

Chignik AC Public Testimony

Board of Fish-Finfish Meeting-February 23,2016

Good Afternoon,

Mr. Chair, Members of the board thank you all for your time. I am Jacob Shangin it's my pleasure to serve as Chairman of the Chignik Advisory Committee. I've been fishing my entire life in Chignik and will continue to do so for the remainder of it.

I'll be referencing selected proposals addressed at our AC meetings on January 19th and February 16th. Submitted as AC10 and RC33 respectively.

Proposal 172

Support 9-1 as amended

According to ADF&G the late run subsistence harvest is less than 10K Sockeye Salmon annually. A member stated **there is frequent under reporting.** The general comments are that **report estimates are low.** Some biologists believe that **the loss of Sockeye Salmon rearing habitat at Black Lake has put more pressure on the Chignik Lake habitat due to the earlier migration of the Black Lake fry into Chignik Lake.** The fry, will likely be most vulnerable to an **increase in predation and greater competition for rearing habitat and food.** It is suggested to **fertilize the lake** and be proactive to fix the problem i.e. **getting more females for the escapement.** We harvested too many red salmon in the past and would like to see **125K additional fish escaped.** A motion to keep the run and escapement timing the same, but increase the escapement in September by 25K.

*The amendment would keep run and escapement timing the same, but increase escapement in late September by 25k.

Proposal 173 and 175

Support as amended 9-0.

Proposal 173 and 175 were discussed jointly.

*Amendment would add a sunset clause.

Proposal 174

Oppose 0-9

This proposal **limits the Department to manage local stocks and the Department, would lack control of over escapement.** Also, **there is no precedent for managing our stocks in other areas.** It is irrational as the **fish predominately travel east,** and there is no evidence of any notable South Peninsula Pink, Chum, and/or Coho salmon contribution in either of the subject two districts. **WASSIP indicated that the South Peninsula Southeastern District**

Mainland is an interception, non-local stock fishery on Chum Salmon with the Chignik/Kodiak stock aggregate dominating the catch for the two years evaluated (2008-09). Many of the salmon streams near these villages of Perryville and Ivanof Bay are of distinct cultural and economic importance. To suggest that local resources in these districts should be restricted based on non-local stocks is most unreasonable and a callous disregard of our people and their cultural lifestyle. It was noted that there were 46 streams in the Western and Perryville Districts that needed to be managed and this proposal doesn't address this.

Proposal 176

Oppose 0-9

The department was opposed to establishing a set schedule that would limit their ability to manage local stocks and be difficult to meet local stock escapement in area M. It was expressed this would expand an interception fishery and Orzinski was the only terminal run in the area and the department was remiss in not stating that this expansion of an interception fishery was contrary to Board of Fish policy. It was stated that if implemented, it would supersede the SEDM plan, removing all allocation assignment and all conservation requirements. If approved, it would wrongly permit SEDM setnetters to intercept Chignik-bound Sockeye Salmon absent of any allocation assignment or conservation requirement.

Proposal 178

Oppose 0-9

The Department is neutral on the allocation aspect but opposed to set fishing schedules as it limits the department's ability to manage local stock. The proposal, if approved, would expand a historic interception fishery and remove the harvest preference granted to Chignik fishermen. The proposal is similar to Proposal 176 as it reflects greed and a willingness to damage Chignik fishermen who invest significantly in the conservation of Chignik's two Sockeye Salmon runs. It was stated that this proposal would do away with an allocation plan with a long history that's been working.

Proposal 179

Oppose 0-9

It was stated this would double the SEDM allocated catch. It would increase interception of salmon and to keep it allocatively neutral cut the 7.6% allocation to 3.8%. Chignik stock abundance varies however it would increase the amount of harvestable fish intercepted, contrary to policy.

Proposal 180

Support 9-0

It was verified a provision in the proposal to waive this requirement as necessary. The department should verify if misreporting is or is not happening and show evidence. The department should be able to verify and check if the rules [allocation] are being applied properly. It was commented that there is a tendency to under report. This proposal would improve honest reporting. It was stated that if we have an allocation on our run then they [the beneficiary] must be accountable for the fish they catch.

Proposal 181-183

The AC opposes these proposals; please refer to RC 10 for complete comments.

Proposal 185

Support as Amended 9-0

It anchors to the Chignik harvest preference of 300k and 600k. We negotiated the 120k number with Area M fishermen but there was not enough notice given for that board cycle. It puts a management tie to conservation of Chignik stocks. There are less than/ about 2% local sockeye. It's an intercept fishery and should have a conservation burden. The fleet has been growing more efficient, better gear, larger vessels. The harvest preference will give accountability when Chignik runs are depressed. It is most important to get conservation ties. By setting up conservation ties this proposal will help SEDM have a greater potential to fish, as Chignik will get its escapement. There was consensus in discussion that the issue of lacking conservation must be addressed. In 2014, 280k were caught in Dolgoi while we caught 600K total. It was suggested negotiating with Area M fisherman again to minimize differences. 851,000 catch for 2015 was startling. There was a motion to amend the 120k figure to 80k. The vote *9-0-0* unanimously (9-0). Additional. Comments entered into record for Proposal 185 are included in the complete meeting minutes and include the following:

- About 50% of the Sockeye Salmon harvested in the Dolgoi Island fishery through July 25th are Chignik-bound early and late run fish as reported by the comprehensive WASSIP study.
- Chignik bound Sockeye Salmon are the dominate stock taken in this fishery even when Chignik runs are weak or well below average.
- Per the Alaska Sustainable Salmon Fisheries Policy, it is reasonable to address the impact of the Dolgoi Island fishery. In accordance it is prudent to set some side-boards on that fishery to address conservation of Chignik-bound Sockeye Salmon as well as limit the degree of non-local stock harvest occurring annually.
- Too often Dolgoi Island fishermen harvest more Chignik-bound Sockeye Salmon than caught at Igvak and in the SEDM combined.
- While there is some historic basis for this fishery, there has been increased gear efficiency and effort advancing the killing power and targeting of migrating Sockeye Salmon.

- **The proposal would not limit local stock harvest opportunity** as there are no terminal Sockeye runs in the Dolgoi Island Area, and the proposal, as drafted, adequately ensures that local Pink and Chum Salmon can be harvested.

*The amendment would change the 120k figure to 80k.

Proposal 186

Support as amended 8-1

It was explained **this is easier and simpler for the Department to manage. It reduces fishing time [25%] and applies the 300K and 600K harvest preference numbers.** The times align with what is currently done. **This is a reasonable plan that gives them fishing time. 300K and 600K is the crux of the issue. Status quo is unreasonable and shutting them down completely is unreasonable.** It is noted that the Chignik component of fish caught in the Dolgoi area is 43% in June and 51% post June. It was pointed out **they are intercepting greater than 45% of Chignik-bound sockeye** to put that into perspective. General agreement that a **25% reduction was not enough. A motion was made to amend the reduce fishing time in the proposal from 25% to 50%. The Amendment passed 8-1.**

*Amendment would reduce the fishing time by 50% rather than 25%.

Proposal 187, 189, 192 and 199

We oppose, once again refer to RC 10 for complete comments.

Mr. Chair that concludes my AC testimony, thank you.