



Juneau Douglas Advisory Committee
11.5.20
Online Zoom

I. Call to Order: [5:39 pm] by [Kevin Maier]

II. Roll Call:

Members Present: Kevin Maier (Freshwater Charter), Jessie Walker (Sportfish/personal Use) Ed Buyarski, (sportfish/personal use) Peter Robertson (non-consumptive commercial, Thatcher Brouwer, Jason Kolhase, Richard Yamada, Kristine Trott (non-commercial, non-consumptive), Mike Bethers (Hunting, fishing and personal use), Melanie Brown (alternate) Chris Miller (commercial Fishing) Mike Cole (Alternate) Nick Orr (Sport Fishing), Jesse Ross (trapper) Terry White (charter, salt).

Members Absent Atlin Daugherty and Forest Wagner

Members Absent (Unexcused):

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 8

List of User Groups Present: ADFG, Commercial Fish, Sport Fish, Personnel Use, Hatchery.

III. Approval of Agenda: Approved by unanimous consent.

Agenda

According to my admittedly less-than-perfect records, we need to hold elections for the following seats tonight:

- o Designated Seat: Processor (Jason Kolhase)
- o Designated Seat: Sport Fish/Hunting/Personal Use (Jesse Walker)
- o Designated Seat: Commercial Fishing (Forest Wagner)
- o Designated Seat: Charter Fishing – Freshwater (Kevin Maier)
- o Alternates: (Melanie Brown, Mike Cole)

Per our usual practice, if elections are contested, we will ask each candidate to offer a brief statement of interest and then open floor for questions before voting.

- Discussion of BOF Southeast and Yakutat Finfish and Shellfish meeting proposals, with particular focus on: 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 89, 90, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 132, 134-141, 143-148, 150, 155, 171-173, 202, 220, and 223, 225

IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: Previously approved.



V. Fish and Game Staff Present: Annie Bartholomew (ADFG), Dan Teske (ADFG), Dave Love, (ADFG) David Harris (ADFG), Bob Chadwick (ADFG), Andrew Olson (ADFG)

VI. Guests Present: Katie Harms (DIPAC Director),

VII. Old Business:

VIII. New Business:

Elections:

Current Seats up for election

- o Designated Seat: Processor (Jason Kolhase)
- o Designated Seat: Sport Fish/Hunting/Personal Use (Jesse Walker)
- o Designated Seat: Commercial Fishing (Forest Wagner)
- o Designated Seat: Charter Fishing – Freshwater (Kevin Maier)
- o Alternates: (Melanie Brown, Mike Cole)

MINUTES

First Order of Business is Elections:

Current Seats up for election

- o Designated Seat: Processor (Jason Kolhase)
- o Designated Seat: Sport Fish/Hunting/Personal Use (Jesse Walker)
- o Designated Seat: Commercial Fishing (Forest Wagner)
- o Designated Seat: Charter Fishing – Freshwater (Kevin Maier)
- o Alternates: (Melanie Brown, Mike Cole)

Passed unanimous consent to reelect current members.

Kevin Maier: Is it okay if we have elections at the next meeting?

No objection.

Kevin Maier: Do you want to set a time limit?

Yes. Two hours was agreed upon.



Statewide Board of Fish Proposals, Joint Board Proposals and Hatchery Resolution.



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast Alaska Finfish

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
81	Commercial		
Oppose			<p>Dave Harris: This is a mop up proposal. Excess quota is rolled into troll fishery. This would establish a framework for the troll fleet to catch the remaining Chinook quota when it is clear that the other Chinook fisheries will not be able to harvest the king salmon.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: In support of proposal.</p> <p>Kristine Trott: Are there fish present if the fishermen have a difficult time catching them?</p> <p>Dave Harris: The allocation is set under the salmon treaty. If nobody catches them they are gone. This would be a way to maximize the fishery. Yes.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: How did the department do this very thing, this year, without a board proposal? If they catch the quota will it impact sport fishermen?</p> <p>Dave Harris: Special emergency regulations allowed for the department to reallocate the fish this year. It will not impact sport fishermen.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: How accurate is the data coming from the department? What is the danger of the troll fishery overharvesting?</p> <p>Dave Harris: The commercial net fisheries are pretty much done at this time. We can manage the troll fishery very accurately.</p> <p>Dan Teske: Dave is correct, the majority of sport harvest is already complete by September 1. Working on ways to manage and account for in season sport harvest. It is fairly accurate, but trying to get more accurate.</p> <p>Terry White: Why do we harvest them instead of let them go?</p> <p>Dave Harris: They will be unavailable to harvest. If we do not catch them someone else will in British Columbia or Washington. It is not conservation issue. More about the economics of harvesting the resource.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: My concern is protecting the resident sport fishery. I do not mind catching allocation, but do not want it to impact the resident sport fishery.</p> <p>Dan Teske: It would not impact sport fishery. We already have our regulations set.</p> <p>Ed Buyarski: Some conservation concerns? Would not reduce or catch.</p>
	6	8	



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast Alaska Finfish

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			<p>Dave Harris: No, but it is basically forgone catch.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: This proposal would reallocate the fish back to the troll fishery.</p> <p>Dan Teske: It is a timing deal. Most of sport fish have already been caught by September 1. Given the timing, there will be plenty of fish for the winter sport fishery.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: These fish might end up spawning. It is not forgone conclusion that they will be caught.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: What is the difference between proposal 80 and 81?</p> <p>Dave Harris: Proposal 80 is submitted by the department and would help them manage the Chinook fishery based on new treaty agreement.</p> <p>Proposal 81 would allocate the uncaught Chinook quota to the troll fishery after September 1st.</p> <p>Melanie Brown: When does the winter season start and when does the department start counting Chinook for purposes of the quota?</p> <p>Dave Harris: The trollers start harvesting Chinook salmon on October 11 in the winter fishery. These count for the next allocative year.</p> <p>Ed Buyarski called question and Jesse Walker 2nd question.</p>
220			
Support	14	0	<p>Andrew Olson: Allow pot gear to be used in Northern Southeast Inside Chatham Strait fishery. Allow gear to be used, but CFEC would need to be petitioned to allow pots. Pot fishing is allowed in the Gulf of Alaska by the federal fishery managers and pot fishing is allowed in Southern Southeast inside waters by ADFG. Currently some boats need to switch between pot fishing and long lining to fish Chatham for boats that have permits in both areas.</p> <p>Kristine Trott: It seems like it is reasonable.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: In support. Pots are a better method for catching sablefish.</p> <p>Jason Kolhase: Pot fishing is much more efficient. The real difference is in reduced buy catch. This is a no brainer. Makes a lot of sense.</p>



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast Alaska Finfish			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			Andrew Olson: Long line catches more by bycatch. Especially Rockfish and small black cod. Ed Buyarski – Question. Jesse Ross – 2 nd .
221			
S	14	0	Andrew Olson: Proposal would require escape rings in the state fishery to be 3 and ¾ inches. All pots would have the same escape ring size. Thatcher Brouwer: Would this put a burden on the fleet? Andrew Olson: No. This would reduce the size currently used in Southern Southeast and it is easy to reduce size. Jason Kolhase: No requirement in gulf for escape rings and it would not be a big burden for fishermen to decrease size in the State fishery. All fishermen would need to do is purchase smaller escape rings. Question: Jesse Walker and 2 nd Ed Buyarski
223			
S	14	0	Andrew Olson: This would require escape rings in pots used by personal use fishermen. 3 and ¾ inch escape rings is the perfect size based on research done. No proposal to long line pot gear in personal use fishery. Jason Kolhase: Why not allow them to be long lined? Andrew Olson: No one submitted a proposal to allow them to be long line them. Jason Kolhase: Should we amend the proposal to allow long lining of pots by personal use fishermen? Jesse Walker: Would support allowing long lining of pots. Richard Yamada: It would set a bad precedent to change the wording of the proposal. Kevin Maier: We have amended proposals in the past. There is some precedent to amend the proposal. Richard Yamada: It might be a note rather than an amendment. Concerned that it sets bad precedent.



