

Robin Samuelsen's
Testimony To
Alaska Board of Fish
February 2013

Good Afternoon Mr. Chairman and the Board of Fish Members,

My Name is Robin Samuelsen, I am from Dillingham Alaska. I have lived and fished in Bristol Bay my whole life. When I was a kid I setnetted with my grandma's and at the young age I started drift fishing in a skiff. Now days I am teaching my two oldest grandson's on how to drift fish in Bristol Bay. I have sat on the Alaska Board of Fish as well as the NPFMC, been a regulator for 12 years.

This Board of Fish meeting on Area M is like no other Area M meeting, because of the genetic work on Area M. No more guessing, you need to curtail the intercept fishery in both the South and North Peninsula fisheries based on this genetic work. We used to have a harvest in the South Peninsula and Unimak fisheries of 8.3% Bristol Bay fish could be caught. Their used to be a chum cap to protect the AYK, Yukon and Norton Sound chum stocks, now there is no protection for these stocks and sustainable stocks is something of the past, in these areas. The North Peninsula fisheries have expanded areas, like the Outer port Heiden Section that shows an 86% interception rate of Bristol Bay red salmon, reduced mesh sizes, more fishing time. You need to terminalize this fishery closer to Bear and Sandy River. It would be easy, close the Outer Port Heiden Section to all user groups, close the Ilnik Section, close the strogonof Section, and close the Cinder River Section to the south boundary line of Three Hills Section. Make Ilnik River and Cinder section a setnet fishery for both Area M and Bristol Bay setnetters both of these river systems have small escapement. Closing the outside section would do away with the Area M interception of Bristol Bay bound fish.

Proposal 173-oppose-Do not expand a mixed stock fishery

Proposal 174-Modify the Southeastern District Mainland management plan to establish weekly fishing periods from June 10 thru July 10 to gillnet gear, and from July 11 through July 25, establish 48 hour closures to both setnet and seine gear.

Proposal 175-Oppose-This is a mixed stock fishery should not be expanded.

Proposal 179-Support- Reinstate the chum salmon cap and limit fishing time in the South Unimak and Shumagin Islands salmon fisheries. WASSIP shows how large the inception of Bristol Bay salmon is in these fisheries.

Proposal 180-Support-The chum cap protected the AYK, Yukon and Norton Sound chum stocks.

Proposal 181-Support-

Proposal 182-Support- We need to modify these fishing areas because of the inception rates are real high based on WASSIP studies.

Proposal 183-Support-

Proposal 187-Oppose-

Proposal 188-Opposed- Why expand a mixed stock fishery, Place these fishermen in terminal fishing areas.

Proposal 189-Opposed-This is a mixed stock fishery and according to WASSIP high percentage of Bristol Bay sockeye are harvested in this area. Please do not expand a mixed stock fishery.

Proposal 190-Opposed-

Proposal 198-Support-The Board needs to create a terminal fishing areas in the North Peninsula this is a mixed stock fishery affecting Bristol Bay sustainable salmon stocks.

Proposal 199-Support-

Proposal 200-Opposed-

Proposal 201-Support- Close this area, this area should never been opened, it an intercept area. 86% of the sockeye caught in this area are intercepted Bristol Bay salmon.

Proposal 202-Support- However if the village of Port Heiden needs a little more area then I would say give it to them.

Proposal 203- Support

Proposal 204-Support

Proposal 205- Support

Proposal 206-Support

Proposal 207-Support-This area needs to have terminal fisheries

Proposal 208-support

Proposal 196- Oppose- We should never allow this type of gear in the Alaska Peninsula or Bristol Bay

Proposal 209- Support

Proposal 210-Support

Proposal 211- Support

Proposal 176- Opposed-

Proposal 177- Opposed

Proposal 185- Opposed-Immature stocks of salmon should not be caught. With the Area M fishers having smaller mesh sized the immature are being caught.

Proposal 195- Opposed- This is a mixed stock fishery and should not be expanded.

Proposal 197- Support

Bristol Bay

Proposal 250-Opposed- This proposed should have never come up, it makes the BOF look bad by who made the motion, there is a conflict of interest. Stacking setnet permits is not like the drift fleet. In Bristol Bay the drift permits number 1800, we needed to consolidate those numbers and we did it by permit stacking. However in the setnet fishery there are only 1,000 permits and we do not need stacking. CFEC has stated that stacking setnet permits in BB has allowed the owner of two permits income of 80- \$85000.00 and a person with one permit earns 35 to \$40,000.00. The value of setnet permits have gone up to \$46,000.00 while the price of Drift permits have fallen. Please do not pass this proposal.