



**Chignik Advisory Committee  
3-8-2022  
Zoom/Teleconference**

I. Call to Order: 1:06 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Members Present: Jacob Shangin, Ivanof Bay Chairman  
Ben Allen, Vice Chair, Chignik Bay  
Raechel Allen, Secretary, Chignik Bay  
Gene Carlson, Chignik Bay  
Clinton Boskofsky, Chignik Lake  
Stephen Shangin, Ivanof Bay  
Edgar Shangin, Ivanof Bay  
Austin Shangin, Perryville  
Boris Kosbruck, Perryville  
Al Anderson, Chignik Lagoon  
Alfredo AbouEid, Chignik Lagoon

Members Absent: Patrick Kosbruck, Perryville (excused)  
Rame AbouEid (alternate), Brandon Daugherty (alternate)

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 7

III. Adopt Agenda: Motion to adopt by Ben/ motion is seconded/approved by unanimous consent

IV. Fish and Game Staff Present: Reid Johnson, Area Manager Biologist Chignik; Nick Sagalkin, Regional Supervisor; Nat Nichols, Area Management Groundfish Shellfish; Area Manager; Lisa Hutchinson-Scarborough, Subsistence Specialist; Cassie Whiteside, Fishery Biologist; Birch Foster, Research; Kevin, Schaberg, Research; Heather Finkle, Research; Jeff Wadle, Salmon Management Coordinator motion is seconded; George Papas, OSM; John Gerkin, Federal Management; Frank Harris, Federal Management Fishery Biologist;

V. Guests Present: George Anderson, CIC; Chuck McCallum, CCAA; Earl Krygier, CCAA; Axel Kopun; Robert Carpenter, City of Chignik; Tim Murphy; Richard Black; Gary Anderson; Nicole Anderson; Wallace Hinderer; Bruce Wright, Knik Tribe Senior Scientist; Jaime Odimon



VI. Staff Updates: Staff offered to read proposals as needed.

VII. Proposal 282: Introduced by Reid Johnson. Motion to adopt made by Ben.

Ben suggested an adaptation to strengthen the intent of the proposal by adding "sockeye directed" to specify the type of initial opening.

Alfredo reminded us, Chignik has been fighting interception harms for SO years. He notes Area M fisherman are having some of the most successful salmon seasons ever and should share to the fullest in the burden of conservation as they are now the primary commercial fishery using the stock while Chignik is not even able to fish (June and July 2021 but sometimes not at all).

Axel found it rather insulting to the communities of Chignik when the staff comments imply the proposal "may" return more sockeye when it's clear that after years of documentation through numerous tagging studies beginning in the 60's going through to the WASSIP study, Chignik fish are present and being caught in Area M in June and July. Sockeye will get back to Chignik from 282. He also disagrees with the staff comment that 282 is "allocative." 282 is clearly not a fish grab. It is obviously a protective measure. He goes on to say the Fish and Game's primary goal should be to make sure runs are successful and deserved returns are achieved. The runs have been neglected and now the Fed's are closing subsistence in Chignik. This is a real problem. Subsistence is first priority. Getting salmon back to the river is priority.

Ben asked why the fish "may" get back in the Department's view and why was it allocative? Jeff clarified that yes it will get more fish back to Chignik, but it's allocative if the salmon are harvested in Chignik and don't make it back to the river. Any level of allocative makes it a Board decision. Nick pointed BEG is for a MSY but below min BEG is not destruction. Ben asked if there was any other way the department has to repair this low escapement, but Jeff doesn't know of any more tools in the Department to use without becoming allocative (if there is any potential that Chignik could harvest the salmon).

Alfredo explains Chignik is not asking for allocation but rather getting escapement back to normal ranges. He believes the South Peninsula has become more effective with higher horsepower, better equipped boats with more packing capacity than they were. He believes the Fish and Game should be protecting the fishery and especially the escapement.

Axel reminded the group that if escapement is met, the proposal would at that point, not apply and that it has been four years of under escapement already.

Earl asked the Department if the goal of proposal 282 isn't to get the escapement to midrange.

Jeff verified the goal of 282 is to get fish back to Chignik area, but it still is allocative if it triggers



a fishery in Chignik. Earl asked if achieving escapement goes without saying there might be a fishery but the midpoint is what's needed to achieve good runs. Jeff explained the dept is not bound by the midpoint but rather a range.