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast Alaska Finfish

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			<p>Jason Kolhase: Okay if we just send comments to board of fish with proposal.</p> <p>Chris Miller: Fine with making the comment if that would be acceptable.</p> <p>Kevin Maier: Proposes that we support proposal 223 with a note that we would prefer to amend the proposal so that pots could be long lined.</p> <p>Kristine Trott: Why would you longline pots?</p> <p>Jesse Walker: Longline the pots would cut down on the amount of line by half.</p> <p>JDAC supported this proposal unanimously</p>
225			
S	14	0	<p>Dan Teske: This would increase the bag and possession limit for the sport fishery for sablefish based on abundance or total allowable catch.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: In 2008 when sport fishing started there was a concern that the sport fishery would take lots of fish. That has not been the case.</p> <p>The average take is about 3% is by the sport fleet in Northern Southeast Alaska black cod quota.</p> <p>This proposal would peg this to some form of abundance.</p> <p>In times of high abundance there would be an increase in bag limits.</p> <p>Andrew Olson: ADFG uses a robust study to estimate the annual harvest objective for NSEI. SSEI they look at trends and do not produce an ABC.</p> <p>As written, this would use the ABC from NSEI to set bag limits.</p> <p>This is an allocative proposal.</p> <p>Jason Kolhase: What is the allowable harvest in Northern Southeast Chatham?</p> <p>Andrew Olson: About 1 million pounds of allowable harvest recently. 2020 was the first year it exceeded 1 million.</p> <p>Jason Kolhase: Concerned about the no annual limit and wanton waste. As it is written I am not going to support this. Irresponsible not to have an annual limit.</p>



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast Alaska Finfish

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			<p>Richard Yamada: This does not change the resident annual limit. It keeps it at status quo.</p> <p>Jason Kolhase: Realizes this is the case, but still opposes the fact that there is no annual limit.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: I see there is confusion based on the way the proposal is written.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: Do you have estimates of sport fishing?</p> <p>Andrew Olson: Yes. We get an estimate from the sport fishery.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: Unguided fishermen do not take very much. Not a big deal.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: It is a lot of work and there is not a lot effort by non-guided resident fishermen.</p> <p>Jessie Ross: Is there a growing interest in this fishery?</p> <p>Richard Yamada: Some guests want to fish for sablefish and others do not. Has been pretty stable. Very niche fishery. In existence for 10 years and we have not seen much increase in the sport fishery.</p> <p>Dan Teske: As written it would put an annual limit on residents. It is incorrectly written. We would flag that. If you were to vote on this and support it you would be putting an annual limit of 8.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: I won't be supporting this as written.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: Not the intent of our organization to put an annual limit on resident sport fishermen.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: I propose we make a comment that we want to strike the annual limit for residents.</p> <p>Peter Robertson: I suggest that we amend the proposal to strike the language about the annual limit for resident anglers.</p> <p>Kevin Maier: We are discussing voting on a proposal that does not include the annual limit of 8 fish for resident anglers included in it. Discussion of the proposal as amended?</p> <p>Jason Kolhase: I am still concerned about the no annual limit. This fishery is maturing and it is irresponsible to not have an annual limit particularly with the pot fishing allowed in the personal use fishery.</p>



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast Alaska Finfish

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			<p>Jesse Walker: This is rod and reel fishery. Not the personal use fishery. Just sport fishing. Not legal to sport fish with a pot.</p> <p>Jason Kolhase: Thank you. This is just sport fish not personal use. I will retract everything I just said.</p> <p>Dan Teske: This proposal just addresses the sport fishery. The rod a reel fishery.</p> <p>Kevin Maier: Just to be clear, pots are not allowed in the personal use fishery?</p> <p>Dan Teske: Correct.</p> <p>Andrew Olson: Pots are only allowed in the personal use and subsistence fishery.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: This is the sport fishery not personal use. The confusion is understandable.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: There is a typo in the proposal. Again it was not our intent to change resident limit.</p> <p>Kevin Maier: I call for unanimous consent to support this proposal as amended to strike the typo of the annual limit for resident sport fishermen.</p> <p>Passed by unanimous consent.</p>

Kevin Maier: I will send a doodle poll regarding the next meeting. We have until April 2, 2021 to get our comments in on these proposals.

Adjournment: Moved to adjourn Kristine Trott 7:27pm.



Minutes Recorded By: Thatcher Brouwer
Minutes Approved By: _____

Date: _____



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game Advisory Committee
11.29.21 – 6:00 pm
Virtual - Zoom

I. Call to Order: 6:00 pm by Kevin Maier, Chair

II. Roll Call

Members Present: Kevin Maier (freshwater charter), Jessie Walker (sportfish/personal use), Chris Miller (commercial fishing) Ed Buyarski, (sportfish/personal use), Peter Robertson (non-consumptive commercial), Thatcher Brouwer (commercial fishing), Richard Yamada (saltwater charter), Kristine Trott (non-commercial, non-consumptive), Mike Bethers (hunting, fishing and personal use), Melanie Brown (alternate), Nick Orr (sport fishing), Jesse Ross (trapper) Terry White (charter, saltwater), Forest Wagner (alternate), Atlin Daugherty (Hunting Guide).

Members Absent: Jason Kolhase,

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 8

List of User Groups Present: ADFG, Commercial Fish, Sport Fish, Personnel Use, Hatchery.

III. Fish and Game Staff Present: Dave Harris, Dan Teske, Dave Love, and Troy Tydingco

IV. Guests Present: Forest Braden (SEAGO), Kathy Hansen (SEAFA), Katie Harms (DIPAC), Aaron Brakel (Public)

V. Approval of Agenda: Ed Buyarski motion and Jesse Walker 2nd. Approved by unanimous consent

VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: Ed Buyarski motion and Jesse Walker 2nd approval of the November 5, 2020 minutes. Approved by unanimous consent

VII. Reports

- a. Chair's report: Thanked Nick Orr for attending, and reporting the recent Regional Advisory Council meeting and explaining the potential impacts to southeast residents and how to participate. Currently there is a Board of Fisheries meeting in Ketchikan scheduled to start on January 4, 2022. Board Support has funds to send a representative from the advisory committee. Please let me know if you are interested.
- b. ADF&G
- c. Others



- VIII. Public Comment
- IX. Old Business
- X. New Business: Board of Fisheries Proposals
- XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting
- XII. Set next meeting date: Please see doodle poll.
- XIII. Other: Send priority proposals to Kevin.
- XIV. Adjourn



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
82	Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to align with the provisions of the 2019–2028 Pacific Salmon Treaty annex, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
No Action Motion: Mike Bethers Second: Jesse Ross	15	0	<p>Dan Teske: Intent of proposal from the Department is to align regulations with recently adopted Pacific Salmon Treaty. To calculate king salmon abundance the treaty team is now using a CPUE model based on the winter troll fishery in district 113. Previously an abundance index was calculated based on a number of factors. With the latest Pacific Salmon Treaty agreement there was also a 7.5% reduction and pay back provisions if the State exceeds its overall allocation. The tiers from the old abundance index do not fit with new model.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: This is a house keeping proposal.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: has concerns with this proposal.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: This proposal using historic averaging and does not give preference to charter sector in years of low abundance.</p> <p>Jesse Ross: Complicated.</p> <p>Atlin Daugherty: Complicated. We should to take no action.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: I support taking no action.</p> <p>Peter Robertson: Support department.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: Support taking no action. Discussion about going back to historic allocations. I would like to restore some sort of stability for the charter fishery.</p> <p>Melanie Brown: We have only been considering sport and commercial sector. Subsistence should come first according to constitution. Do not forget about the people who fished before us.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: Some of these proposals address resident priority.</p>



