

**On Time Advisory Committee Comment List
Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting
March 19- 24, 2013**

Central Peninsula Advisory Committee	AC 01
Craig Advisory Committee	AC 02
Homer Advisory Committee	AC 03
Juneau Douglas Advisory Committee (Feb. 6 and Oct. 30 Minutes)	AC 04
Kenai/Soldotna Advisory Committee.....	AC 05
Wrangell Advisory Committee	AC 06
Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee (Nov. 14 and Feb. 27 Minutes)	AC 07
Nushagak Advisory Committee.....	AC 08
Seward Advisory Committee	AC 09
Upper Lynn Canal Advisory Committee	AC 10
Chignik Advisory Committee.....	AC 11
Sitka Advisory Committee (Nov. 29, Dec. 13 Minutes).....	AC 12
Upper Kobuk Advisory Committee	AC 13
Kodiak Advisory Committee	AC 14
Yakutat Advisory Committee	AC 15
Northern Seward Peninsula Advisory Committee	AC 16
Delta Advisory Committee	AC 17
St. Lawrence Island Advisory Committee	AC 18
Kotzebue Sound Advisory Committee & Lower Kobuk Advisory Committee (Joint Meeting)	AC 19
Fairbanks Advisory Committee	AC 20
Lower Kuskokwim Advisory Committee	AC 21
Edna Bay Advisory Committee	AC 22
Noatak and Kivalina Advisory Committee	AC 23
Northern Norton Sound Advisory Committee	AC 24
Anchorage Advisory Committee	AC 25
Copper River/PWS Advisory Committee	AC 26
Unalaska Advisory Committee	AC 27

Chignik Fish and Game Advisory Committee Meeting

Wed, Feb 20, 2013 10:00 am

Offices of Ivanof Bay Tribe

*7926 Old Seward Highway, Suite B-5
Anchorage, Alaska 99518-3263*

Teleconference meeting was brought to order at approximately 10:15AM by Chair Jacob Shangin

1. Call to Order

Chair Jacob Shangin called meeting to order.

2. Roll call

AC members present;

Stephen Shangin, Ivanof Bay

Jacob Shangin, Ivanof Bay

Noah Shangin, Ivanof Bay

AC members attending via teleconference;

Alfredo Aboueid, Chignik Lagoon

Alvin Boskofski, Chignik Lake

AC members absent;

Gary Anderson, Chignik Lagoon

Don Bumpus, Chignik Lagoon

Don Lind, Chignik Lake

Harry Kalmakoff, JR., Chignik Lake



ADF&G

Susie Jenkins-Brito, Boards support section, Southwest Regional Coordinator

Todd Anderson, ADF&G

Aaron Potter, ADF&G

Guests;

George Anderson, Chignik Lagoon

A quorum of 5 Chignik Advisory Committee members was established.

3. Approval of Agenda

Alvin/M, Stephen /S

Motion to approve agenda

Question called by Alvin

Passed 5-0

4. Approval of Minutes

Alvin/M to table minutes until next meeting, Noah/S

Question called by Alvin:

Passed 5-0

5. Introductions

Susie Brito-Jenkins, Boards support section, Southwest Regional Coordinator

Todd Anderson, ADF&G Area L Biologist

Aaron Potter, AFG&G Area M biologist

Jeff Wadle, ADF&G Westward Commercial Fisheries Division

6. Staff Reports:

None

7. New Business



Proposal 244:

Alvin/m, Noah/S Move to adopt.

Todd Anderson reads proposal

Discussion: Alfredo explains intent of proposal. He recites history of how proposal was generated in Chignik with the intent of holding off an opening due to weather triggered by a “Gale force warning”. Somehow through the process, proposal was passed with a “Small Craft Advisory” as a trigger for postponing an opening. Cited by AC members, a “Small Craft Advisory” during the winter months is rare. In the Past, the Fleet sat for 10 days waiting for *less than* a Small Craft advisory to start fishing. This is a housekeeping issue that should be cleared up.

Language needs to be changed from “Small Craft Advisory” to “Gale Force Warning” in regulation.

Question called by Stephen

Motion passed 5-0

8. Old Business:

None

9. Date and Location of next meeting;

Chignik Advisory Committee meeting to be held in Chignik Lagoon on April 3, 2013 or April 5th, 2013.

Stephen /M, Noah/S – adjourn 11AM



SFGAC Minutes
November 29, 2012

Committee

Tad Fujioka-trapping-chair
Floyd Tomkins-conservation- vice chair
Jerry Barber-hand troll
Kim Elliot-subsistence
Randy Gluth-hunting
John Baird-processor
John Murray-power troll
Karen Johnson- at large
Mo Johnson-seine
Tory O'Connell -alternate-secretary
Aaron Bean-guide
Eric Jordan-alternate

Agencies

Phil Mooney ADFG
Carole Goularte USFS
Jeff Feldpauch, STA
Jessica Grill, STA

Public

Rep. Jonathon Kreiss-Tomkins
Kameron Perensovich

Begin 18:35, quorum

.

Statewide FinFish Proposals to follow:

Proposal 227 – Department proposal establishing sport proxy fishing to be limited by EO.

JB – this one is a good idea because they should be able to restrict proxy limits.

EJ – they can just reduce the limit for all users.

FT – this way they can shut off the proxy fishing before limiting other fisheries.

EJ – I proxy fish for other elders – I can see where it can be a confusion issue.

KE – I know too many elders that need these fish.

TF – I have heard that in some situations the proxy process may be being abused. Juneau area king crab has a one crab limit. Proxy fishing permits a harvest big enough to be worthwhile. The catch may not be given to beneficiary as it is supposed to be. Hopefully these are isolated specific cases and this sort of tool will only be used where there is a specific issue.

RG – you can pile proxies on top of others – no restrictions?

EJ – I don't know if you can get multiple proxies



AB – I use a proxy for my folks – I can only fish one proxy for any sport fish.

KE – Motion to Table

JB 2nd

12-0-0

Motion passes

Proposal 228 – Limit high grading – any fish that isn't immediately released becomes part of the bag limit.

JM – MTA

AB 2nd

TO – I will support this. It seems absurd that this isn't already understood to be the case.

EJ -?

12 – 0- 0

Motion passes

Proposal 229 – Transfer of harvest record for annual bag limits

EJ – MTA

TF – 2nd

EJ – I hear that this is happening now with out of state residents that leave town and then come back and fish another limit.

RG – there are a lot of operations that cater to just this type of monkey business.

There is a lot of abuse.

JB ?

12-0-0

Motion passes.

No action 230

Proposal 231- Define compensation in regard to guided sport

KE – MTA

JB 2nd

FT – this proposal defines compensation as wages, dues, fees, employment benefits, does not include reimbursement for fuel, food and bait. Loop hole filler.

RG – this is too hard to regulate.

JB – the dept likely talked to their attorneys.

TO – I would support this because we have to start somewhere.

AB – I can see wanting to allow the pay back for gas, but I see that as a loophole open for abuse.

TO – I disagree with you.

EJ – I agree with you and Randy and I do this – I take out friends that are sport fishing on my boat. I refuse to let them pay me for anything but there is in kind compensation.

I think the exception for food, fuel, bait is a tough one.

JB – in the spirit of the law we are all trying to do the same thing – I would support this in moving in the right direction

EB – the Dept of Law comments on all of this – I think John is right.



RG – this seems like a Hail Mary attempt by the Dept to get a handle on nonresident sport fishing but it could turn around and bite us. Enforcement does not look at things other than black and white. I realize this is a huge problem but I don't want to give Enforcement carte blanche to use regs against anybody.

JB – I don't disagree but I do think it's a step in the right direction. Definitions are good.

TF – I concur with JB

JM ?

9-2-1

Motion passes

Proposal 232 – use of sport caught fish parts for bait.

TF MTA

KE 2nd

TF – this is of interest to me because there is a commercial fishery prohibition on using blackcod, lingcod and certain rockfish for bait in SE, and that regulation has identical language on the exempted parts of the fish. I agree with this proposal and I would like to offer a motion to request that the BOF also change the analogous SE commercial regulation in the same manner as this proposal seeks to change this sport fishing regulation.

KE – Use of sport caught fish as bait? For anything? For any kind of fishing.

JB?

10-0-2

Motion passes

TF – Move that the Sitka AC request that the BOF incorporate the language of proposal 232 into commercial fishing regulation 5 AAC 28.190 (1) prohibiting the use of sablefish, lingcod, and certain rockfish as bait.

EJ – 2nd

EJ – why do you feel like you need to specify the species.

TF – This is an existing regulation. The prohibited species are already listed in that regulation

KE?

12-0-0

Motion passes

243 – Modify the Forage Fish Management Plan to add Pacific herring

TO – I don't think we should take this up without advertising it specifically.

KE MTA

AB – 2nd

EJ – I move to table

JB 2nd

AB – I would like to mention that this is a Board generated proposal. They are adding it to the agenda.

EJ – we need to let the Department know.

JM – can we invite the staff to the next meeting

TO – the public needs to be noticed specifically about herring proposals.



8-4-0

Motion passes

Next meeting – December 13, 2012 – Election meeting. Proposal 243 will be on the agenda.

TF – will step down as chair but keep trapping seat

TO – stepping down.



Sitka Fish & Game Advisory Committee

Tad Fujioka, Chairman
214 Shotgun Alley, Sitka, AK 99835

Minutes of Meeting December 13, 2012

Committee

Aaron Bean-guide rep, Tad Fujioka- trapping rep/chair, Dick Curran-longline rep, Tory O'Connell-alternate/ secretary, John Murray- power troll rep, Eric Jordan-alternate, Mo Johnson-seine rep, Karen Johnson-at large
Floyd Tomkins-conservation rep, Kim Elliot subsistence rep, Brad Shafer at-large, Jerry Barber-hand troll rep, Randy Gluth-hunting rep, John Baird (JBa)-processor rep

ADFG

Dave Gordon (Comm Fish), Patrick Fowler (Sport Fish)

Public

Michael Baines, Harvey Kitka, Al Wilson, Lillian Feldpausch, Christopher Brewton, Jeff Feldpausch

227: Sport Fishing Proxy fishing permits- allow dept EO authority to restrict proxy fishing separately from non-proxy fishing

JB MTA 227 2nd FT

Patrick: 118 proxies in SE, 3000+ statewide- proposal mostly driven by Kenai River fisheries where there is a lot of proxy fishing effort.

KE - I think proxy fishing is for elders and those that need it the most . I don't feel comfortable with this

JM – Can you ever see using this authority in SE?

