Salomone: Ugashik, Egegik Salmon season report. Paul plans to manage 2013 season similar to 2012 season if run develops in a similar manner. Ugashik was earlier than normal in 2012. Paul explain new MSY's put out by the Department but states these will have no real change in the management strategies. Mitch stated that he has noticed a larger number of late run sockeye when the Area M drift fleet is not able to fish in their Northern section areas. Mitch asked if the department noticed and had any concerns with late (July and early august) runs and the under managed smaller Ugashik system Sockeye stocks. (Ugashik Proper, Dog Salmon, & King Salmon Rivers) Paul stated that late run Sockeye are present in these river systems and management for these Sockeye is minimal. Paul said he did see good numbers of small Sockeye in late July and early August this year that he does not see normally, that are returning to many smaller systems of Dog Salmon and Ugashik Rivers. Paul stated that when managing Egegik and Ugashik escapements he tries to shuffle escapement and catch from year to year to get greater numbers of escapement at different times of the runs. He said that after the 26th of June with a large fleet fishing in the North Peninsula his management plan has fewer options for early fishing time for Ugashik .

Roland asked about OEG's being established, and had concerns with the new proposed escapement numbers. Roland wondered why the dept. would want more smolt being produced into poorer ocean conditions that are happening presently, and why tinker with the present Ugashik management plan that has a

very good track record. Paul explained that it is up to the Board to set OEG, Department will recommend for the MSY.

Mitch raises the Kvichak issue of different escapement methods and numbers that the department have tried over the last thirty years which seem to have had a negative effect on that system.

Ted Krieg: Gives Harvest data on Subsistence Salmon

Susie Jenkins-Brito: Brief introduction as the new SW Regional Coordinator.

Joe Whitkop: Salmon season overview of Troopers. it was noticed by the committee that the Fish and Wildlife Troopers are very creative and efficient with the limited resources they have to work with, however its obvious that they are stretched pretty thin at times with their workload in Bristol Bay and have almost zero enforcement in the Northern Area M salmon fisheries.

Jason Dye: Gives Sport Fish update understands that the lower economy has brought in lower numbers of sport effort. Discussions ranged from how management was seriously affected by the lack of funding for important data that is essential for true conservation management, about increased effort in certain areas that are possibly over targeting depressed stocks, and about allowing harvest without knowing anything about abundance, and ways to utilize local help to enhance the sports fish div. Bob Dreeszen states that for Sport Fish we need some Hard Data!

Nominations for Officers is Tabled until Port Heiden Village Seats are filled.

The nominations for interim officers are started. Eddie Clark will remain interim Vice – Chair, Tim Enright will remain interim Secretary.

Nominations for Interim Chairman:

Roland Briggs – Nom. By Eric Beeman, 2nd By Eddie Clark

Roland Declines Nomination.

Mitch Seybert – Nom. By Eddie Clark, 2nd By Eric Beeman

Myra Olsen – Nom. By Tim Enright, 2nd By John Bragg

Eddie moves to close Nominations, 2nd By Eric. All in Favor.

Roll Call Vote:

For Mitch: Roland, Eric, Hattie, Myra, Eddie, Tom, Mark (7)

For Myra: Tracy, Kim, Mitch, John, Bob, Tim (6)

Hattie moves to name Mitch Chair, Tim 2nd All in Favor.

Susie hands over control to Mitch who calls a 20 minute break at 12:40pm to reconvene at 1:00pm.

PROPOSAL 5-5ACC 65.020 Bag limits, possession limits and size limits for Coho in the Ugashik and Cinder Rivers salmon districts.

Motion made and seconded

Discussion: conservation concern for Coho in these systems is the main concern from user groups from this area. There has been a huge decline in Coho runs in this area for several years and not enough data available to safely justify the present large catch limits. Bob Dreezen and Tracy Vrem both expressed concern that if the Ugashik River drainages were to see a reduced size and bag limit for Coho when the Egegik and Cinder Rivers were not in alignment with these changes, it could lead to increased effort on the other systems. Footnote: Added at Novemeber 14, 2012 meeting***Bob had received input from several sport fishermen that stated they were reluctant to support any measure reducing sport fishing limits on coho without equivalent regulation to the commercial fishermen. Two in particular stated they had seen net marks on coho's this year after being told by me there was no commercial netting activity.

Approved, all in favor.

PROPOSAL 16-5 ACC 06.331 Allow set gillnet gear to remain in place between fishing periods on consecutive tides.

Motion made and seconded.

Discussion: This proposal would allow fishing to occur on a closed period for a few fortunate fishers and to make it make less work for them. This proposal is unfair to all other fishers.

Failed, all opposed.

PROPOSAL 17-5 ACC 06.331. Gillnets spec. and operations.

Motion made and seconded

Discussion: This proposal is trying to address a loop hole that was created through a past board approved proposal from a different fishing district. Proper board process was not done for this allowed loop hole.

Approved, all in favor.

PROPOSAL 18-5 ACC 06331. Gillnet specs. and operations.

Motion made and seconded

Discussion: This proposal was made out of safety concerns from a new way of fishing in the Ugashik up river exclusive set net fishing area.

It was summited to address new fishing practices by one of our committee members from this fishing area, he states that he is able to navigate with no problems in this area and that present regs. Provide options that allow better opportunities for all fishers in this area. Tim, a life time resident of Ugashik and was around at the time of this section of development gave a firsthand account of how this area developed as a fishery in 1941. He stated that it was designed as a 25 fathom low impact fishery for fishermen wive's to support their families while their husbands were off at war. He said all fishing leases have been on shore 300 feet wide and 400 ft. deep off the beach. He stated that to have nets and running lines that can go almost all the way across the river is a huge safety issue and this fishery was never created for these new practices.

In Response to Tim, Roland stated: The 11 setnet sites were not established until statehood when the fishing boundary was moved to Muddy Point. Before

that (during federal days drift fishing and setnet was allowed upriver in front of the village.)

Roland stated that current practices are NOT new, just unfamiliar to drifters who are on this board. It has been used extensively on the East side of the bay for 20 years; we have been refining bridle nets fishing in this area for 8 to 10 years.

The 25 fathoms portion is incorrect also as we have always, since '65, fished the full 50 fathoms.

Roland asked that the minutes reflect that when I requested of Hattie, one of the initial submitters of one proposal, that IF the safety issues, which she stated as the primary reason for submitting the proposal, were addressed would she withdraw it and she answered NO, she supported it as written. This is important as it questions the reasons behind the submitting it, which was a big discussion

Motion failed, 5 in favor and 5 against 3 abstained.

****Footnote offered by Roland on November 14, 2012:

During statehood Mr Matsuno and Mr Enright (Tim and Hattie's dad) petitioned Congress to get 11 sites in front of the village. It was granted. When my parents arrived in Ugashik village in 1965 they bought a site from the estate of Sasa Struck and Mr Matsuno family fished 5 sites Mr. Enright family fished 4 sites. I am not sure who fished the eleventh site in '65. The Matsuno and Enright families had about half their sites registered in their children names. So to say it was set up for wives of men off at war is totally incorrect.

PROPOSAL 19 -5 ACC O6331. Gillnet specs. and operations

Motion made and seconded

Discussion: After hearing the depts. comments of this proposal, and with all agreeing with them, that this proposal is a gear conflict reaction that reg's presently in use all ready address.

Motion failed, all against.

PROPOSAL 20-ACC 06331. Gillnet spec. and operations

Motion made and seconded

Discussion: Gear conflict, lack of public safety in this area is probably the reasons for this proposals, this proposal might go past legal board perimeters if adopted by the board. There are issues here that should be addressed but as written would harm the legal setnet fishery.

Motion failed, all against.

PROPOSAL 24 -5 ACC 06330. GEAR.

Discussion: We support the dept's comments on this proposal.

Motion failed, all against

PROPOSAL 25-5ACC 06330. Bristol Bay commercial Coho Salmon Troll Fishery.

Discussion: We support the dept.'s comments on this proposal.

Motion failed, all against.

PROPOSAL'S 32,33,34,35, -5 ACC 06.341

Motion made to combined as one for approval, seconded

Discussion: These proposals have been visit at every board cycle and debated without approval. These proposals would benefit very few well off fishers and burden the rest. Quality of the Bristol Bay pack is at an all-time high and improving every year and the fleet has no problems with not being able to harvest any abundant salmon with the 32 foot limit.

Motion failed, all against.

PROPOSAL'S 36,37,238 5ACC 06.333. Permit stacking.

Motion to adopt as one was made and seconded

Discussion: If approved and everyone had 2 drift permits it would eliminate half of the boats in the bay and might eliminate 9000 fathoms of drift gear. The economics for the boats left in the fishery would have a better chance considerably, however if changes are made with the two permit system now in place , would make it more difficult for new fishers to come into the fishery and could eliminate some crew positions.

Motion failed, 1 support, 12 opposed.

PROPOSAL 41 ,42 -5 ACC 06.331 gillnet spec's and operations.

Motion to adopt as one and seconded

Discussion: We support the current system in place because it makes it easier for new fishers to get in the fishery and helps people that have boat problems to keep being able to fish.

Motion failed, all opposed.

PROPOSAL 44 THRU 54 -5ACC Set net permit stacking

Motion to adopt as one and seconded

Discussion: The system in place has enhanced the setnet fishers that were having troubles before it was adopted, no sunset.

Motion passed, all support.

PROPOSAL 55 -5 ACC 06.331. Gillnet spec's and operations

Motion to adopt and seconded

Discussion: It was not the intent of the board to allow this when the dual permit system was adopted to allow what the proposal is asking for.

This will re allocate salmon and cause gear conflicts and make these set net sites too efficient

Motion fails no support

PROPOSAL 58,59,60,61, GENERAL DISTRICT.

Motion to adopt and seconded

Discussion: Our committee has never supported any general district. It is a mixed stock fishery that has potential to harvest stocks that could be weak or to harvest too much of the front end of runs that could cause escapement concerns.

Enforcement will have troubles trying to cover this big area. It is possible that other species might be harvested that would cause waste.

Motion failed no support.

PROPOSALS 63,64,65, ALLOCATION PLAN

Motion to adopt as one and seconded

Discussion: When this plan was adopted, all angles were truly discussed, average historical catch data were looked at and all agreed to by all participants. It would reallocate fish were they don't belong. The present plan has been working very well.

Motion fails, no support.

Motion was made and seconded to adjourn at 3:10 pm.

All in favor

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES
DECEMBER 4-12, 2012
BRISTOL BAY FINFISH

Comments from the Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee

Bristol Bay Sportfish

PROPOSAL 5

ACTION: Support – Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Decrease coho salmon bag limit to one in the Ugashik, Dog Salmon, and King Salmon rivers. *(This proposal will be addressed in both the Bristol Bay and AK Pen/Aleutian Island meetings.)*

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Conservation concern for Coho in these systems is the main concern from user groups from this area. There has been a huge decline in Coho runs in this area for several years and not enough data available to safely justify the present large catch limits. Bob Dreezen and Tracy Vrem both expressed concern regarding the Egegik and Cinder River drainages seeing increased effort if the Ugashik River drainages had a reduced bag limit and size restrictions, that differed from these other rivers. Bob had received input from several sport fishermen that stated they were reluctant to support any measure reducing sport fishing limits on coho without equivalent regulation to the commercial fishermen. Two in particular stated they had seen net marks on coho's this year after being told by me there was no commercial netting activity.

Bristol Bay Salmon

PROPOSAL 16

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow set gillnet gear to remain in place between fishing periods on consecutive tides.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: This proposal would allow fishing to occur on a closed period for a few fortunate fishers and to make it make less work for them. This proposal is unfair to all other fishers.

PROPOSAL 17

ACTION: Support - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: In the Nushagak District, prohibit a permit holder from operating a set gillnet seaward of another set gillnet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: This proposal is trying to address a loop hole that was created through a past board approved proposal from a different fishing district. Proper board process was not done for this allowed loop hole.

**PROPOSAL 18
Support 5, Abstained 3**

ACTION: Motion to adopt Failed: Opposed 5,

DESCRIPTION: Shorten the distance that a set gillnet can be set from the high-tide mark from 1,000 feet to 600 feet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: This proposal was made out of safety concerns from a new way of fishing in the Ugashik up river exclusive set net fishing area.

It was submitted to address new fishing practices by one of our committee members from this fishing area, he states that he is able to navigate with no problems in this area and that present regs. provide options that allow better opportunities for all fishers in this area. Tim, a life time resident of Ugashik and was around at the time of this section of development gave a firsthand account of how this area developed as a fishery in 1941. He stated that it was designed as a 25 fathom low impact fishery for fishermen wife's to support their families while their husbands were off at war. He said all fishing leases have been on shore 300 feet wide and 400 ft. deep off the beach. He stated that to have nets and running lines that can go almost all the way across the river is a huge safety issue and this fishery was never created for these new practices. Roland asked if the safety issue was addressed and solved if that would satisfy the concerns of the proposer. The response to that was "no, I support the proposal as written". It was pointed out that it would turn into a complete different fishery if this proposal is not approved and that there will be higher costs to fishers with this new way of fishing, if other fishers have to do the same to stay competitive, but will be restrictive for this area if approved by the board.

Roland commented in response to Tim:

The 11 setnet sites were not established until statehood when the fishing boundary was moved to Muddy Point. Before that (during federal days drift fishing and setnet was allowed upriver in front of the village.)

Roland would like all references to this being a 'new' way of fishing to be taken out. It is NOT new, just unfamiliar to drifters who are on this board. It has been used extensively on the East side of the bay for 20 years; we have been refining bridle nets fishing in this area for 8 to 10 years.

The 25 fathoms portion is incorrect also as we have always, since '65, fished the full 50 fathoms.

Roland asked that the minutes reflect that when Hattie, one of the initial submitters of one proposal, was asked that IF the safety issues, which she stated as the primary reason for submitting the proposal, were addressed would she withdraw it and she answered NO, she would continue to supported it as written.

Motion failed, 5 support, 5 opposed, 3 abstained

***Footnote offered by Roland on November 14, 2012:

During statehood Mr Matsuno and Mr Enright (Tim and Hattie's dad) petitioned Congress to get 11 sites in front of the village. It was granted. When my parents arrived in Ugashik village in 1965 they bought a site from the estate of Sasa Struck and Mr Matsuno family fished 5 sites Mr. Enright family fished 4 sites. I am not sure who fished the eleventh site in '65. The Matsuno and Enright families had about half their sites registered in their children names. So to say it was set up for wives of men off at war is totally incorrect.

PROPOSAL 19

ACTION: Oppose - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Restrict drift gillnet gear from fishing within 1,000 feet from the mean high-tide line.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: After hearing the depts. comments of this proposal and with all agreeing with them, that this proposal is a gear conflict reaction that reg's presently in use all ready address.

PROPOSAL 20

ACTION: Oppose - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow only historical set gillnet sites on the outside beaches of Ugashik District.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Gear conflict, lack of public safety in this area is probably the reasons for this proposals, this proposal might go past legal board perimeters if adopted by the board. There are issues here that should be addressed but as written would harm the legal setnet fishery.

PROPOSAL 24

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow seine nets in Bristol Bay for permit holders who hold two Bristol Bay drift gillnet permits.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: We support the Dept's comments on this proposal.

