


①

LAKE ILIAMNA F&G Advisory Committee

January 18, 2013

BOF comments for Feb 26, 2013 meeting
Comments by RANDY ALVAREZ - Chairman



Board generated proposal for setnet
permit stacking in Bristol Bay

Committee Vote 0-5, we are opposed

Reason: It violates the original intent of permits

Proposal #179

Vote 5-0 we support

Reason: Chums returning to S.W AND western
ALASKA have been in decline. We also
support the 8.3% sockeye cap

Proposal #181

Vote 5-0 we support

Reason: There needs to be a chum number




②

Proposal # 182

Vote 5-0 we support

Reason: Bristol Bay is under allocation AND Fish in terminal areas. The North Peninsula district should be the same.



Proposal # 183

Vote 5-0 we support

Reason: IF 8.3% or 400,000 caps are not instituted we would like to see this timeline.

Proposal # 185

Vote 0-5 we oppose

Reason: We oppose additional fishing time
we support up to 8.3 allocation

Proposal # 187

Vote 0-5 we oppose

Reason: Lengthening openings would tend to overly impact a specific stock moving thru

Proposal # 188, 189, 190

Vote 0-5 we oppose

Reason: Lengthening opening would tend to overly impact a specific stock moving thru



③

Proposal # 195

Vote 0-5 we oppose

Reason: We do not support adding more time & area

Proposal # 196


Vote 0-5 we oppose

Reason: Monofilament gillnet would greatly increase harvestability as fish could not see the nets.

Proposal # 199

Vote 5-0 we support

Reason: We support terminal fisheries



Proposal # 200

Vote 0-5 we oppose

Reason: We oppose adding new area or fisheries

Proposal # 201

Vote 5-0 we support

Reason: According to WASSIP information about 75% of fish harvested are bound for Rivers farther up

Proposal # 202

Vote 5-0 we support

Reason: We feel the WASSIP data should be used for all fisheries



④

Proposal # 203

vote 5-0 we support

Reason: The Port Heiden section should be a terminal fishery


Proposal # 205

vote 5-0 we support

Reason: Bristol Bay is a terminal fishery. These areas should be the same

Proposal # 206, 207

NO ACTION because of 205



Proposal # 208

vote 5-0 we support

Reason: Terminal fisherys AND WASSIP DATA

Proposal # 209

vote 5-0 we support

Reason: We support using the WASSIP DATA to manage all the Fisheries in Bristol Bay AND the North + South Peninsula Fisheries OF AREA M.