PF-No, not given how few proxies are sportfishing in SE

KE – can you proxy fish for subsistence?

PF – You can, but this is just a sport fish regulation, not a subsistence regulation.

EJ – you could have a situation where you still had guided sport fisheries and nonresident sport fishery going on but you limited resident proxy fishing. If that is the case I don't support this.

TO – I would think you would want to close the non-resident fishery before you close the resident proxy fishery.

JM – is there a priority in closing? What do you look at for priority?

JB – I don't think this has much impact either way

EJ - ?

Motion fails 3-9-2

243 – Add Herring to the Forage Fish Management Plan

EJ MTA 243 KE 2nd

JM – I don't know much about forage fish and I am going to have a hard time voting about this until I at least see the staff comments and hear more information – I don't want to rush this, so I would like to give myself more time. This is new to me and it has some significant impacts for the future – not sure of management planning process.

KE – In order to alleviate JM questions and for the rest of the group we want to hear from ADFG before we go too much further. I would like to say that adding herring to the forage fish management plan and this does nothing to the fishery because they are allowed under regulation. I support this proposal, we need to recognize that they are the bottom of the food chain.

EJ – I have a question to DG – will designating herring as a forage fish make any difference to management?

DG – It would not change management right now because there are commercial fisheries exceptions allowing the existing fisheries to continue.



Sitka Fish & Game Advisory Committee

Tad Fujioka, Chairman

214 Shotgun Alley, Sitka, AK 99835

TF – the Dept comments clouded my understanding of this – is the exception relating to 5AAC3-39 static or future? Ie are only fisheries that are currently permitted covered by this exception, or is any new fishery allowed provided that it is placed in the proper section of the reg book?

DG – the Board can make changes to any of those regulations. The intent was to stop the development of new fisheries on forage fish in the federal arena. The state regulation mirrors the federal regulation on species (60 species).

TF – do any other species have significant value?

JBa – not to us in SE, but out west they have tried to use some.

EJ – all fish are forage fish at some stage of their lives for some species and this proposal won't change management

RG – would passing this proposal have any effect on encouraging the feds to change any management?

DG – no

EJ – I move that we add all species of salmon to this regulation

<dies for lack of second>

JM - AB isn't this is your proposal? What does this language mean?

AB – the BOF changed my proposal to be statewide and add in the exemption of existing commercial forage fish fisheries. So while I support this proposal, it has been changed significantly from what I submitted.

TO – Clearly this proposal will be used to change herring management. I can support herring as a forage fish but I don't support this as a signal to change management of the Sitka herring fishery and I think that we would be naïve not to put that out on the table. It is presented as a Board generated proposal, but it was originally submitted by AB and included a provision to remove the exemptions. So, although herring may be classified as a forage fish, the designation of herring as such by this AC does not mean that we support changes in management to the Sitka Sound Sac Roe Fishery.

(several members): Well said.

JB?

Proposal passes 11-1-2

EJ – I didn't support this because the committee wouldn't add salmon.

DC- I didn't support because I think it would prohibit new roe on kelp fisheries

JM – I think I want more time to revisit some of these state wide proposals. I am concerned about the intent of the Kenai River Fishing Association and others and I don't think we should rush, our comments aren't due until March.

TO – I would like to discuss Proposal 247 which revisits the Board decision on allocation issues on the Tsiu River – They should not be able to do this type of thing – this is not an emergency and it shouldn't have been brought back up. They spent significant time on it at the BOF meeting. This is similar to what happened with blackcod, where a faction of the Board is angry about a decision and they bring it back to the table. I think the proposals coming out of the October meeting should be true emergencies or new issues that have a timeliness issue.

EJ – Move that we notify the Board that we do not think there is an issue on the Tsiu that warrants this being taken out of cycle.

JBa 2nd

KE ?

11-1-2

Motion passes.



Upper Kobuk Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
2.21.13 6 pm-9:45 pm

Roll Call Quorum:

Marvin Joe Cleveland
Henry Horner Sr.
Elmer Ward
Billy Custer
Frank Downey

Not Present:

Melvin Lee-
Glenn Douglas
Warren Douglas

Introduction:

Carmen Daggett-Boards Support
James Saveride-Sport Fish Biologist

Per diem discussion:

AC members: discuss cost of traveling to meetings and what it costs to travel up river, gas is \$10 a gallon, we can't buy food for travel, and would like to have per diem issued even if travel status is less than 12 hours.

Carmen: I brought food for you guys, so make sure you guys get some.

Carmen: Explains how amount of mileage is determined and how it is used to reimburse meeting attendees.

Carmen: Explains 12 hour rule with per diem and reimbursement for mileage.

Joe Cleveland: We need more money to travel.

Carmen: Explains that you could fly and then you wouldn't have to worry about paying for gas if you can't afford it.

Joe Cleveland: Inquires about how per diem works.

Carmen Daggett: Explains per diem distribution and how it is distributed if you are out beyond 12 hours. Gives example of how per diem works.

Elections:

Henry Horner: Inquires if the individual has to be present

Carmen Daggett: Individual should be present

Motion to table Kobuk elections to the next IRA meeting.



Seconded

Motion carries

Elections: Tabled to take place at the Kobuk Annual meeting for 2 Kobuk seats and one alternate.

Minutes Approval:

Motion to approve meeting minutes

Minutes approved

Agenda Approval:

Motion to approve agenda

Seconded:

Agenda

Proposal 215

Motion to support:

Joe Cleveland: Me I would support this proposal

Motion to support proposal 215

Seconded:

Motion carries

Proposal 217

Discussion:

It is hard for us to make a decision for us to support or not support, because we are not from the area.

Carmen Daggett: if you feel uncomfortable with making this decision, you can abstain from voting.

Joe Cleveland: inquires about local escapement goals. There are not escapement goals in Kotzebue there are in Nome.

Carmen Daggett: Explains possible local significance.

Joe Cleveland: The lower end is at the mouth?

Carmen Daggett: Explains the lower end referred to is the lower end of the escapement goal range.

Motion to support proposal 217

Seconded:

All support

Motion carries

Proposal 218

Joe Cleveland: Inquires about what the proposal is about.

Carmen Daggett: Gives an example of escapement goals and how the SET applies to it. Inquires with James Saveride about SETs

James Saveride: Eventually when we do escapement goals sometimes gives us a mark for having poor data on a specific location. We are guaranteeing that there is going to be this much fish out there no matter what.

Joe Cleveland Motion to support proposal 218

Seconded:

All Support

Motion Carries



Proposal 225

Henry Horner: Motion to support

Seconded:

Discussion:

Inquiries for how permit stacking works

Carmen Daggett: Explains how permit stacking works

All support

Motion Carries

Proposal 227

Carmen Daggett: Explains proxy fishing.

Joe Cleveland: motion to support 227

All Support

Motion Carries

Proposal 228

Joe Cleveland: Motion to support proposal 228

All support

None Opposed

Motion carries

Proposal 229

AC Member: inquires about who the proposal applies to

Carmen Daggett: Explains residency and gives examples of one day fishing licenses

Motion to support

All support

Motion Carries

Proposal 230

Joe Cleveland: Motion to support proposal 230

Second

All Support

Motion Carries

Proposal 232

Joe Cleveland: Motion to support proposal 232

Second

All Support

Motion Carries



Proposal 233

Carmen Daggett: Explains why felt bottom soles were banned.

Joe Cleveland: Motion to support proposal 233

Seconded:

All support

Motion carries

Proposal 234

Motion to support proposal 234

Seconded

All support

Motion carries

Proposal 235

Joe Cleveland: Motion to support 235

Seconded

All support

Motion carries

North Pacific Fisheries Management Council Letter

Joe Cleveland: Inquires if we are the only one's commenting on this.

Carmen Daggett: It is not just you guys' comments, they requested it distributed across the state.

Joe Cleveland: Motion to support the letter

Seconded:

All support the letter

Motion carries

International Circumpolar Council Food Security

Informative flyer

Ray Hander Presentation on Sheefish

Information

James Saveride-Sheefish presentation

Apologized for not being there in person

I have been working in the Kobuk area since 2008

It kind of culminated with Ray Hander's work in the Selawik

The fish that live in the Kobuk and the Selawik

Fish and Game are estimating spawners in the Kobuk

We don't have a lot of information about the juvenile sheefish

I am going to cover the information from my presentation

Gives outline of the talk with background of sheefish in Alaska: Radio telemetry data & data summary

There global range goes from the Mackenzie River to the White Sea of Western Russia. In Alaska their range is pretty much in the Yukon, Kuskokwim, in the Selawik and the Kobuk. The fish in the Selawik and the Kobuk are the oldest and largest and size. The Selawik fish average to be 8-9 years old.

Explains otolith aging with annual rings like a tree. They are a long lived species as old as 43 years old 30-40 fish have been observed in the Kobuk and the Selawik. There are 25,000-35,000 fish and there are few more going up the Selawik River and they mix in Kobuk and Selawik lake. They don't go up the river



until they are 6 or seven years old. Spawners don't have to spawn every year. That complicates figuring out the actual population. For those reasons in general is the reason why we decided to come to Kobuk to do a telemetry study. We are trying to get more of the knowledge. We are trying to get an idea of spawning frequency. There is not much energy investment for males there is for females. We suspect we would see an every other spawning strategy. If we had 100 Kobuk and 100 Selawik spawners we suspect we would see half of each group spawning and coming in. We went upstream in the Kobuk River to use the radio telemetry techniques to try to figure out spawning frequency.

We thought we could come in late fall and we could use sonar and get a total population estimate. All of these pictures each one of the fish was radio tagged we tagged 150 sheefish in 2008 and another 150 in 2009. For the people who live in Kobuk you have probably seen me. I was in the village a few years with a station and another station up river and we used to track the fish. We did get help from the Cleveland's and the Ward's. We surgically plant radio tags in sheefish because they are multi-year spawners. We use clove oil to sedate them and make sure they recover.

In 2008 and 2009 students from the school were used to keep track of the tower in Kobuk and they took charge and learned to build a run time curve. The office of subsistence management tries to include outreach to the communities.

Showed a slide with the distribution of sheefish up river to spawn, the red dots are from 2008 and the yellow dots are from 2009. The spawning area spans from Beaver Creek to Kalla. The local knowledge has been telling us that for as long as we know and the data supports that. As you go down river there is more turbulence and it is more tannic. The Paw River fork has lots of sheefish it is a bit more tannic but the substrate is perfect.