PROPOSAL 25

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Create a new troll fishery for coho salmon outside commercial fishing districts of Bristol Bay.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: We support the Dept's comments on this proposal.

Vessels

PROPOSAL's 32, 33, 34, 35

ACTION: Opposed to ALL - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Increase vessel length increase from 32 feet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: These proposals have been visit at every board cycle and debated without approval. These proposals would benefit very few well off fishers and burden the rest. Quality of the Bristol Bay pack is at an all-time high and improving every year and the fleet has no problems with not being able to harvest any abundant salmon with the 32 foot limit.

Permit Stacking (20 proposals)

PROPOSAL's 36, 37, 238

ACTION: Motion to Adopt Failed: 1 Support 12

Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Allow one permit holder who owns two drift gillnet permits to operate 200 fathoms of drift gillnet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: If approved and everyone had 2 drift permits it would eliminate half of the boats in the bay and might eliminate 9000 fathoms of drift gear. The economics for the boats left in the fishery would have a better chance considerably, however if changes are made with the two permit system now in place , would make it more difficult for new fishers to come into the fishery and could eliminate some crew positions.

PROPOSAL's 41, 42

ACTION: Opposed- Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Disallow permit stacking in Bristol Bay.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: We support the current system in place because it makes it easier for new fishers to get in the fishery and helps people that have boat problems to keep being able to fish.

PROPOSAL's 44-54

ACTION: Support - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: The system in place has enhanced the setnet fishers that were having troubles before it was adopted, no sunset.

PROPOSAL 55

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Allow two set gillnet permit holders to fish 100 fathoms on a single site.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: It was not the intent of the board to allow this when the dual permit system was adopted to allow what the proposal is asking for.

This will re allocate salmon and cause gear conflicts and make these set net sites too efficient

General District (4 proposals)

PROPOSAL's 58-61

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Open a General District

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Our committee has never supported any general district. It is a mixed stock fishery that has potential to harvest stocks that could be weak or to harvest too much of the front end of runs that could cause escapement concerns. Enforcement will have troubles trying to cover this big area. It is possible that other species might be harvested that would cause waste.

Bristol Bay Allocation Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL's 63, 64, 65

ACTION: Opposed - Unanimous

DESCRIPTION: Increase set gillnet allocation to 20% in Nushagak, Naknek-Kvichak, Egegik and Ugashik districts.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: When this plan was adopted, all angles were truly discussed, average historical catch data were looked at and all agreed to by all participants. It would

reallocate fish where they don't belong. The present plan has been working very well.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game Northern Norton Sound Advisory
Committee Meeting Minutes

10/30/2012

Start time: 9:05 pm

Attendance: 26 people

Advertised: Nome Announce, Nome Nugget, KNOM, KICY, flyers posted in the post office, Sinisauk, emailed Ads to all of the AC members

Attendance

Committee Members:

Vernon Rock	Stanley Tocktoo	Clifford Seetook
Tom Gray	Paul Kosto	Jack Fagerstrom
Daniel Stang	Nate Perkins	Adem Boeckman
Charlie Lean	Roy Ashenfelter	

Members not present:

Chuck Okbaok	Sheldon Nagaruk	Charlie Saccheus
--------------	-----------------	------------------

Fish and Game Staff:

Subsistence-Nicole Braem	Assistant Wildlife Biologist: Letty Hughes
Area Biologist Wildlife: Tony Gorn	Area Manager: Peter Bente
Sport Fish: Brenden Scanlon	Commercial Fish: Jim Menard
Commercial Fish: Scott Kent	Commercial Fish: Justin Leon
Biometrics: Dan Reed	

National Park Service

KNOM

Ken Adkisson	Margaret Demaiorbus
Janette Pomrenke	

General Public

Kenny Hughes	Kevin Knowlton
--------------	----------------

Howard Farley-Commercial Fisherman Robert Madden

Michael Sloan- Nome Eskimo Community Biologist Tom Sparks

NSEDC:

Fisheries Biologist: Kevin Keith Tiffney Martinson

Alaska State Troopers:

Jay Sears

Motion for approval of the agenda:

Additions to Agenda

Charlie: Stuff in the news about Bob Bell getting off the hook for not destroying his antlers of musk ox

Stanley Tocktoo: Musk Ox 22E discussion

Discussion for Elections

Potentially 4 new people:

Mike Quinn Bob Madden Dan Stang Tom Gray

Adem Boeckman: Inquiry about having elections at the beginning of the meeting

27 Fish proposals to consider

Heads shaking about changing the agenda for the elections

Motion to Approve the Agenda:

All in favor

No opposition

Motion carries Agenda Approved

Elections: Conducted by: Roy Ashenfelter

Identifies the parties that are running

Electoralates:

Dan Stang Tom Gray Kevin Knowlton

Kenny Hughes Robert Madden

Each Party Gives explanation of reason for running

Robert Madden Jr.

Kenny Hughes-From Teller explains his background and position

Kevin Knowlton: been in Alaska for 12 years have direct family linkage to King Island

Sport Fisherman

Sport Hunter and Subsistence Hunter

Volunteer with Nome Ambulance and Fire Department

Mr. Knowlton explains his relationship to people who hunt and fish, their safety and seeing people under pressure who are hunting when the weather is bad because of regulations, personally been frustrated with the varied success with putting meat on the table.

Tom Gray: Explains his position hunting and fishing.

Daniel Stang: Does feel that this board doesn't have much clout, sits in for the information

Rest electorates give speech

Elections Calculated

Elected Individuals:

Kevin Knowlton

Tom Gray

Dan Stang

Motion to approve the meeting minutes

All support

None opposed

Minutes Approved

Motion to consider Game Proposals

Approved

Proposal # 41&42 Antlerless Moose Reauthorization

Comments:

Tom Gray: Antlerless moose hunt I have voted against for years, I feel that the moose came from Fairbanks, Yukon River, the moose will move around they are not going to die in this area from over grazing. Fish and Game put out a paper that said you kill one cow moose you kill 200 moose throughout its life time. We have moose problems all over the place.

Voting Antlerless Moose Hunt Reauthorization:

Motion to have an Antlerless Moose Reauthorization

2 opposed

10 support

Motion carries

Brown Bear Tagging Fee Exemption:

Comments Bear Tagging Fee: knowing who is out hunting and the fee is nothing for people here.

Kenny Hughes: License registration fee clarification, there are too many brown bears we need to do something different.

Nate Perkins: this is just a reauthorization

Tony Gorn: explains reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption. This reauthorization allows people

-explains Tom Gray's point about the effort, we don't understand who is hunting bears, we do understand who is killing bears because of fur sealing.

Tony Gorn: we have reporting through the sealing of the fur, most people comply for the regulation.

Stanley Tocktoo: Explains the bear issues. Explains brown bear attacks in Shismaref downtown two brothers get mauled. People are getting attacked when then are hunting.

Kevin Knowlton: explains having people to purchase a tag, buying a tag that everyone will buy a tag and the numbers will be skewed. It won't give a good indication of who is actually hunting because everyone is going to have one.

Tom Gray: a registration hunt, gives who are the cliental that are hunting the bears. In the long run this information is going to be needed. Ignoring it will not be a good thing.

Kevin Hughes: What affect will this having on the population? Do we want to reduce some effort or increase it? I have been interested in this bears for a long time. We need to restrict bear hunting a little bit? Why does it make sense? The biggest predator of the bear population is male bears, but we are taking all of the bears out all of the bear and sows been destroyed. By reducing the amount of male bears, we reduce the predation on baby bears leading to an increase in male bears. I say allow the fee to reduce population.

Howard Farley: Explains reindeer herders kept the bears down. I have been here for 50 years and I don't remember bears coming into town and now we do. You cannot go out the road and not see a bear. Explains bear behavior. If we don't reduce the number of bears there isn't going to be any moose.

Peter Bente: Explains bear regulation. There has been a lot of talk about reporting of hunt information. We have a general season bear hunt that does not require a hunt permit. We don't have a permit that requires one bear per permit. A hunt report doesn't exist about brown bears. We do have a regulation, that if you have a moose permit you have a reporting requirement. This is a proposal that the committee that would have to bring to the Board of Game. Explains tag fees for the subsistence hunt. The committee needs to weigh in on this point.

Adem Boeckman: Questions the helpfulness of having a brown bear fee.

Charlie Lean: I think we should waive the fee for brown bear. We are seeing a gradual increase over eight years. We are harvesting less than the population can stand.

Motion Proposal

None opposed

All Support

Motion Carries

Tony Gorn: Gives Game Presentation

Caribou Report: 10-20,000 caribou around in the Death Valley and around Granite Mountain

Musk Ox: Last year refers to the graphs in 2012, we did a range wide survey 13% annual decline between 2010 and 2012. We followed up by range wide composition surveys. Declining bull cow ratios, expanding range to the east. Far as musk ox are concerned they pretty disappointing. In 22A where there is no hunting, that is where the composition is the best. The Western Seward Peninsula ratio was what it reminded me of in 22A, good bull cow ratios. A product of the declining the musk ox population putting us back into tier II. We are trying to build bull cow ratios. Not that many musk oxen to harvest these days in comparison to five years ago. Hunting seasons open August 1st now that know we are

going to be hunting tier II. Application period opens November 1st-December 17th, will go to villages to fill out applications for the tier II hunt. In 22E has its own unique ANS.

Letty Hughes: Explains application process.

Tony Gorn: there is a statewide application period. We are back into tier II we have to be available 29 animals available. A hundred musk ox were harvested last year. Two other things are, we got rid of helicopters it is easier on the animals and easier on staff; there are very high mortality rates for cows greater than three years of age. The last thing we need to get you guys to do. We are still basing the information on the musk ox management plan from 1998. The first draft we want available to the public. Before we can bring it to the public we need to get the agency on the same page. We spend an unbelievable amount of time on musk ox. We need a population objective for 22C. It is going to be a tough question to answer and you guys can help guide us through that. You guys we are asking you for how many musk ox you need.

Tom Gray: inquires about sampling methods

Adem Boeckman: what is the average mortality age?

Tony Gorn: explains selection of mature cows, darting a musk ox from a helicopter is an aerial rodeo. That is one of the nice things by looking at them from the ground; you can look at the horn bases better. I wondered when we were selecting the oldest cows to be selected for three year old cows. What is killing them it seems like a variety of things. Brown bears seem to be predated them. We need to find some balance between killing them all and sustaining them. Living with wildlife, if you live in Nome you should not be surprised to see musk ox. We are in musk ox habitat. I am more concerned about airports with musk ox particularly in the morning and the evening. Animals hanging around city field and around the airport are more what I am concerned about where the chance for human casualty is possible. 29 animals available for harvest rate for musk ox 2% harvest rate. We cannot have a musk ox free zone around Nome.

Adem Boeckman: Explains managing musk ox in Nome as opposed to around Nome.

Tom Gray: Explains situation, if we have less bears in 22C it will make a difference 50 yards from my window a bear killing a moose that is ridiculous. I have musk ox every year in my yard, if there is a musk ox near my grandchildren, there won't be a musk ox anywhere in Anvil Mountain.

Stanley Tocktoo: 22E there is a large increase in musk ox along the coastline and Serpentine, I take my family berry picking. I can't even get to the bathroom, it dangerous to see your family getting attacked by musk ox and brown bear. They are eating sour dock, black berries, some of our subsistence food. They are dangerous, I try to shoot above them and it just makes them madder. It is dangerous for subsistence hunting and berry picking. We see lots of antlerless cows. We hardly see any bulls they are up towards the hot springs.

Howard Farley: Are you still maintaining the collaring for the caribou herd?

Tony Gorn: We are collaring the caribou herd, we are in a transitional time and Peter Bente is going to talk about the Western Arctic caribou herd. Kenny Hughes: Explains that Nome is dealing things that the villages have been dealing with for a long time. Villagers are ok with musk ox herd declining. Villagers want to see the big black lawn mower decline in 22B Southwest.

Stanley Tocktoo: A few years back there was a study in a couple of regions Kotzebue area and Northern Seward Peninsula. Inquires about differences in tooth decay.

Tony Gorn: Explains the growth of the Seward Peninsula population grows to 3,000 and the animals in Cape Krusenstern are smaller and the teeth and every time they handle the animals the teeth at Cape Krusenstern. Explains the differences in the dynamics of the musk ox population in the Seward Peninsula and Cape Krusenstern.

Stanley Tocktoo: Wants to know difference between musk ox in the different regions. I am concerned about the differences in health.

Ken Adkisson: the studies from the research that the park service is funding reports will be distributed and explains the differences in habitat quality between the two regions. It is not so much you eating them as what they are eating during the winter.

Peter Bente: On the caribou herd. The proposal deadline is May 1st. If you want to act on the proposals The books won't be consolidated until about July 1st.

Roy Ashenfelter: inquires about musk ox report.

Tony Gorn: We are not going to have that management plan available by May.

Tony Gorn: I will work with you guys as closely as you want to develop the proposals. I think it is most valuable when the department works with the ACs to submit proposals for comment. It is helpful to have a meeting date after the proposals have been submitted.

Charlie Lean: I am on the other side of the fence, I understand the conflicts. My wife picks Quivit it is better than gold mining. I am frustrated with the thumbing their nose at the information. I am frustrated with Bob Bell thumbing his nose at regulations at sitting member of the Board of Game. I thought we had a scientifically sound conclusion about the musk ox. What is happening at Bethel, there are many guys that are going to get cited and fined for not following regulations? There are many of us that are disappointed about how our testimonies are received by Fish and Game. We are here for window dressing for Fish and Game. I think local staff passed on the right information, a sitting member of the board of Game went out and shot a mature bull and went out and shot a trophy. All of my friends respect the regulation. It looks like an abuse of power to me. I hope you take this message to the superiors.

Jay Sears: I can't talk about the case, but there are serious loop holes in the trophy destruction. I would encourage you to file a complaint. There are always people that work loop holes. Do we want a trophy or not. We can do our investigation, but we need to have the eye cuts.

Nate Perkins: When we have a meeting and consider the proposals and then men Charlie Bell, what good a supposed support body. Have no regard, will the board of game going to do anything with it?

April meeting to discuss BOG proposals.

Roy Ashenfelter: A letter will be put together by Charlie Lean and Paul Kosto. There will be a letter sent around the AC for review and comment deadline will be set. Maybe we should also go to our legislators. (Discussion about where the letters should go).

Short Break from 10:30 am

Resume meeting 10:45 am

Peter Bente: Explains Western Arctic Caribou Herd report, explains jaw examination. 490,000 reduced 350,000 bull cow ratios have declined; the herd is in a steady decline. There are 15,000 animals taken for subsistence and 1000 animals from people coming into hunt. Herd is clean not as many diseases. We are just aware of population are in a steady decline. There is a good portion of the herd is further North. Herd migrating later in the fall. The caribou herd working group is taking place at the beginning of December 4,5,6th.

Adem Boeckman: Is it a healthy decline?

Peter Bente: Healthy in the sense of there isn't a major contributor, no outlier. Rain on snow problem for caribou for an order of a few hundred of the animals not the whole herd. We know that caribou population cycle; it gives a chance of the range to re grow. A steady slow decline is better and easier to respond to.

