

Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee
January 28, 2016
834 Lincoln Street, Sitka, AK 99835

- I. Call to Order: 6:00pm by John Murray, Chairman
- II. Roll Call:
Members Present: Dick Curran, Karen Johnson, Moe Johnson, Wayne Unger, Randy Gluth, Brian Massey (Vice-chair), Jerry Barber, Jeff Feldpausch, Bradley Shaffer, Jessica Gill (Secretary), John Murray (Chair), Floyd Tomkins, Jon Martin, Kim Elliot (vacated her seat during this meeting)
Members Absent: Cody Loomis, Tad Fujioka, Peter Roddy
Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 7
List of User Groups Present: Seine, Subsistence, Hand Troll, Alternate 1, Alternate 2, Hunting, At-Large 1, Longline, Power Troll, Conservation, Charter, Resident Sport Fish, At-Large 2, Processor
- III. Approval of Agenda:
No formal agenda
- IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: From February 2, 2015:
Brian motioned, Jeff seconded. Minutes approved.
- V. Fish and Game Staff Present:
Troy Tydingco, Dave Gordon, Matt Catterson, Mike Vaughn
- VI. Guests Present:
Mike Svenson, Harvey Kitka, Al Wilson, Ty Barkinhoff, Frank Bolivich, Matt Donahoe, Doug Jenny, Kim Elliot
- VII. Old Business:
No old business to discuss.
- VIII. New Business:
Elections--
John told the group Cody Loomis resigned his seat as Guide seat. At-large and alternate seat is for one year service. Questions about guide seat not being advertized was raised, and we will postpone that election until next meeting.
Hand Troll— Bradley nominated Jerry. Motion was seconded by Kim. Motion was approved with a vote of 12 in favor.
Hunting—Kim nominated Randy for hunting seat. Wayne seconded. Randy suggested he would vacate his seat if there were other interested parties. Motion was approved by a vote of 11.
Subsistence—Kim would not like to continue her seat. She nominates Jeff. Brian seconded the motion. Motion was approved by a vote of 11.
Alternate—Jessica nominated Joel Markis for Alternate seat. Jessica read a letter given to her from Joel to the group. Brian seconded the motion. Discussion arose on the legality of Joel's presence (can he be nominated without being here?). It was moved to the next meeting pending two weeks of advertisement.
Seine—Randy nominated Moe, Brian seconded. Motion was approved by a vote of 10.
At-Large—Moe nominated Karen, and Dick seconded. Motion was approved by a vote of 11.

Proposals were read in this order: 126-2014-2015, 209, 210, 211, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 212, 213, 214, 215, and 216.

STATEWIDE FINFISH AND SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

March 8–12, 2016

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOF	202	Prohibit the use of felt bottom boots in all waters, while fishing.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	9	1,2 abstain	Bradley left prior to the adoption of this (voting members down to 12). Jon motioned to adopt, Wayne seconded. Troy Tydingco (ADF&G) mentioned that the proposal would apply to all fishing activities, including sport fishing, subsistence fishing, etc. This is to prevent the spread of invasive species in saltwater, which isn't known to occur. Wayne called the question.
BOF	203	Expand emergency order authority to close sport fishing in special harvest areas if hatchery cost recovery goals may not be met.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12	Brian moved to adopt, Wayne seconded. Troy Tydingco (ADF&G) clarified that ADFG can't close fisheries for cost-recovery, but can for conservation/brood-stock purposes. The proposal would also require setting an escapement goal for a hatchery to include brood-stock and cost recovery, which means possibly modifying the way ADF&G manages those fisheries. Randy asked what harm sport fishing can do and questioned how hatcheries can justify closing for cost recovery if they are private non-profits. Troy mentioned that when there are concerns, ADF&G utilizes a management plan, and haven't been asked to manage for cost recovery. Sport fisheries weren't really thought of when Special Harvest Areas (SHAs) were put into place. Brian clarified that cost recovery is run by fishermen, so they want as little cost recovery fishing as possible. Discussion about our local SHA and the fisheries associated with it and what would happen with the implementation of this proposal. Brian would like to remind the group that it is by Emergency Order, not shutting it down every year at a certain time. Troy suggested that this proposal would also add an element of an escapement goal. John asked how it would work if the cost recovery for chum was going on, if all sport fishing for all species are closed. Troy mentioned that's correct. Jerry mentioned that it's for hatchery cost recovery of a public resource, and sport fishing does so little damage. Jerry called the question.
BOF	204	Modify the definition of an artificial fly to include the use of a bare single hook.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			No motion to adopt.
BOF	205	Clarify that a bead not attached to a hook is an attractor, and not a lure or fly.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	12	0	Brian motioned to adopt, Jerry seconded. Troy Tydingco (ADF&G) would consider this as a housekeeping proposal. Jerry called the question.
BOF	206	Revise definition of "closely attended" as it applies to coho salmon fishing.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12	Brian motioned to adopt, Wayne seconded. Troy Tydingco (ADF&G) mentioned the proposal could affect our area, even though it comes from Kenai and is specific to coho fishing. There already is a regulation for closely attended, which is "the line or strike indicator is within view and accessible to the angler at all times" (75.995 40). Jerry mentioned he is opposed to it and called the question.
BOF	207	Allow a bang stick to be used to dispatch sport-caught fish.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	11, 1 abstain	Jerry moved to adopt, and Brian seconded. Troy Tydingco (ADF&G) mentioned this happens in other parts of the State, but it's not clearly defined

