Chignik Fish and Game Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

November 14, 2013

Location: Chignik Lagoon Subsistence Building

Minutes

I. Call to Order at 1:45 pm

II. Roll Call:

Committee Members Present	**Absent**
Don Bumpus, Chignik Lagoon, Vice Chair	Noah Shanign, Ivanof Bay
Rodney Anderson, Chignik Lagoon, Alt.	Ben Allen, Chignik Bay
Gary Anderson, Chignik Lagoon	Don Lind, Chignik Lake
Jacob Shangin, Ivanof Bay, Chair	Harry Kalmakoff, Chignik Lake
Stephan Shangin, Ivanof Bay	Alvin Boskofsky, Chignik Lake
Patrick Kosbruk, Perryville	Marvin Yagie, Perryville
Boris Kobruk Jr., Perryville	Alfredo Abeuid, Chignik Lagoon

Seven of thirteen members are present, quorum is established.

Others in Attendance:

Susie Jenkins- Brito, ADFG
Charlie Russell, ADF&G
Mark Stichert, ADF&G
James Jackson, ADF&G
Gayla Woods, BBNA
Frank Woods, BBNA
Courtney Gomez, BBNA
Chuck McCallum, Lake and Pen. Borough
George Anderson, Chignik Lagoon
Aaron Anderson, Chignik Lagoon
Alvin Pedersen, Chignik Lagoon
Ernie Carlson

III. Approve Agenda: Patrick Kosbruk moves for Approval of the Agenda, Gary 2nds
Agenda Approved by unanimous consent

IV. Approval of Minutes: Patrick Kosbruk moves to approve the September 10 and October 3 minutes. Minutes approved by unanimous consent.

V. Introductions: All present briefly introduced themselves.

VI. BOF Proposed Regulatory Changes

Chignik Finfish Proposals

PROPOSAL 38 - **Action Taken: Support 7-0**

DESCRIPTION: Open commercial fishing in June in the Western District, excluding the Inner Castle Cape Subsection, concurrently with commercial fishing openings in Chignik Bay, Central, and Eastern districts.

Motion to adopt: Patrick Kosbruk; **Second:** Gary Anderson

DISCUSSION:

- The Chignik Advisory Committee submitted this proposal
- The eastern boundary of the Western District is only 13 miles from Chignik Lagoon. There is no biological justification for limiting fishing time in this district when a surplus of early run sockeye salmon are destined to the Chignik system.
- WASSIP findings show that this is a terminal stock harvest area with minimal presence of any other than Chignik-bound sockeye salmon in June.
- The Eastern District is about twice as far from Chignik Lagoon as the Western District; anytime the Eastern District is open, terminal stock fishing should be permitted in the Western District.
- The Perryville District, which boarders the Western District on its east side, serves as more than enough of a buffer area in June for any non-Chignik-bound sockeye salmon traveling west toward Area M and beyond.
- This would reduce fleet crowding in Chignik's Central District and provide alternative areas to fish during bad weather conditions.
- As long as the Western District is managed exclusively on Chignik-bound sockeye salmon there cannot be a reason for not allowing fishing in this district when other outside areas in the Chignik area are open.
- This would benefit local fishermen including those from the Village of Perryville by reducing travel time and other factors.
- Gary expressed concerns about the pink and chum escapement, Department staff indicated pink and chum would still be managed based on escapement.

QUESTION CALLED: Rodney Anderson

ACTION: Support 7-0

PROPOSAL 39 - **Action Taken: Opposed 0-7**

DESCRIPTION: Change management plan to direct department to manage Perryville and Western districts based on abundance of pink, chum, and coho salmon in Stepovak and Shumagin Islands sections of Southeastern District, including closures in July through August.

Motion to adopt: Stephen Shangin; **Second:** Rodney Anderson

DISCUSSION:

- The proposal does not acknowledge that the Western and Perryville districts support numerous local pink, chum, and Coho runs and are managed for Chignik-bound sockeye salmon as well. There are 22 known salmon streams in the Western District and 24 in the Perryville District for a total of 46 salmon streams in both districts combined.
- There is no evidence of any notable South Peninsula pink, chum and/or Coho salmon contribution in the Westward or Perryville Districts.
- The WASSIP study showed that South Peninsula Area chum salmon contributed an average of 6.6% of the catch for the three years 2006-08 and that Chignik sockeye salmon dominated the sockeye catch from the two districts in the same period.
- The WASSIP study indicated that the Southeastern District Mainland fishery intercepts non-local chum salmon with the Chignik/Kodiak stock aggregate dominating the catch for the two years evaluated (2008-09).

