

STATE OF ALASKA

Bill Walker, Governor

Central Peninsula Fish & Game Advisory Committee

David Martin, Chair
PO Box 468
Clam Gulch, AK 99568
907-567-3306

December 4, 2015

Joint Board of Fish and Game meeting
Anchorage, Dec. 9, 2015

Mr. Chairman and Board members,

My name is David Martin and I am chairman of the Central Peninsula Advisory Committee (AC). The Committee is made up of eleven members and two alternates from the Ninilchik area. At our Dec. 4th 2015 meeting we did our civic duty and addressed ways the Board of Fish and Board of Game can be more cost effective, reduce cost, serve the affected public and reduce the number of Proposals and days of their meetings.

First and foremost we must have fish and game management plans that are constructed using science and biology and not politics and allocation. The plans must be consistent and compliant with the Alaska Constitution, Sustainable Salmon Fisheries Policy, Magnuson-Stevens Act that promulgates maximum sustained yield management. That means implementing management plans that protects the habitat, addresses in-river crowding, provides for orderly and enforceable regulations that do not conflict with other regulations and harvest all salmon surpluses. Implement game management plans for predator management, and high game harvest including promoting improved habitat. Management plans that don't address and achieve these issues only creates an ongoing and increasing number of proposals to try to bring the management plans into compliance with MSY management. MSY management on both fish and game provides the most benefits to all user groups and the State. MSY management also creates reliable high harvest on our renewable natural resource and creates the highest economic value and work force. These goals for MSY management are consistent with Governor Walker's Fisheries and Game transition team's recommendations.

Every dollar counts with the decline in the State's oil production and crude oil prices along with a three billion dollar plus budget deficit and cuts to State Departments and programs. This means the highest priority is for getting the most benefit out of the State's renewable

natural resources which is critical to the people and the State. The harvestable surpluses must be harvested. Department data show many salmon systems statewide are over-escaping their goals.

In upper Cook Inlet alone for 2015 , under the current management plans, the unharvested surplus salmon, after going through the commercial, dip net, sport, guided sport and subsistent fisheries was a loss of salmon taxes to the State in the amount of \$850,000 and a loss to the commercial industry of \$24,000,000 dollars first wholesale value. The value of the loss in the last five years in Cook Inlet alone is \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000 dollars in State taxes and \$120,000,000 loss to the industry. There are 63,000 direct jobs that are affected Statewide. The State and industries can not afford these annual losses.

Other cost cutting and proposal reducing measures were implemented at the last Regional AC meeting in the late 1990's and their recommendations are included with our AC's following recommendations:

1. **Keep the three year cycle.**
2. **Meet in the area that is most impacted and where the most fishing, hunting and trapping occurs.** Meet in the Kenai / Soldotna area for the Upper Cook Inlet fin fish meeting, for example.
3. **Could combine Upper Cook Inlet and Lower Cook Inlet fin fish.**
4. **No Board generated proposals!** They totally circumvent the intended Board, public and AC process. They also generate a lot of proposals for the next cycle to address their effects.
5. **No committee process on all proposal.** Only have short committee meetings at the Board meeting on a specific proposal to get additional information. This would reduce the Upper Cook Inlet meeting alone by four or five days and this was the Board practice before 1995.
6. **Only have as few Department staff as are necessary.** Use teleconferencing when and if their input is needed.
7. **If no Advisory Committees in the area approve a proposal then the Board can automatically take no action on it.**
8. **Proposals with more than one issue are tossed out.**
9. **Have the Department get their comments and reports out earlier.**
10. **Have the AC chairs or the Representative at a table and asked if there are any errors of admissions before the vote.** This would prevent proposal intent from being changed.

- 11. No rewriting a proposal that changes the intent of the proposal.**
- 12. Analyze, discuss and gather the professional economic impacts in detail. Not just read a single opinion into the record. This is the same for the allocation criteria.**
- 13. Going to a professional style Board with a scientific committee oversight would reduce the number of proposals, reduce cost and maximize resource production, economies and taxes.**

Thank you,

David Martin, AC Chair