Adem Boeckman: Inquires about healthy cycle

Stanley Tocktoo: There are lots of white things in the meat; inquires about cysts in caribou. The cysts are inside the whole meat, the whole carcass.

Peter Bente: explains how the tapeworm parasite effects the animal and it won't make humans sick. The pellets will be in the meat or the whole carcass. The parasite does not affect humans.

Peter Bente: explains about range health. There is a standing crop of lichen, though it is in decline which could affect herd survival in the winter. Fire through the lichen takes 50 years to grow and cause herd problems.

Roy Ashenfelter: Fishery Reports

Proposal #115 Norton Sound-Port of Clarence Customary Trade

Nicole Braem: Subsistence division supports this proposal. It is not like there has been a spike in customary trade. \$500 does not seem like an unreasonable limit. The division of subsistence and commercial fish don't feel this is an unreasonable amount.

Nate Perkins: Inquires about length \$200 amount hasn't changed since 2007.

Charlie Lean: This proposal was put forth; the board of fish was caught by surprise with this regulation. The \$200 amount was whittled down. Board of fish doesn't like customary trade. Sometimes it better to stick with what you got. There is public notice for this to be reconsidered. This is a moment for people to shoot down customary trade.

Kenny Hughes: It is not like it is affecting a lot of people according to this graph.

Nicole Braem: it is a recognized subsistence use. It is not like it is doing for subsistence use. It is not like it has done something horrible to chum salmon in district 1. We need to comment only on that proposal.

Motion to consider the proposal, moved.

Comments:

Nicole Braem: This proposal is about raising the limit on the cash sales, the people who want to do it have to get a permit from Jim Menard and to report what they sold to Jim Menard and you need a permit.

Harley: Commercial fishing and subsistence fishing and I do both. A lot of people do barter and it is a good thing how are you going to keep track of people subsistence selling. Saying that subsistence people can sell fish doesn't make sense. How are you going to keep track of it?

Jim Menard: Explains customary trade permit for selling dry fish. There has been little participation in it. The people who advertise things like dried fish I tell them that they need a permit. There has been little participation reported. I don't know how much is going on under the table. There were several citations issued by the troopers during salmon season for selling subsistence caught salmon without a permit.

Scott Kent: There is a significant amount of fin fish cash sales going on under the table. A lot of people were afraid of the precedent this would set. However, I think it has been good because it makes a distinction between people who are abusing subsistence and those that are legitimately trying to get a little cash to conduct subsistence activities. It is good to have customary trade defined in Norton Sound and Port Clarence.

Adem Boeckman: I support this proposal. So many proposals that we got, can we streamline for the vote.

Roy Ashenfelter: We are going to hear from the general public and the villages if they are here.

Stanley Tocktoo: Talks about barter it is ok.

Jim Menard: It is just for finfish in regards to cash sales not for crab, you need a permit for crab. You need a commercial permit to sell crab.

Tom Sparks: I was trying to increase the amount, not have it taken away.

Howard Farley: Gas is going up in price; I think there is some danger in this. I don't want some people to get into trouble. I think that the price going up, I think it would be good.

Proposal #115

All in favor

None opposed

Proposal carries

Proposal #116

Put on the floor

Comments:

All in favor

None opposed

Motion Carries

Proposals #95 Allow hooks for large fish other than salmon AYK region

Move to support

Comments:

Charlie Lean: People who oppose this are going to be worried about snagging. It has to do with overlap of seasons so if you are out there with a monster hook; people can claim they are fishing for whitefish. explains snagging gear...

Adem Boeckman: we talked about whitefish for a long time.

Brandon Scalon: explains the China River in Fairbanks, people snag for pike or burbot. People didn't want grayling to get caught and killed in this instance.

Stanley Tocktoo: explains the use of hooks in Shismaref a lot people are doing fishing for grayling after freeze up. We use large single hooks and a lot of fish are caught for fish with seal oil. Does this include ling cod hook? They are single bone hook. Our ancestors did this for hundreds of years.

What does the department think about by catch from snagging such as grayling and salmon. That is illegal in freshwater.

Roy Ashenfelter: Is there a size for the enforcement?

Paul Kosto: gives comments

All in favor

None in opposition

Proposal #92 motion carries

Proposal #95 Prohibit putting fish parts in the water

Comments:

Brendan Scanlon: I don't have any department comments about this proposal. I don't have department staff comments from this proposal.

Roy: Lets wait till later

Adem: Can't use bait can't use chum

Proposal #95

All in favor

None opposed

Motion Carries

Motion to call question proposal #102

Proposal #102

Adem Boeckman: How healthy is the stock?

Brendan Scanlon: The Nome River is really good about making large grayling in low numbers. Gives reports of stock estimates. The department did try to release juvenile grayling. We have not had any evidence of good survival of these grayling.

Tom Gray: Do you think that the grayling are affecting the comeback of other chum and other salmon species.

Brendan Scanlon: I don't think there is any tie between grayling and salmon.

Charlie Lean: I think it is the rivers the grayling that disappeared are the same size as the chum and pink fry when they go to sea. I can tell you from take samples from rivers. We see mostly large grayling. It is rare to catch a grayling on the Nome River. There is a difference in abundance. The greatest effect of mortality on juvenile grayling is coho salmon smolt. I am going to oppose this.

Adem Boeckman: we probably released near Tanner Creek. I think releasing up banner creek, might be better for the fry.

Stanley Tocktoo: We have a lot of grayling fish on the Serpentine area for November. We see a lot of shee in the river in 22A Serpentine River. We don't know what they feed on. We will see what happens on the grayling in the rivers after freeze up and how it is going to affect grayling populations.

Proposal #102

All support

All opposed

Motion Fails

Proposal #103 Motion supported

Comments: There are no comments, lets table this

Salmon Stock Identification Project

Charlie Lean: WASSIP due to come out

Nate Perkins: Table the comments

All wish to table

Proposal #117 asks for a motion for #117. Allow commercial fishing in Subdistrict 1-West of Cape Nome

Comments:

Howard: Over the years that Nome has not had a commercial fishery for salmon. The salmon are coming back, just letting them go up and die it doesn't make sense. There could be a pink fishery. There are not many people out netting.

My family has been fishing for subsistence for years. I'll go up for there for 20 minutes versus 30 minutes we will get too many pinks. These days people are catching them mostly by hook and line. What I would like to be able to open it by emergency order because it is actually. Go look at the racks, there are not many fish. Most people are fishing using a hook and line. I would like to be able to have it be opened by emergency order because it is closed.

Jim Menard: West of Cape Nome is closed by regulation for all salmon. The proposal was written to create a commercial fishery for salmon west of Cape Nome. Pink salmon fish is not closed. Clarifies the current regulations. We can fish pinks and silvers east of Cape Nome. The commercial chum salmon fishery, however, is closed by regulation throughout the Nome Subdistrict.

Howard: we now have a processing plant in here Nome, it is possible to have a fishery. It is possible to have a fishery and it is there and available.

Charlie Lean: I think I am opposed to this; it is not that I don't like Howard. Explains differences between East of Cape Nome versus West of it by differences in Escapement goals. There is also a tagging study that has occurred. Those that go east go east those that go west end up in Western Streams. There is a big mixing zone. I think that sub district should be divided into two management zones and the west of management zone should be closed. The index stream has a good escapement and the Nome and Snake Rivers do not have good returns. The Safety Sound is a good mixing zone. Basically I think that subdistrict 1 should be divided into two management zones, with West of Cape Nome being closed.

Howard: Aren't this fish migratory? I have fish all the way from Nome to the Cape. I understand the Nome and Snake situation. There is no estuary the little fish go out into the estuary. We have dredgers and we don't know effect has or will have in the future, there has to be some impact there.

Tom Gray: In the Nome River isn't Chum a species of concern? Wouldn't this have impact on what will happen in ocean?

Jim Menard: You can still have a fishery on a stock of concern. Explains where the chum and pink salmon power is in the sub district. Over the past twenty years, we have an estimate 70% of the chum salmon production is east of Cape Nome. In contrast, 80% of the pink salmon production west of Cape Nome. If the western half of the subdistrict is open, we can designate specific areas within the subdistrict where commercial fishing can occur based on existing regulations. Right now west of Cape Nome is closed by regulation so we could not open commercial fishing. Menard explains possibilities of using areas within existing regulations to manage the fishery. Commercial Fisheries division is going to support this proposal.

Jim Menard: Stocks of concern doesn't make a difference in that you can still fish on a stock of concern just as Golovin and Elim fish on chum salmon that are stock of concerns in their subdistrict; presents data. You can still have a fishery on stocks of concern. Explains where the power is in regards to number of fish in the Sub-district. #1 is the sub-district. Over the past twenty years, we have an estimate 70% of the chum salmon are east of Cape Nome. The power %80 of the for the pink run is the west of Cape Nome so the power for the chum is in the east half and pink in the west half of the subdistrict. If the West part is open and we can designate areas within existing regs. Right now it is closed so that we couldn't open commercial fishing. Menard explains possibilities of using areas within existing regulations to manage the fishery. Commercial fisheries division is going to support this proposal.

Howard: we are looking at a directed pink fishery.

Adem Boeckman: Can we change this? Can we have a seine fishery? Is this a place to talk about this?

Jim Menard: Charlie has talked about adding this as a possible proposal.

Charlie Lean: Purse seining is much more of a problem and we need to come back with a better scheme and we should talk about beach seining.

Adem Boeckman: when you have stocks of chum salmon that are of concern and then the pinks that are going up can you separate them.

Howard: 5.5-6.0 inch mesh chum nets versus the smaller 4.5 inch mesh Pink size nets. You are not going to get much chum in the pink nets, and you can put chums back if you are staying with your nets.

Tom Gray: if you beat up on any certain fisheries, is there any other fish that feed on the pinks or on the chum. Are other fish going to be impacted by the opening of the other commercial fishing?

Jim Menard: If we look long term with the Chum, ~~there is a funky not return~~, there was a management concern in Subdistrict 1 and now it is a yield concern. In 2006 there was a great brood, creating great returns in 2010. There was just a little blip on the screen. The chum are staying down in recent years west of Cape Nome. Some say how the pink went determined how the chum go. Since the 1980s the pinks have been increasing and we have had record returns, but the chum overall have had a downward trend in Norton Sound since the 1980s. Is it because of the record pink runs that chum are having difficulties with spawning success because of the overlay of the record number of pink salmon spawning at the same time. How the pink go is there problems with reproduction of the chum. We have 14 permit holders that live in Nome. Are the pinks effecting the reproduction of the chum? I would not see taking out the pinks in the commercial fishery will have an effect on the chums because we don't have a large commercial fleet. Both of pink and chum salmon fry these go to sea immediately and don't overwinter; pinks make good food for silvers.

Janette: Is this for all Salmon? Should it be amended to be more specific?

Jim Menard: we can fish in District 1 for all salmon except for chum, We can't fish West of Cape Nome and we cannot fish for chum salmon by regulation.

Adem Boeckman: I think we can support it for beach seining. I would like to think of ways to specifically target specific species by net or by beach seine. If the chum stocks poor.

Adem makes an amendment proposal for beach seining in Subdistrict 1 under 5 AAC 04.330 on the ocean.

Motion put on the table

Comments:

Adem Boeckman: I see some serious potential for Topkok, in Sbdistrict 1. For rivers like the Nome River for beach seining you can segregate for pinks than you can for a gill net.

Roy Ashenfelter: I thought commercial fishery had a problem with water marked fish.

Roy Ashenfelter: We are only allowed to vote on the amendment.

Howard Farley: If you are fishing you would probably have to be fishing at the mouth of the river in order to make it worth your time. Beach seining is easily limited by the weather even though it might be a way to segregate the different species of salmon.

All in favor of amendment

None Opposed

Motion Passes

Proposal #117 as amended

1 opposes

Remaining support

Passes as amended

Proposal #118 Motion moved: Allow a commercial set net fishery in Golovin Bay based upon Escapement goals

Comments:

Jack Fagerstrom: current escapement level?

Scott: 2400-7200 escapement goals has been made consecutively since it was established. We got knocked out this year early because of high water but were projecting to easily reach the goal as of August 16. Refers to the escapement goals. There were a record runs in 2008 and 2010. We counted 2,408 last year; we barely made it last year.

Jack Fagerstrom: I walked around Golovin and the consensus was that at that level of escapement goal there isn't going to be a commercial fishery in Golovin. They feel this is a good proposal, it is going to take away a commercial opportunity. We have limited jobs and limited fishing opportunity. It is pitting our community against another community. We draw a line in the sand we are going to fight over it. I like Tom I just don't agree with him. Inquires in the past 5 years escapement.

Scott Kent: Reviews the past couple of years escapement counts between 2400 and 13,000.

Jack Fagerstrom: Mr. Menard, the consensus there is going to be no commercial fishing for the now set escapements for commercial fishing. Basically it is pitting our community against another community. The people in Golovin, they support subsistence and commercial. An elder said, what we are doing here

fighting over fish. If they caught the fish they could sell it they could buy something. If you are sport fishing all you are doing is playing with our food.

Tom Gray: This proposal it came from our cooperation. If you look at the fish runs in the Niukluk, it should be written slightly differently. Commercial fishing should be opened once you hit the middle of the escapement goal. We don't believe that the fish are actually meeting the escapement goal. If you pay attention for the escapement goals they are being lowered continually. If you leave it the way it is now there will be three years of commercial, following seventeen years of commercial fishing. These stocks need a break. We need to do something different. Fish and Game need 2400 fish and got 2405 fish. There is no reason to managing the fishery so closely. Our intention is not to punish the commercial fisherman we are trying to manage the stocks so everyone can have fish. Again our intent we want to help that resource and put some safeguards. All commercial fishing should have these checks and balances, not only what we are proposing but in totality. Again above the tower that that 2400 that is being met. There are a lot of people taking fish out of the tower.

Scott Kent: Gives department comments. The department is going to be neutral on this proposal because it is allocative. Commercial fishing did not take place in Golovin Bay during the six years prior to 2008. The escapement goal has never been lowered at the Niukluk River; the upper bound has increased. The escapement goal range is based on all data collected at the tower including years with escapements lower than the goal that produced returns. Thus, the lower bound of the escapement goal range is already a precautionary level of escapement. It has a built-in buffer.

Jack Fagerstrom: This there a better methodology for counting those fish. Is there a better way to count fish? The way that it is set up now.

.....

Jim Menard: Explains tower counts. 20 minutes a count each hour and we have to expand that count by three-(because we only counted one-third of the hour) to getting an hourly passage estimate. We believe that a tower estimate is at least it is going to seek the mean-90% accurate. Some hours the estimate would be less than actually passed and some hours more, but overall during the season it should give a mean escapement. In 2007 we counted 24 hours a day for 17 days. No matter what we used, the first 20 minutes, the next or the last, or a 30 minute count and multiplied by 2 we multiplied all the different counts out and compared those estimates to those out we had the total count of silver salmon amount. The greatest differential was 3%. We feel confident the tower estimate number is within the 90%. As far as the telemetry goes we tagged the fish and figured out where all of the fish are spawning and flew those the major drainage. We have both chum and silvers went up the Niukluk River and we have a location where we can count from a tower. We can't operate a tower effectively on Fish River. By telemetry studies we have noted about one-third of the chums go up Niukluk River versus the Fish River and for coho salmon it was 40% up the Niukluk. That is how we come up with the Niukluk River counts we are able to expand and to get a Fish River drainage-wide count. We are going to guess what is going to happen over the smaller systems like McKinley, Chinik, and others in Golovin based on subsistence reports.

