

Proposal 112:

We support the proposal and see this as a conservation gear restriction on subsistence and commercial fishermen to enhance depleted Chinook salmon stocks, and limits sport fishing during the time of rebuilding the run.

Proposal 113:

We support the proposal for its' merit as in proposal 111, and refer to our comments there.

Proposal 114:

We support the proposal and agree with the proposer that protection of salmon spawning areas with these restrictions, and this is especially for Chinook salmon are critical right now with such low returns.

Proposal 131:

We support the proposal and agree that the majority of the fishermen on the Yukon River drainage want first pulse protection during the Chinook salmon run, because data from when this strategy was adopted we could see there was good escapement throughout the drainage.

Proposal 132:

We feel this proposal needs to be clarified and amended to protect subsistence fishermen. The language is vague and it would be possible to reduce subsistence fishing effort and the customary trade of salmon for the benefit of commercial fishermen only.

Proposal 133:

We oppose this proposal and would like further studies done to ensure there is not impact to very bad Chinook salmon runs, and then allow commercial fishing if there is minimal impact. The proposal is very complex with a lot of Emergency Orders in place, that are already there. We are very concerned that there may be impacts to Chinook salmon in any commercial fishery on the river.

Proposal 134:

We support the proposal and agree that there is some impact to Chinook salmon runs when you take fish from the bottom in the middle of the river. No study has been done to see if those salmon are going into Canada or not, and it would be a good way to see if this idea is supported in conserving Chinook salmon in the future.

Proposal 135:

We oppose the proposal if there is any impact to Chinook salmon runs that are currently not healthy, but we agree with the proposer that smaller mesh will likely enhance Chinook escapement. Further studies need to be done to see that impacts of Chinook are minimal.

Proposal 136

We support the proposal and think that the alternative proposal of eliminating all Chinook harvest on the Yukon may not be supported by all users along the Yukon River. Our concern would be how to assess the CAP, and what we have to compare it too.

Proposal 137:

We support the proposal and agree we need summer Chum salmon escapement goals.

Proposal 138:

We oppose the proposal as the fall Chum salmon are critical to subsistence fishermen who traditionally took Chinook salmon for eating fish, and the fishery needs to be protected.

Proposal 139:

We support this proposal and agree with the Department that making clear regulations will make it easier for all fishermen.

Proposal 140:

We oppose the proposal because if there is a subsistence opportunity with large numbers of fish coming in, windows only will not work. It should be left as it is for now with Chinook salmon numbers so low, and subsistence catch so low and burdensome.

Proposal 141:

We oppose this proposal as there could be violation of commercial fishing with them using their subsistence catch at the same time.

Proposal 142:

We are neutral on this proposal because we supported the majority of fishermen who submitted proposal 131, see our comments on that proposal to protect the first pulse, as a way to protect Chinook salmon.

Proposal 143:

We oppose this proposal because of concerns about subsistence harvest of Fall Chum in the TCC region, and refer our comments to proposal 138.

Proposal 144:

We support the proposal as it is a way to protect declining Chinook salmon runs, and not enough is known about how these fish swimming deep in the middle of the river are going. And we refer to comments on proposal 134.

Proposal 145:

We support this proposal and refer to our comments on proposals 134 and 144.

Proposal 146:

We oppose this proposal because the majority of the fishermen from the TCC region do not have 6-inch or less gear to fish with.

Proposal 147:

We support the proposal to reduce fishermen competition for limited fishing sites in this area of the Yukon River. Because there will be no increased harvest the conservation effort will have minimal impact to declining Chinook salmon stocks.

Proposal 148:

We support the proposal and refer to comments for proposal 147.

Proposal 149:

We oppose this proposal and do not know if there is commercial use of these subsistence catches, and more data needs to be presented for further discussion.

Proposal 150:

We support this proposal because it is an unbiased attempt to give the managers a better handle on subsistence in the TCC region without placing blame on subsistence users. We do need better data on in-season harvest and this is one way the Department and the users can provide managers needed data during the run.

Proposal 151:

We oppose the proposal as it is very complex and we do not see subsistence fishermen anywhere using Chinook salmon for dog food, and a law is in place to prevent it. The intent of the proposer is not clear; and thus, regulations will not be clear if this is adopted.

Proposal 152:

We are neutral on this proposal and do not understand the scientific merit of the proposer in this effort to establish a new fishery.