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
83	Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for an average sport harvest of 20% of the sport/troll allocation with commensurate regulations addressing sport fishery overages in the commercial troll fishery, as follows:		
No Action Motion: Mike Bethers Second: Jesse Ross	15	0	<p>Dan Teske: This Southeast Alaska Guides Organization proposal seeks adjust allocation depending on abundance to prevent in season closures for the charter sector. In years of low abundance, the charter sector would get fish from the commercial troll sector. The opposite would occur in years of high abundance. This is an allocative proposal.</p> <p>Terry White. Does this include hatcheries. ADFG: No</p> <p>Richard Yamada. This would help remedy a problem for the charter sector in years of low abundance.</p> <p>Ed Buyarski: How would this impact fisheries?</p> <p>Dan Teske: in 2020 low effort and in 2021 CPUE way up. Very difficult for the department to predict how this would impact fisheries.</p> <p>Kristine Trott: How do you justify keeping it open for residents and prevent overharvest?</p> <p>Dan Teske: We manage for sustained yield. Shut down fisheries if there is concern.</p> <p>After this discussion on both proposals 82 and 83 a decision was made to take no action on both proposals.</p>
84	Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to ensure no closure of the resident king salmon fishery due to allocation concerns, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
Support Motion by Thatcher Brouwer	9	4	1 Abstention. This proposal would give the department the tools it needs to manage the resident sport fishery so that it is not shut down. The author directs the department to manage the fishery so that the nonresident guided sector does not take the quota early in the season, thus preventing the resident king salmon fishery from being closed prematurely. Does the department have the tools they need? Dan Teske: The guided sportfishing sector is currently required to report weekly by electronic means. It takes a couple weeks to process the reports. In the Department's opinion, it would be difficult for the operators to report daily and for the department to tabulate the data. Richard Yamada: Concerned with increased reporting. Terry White: I oppose this. Do not see need for daily reporting.
<u>85</u>	Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a resident priority by implementing closed periods and reducing bag limits for nonresidents, as follows:		
Support Motion: Jesse Walker Second: Mike Bethers	10	3	1 abstention This proposal seeks to allow resident priority, by requiring the department to adjust bag limits for nonresidents if they think king salmon sport harvest will be exceeded. Similar to proposal 84.
<u>86</u>	Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a resident priority by implementing closed periods and reducing bag limits for nonresidents, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
Support Motion: Mike Bethers Second: Chris Miller	10	3	1 abstention Another proposal that seeks to ensure resident priority for king salmon by asking the department to adjust bag limits for nonresidents if they expect the king salmon quota to be exceeded. Currently there is a potential for the nonresident guided sector to take the full sport quota in June in primarily outside waters. If this happens the resident fishery would close. Mike Bethers: I urge the committee to support the proposal.
87	Make numerous changes to management of commercial troll and sport fisheries for king salmon in Southeast Alaska, as follows:		
			Did not consider.
88	Amend the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan to manage for a sliding sport allocation between 16 and 24 percent with commensurate commercial troll fishery allocation modification under commercial regulation, as follows:		
			Did not consider
89	Allow the use of two additional fishing lines during periods of king salmon nonretention in all of the Southeast-Yakutat area if there is more than one CFEC power troll permit holder on board the vessel, as follows:.		



Support Motion: Thatcher	7	6	3 Abstentions <p>Dave Harris: This proposal would allow commercial trollers to use 6 lines during periods of Chinook non-retention if the vessel was operated with two troll permits. Currently trollers are limited to 4 lines east of Cape Spencer and are only allowed to fish 6 lines west of Cape Spencer outside of 3 miles. Permit stacking is allowed in other fisheries.</p> <p>Ed Buyarski: How often do commercial fishermen need to report? Do fishermen need to report?</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: Commercial fishing catch is reported at time of delivery and the department coordinates a call in program when they are assessing run strength.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: I am concerned impact to other fish species/fisheries.</p> <p>Aaron Brakel: This proposal could have a potential negative impact on communities by allowing for permit consolidation.</p> <p>Forest Wagner: I support status quo.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: Concerned about impact to kings as bycatch. Supportive of proposal as long as it does not increased in bycatch.</p> <p>Dave Harris: No information on incidental king salmon catch rates.</p> <p>Nick Orr: Support.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: Do not support. Permits not currently being fished will be bought up and this proposal will increase effort in the troll fleet.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: I support this proposal. It could potentially allow trollers to earn a little more. Nobody is building new trollers. Currently there is not a lot of money in this fishery. This proposal could benefit the fleet and make the troll fishery more viable.</p>
90	Change trigger to from an annual abundance index (AI) number to a District 13 early-winter power troll CPUE tier, as follows:		
No Action Motion:	15	0	Dave Harris: This proposal would adjust when king salmon are added to the spring troll fishery to a tier 3 or above with



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
Thatcher Brouwer Second: Nick Orr			<p>the CPUE model currently being used to set quota. It would potentially add fish to the spring fishery.</p> <p>Concerns that it could potentially increase the quota during the spring fishery when there is a greater chance of catching Southeast stocks of concern.</p> <p>Members felt that it is a complex proposal dealing with Pacific Salmon Treaty and opted to take no action.</p>

Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: _____
Minutes Approved By: _____
Date: _____



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game Advisory Committee
12.13.21 – 6:00 pm
Virtual - Zoom

I. Call to Order: 6:00 pm by Kevin Maier, Chair

II. Roll Call

Members Present: Kevin Maier (freshwater charter), Jesse Walker (sportfish/personal use), Chris Miller (commercial fishing), Ed Buyarski, (sportfish/personal use), Peter Robertson (non-consumptive commercial), Thatcher Brouwer (commercial fishing), Richard Yamada (saltwater charter), Kristine Trott (non-commercial, non-consumptive), Mike Bethers (hunting, fishing and personal use), Melanie Brown (alternate), Nick Orr (sport fishing), Jesse Ross (trapper), Forest Wagner (alternate), Atlin Daugherty (Hunting Guide).

Members Absent: Jason Kolhase (processing), Terry White (charter, saltwater),

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 8

List of User Groups Present: ADFG, Commercial Fish, Sport Fish, Personnel Use

III. Fish and Game Staff Present: Christy Tibbles, Dave Harris, Dan Teske, Dave Love

IV. Guests Present: Mike Riederer, Commercial Fishing.

V. Approval of Agenda: Motion by Ed Buyarski and Seconded Jesse Walker. Passed by unanimous consent.

VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: Thatcher Brouwer has been on vacation and has not had an opportunity to finish the minutes.

VII. Reports

- a. Chair's report: Terry White and Thatcher Brouwer have expressed interest and ability in attending Board of Fisheries meeting. Terry should be available tomorrow and we will discuss it then.
- b. ADF&G
- c. Others

VIII. Public Comment

IX. Old Business

X. New Business: Board of Fisheries Proposals



- XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting
- XII. Set next meeting date: December 14, 2021 at 6:00 pm
- XIII. Other:
- Adjourn: 8:52 pm.

Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
110	Require reporting and recovery of lost drift gillnet gear, as follows:		



SUPPORT Motion: Jesse Walker Second: Mike Bethers	12	1	<p>1 Abstention</p> <p>Dave Harris: It would establish a regulation that would require a permit holder to report a lost gillnet within 12 hours. A companion proposal would also be necessary to require permit holder to mark net. Department is neutral. Reporting requirement would be unenforceable without marking requirement.</p> <p>Kristine Trott: Is there an additional requirement to mark gillnet with ownership?</p> <p>Atlin Daugherty: There are not too many nets left out in the water. Most of the time you can salvage the net. I am not a fan of regulation.</p> <p>Peter Robertson: This regulation as proposed is worthless as written since it does not require marking. Would it not be better to require marking of nets.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: Under impression marking would go hand in hand with this proposal. I am in favor. Gear should be marked and reported.</p> <p>Nick Orr: I support.</p> <p>Michael Riederer: Difficult to make repairs with new requirement. Do not want to set our self-up for failure. As long as it not setting us up for failure.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: Any information from Bristol Bay on how often it is used?</p> <p>Dave Harris: No. I do not know. Greater likelihood of losing a net in Bristol Bay.</p> <p>Chris Miller: Not that onerous of a requirement to mark net. I am in support of proposal.</p> <p>Forest Wagner: I would reiterate would Chris Miller said. I am for this proposal.</p> <p>Melanie Brown: Cork marking is not a hardship. It is good to have a reporting requirement.</p> <p>Jesse Walker . Called question and Mike Bethers Seconded.</p>
<u>111</u>	Change the maximum drift gillnet mesh size during periods established by emergency order from 6 inches to 6 and one-eighth inches, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals

January 4-15, 2022 | Ketchikan, AK

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/N o Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
OPPOSE Question Chris Miller Second Ed Buyarski	4	6	4 Abstentions Atlin Daugherty: Nets can stretch and this would allow fishermen to relax about net size because of increase by an 1/8 inch of allowable net size from 6 inch to 6 and 1/8 inch. Dave Harris: This could increase incidental catch of king salmon. Two citations for nets greater than six inches in past 5 years. The Department opposes this proposal. Atlin Daugherty: I do not think people will buy 6 and 1/8 inch net and I do not think you will catch more kings with a larger net. Jesse Walker: Is there a case of troopers issuing a ticket for a net that has stretched? Dave Harris: No. Thatcher Brouwer: Do they stretch? Dave Harris: They do stretch, but people have not been ticketed. Atlin Daugherty: They do stretch, and has heard that at least one person was cited when they thought they have a 6 inch net. Nick Orr: If everyone was so worried about net size, maybe they should order smaller nets. Atlin Daugherty: Sometimes there is a 6 inch minimum so it would not make sense to order a smaller net. I am in support.
112	Provide the department authority to allow drift gillnets of up to 90 meshes in depth to be used in the District 11 drift gillnet fishery beginning in SW 34, as follows:		



