

Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee
February, 6th, 2019
Teleconference

I. **Call to Order:** 9:09 a.m.by Mitch Seybert, Chair

II. **Roll Call:**

Members Present: Mitch Seybert, Mike Enright, Tim Enright, ,Brian Cato (until 10:20), Kim Rice, Mary West, John Christiansen, Gerald Olsen Jr., Tracy Vrem, Tom Bursch (arrived 10:20)

Members Absent : Eric Beeman, Mark Kosbruk, Eddie Clark

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 7

List of User Groups Present:

III. **Approval of Agenda:** Tim E moved, Mike E 2nd. Approved unanimously.

IV. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes:**

V **Fish and Game Staff Present:**

Bob Murphy—ADFG North Peninsula
Travis Ellison—ADFG Nak-Kvi
Taryn Oconnor-Brito—LBBAC

VI. **Guests Present:** Gene Sandone—BBEDC

Chuck McCallum—Lake and Pen Borough
Avery Lill—KDLG
Chris Maines—BBNA

Old Business: Staff Comments

Bob Murphy: Got email for Prop 144. Was there one for 145 also?

Mitch S: No

Taryn O: New board meeting sched. One in the book is not accurate.

Gene S: Issue with Prop 145 amendment?.

Bob M: Coordinates not the same line. Latitude is same but not longitude.

When plotted is 3 miles inland. much different line—one is N-S, the other E-W.
144 is N-S, but 145 is a completely different line.

Mitch S: Want both lines East—West. How to fix? So should we make both lines the same?

Gene S: That's what I understand you wanted to do. Write amendments to both proposals and submit?

Bob M: Do you want to use new coordinates in 144 or 145? 144 is simpler but 145 is E-W and more restrictive, but at a stranger angle. We don't currently have E-W lines, but lines are more parallel to beach. In 144 there is 5-8 miles new closed area above Reindeer Cr, area that is currently fishable.

Mitch S: is East-West, or lines at a different angle that normally used, a problem?

Bob M: No, but 145 would draw a boundary box to north of area and make a little sliver of area that would remain open in area you are trying to close. Prop 144 coordinates are cleaner and more straightforward, and your intention is clearer.

Mitch S: So we should use the 144 coordinates for the north line?

Bob M: I can't tell you what to do, but 144 lines are simpler and very straightforward.

Mitch S: Prop 145 lines are straight with the current, though. Maybe we should go N-S. Gene?

Gene S: Think Bob explained it pretty well. E-W is perpendicular to beach, N-S is how all the rest of the boundaries are set, on the longitudinal line.

Mitch S: Protection area for Reindeer Creek?

Bob M: N-S line—creek mouth moves a bit some years, not much. Prop 144 coordinate is south of Reindeer Ck, which would be above in the closed waters in 144.

Mitch S: So it would be protected?

Bob M: If 144 adopted with the proposed coordinates, Reindeer Ck would be in the new closed area.

Mitch S: So we just need to make it the same as 144?

Bob M: Would make it simpler for folks to understand. And sorts out the problem with small sliver of open area, which I know you don't want to leave open.

Mitch S: So that would be an amendment to 145 which we would have to consider.

Bob M: I think putting the coordinates from 144 into 145 would make it easier to understand and less ambiguous. Willing to help write up amendment.

Mitch S: Need to vote now or are we still on public comments?

Taryn O: We've kind of merged into new business, but we should see if anyone has any more public comments.

Mitch S: Anyone else? Chuck?

Chuck M: Looks like AC is on the right track. Make it easy for the public to understand.

Mitch S: Any more comments? Anyone want to bring it to the table, proposal 145 for an amendment? How should we do that?

Taryn O: Make a motion to reconsider

VIII. New Business:

Prop 145

Tim E: move to reconsider 145.

Mike E?: second

Taryn O: Need to vote on the motion to reconsider
Mitch S: All in favor of the reconsidered motion
Motion carried unanimously.
Taryn O: Someone needs to move to amend.
Brian C: Move to amend 145. Tim E, second
Mitch S: Wording?
Gene S: use same coordinates as presented in 144 for northern 145 boundary.
Mitch S: Bob, does that work?
Bob M: Yes
Mitch S: Any more discussion?
Question called on amendment. Carried Unanimously
Taryn O: now you need to vote on 145 as amended.
Vote on amendment to Prop 145 as amended: Carries Unanimously.

Prop 144

Mitch S: Need to vote to reconsider.
Motion to reconsider by Gerald O, 2nd Brian C
Approved unanimously.
Gerald O: Move to amend, Tim E 2nd.
Gene S: Amendment as emailed out before the meeting: this proposal also seeks to reduce fishing time in the Ilnik and OPH sections when the pre-season BB forecast is 30 million fish or less. I believe it will reduce fishing time by about 50%. Does that look right Bob?
Bob M: Looks about right.
Mitch S: Anything to add or take away, anyone? Helps when runs are small in BB and puts burden of conservation on everyone.
Gene S: at present, current regs only restrict fishing in this area when EG North line is pulled in to protect UGA fish. Very late to react to small run strength. Doesn't proscriber any particular action, just states that Comisioner is to take "appropriate actions" .
Bob M: or when Ilnik or Meshik is under escaping. So we also open or close N. Peninsula fisheries based on local abundance.
Gene S: Yes. SW based on Ilnik, NW based on Ilnik and UGA.
Mitch S: Processing (catch limits) during main season in N Pen?
Bob M: Yes, some years, etc.. N Pen has one shore based processor, and also export to King Cove.
Discussion of processing limits, etc by Mitch S and Bob M.
Mitch S: call for vote as amended
Vote Prop 144 as amended—Carries unanimously

Bob M departs

Joint Board Props introduced by Taryn O: No Dept comments. Any questions, I will try to answer, but these are only my understanding. 40 proposals total.
Props 1—11 No Action

Prop 12

Taryn O: No minutes from other ACs on this yet.

Gene S: No minutes, but my notes have Nush AC opposed, Togiak AC supported.

Mitch S: LBBAC very diverse. Members live all over, but are all users. Majority are area residents. Current membership works well. I think majority should be area residents, but other users should be able to be AC members also.

Seems like our current makeup works well

No motion on 12

Props 13–18 No action.

Meeting halted due to phones being down @ 10:20, restarted @ 10:25 with members Mitch, Gerald, Tim, Kim, Mike, John, Mary and Tom.

Props 19–27 No Action.

Prop 28

Tim E moves to adopt, Gerald O 2nd.

Mitch S: Would allow AC to counter new things that come up during deliberation. In favor of proposal.

Tom B: Can't see downside.

Tim E: Concur. For proposal.

Taryn O: Possible proposal inflation, by ACs, just to get some time at the Board table, the only potential downside that I can see. Don't know enough about it to say for sure.

Mitch S: Not voting rights, just comments.

Vote Prop 28—Carries unanimously

Prop 29

Tim E moves to adopt, Gerald O 2nd.

No further discussion. Reference comment on prop 28.

Vote Prop 29—Carries unanimously.

Props 30–40 No Action

Approval of minutes from this meeting.

Mike E motions for Mitch S to approve minutes from this meeting, Tim E 2nd.

Motion carries unanimously.

Recording of minutes and meeting notes by Taryn to be sent to Eric B for drafting of minutes.

Next meeting time to be called at discretion of Chair

Adjournment: 11:00 a.m.

Minutes Recorded By: Eric M Beeman _____
Minutes Approved By: ms [signature] _____
Date: 2/29/17 _____