Explains the migration timing of the radio tagged sheefish. We started to see them at the end of July maxing out at 30th of August to the end of September. You can see from 2008 and 2009 50% of the sheefish left by the 29th of September. The traditional knowledge says that the sheefish come in slow and leave really fast and the data that I collected supports that traditional knowledge. The females are larger than the males; this is the data that supports that. The pattern is repeated in the Selawik, Yukon and the same pattern is in the Kobuk. The Kobuk River spawners are definitely a large sized population. We know a lot about adults and not much about juveniles. I paid the fisherman to keep track of the size of the fish that they were catching through the ice on Kobuk Lake and they caught a wider range of age classes during the winter.

In 2008 that returned in 2009 most of them were males and some were females. Now that we have skipped a year more of the females have come back. The resources available to sheefish available in the Kobuk River area nothing is limiting their spawning. This year we are going to keep flying and tracking fish. We will estimate what proportion of the fish are spawning to get the total population size. I want to reiterate that the support from the Ward's and the Cleveland's is much appreciated.

Next meeting Date & Time

Joe Cleveland: It seems like there aren't a lot of regulations discussions about this region. The regulations must be pretty good.

Carmen Daggett: That is not necessarily true. It is possible that people haven't been using the process to make changes. It would be good to share things with IRA and city council meetings to get a wider amount of changes.



Carmen Daggett: Kobuk and Shungnak need to have elections and I have had a hard time making head way with it.

Henry Horner: There has been a lot of turn over lately.

Joe Cleveland: Is there a possibility of have alternates in addition to the representatives assigned.

Carmen Daggett: Explains use and elections/alternates for appointments. They are good to have a go to person for when people aren't able to make meetings. It also helps with making quorum.

Henry Horner: Inquires with the number of seats for Kobuk.

Carmen Daggett: There are two seats from Kobuk.

Joe Cleveland: There are three from Ambler, three from Shungnak or Kobuk?

Carmen Daggett: Explains the undesignated seats.

Joe Cleveland: Motion to Adjourn

AC would like to meet with the Lower Kobuk AC.

Discussion about Louie Commack as the alternate for Ambler.

Motion adjourned 9:45 pm



Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee February 13th 2013--- KNWRVC

(Julie Kavanaugh –acting Chair)

*Auth: Frances/Mina
BOF Statewide
KAC Comments*

(Minutes represent a paraphrased summary of the KAC, department staff and public comments and are not a verbatim transcript of the meeting. Tapes of the meeting are available for public review by contacting the committee secretary)

Call to order: 7:00pm February 13th 2013 at the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge Visitors Center.

Roll call: Pat Holmes(for Andre Finke), Harvey Goodell(for Pete Hannah), Davey Jones(for Rolan Ruoss), Mitch Simeonoff(for Rick Berns), Oliver Holm, Don Fox, Julie Kavanaugh, Ron Kavanaugh, Jason Bunch, Kip Thomet(for a portion of the meeting) and Herman Squartsoff. A quorum was achieved with 11 members present.

Excused: Tuck Bonney, Lou Dochtermann, Curt Waters, Andre Finke, Pete Hannah, Rolan Ruoss, Rick Berns and Ronnie Lind.

Agency Staff; ADF&G- Geoff Spalanger, James Jackson, Jeff Wadle, Nick Salgalkin, Don Tracy and Tyler Pollum. USFWS-Matt Kees. Public Safety- Trooper Paul Fussey.

BOF: Board of Fish member Sue Jeffrey was there for the entire meeting.

Agenda: Approved unanimously.

Minutes of our February 5th 2013 meeting: Approved unanimously.

Correspondence: e-mail letter from KAC member Ruoss on the Department of Natural Resources rewrite of the Bristol Bay area Plan.

Chair Announcements: Julie Mathwayew gave a web address link to a survey for the FSMI.

Old Business: Pat Holmes had an update on Kodiak Area king and tanner crab subsistence pot regulations. He stated that the regulations passed by the BOF makes it difficult for subsistence users to fish for crab in their traditional ways. The RAC and KAC would be working with department staff on crafting new regulations to be submitted in the next board cycle.

New Business:

- 1) KAC member Holm said that he was filling the herring/salmon seat on the city/borough fisheries advisory committee and the KAC seat was vacant. Julie Kavanaugh was selected to fill the seat.
- 2) KAC will meet September 30th 2013 at 6pm at the new F&G building to discuss and take action on statewide cod proposals.
- 3) **Department Staff:** Wrap up of the 2012 herring season by Geoff Spalinger. James Jackson gave a presentation on the 2012 salmon season and projections for 2013.
- 4) **Statewide fin fish proposals:**
- 5) **Statewide sport fish proposals:**
- 6) Don Fox selected to attend the BOF meeting in Anchorage.

ADJOURN -11:00pm.

RECEIVED

MAR 04 2013



Finfish proposals

Proposal #216

Action: 0-11 Oppose

Description: Require statewide adherence to salmon fishery management plans.

Committee comments: The KAC feels that adoption of this proposal could possibly circumvent the board and public process. Could open fishery management to public pressure. If we liberalize the commissioners powers the commissioner could possibly circumvent management plans in one area when escapement goals are not being met in another area that is under a different management plan.

Example: Kodiak experienced this scenario under an unnamed commissioner in the late 80's early 90's when the salmon fishing in the Shelikof Strait was shut down under intense pressure from Upper Cook Inlet fisherman to protect Cook Inlet bound sockeye stocks. The action was rescinded a week later but the damage to the Kodiak fishery had already been done. Through the **board process** a North Shelikof Strait Management Plan was adopted that set caps on sockeyes but still allowing for harvest of local stocks.. The management plan has been tweaked several times since **BUT ALL DONE THROUGH THE PUBLIC PROCESS.**

Proposal #218

Action: 0-11 Oppose

Description: Establish a sustained escapement threshold (SET) for stocks listed as yield or management concern.

Staff comments: Oppose.

Committee comments: Support staff comments.

Proposal #ACR243

Action: 0-11 Oppose

Description: Would add Pacific herring to the Forage Fish Management Plan.

Committee comments: Even though this is a BOF generated proposal committee members feel its being pushed by Sitka. There is an **exemption** for herring fisheries that could be removed or easily tinkered with. KAC members agree with Mr. Holm it should not be a statewide issue the proposal doesn't apply to many of the states herring fisheries. As written seems unnecessary and confusing. Herring fisheries should be evaluated on a region by region basis. There are many successful fully managed herring fisheries around the state.



Sport Fish Proposals

Proposal #215

Action: 0-11 Oppose

Description: Address allocations by percentages.

Committee comments: It shouldn't be a statewide issue.

Proposal #217

Action: 0-11 Oppose

Description: Mandate statewide priority for management of King Salmon.

Staff comments: Neutral on allocative aspects but **opposed** to conservation aspect. Would compromise the departments ability to maximize productivity of other species. Goals we have are best for Kodiak King Salmon stocks.

Committee comments: Agree with and support staff comments. Adoption for Kodiak could have dire consequences for other species an example would be over escapement of early sockeye bound for the Karluk River which has happened before several times. Fisherman could lose harvest opportunities for millions of returning pink salmon to achieve an optimum King Salmon escapement goal. The whole West Side Salmon Fishery could be sacrificed to achieve a minimum(minor) rise in King Salmon escapement.

Proposal #219

Action: 0-10 Oppose

Description: Define terms, including "maximum sustained yield", "optimum sustained yield", "sustained yield."

Committee comments: One committee characterized this as a stupid(dumb) proposal.

Proposal #226

Action: 10-0 Support

Description: Update regulations to accurately reflect changes to the Statewide Sport Shark Fishery Management Plan which allowed for an increase bag and possession limit of spiny dogfish shark and no annual limit requirement.

Staff comments: Housekeeping proposal which would standardize sport shark fishing regulations statewide.

Committee comments: Agree with and support staff comments.



Proposal #227

Action: 5-5 Fails on tie vote

Description: Would provide the department with EO authority to restrict sport proxy fishing.

Committee comments;

Proponents: Agreed with KAC member Mr. Holm that when runs come in weaker than expected adoption would let the department limit proxy fishing which is better than eliminating the whole fishery so that escapement goals may be achieved.

Opponents: Since you have to be 65yrs old or 70% disabled to have someone proxy fish for you it discriminates against some elderly people who have no other way to obtain fish.

Proposal #228

Action 10-0 Support

Description: Prohibit the practice of high grading by anglers.

Staff comments: Would reduce mortality on fish held for extended periods of time.

Committee comments: Agree with department staff that potential for mortality is too high if fish are held too long.

Proposal # 229

Action: 10-0 Support

Description: Specify harvest reporting requirements for additional sport fishing licenses and harvest records.

Staff comments: Department proposal aimed at loophole in regulations that allows for exceeding annual limits(for certain species). Would discourage practice of anglers getting a duplicate license to circumvent annual limits by requiring them to put all catch information on duplicate license.

Committee comments: Agree with and support staff comments.

Proposal #231

Action: 10-0 Support

Description: Define the term compensation.

Staff comments: Would establish definition of compensation other than food, fuel or bait.

Committee comments: Agree with staff comments and committee members felt it would make it easier for public safety to go after persons who are illegally guiding.

Proposal #232

Action: 10-0 Support

Description: Clarify use of sport caught fish as bait.



(Proposal #232-continued)

Staff comments: Housekeeping proposal which clarifies which parts of sport caught salmon you may use as bait. You can't use any sport caught fish with bag limits whole as bait.

Committee comments: Agree with and support staff comments.

Proposal #233

Action: 5-4-1 Support

Description: Create an exemption for the use of foot gear with felt soles for the disabled or handicapped fisherman.

Committee comments:

Proponents: Committee members felt that felt soles don't spread disease anymore than other shoes fishermen wear. They could be put into disinfectant before going to a different drainage.

Opponents: Agreed with KAC member Mr. Fox that allowing an exemption defeats the whole purpose of the regulation. It only takes one wader to introduce a invasive species that's coming from out of state or country.

Proposal #234

Action: 0-10 Oppose

Description: Ban use of lead weights in fresh and salt waters of Alaska in sport fisheries.

Committee comments: Not appropriate for statewide ban. May be better applied in certain heavily used waterways. If enacted should only be used for smaller sizes.

Proposal #235

Action: 0-10 Oppose

Description: Establish mandatory reporting system for sport fisheries statewide.

Staff comments: Already have a statewide reporting system for guided anglers. Unguided use a statewide survey. The department has creel and census data on specific drainages as funding allows.

Committee comments: Agree with staff comments and KAC members also felt it would put an unnecessary burden on the department and especially the angler on the water trying to fill out a report while fishing in inclement weather.