OPPOSE Question Kevin Maier	4	6	3 Abstentions Dave Harris: In District 11 fishermen could use deeper gillnets that are approximately 50 percent deeper. There are specific harvest agreements necessary to abide by recent Pacific Salmon Treaty. Department is neutral on allocation, but opposes deeper nets based on increased catch potentially for transboundary fish. Concerns about CPUE with the new net depth. It would complicate matters. Mike Bethers: How many more incidental king salmon will we harvest if this proposal is to be adopted. Dave Harris: Very minimal king salmon bycatch at the time of the coho fishery. But could impact other stocks. Atlin Daugherty: What is the Department response. What has the coho escapement been? Dave Harris: Neutral on Taku river area, but opposes use in other areas. Escapement above range of 75,000 coho this year. Jesse Walker: I am going to oppose. Michael Riederer: I support. Mike Bethers: I oppose. Concerns about stocks of concern. Kristine Trott: Groundfish bycatch? Dave Harris: Very small amount of groundfish bycatch. Atlin Daugherty: Very minimal groundfish bycatch. Richard Yamada: What conditions need to be right for gillnetters to deploy deeper net? Dave Harris: The department has not worked out hard numbers when it would be triggered. As written, it would be for times of high coho abundance.
<u>113</u>	Change the maximum mesh size during periods established by emergency order from 6 inches to a range of five and one-quarter to 6 inches and define dates in Districts 6, 8 and 11 when the mesh size will be implemented, as follows:		
OPPOSE Question: Jesse Walker	13	0	Dave Harris: Add a mesh size restriction at the discretion of department. Could add additional mess size restriction, but does specify size. Currently use mess size restrictions of 6 inch max or



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
Called question.			<p>minimum. Department opposes this proposal. Does not feel it is necessary.</p> <p>Nick Orr: I oppose this proposal.</p> <p>Michael Riederer: Would this potentially help fishermen retain fishing time if Department could allow another mesh size?</p> <p>Dave Harris: This would not allow much more fishing size.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: Would this help protect Taku and Stikine stocks?</p> <p>Dave Harris: This proposal could reduce incidental mortality, but could also increase time for gillnetters.</p> <p>Chris Miller: Oppose. Reduction in mesh size does eliminate take of kings. Smaller mesh still catches kings.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: Concern that kings are smaller and smaller mesh could also catch kings. I do not know what the real effect is going to be.</p> <p>Atlin Daugherty: Support Chris Millers comments</p>
114	Allow the use of fishing rods in conjunction with downriggers by hand trollers, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals

January 4-15, 2022 | Ketchikan, AK

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
OPPOSE Question Chris Miller Second Mike Bethers	3	9	2 Abstentions Dave Harris: Allow use of downrigger with fishing rod by hand troller. Increase efficiency for hand trollers. Harvest could increase and could even increase number of permits being fished. Could make it more difficult for enforcement. Department is neutral on this allocative proposal. Mike Bethers: This would allow more king salmon to be caught. Do not see need for this. Thatcher Brouwer: The number of king salmon available to be caught is set. This will not increase harvest. Atlin Daugherty: Hand trollers are allowed to run multiple hooks off a single line. Ricahrd Yamada: When would this be allowed? Dave Harris: This would be allowed throughout the season. Jesse Walker: Would you see guides buying hand troll permits? Thatcher Brouwer: Yes. Currently happening. Recent citation for someone doing this and failing to report catch.
<u>115</u>	Modify the start date of the winter troll fishery, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
OPPOSE	1	13	<p>Dave Harris: Winter fishery would start on Stat week 31 rather than October 11. Would increase fishing days. Potentially change CPUE and abundance index ratio in Pacific Salmon Treaty. In 2018 the Department limited the winter fishery to protect stocks of concerns. The department opposes proposal. This would add days to the CPUE assessment period. Department is neutral on allocative aspect of proposal.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: Would this proposal impact stocks of concern? Is there a way to recalculate the CPUE?</p> <p>Dave Harris: This would change metric. It would be difficult to recalculate it. Would not be comparing apples to apples. Changing number of days would be challenging. Each year is different based on stat week. If this proposal increased overall quota it could impact transboundary stocks.</p> <p>Nick Orr: This would mess up Pacific Salmon Treaty. I oppose.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: I oppose this. Common sense is that there are more fish available at this time.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: We should be very careful with this. I think there could be more transboundary fish at this time</p>
116	Require retention of king salmon caught during periods of nonretention to be retained if they are deemed too injured to be released and set price at one dollar for selling retained fish, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals

January 4-15, 2022 | Ketchikan, AK

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/ No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
OPPOSE Question Chris Miller Second Mike Bethers	0	14	Dave Harris: This would allow retention of king salmon during periods of non-retention. This would decrease value. Incidental mortalities are accounted for. The department opposes this proposal. This would reduce traditional harvest targets and increase harvest of Southeast stocks. Without size limits this would destabilize Pacific Salmon Treaty. Mike Bethers: You cannot tell whether or not a fish is going to make it. Tag recoveries from seemingly injured fish. I oppose.
<u>117</u>	Allow trollers the use of two additional fishing lines in designated chum troll fishing areas in August and September, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
<u>118</u>	Modify the boundaries of Districts 6 and 8 in Sumner Strait, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
<u>119</u>	Create a new section in District 6 and reimplement the Section 6-D Pink Salmon Management Plan, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
<u>120</u>	Remove Section 6-D closure to fishing with drift gillnet gear during the month of August, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
<u>121</u>	Establish waters closed to commercial drift gillnet fishing in and around Coffman Cove, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
<u>122</u>	Northern Southeast seine salmon fishery management plans -- Remove sunset date so regulation remains in effect, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
<u>123</u>	Remove the sunset date so regulation remains in effect and change effective end date of the plan from July 22 to July 15, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
<u>124</u>	Establish additional guidelines for the department to manage the District 12 purse seine fishery north of Point Marsden, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
276	Allow for the retention of salmon during periods of commercial nonretention when the sport fishery in the area is open for that species, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
125	Clarify language for subsistence take of coho and king salmon, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
126	Repeal net tending requirement in Yakutat Bay, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
127	Repeal net tending requirement in Yakutat Bay, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
128	Allow use of set gillnets in all Southeast Alaska area subsistence salmon fisheries, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
129	Modify closed waters and remove coho salmon annual limit for the Klawock River, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
130	Modify fishing times and locations for subsistence salmon fishery in the Klawock River and Lake, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
131	Modify fishing area and add hand purse seine as legal gear for the Redoubt Bay and Lake subsistence salmon fishery, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
132	Prohibit the use of spears in Redoubt Bay and Lake subsistence fishery from June 21 to August 1, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
133	Allow the use of seine and gillnet gear in the waters of Redoubt Bay that are open to commercial salmon fishing, as follows:		
134	Prohibit obstructing more than half of the stream, creek, or river when personal use fishing, as follows:		



SUPPORT AS AMENDED BY AC Motion: Thatcher Brouwer Second: Nick Orr Amended Motion: I move that we support with the inclusion of subsistence fishery. And exclude terminal harvest areas.		<p>Dave Harris: This would prohibit personal use from obstructing more than half of waterway. Some areas already have restrictions, but not all. The Department is neutral on proposal. Could prevent excessive harvest and allow opportunity for more, however, the salmon fishery has been managed sustainably. Department supports if proposal 126 were to pass.</p> <p>Ed Buyarski: Can we amend or recommend an amendment to apply to both personal use and subsistence?</p> <p>Dave Harris: The state manages subsistence fishery on state lands/waters. Federal government manages subsistence fisheries on federal lands/waters.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: An individual fisherman or permit holder could not obstruct stream? What about a case where two permit holders block off more than half of the river.</p> <p>Dave Harris: I believe it is one intended for a single permit holder.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: Seems like a common sense proposal. I support.</p> <p>Kristine Trott: How do you keep the stream open when there are multiple people with permits blocking a portion of the stream?</p> <p>Dave Harris: The intent is to prevent any one harvestor from blocking the stream or waterway. You cannot escape the situation. When you have multiple people fishing there is some gap between nets.</p> <p>Nick Orr: In support with exception of sweetheart creek.</p> <p>Peter Robertson: What gear types are we talking about. Some gear types are more effective. Only in relation to stream size. Concern that would limit personal use fisheries.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: The idea is sound. In concept I support this proposal and should pertain to both subsistence and personal use.</p> <p>Atlin Daugherty: I agree with Mike.</p> <p>Ed Buyarski: Recommend that we support for both Personal Use and subsistence.</p> <p>Dave Harris in Response to Kristine Trott: This also pertains to other manmade objects.</p>
---	--	--