Jack Fagerstrom: Inquires about radio telemetry and inquires about the estimations for the other rivers.

Brenden Scanlon: Responds to the sport fishing above the tower. There was averaging 800 coho between all of the rivers for sport fishing. In 2007 there was 400 coho harvested in the Niukluk was above the tower. We have changed the statewide questionnaire to take into account the difference of counting above and below the tower.

Charlie Lean: I was instrumental in getting the tower established in the Niukluk River established. The problem with the Fish River is that it is stained with tannins and the Niukluk is clear. It provides escapement data even in high water years. I think it is an important and decent project. It is not as timely as I would have liked it. The proposal is written it sets a single escapement goal. Tom was saying that he was looking for the projection would give some serious difference; I think we should take this into consideration. I want clarification on the escapement goals were set to be hitting the middle of the range not the lower limit. I thought escapement goals were set to meet the middle of the escapement range.

Scott Kent: Most escapement goals are established to provide the greatest potential for attaining 80% of MSY. It means the greatest potential; doesn't necessary mean you will attain MSY.

Dan Reed: Explains the escapement goal mechanics, either it is under or over. The range is set by analyzing the number of fish it take produce %80 of maximum sustainable yield.

Charlie Lean: Over the long term in the ideal world escapements wouldn't all line up on the lower limit? At the risk, at the lower limit that is the escapement goal, what ever the lower limit is the escapement goal. That is the criticism for a range versus a point. This is a bulls eye on a target for escapement goal. The lower limit is the bulls eye.

Scott Kent: Managing toward the lower or upper limit is based on the manager. Just because you project you'll reach the lower bound doesn't mean you open it all the way up full on. The forecast in my mind carries more weight early in the run and becomes less important as escapement data is collected in season. I might pop a 24-hour or 36-hour opening to see what's coming if my early projection has me reaching the goal. Then I look at my tower counts. Is my projection falling, holding, or going up? Golovin Bay fishermen have a narrow window of opportunity to commercial fish for silvers. We don't commit to a schedule or more aggressive fishing periods until we firmly project we are going to easily achieve the range.

Dan Reed: Other than being a single point and having a range is that it keeps the risk down for coming in low.

Charlie Lean: That is my point coming in at the minimum every year is shooting at the lower end of the range. As an area manager I have been there and there has been a range. Well throw the doors open lets go fishing. I was shooting for the midpoint of the range. The midpoint was my goal with the range not the low point. My understanding you are striving for the midpoint of the range. You are not going to get it perfect but in the general range. If the management is trying to hit the midpoint it is idea.

Jim Menard: What we shoot for in a big year to get a more escapement at the upper part of the escapement goal range versus in a lower year we go towards the lower part of the escapement goal range. 2010 is the example the record commercial catch, and in that year we went for the higher end of the escapement goal range although we overshot the high end of the range by nearly 2,000 coho salmon. We are shooting for the bigger side in the big year runs and the lower side in the lower run years. Overall we are trying to land within the escapement goal range of 2400-7200 coho salmon.

Tom Gray: when we first talked about this proposal our goal was to improve these stocks for everyone. This 2400 has been thrown on the table that is a goal. We have survived the year and we are doing something. When we have 2400 fish in the river it is like a ghost town below us on the river. Once we reach 2400-3000 fish we have a year's information a couple years of studies what is being taken out this is not the gospel of truth. If we had 15-20 years of study we have something. In a 20 year period we have counts for ADF&G, 10 years we are not going commercial fishing. If our fishery is not that unstable, let's all of us not go fishing. We are not going to argue that that 2000 fish can't make 12000 fish on the return. We don't have the understanding and mentality and we want to protect the fishery. There has been 20 years of this fishery, there will be a good year here and there but we want to protect the fishery.

Tom Gray: would like to make a motion to have it made a projected number.

Motion: I would make an amendment, that we hit a projected number 4800 for commercial fishing amendment

Amendment:

Support: 7

Opposed: 2

Comments:

Scott Kent: My point is that having a projected number is not going to change how things are done. I cannot tell how the run is developing definitively until the 2nd week of August. Making projections is somewhat subjective early in the run. You need to think about the specificity of what you mean by making a projection. Might want to have a date in there.

Proposal 118 as amended.

Support 3

Majority Opposed

Motion fails

Proposal #118 not supported.

LUNCH BREAK 12:15-13:15 RESUMED

Motion to Move Proposal #119

PROPOSAL #119: Subdistricts 2&3 Repeals regulatory requirement to have chum salmon escapement goals need to be met in order to open the commercial fishery.

Scott Kent: Reads outline of proposal

-Gives background for Norton Sound Chum Salmon

Comments:

Department of Fish and Game supports this proposal

Support 11

Opposed: 0

Motion #119 Proposal passed

Proposals 120-121: Roy Ashenfelter: Explains the Southern Norton Sound proposals. It is the Southern Norton Sound area AC that should comment on these proposals.

Adem Boeckman: How many proposals affect Southern Norton Sound

Commenter: I agree that SNSAC should give comments on this

Supporting Southern Norton Sound is a good thing.

Proposal #122 Summond Allows subsistence gill net fishing in Norton Sound 7 days a week Except by E.O.

Moved by Paul

Seconded by Adem

Department Comments: Needs to have Jim Menard.

Jim Menard: Proposal 122 Department Comments: Requests subsistence gill net fishing 7 days a week in district 1. Explains harvests in Subdistrict 1 in tables 1 and 2 (see attached documents) . Comm Fish, would support up to 5 days a week in marine waters during chum season. Reduced 5 days to 3 days a week in the marine waters with the implementation of Tier II before it had been 5 days a week during both chum and silver salmon season. In freshwaters the weekly schedule is 2 fishing periods at 48 hours each. Proposer is asking for 7 days a week for all salmon. Comm. fish feels more comfortable going up incrementally. Comm. Fish will stay with the 2-48s in the river, and doesn't have a problem going up to 5 days a week for chum season in marine waters. Based on table 122 (3), we didn't think that the net use was too excessive so going up a couple of days is ok but not to a fully 7 days a week.

Roy Ashenfelter: Explains we could amend this proposal to 5 days a week instead of 7 days a week

Paul Kosto: except by EO

Jim Menard: Set in to be open for 72 hours during chum salmon season in regulation, you can recommend which days you would like fishery to be open. It can still be closed by EO if there are concerns.

Jim Menard: Dring silver coho salmon season the time is in regulation at 6 pm Monday until 6 pm p.m. Saturday, but you (A.C.) can recommend days open ifyou want to propose something to the borad. It can still be closed by E.O.

Adem Boeckman: I would like to make an amendment to 122 to mirror the silver opener to be 1 pm-6pm.

Howard: there are only two nets, need to get fish

No second on the motion, motion fails.

Howard Farley: With EO give us the good days. We want to dry the fish

Kevin Knowlton: Gives the fisherman the chance to get the chance to get good days for drying. It doesn't matter if the fisherman can pick the days.

Howard Farley: 7 days a week, I want nets in the rivers.

Jim Menard: Refers to data from the number of permits.

Roy Ashenfelter: Reviews the number of nets

Howard: Subsistence going down in district 1 the total number of nets, It will be limited to hook and line.

Jim Menard: In the even numbered years the majority of salmon caught are pink salmon and those are being taken by hook and line in Subdistrict 1. Seining is not allowed in the Nome River

Tom Gray: Here we are talking about who is going to get what fish. It is an allocation thing. Subsistence you can only fish one time a year. It is an allocation thing if you only get one day of good weather. My feeling subsistence should have a broad package and fish and Game will close it down when it goes down. Subsistence takes number one. If it is 7 days a week I am for it. We got the resources when the weather was good. My ancestors got their subsistence resources when the resources should be available. We are limiting subsistence.

Scott Kent: The difference in fishing period length between freshwater and salt water really comes down to the efficiency of the gill nets. It is good to have windows in the freshwater to protect milling salmon stocks in the lower reaches of the rivers. In the ocean, you're fishing on several actively migrating stocks and opportunities are limited by the surf conditions. . There are only a few people who are going to fish in the marine waters with gill nets. It is good to have windows in the rivers and there should be less limitation out on the ocean.

Proposal 122

All in support

None opposed

Motion Carries All in favor

Moved to support Proposal 123: Allows beach seines, during the schedules as gill nets in Sub District one.

Comments:

Jim Menard: In 2010 and 2011 I EO'd beach seining during the chum salmon season during the gillnet schedule. In 2012 I pulled out one beach seining period during the second week in July but otherwise it was opening during chum salmon season gillnet schedule. We would support on the front end during chum season but have concerns during the silver salmon run. Commercial Fish is ok until coho salmon season starts until July 26th being a problem. The chum salmon runs are not the same as the coho runs. Give it a shot in chum and pink season. Here are the harvests in recent year stable 123 (1). We to do a catch limit to limit the amount of salmon people can catch. Commercial Fish can give it shot when the whether it is better. Explains graphs with the number of permits that beach seine, rod and reel harvests, pink salmon, broke it down by location of fishing by subsistence users, chum net caught fish were dominantly in the marine waters. Marine harvests, in 2010 in 2011 and 2011 had poorer weather likely resulting in lower harvests, the harvests can be weather driven. Silver salmon, not many seining there, but it's not open often so that is there isn't anyone seining.

Charlie Lean: Seining is used in mass production or to specialize the catch. There is a very short portion of the Sinuk River that is open for subsistence. Seining has an advantage over gill nets. You have a better chance of release fish alive. I think seining gear has a place. Sparks and I used to be a power house team on that. Seining has an advantage over gill nets because you have a better chance of releasing what you don't want.

Howard Farley: Agrees that seining is more selective.

Charlie Lean: Seining gear has its place.

Roy: If we support proposal 123, should we take action on 124. Any more comments

Proposal #123 All Support

no opposition

Motion Carries

Proposal 124: Boundaries for subsistence

Comments:

Charlie Lean: The **Sinuk** River you are targeting silvers or reds depending on what time you are fishing. The opportunity for seining is very limited. It is quite time specific for fish with these methods in this region.

Roy Ashenfelter: By having the separation further up the river you will get better separation of fish species, without having to deal with other species.

Jim Menard: Comm fish supports the proposal 124, explains graphs and maps with the black flag marking with the proposed boundary and the present and lower river boundary.

Proposal #124

All Support

No opposition

Motion Carries

PROPOSAL #125 Proposal by Dan Reed The proposal is to allow a dip net for fishing for salmon NOT chum salmon in the Pilgrim River. The net harvest has been 125 (1) (2) (3). It may be an effective economic way to catch salmon or be good for targeting a specific.

Comments:

Jim Menard: gives department comments and data on the Pilgrim River. Department supports this proposal.

Dan Reed: Dip net is only used for personal use.

Paul Kosto: I like dip netting. Is dipping netting allowed for subsistence use in the rest of the state.

Charlie Lean: the King salmon are really going down on the Pilgrim. Makes suggestion for having Kings put back.

Adem Boeckman: I like doing it in front of your doorstep

Roy Ashenfelter: It took a while to get rod and reel to be considered subsistence gear. Amend to add cast nets to the proposal

Dan Reed: I talked with people around town about dip netting and people were wondering why I didn't put cast nets on there too? People have expressed interest in using cast nets too. Said that he could not change the proposal but the AC can.

Amend to add cast nets to the proposal

All in favor of the amendment, none opposed

Nicole Braem: Dip nets are used for different species not salmon in Norton and in Kotzebue. You could make the case that they had large nets historically for something.

Proposal 125 all Support Motion Carries as amended

All supported

None opposed

Motion Carries

Proposal 126:

Comments:

Scott Kent: Wes Jones submitted this proposal the extension of the salmon season by emergency order. The Department supports this proposal, it would not affect the management of the late fall management. The Department has extended the season by emergency order in 2006, 2008, 2009, and for one period in 2012. No harm in allowing increase in period of time when bulk of run is in river or there is late season surge in abundance of coho salmon.

Charlie Lean: Wes Jones is a member of NSEDC and I am his supervisor. We believe that it technically requires a commissioner's order to extend the season. The flexibility needs to be increased.

Proposal #26

All in support

None opposed

Motion carries

Proposal 127 Gill net specifications and operations

Comments:

Scott Kent: Reads Department comments report

Department supports the proposal. Market interest in pink salmon has increased.

Charlie Lean (NSEDC employee): We tried to buy pink salmon commercially this year, even though it wasn't an even year there were have been a boom in market if people could have caught more it would have been good if we could have gotten more. Using gillnets already recognized in the regulations the gill nets can be used efficiently. This is a cleaner easier way to increase the value of commercial fishery. This is a more workable solution.

Howard Farley: Have they thought of stacking permits like they do in Bristol Bay? They want to fish it like herring. Stacking seems like a good thing. Those pink nets can load up like you wouldn't believe. It would be good for getting to the peak. I don't know, you would have to watch it. Use the shoulder of the season. You are lucky to keep one net clean. It would be good to use this on the early part of the run.

Scott Kent: It would help increase pink salmon harvests during the non-peak fishing times and help mitigate losses from forgone harvest opportunities (i.e., weather, chum salmon conservation concerns).

Proposal 127

All in support

No opposition

Called Motion carries

Proposal 128 Use of pink salmon for bait in the Norton Sound Port Clarence Area

Comments:

Scott Kent: Reads proposal. Allows pink fish commercial fish for personal use as bait and gives department comments and data. Permit holders would require permission from the department to exceed the 2 ton salmon amount.

Department opposes this proposal as written because this fishery should be opened by emergency order rather than at any time.

Department many authorize other uses of salmon.

The department opposes the proposal as written because there may not be surplus available for this fishery in years of low pink salmon abundance. In years of low abundance, all surplus will be needed to provide for subsistence uses. Howard Farley: I have been fishing the river for years. The pink salmon don't fit in a can because they are too small. They have a high oil content and as such make really good bait. Bait that we otherwise have to purchase from elsewhere. We have to buy spawned out herring that don't have the oil content or from Dutch Harbor. We have fish right under our boats that are going up river and dying and not being of use to anyone. I understand it would be ok to do with EO. There are some herring and crab. The pink salmon are trout size not salmon size.

Scott Kent: The only thing we are not comfortable with allowing this fishery to occur at any time, irrespective of abundance. This fishery should be opened by E.O. Supportive of the idea of utilizing pink salmon surpluses for bait in years of high abundance.

Paul Kosto: The department doesn't like the anytime portion of this proposal, that is it? He could go out for herring. The difference is that it is salmon.

Scott Kent: the problem is people using this for bait in years when people will have difficulty putting pink salmon on the rack for food.

Paul Kosto: Requests that the motion be amended to reflect the change in the proposal keep the proposal as the same but include a clause about by Emergency Order Only.

Accept as provided in paragraph 1 in parentheses except as in paragraph three in marine waters only.

-You don't have to be a salmon permit holder in order to harvest the bait fish in this case pink salmon.

