

From: "Paul A. Shadura II" <sabaka@ptialaska.net>
Date: March 28, 2014 10:54:09 AM MST
To: "Orville Huntington" , "Fritz Johnson" , "Karl Johnstone"
Subject: KPFA,SOKI Petitions

Chairman Johnstone; member Huntington; member Johnson,

I understand that the recommendations that ADF&G have completed have been sent out to you. We also have seen them and are dismayed at the lack of information that they produced. Not a very helpful document in that they did not discuss the high potential of loss harvests of sockeye, to the tune of a million dollars per 12 hours for each period lost to the ESSN fishery during the latter parts of July. Pat Shields had told the board that three periods would amount to about an average of 250 thousand sockeye, this would be a lost harvest opportunity. So 83 thousand sockeye at a 6 pound average in that part of the season times the 2.50 per pound which was the setnet price with add on's for last year gives us the million- plus loss per period. Was this the intention of the Board of Fisheries members?

A large percentage of the fishermen cannot get the required 29 mesh deep nets in time to for the season, they can't hang them in time for the season if they even can get them. CI uses a particular style and type of net so the options of using 29 mesh deep nets designed for the drift fleet in BB is not an option and certainly when you consider the cost of lines, webbing, corks, leads and the transportation costs then hanging costs (either in time or paying an individual to do it). To say that you as a fishermen but with less gear than another does not equate to equal opportunity. You are treating individuals in the same class differently. Given time, setnet fishermen can work the new gear into their operation but this just doesn't happen over night. There could be other solutions offered for temporary relief. If the depth is the main reason than the current 6 inch by 29 mesh depth could be accomplish by lessening the size of each mesh. Just one of the solutions not considered at the UCI meeting.

Overall, the proposal does not have to potential to bring in anymore kings than the entire run would bring in that year. Setnet fishermen do not have the efficiency to harvest kings and the majority of the nets do not catch a king in a season anyway. The entire ESSN fishery last year caught 736 kings over 30 inches, which are age 5 and above. The inriver fishery caught 1500 kings over 30 inches last year. The entire ESSN fishery in 2013 harvested 65% to 75% under the sonar counted kings; The inriver harvest about 5% to 10% of these immature mostly male kings. There is no parity here.

On a forecast of 19,700 the potential to put more than 750 large kings in the river late season is minimal. The potential to decimate the ESSN fishery is huge. Even if you were to put 22, 000 on the spawning grounds which would be 7,000 over the low end escapement goal you would be getting only 4000 kings in return as the sustained yield tables suggest. So in all, the sport fishery inriver will enjoy more opportunity to harvest, catch and release or subject the animal to mortality and the setnetters value will continue to be diminished.

The Kenai is not the Yukon or Kuskokwim and it has not had an escapement less than the BEG. We are in an SEG as the data has a margin built in to the model. The return of 12,000 or 28,000 (BEG) spawners gives you a 90% chance of returning a yield of 32,000 or more per year.

I am available by phone if you have further questions. We are asking at the very least that two members of the board vote to listen to all the petitions so that the public has a chance to hear clarifications and

intent of board members. I see it as a three vote process; the initial two votes per petition to convene a teleconferenced meeting, then at the teleconferenced meeting a discussion on which petition meets the criteria of an emergency petition which would require a majority vote of support for each to move forward, this then opens the board up to discuss the full content of the petitions and ask pertinent questions of the Department, to pass any changes the board would again have to vote in majority of support to implement the changes. A high bar but one that will give adequate consideration and fulfill the publics request for clarity and hopefully relief.

Did the board really have the intentions to hinder the ESSN fishery to this high degree while considering the possible gain of only a few thousand kings? Hundreds of thousands of surplus reds will be lost to harvest with values in the millions while managers exceed (10,000 or so over the low bound BEG goal) the goal for kings in the Kenai River. Does that make sense?

We again request relief from the unintended consequences of the actions by voting to hear each petition, discuss in detail and then to make a positive decision for all concerned.

Thank you,

Paul A. Shadura II
sabaka@ptialaska.net
907.252.4290