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/N o Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
			<p>Nick Orr: I would like to amend this proposal to exclude Sweetheart Creek.</p> <p>Peter Robertson: What about a log or manmade dam obstruction river?</p> <p>Richard Yamada: Do we need to go back to the original proposal?</p> <p>Chris Miller: We can pass the amended proposal.</p> <p>Ed Buyarski: I agree.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: That is fine.</p>
135	Allow permits to be issued for the personal use taking of king and coho salmon, as follows:		
OPPOSE Question Jesse Walker Second Mike Bethers	0	14	<p>Dave Harris: If this proposal was adopted. It would reallocate fish to personal use fisheries. Currently salmon are fully allocated. Harvest limits are set by Pacific Salmon Treaty. Opposes issuance of permits for personal use king and coho salmon.</p> <p>Nick Orr: Does anyone want to support this? Seems like these are fully allocated fisheries.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: This proposal has been proposed for many years.</p>
136	Include commercial harvested salmon to fish that may not be possessed on the same day sport or personal use salmon are taken, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
OPPOSE Question Mike Bethers Second Chris Miller	0	14	Dave Harris: Commercial fishermen have always been allowed to retain a portion of their catch for personal use. This would prohibit a commercial fishermen from retaining personal use fish. Nick Orr: I do not understand. I do not support Jesse Walker: A solution in search of a problem.
137	Prohibit personal use proxy permits at Sweetheart Creek, as follows:		



OPPOSE Question Jesse Walker Second Chris Miller	3	5	6 Abstention <p>Dave Harris: This proposal would mean fishermen are not allow harvest of fish by proxy in sweetheart creek. The department is neutral on this allocative proposal. The board has the authority to restrict proxy fishing. No biological concerns.</p> <p>Nick Orr: This is a small area and it is a big deal that people are fishing proxies and the rest of the fishermen do not have opportunity. Limits other people's opportunity.</p> <p>Melanie Brown: Why do you apply this to sweetheart creek only?</p> <p>Nick Orr. I am familiar with this fishery and I am not familiar with other fisheries. It is a long way to go and not have an opportunity to fish.</p> <p>Richard Yamada. State has allowed proxy fishing with good intent. May be abused in this situation, but generally a good idea.</p> <p>Nick Orr. It is not about abuse, but there are limited spots on the creek.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: I understand problem. Maybe we could word it so that someone could not fish their own permit and the proxy permit on the same day.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: I am inclined to support this proposal if it was only for the weekend.</p> <p>Jesse Ross: People are abusing this fishery. Maybe there should be an annual limit? Some people are not utilizing fish they catch. Maybe you can limit the time you can fish.</p> <p>Chris Miller: What are the harvest numbers of proxy permit numbers? Perhaps we can reduce number of fish permits</p> <p>Dave Harris: Annual harvest about 4,000 fish with about 230 permits and about 175 proxy fish by 12 permits.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: I am inclined to oppose this proposal. It is not a problem.</p> <p>Kristine Trott: Is this fishery enforced?</p> <p>Dave Harris: The State Wildlife Troopers stop by when they are in the area.</p>
---	----------	----------	--



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/N o Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
			Atlin Daugherty: Terminal harvest area. The fish are there to be caught. I support status quo. Nick Orr: Not a conservation issue. Fairness issue.
138	Create salmon personal use fisheries in marine waters of the Juneau Management Area, as follows:		
OPPOSE Motion to Oppose Richard Yamada Second Chris Miller			<p>Proposal 138 – 141</p> <p>Dave Harris: There are 4 proposals that are similar. 138-141. These would establish new marine personal use fishery in the for Sockeye in the Juneau area. If these proposals were adopted there would be conservation concerns about populations of sockeye. These fish are fully allocated both domestically and as part of the Pacific Salmon Treaty. The department is neutral on allocative nature of proposal. Conservation concerns with fisheries on road system.</p> <p>Dave Harris: Some of these proposals would have Pacific Salmon Treaty implications.</p> <p>Dave Harris: Species compensation of a personal use fishery would be similar to commercial catch. Approximately 15% of catch.</p> <p>Dave Harris: An area would need to be established to reduce conflict with existing fisheries.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: I propose we group these proposals and for the reasons mentioned by Dave Harris we oppose these proposals.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: I move that we reject these proposals. Chris Miller 2nd.</p>
139	Modify where personal use fishing can occur in the Taku River to include all of Section 11-B and remove dates when the fishery can occur, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals

January 4-15, 2022 | Ketchikan, AK

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/N o Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
OPPOSE Motion to Oppose Richard Yamada Second Chris Miller			<p>Proposal 138 – 141</p> <p>Dave Harris: There are 4 proposals that are similar. 138-141. These would establish new marine personal use fishery in the for Sockeye in the Juneau area. If these proposals were adopted there would be conservation concerns about populations of sockeye. These fish are fully allocated both domestically and as part of the Pacific Salmon Treaty. The department is neutral on allocative nature of proposal. Conservation concerns with fisheries on road system.</p> <p>Dave Harris: Some of these proposals would have Pacific Salmon Treaty implications.</p> <p>Dave Harris: Species compensation of a personal use fishery would be similar to commercial catch. Approximately 15% of catch.</p> <p>Dave Harris: An area would need to be established to reduce conflict with existing fisheries.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: I propose we group these proposals and for the reasons mentioned by Dave Harris we oppose these proposals.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: I move that we reject these proposals. Chris Miller 2nd.</p>
<u>140</u>	Add section 11-B as a personal use salmon fishing area when the area is closed to the commercial drift gillnet fishery, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
OPPOSE Motion to Oppose Richard Yamada Second Chris Miller			<p>Proposal 138 – 141</p> <p>Dave Harris: There are 4 proposals that are similar. 138-141. These would establish new marine personal use fishery in the for Sockeye in the Juneau area. If these proposals were adopted there would be conservation concerns about populations of sockeye. These fish are fully allocated both domestically and as part of the Pacific Salmon Treaty. The department is neutral on allocative nature of proposal. Conservation concerns with fisheries on road system.</p> <p>Dave Harris: Some of these proposals would have Pacific Salmon Treaty implications.</p> <p>Dave Harris: Species compensation of a personal use fishery would be similar to commercial catch. Approximately 15% of catch.</p> <p>Dave Harris: An area would need to be established to reduce conflict with existing fisheries.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: I propose we group these proposals and for the reasons mentioned by Dave Harris we oppose these proposals.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: I move that we reject these proposals. Chris Miller 2nd.</p>
<u>141</u>	Add section 11-B as a personal use salmon fishing area when the area is closed to the commercial drift gillnet fishery, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
OPPOSE Motion to Oppose Richard Yamada Second Chris Miller			<p>Proposal 138 – 141</p> <p>Dave Harris: There are 4 proposals that are similar. 138-141. These would establish new marine personal use fishery in the for Sockeye in the Juneau area. If these proposals were adopted there would be conservation concerns about populations of sockeye. These fish are fully allocated both domestically and as part of the Pacific Salmon Treaty. The department is neutral on allocative nature of proposal. Conservation concerns with fisheries on road system.</p> <p>Dave Harris: Some of these proposals would have Pacific Salmon Treaty implications.</p> <p>Dave Harris: Species compensation of a personal use fishery would be similar to commercial catch. Approximately 15% of catch.</p> <p>Dave Harris: An area would need to be established to reduce conflict with existing fisheries.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: I propose we group these proposals and for the reasons mentioned by Dave Harris we oppose these proposals.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: I move that we reject these proposals. Chris Miller 2nd.</p>