Ben asked if all changes (time or area) in an interception fishery area would be considered allocative. Jeff responded if the question was understood right, then yes.

Al states the Department shouldn't bend on escapement issues and should be in support proposal 282. If Department continues saying managing for escapement is allocative, there will soon be no fishery at all in Chignik.

Clinton asks if the recent past few years of sockeye runs are sustainable in the CMA? Jeff explains it is sustainable but not sustainable for harvest. It is not for maximum sustained yield, but it is sustainable. Kevin said the current trends seem to be environmentally linked but there fishery is no concern that the run will go away. Once conditions increase/improve the salmon should rebound and the fishery will then continue again. Clinton states that this issue is impacting him, his 4 children and that people are moving away and is very concerned.....

Ben made a motion to table 282 until after the presentation. Al seconded.

#### VIII. Investigations into reduced sockeye salmon runs in Chignik (ADFG)

Birch Foster presented the Department power point. The presentation generated many questions and comments from the public, and stakeholders did not see links and it was difficult to draw conclusions from the information in general. The lack of link of condition factor to returns 2014, 2016, 2017, and 2019 was pointed out by Axel. Public was uncomfortable with the use of Fulton's index to estimate the condition factor. Raechel asked if smolt size was differentiated between Black Lake and Chignik Lake stocks (no); asked for more info on the new Eurytemora (zooplankton) in the graphs (it was described as basically another food source common in 90's), then asked if the effects and outcome of managing for low bounds of escapement since 2002 had been evaluated? Heather said lowering targeted escapement to preserve zooplankton [after a weir blowout caused over escapement) was discontinued around 2014 or 2015 and hasn't been assessed but could be a proposal.

Among the confusions was how Daphnia production was being interpreted by the department, and that it seemed to point to a healthy system. The decline in sockeye numbers and sizes is viewed by public as a State wide issue. Marine factors are viewed by public as a more likely area of influence on low salmon returns. Department agrees there is "no smoking gun" in the presentation. Ben asked if there



are Black Lake specific studies that take in considerations of and on Black Lake? The Department looks at Chignik Lake as the limiting factor. Raechel described that Parr (1972) found an inverse relationship in Black Lake between sockeye and stickleback that factored into increasing the Black Lake escapement to 400K (60's-70's).

More evaluation of material presented is needed from public about the presented information and more questions will be forth coming.

IX. Revised Run Reconstruction Methods (ADFG)

Heather presented the information. Earl asks if the proportional contributions are from WASSIP data (yes). He notices there is a lot of variation depending on what time period is looked at. Heather explains yes, it is an average of the WASSIP data and a fair representation, and a line must be drawn somewhere, and the fisheries have changed. Heather explains with the question, do the Dolgois even make a dent at less than 50% and with a cap? The Department wanted to use things that contribute consistently. Axel pointed the problem out that while the average may get watered down by Bristol Bay in the beginning, there is very different impact on fish caught on different days later (in for instance the Shumagins) over the course of the month. This method doesn't give an accurate picture of what is going on. It doesn't accommodate for intricacies and often would be way off from what's actually happening and could lead to inaccuracies that could impact fisherman negatively. Kevin tried to refocus everyone that this method was not about management or in-season management; it's about the brood tables. The old brood tables were based on regulations, old information, and had assumptions. The method is an average but it shows a better picture of the production of the river. It's the best approximation of composition. Axel asked if they tried to estimate early and late run by sampling fish? Kevin explains the method uses WASSIP data to apportion fish first, then uses the histogram to identify run timing which is then used to identify early, late and late-late components of the run. Axel points out the applying lags adds uncertainty. Heather says lag time is just to align escapement with the harvest. Earl asked is August 1<sup>st</sup> still assuming all second run? Kevin explains that the histogram can predict run timing just as well. George asks when this will inform the brood tables? Kevin answered it already has. George has many more questions. Raechel asked if 2002 parent year with the purposefully lowered escapement, aligned with 2007 and 2008 returns? (yes) Was it considered as a factor when 2007 and 2008 had lower percentages of Chignik% in WASSIP? Department does not think it has been looked at and to try to weight information is complicated. The utility of information of the WASSIP is most applicable at the time of data collection and using it outside of that time leaves you at the whim of the changes in the fishery of weather for example. Raechel also asked, does low escapements have high return to spawner ratio? (usually) Shouldn't we run a double set of data for two salmon cycles while we are searching for ca.us es for the low returns to align data. Kevin explained it is more difficult and that old information is not in a usable format for use in the current technology. Earl requested that parallel testing occur to affirm that the new reconstruction approach is valid; perhaps validating genetics data, etc. for five years as this is common