Proposal 154:

We support proposal 154 and feel that with our Chinook salmon in such a depleted state, that any way we can enhance escapement and spawning will help in the long run. There are other places to fish in the area where sport fishermen can catch fish where the Chinook salmon can be left in peace.

Thank you.

TANANA CHIEFS CONFERENCE



Jerry Isaac  
President

RC40

# Tanana Chiefs Conference

Chief Peter John Tribal Building

122 First Avenue, Suite 600

Fairbanks, Alaska 99701-4897

(907) 452-8251 Fax: (907) 459-3850

January 16, 2013

To: BOF Comments

Boards Support Section  
Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
P.O. Box 115526  
Juneau, AK 99811-5526

FAX: 907-465-6094

## SUBREGIONS

### UPPER KUSKOKWIM

McGrath  
Medfra  
Nikolai  
Takatna  
Telida

### LOWER YUKON

Anvik  
Grayling  
Holy Cross  
Shageluk

### UPPER TANANA

Dot Lake  
Eagle  
Healy Lake  
Northway  
Tanacross  
Tettin  
Tok

### YUKON FLATS

Arctic Village  
Copper River  
Canyon Village  
Chalkyitsik  
Circle  
Fort Yukon  
Venette

### YUKON KOYUKUK

Galena  
Huslia  
Kaitag  
Koyukuk  
Nukato  
Ruby

### YUKON TANANA

Alatna  
Atkasook  
Evansville  
Fairbanks  
Hughes Lake  
Minchumina  
Manley Hot Springs  
Minto  
Nenana  
Rampart  
Stevens Village  
Tanana

## Proposal 95:

We oppose this proposal because a lot of subsistence fishermen throw fish waste in the water to avoid aggressive bear behavior around camps and villages. It is not reasonable to assume it would not cost a great deal to haul fish waste to a landfill where it becomes even more of a bear problem. The proposal should limit the intent of these kinds of proposals to only unethical fish guides and those fishing with guides, and not be put upon those subsistence fishermen who practice their old ways.

## Proposal 97:

We support the proposal for conservation purposes and for continued northern pike subsistence fishing in the area of Innoko River and Paimiut area. The overharvest of northern pike in this area is known to be significant and increasing. This area also uses current sport fishing as a way to subsist and needs to be protected for future generations, as well as for other sport fishing by those who enjoy that part of their life.

## Proposal 98:

We support the proposal with same comments as we provided in Proposal 97.

## Proposal 99:

We support the proposal to meet subsistence needs on the Tanana River, and agree with the Departments assessment of current regulations in the area.

## Proposal 100:

We support the proposal, subsistence should be allowed if these fish are taken.

## Proposal 101:

We oppose the proposal because it deals with a traditional means of catching fish for subsistence in the area.

Proposal 103:

We support the proposal to use the best available data for making decisions in all fisheries within State and Federal waters.

Proposal 104:

▶ We support the proposal with amendments to include all historical data, and not limit to commercial data and rely on only recent data to lower the harvest of subsistence fishermen who have always relied on these fish resources for thousands of years.

Proposal 105:

We support with amendments to allow use of windows in the plan for management of stocks of concern in the Kuskokwim River drainage. The regulations should open the subsistence fishery in a liberal manner to lessen impacts to subsistence fishermen, and be closed by emergency order when escapement is known to be not being met.

Proposal 106:

We support the proposal and agree with the proposer that an OEG is needed before making rampant changes to the Kuskokwim River Salmon Rebuilding Management Plan (Plan). The economic hardship on subsistence fishermen needs to be taken into account as well as having all users sign off on these new goals. We would favor postponement of drainage-wide escapement goals for two years and tributary goals as well, until the Department has good scientific data to establish fair escapement goals in the Plan.

▶ Proposal 109:

We oppose the proposal because it sets up selling subsistence fish that is needed by tribes for food, and gives a profit that only benefits those selling their fish. Any exchange for cash is a commercial enterprise, and this is not customary trade but for profit only.

Proposal 110:

We support the proposal, and this method of gear restriction should only be used until Chinook salmon stocks return to healthy levels. This will cause a huge impact to those fishermen who use the larger mesh nets, and it needs to be further discussed and maybe amended.

Proposal 111:

We support the proposal on its merit, that our beliefs protected by Native American Freedom of Religious Rights are not addressed in these kinds of catch and release fisheries.