Juneau Douglas Fish and Game Advisory Committee
12.14.21 – 6:00 pm
Virtual - Zoom

- I. Call to Order: 6:00 pm by Kevin Maier, Chair
- II. Roll Call. Members Present: Kevin Maier (freshwater charter), Jesse Walker (sportfish/personal use), Chris Miller (commercial fishing) Ed Buyarski, (sportfish/personal use), Peter Robertson (non-consumptive commercial), Thatcher Brouwer (commercial fishing), Richard Yamada (saltwater charter), Mike Bethers (hunting, fishing and personal use), Melanie Brown (alternate), Nick Orr (sport fishing), Jesse Ross (trapping), Atlin Daugherty (Hunting Guide), Terry White (charter, saltwater),

Members Absent: Jason Kolhase (processing), Forest Wagner (alternate)

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 8

List of User Groups Present: ADFG, Commercial Fish, Sport Fish, Personnel Use

- III. Fish and Game Staff Present: Scott Forbes, Dan Teske, Dave Love, Adam Messmer
- IV. Guests Present:
- V. Approval of Agenda: Chris Miller motion and Mike Bethers second. Passed by unanimous consent.
- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
- VII. Reports
 - a. Chair's report: Board of Game proposals need to be considered and proposals for Southeast Board of Game cycle are due in May. In particular the Department has asked us to host a discussion on Douglas island deer hunt and wolf management.
 - b. ADFG
 - c. Others
- VIII. Public Comment
- IX. Old Business
- X. New Business: Board of Fisheries Proposals



- XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting: Thatcher Brouwer has expressed interest in representing the AC in Ketchikan. Thatcher Brouwer noted that he understand the role he has as an AC representative. Representation approved by unanimous consent.
- XII. Set next meeting date: To Be Determined by Doodle Poll
- XIII. Other: Nick Orr: Is there interest on the AC in the herring proposal?. Kevin Maier: They could have been mine. Scott Forbes: This issue is in litigation. I will not be able to provide a lot. Nick Orr: I see this as a Sitka issue. Kevin Maier: Historically we have talked to them. There are permit holders that live in Juneau. We could bracket them and move to the bottom of agenda. Chris Miller: I agree with Kevin. Motion by Chris Miller and seconded by Mike Bethers to move proposals 156 – 158 to the bottom of agenda. Passed by unanimous consent.

Adjourn: Kristine Trott and Mike Bethers second.

Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
143	Require inseason reporting of nonresident sport fish harvest, as follows:		



OPPOSE Question: Ed Buyarski Second: Mike Bethers	9	4 Abstentions. David Love: There are several proposals that you could take up all at once. 143, 145, 146 and 147. They are all about nonresident bag and possession limits. Dan Teske: Proposal 143 would require logbook for finfish and shellfish. New logbook program and is duplicative to what is already being done. Proposal 145 would reduce nonresident possession limits and establish annual limits. Proposal 146 would reduce bag and possession limits. Proposal 147 limits coho salmon bag and possession in fresh water between Cape Fairweather and Dixon Entrance. Chris Miller: 143 does not impact bag and possession limits. Kevin Maier and Department: Agree. We will consider 143 separately. Nick Orr: Is this a problem? Regulation in search of a problem. Mike Bethers: Submitted by southeast subsistence. Not sure what information are they trying to gather. Unnecessarily burden on department. Thatcher Brouwer: Can you comment on timeliness and accuracy of reporting. Daniel Teske: Four different programs to measure effort. Mail out survey. Creole survey. Electronic charter log book. Shrimp permit effort and harvest information. Each of these are used in tandem to estimate harvest. This proposal would duplicate efforts and would not lead to any timelier information. Peter Robertson: How would catch rates be monitored for non-compliant anglers or unguided rental boat anglers? Dan Teske: Does not account for non-compliant anglers but survey is pretty extensive. Peter Robertson: What about unguided rental boat anglers who dock at a private dock. Dan Teske: Correct no captured in creole survey, but information is captured in mail out survey. Jesse Walker: Department is not interested in proposal. Not Necessary. I am going to vote no.
--	----------	---



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
144	Establish a logbook program for rental vessels used in Southeast Alaska sport fisheries, as follows:		

DRAFT



SUPPORT Question: Chris Miller Second: Nick Orr	10	3	<p>Dan Teske. Department logbook for non-guided nonresident sport anglers using rental vessels. Currently no definition of rental vessel definitions. Logbooks are only required in guided marine sport fishery.</p> <p>Richard Yamada: We discussed this at North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. Council wanted registration, but did not go through process. The vessel rental model has been growing. No reason could not start on state side even though it is being done on federal side. I am not in support proposal as written, but I would support defining this type of anger using rental vessels. Could this legally be done by department? What this need to be a separate proposal to define what an angler is? Understand intent. But not in favor as written.</p> <p>Daniel Teske: The process would be a collaborative effort between Departments of Fish and Game, Public Safety, Law and Board of Fisheries to come up with a definition.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: Is the Department accurately accounting for fish caught by non-resident anglers renting boats.</p> <p>Dan Teske: The halibut issue is federal. The Department would like to leave it up to the federal regulatory agencies.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: What about king salmon.</p> <p>Dan Teske: Still captured in creole survey and mail in survey.</p> <p>Nick Orr. It is an issue we all recognize. In support of proposal.</p> <p>Chris Miller: I would move that we amend this proposal to include salmon as well. This is an issue in Southeast. Worth having conservation.</p> <p>Kevin Maier: This proposal captures all non-resident, unguided sportfishermen.</p> <p>Chris Miller: No need to amend.</p> <p>Daniel Teske: For salmon, the bag limit is the same for both guided and unguided non-resident anglers.</p> <p>Mike Bethers: This mainly has to do with the definition. The Department is getting the information. This would require additional, duplicative paperwork.</p> <p>Kristine Trott: Response rate for mail out survey is low.</p>
--	-----------	----------	---



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/ No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
			<p>Dan Teske: The survey is scientifically rigorous and data is only used if it is statistically significant. All three programs are rigorous and comfortable is comfortable with the data that they receive.</p> <p>Atlin Daugherty: In support of proposal. The industry is moving this way.</p> <p>Chris Miller: What is response rate for survey?</p> <p>Dan Teske: Anything that is reported, has undergone a biometric review. Outliers are accounted for.</p> <p>Chris Miller: Rough estimate of estimate of response rate for survey.</p> <p>Dan Teske: I estimate response rate of 10-20 percent. The shrimp survey response rate is higher.</p> <p>Dave Love: Better than 30% for statewide harvest survey.</p> <p>Terry White: This is an unfair playing field for operators in terms of halibut. Lots of boats. No creole census on private dock. No logbook for unguided non-resident anglers. Support.</p> <p>Peter Robertson: Survey is relying on self-reporting. Issues of recall of catch. Do they know the rules? Could they big error in survey.</p> <p>Nick Orr. Private docks. Making money. In support.</p> <p>Mike Bethers. Lots of respondents in areas where there are these unguided, non-resident anglers using rental vessels.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: I move that we support this proposal. I would like to see more data. Another tool.</p>