Don

I recently learned that during 2013 Ak. Dept. of Natural resources will be rewriting the Bristol Bay Area Plan that it revised and adopted in 2005 at the request of Gov. Murkowski. DNR is not undertaking this rewrite voluntarily, but as a result of a court challenge by Bristol Bay villages, commercial fishermen, and sport fishing groups.

Before the 2005 revision the Bristol Bay Area Plan classified the majority of State lands in the region as fish and wildlife habitat, a classification consistent with current and historical use. Under an Area Plan, multiple uses can coexist on State lands, if the uses are compatible. The previous BBAP recognized compatible historical uses by co-classifying lands for a variety of habitat, harvesting and recreation uses.

By its 2005 revision DNR reduced lands classified as fish and wildlife habitat by 94%, a monumental change. I haven't had time to research DNR's justification for this reduction, or if an explanation was offered. Notably, the 2005 revision made mineral exploration the only designated use on 80% of State lands in the region, a glaring bias in favor of allowing the development of the Pebble Project.

I propose that the Kodiak Advisory Committee coordinate with Bristol Bay Advisory Committee and the RAC to urge the Boards of Fish and Game to participate in this 2013 revision process to ensure that State agencies accurately classify land uses in the region.

DNR will be accepting public comment until early April and I encourage everyone to send letters. I will be back around March 15th and would be willing to write a letter for the KAC's endorsement.

Rolan Ruoss

*Requested this be included in Kodiak
Correspondence to the BOF Statewide
Comments for March 19-24 meeting.*

RECEIVED
MAR 04 2013
BOARDS
ANCHORAGE



**Yakutat Advisory Committee Meeting
March 3, 2013**

Call to order @ 7:00 pm. Audience - Gordon Woods (commercial fish manager) Brian Marston (sportfish manager)

- 1) Roll call. Present were B. Fraker, D. Stone, R. Kerkovich, Nate Endicott, L. Bemis, S. Chadwick, Jerimiah Pavlik, Martha Inderland, C. Mapes, Jonathan Pavlik. Absent were- Jesse Pavlik, L. Clark, S. Nelson, H. Holcomb, J. Fraker
- 2) Adoption of the agenda B. Fraker makes motion, R. Kerkovich 2nd. S. Chadwick question, 10 ayes, 0 neys.
- 3) B. Fraker moves to approve the minutes of 12/12/12, D. Stone 2nd, J Pavlik question. 10 ayes, 0 neys.
D. Stone moves to approve minutes of meeting 3/19/03 , S. Chadwick 2nd, J. Pavlik question. 10 ayes, 0 neys.
D. Stone moves to approve minutes of meeting 3/27/03, R. Kerkovich 2nd, S. Chadwick question. 10 ayes, 0 neys.
- 4) C Mapes asks that the committee approve of all proposals, comments, and postings pertaining to the minutes approved. B. Fraker makes motion, D. Stone 2nd, S. Chadwick question, 10 ayes , 0 neys.
- 5) C. Mapes states that elections for 4, one year terms will be posted prior to next meeting, and elections will be held then.
- 6) C. Mapes fills the committee in on the findings of proposal 284 and how it pertains to Yakutat. He recommends that the AC take no action.
- 7) S. Chadwick moves to adjourn, B. Fraker 2nd, R. Kerkovich question, 10 ayes, 0 neys.

Meeting adjourned @ 720 PM.



To; Chairman Karl Johnstone and members of the Alaska Board of Fisheries,

The Yakutat area Fish and Game Advisory Committee has met and drafted the following positions on Board generated proposal 247 of the Statewide fisheries meeting agenda.

The Alaska Board of Fisheries proposal 247 was ratified and written under unfair pretenses, and we must call this into question. The parameters for the ACR workshop held October 9th, clearly state that only written testimony on properly submitted proposals would be accepted by the Alaska Board of Fisheries. However, during the course of the meeting the BOF allowed videos to be submitted that may have affected some, or all, of the BOF's decisions on the concerns brought before you. These videos, narrated by the camera operator, depict commercial setnetting activities, and vessel operation on the Tsiu river. Our concern is, BOF accepted these videos as evidence, with only one person's perspective on what they represent, how is this fair? In addition, *it appears there were no laws broken* in any of the videos, yet BOF has decided to place the entire blame of the proximity issues between the users, as depicted, solely on the commercial setnet fisheries, by calling it a "disorderly fishery". BOF has received official letters from other lodge owners who operate at the Tsiu that state that their clients have no problems operating in proximity to active commercial fishers. There exists a documented history of commercial fishing activity dating back to the 1930's, that has changed very little in all that time. Yes, motors and skiffs are different, but the style of the fishery is virtually the same. Sport lodges began operating at the Tsiu in the very early 1980's. So for 25 years, through some of the years when the Tsiu was the very shortest in length it has ever been, and had the highest number of active commercial fishers, there was not one documented case of confrontation between the user groups. What has changed since the advent of confrontation is, the average number of active commercial setnet operators has diminished considerably, while the numbers of clientele at one lodge in particular has increased considerably. There is nothing disorderly about the way commercial setnetting is conducted on the Tsiu, the health of the returning stocks, and historically low number of citations prove this out. So, we find that it is premature, and unfair to place the blame for the conflict solely on one user group, without even considering the commercial setnetters position. If a person is actively herding fish in a hole, and another person desires to go stand in the middle of it, who is at fault? There exists no clear law for BOF to have made the determination that this is predominately a commercial fishing problem.

As a committee, and as a community, we feel it is a grievous error for the Alaska Board of Fisheries to generate it's own proposals in all matters but the extreme emergency. We feel that proposal 247 demonstrates a clear reason why. Exactly how are the commercial setnetters of Yakutat supposed to feel like they have been given a fair hearing, when those who would sit in judgement over them, are also those who wrote the proposal to curtail their fisheries?

We can see no sound reasoning in over looking the decades long tried and proven practices of how things are done at the Tsiu river based on the evidence presented. One lodge operator has a couple of hundred of his clients write to BOF, and tell BOF that commercial fishermen ruined their preconceived expectation of what the experience was sold to them as, in an effort to



garner more real estate, or put his competition out of business is how it looks to us. At our meeting it was explained to us, how the videos BOF watched at the October workshop, that we as a community were never allowed to comment on, are misleading and out of context.

So our official comment as a community advisory committee, comes in two separate parts. First, we feel that there is no realistic need for changes of any kind to occur at the Tsiu. Everyone doing business or commercial fishing there is doing quite well. All the threats of clientele, " who won't be coming back", is not validated when a person looks at the statistics of numbers of sportfishermen on the Tsiu. The runs of coho salmon are strong and healthy, and no one, not one person has received a citation for an interaction or altercation of any kind. Our feeling is, it's working, it has worked, for many decades, leave it alone.

Should the BOF decide to ignore our findings and overall feeling on how proposal 247 should be dealt with, and proceed, then we feel that you should do so in this manner. As written, proposal 247 proposes to move the existing ADFG regulatory markers down river half the distance to the river terminus in order to create a sportfishing only section of the river. The Yakutat Fish and Game Advisory Committee is opposed to proposal 247 based on these concerns. 1) There is no mention of making the lower half of the river exclusive to commercial only, so there will still exist the possibility of potential conflict between the user groups in the same manner as always, in the lower half of the river. So, while attempting to alleviate the problem, this proposal would accomplish virtually nothing worthwhile. What would happen is, BOF would effectively cut the allowable distance for commercial setnet sites in half. This may not seem like such a huge issue given the river's current length, and the current number of commercial fishermen operating on the Tsiu, but things do change. If the river were to shorten in length, which it does often, regulation would not change. Half the distance would always be allocated to sport only, whether the river is long, or short. 2) If economics and or the value of salmon changes, we could see a dramatic return to the historic numbers of commercial fishermen returning to the Tsiu, and now there would not be room enough for all of them in the proposed new area, creating an entirely new set of conflicts. 3) We also feel that taking sides, and taking from one user group and labeling them as being solely responsible for the conflicts when there is no clear reasons for doing so, will likely create an increase in the very conflicts BOF hopes to quell. 4) Lastly, it is our feeling that placement of regulatory markers on the Tsiu, or any river should be left solely up to the Department, based on sound biological necessity. Markers should never be used as political footballs, and doing so runs the risk of seriously affecting the fragile dynamics of the ecosystem, and or adversely affecting all the users involved. As an example, cutting the allowable distance of commercial fishing area in half, will likely allow for more escapement of salmon above the markers, forcing the Department to open the river to commercial fishing more often by emergency order. This will increase the chances of conflicts, and adversely affect the dynamics of both fisheries, and the schedule for getting the commercial product to market. Our position on the Tsiu conflicts as described, has not deviated. We feel that the majority of the lodge owners, the entire commercial setnet fishery, and potentially the overall health of the river it's self should not be changed in order to accommodate the sensibilities of a few.

Should BOF still feel the need to proceed with a motion in an attempt to alleviate user conflicts, BOF must first consider the number of user days allowed for each user group. Consider the fact that there was exactly 6- 24 hr. commercial openings on the Tsiu river this



year, which is relatively normal, given weather conditions. All of the lodges up there are in operation for at least a month, most upwards of 2 months. Generally, five days out of the week, the Tsiu is exclusively a sportfishing only river. Is there any fair reason that commercial should have to accept changes on the two days per week that are left? There are plenty of fishing holes above the markers, maybe not the best, but there is fish there. If any changes are made, it should be that sport fishing should not allowed below the markers on days that commercial fishing is in affect, leave the placement of the markers solely up to the Department, based on conservation need only, change the openings from 9 am. to 9am. , to 6 am. to 6 am., that way only one day of daylight would be required to be affected for a commercial fishery to take place, not two. We feel that 24 hr. closures between commercial openings should be mandatory. This allows for fish to disperse evenly throughout the river making it fair for up river fishermen to have a viable opportunity. In addition, 24 hr. closures allow the processor the chance to keep up with moving the fish so they don't get back logged, and it keeps the product as fresh as possible. If this concept were accepted, sportfishing would not be allowed below the markers two days per week, with the remote possibility of a third day. Even at three days per week, who can honestly say that an allocative breakdown of of four sportfishing days to three commercial fishing days isn't fair?

The Yakutat Fish and Game Advisory Committee feels that given the allocative breakdown of the user days, the nature of the conflicts that arise, this seems like a more than fair way to resolve the issue, and we feel it would be a permanent solution that would maintain the viability of both user groups, should the Alaska Board of Fisheries feel the need to pursue a solution.