Motion seconded

All support the amended version of the proposal as highlighted above

None opposed

Motion carries

All Support: 128 # no opposition motion carries

All Support Amended #128 no opposition motion carries

Proposal #129: would support harvest of chum salmon

Motion Supported

Comments:

Brendan Scanlon: Reads Fred DeCicco submitted proposal. Reads department comments, this proposal hook and line would be legal subsistence years. Adoption of this proposal would allow people to fish outside the subsistence zone using rod and reel. Refers to figure (see attached).

The Department is neutral on the allocation effects, but would be in support of EO in the Nome sub district. The sport harvest was going under sport harvest when escapements can be met.

Jim Menard: Explains the subsistence regulations versus the sport fish gear regulations.

Brendan Scanlon: it would probably add very little.

Roy Ashenfelter: Is for sport harvest

Charlie Lean: West of Cape Nome is in different shape than East of Cape Nome. I could probably support the E.O. to do that. If commercial is closed and so should sport fishing be closed. Subsistence should take first priority. The Nome and Snake River chum salmon concerns.

Jim Menard: SEGS for the individuals, we only have SEGS for 3 rivers. The El Dorado, Snake and Nome.

Charlie Lean: wants to make an amendment, I don't like the idea of a blanket opener. It should be open the sport fishery when adequate subsistence harvest is allowed. That would include meeting

the escapement goals. My concern if the El Dorado fishing is good, but it is not true for the Snake and Nome that the E.O should account for that.

Amendment

All support the amendment

None opposed

All in favor supporting the amended version of proposal #129

None opposed

Amended motion carries.

All Support 129 motion carries

129 Amended motion carries

Roy Ashenfelter: should act on 179, 180, 181, maybe 216.

Roy Ashenfelter: These proposals have been submitted to allow some measure of control in the fishery to reduce the by catch of chum either through time tables or through the actual cap.

For those who are unfamiliar with the area M fishery, we have some success and not with others.

What the board has supported in the past was the chum cap, there was one year that there was a window of fishing in the area M fishery. It is necessary to have some direction on the fishery other than the fisherman themselves. What the board has supported in the past was a chum cap. There was a window before, but it only lasted one year. It is important to comment on these to have an AC direction, so that when I go before the fishery board I can comment on what the AC would like to do.

Charlie Lean: Everything Roy said is true. All of the proposals are a variation are the same idea. Explains there is 400,000-300,000 fishery. The June fishery at area M at False Pass. The June fishery has a long run. In 1978 they really developed fishery from a sleepy little fishery to one of the most lucrative fisheries in the state each boat is well-capitalized. They have a time allotment to catch the fish. They will catch a portion of fish bound to western Alaska each week with no question of whether the run is strong or weak. The cap when it was in place was from 700-350 on chum, it depended on the attitude of the board and it used to change a lot. It was highly contentious. As an area manager I was in court over this. Speaking as a resident of the region, not necessarily in employment of everyone; I think we should go for the cap. I like proposal #179, it aligns us with Bristol Bay who has a similar issue with red salmon. This is a big battle and we need all of the friends that we can get.

I think all of us in Western Alaska in the same boat. The June fishery needs to be regulated based on salmon abundance and not just how many days there are in the month.

Roy Ashenfelter: I am moving to support. If we take action on 179 we also take action on 180 and 181. If you don't mind I would to offer to the AC we just deal with 179 and forgo 180 and 181.

Paul Kosto: Comments to give a response to actions over to 180 and 181.

Kevin Knowles: I am wondering if these numbers are in favor for our region.

Roy Ashenfelter: Explains the proposals that are being discussed. 179 A is the chump cap, the 8.3% is the sockeye allocation for the area M fishery.

Charlie Lean: If there is chum cap and they are fishing like crazy they will focus on taken fewer chum if it is possible if their goal is sockeye. There is a history 8.3 % or of 400,000 fish. They are not going to stop the area M fishery. It is better to come off with a more real option, instead of we don't like you and we want you to go away. We cut Bristol Bay off, Kuskokwim with the cap. I think we can support them.

Roy Ashenfelter: Explains supporting the Bristol Bay fishery.

Jim Menard: They started in 1984 with an Area M schedule for fishing time with chum caps beginning in 1986. Explains fishing history, in 2001 they put them on a 16 hour fishing day. The Area M fisherman felt if they got into the chum and they didn't have time to move out of the area and they would keep catching chum when they would prefer to move at an area where more sockeye were. In 2004 the board came up with a schedule of 88 hours fishing on and 32 hours off with the idea it will give the fisherman time to move out of the area if they are getting high chum numbers. You may hear the fishermen are going to stand down from fishing early in the season some years because of the chum catch ratios being high compared to sockeye salmon.

Proposal 179 Support (all)

None oppose

Motion carries

Proposal #180 and 181 defer to 179

All in support of motion

None opposed

motion carries to defer to proposal #179

Proposal #216

Comments: Roy Ashenfelter: inquires about his proposal being statewide.

Jim Menard: It seemed like to set some escapement goals outside the management plan, and it was made by Kenai sportsman fishing and they grabbed a bunch of different areas.

Roy Ashenfelter: This is a statewide proposal. We won't meet again for this year. I wanted to make sure if there were comments on this.

Adem Boeckman: I don't like it when people tell the rest of the state what they should do. Essentially Cook Inlet is using the whole state to get this proposal passed and I don't like it when they do that.

Adem Boeckman: I would like to vote this down

All opposed to proposal 216

None in support

Motion Fails

Proposal 218:

Charlie Lean: there should be a bottom line for escapement, it would include some streams in Norton Sound. It is asking the department has said, the regulation has been in place for a long time. There has never been a SEP set in the state.

This should occur, the downside to this it could be used as an endangered species act thing. The Nome River failed to meet the SET river threshold, it might close fishing for everything in the Nome sub district. SFA is looking for lever to push area M around, and Pollock by catch. It is a little bit scary. I think there should be a bottom line. The scary thing is if they hit it. It is something that the Bering Sea fisherman's association wanted me to bring to the AC. It is a double edged sword. This will tie Jim's hands, it would completely closed everything down. If were that low it would be below the escapement goal. There has never been one of these.

Jim Menard: Sub district 1 was listed as stock of management concern and Golovin and Elim were listed as stocks of yield concerns. We have never been that low again in sub district 1 as when the management concern was declared by the board in 2000. We did not establish an SET. We are (Nome) still a yield concern in sub districts 1, 2. and 3.

Adem Boeckman: questions effects of working the fishing of the crash.

Jim Menard: it is kind of after the fact. How low is the SET. We had the lowest escapment on the Snake River and Nome River in 1999 and that produced a return so we believe the SET is below that number.

Charlie Lean: the SET is the number when you

Paul Kosto: Is this a useful for Jim Menard for your too box?

Jim Menard: No

Proposal 218

None Support all

All in Opposition

Motion fails

Motion Ajournd: 3:14 pm.

Southern Norton Sound Meeting in St. Michael

Minutes 11.13.12, Meeting start time 12:10 pm

1. Establish Quorum and Attendance

AC Member Attendee	Representative Info	ADF&G Attendee	Representative
Norbert Otten Jr.	Alternate St. Michael	Letty Hughes	Wildlife Biologist
Art Ivanoff	Unalakleet	Tony Gorn*	Area Biologist
Merlin Henry	Koyuk	Brendan Scanlon*	Sport Fish Biologist
Peter Martin Sr.	Stebbins	Scott Kent*	Comm. Fish Biologist
Henry Oyoumick*	Unalakleet	Jim Menard*	Comm. Fish Biologist
Wade Ryan*	Unalakleet	Nicole Braem*	Subsistence
Michael Sookiyak Sr.	Shaktoolik		

***Indicates Telephonic participation**

AC Members not present:

Allen Atchak-Stebbins
Milton Cheemuk-St. Michael
Kris Mashiana-Unalakleet

General Public:

Vera S. Niksik
James Niksik Sr.
Frankie Myoumick
Andrew Lockwood
James Niksik Jr.

2. Elections

There was supposed to be an alternate for St. Michael that Milton Cheemuk arranged, but we don't know who.

Norbert Otten elected to serve on the St. Michael Advisory Committee serve next to Milton Cheemuk...(CALL MILTON TO SEE ABOUT RE-ELECTIONS)

Vote on establishing Norbert Otten as the representative from St. Michael.

3. Motion to Approve the Agenda

Michael Sookiyak requests addition to agenda Item four to include a prayer

Motion to add a prayer

Motion to approve the meeting minutes

All approve

None opposed

4. Invocation prayer-Michael Sookiyak

5. Approval of last meeting minutes

Motion to approve minutes

Question:

All support

None opposed

Minutes adopted

6. Game Report

Letty Hughes

Gives paperwork for updated meeting materials

Tony Gorn gives Unit 22 Wildlife Report

Gives information about the moose census 545 moose in 2012. In 2008 and 2012 the percent yearlings was complete there was a series of years in 2008 there was 21 % short yearlings in 2012 there was %19 short yearlings. It is encouraging we still have to remember the amount of moose densities is terribly low less than .25% moose per square mile. From where we were a decade ago we are doing better but they are still low.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about past suggestions for having moose surveys in the St. Michael-Stebbins region. Mr. Ivanoff will write a letter to have financial allocation for additional surveys to take place on the Southern portion of Norton Sound around St. Michael and Stebbins.

Tony Gorn: Recalls receiving the letter about having moose surveys in St. Michael and Unalakleet. The next time we can come down to Unalakleet in 2015. Gives response, I took another two super cubs with me to Unalakleet. The idea was to get a good solid Unalakleet census. The intent was to send two super cubs south to collect data on St. Michael and Stebbins but that didn't happen because of weather in the region and additional data had to be collected on the Seward Peninsula musk ox census. Explains we cannot do a moose census at this point, but we can do a trend count. We can't do a moose census, but we can do a trend count. We are interested in looking at the moose count in the lower Yukon it is getting really high.

Peter Martin: Questions about only have antlered moose hunts. Inquires about getting an antlerless moose hunt in Southern Norton Sound (St. Michael-Stebbins Region).

Tony Gorn: That is another good reason to look at moose in your back yard if you want to be having antlerless moose hunts. Would consider having an antlerless moose hunts based on information.

Letty Hughes: Gives past fall harvest report from 22A. With the increase in the moose population it increased the number of possible moose harvests to 22. That was with the city of Unalakleet to extend the season to the 20th of September. We had 16 moose taken as part of that EO, part of that EO plan was to have a winter moose hunt. The plan was that if there was enough moose left over in the quota to allow a winter hunt in Unalakleet. This is not for 22A it is for the Unalakleet region only. Answers question about the hunting with the general season hunting harvest times.

Tony Gorn: I don't know if you remember going back and forth over the past couple years.

Peter Martin: Explains the reasoning for the hunting season extension each year because of the bad weather and not being able to get the moose quotas.

Letty Hughes: Explains that it is necessary for Unalakleet to send in a request to have the moose hunting season extended.

Peter Martin: in the past five years we have requested extensions. We may need to request extension again. We need this subsistence moose meat for our community.

Tony Gorn: We have been responding to the questions of St. Michael and Stebbins to extend the season throughout the winter. We should look for a solution so that St. Michael and Stebbins don't have to keep reapplying for an extended season.

Merlin Henry: I never have heard anything about 22E I have never heard anything about the moose. I didn't see any bull moose in that area only cows.

Letty Hughes: We have been focused our moose census for 22B was West of the Darby Mountains. In the eastern portion in the Koyuk area. There are a few moose taken from Elim and Koyuk, but I am not sure .

Tony Gorn: 22E is a really big area. We focus our energy in the scariest areas. There isn't any biological concerns in Koyuk and Elim and the harvests are relatively low. IF you look at the reg book that the moose seasons are really long in that region because there are no biological concerns. I have heard a lot about a lot of female moose and not a lot of male moose. I thought that high it was linked to the high water causing a change in distribution the male moose. The areas where you see most of the male moose was underwater this year. The Koyuk River area we try to get to, it has been about 3 years and we try to do trend counts.

Merlin Henry: There was a lot of high water this year in the Koyuk River from all of the rain. The people who got moose were lucky to get their moose. Inquires about getting a proxy permit for hunting for elders.

Inquires about barren female, How come it is not in the reg book. I have heard about barren females and I heard we can get them. How come I don't know if I can get a barren female.

Letty Hughes: I have the paperwork for the hunting by proxy permit and I can help you fill that out, there is a winter hunt right now from November 1st to December 31 for the Koyuk-Elim area

Letty Hughes: For 22B there isn't a regulation for an antlerless moose hunt. There would need to be a proposal put in for an antlerless moose hunt.

Tony Gorn: There are a couple of spots in the area in 22C we have an antlerless moose hunt. In an area like 22E, from the trend count we have completed. From talking to people from flying around it doesn't sound/look like 22E that the density of the moose population is not that high. Moose are like people, moose as they get older they get less likely to be able to have a calf. That does not mean that the older female moose cannot have calves. It would be better to leave that cow in the population so it can try again in another year. When we have low moose densities it is hard to justify an antlerless moose hunt.

Art Ivanoff: We can ask for more resources to conduct surveys so we can increase moose hunts and to consider more time hunting. It sounds like the resources are spread too thin to allow information to be collected to allow various hunts. If you had more funding would you be able to get more information on the moose populations in this area?

Tony Gorn: That is a loaded question. It is always good to have more data on an area. Right now 22B has the longest hunting seasons with four months of hunting opportunity. The reason why we focus on energy on places like Unalakleet is because we have higher harvest rates We have two and half people in the Nome office, we can't get everywhere that we want and that is just the way that it is.

Art Ivanoff: I think that this region needs to have more money thrown into the coffers so that they can do their jobs sufficiently. Though there are long hunting season in Koyuk, it sounds like they would like to have more hunting opportunity same with St. Michael and Stebbins. I would like to write a letter to our senators and representatives to seek additional funding for the Department of Fish and Game to conduct more research so that people in the villages can have more opportunity. 24,000 sq miles is a big area and it sounds

Michael Sookiayak: The hunter's in Shaktoolik are talking about having very high ratios of cows to bull ratios in Unit 22A. Comments there are more cows than bulls in unit 22A, there were no real concerns for the moose populations in Shaktoolik. The cow to bull ratio according the hunter is not good.

Art Ivanoff: I like the idea to engage the senator's, representative and the Governor's office.

James Niskisk Sr.: Wonders when the last moose census area in the Stebbins/St. Michael area.

Tony Gorn: We have never completed a moose census, it estimates the number of moose per square mile. It is a project that takes a very long time to do. We do trend count surveys in the spring and fall time. I am willing to share all of the data that I have from trend counts from all of the years that we have done it. We were in the South part of A was about four years ago. We did a trend count not a

census. The census gives you the number of moose per square mile where as the trend count gives you an idea of bull:cow ratios, the number of calves, and a lot of times trend counts you can do in a day or two day. The population survey can take the better part of two weeks. We have a five week period to conduct surveys in this region. If you give your name to Letty, I will give you all of the results that we have. I'll get them to you. The last trend count we did was last fall. It was a trend count not an abundance survey. Population surveys are useful to determine population density. You can do trend count in two days versus two weeks.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about having a long enough time to hunt for the moose. We took direction last year to submit a letter to get future moose hunting in the region. We will do it again to get resources allocated for surveys so that the St. Michael-Stebbins area can have a more liberal hunt. Our question is if the data is sufficient.