- Many of the salmon streams near 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 ridiculous.
- The proposal would impede local (Chignik) stock management in the Western and Perryville Districts, resulting in lost harvest opportunity on our local stocks and biological mismanagement to the detriment of all subsistence and commercial fishermen of the Chignik area, and the people of the State of Alaska.
- Don asked if the Department had conservation concerns in these districts, Charlie Russell indicates current escapement in the Western Districts and Perryville is adequate.

QUESTION CALLED: Rodney Anderson
ACTION: Motion Failed 0 - 7

PROPOSAL 40 - Action Taken: Support 7-0
DESCRIPTION: Change "shall" to "may" relative to use of emergency orders (EOs).
Motion to adopt: Don Bumpus; **Second:** Gary Anderson
DISCUSSION:

- The proposal word change in the Chignik Management Salmon Plan from "shall" to "may" makes sense and is in everyone's interest, including the resource.
- It was also noted that the 20,000 number might need to come up some to give better subsistence opportunity and we might want to look for a change in that number at the Board meeting.
- Several members voiced concerns about adequate subsistence needs not being met.
  QUESTION CALLED: Don Bumpus
  ACTION: Motion passes 7-0

PROPOSAL 41 - Action Taken: Support 7-0
DESCRIPTION: Change seine specification for when seine has stopped fishing.
Motion to adopt: Rodney Anderson; **Second:** Stephen Shangin
DISCUSSION:

- Every haul is different; sometimes you get fouled up; you are more likely to lose fish than gain after the ends are together.
- The proposal is well justified by bringing Chignik in-line with the standard applied to the Kodiak seine fleet and making law-enforcement easier.
- Expectedly, the change may improve safety as once a seine is closed with both ends on deck, crew members would have more time to stack the seine and deal with the catch, and the later would tend to benefit fish quality too.

QUESTION CALLED: Gary Anderson
ACTION: Motion Passed 7 – 0

PROPOSAL 42 - Action Taken: Oppose 0-6 (1abstain)
DESCRIPTION: Increase purse and hand purse seine, and seine lead lengths allowed in Eastern, Central, Western, and Perryville districts.
Motion to adopt: Don Bumpus; **Second:** Rodney Anderson
DISCUSSION:
It is noted that in Kodiak the leads have 7 inch mesh.

In opposition to the proposal it was noted that the proposal has allocative implications. The smaller boats were built for the lagoon fishery and now the fishery outside is growing and this proposal would hurt Lagoon fishermen.
In support of the proposal it was noted that longer seines would be more efficient; that Kodiak has been fishing longer nets with smaller boats; and, this proposal would align us with those boats in other areas that are intercepting us. We should have the same size seines as neighboring areas so maybe we should ask everyone else to shorten their nets.
QUESTION CALLED: Stephen Shangin
ACTION: Motion Failed 0-6 (1 abstention)

PROPOSAL 43 - Action Taken: Oppose 0-7
DESCRIPTION: Create state-waters groundfish management plans for trawl vessels less than 58 feet in the Cook Inlet, Kodiak and Chignik management areas. (This proposal will be considered at the Chignik, Lower Cook Inlet, and Kodiak Finfish meetings.)
Motion to adopt: Rodney Anderson; **Second:** Don Bumpus
DISCUSSION:
Several members expressed concern against any kind of drag fishery citing how fragile our Tanner crab are and are completely opposed to dragging inside three miles.
A major problem with the idea of having 100% observers is that the State doesn't have an observer program and it would be a major hurdle to implement one.
QUESTION CALLED: Patrick Kosbruk
ACTION: Motion Failed 0 - 7

PROPOSAL 44 - Action Taken: Oppose 0-7
DESCRIPTION: Create state-waters walleye pollock management plans for Cook Inlet, Kodiak and Chignik management areas. (This proposal will be considered at the Chignik, Lower Cook Inlet, and Kodiak Finfish meetings.)
Motion to adopt: Don Bumpus; **Second:** Rodney Anderson
DISCUSSION:
QUESTION CALLED: Gary Anderson
ACTION: Motion Failed 0 – 7