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
145	Establish nonresident bag, possession, and annual limits for coho and sockeye salmon in the fresh and salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area, as follows:		
OPPOSE Question: Nick Orr Second: Mike Bethers	0	8	5 Abstentions Proposals 145 -148 Dan Teske: Proposal 145 would reduce nonresident possession limits and establish annual limits. Proposal 146 would reduce bag and possession limits. Proposal 147 limits coho salmon in fresh water between Cape Fairweather and Dixon Entrance for nonresidents. Only one conservation concern. Kevin Maier: Do we want to consider these separately or together? Richard Yamada: No biological rational for limiting nonresident harvest. I think we should consider them as a group. I do not think the proposals have any traction. These proposals reduce nonresident access to fish in favor of resident access. Nick Orr: I move that we vote against them as a group. No biological concern.
146	Establish nonresident bag and possession limits for coho, sockeye, chum, and pink salmon in salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
OPPOSE Question: Nick Orr Second: Mike Bethers	0	8	5 Abstentions Proposals 145 -148 Dan Teske: Proposal 145 would reduce nonresident possession limits and establish annual limits. Proposal 146 would reduce bag and possession limits. Proposal 147 limits coho salmon in fresh water between Cape Fairweather and Dixon Entrance for nonresidents. Only one conservation concern. Kevin Maier: Do we want to consider these separately or together? Richard Yamada: No biological rationale for limiting nonresident harvest. I think we should consider them as a group. I do not think the proposals have any traction. These proposals reduce nonresident access to fish in favor of resident access. Nick Orr: I move that we vote against them as a group. No biological concern.
<u>147</u>	Establish nonresident bag and possession limits for coho salmon in the fresh waters east of the longitude of Cape Fairweather, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
OPPOSE Question: Nick Orr Second: Mike Bethers	0	8	5 Abstentions Proposals 145 -148 Dan Teske: Proposal 145 would reduce nonresident possession limits and establish annual limits. Proposal 146 would reduce bag and possession limits. Proposal 147 limits coho salmon in fresh water between Cape Fairweather and Dixon Entrance for nonresidents. Only one conservation concern. Kevin Maier: Do we want to consider these separately or together? Richard Yamada: No biological rationale for limiting nonresident harvest. I think we should consider them as a group. I do not think the proposals have any traction. These proposals reduce nonresident access to fish in favor of resident access. Nick Orr: I move that we vote against them as a group. No biological concern.
<u>148</u>	Establish nonresident bag and possession limits for sockeye, chum, and pink salmon in fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
OPPOSE Question: Nick Orr Second: Mike Bethers	0	8	5 Abstentions Proposals 145 -148 Dan Teske: Proposal 145 would reduce nonresident possession limits and establish annual limits. Proposal 146 would reduce bag and possession limits. Proposal 147 limits coho salmon in fresh water between Cape Fairweather and Dixon Entrance for nonresidents. Only one conservation concern. Kevin Maier: Do we want to consider these separately or together? Richard Yamada: No biological rationale for limiting nonresident harvest. I think we should consider them as a group. I do not think the proposals have any traction. These proposals reduce nonresident access to fish in favor of resident access. Nick Orr: I move that we vote against them as a group. No biological concern.
<u>149</u>	Reduce saltwater coho salmon bag and possession limit in Puget Cove to two fish, as follows:		
			Did not Consider.
<u>150</u>	Repeal rainbow trout size limits in Crystal, Glacier, and Moraine lakes, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
SUPPORT Question: Mike Bethers Second: Chris Miller	11	1	2 Abstentions Dan Teske: Submitted by the department. Would repeal roadside sportfishing regulations for trout in Dredge Lake area. Provide an area for public to fish in Juneau. Had some successful stocking in area. Not open to salt water. Would like to continue to stock lakes and allow harvest of smaller size trout. Ed Buyarski: What is the survival rate of the fish? Dan Teske: Some winter survival but do not know rate. Kevin Maier: What about cutthroat in that area? Dan Teske: Some but not many. Mike Bethers: Historically good cutthroat fishing. Do people have a hard time differentiating between rainbow and cutthroat trout? Dan Teske: I do not think it was an issue. With new proposal it could be an issue, but Department would make an effort to ensure only rainbows are being harvest. Mike Bethers: Support. Another place to take kids fishing.
<u>151</u>	Prohibit guided sport fishing on the Salmon River near Gustavus, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider.
<u>152</u>	Close sport fishing in a section of 108 Creek, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider.
<u>153</u>	Close sport fishing in a section of Log Jam Creek, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider.



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
154	Allow the use of bow and arrow in Southeast Alaska sport fisheries, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider.
155	Prohibit the removal of salmon from the water when nonretention regulations apply and prohibit the use of a multiple hook in Southeast Alaska sport fisheries, as follows:		



SUPPORT AS AMENDED To only include first part of proposal relating to removing salmon from water. Question: Mike Bethers Second: Jesse Walker	9	3	1 Abstentions Dan Teske: Would prohibit removal of salmon from water when it is a non-retention period. Also prohibit use of multiple hooks in certain sport fisheries. Mike Bethers: This should be written as two proposals. I think the first part is a good proposal. The second part regarding multiple hooks is not something I support. In a study years ago, it was found that king salmon survived different hook types at same rate. Jesse Ross: I support first part of proposal, but not second part. Terry White: I agree with Mike. Richard Yamada: The first part of the proposal seems like it would be hard to enforce. Fish identification problem. They might lift fish out of the water to identify fish. Is this proposal saying that you cannot have multiple hooks on a lure? Jesse Walker: He is specifically targeting treble hooks. Richard Yamada: I am having trouble with part one of the proposal, but support part two. Unintentionally make everyone a criminal. Jesse Walker: The proposer is concerned with people take a fish out of the water and handing it around for photos and then throw it back dead. Dan Teske: I expect if the first part was adopted the board would come up with some alternative language for enforcement purposes. Chris Miller. Most people support intent of first part of proposal. I move that we strike item 2 from the proposal. Jesse Walker: Second. Terry White: Survival depends on who is dislodging hook. Kristine Trott: Are treble hooks used for snagging. Kevin Maier: Treble hooks are used for both snagging and fishing. Mike and Jesse support as amended Department will work out specifics
--	----------	----------	---



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
277	Align bag limits for non-resident unguided halibut harvest from rental vessels in Southeast Alaska with NOAA bag limits for guided anglers in Halibut Management Area 2C, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
156	Modify harvest rate control rule for Sitka Sound sac roe herring fishery, as follows:		



NO ACTION Motion to Take No Action: Thatcher Brouwer Second: Jesse Walker Question: Jesse Walker Second: Mike Bethers	11 in Support of Motion to take no Action	1 in Oppositi on of Motion to take no Action	1 in abstention to motion to take no Action Proposals 156-158 Kevin Maier: Three proposals submitted by Sitka Tribe of Alaska. Scott Forbes: Proposal 156 intent is not clear, but likely proposer would like to reduce harvest from 12% to 7.5% of biomass Sliding scale harvest rate. Bring Sitka sack row fishery in line with other fisheries in southeast. Proposal 157 would modify how guideline harvest limit is calculated by separating biomass between young and old fish. Proposal 158 would prevent Sitka Row Fishery if certain percentage of fish are over five years. Jesse Walker: These are complex proposals. I will be abstaining. Thatcher Brouwer: I agree with Jesse. I move that we take no action on these proposals. Kristine Trott: I think 156 is the best alternative in my opinion. Nick Orr: No action. Sitka issue. All the viewpoints are represented in Sitka. Melanie Brown: Does the Department has a position or recommendation on this? Will these proposals make a difference in herring abundance? Scott Forbes: I am not comfortable speaking to your question. More appropriate for herring biologist. Mike Bethers: I will be abstaining. Thatcher Brouwer. Motion: No Action on 156-158 Jesse Walker: Second Melanie Brown: Need to bookmark herring. I agree with Sitka Tribe about importance. We need to take these more seriously in the future. I ask that all of us educate ourselves more. Importance in food web and relationship to Chinook salmon abundance. Richard Yamada: Heated debate years back. Very complex. People trying to understand science and issue. It is an important issue.
--	--	---	--



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
			<p>Jesse Walker: Echo Melanie and Richard. Herring are incredibly important to food web.</p> <p>Jesse Walker called question and Mike B. 2nd.</p> <p>Kevin Maier: I agree with Melanie Brown and Richard Yamada. This is complicated. But it is important</p>
<u>157</u>	Modify harvest rate for Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery based on forecasted age structure, as follows:		



NO ACTION Motion to Take No Action: Thatcher Brouwer Second: Jesse Walker Question: Jesse Walker Second: Mike Bethers	11 in Support of Motion to take no Action	1 in Opposition of Motion to take no Action	1 in abstention to motion to take no Action Proposals 156-158 Kevin Maier: Three proposals submitted by Sitka Tribe of Alaska. Scott Forbes: Proposal 156 intent is not clear, but likely proposer would like to reduce harvest from 12% to 7.5% of biomass Sliding scale harvest rate. Bring Sitka sack row fishery in line with other fisheries in southeast. Proposal 157 would modify how guideline harvest limit is calculated by separating biomass between young and old fish. Proposal 158 would prevent Sitka Row Fishery if certain percentage of fish are over five years. Jesse Walker: These are complex proposals. I will be abstaining. Thatcher Brouwer: I agree with Jesse. I move that we take no action on these proposals. Kristine Trott: I think 156 is the best alternative in my opinion. Nick Orr: No action. Sitka issue. All the viewpoints are represented in Sitka. Melanie Brown: Does the Department has a position or recommendation on this? Will these proposals make a difference in herring abundance? Scott Forbes: I am not comfortable speaking to your question. More appropriate for herring biologist. Mike Bethers: I will be abstaining. Thatcher Brouwer. Motion: No Action on 156-158 Jesse Walker: Second Melanie Brown: Need to bookmark herring. I agree with Sitka Tribe about importance. We need to take these more seriously in the future. I ask that all of us educate ourselves more. Importance in food web and relationship to Chinook salmon abundance. Richard Yamada: Heated debate years back. Very complex. People trying to understand science and issue. It is an important issue.
--	--	--	--