Thank you for considering our concerns,
On behalf of the Yakutat Fish and Game Advisory Committee,
Casey Mapes - Chairman



Minutes for Yakutat Advisory Committee meeting February 27, 2013

call to order 7:07 PM. Brian Marston (ADFG sportfish), Sam Demmert, Lowell Peterson in the audience.

1) roll call. D. stone, B. Fraker, J. Fraker, Jesse Pavlik, Jerimiah Pavlik, L. Bemis, N. Endicott, S. Chadwick, L. Clark, C. Mapes- present. Absent were, R. Kerkovich, Jonathan Pavlik, S. Nelson, H. Holcomb, M. Inderland. Quorum present.

2) adoption of agenda. B. Fraker moves, S. Chadwick 2nd. 10 ayes, 0 neys. S. Chadwick calls for the question.

3) move into comment on proposals to the statewide BOF agenda,(other than 247 which has already been dealt with)

Proposal 216- B. Fraker moves to support, J. Fraker 2nd discussion- C. mapes said, " he feels that this proposal goes to far. While there are occassions that protective measures need to be in place, having a statewide blanket measure, is effectively saying that the Dept. is doing their job. He feels like they are doing a good job, and instances need to be handled just like they are, on a case by case basis. Were this proposal to pass, it would have far reaching adverse affects on everything except in river fisheries." Others concur. No further comment. S. Chadwick calls for question, 0 in favor of support, 10 opposed. Motion fails.

Proposal 217- L. Clark moves to support, S. Chadwick 2nd,- J. Fraker calls for the question, 0 in favor, 10 opposed. Motion fails.

Proposal 219- L. clark moves to support, J. Fraker 2nd,- B. Fraker question, 0 ayes, 10 neys, motion fails.

Proposal 220- D. Stone moves to support, B. Fraker 2nd- L. clark calls for the question, 10 ayes, 0 neys, motion passes.

Proposal 222- S. Chadwick moves to support, N. Endicott 2nd, Endicott calls for the question, 10 ayes, 0 neys. motion passes.

Proposal 224- D. Stone moves to support, S. Chadwick 2nd. B. Fraker question, 10 ayes, 0 neys, motion passes.

Proposal 225- S. Chadwick moves to support, B. Fraker 2nd. discussion, S. chadwick says," this seems like a move to make it harder to do permit stacking by the proposal maker, but it doesn't have to be that way. It could make it easier. There is no criteria asked for, nor does it specify who would set the parameters. BOF? Dept.? Establishing a preset guideline might make it easier to establish when permit stacking is in order with the right parameters. We should support it, with the recommendation that the guidelines be worked out in committee by the user groups, and I'd like to make that a motion." B. Fraker 2nd. N. Endicott question on the



amendment, 10 ayes 0 neys, amendment passes. N. Endicott question on the main motion as amended, 10 ayes, 0 neys, motion as amended passes.

Proposal 226 - N. Endicott moves to approve, J. Fraker 2nd. B. Fraker question 10 ayes, 0 neys. Motion passes.

Proposal 227- B. Fraker moves to support, D. Stne 2nd. L. Clark question 10 ayes, 0 neys. Motion passes.

Proposal 228- B. Fraker moves to support, N. Endicott 2nd. D. Stone question 10 ayes, 0 neys. Motion passes.

Proposal 229- J. Fraker moves to support, S. Chadwick 2nd D. Stone question 10 ayes, 0 neys. Motion passes.

Proposal 230- B. Fraker moves to support, Jesse Pavlik 2nd. L. Clark question 10 ayes 0 neys. Motion passes.

Proposal 232- S Chadwick moves to support, B. Fraker 2nd. Jesse Pavlik question 10 ayes 0 neys. Motion passes.

Proposal 233- B. Fraker moves to support, L. Clark 2nd. discussion- B. Fraker says, " no one at all, should be allowed to risk harming fish. Thats why the ban was put in place. The risk isn't worth the reward, there has to be somewhere for handicapped to be able to fish that won't be detrimental." D. Stone question 10 ayes, 0 neys. Motion passes.

Proposal 234- B. Fraker moves to support, D. Stone 2nd. discussion, B Fraker says, " I think this proposal is just ridiculous." D. Stone calls for the question. 10 ayes, 0 neys.

Proposal 235- L. Bemis moves to support, S. Chadwick 2nd. discussion, B Fraker says "that making sport fishermen mark down when and where they caught a fish is a good idea. It will help enforcement curb double dipping, which is the practice of catching your baglimit, taking them home, then going back out fishing again. In addition, he likes the idea of mandatory reporting, it will give the Dept. a better clue of what's going on." L. Clark says, " Subsistence has to report, so does commercial, why shouldn't sport have to also?" D. Stone says, " I'm an old man, I might forget to punch my card, I wouldn't want to get a ticket for a fish I caught legally, just because I forgot to write it down on a piece of paper, ' though he agrees it would help stop double dipping. B. Marston says, " he agrees that it would help enforcement with mandatory writing it down, but says he doesn't think mandatory reporting is that critical to the Dept. He feels they're data is pretty accurately estimated." C. Mapes agrees with L. Clark, " what's good for all the other users, should be good for sport too. In addition, he agrees that it will help stop double dipping." S. Chadwick calls for the question, 8 ayes 2 neys (D. Stone, Jerimiah Pavlik), motion passes.



Proposal 247- Motion to oppose already passed at meeting on 2/19/2013

B. Fraker moves to adjourn, D. Stone 2nd. 10 ayes, 0 neys,

meeting adjourned at 9:10 Pm.

Yakutat Advisory Committee minutes from meeting February 19, 2013

1) Meeting called to order at 7:05 PM. Audience, Lowell Peterson, Gordon woods(ADFG-commercial) Nicole Zieser (ADFG- commercial), Brian Marston (ADFG sport), John Vale, Sam Demmert Sr., Greg Inderland

2) Roll call. present members were, D. Stone, M Inderland, L. Clark, C. Mapes, R. Kerkovich, Jesse Pavlik, Jerimiah Pavlik, J. Fraker, B Fraker, L. Bemis, N. Endicott. Absent were- Jonathan Pavlik, S. Nelson, S. Chadwick, H. Holcomb Quorum present.

3) Adoption of Agenda- 11 ayes, 0 neys.

4) discussion on proposal 247. John vale from the audience felt like "given the nature of a board generated proposal, it would be risky to just outright oppose this proposal. He felt like a counter proposal to move the markers for commercial fishing down river a 1/4 of the distance to the mouth, instead of half the distance would be something that fishermen could live with on both sides. He felt it would have a better chance of proceeding." I. Clark stated that, " if you give an inch, they'll take a mile. If we allow the markers to start being used to separate fisherman, it will never end. That is not what markers are supposed to be for. Plus, they'll still be sportfishing in the lower river, there will still be conflicts." others agreed with this assessment. H. Holcomb asked where the wording "un-organized fishery came from?" C. Mapes explained that "it went back to the videos that were presented at the ACR meeting in Oct. This where this proposal was generated. To the board, it looked like thigns were a mess up there." C. Mapes said he didn't feel like these videos ever should have been allowed at that meeting." Jesse Pavik said, " They were totally taken out of context. The guy filming was stand far enough away from the river that it made it look like there was barely enough room to fit a skiff between people." Jerimiah Pavlik said," and the video of guys circling around scaring fish in the aluminum skiff, thats just what has to be done in order to catch fish. The guy with the rod in his hand is literally standing on their corkline. Was there really nowhere else you could go fish?" and He said "he thought he heard narration that said the guys in the boat were herding fish on a day when commercial was closed just to harass sportfishermen". He said, "no one harasses sportfishermen, they just go up there and fish. Who would scare fish out of their own hole on a day off? There was a net just outside of the frame of the picture that the fish were intended to be scared into. The guy taking the picture is lying."

C. Mapes interjected that discussions with Greg Dierick indicated that he felt like maybe making the upper half of the river a no outboard motor zone, instead of a no commercial fishing zone, might have the same affect of making a compromise that everybody could live with. Jerimiah Pavlik said, " that the upper river is the only place with any real holes that require fish to be scared. Making this a no outboard section would kill the fishery. L. peterson,



Jesse Pavlik, and L. Bemis agreed with Jerimiah Pavlik's statement. B. Fraker asked G. woods "what the dept's take on moving the markers would be, and if he felt it would have any adverse affects?" G. Woods indicated that "the Dept. would be neutral on what they felt was a strictly allocative proposal."

J Fraker said "he felt like the issue had been hashed and rehashed. For the amount of days that commercial is in the water, sport should be willing to work around the commercial fleet." He asked if Chairman Mapes had drafted the letter of comment as asked at the previous meeting. Chairman presented the comment verbally.

To; Chairman Karl Johnstone and members of the Alaska Board of Fisheries,

The Yakutat area Fish and Game Advisory Committee has met and drafted the following positions on Board generated proposal 247 of the Statewide fisheries meeting agenda.

The Alaska Board of Fisheries proposal 247 was ratified and written under unfair pretenses, and we must call this into question. The parameters for the ACR workshop held October 9th, clearly state that only written testimony on properly submitted proposals would be accepted by the Alaska Board of Fisheries. However, during the course of the meeting the BOF allowed videos to be submitted that may have affected some, or all, of the BOF's decisions on the concerns brought before you. These videos, narrated by the camera operator, depict commercial setnetting activities, and vessel operation on the Tsiu river. Our concern is, BOF accepted these videos as evidence, with only one person's perspective on what they represent, how is this fair? In addition, *it appears there were no laws broken* in any of the videos, yet BOF has decided to place the entire blame of the proximity issues between the users, as depicted, solely on the commercial setnet fisheries, by calling it a "disorderly fishery". BOF has received official letters from other lodge owners who operate at the Tsiu that state that their clients have no problems operating in proximity to active commercial fishers. There exists a documented history of commercial fishing activity dating back to the 1930's, that has changed very little in all that time. Yes, motors and skiffs are different, but the style of the fishery is virtually the same. Sport lodges began operating at the Tsiu in the very early 1980's. So for 25 years, through some of the years when the Tsiu was the very shortest in length it has ever been, and had the highest number of active commercial fishers, there was not one documented case of confrontation between the user groups. What has changed since the advent of confrontation is, the average number of active commercial setnet operators has diminished considerably, while the numbers of clientele at one lodge in particular has increased considerably. There is nothing disorderly about the way commercial setnetting is conducted on the Tsiu, the health of the returning stocks, and historically low number of citations prove this out. So, we find that it is premature, and unfair to place the blame for the conflict solely on one user group, without even considering the commercial setnetters position. If a person is actively herding fish in a hole, and another person desires to go stand in the middle of it, who is at fault? There exists no clear law for BOF to have made the determination that this is predominately a commercial fishing problem.

