

I would like to point out some ethical concerns that I have observed as an active member of the public and as a user group of concern in this meeting.

1. **False information:** Telling the truth is important in these meetings, and good decisions are based on good information. As a setnetter and member of KPFA I was shocked to see the language in **RC 183** as authored and submitted by Board Member Carlson-Van Dort which reads “*each setnet permit holder may use up to one set gillnet*”
https://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/regulations/regprocess/fisheriesboard/pdfs/2023-2024/uci/rcs/RC183_Member_Carlson-VanDort_Stock_of_Concern_Action_Plan.pdf .

This is language that we have NEVER used, this limits dual permit holders from using one net to two nets, which is a big deal! Chairman Wood asked Ms. Carlson-Van Dort if this language was correct, and Board Member Carlson-Van Dort said, “*that this language comes directly from KPFA’s RC 96*”. The language actually reads “*by restricting gear to one set gill net...*”

https://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/regulations/regprocess/fisheriesboard/pdfs/2023-2024/uci/rcs/RC096_KPFA_Proposed_Kenai_River_Late_Run_King_Action_Plan.pdf.

Here is the recording of this conversation:

<https://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/regulations/regprocess/fisheriesboard/swf/2023-2024/uci-3/index.html?mediaBasePath=/Meeting%2003-01-24%20%28Mar-01-24%205-18-41%20PM%29#>

Time stamp recording: day: **3/1/2024** recording time: **1:10:16** (J. Wood) and **1:11:05**

There is no language in RC 96 that talks about limiting one permit holder to one net. The language and implication has always been to limit that to one net **per permit**, it has been this way for years.

2. **ADF&G’s Role during the deliberation Process** - My understanding is that ADF&G is supportive staff at this meeting, to help the BOF make good decisions. They should be neutral and implement the plan as set forth by the BOF. They should not lead or steer the BOF. I object to the bias way in which the department interrupted, surmised, speculated, led and made compound remarks to sway the BOF votes. This evidenced in the following recordings. **See recordings 3/1/2024 1:12:16 through 2:08:34**
<https://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/regulations/regprocess/fisheriesboard/swf/2023-2024/uci-3/index.html?mediaBasePath=/Meeting%2003-01-24%20%28Mar-01-24%205-18-41%20PM%29#>

3. **Refusing to take a lunch break before voting on RC 183** - RC 183 is the elephant in the room, so let's get it right! Board member M. Wood wanted to make a motion to change some "*may fish*" language" to "*shall fish*" and he needed some time to get this motion correctly. Board member Carpenter also requested to utilize lunch time to understand this and having Godfrey and Carpenter not here in the meeting has worked against the setnetters. This is the first time we have had access with Godfrey to clarify some important aspects of this RC. KPFA negotiated away number of nets, mesh depth, low-tide, weeks of fishing, expanded windows, and reduced fishing days and hours all in exchange for some predictable "shall fish" language for July. Under this current administration a "*may fish*" is essentially a "no fish" - which has the real potential to destroy the setnet fleet. It certainly was worth burning a lunch break to get that aspect correct. To vote on such a critical issue when 2-3 board members were confused and not fully understanding these nuances was unethical.