Tony Gorn: This is a great dialog, you want to have more surveys and know more detail about the populations. We want to do more surveys. I just want everyone to understand, that what your implying is that more surveys are going to lead to more liberal hunts. Take a look the regulation book. You have more liberal hunt times and if you add more surveys it is possible that the hunts may not be more liberal. I want to perfectly clear about the possibility. We respond to the squeaky wheel and if you look at the regulation book that often means that there are more stringent regulations. If we get more information that very well lead to more stringent regulations.

Art Ivanoff: Having the data is important to have the management of the resources. I think that is a really good point and it is important to have good conservation like around the Unalakleet River. Are there any other

Wade Ryan: I have no further comments

Letty Hughes: Musk Ox management

What you see in front of you is the hunts, last year we went back into tier two hunts with the exception of 22E except the Koyuk Elim area. There hasn't been any musk ox harvested in that area. The tier II has opened. I was in Koyuk last Tuesday at the IRA helping people fill out Tier II permits with supplements for 22B, 22C, 22C, 23 you have until December 17 online.

Art Ivanoff: Tony would you like to add to what Letty had to say.

Tony Gorn: Basically the musk ox population on the Seward Peninsula it is in a bad shape between 2010 and 2012 the population declined 13% annually so between 2010 and 2012 it decline in total by %25. That is why we are now in tier two. Recruitment rates and bull cow ratios are low. The Seward Peninsula musk ox situation is not great. Over the years we know that musk ox has moved in to the Nuvallik Hills, it changed the way we did the surveys. We estimated 84 musk area. We went back to the Mullato Hills and landed next to every group of musk ox that we could find and took down data on the groups aging them. The results were very encouraging. The bull cow ratio went up as well as an increase

in the number of yearlings. The total number of animals is still quite low. The ones that are living in that area are doing really good even though the population is low right now.

Wade Ryan: Inquires about musk ox

Wade Ryan: Inquires

Tony Gorn: We do not want to overharvest bulls. We need to be very conservative. We have learned that. In 2011 I told the board of game that we found these animals. We need 100 musk ox for the subsistence, we can't kill 100 musk we are in Tier II, we have 39 musk ox allotted. I would expect to be in tier II for the foreseeable future. If we started a musk ox hunt in 22A we would start in tier two and everyone in the state of Alaska could hunt. Explains tier two selection and the point system. This means that all Alaska residents can apply for these permits and the hunts are determined by where you live, how much you pay for food and gas etc.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about action items.

Tony Gorn: The only thing that you need to think about proposals for having a hunt need to be submitted on May 1st. The next meeting will be on January 2014. The tier two time application is now. This is a slow process; there is a population of 80 to 100 musk ox. I would think you would want to put a lot of thought into what you are doing and take it into the Board of Game. We have been very successful as a group working together.

Wade Ryan: Inquires about the time frame for when the regulations would go into action..I don't have any problems with this idea

Tony Gorn: Explains I know this process is slow. I think we are going to want to think very hard about what we want to do and getting it right the first time. You have been very patient and I think that if we work together as a department and AC we have been very successful with getting proposals put together in the past if we work together.

Wade Ryan: I don't have any problems with the regulations because the population is so low right now.

Michael Sookiyak: I put this question to my community during the last annual meeting. There was more questions than interest in the musk ox hunt. They agreed at the last annual meeting to wait for additional information from the meeting in their behalf.

Henry Oyoumick: Wants to know how often we have these survey's

Tony Gorn: We have these surveys every two years. Explains the details of the survey methods.

Art Ivanoff: I want to welcome and introduce Henry Oyoumick to the group. I think Tony and Wade should work together to get a hunt on for a proposal.

Letty Hughes: Explains brown bear tagging fee exemption waiver fee for 22A.

Art Ivanoff: We need to cover the tagging fee

Letty Hughes: Explains brown bear harvest data for Unit 22. I have the upper bar graph for the total number of bears harvested. I have it broken down by subunit. From 1990 to 1997 we were harvesting, explains the total number brown bear harvests. Without the tag fee we increased are harvest to 93 bears a year and increased our harvest by 80%. This information is taken by brown bear sealing. Explains the number of bears harvested (Refers to data included in the handout).

Tony Gorn: Thanks for the opportunity. I didn't hear everything that Letty said. The Southern Norton Sound needs to vote on the brown bear tagging fee.

Proposal 40 Continued Exemption for the brown bear tag fee. We are asking the \$25 fee be waived or otherwise it defaults back in.

Motion: to support the proposal

Second:

Question called

All supported

None opposed

Motion carries

B. Fisheries

Scott Kent: I am not sure what you want me to focus on. Summarized what has been happening Southern Norton Sound. We have the lowest king salmon return on record. We have just under 3000 king salmon for the entire Unalakeet drainage. We did make our escapement goals this year and we didn't make them last year because of high waters at the towers. This year the counts were good at the towers. The weir counts was much lower. The forecast for a muThe magnitude of the run was extremely weak this year.

Michael Sookiyak: Requests information from the Shaktoolik River and when it will be available.

Scott kent: 800-1200 chinook. We are still in the process of finalizing our data.

Art Ivanoff: it seems like the count wasn't there. It didn't pan out in 2012. It wasn't a good year

Scott Kent: There were a lot more reds in the river. It got to the point that there weren't many chum, there were many kings. Explains issues with difficulty with miscounted fish. The projected harvest was over 130 fish.

Art Ivanoff: you did suspect that we did make our escapement for 2011.

Scott Kent: They were using both tower counts and wier counts and there are problems with both because.

Art Ivanoff: Explains the necessity for escapement goals, and the establishment of making these stocks making them stocks of concern.

Henry Oyoumick: do you have data taken from Golovin on down. The amount of fish taken from Golovin on down.

Scott Kent: you don't want to have it go to tier II. We have almost 30 years of comparable data. It is hard to project.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about the test net necessity. How valuable is the data you are collecting from the test net.

Scott Kent: I don't the value at the moment that being said that the data may be more profitable long run. If we can figure out the way to get the kings in the bag and allow people to conduct better subsistence.

Art Ivanoff: I would like to take up the opportunity to sit down with you. I wanted to sit down the village of Unalakleet for the test net. Perhaps a pre-fisheries meeting in the spring time to see if the test net is necessary. The question is if we aren't making escapement goals what is the point of the test net.

Scott Kent: my understanding about running the sonar in the Southern Norton Sound Area.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about the Chinook salmon in the Southern Norton Sound. What I heard from NSEDC because escapement wasn't met. The reason it wasn't operated by because of escapement goals was not met. They took one male and one female. The kings met the escapement goals.

14:20 Meeting Break

Tony Gorn: Summary Robert Bell incident. It is part of musk ox provision, and how we have administer the musk ox hunt. To allow the appropriately musk. Seward Peninsula has a positive customary and use finding. What does the Seward Peninsula musk ox hunt look like? Explains no trophy use of the horns of the musk ox. There has always been some level of trophy destruction.

Michael Sookiyak: I was very disturbed by Bob Bell's actions. I felt disturbed about his actions. The people that I shared this story with in Shaktoolik had the same feelings.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about Northern Norton Sound actions.

Michael Sookiyak: I think it would be beneficial for this board to consider action on this incident to prevent further incidents versus for other incidents to happen. It may be worth it work with the Northern Norton Sound AC meeting.

Peter Martin: Inquires about the Bob Bell incident.

Tony Gorn: There have been several hunters that are being investigated for the trophy destruction.

Art Ivanoff: inquires about taking action

Michael Sookyiak: Makes a motion to work with Northern Norton Sound to draft a letter about this incident.

Motion Seconded:

Question called:

Motion Carries to draft a letter.

AYK Finfish

#115

Nicole Braem: Gives information about customary trade.

Comments:

Michael Sookyiak: Suggests that the Southern Norton Sound supports this proposal

Henry Oyoumick: I would oppose this because of the low numbers for Chinook versus other species

Merlin Henry: What about Koyuk people sell smoked salmon in the store. What I understand here how much money they can make. Inquires about the amount that they make from selling the smoke salmon.

Norbert: With the Chinook salmon being so low, I don't know if this is good idea

Motion

Discussion: _____

All Support

None Opposed

Motion Carries Proposal #115.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about the committee participation on the proposals.

Michael Sookyiak: I think we should move on to proposal #120

Proposal #120

Scott Kent: Reads the proposal. It would prohibit the sale of King Salmon that are incidentally caught. It would give the department some flexibility in the regulation of the salmon fishery.

Department Position: Supports with reservations.

Art Ivanoff: Wrote this proposal in with along NSEDC.

Wade Ryan: inquires about the length of time that this proposal would be effective for.

Scott Kent: This would be effective for three years. It is important information to report king salmon and when they get them.

Art Ivanoff: Requests about the changes that department wants.

Scott Kent: explains the midpoints of the range and the necessities of using different parts of the range.

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about supporting

Motion for

All support

No opposition

Motion carries #120

Proposal #121

Scott Kent: Presents the proposal to the committee

Department: Supports this proposal; gives department comments

Art Ivanoff:

Motion on the floor

Discussion

Question called

All support

None opposed

Motion Carries #121

Art Ivanoff: We are only voting on proposals that effect Southern Norton Sound

All support

None opposed

Proposal #126: proposed by Wes Jones

Scott Kent: Presents the proposal

Department Comments: Department Supports this proposal.

Wade Ryan: Inquires about June 8th to September 7th fishing time frame.

Scott Kent: There is some agreement to disagree with NSEDC.

Art Ivanoff: I am in favor of the proposal. I like the idea of supporting the proposal.

Michael Sookiyak: there are some years when we feel like the salmon are running late and the season is running later. Motion to support proposal

Seconded:

Discussion on 126:

Question 126

All support

None Opposed

Motion Carries

Proposal #127: Allows EO authority for the use of mesh

Scott Kent: Reads proposal #127 and presents the proposal to the AC along with department comments

Department Position: Supports the proposal, will allow for more harvesting of pink salmon.

Henry Oyoumick: inquires about the length change that will be affected by this regulation changing

Art Ivanoff: I like the idea of allowing people, as long as there is not an environmental issue

Michael Sookiyak: I am concerned about fisherman who don't have the big enough boats to handle all of the gear.

Art Ivanoff: I think your concern is a good one and I think for those people who are well equipped.

Motion to support proposal #127

Seconded

Question:

All support

None opposed

Motion Carries

Proposal #128-Use of pink salmon as bait

Scott Kent: Presents the proposals

Gives department comments: Department doesn't support this proposal, the department supports on years of abundance.

Art Ivanoff: The department was neutral on this proposal

Michael Sookiyak: inquires about the effect on herring fisherman for bait.

Scott Kent: The data would say no.

Henry Oyoumick: Could you explain the Port Clarence Area

Scott Kent: Explains Norton Sound Port Clarence Area

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about whether if this proposal would affect the Southern Norton Sound

Wade: It sounds like basically people want to use this for crab. My only concern is overharvesting the pink salmon. I support this.

Scott Kent: Claifies the necessity of modifying the proposal

Henry Oyoumick: I would be in favor if it only affects Northern Norton Sound

-I would to oppose this because I think we should use our herring bait fishery

Michael Sookiyak: I think we should support this proposal with the changes that the state recommends.

Art Ivanoff: I feel I agree with Henry, this could be impacting this region

Question

2 support

1 opposed

Motion carries with state modifications.

Scott Kent: I don't have any more proposals to cover

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about the sport fish record of Kings in Unalakeet, 534 king were caught. That is from the statewide harvest survey. 534 king that were caught and released.

Brendan Scanlon: That includes the 53 that were harvested.

Art Ivanoff: inquires about the mortality about catch and release for Chinook salmon.

Brendan Scanlon: There was a project conducted on the Kenai River. Over 5.5 and 8.8% death rate for hooked fish.

Art Ivanoff: on the 2011 harvest of 53 king inquires about the number of 53 of the salmon that were harvested how many of them were residents.

Brendan Scanlon: about half of the sport harvests is Alaska residents and half non-residents.

-All of the regulations are the same

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about Kenai resident versus non-resident preference.

Brendan Scanlon: says that there is only one in the marine waters.

Art Ivanoff: There is statutory language to give residents first stab. I am just trying to figure out what we need to do get our stocks to the historical level. Looking at the 534 number 8% up.

Brendan Scanlon: it is more like 10%. It looks like the data from Kenai, 15% of the salmon that didn't survive.

For king salmon it is 5.5% and 8%.

Art Ivanoff: There have been more reports that mortality rates are higher. I can't remember that the study by Susiski was higher if it was sockeye. I don't like the idea of the sports fishing up the river along the subsistence fish. I don't like that our people doing subsistence aren't able to catch.

Brendan Scanlon: Explains the AYK Resident Species is for Northern Norton Sound for the Nome River

Art Ivanoff: Defer to the Northern Norton Sound proposals

AYK Genetics:

Scott Kent: this years there were 3 collection trips for Norton Sound Port Clarence Chinook Stock for the Igallik and Shaktollik Rivers. We 53 samples on the Ingallik we are just shy of 100 total. We working towards getting more samples and putting new markers on the fish.

Michael Sookiyak: Inquire about if Fish and Game is working with the Northern Norton Sound Aquatic Association.

Scott Kent: Not really. They are not really involved. Genetics requires certain things that aqua culture does not. It is pretty much the department is one.

Henry Oyoumick: I have always been interested in the genetic influence.

Scott Kent: The AYK Chinook salmon symposium and there is a research topic about (((SEND FLYER TO HIS NEW EMAIL ADDRESS)))

Art Ivanoff: Some of the people in Barrow are catching Chinook Salmon, and there has been a complete regime shift.

Scott Kent: It is not too far to suggest that salmon species are expanding their range. My trip to their was very eye opening. I thought that the Ingallik should have a lot of Chinook salmon. A lot of fish in the Ingallik were large. It is possible that things are change. Salmon are good at finding a new habitat.

Art Ivanoff: I am not sure if this is an anomaly, but it is interesting.

Merlin Henry: There used to be a lot of fish up there a long time ago.

Scott Kent: Your river is probably the healthiest in Norton Sound. There isn't any pollution.

Merlin Henry: Commercial fisherman had a low King Salmon return. In the Ingallik I only caught two king fish. I saw chums with sore heads (more than one). I don't know where they get their sores.

Jim Menard: Nothing from our end.

Art Ivanoff: Maybe it would be good to go through the proposals Southern Norton Sound Supported.

Michael Sookiyak: there are a lot of new faces sitting around the table.

Proposal #183 Jim Menard gives presentation

There has been a lot of discussion and changes throughout the years.

Art Ivanoff: the proposal was written because they currently stand down during the time period. We wanted to have some sort of regulation that prevent them from fishing during this time period, because of the mixed stock composition. We wanted to prevent them from fishing for fish that were our fish.

Michael Sookiyak: I just wanted to bring it up so that new people know what is going on .

Art Ivanoff: We submitted this proposal again to address our concern. Any question?

Proposal #180

Art Ivanoff: I think that window establishes a stand down and it gives our salmon time to. I think we want to be there at the Board of fish to present our proposal. Inquires about action taken a year ago.