As a committee, and as a community, we feel it is a grievous error for the Alaska Board of Fisheries to generate it's own proposals in all matters but the extreme emergency. We feel that proposal 247 demonstrates a clear reason why. Exactly how are the commercial setnetters of Yakutat supposed to feel like they have been given a fair hearing, when those who would sit in



judgement over them, are also those who wrote the proposal to curtail their fisheries?

We can see no sound reasoning in over looking the decades long tried and proven practices of how things are done at the Tsiu river based on the evidence presented. One lodge operator has a couple of hundred of his clients write to BOF, and tell BOF that commercial fishermen ruined their preconceived expectation of what the experience was sold to them as, in an effort to garner more real estate, or put his competition out of business is how it looks to us. At our meeting it was explained to us, how the videos BOF watched at the October workshop, that we as a community were never allowed to comment on, are misleading and out of context.

So our official comment as a community advisory committee, comes in two separate parts. First, we feel that there is no realistic need for changes of any kind to occur at the Tsiu. Everyone doing business or commercial fishing there is doing quite well. All the threats of clientele, " who won't be coming back", is not validated when a person looks at the statistics of numbers of sportfishermen on the Tsiu. The runs of coho salmon are strong and healthy, and no one, not one person has received a citation for an interaction or altercation of any kind. Our feeling is, it's working, it has worked, for many decades, leave it alone.

Should the BOF decide to ignore our findings and overall feeling on how proposal 247 should be dealt with, and proceed, then we feel that you should do so in this manner. As written, proposal 247 proposes to move the existing ADFG regulatory markers down river half the distance to the river terminus in order to create a sportfishing only section of the river. The Yakutat Fish and Game Advisory Committee is opposed to proposal 247 based on these concerns. 1) There is no mention of making the lower half of the river exclusive to commercial only, so there will still exist the possibility of potential conflict between the user groups in the same manner as always, in the lower half of the river. So, while attempting to alleviate the problem, this proposal would accomplish virtually nothing worthwhile. What would happen is, BOF would effectively cut the allowable distance for commercial setnet sites in half. This may not seem like such a huge issue given the river's current length, and the current number of commercial fishermen operating on the Tsiu, but things do change. If the river were to shorten in length, which it does often, regulation would not change. Half the distance would always be allocated to sport only, whether the river is long, or short. 2) If economics and or the value of salmon changes, we could see a dramatic return to the historic numbers of commercial fishermen returning to the Tsiu, and now there would not be room enough for all of them in the proposed new area, creating an entirely new set of conflicts. 3) We also feel that taking sides, and taking from one user group and labeling them as being solely responsible for the conflicts when there is no clear reasons for doing so, will likely create an increase in the very conflicts BOF hopes to quell. 4) Lastly, it is our feeling that placement of regulatory markers on the Tsiu, or any river should be left solely up to the Department, based on sound biological necessity. Markers should never be used as political footballs, and doing so runs the risk of seriously affecting the fragile dynamics of the ecosystem, and or adversely affecting all the users involved. As an example, cutting the allowable distance of commercial fishing area in half, will likely allow for more escapement of salmon above the markers, forcing the Department to open the river to commercial fishing more often by emergency order. This will increase the chances of conflicts, and adversely affect the dynamics of both fisheries, and the schedule for getting the commercial product to market. Our position on the Tsiu conflicts as described, has not deviated. We feel that the majority of the lodge owners, the entire commercial setnet



fishery, and potentially the overall health of the river it's self should not be changed in order to accommodate the sensibilities of a few.

Should BOF still feel the need to proceed with a motion in an attempt to alleviate user conflicts, BOF must first consider the number of user days allowed for each user group. Consider the fact that there was exactly 6- 24 hr. commercial openings on the Tsiu river this year, which is relatively normal, given weather conditions. All of the lodges up there are in operation for at least a month, most upwards of 2 months. Generally, five days out of the week, the Tsiu is exclusively a sportfishing only river. Is there any fair reason that commercial should have to accept changes on the two days per week that are left? There are plenty of fishing holes above the markers, maybe not the best, but there is fish there. If any changes are made, it should be that sport fishing should not allowed below the markers on days that commercial fishing is in affect, leave the placement of the markers solely up to the Department, based on conservation need only, change the openings from 9 am. to 9am. , to 6 am. to 6 am., that way only one day of daylight would be required to be affected for a commercial fishery to take place, not two. We feel that 24 hr. closures between commercial openings should be mandatory. This allows for fish to disperse evenly throughout the river making it fair for up river fishermen to have a viable opportunity. In addition, 24 hr. closures allow the processor the chance to keep up with moving the fish so they don't get back logged, and it keeps the product as fresh as possible. If this concept were accepted, sportfishing would not be allowed below the markers two days per week, with the remote possibility of a third day. Even at three days per week, who can honestly say that an allocative breakdown of of four sportfishing days to three commercial fishing days isn't fair?

The Yakutat Fish and Game Advisory Committee feels that given the allocative breakdown of the user days, the nature of the conflicts that arise, this seems like a more than fair way to resolve the issue, and we feel it would be a permanent solution that would maintain the viability of both user groups, should the Alaska Board of Fisheries feel the need to pursue a solution.

Thank you for considering our concerns,
On behalf of the Yakutat Fish and Game Advisory Committee,
Casey Mapes - Chairman

Jesse Pavlik said that "this was the only concept that the AC should entertain, all other ideas would be to risky as far as possibly crippling the fisheries."

Lowell Peterson from the Audience agreed with this. Greg Inderland from the audience also agreed.

J. Fraker made motion to accept the letter drafted by chairman Mapes, and make it the official comment of the Yakutat Advisory Committee on proposal 247. H. Holcolm seconded. 11 ayes 0 neys.

Discussion, C mapes stated that it seemed like the only reasonable stand given the circumstances. It does seem like the breakdown in user time has to be considered.

B. Fraker called for question on the motion. 11 ayes, 0 neys.



in other business, L. Bemis reported the results of the BOG meeting in Ketchikan. Deer proposal passed, and bear proposal failed. He stated that guides assoc. weigh in had had a big impact on the bear proposal. C. Mapes said he was excited that the deer proposal had passed. J. Fraker asked what the schedule looked like for having Hunter education courses in Yakutat? C. Mapes said he would be staying touch with Ryan Scott to find out more.

H. Holcomb moves to adjourn, J Pavlik 2nd, 11 ayes 0 neys,

Meeting adjourned @ 9:18 Pm.



Meeting minutes for Yakutat Advisory December 12, 2012

1) Meeting called to order at 07:05 PM

2) Roll call. L. Bemis, H. Holcomb, C. Mapes, S. Chadwick, S. Nelson, L Clark, J. Pavlik, Jon Pavlik, Jesse Palik, R Kerkovich, D. Stone, B. Fraker, J Fraker. - Present.

M Inderland- absent.

Also in attendance were. Gordon woods, Brian Marston, and Nicole Zieser representing the ADFG.

3) Motion made by H. Holcolm to support proposal #2- a youth only deer hunt (18 and under) in unit 5, seconded by B. Fraker.

Discussion- Chaiman Mapes pointed out that it appears there would be no negative response from the Department on this proposal, they would only ask for a fairly general set of stipulations. Mapes stated that most of these stipulations appeared to be good ideas, but he did have one concern. One of the stipulations was that a youth hunter would have to complete a certified hunting education course. While we appreciate the concept, we don't have readily accessible course training personnel available out here in Yakutat, and it very well could render the whole proposal useless. If a youth hunter would have to complete a course that simply wouldn't be available in Yakutat, there would be no youth only deer hunt. Mapes stated that he had made this concern known to the area biologist, and that it was felt we should make our concerns know in record. Other advisory members concurred with this concern. Question called by- H. Holcolm. 13 ayes, 0- neys.

Motion made by C. Mapes, seconded by R. Kerkovich, to support the Department's stipulations on proposal #2 , with language added - "Over the years, the Board has created several youth hunts, and all the current youth hunts require participants to have taken a hunter education course. Generally this is required through a discretionary permit condition. However, since this hunt is managed by general season harvest ticket for deer, rather than a permit, these discretionary conditions don't apply. In Kodiak, the Board extended the restricted weapons season for deer and created a special management area which requires hunter education and additional requirements for a youth hunt. If the Board chooses to adopt this proposal, the department would recommend a similar amendment to create a special management area as that used to manage the Kodiak hunt." **(provided that an approved hunter education course can be made available in Yakutat, otherwise, the youth hunt will proceed without this stipulation.)** Question called by H. Holcolm, 13 ayes, 0 neys.

M. Inderland arrives at the meeting. (7:50 PM)

4) Motion made by B. Fraker to support proposal #5 to change regulation in unit 5 as follows; 1 brown bear every 4 regulatory years, to 1 brown bear every 2 years. Seconded by S. Chadwick. Comments were made that given the statistical number of brown bears harvested by Alaska resident hunters, it was felt that the potential for increase was nominal, and would provide an increased opportunity for Alaska resident hunters to harvest brown bears. Question is called for by S. Chadwick, 14 Ayes, 0 neys.



5) C. Mapes makes motion to support proposal #10- the reauthorization of the antlerless moosehunt on the Nunatak bench, seconded by B. Fraker. Discussion- Mapes pointed out that this is a form of house keeping, the hunt has been closed by emergency order for some time, but reauthorization will maintain the historical way the hunt is conducted, should it be opened again. Question is called by B. Fraker, 14 ayes, 0 neys.

6) Motion made by B. Fraker to oppose proposal #20 , seconded by J. Pavlik, This proposal seeks to shorten the allowable trapping season for wolves in some parts of S.E. Alaska. We feel that the current structure is working, and maintaining a healthy population, leave it alone. Question called by H. Holcolm, 14 ayes, 0 neys.

7) Motion made by B. Fraker to support Department proposal #22, seconded by H. Holcolm, This proposal would lengthen the coyote trapping season on both ends. The department feels that stocks are healthy enough for this to take place, we concur. It goes hand in hand with the current wolf trapping season, and would be hard to seperate the two species. we would not like to see the wolf season shortened. Question called by J. Pavlik, 14 ayes, 0 neys.

8) Motion to adjourn by H. Holcolm, seconded by S. Chadwick, 14 ayes, meeting adjourned @ 8:15 PM.