practice to validate and recalibrate new approaches. Kevin assured this approach allows for this if information is available and we will by all means test to see if it is performing. Ben shared heavy concern that the Dolgoi 46% numbers are not considered important even as rules and regs change the influences. What if cap is removed? Past numbers in the range of 400k to 800k have occurred. Keven says consistency in approach is most important and a line must be drawn somewhere for comparison consistency. Closer to Chignik should be more representative. Ben is concerned that the% representation in Chignik area changes from June to July and the percentage was derived from poor return years.

X. Other Proposals

Ben motions to return to Proposal 282. Chuck recommends it is preferable to make amendments with the proposer's involvement. Ben states there are only minor corrections from the AC view and could wait for Don to make adjustments. Ben called the question. Proposal 282 is unanimously supported.

Nat introduces the next Proposals.

Ben made motion to adopt Proposal 264. The motion is seconded. Ben asked if 30 days could cause mortality? Department answered yes there is delayed mortality. Alfredo says leeway is needed for weather or unusual encumbrances. Alfredo would support a bit longer than 14 days. Axel opposes the proposal as written; 30 days is too much. Ben clarified that enforcement has enforced this type of reg in other pot fisheries. Ben is not in support because it would be unappreciated for someone to fill a bay with pots (in the way) and leave the area for 30 days. Al notes sand fleas and octopus cause increased mortality after 14 or 15 days and is opposed. Ben calls question/unanimous consent. Proposal 264 is unanimously opposed.

Ben makes a motion to apply the comments (264) to Proposal 265 and requests unanimous consent. It was seconded. Proposal 264 is unanimously opposed. Alfredo says leeway is needed for weather or unusual encumbrances. He would support a bit longer than 14 days. Axel opposes the proposal as written; 30 days is too much. Ben clarified that enforcement has enforced this type of reg in other pot fisheries. Ben is not in support because it would be unappreciated for someone to fill a bay with pots (in the way) and leave the area for 30 days. Al notes sand fleas and octopus cause increased mortality after 14 or 15 days and is opposed. Proposal 264 is unanimously opposed.

Proposal 266 is introduced. Ben makes motion to adopt. Motion is seconded. The appropriate number of pots for an area was discussed. Ben points out that this is outside our area but if it was proposed in our area, he would be opposed. Axel notes the intent seems to try to not collapse the fishery. He supports pot limits but does not support limiting participants trying to fish in two fisheries. Motion to take no action is made by Ben. Motion is seconded. Unanimous consent is requested. No action taken on Proposal 266



Proposal 268 is introduced by the Nat. Ben makes a motion to adopt. The motion is seconded. Alfredo says the ratio of females and immatures was too high in this winter's catch and believes the surveys are not accurate enough and pot surveys should be used. Department clarified that the surveys were good at tracking trends more so than being a census. Al suggested that can occur if pots are pulled too frequently. Axel asked if it could be possible to have a smaller GHL like 100,000 lbs. Crab are aging out and dying while waiting to meet 200k GHL. Nat suggested requesting a smaller GHL would be an opportunity to come together before the Board. Alfredo believes smaller GHL openings with more frequency retards the ability of the population of crab from establishing a strong presence. He is opposed to lowering GHL. Al also is against lowering the GHL and says the frequent seasons wipe out subsistence opportunity. Ben asks for unanimous consent to support. Proposal 268 is supported unanimously.

Proposal 269 and 270 were discussed and it seemed reasonable to take no action. Alfredo states these proposals don't consider big boats. It was realized there is often a trickle-down effect from other areas. Alfredo believes this proposal would not be good for Chignik.

Short reminder given for AC members to update their information with Taryn at Board Support.

- XI. Approval of Minutes: Ben makes a motion to have Jacob or himself able to approve these minutes and also have both able to represent the AC at the Board meeting beginning March 26<sup>th</sup>, 2022.
- XII. Set next meeting date: to be determined
- XIII. Adjournment: 5:12pm

Minutes Recorded By:   Raechel Allen      

Minutes Approved   Bv    
  Ben Allen  

Date:   3-11-2022