Jim Menard: Area M is allowed to catch 8.3 % of the sockeye salmon. Explains the chum cap. One of the arguments presented about the 16 fishing day and how it didn't give them time to get out of the chum they are currently on 88 hours fishing with time off in between to allow them to move out of the chum.

Art Ivanoff: We need a motion to support 183 and I think it would be great to give a representative some flexibility.

Michael Sookiyak: I make a motion to support 183.

There is a motion 183.

Seconded:

Discussion:

Art Ivanoff: The proposal 180 is by Roy Ashenfelter, I think when you go to these meetings you pick up a lot more information when you change. The idea is to focus on conservation.

Is there support for the amended motion.

All in support for the amended motion

Gives the representative to have flexibility to make decisions based on the information given at the meeting.

Jim Menard: We don't have anything about the statewide salmon.

Art Ivanoff: Explains the minority report. The minority report was designed to push the envelope on providing resources to this region. We submitted it to higher ups the commissioner's office and senator's office to let them know there are some issue.

-covers disaster declaration

Explains that we didn't agree with the findings for the submission of declaration of the disaster from district 5 and 6. The letter was resubmitted to commerce for reconsideration. The Kenai River was classified as a disaster area. We are going through the motions.

Michael Sookiyak: Inquires about the letter submitted and the response to the letter.

St. Michael Public: Inquires about whitefish commercial fishing.

Jim Menard: you can apply for a permit

Scott Kent: there is a good basis for possibly developing the whitefish fishery. We need data we don't have any data.

Art Ivanoff: I will carry on that dialog with Wes Jones. That St. Michael will would like to develop a whitefish fishery.

Scott Kent: There is not likely a massive fishery here, but there is potential for development.

Art Ivanoff: Is there opportunity for tom cod for bait?

Jim Menard: People would need to get a permit for collecting tom cod for bait. You can get that permit from NSEDC. If there is somebody fishing for tom cod with their permit.

Art Ivanoff: We do have several people who are taking up targeting fishing of tom cod it is a really good opportunity.

Michael Sookiyak: Joint Board Modification

I would like to make a motion to support the Joint Board Proposal

Discussion:

Questions:

All support

None Opposed

Art Ivanoff: What was suggested was something. There needs to be some modifications and overhaul for the AC systems to fine tune this machine. You control 40%/44 million miles lands based on our hunting and fishing history. The tools need to be sharpened to get ACs involved in the decision making processes. The system is broken. The ACs should be involved in the deliberations. There needs to be more money put into these processes to make the ACs to support rural Alaska. It is difficult, but it needs to be overhauled. St Michael and Stebbins brought up some issues needs to be addressed. There is more that is required so that our people can harvest moose when they need it.

I would like to submit a motion for a letter SNAC to request additional resources from the Department of Fish and Game so that people can get the moose that they need.

Motion

Seconded:

Discussion: there is are other areas that we could focus on. I know that Shaktoolik has been trying to get support for Chinook Salmon and the resources need to be covered across a greater area.

Michael Sookiyak: A agree that there needs to be more resource allocation to conduct more surveys in this region.

Amended motion to the board to include the Shaktoolik River resources

Motion carries for the amended

Art Ivanoff: two letters one for Senator Olson to allocate more resources to the Shaktoolik region Chinook salmon stocks with their own research and funding independent of Unalakleet

All support

None opposed

Motion Carries

Art Ivanoff: Returns back to Koyuk for antlerless moose hunt possibility. Is that the direction that Koyuk would like to do.

Merlin Henry: I have never been to this type of meeting before.

Art Ivanoff: We addressed the St. Michael and Stebbins about surveys.

Michael Sookiyak: Musk ox when I posed the question to the people at home. They wanted to leave it to the next annual meeting. Hopefully we will have an answer from

Wade Ryan: I would like a tier two hunt that gives more preference (local preference only) for local hunters, to reallocate the point system. All of those names at the top will be thrown into the hat to be drawn.

Art Ivanoff: inquires about further issues that Wade Ryan might have

Wade Ryan: I don't have any more questions and concerns

Art Ivanoff: Inquires about further issues that Henry Oyoumick might have.

Henry Oyoumick: Cisco data needs to be looked at for a whitefish fishery. Questions about the Western Arctic Herd, it was geared for the reindeer herders. It needs to be public use of public money. The real need of the Western Arctic Herd are the people who really need it.

Scott Kent: No further comments. You conducted a good meeting today.

Art Ivanoff: I know we have taken action on several proposal. I think there needs to be some flexibility to give some discretionary flexibility.

Michael Sookiyak: I would like to propose to send Art to the board meetings to represent us. If there is additional funding to have

Motion:

Discussion:

Art Ivanoff: I think the representative needs to have some flexibility.

I think there are other times it could have a greater impact a lot of communities.

Question:

All in favor

None Opposed to support the flexibility of representative.

Art Ivanoff: I think we need to choose an additional person assigned to go to these meetings.

Peter Martin: Motions to have Michael Sookiyak represent the advisory committee

Art Ivanoff: I would like to advocate to have Michael Sookiyak attend, based on his schedule.

Question: Motion carries

Art Ivanoff: Requests an alternate

Peter Martin: Wade Ryan as an alternate

Motion to have Wade Ryan to attend

Michael Sookyiak: Suggests Henry Oyoumick

Amended to have Henry and Wade serve as alternates

All in favor

Discussion

Question for the main motion

All Support

Motion Carries

Date and Time of Next Meeting

April Meeting in Unalakleet in conjunction with the pre-fishing season meeting.

Togiak Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
October 23, 2012 9:00 a.m.
Togiak Senior Center
Togiak, Alaska

Agenda/Meeting Minutes

- **Call to Order** 10:07
- **Roll Call**

Julius Henry P	Frank Logusak P	Gust Bartman P
John Bavilla P	John Nick Exc.	Moses Kritz Exc.
Jonathan Forsling P	Peter Lockuk Exc.	
- **Approval of Agenda** FL made a motion to approve agenda items seconded by JH, motion carried
- **Approval of Last Meeting Minutes** FL made a motion to table March 2012 Meeting Minutes seconded by GB, motion carried
- **Introduce Staff and Guests** Susan Jenkins-Brito, the new ADFG Board Support Coordinator for SW Alaska Region, Jim Wollington F&G, Paul Liedberg F&W, Andy Aderman F&W, Frank Woods BBNA, Arline Woods BBNA, Mark Strubb BBNA, Sally Nukwak BBNA, Scott Quist F&G, Matt Jones F&G, Helen Gregorio, Bob Dubey, John Parker, Pete Abraham, James Awolin
- **Reports from the Department and F&W Troopers**

Jim Woolington-Here to cover Moose Management Plan and BOG Proposals Handouts for 17A harvest numbers for fall and winter hunts Bear, Moose and Caribou 33 Fall Moose permits have not reported out of 135 issued out of 102 reports 90 hunters hunted and 28 moose were taken which is similar to last year (List Eunice non reporting) Questions Frank L. How many guides in 17A? Andy A. 2 guides Frank W. Too many bears in 17A How can we solve this? Any Leases? FL Set up bear guides with BBNA Paul L. Twin Hills and Manokotak have this in place

Andy Aderman- Nush. Penn. Caribou-86 harvests 3rd highest Togiak 15 the rest Manokatak, Dillingham and Anchorage good calf recruitment & and overall population including bulls are up 900+ minimum count 2011 859 minimum count Twin Hills had permits but didn't hunt 2012 moose had good calves with 59% twins Lost many collard moose but high percent of older moose data within historical range no 17A counts last year plan to count Feb 2013 Last count 2011 1,166 moose in Feb-March 2008 1,070 moose Frank L. At 2011 Wasilla BOG hunters say they want to sport hunt and that the

population is wealthy and I am afraid 2013 BOG will approve this and local hunters will have trouble and questioned whether Fed Sub Board restrict hunts if BOG approves Sport hunts Andy A. They can but this hasn't occurred yet Jim W. BOG will often follow plans put into place by local entities Frank L. Glad Traditional Council of Togiak talked to USF&W, ADF&G and BBNA and have good communication [to develop MMP] Gust B. Long time to increase moose population John B. How high do guides fly for moose hunt (Andy A. Doesn't think it is restricted) they fly to low and drive moose inland making fall hunts hard Frank L. Wants annual counts not every other year Paul L. funding is tough to perform counts annually Jim W. Remember radio tracking, calving surveys and other data not just count important Paul L. Togaik Refuge limit 17 to two guides an unit 18 one guide Frank W. Boundries need flex into Chogg land John B. Wolf counts? (Andy A. no counts) I have heard there are lots of wolves in Kulukuk area and the moose bring them in Frank L. Wolves not only predators lots of bears and I have witnessed them killing moose

Jason Dye No report will answer questions during proposals no 2012 data yet hopefully will have it before BOG

Frank Woods BOF Dec. 4-12 BOG wait for recommendations

Break 11:00-11:13

- **New Business**

- **Signing of the Moose Management Plan** FL made a motion to adopt and sign Moose Management Plan seconded by GB, motion carried

- **Board of Game Proposals** FL made a motion to table BOG proposals till next meeting seconded by JH, motion carried

- **Area T (Bristol Bay) Proposals**

Proposal 1-3 Nushagak specific No Action

Proposal 4 FL made a motion to adopt seconded by JH discussion F&W concerned about guts in the water and how to enforce

JB have always thrown fish parts in the water to keep bears from coming around

Jason D. not really affect Togiak water social issue chumming mostly rainbow

FL artificial bait is worrisome specifically treated eggs, Motion carried

Proposal 5 No action

Proposal 6-7 No action based on Proposal 8

Proposal 8 FL made a motion seconded by JH discussion FL made a motion to

amend the proposal to include all waters from Cape Newenham to Cape

Constintine, motion carried discussion JF we are concerned with the future of our

Chinook run, motion carried

Matt Jones update 2012 Salmon season and 2012 herring season and 2013 herring forecast

FL made a motion to request a amount necessary for subsistence use study to

BBNA and have Traditional Council of Togaik pass a resolution to same affect

and have Traditional Council of Togiak request BBNA to work with NPMC to oversee yellow fin trawl fishery seconded by JB, motion carried

Proposal 9 no action

Proposal 10 FL made a motion to adopt seconded by JB discussion ADF&G neutral on allocative proposals JB Kelp not as much as it used to be FL where does our herring go does it go to Dutch harbor Matt J? Matt J. a lot is unknown but we believe it is one stock JF would take away spawn on kelp fishery giving our subsistence resource away, motion failed

Proposal 11 JF made a motion to adopt seconded by FL discussion JF fishing is too early and taking too many females the ecosystem can't handle the aggressive nature of the fishery FL seiners catch 100% of targeted fish and gillnetters inadvertently release some of the targeted fish taking away from our local resident opportunity to participate in the fishery, motion failed

Proposal 12 FL Made a motion to adopt seconded by JB discussion JF we have gone long enough allowing our resource to be exploited with extreme detriment to our eco-system Matt J. drifters couldn't pull 50% of allocation from Kalukuk Section Frank W. historically there has been a gillnet fishery in additional grounds FL made a motion to amend to allow additional fishing grounds for drifters seconded by JH, motion carried, main motion carried

Proposal 13 FL made a motion to adopt seconded by GB discussion JF we are very serious about resource and how it impacts our subsistence and our ecosystem and the impacts of this fishery and current management are well addressed in the proposal the changes in this fishery have been very dramatic to the local ecosystem and this needs to be studied as to the cause of these changes, motion carried

Proposal 14 FL made a motion to adopt seconded by GB discussion FL made a motion to amend the proposal to allow gillnet fisherman with in closed waters seconded by GB discussion FL concern is with seine fishery catching 100% of targeted schools of fish not allowing for spawn and due to action on Proposal 12, motion carried, main motion as amended carried

Proposal 15-20 No Action

Proposal 21-24 FL made a motion to adopt seconded by GB discussion regulations are good as written, motion failed

Proposal 25 No action

Proposal 26 & 29 FL made a motion to ask BOF to take no action based on comments on 85&86, motion carries

Proposal 27 & 28 FL made a motion to adopt seconded by JH discussion housekeeping proposal, motion carried

Proposal 30 & 31 No Action

Proposal 32-35 JH made a motion to adopt proposal 32-35 seconded by FL discussion JF Togiak is a smaller fishery with often time smaller than 32 foot and shallow draft vessels specific to our bay we oppose all vessel size increases, motion failed

Proposal 36-40 No action based on actions taken on 41-42

Proposal 41 & 42 FL made a motion to adopt seconded by JH discussion JF the spirit of dual permitting has not been realized and everyone should be afforded equal opportunities to participate in the fishery, motion carried

Proposal 43 FL made a motion to adopt seconded by JB discussion JF hurts small local fishery as we have small run and small district FL after transfer date many outside boats are coming to our district with dual permits we have a gentleman fishery and we like to provide equal opportunities to all participants within the fishery JF we could also extend transfer date to August 1st to allow for the more opportunity for local harvest of our late run fishery, there are some very small areas in our district almost allowing dual permits to cover more than half the allowed fishing area, motion carried

Proposal 44-54 FL made a motion to adopt seconded by GB discussion JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed

Proposal 85 & 86 FL made a motion to adopt discussion JF invite all user groups to come together with department to develop comprehensive species specific Chinook enhancement/management plan to proactively conserve and preserve this fishery develop triggering management to grow our stocks to establish a necessity to gather data concerning these runs FL form working group to conserve these fisheries without affecting our sockeye run, motion carried

FL made a motion to support Nushagak ACs actions on all remaining proposals seconded by JH motion carried

Proposal 86 FL made a motion to adopt seconded by JB discussion alignment proposal to move Emergency order waiving period to align with movement of transfer period to July 27th at last BOF meeting

- **Old Business**
- **Set next meeting date and place** Early January Call of the Chair
- **Adjourn** JH made a motion to adjourn at 5:08

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES
DECEMBER 4-12, 2012
BRISTOL BAY FINFISH

DESIGNATED REPORTER:

This summary of actions is for information purposes only and is not intended to detail, reflect or fully interpret the reasons for the Board's actions.