C Mapes- Chairman

Minutes prepared by C. Mapes



NORTHERN SEWARD PENINSULA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Board of Fish Proposals
Deering, Alaska
Minutes February 26th, 2012
7:00 pm

- I. Call to Order, *Chair Ron Moto*
 - A. Roll Call / Establish Quorum
Marlene Moto-Karl
Percy Ballot
Nathan Hadley
George Sheldon
Mona Washington
- II. Introductions
Carmen Daggett
Mona Barger
- III. Attendance
- IV. Approval of Agenda
Mona motion to approve agenda
Marlene Moto-Karl Seconded
Agenda Approved
- V. Approval of Minutes from December 10, 2012
 - A. Motion to approve minutes Mona
 - B. Seconded Marlene
Percy Ballot: minute amendment requested wolves and bears picking on moose
Minutes approved
- VI. Elections postponed till Selawik seat are decided
- VII. Motion Brown Bear Tag Fee & Antlerless Moose Hunt-the board did approve and agree with you on the decisions on proposals.
 - A. Percy Ballot: It makes it a little easier for people to get a brown bear because we have too many bears in our area.

STATEWIDE FINFISH AND SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

- A. Statewide Allocation, Management Plans and Policies

Proposal 215

Comments: Support subsistence, a proposal not trying to support

Marlene Moto: Motions to support the proposal

Seconded: Mona Washington

Carmen Daggett: Explains that this proposal is meant to prevent one industry from taking over a fishing industry in a particular region.

Discussion:

Nathan: Question about location that is covered by the proposal

Percy Ballot: Explains it is for the whole state.

Nathan: We need to protect our river for subsistence for daily food

Question:

Motion Carries



Proposal 217

Percy Ballot: Suggests that we not support this proposal

Nathan Hadley: We do put nets out for subsistence, last couple of summers we have not been getting king salmon coming up the river maybe the mine up river. Our freezer and dried fish.

Nathan: Motions to not support 217

George: seconded

Discussion: Marlene: a couple years ago when my husband first started fishing and when we first got the allotments the other season was the first time the beluga going up the river the Naknek River.

Percy Ballot: they have a history of going up river, but they are going up river more and more.

All Support

Motion carries

Proposal 218

No comments

Motion to support proposal 218 Marlene Moto-Karl

Is this like what happened what happened with the Kuskokwim River last year?

Will this be a good thing for river fisherman?

Carmen Daggett: This is about fish conservation and setting a number below which escapement goals will be set.

Marlene: Does Fish and Game have a good idea of escapement goals

Carmen: I do not feel I can give good answer.

Marlene: Inquires about escapement goals and if they exist around the state.

Carmen: It was proposed by the Bering Sea Fisherman's Association.

Percy: We work real close with those guys. I will leave this to the council to support or not support.

Seconded:

Discussion:

All support

Motion carries

B. Commercial

Proposal 225

Marlene: I don't think that we should support this. Further example of why we should not support expand.

Marlene motion not to support the proposal, there have been violations by people under permit stacking, it makes it confusing.

Carmen Daggett: Explains that this is not about allowing or not allow permit stacking, but clarifying.

Marlene Moto: Inquires about what permit stacking is and what this proposal is about. Sponsored by the Kenai River Sport Fishing Association.

Percy Ballot: I am concerned about people using two permits at the same time.

I am going to move not to support this.

Discussion: Percy Ballot: if you are going to be commercial fishing you should have your own boat and your own stuff.

Marlene Moto: Move not to support it



George: Seconded
Question: All support
Motion carries to not support this proposal

C. Sport

Proposal 227

Carmen Daggett: Gives examples to explain proxy fishing.

Percy Ballot: There are not that many people that do proxy sport fishing around here.

Percy Ballot: I would support it. If there is a real bad reason for them to EO they should close. Remember we don't even use that proxy fishing in villages.

Mona: Inquires what sport fishing is

Carmen Daggett: Explains sport fishing

Mona: Inquires about what a proxy is.

Mona: To me people use rod and reel for subsistence.

Carmen Daggett: Explains rod and reel fishing and subsistence fishing is regionally designated.

Marlene: Many people came here many years ago to come dry fish.

Marlene: What are they asking in this proposal?

Mona: Motion to support the proposal

Mona: Is it hard to change things down the road that we support or not support?

Percy Ballot: If we don't like this proposal we can write a counter proposal for later to change it back.

Percy Ballot: I would support it because if there is a real bad reason to close the season it would be good for the state to be able to do it.

Mona: Motion to support the proposal

Seconded: George Sheldon

Discussion:

Question: All support

Motion carries

Proposal 228

Carmen Daggett: Explains examples of the high grading from the proposal.

Percy Ballot: We don't want that if you catch a fish and you keep it, I think Fish and Game want to say don't throw it in.

Carmen Daggett: Explains the bag limit in relation to catching fish.

Mona Washington: Motion to support 228

Seconded: George Sheldon

Question: All Support

Motion Carries



Proposal 229

Carmen Daggett: Gives examples of what happens with fishing licenses. There is an annual limit on the fish.

Motion to support: Mona Washington

Seconded: Marlene

Question: All support

Motion Carries

Proposal 230

Carmen Daggett: Gives examples of what happens with fishing licenses under the circumstances of this proposal.

Percy Ballot: Inquires about annual limit

Carmen Daggett: The individual will lose their annual limit.

Percy Ballot: move to support

Mona: Motion to support

Seconded: by Nathan Hadley

Question: All support

Motion carries

Proposal 232

Carmen Daggett: Rereads proposal explains example of what the proposal is about.

Marlene Moto: Questions what the proposal is about

Percy Ballot: they are asking if they may be used

We use most of them anyways

Percy Ballot: Move to support

Percy Ballot: Whitefish means everything

Marlene Moto: Re-reads the proposal

Carmen Daggett: Explains where there are limits on whitefish it wouldn't fall under this proposal.

Percy Ballot: They want to use it for crab fishing or commercial fishing. They want to use the head and the tail.

Mona: Mostly the parts we don't use.

Marlene: Motion to support

Seconded: Nathan

Discussion:

All support

Motion carries

Proposal 233

Carmen Daggett: Reads proposal 233

Carmen Daggett: Explains reasoning for banning felt soles for the first place.

Mona: What about the disabled people who cannot use the boots and won't be able to fish. I would support the disabled by supporting the proposal. Motion to support

Seconded: Nathan Hadley, I am a veteran I and I support that

All support

Motion carries



Proposal 234

Mona: Wonders if there are other weights at Rotman's

Carmen Daggett: Explains the size of weight importance as well as availability on line.

Marlene: Inquires about use of lead weights by the general public.

Nathan Hadley: I eat a lot of whitefish and I am still alive.

Marlene: We get lead too in our bodies when we eat fish

Mona: as long as there are other kinds of weights out there to use..

Marlene: Motion to support

Seconded: Nathan

Discussion:

Question: All support

Motion Carries

Proposal 235

Marlene: It's a good one. We should support the new regulation. Establish mandatory sport fishing requirements, a new regulation

Look like it is good to support, reviews what the proposal is suggesting. We could support it.

Marlene: Don't they ask us how much we catch.

Carmen Daggett: Explains reporting of sport fishing.

Marlene: Proposed by the Native Village of Eyak, it would be wise to support it.

Seconded: Mona Washington

Question: All support

Motion carries

JOINT BOARD PROPOSALS

A. Moving Selawik from NSP to Lower Kobuk AC

Marlene Moto: Can we support it weren't they part of Noorvik and Selawik several years ago?

Percy: I would support it also, the wording regarding on Sheefish and whitefish in Buckland and Deering

Motion to support as amended strike out "From a fish perspective Selawik, Noorvik and Kiana are more dependent on sheefish and whitefish, while these fish have little to no use in Buckland and Deering".

Marlene Moto: Motion to support as amended

Marlene Moto: We all go after the same thing it is just in a different location.

Mona Washington: Seconded

All support

Motion carries

B. Joint Board-Robert's Rules of Order

Carmen Daggett: Reads proposal

George & Marlene: No comment

Mona: I make a motion to support the proposal

Seconded: Marlene Moto

Discussion:

Question: All Support

Motion Carries



C. Discussion of Additional Joint Board Proposals

Be aware that the new proposal book is out for the Joint Board Proposals. Please review these and be aware that the comments are due at the beginning of the cycle next year.

OTHER

B. NPMFC Letter

Carmen Daggett: Explains the meat of the proposal

Percy: Recommendation to support because it is about by catch, they waste a lot of fish and we live on fish. We need to support this proposal.

Marlene: there are more and more high seas fishing from other countries, they are manipulating the oceans too, the same ocean we are using.

Percy: I think it is a good letter to support this request.

Last summer there were several people sighted people for subsistence fishing for salmon in the Kuskokwim area, but they don't do anything about the fisherman wasting fish in the high seas.

George Sheldon: Motion to support

Nathan: Seconded

Question: All support

Motion carries

C. ICC (Percy Ballot)

We are going to four regions to talk with hunters and gatherers for food security. We are going around doing interviews with hunters and gatherers to gather what they are seeing for changes that are affecting their food. Two phase project will be in 2015. Beginning with Carolina Behe to assess our food security and how it is related to our environment. So we can protect our food resources. We already went to Selawik and will be going to Kobuk we will use those information to start the second phase about traditional knowledge. We will start to see a lot about shipping. We are seeing drilling, weather and a lot of different things are happening. We are trying to use this knowledge to cure what kind of actions we need to do to manage our food resources better.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

Maybe have a large meeting in Kotzebue talking about the Joint Board proposals

Need to get a person to attend the Statewide Board of Fish meeting



Delta Advisory Committee vote on 2013 Fisheries Proposals

Proposal #222, motion and 2nd, 9 in favor 1 abstain

Proposal #227, motion and 2nd, 10 in favor

Proposal #228, motion and 2nd, 10 in favor

Proposal #229, motion and 2nd, 10 in favor

Proposal #230, motion and 2nd, 2 in favor, 2 oppose and 6 abstain, proposal may need more research before it can be applied effectively.

Proposal #232, motion and 2nd, 7 in favor, 3 abstain

Proposal #233, motion and 2nd, 10 in favor

Proposal #234, motion and 2nd, 3 oppose, 7 abstain Majority do not feel like this is an issue in Alaska.