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
			Jesse Walker: Echo Melanie and Richard. Herring are incredibly important to food web. Jesse Walker called question and Mike B. 2 nd . Kevin Maier: I agree with Melanie Brown and Richard Yamada. This is complicated. But it is important
158	Incorporate forecasted age structure into Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery spawning biomass threshold, as follows:		



NO ACTION Motion to Take No Action: Thatcher Brouwer Second: Jesse Walker Question: Jesse Walker Second: Mike Bethers	11 in Support of Motion to take no Action	1 in Opposition of Motion to take no Action	1 in abstention to motion to take no Action Proposals 156-158 Kevin Maier: Three proposals submitted by Sitka Tribe of Alaska. Scott Forbes: Proposal 156 intent is not clear, but likely proposer would like to reduce harvest from 12% to 7.5% of biomass Sliding scale harvest rate. Bring Sitka sack row fishery in line with other fisheries in southeast. Proposal 157 would modify how guideline harvest limit is calculated by separating biomass between young and old fish. Proposal 158 would prevent Sitka Row Fishery if certain percentage of fish are over five years. Jesse Walker: These are complex proposals. I will be abstaining. Thatcher Brouwer: I agree with Jesse. I move that we take no action on these proposals. Kristine Trott: I think 156 is the best alternative in my opinion. Nick Orr: No action. Sitka issue. All the viewpoints are represented in Sitka. Melanie Brown: Does the Department has a position or recommendation on this? Will these proposals make a difference in herring abundance? Scott Forbes: I am not comfortable speaking to your question. More appropriate for herring biologist. Mike Bethers: I will be abstaining. Thatcher Brouwer. Motion: No Action on 156-158 Jesse Walker: Second Melanie Brown: Need to bookmark herring. I agree with Sitka Tribe about importance. We need to take these more seriously in the future. I ask that all of us educate ourselves more. Importance in food web and relationship to Chinook salmon abundance. Richard Yamada: Heated debate years back. Very complex. People trying to understand science and issue. It is an important issue.
--	--	--	--



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
			Jesse Walker: Echo Melanie and Richard. Herring are incredibly important to food web. Jesse Walker called question and Mike B. 2 nd . Kevin Maier: I agree with Melanie Brown and Richard Yamada. This is complicated. But it is important
159	Repeal this regulation related to management of the commercial sac roe herring fishery in Sitka Sound, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
160	Reduce closed waters in the Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
161	Require a subsistence fishing permit to harvest herring roe on branches in the Sitka Sound area, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
162	Increase the possession limit for subsistence spawn-on-kelp harvest, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
163	Establish equal share quotas for the Sitka sac roe purse seine fishery, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
164	Establish equal share quotas for the Sitka Sound sac roe herring purse seine fishery, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
165	Allow unharvested Sitka sac roe quota to be harvested for food and bait by herring sac roe purse seine permit holders, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
166	Create an open pound herring spawn on kelp fishery in Sitka Sound, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
167	Redefine the boundaries of the Hoonah Sound spawn-on-kelp fishery (13-C) and the Sitka sac roe fishery (13-A/B), as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
168	Repeal commercial set gillnet sac roe herring fisheries in Section 1-F, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals

January 4-15, 2022 | Ketchikan, AK

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/ No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
NO ACTION	13 In Support of Motion to Take No Action.		<p>Scott Forbes: Proposals 171-173. All shift start of shrimp fishery from fall to spring/summer.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: Does the department have a position on this proposal? Can you discuss British Columbia's management of fishery?</p> <p>Scott Forbes: The department supports moving the fishery to the spring. Neutral allocative aspects of fishery. Fall fishery was developed in part to avoid competition with BC fishery.</p> <p>Scott Forbes: The Department supports moving the fishery to the spring. It is a better time biologically if it occurs after May 15th.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: I would like to support all three of these proposals. We should not be harvesting shrimp when they have eggs.</p> <p>Atlin Daugherty: I would support the May 21st start date in proposal 173.</p> <p>Kevin Maier: I propose we take no action on 171 and 172.</p> <p>No objection.</p>
<u>172</u>	Change the pot shrimp fishery from a fall/winter season to a spring/summer season, as follows:		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
NO ACTION Motion: Kevin Maier	13 in Support of Motion to Take No Action		<p>Scott Forbes: Proposals 171-173. All shift start of shrimp fishery from fall to spring/summer.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: Does the department have a position on this proposal? Can you discuss British Columbia's management of fishery?</p> <p>Scott Forbes: The department supports moving the fishery to the spring. Neutral allocative aspects of fishery. Fall fishery was developed in part to avoid competition with BC fishery.</p> <p>Scott Forbes: The Department supports moving the fishery to the spring. It is a better time biologically if it occurs after May 15th.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: I would like to support all three of these proposals. We should not be harvesting shrimp when they have eggs.</p> <p>Atlin Daugherty: I would support the May 21st start date in proposal 173.</p> <p>Kevin Maier: I propose we take no action on 171 and 172.</p> <p>No objection.</p>
<u>173</u>	Move the start date of the shrimp fishery to May 21 st .		



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
SUPPORT Question: Atlin Daugherty Second: Jesse Walker	13		<p>Scott Forbes: Proposals 171-173. All shift start of shrimp fishery from fall to spring/summer.</p> <p>Thatcher Brouwer: Does the department have a position on this proposal? Can you discuss British Columbia's management of fishery?</p> <p>Scott Forbes: The department supports moving the fishery to the spring. Neutral allocative aspects of fishery. Fall fishery was developed in part to avoid competition with BC fishery.</p> <p>Scott Forbes: The Department supports moving the fishery to the spring. It is a better time biologically if it occurs after May 15th.</p> <p>Jesse Walker: I would like to support all three of these proposals. We should not be harvesting shrimp when they have eggs.</p> <p>Atlin Daugherty: I would support the May 21st start date in proposal 173.</p> <p>Kevin Maier: I propose we take no action on 171 and 172.</p> <p>No objection.</p>
174	Change the pot shrimp season in Districts 2 and 6 from a fall/winter season to spring/summer season, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
175	Limit the number of shrimp pots that may be deployed on a longline to 10, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider



Alaska Board of Fisheries: Southeast and Yakutat Proposals			
January 4-15, 2022 Ketchikan, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/ Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments
198	Establish fixed start date for the Registration Area A commercial Tanner crab fishery, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
199	Allow operation of personal use, subsistence, or sport Dungeness crab and shrimp pot gear during the commercial king or Tanner crab fishery, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
200	Close the Dungeness crab commercial and nonresident sport fisheries in the vicinity of Klawock, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
201	Expand closed water boundary lines for the Dungeness crab commercial fishery in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area during the summer season, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider
202	Reduce waters closed to Dungeness crab commercial fishing in Tenakee Inlet, as follows:		
OPPOSE Question: Chris Miller Second: Kristine Trott	1	9	3 Abstentions Adam Messmer: Reduce size of area closed to commercial crabbing in Tenakee Inlet. It would leave a portion of the area closed and open another area. No conversation concerns. Department supports allowing commercial fishing when there is not a conservation concern. No position on allocation. Mike Bethers: I spend a lot of time in Tenakee. This was established a long time ago because of sport/commercial conflict. The way it is now works well. I do not know of any yacht charters. I like the status quo. Jesse Walker: I agree with Mike. Small area that is set aside for personal use crabbing. In opposition to proposal.
203	Repeal closed waters for Dungeness crab commercial fishing in Merrifield Bay and Port Protection, as follows:		
			Did Not Consider

Minutes compiled by Secretary Thatcher Brouwer and approved by AC Chair, Kevin Maier, via email on 12/21/21 -Annie Bartholomew, DFG Boards Support