Bristol Bay Subsistence (1 proposal)**PROPOSAL 1****ACTION:** No Action**DESCRIPTION:** Allow for a weekend subsistence schedule in the Nushagak District.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:*****Bristol Bay Sportfish (8 proposals)*****PROPOSAL 2****ACTION:** No Action**DESCRIPTION:** Increase nonretention, no bait waters of the Nushagak River.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:**

PROPOSAL 3 ACTION: discussion F&W concerned about guts in the water and how to enforce

JB have always thrown fish parts in the water to keep bears from coming around

Jason D. not really affect Togiak water social issue chumming mostly rainbow

FL artificial bait is worrisome specifically treated eggs, Motion carried

DESCRIPTION: Require barbless hooks in unbaited, single-hook, artificial fly waters.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:****PROPOSAL 4****ACTION:** Adopt**DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit putting fish parts in water where use of bait is prohibited.**AMENDMENT:**

DISCUSSION: discussion F&W concerned about guts in the water and how to enforce

JB have always thrown fish parts in the water to keep bears from coming around

Jason D. not really affect Togiak water social issue chumming mostly rainbow

FL artificial bait is worrisome specifically treated eggs, Motion carried

PROPOSAL 5**ACTION:** No Action

DESCRIPTION: Decrease coho salmon bag limit to one in the Ugashik, Dog Salmon, and King Salmon rivers. *(This proposal will be addressed in both the Bristol Bay and AK Pen/Aleutian Island meetings.)*

AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 6 **ACTION:** No Action
DESCRIPTION: Clarify king salmon bag limit between Constantine and Newenham.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Based on action on Proposal 8

PROPOSAL 7 **ACTION:** No action
DESCRIPTION: Reduce king salmon bag limit between Constantine and Newenham.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: Based on action on Proposal 8

PROPOSAL 8 **ACTION:** Adopt as amended
DESCRIPTION: Reduce king salmon bag limit in the Togiak and Kulukak rivers.
AMENDMENT: To include all waters between Cape Constantine and Cape Newenham.
DISCUSSION: JF we are concerned with the future of our Chinook run, motion carried

PROPOSAL 9 **ACTION:** No Action
DESCRIPTION: Limit guided access to rivers.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION:

Bristol Bay Herring (5 proposals)

PROPOSAL 10 **ACTION:** Opposed
DESCRIPTION: Allow unharvested herring stocks in the Togiak District to be reallocated to the Dutch Harbor food and bait fishery.
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: JB Kelp not as much as it used to be FL where does our herring go does it go to Dutch harbor Matt J? Matt J. a lot is unknown but we believe it is one stock JF would take away spawn on kelp fishery giving our subsistence resource away, motion failed

PROPOSAL 11 **ACTION:** Opposed
DESCRIPTION: Remove the necessity for maintaining catch percentages between gear groups inseason by emergency order (EO).
AMENDMENT:
DISCUSSION: JF fishing is too early and taking too many females the ecosystem can't handle the aggressive nature of the fishery FL seiners catch 100% of targeted fish and gillnetters inadvertently release some of the targeted fish taking away from our local resident opportunity to participate in the fishery, motion failed

PROPOSAL 12 **ACTION:** Adopted as amended

DESCRIPTION: Split the Togiak District herring sac roe quota allocated to seine and gillnet gear 50/50.

AMENDMENT: amend to allow additional fishing grounds for drifters

DISCUSSION: JF we have gone long enough allowing our resource to be exploited with extreme detriment to our eco-system Matt J. drifters couldn't pull 50% of allocation from Kalukuk Section Frank W. historically there has been a gillnet fishery in additional grounds

PROPOSAL 13

ACTION: Adopt

DESCRIPTION: Close the Togiak herring sac roe fishery through 2016.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JF we are very serious about resource and how it impacts our subsistence and our ecosystem and the impacts of this fishery and current management are well addressed in the proposal the changes in this fishery have been very dramatic to the local ecosystem and this needs to be studied as to the cause of these changes, motion carried

PROPOSAL 14

ACTION: Adopted as amended

DESCRIPTION: Extend the closed waters area in Togiak Bay.

AMENDMENT: allow gillnet fisherman with in closed waters

DISCUSSION: FL concern is with seine fishery catching 100% of targeted schools of fish not allowing for spawn and due to action on Proposal 12, motion carried, main motion as amended carried

Bristol Bay Salmon (73 proposals)

Fishing Gear Specifications and Operations (11 proposals)

PROPOSAL 15

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow set gillnet anchors and running lines at registered sites to remain in the water during closed periods.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 16

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow set gillnet gear to remain in place between fishing periods on consecutive tides.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 17

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: In the Nushagak District, prohibit a permit holder from operating a set gillnet seaward of another set gillnet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 18

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Shorten the distance that a set gillnet can be set from the high-tide mark from 1,000 feet to 600 feet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 19

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Restrict drift gillnet gear from fishing within 1,000 feet from the mean high-tide line.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 20

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow only historical set gillnet sites on the outside beaches of Ugashik District.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 21

ACTION: Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Require name of permit holder on stationary gear.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: regulations are good as written, motion failed

PROPOSAL 22

ACTION: Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Change marking requirement from six inches to twelve inches in height.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: regulations are good as written, motion failed

PROPOSAL 23

ACTION: Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Remove the drift gillnet marking requirement that a cork must be marked every 10 fathoms and mark only at each end of the drift gillnet with vessel ADF&G number.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: regulations are good as written, motion failed

PROPOSAL 24

ACTION: Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Allow seine nets in Bristol Bay for permit holders who hold two Bristol Bay drift gillnet permits.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: regulations are good as written, motion failed

PROPOSAL 25

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Create a new troll fishery for coho salmon outside commercial fishing districts of Bristol Bay.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Closed Waters (4 proposals)

PROPOSAL 26

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Amend closed waters in Togiak District from June 1 to June 30 for king salmon conservation.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: FL made a motion to ask BOF to take no action based on comments on 85&86, motion carries

PROPOSAL 27

ACTION:

DESCRIPTION: Change regulatory boundary descriptions for closed waters at the mouth of Igushik River.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JH discussion housekeeping proposal, motion carried

PROPOSAL 28

ACTION:

DESCRIPTION: Change regulatory boundary descriptions for closed waters at the mouth of the Togiak River.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JH discussion housekeeping proposal, motion carried

PROPOSAL 29

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Create a buffer zone closed to commercial drift gillnet fishing at the mouth of the Togiak River.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: FL made a motion to ask BOF to take no action based on comments on 85&86, motion carries

Landing Requirements (1 proposal)

PROPOSAL 30

ACTION:No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow set gillnet vessels to transport salmon through the Snake River Section provided they have no gear on board the vessel.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Vessels (5 proposals)

PROPOSAL 31

ACTION:No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow vessels with permanent markings to be exempt from dual marking requirements when vessel is used in more than one salmon fishery.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 32

ACTION: Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Increase vessel length up to 42 feet in length based on vessel processing capabilities.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: by FL discussion JF Togiak is a smaller fishery with often time smaller than 32 foot and shallow draft vessels specific to our bay we oppose all vessel size increases

PROPOSAL 33

ACTION: Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Increase vessel length to 36 feet if vessel chills catch and 39 feet if the vessel processes and freezes catch.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: by FL discussion JF Togiak is a smaller fishery with often time smaller than 32 foot and shallow draft vessels specific to our bay we oppose all vessel size increases

PROPOSAL 34 **ACTION:** Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Increase vessel length up to 36 feet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: by FL discussion JF Togiak is a smaller fishery with often time smaller than 32 foot and shallow draft vessels specific to our bay we oppose all vessel size increases

PROPOSAL 35 **ACTION:** Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Increase vessel length over 32 feet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: by FL discussion JF Togiak is a smaller fishery with often time smaller than 32 foot and shallow draft vessels specific to our bay we oppose all vessel size increases

Permit Stacking (20 proposals)

PROPOSAL 36 **ACTION:** No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow one permit holder who owns two drift gillnet permits 200 fathoms of drift gillnet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 37 **ACTION:** No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow one permit holder who owns two drift gillnet permits 200 fathoms of drift gillnet.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 38 **ACTION:** No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow an individual to have two drift gillnet permits registered in one name.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 39 **ACTION:** No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow dual drift gillnet permit holders 200 fathoms in other districts when Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) is open.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 40 **ACTION:** No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow dual drift gillnet permit holders 200 fathoms in other districts when Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) is open.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:**PROPOSAL 41****ACTION:** Adopted**DESCRIPTION:** Disallow permit stacking in Bristol Bay.**AMENDMENT:**

DISCUSSION: JF the spirit of dual permitting has not been realized and everyone should be afforded equal opportunities to participate in the fishery, motion carried

PROPOSAL 42**ACTION:** Adopted**DESCRIPTION:** Disallow additional gear for vessels with two drift gillnet permits.**AMENDMENT:**

DISCUSSION: JF the spirit of dual permitting has not been realized and everyone should be afforded equal opportunities to participate in the fishery, motion carried

PROPOSAL 43**ACTION:** Adopted**DESCRIPTION:** Disallow additional drift gillnet gear for dual permit vessels in the Togiak District.**AMENDMENT:**

DISCUSSION: JF hurts small local fishery as we have small run and small district FL after transfer date many outside boats are coming to our district with dual permits we have a gentleman fishery and we like to provide equal opportunities to all participants within the fishery JF we could also extend transfer date to August 1st to allow for the more opportunity for local harvest of our late run fishery, there are some very small areas in our district almost allowing dual permits to cover more than half the allowed fishing area, motion carried

PROPOSAL 44**ACTION:** Opposed**DESCRIPTION:** Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.**AMENDMENT:**

DISCUSSION: JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed

PROPOSAL 45**ACTION:** Opposed**DESCRIPTION:** Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.**AMENDMENT:**

DISCUSSION: JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed

PROPOSAL 46**ACTION:** Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed

PROPOSAL 47

ACTION: Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed

PROPOSAL 48

ACTION: Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed

PROPOSAL 49

ACTION: Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed

PROPOSAL 50

ACTION: Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed

PROPOSAL 51

ACTION: Opposed

DESCRIPTION: Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed

PROPOSAL 52**ACTION:** Opposed**DESCRIPTION:** Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed**PROPOSAL 53****ACTION:** Opposed**DESCRIPTION:** Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed**PROPOSAL 54****ACTION:** Opposed**DESCRIPTION:** Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** JF we oppose all dual permits for drifters and set netters FL we oppose dual permits for set netters as it would restructure entire fishery and it has dried up set net permit market, motion failed**PROPOSAL 55****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC**DESCRIPTION:** Allow two set gillnet permit holders to fish 100 fathoms on a single site.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:*****Registration and Reregistration (1 proposal)*****PROPOSAL 56****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC**DESCRIPTION:** Prior to June 25, if a drift gillnet permit holder intends to fish in either the Ugashik or Egegik district they must be registered for that district.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:****Bristol Bay Management Plans (31 proposals)*****Genetics (1 proposal)*****PROPOSAL 57****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Placeholder for possible regulatory changes based on results from Western Alaska Salmon Stock Identification Project (WASSIP).

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

General District (4 proposals)

PROPOSAL 58

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Open General District and allow a harvest of up to 25% of projected sockeye salmon run.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 59

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Create two new general districts when all eastside river systems have met their escapement goals or on July 17, whichever comes first.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 60

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Create a general district when all eastside river systems have met their escapement goals or on July 17, whichever comes first.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 61

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: After all eastside Bristol Bay rivers have reached escapement goals, remove existing boundaries and allow open access on or after August 1.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Bristol Bay Restructuring Plan and Process (1 proposal)

PROPOSAL 62

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Develop a process for addressing future proposals deemed as Bristol Bay salmon industry restructuring proposals.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Bristol Bay Allocation Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL 63

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Increase set gillnet allocation to 20% in Nushagak, Naknek-Kvichak, Egegik and Ugashik districts.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 64

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Increase set gillnet allocation to 20% in Nushagak, Naknek-Kvichak, Egegik and Ugashik districts.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 65

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Increase set gillnet allocation to 20% in Nushagak, Egegik, and Ugashik districts, and to 22% in the Naknek-Kvichak District.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Naknek-Kvichak Management and Allocation Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL 66

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Remove set and drift gillnet allocations.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 67

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Stagger fishing periods throughout run.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 68

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Open a new set gillnet fishery at Levelock when Kvichak River reaches minimum escapement.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Alagnak River Special Harvest Area Management Plan (2 proposals)

PROPOSAL 69

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Open Alagnak River Special Harvest Area (ARSHA) to set gillnets when the Kvichak Section is open.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 70

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Change the allocation plan in the Alagnak River Special Harvest Area (ARSHA) to 84% drift and 16% set.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Naknek River Special Harvest Area Management Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL 71

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Open the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) to set gillnet gear when the Naknek River escapement goal is met.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:**PROPOSAL 72****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC**DESCRIPTION:** Open the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) to set gillnet gear when the Naknek Section is open.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:****PROPOSAL 73****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC**DESCRIPTION:** Limit the amount of gillnet on board a drift vessel to 75 fathoms in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA).**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:*****Nushagak-Mulchatna King Salmon Management Plan (4 proposals)*****PROPOSAL 74****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC**DESCRIPTION:** Revise king salmon reference points.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:****PROPOSAL 75****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC**DESCRIPTION:** Increase king salmon escapement in the Nushagak River by restricting the drift gillnet fleet.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:****PROPOSAL 76****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC**DESCRIPTION:** Restrict commercial fishing to no more than 3 tides in a 48-hour period and fishing time may not exceed 24 hours in length.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:****PROPOSAL 77****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC**DESCRIPTION:** Restrict commercial fishing to no more than 12 hours of commercial fishing in any 24-hour period and no commercial fishing on consecutive high tides if there has been any sport fishing restrictions placed on the Nushagak.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:*****Wood River Special Harvest Area Management Plan (7 proposals)*****PROPOSAL 78****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC**DESCRIPTION:** Revise sockeye salmon escapement reference points.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:****PROPOSAL 79****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Allow separate drift and set gillnet fishing periods in the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA) and require all running lines, anchors and buoys shall be removed from the water during drift periods.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 80

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Allow separate drift and set gillnet fishing periods in the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA).

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 81

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Allow up to 150 fathoms on board a drift gillnet vessel when fishing in the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA).

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 82

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Allow dual drift gillnet vessels to have up to 200 fathoms on board in the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA).

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 83

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: When the Nushagak District is closed and the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA) is open, allow set gillnet permit holders to remain in the Nushagak District with 25 fathoms of gear.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL 84

ACTION: Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Allow dual set gillnet permit holders to have up to 50 fathoms of gear on board and fish two sites with up to 25 fathoms at each site.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Togiak River Salmon Management Plan (3 proposals)

PROPOSAL 85

ACTION: Adopted

DESCRIPTION: Create a Togiak River king salmon management plan similar to Nushagak River plan.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JF invite all user groups to come together with department to develop comprehensive species specific Chinook enhancement/management plan to proactively conserve and preserve this fishery develop triggering management to grow our stocks to establish a necessity to gather data concerning these runs FL

form working group to conserve these fisheries without affecting our sockeye run, motion carried

PROPOSAL 86**ACTION:** Adopted

DESCRIPTION: Create a Togiak River coho salmon management plan similar to Nushagak River plan.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: JF invite all user groups to come together with department to develop comprehensive species specific Chinook enhancement/management plan to proactively conserve and preserve this fishery develop triggering management to grow our stocks to establish a necessity to gather data concerning these runs FL form working group to conserve these fisheries without affecting our sockeye run, motion carried

PROPOSAL 87**ACTION:** Adopt

DESCRIPTION: Change the waiving period to July 24 if escapement goal is projected to exceed 175,000 before July 27.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: alignment proposal to move Emergency order waiving period to align with movement of transfer period to July 27th at last BOF meeting

*Supplemental Proposals***PROPOSAL 238****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Allow one permit holder who owns two drift gillnet permits to use 200 fathoms drift gillnet gear, and operate the gear from a single vessel.

AMENDMENT:**DISCUSSION:****PROPOSAL 239****ACTION:** Same as Nushagak AC

DESCRIPTION: Limit sport and guided sport fishing for king salmon in the Nushagak River drainage, excluding the Wood River drainage, to unbaited, single-hook, artificial lures from May 1 through July 31.

AMENDMENT:**DISCUSSION:**