Proposal #235, motion and 2nd, 9 in favor, 1 abstain



St. Lawrence Island AC Meeting Minutes 2.12.13, 3:00 pm

Role Call/Quorum

Verna Immingan
Melvin Apassingok
Ronnie Toolie
Peggy Akeya

Introductions

Alex Andrews
Carmen Daggett

Minutes

Dorothy Childs
Need more information from Dorothy Childs-Anchorage
Morris Muller-Based out of Unalakleet
Want to join Southern Norton Sound- I'll draft a proposal
Motion to approve the minutes Verna Immingan including the minutes from Dorothy Child's.
Minutes Approved

Agenda

Agenda approved

Proposal 215

Melvin Apassingok: We are concerned about the Southeast and Southwest side of St. Lawrence Island, there are lots of marine mammals over there. We don't want the trawlers to go to that place.

Peggy Akeya: We don't want one person to control fishing all over Alaska. Look at Aleutians and what happened to their fish because of the trawlers.

Melvin Apassingok: Northwest from here that is where they wanted to we are surveying that area for the other commercial fisherman to their fishing in that area what needs to be proposed to not.

Ronnie Toolie: Bottom trawlers 100 miles out. We need to keep trawlers out and keep our island segregated. Trawlers are just wasting.

Carmen: you should work with Art Ivanoff to work on a proposal for trawlers

Melvin Apassingok: We need to support the Northern Kuskokwim because they were having difficulties with fishing.

Ronnie Toolie: Motion to support

Peggy Akeya: Seconded

Motion Carries

Proposal 217

Marvin Apassingok: there should be less sport fishing. Reviews the proposal meaning

Peggy Akeya: Will this benefit all of the fisherman?

Marvin Apassingok: Motion to support increasing Chinook salmon return, there shouldn't be as much sport fishing.

Verna Immingan: Seconded

All Supported

Motion Carries



Proposal 218

Discussion: Question about sustained yield

Peggy Akeya: Motion to support

Seconded: Ronnie Toolie

Motion Carries

Proposal 225

Discussion:

Inquires about if permit stacking already occurs

Carmen: yes

Marvin Apassingok: Motion to support permit stacking

Seconded: Ronnie Toolie

Motion Carries

Proposal 227

Marvin Motion: motion to not support the proposal

Seconded:

Peggy Akeya: fish may go to elders and this proposal would keep that from happening and I don't want to happen.

Motion Fails: The AC wishes to not support proposal 227

Proposal 228

Discussion:

Peggy Akeya:

I want to stop anglers from high grading and waiting for bigger fish.

Ronnie Toolie: Motion to support

Marvin Apassingok: Seconded

Motion Carries

Proposal 229

Discussion:

Inquiry about who would be affected by this proposal.

Marvin Apassingok: Motion to support

Peggy Akeya: Seconded

Motion Carries

Proposal 230

Discussion: Motion to support the proposal

All opposed

Motion Fails



Proposal 232

Discussion:

Peggy Akeya: Our commercial fisherman and subsistence fisherman use white fish as halibut bait they ship it from Nome or from camp. This is why we want to support this.

Motion to support

Seconded: Verna Immingan

Motion Carries

Proposal 223

Peggy Akeya: I want the handicapped and the elders to go out fishing in the waters.

Melvin Apassingok: Motion to amend to add a guide requirement for disabled fisherman.

Seconded: to support as amended

Motion Carries as amended

Proposal 234

Motion to support

Seconded by Peggy Akeya

Motion Carries

Motion 235

Peggy Akeya: inquires about bringing and trading fish

Carmen Daggett: it is sport fishing

Peggy Akeya: Motion to approve

Seconded:

All support motion carries

NPFMC: We want to draft a letter

Peggy Akeya: Motion to support it

Seconded:

All support motion carries

Joint Board Proposal:

Motion to support

Seconded:

Motion carries

Motion to table the AC process give presentation before elections.

We want to be combined with Southern Norton Sound AC.



Excerpt of Minutes from 2.19.13 for the Statewide Board of Fish Meeting Kotzebue Sound & Lower Kobuk Joint AC Meeting

Proposal 215

Lower Kobuk

I would like to motion to support proposal 215

Seconded

Motion carries

Proposal 217

Lower Kobuk

Lonnie Tebbits Motion to support 217 as is.

Seconded:

All support motion carries

Proposal 218

Lower Kobuk

Lonnie Tebbits: I motion to take no action on proposal 218.

I get proposals like this because I am on the federal fish and game, we get more proposals like this. The more support they get the better support from the board.

Discussion: we are supporting those individuals who are in different regions

Jim Menard: Explains the SET (sustainable escapement total) and the management concerns.

Motion fails

Wilbur Westlake: I would like to make a motion to support this proposal. My understanding was that the person who was doing this proposal.

Motion to not to take action..

Eugene Smith: Explains the subsistence fisherman representation not present.

Carmen Daggett: Explains the possibility of re-writing the proposal.

Eugene Smith: This is going to affect the people on the tributary not the people on the ocean.

Karmen Monigold: Explains the compounding effects of different groups.

Jim Menard: This is somewhat about making these decisions on the data.

Eugene Smith: This proposal only affects the fisherman on the river.

Clyde Ramoth: I don't have any voting power, but I would either support it or take no action.

Seconded:

Question:

Abstain from taking action

Proposal 225-Lower Kobuk

Motion to take no action on proposal 225

Seconded:

Question:

Motion carries to abstain from voting on proposal 225



Proposal 227 Lower Kobuk

Glenn Miller: motion to take no action

Seconded:

Question: Motion carries to take no action

Proposal 228 Lower Kobuk

Lonnie Tebbits: I would like to support this proposal

Discussion: It should include that it can have an impact on subsistence uses.

Seconded:

Question: All support motion Carries

Proposal 229 Lower Kobuk

Brendan Scanlon: Gives example of a time when this particular regulation would apply. There are no annual limits in the Northwest Arctic.

Glenn Miller: Explains how people are getting one license going again and getting another license and not have to report.

Lonnie Tebbits: motion to support the proposal

Glenn Miller: Seconded

Motion carries to support proposal 229

Proposal 230 Lower Kobuk

Glenn Miller: move to take no action

Seconded:

Discussion:

Question:

Proposal 232 Lower Kobuk

Lonnie Tebbits: move to take no action on 232

Seconded

Question

All support taking no action on proposal 232

Proposal 233 Lower Kobuk

Lonnie Tebbits: motion to support 233

Seconded

All support 233

Motion carries

Proposal 234 Lower Kobuk

Glenn Miller: motion to support the proposal as is.

Seconded:

Discussion:

Question:

All support proposal 234

Proposal 235 Lower Kobuk

Glenn Miller: Motion to amend to make this proposal to be management units specific

Seconded:

All support

Motion carries as amended.



Excerpt of Meeting Minutes 2.19.13 Kotzebue Sound and Lower Kobuk AC Joint Committee Meeting

Proposal 215

Kotzebue Sound

Discussion: They left out subsistence use in this proposal and seeing that I don't like this proposal at all.

Michael Kramer: I would like to amend this to make this proposal management unit specific.

Seconded

Question

Motion carries as amended

Proposal 217

Kotzebue Sound

Eugene Smith: I would like to make it management unit specific.

Eugene Smith: I don't know why they are trying to go statewide with this proposal.

I think we can agree with it.

Michael Kramer: I would like to make a motion to make it management unit specific. The theory the fish where the fish thrive and caught.

Pete Schaeffer: I would like to remind everyone that the state water is unit 26.

Comment: The areas that are getting really intensely management.

Motion fails

Eugene Smith: Make a motion to support the proposal

Seconded:

All Support

Motion carries

Proposal 218

Kotzebue Sound

Discussion:

Pete Schaeffer: I think this is more problems down in the Nome and Unalakleet proposals

Eugene Smith: I hate this kind of proposals and subsistence wasn't mentioned again. It is not specific enough. I hate to see the Kuskokwim not being able to subsistence fish.

We need to protect subsistence

Pete Scheaffer: I am not sure this proposal says anything about that.

Eugene Smith: Motion to take no action on this time

Seconded:

Abstained from voting



Proposal 225-Permit Stacking Kotzebue Sound

Jim Menard: Explains permit stacking allowed in Nome and not allowed in Kotzebue

Motion to abstain from voting on this proposal

Discussion: We don't permit stack here. I think permit stacking should be illegal.

Seconded:

Question

Motion carries to abstain from voting on proposal 225

Proposal 227 Kotzebue Sound

Discussion:

Brendan Scanlon: Explains proxy fishing and the proposal, this has nothing to do with subsistence, only with sport proxy fishing

Michael Kramer: Motion to take no action

Eugene Smith: seconded no action

Question:

Motion carries to abstain from voting

Proposal 228 Kotzebue Sound

Pete Schaeffer: motion to take no action

Seconded:

Discussion: I am kind of curious about what the Lower Kobuk thinks about this.

Eugene: Motion to support the proposal 228

Seconded: Victor Karmum

Question: motion carries to support 228

Proposal 229 Kotzebue Sound

Pete Schaeffer: I think we should let Lower Kobuk vote on this one again.

Motion to support

Seconded

Motion carries to support 229

Proposal 230 Kotzebue Sound

Brendan Scanlon: Explains duplicate license in the event of a loss of license, there are no species with annual limits.

Eugene Smith: Move to take no action

Seconded:

Motion carries to abstain from voting

Proposal 232 Kotzebue Sound

Eugene Smith: move to abstain

Seconded:

Question:

No action taken



Proposal 233 Kotzebue Sound

Eugene Smith: Move to support

Discussion: Pete Schaeffer: Explains that felt soles may transport snails, plants and insects.

All Support proposal 233

Motion carries

Proposal 234 Kotzebue Sound

Eugene Smith: move to oppose proposal 234

Seconded:

Discussion: Eugene Smith: I still use lead weights for shee fishing because there aren't any alternatives. There is a very limited use of lead weights in this area.

Question:

All oppose proposal 234

Proposal 235 Kotzebue Sound

Brendan Scanlon: Explains how the state gets sport fishing data and makes sport fishermen keep a count of the number of fish and if they don't they don't get a license for the next year.

Eyak is located at the mouth of the Copper River.

Eugene: Why did they make this a statewide proposal

Eugene: move to make it management units specific

Motion to support as amended to be game management units specific.



Excerpt from DRAFT Fairbanks AC Meeting Minutes from February 13, 2013

Statewide BOF Proposal

- Proposal 235; Establish mandatory reporting system for sport fisheries statewide: Unanimous opposed
- 232 Clarify the use of sport caught fish as bait: Unanimous support
- 228 Prohibit the practice of “high grading” by anglers: 5 opposed and 6 support
Release immediately if intention is not to kill.