PROPOSAL 45 - Action Taken: Support with Amendment 7-0
DESCRIPTION: Require 100 percent observer coverage on groundfish trawl vessels in state waters of the Cook Inlet, Kodiak and Chignik management areas. (This proposal will be considered at the Chignik, Lower Cook Inlet, and Kodiak Finfish meetings.)
Motion to adopt: Don; **Second:** Gary
AMENDMENT: Close all Chignik Area State-waters (within 3 miles) to all pelagic and non-pelagic trawl.
DISCUSSION:
It's not clear who would be responsible for observers, the State or the Feds.
Can the State tell feds to have 100% observer coverage inside 3 miles?
If the Feds say no then the State needs to develop its own program and that would be difficult.
The State can keep boats from fishing inside three if they don't have 100% observers.
If they were fishing mid-water then fine but we don't know they are and we don't know the impact on kings and the hitting bottom.
Cod are mid-water also and flatfish can be mid water sometimes and we just don't know the

impact.
The eastern District is very shallow inside 3 and your net is going to hit bottom.
By definition Pelagic trawling is mid-water, Aaron A. commented at the meeting, that just because they are considered mid-water doesn't mean that they stay mid-water. The bigger fish are close to the bottom during certain times of the day. The draggers then target them. What they won't tell you though is that they end up scraping the bottom on a regular basis doing so. Because they do this, they try to stay on mud bottom otherwise they tear up their nets. Our crab are on mud bottom.
Crab move tremendous distances, why aren't the crab coming back the way they should? And what is happening to our halibut fishery?
AMENDMENT: Motion: Rodney Anderson; Second: Don Bumpus
Amendment made to close all Chignik Area State waters (within 3 miles) to all pelagic trawl.
QUESTION CALLED: Gary
ACTION: Motion Passes as Amended 7 – 0

*****Stephan Shangin excused from meeting, remaining proposals discussed by subcommittee appointed by the Chair approved unanimously prior to Stephan's departure, subcommittee consists of remaining six AC members.**

Statewide King and Tanner Crab Proposals

PROPOSAL – 326 **Action Taken: Oppose 0-6**
DESCRIPTION: Close all commercial king and Tanner crab fisheries, except Southeastern Alaska. (The finfish aspects of this proposal will be considered at the Lower and Upper Cook Inlet Finfish meetings.)
Motion to adopt: Don Bumpus; **Second:** Gary Anderson
DISCUSSION: Proposal taken up for the express purpose of showing BOF the AC soes not soppurt any aspect of the proposal.
QUESTION CALLED: Gary Anderson
ACTION: Motion Failed 0 - 6

PROPOSAL – 341 **Action Taken: Support with Amendment 6-0**
DESCRIPTION: Repeal Tanner crab tank inspection requirements**.**
Motion to adopt: Don Bumpus; **Second:** Gary Anderson
AMENDMENT: Require a vessel operator or agent to register in person with the department or department designee no earlier than 24 hours before the beginning of the season.
DISCUSSION: Concern is expressed that about faxing to vessels and possibly circumventing the intent of the proposal and an amendment is suggested with intent to keep someone from registering from the fishing grounds.
QUESTION CALLED: Gary Anderson
ACTION: Motion Passes as amended by unanimous consent

Mark Stichert gives an overview of Pacific Cod BOF meeting.

Kodiak Finfish Proposals

PROPOSAL 92 - Action Taken: Support with Amendment 6-0
DESCRIPTION: Change management standard that harvest of sockeye salmon in Cape Igvak Section not exceed 15% at any time or before August 26.
Motion to adopt: Don Bumpus; **Second:** Rodney Anderson
AMENDMENT: Change the August 26 date to July 25.
DISCUSSION: The amendment is to address the only reason that the department opposed the proposal – the department needs to be able to manage the local pinks and chums between July 25 and August 26. Motion to amend: Rodney Anderson; Second: Don Bumpus
QUESTION CALLED: Gary Anderson
ACTION: Motion Passed as amended 6 - 0

PROPOSAL 93 - Action Taken: Support 6-0
DESCRIPTION: Amend plan to apply allocation of 15% of total Chignik sockeye salmon catch only before July 8.
Motion to adopt: Don Bumpus; **Second:** Gary Anderson
DISCUSSION:
Don- How many reds are taken from Cape Igvak section post July 8th?
Dept- Harvest varies from year to year.

Aaron- Is this proposal passes, what would happen post july 8th?
Dept- After 25th, they will be managed on local stocks.

George- What is the % of the cape igvak section contribution of the overall Kodiak salmon harvest?
Dept- Table 9 of the AMR breakdown by fishery. The information is there.

QUESTION CALLED:
ACTION: Motion Passed 6 – 0

PROPOSAL 94 - Action Taken: Support 6-0
DESCRIPTION: Require check-in and check-out in Cape Igvak Section and delivery of salmon before leaving section.
Motion to adopt: Rodney Anderson; **Second:** Don Bumpus
DISCUSSION: Rodney: We as fisherman can get blurred vision when it comes to reporting. I am looking for a way to clarify the reporting.
QUESTION CALLED: Don Bumpus
ACTION: Motion Passes 6 – 0

New Business – BBNA Presentation on Rural Determination Criteria

The question of AC representation at the Chignik finfish meeting of December 4-5 can continue by email.

Adjourn 5 pm