			in regulation. John looked it up, and bang sticks are kind of dangerous. Brian mentioned they should learn to use a gaff. Matt Donahoe (public) mentioned that it is commonly used in other parts of the state. Jeff called the question.
BOF	208	Establish bag limits by port of call.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12	Brian moved to adopt, Jeff seconded. Troy Tydingco (ADF&G) mentions there's no definition in regulation for port of call. Jerry sees this as an unnecessary law.
BOF	209	Designate Pacific herring as a forage fish.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	5	6	Randy moved to adopt, Jerry seconded. Floyd put this proposal forward because herring are a forage fish, and the purpose is to shift the scope of management from commercial to conservation/ecosystem function. Doing so is not necessarily incompatible with current management, and would likely not change at all. Everything other agency manages herring as a forage fish, and passing this would agree with other management throughout the world. There's no guarantee herring will continue to stay in Sitka Sound. Becoming complacent in any management regime isn't good. Brian asked if it would change the fishery because of an exemption in 5 AAC 39.212. Dave Gordon (ADF&G) mentioned that there is a eulachon fishery, which is listed in the plan, but that's not necessarily what the regulations mean. The intent of this regulation is to not have new fisheries developed on forage fish, because there were current fisheries on herring with stock assessments and management plans when the Forage Fish plan was enacted. The intent of the regulations was not to define what a forage fish is but to avoid starting new fisheries. John asked re the purpose of this proposal. Floyd mentioned that he would like to recognize herring more as a forage fish than a commercial species. Bradley suggests the proposer would like to move to more science based management. Jeff gave an overview of this proposal through the BOF process in 2012. Wayne suggests that ADF&G recognizes that herring already are a forage fish, and that Alaska has the best managed fisheries in the world. He sees it as another angle to get the sac-roe fishery shut down so he is not in favor of this. John mentions this proposal could apply to the other herring stocks in Southeast if they rebound which could preclude fishing on those stocks. Kim Elliot (public) asked about a test fishery for the age composition. Dave replied with a high number of 3 year olds (50%) and good recruitment. Kim asked about spawning by the 3 year olds. Dave replied about 25% of the 3 year olds spawn. Kim asked about fishing on young spawners (with smaller eggs) having an effect on the population, and mentioned there are way more whales out in the Sound. Dave mentioned that ADF&G thinks they're managing conservatively, and the biggest driver in the production of this fishery is the environment. Mike Svenson (public) asked about the length of 3 year olds, because they make the roe on kelp best product. Dave mentioned the good spawn last year was mostly from 3 year olds. Matt Donahoe (public) asked about the survival of eggs, but Dave said they don't measure that survival. Test fishing should start in early February. Randy asked about revising a law, but Dave suggested there could be some confusion about the language. Floyd brought up the federal management plan comments on the environmental impact statement from the Juneau access road project in which herring excluded in Essential Fish Habitat plan but not in the management plan. Moe mentions that ADF&G, Dave in particular, gets a lot of heat from a lot of people given the herring stock fluctuations. Moe is for herring being called a forage fish, but worried about getting the fishery shut down based on the wording of a proposal. Moe mentioned there are a lot of herring out in the Sound. Harvey Kitka (public) has seen a lot of different things with herring, the biggest thing was the closed area, and with

			<p>the closure the herring population has gone up. The closed subsistence zone worked as a conservation zone. Herring are more valuable in the water—one king salmon is worth as much as one ton of herring. Jeff asked how many sac-roe fisheries would be open this year. Dave mentioned there could be one in Hobart, but not sure. Seymour Canal gillnet fishery is above the threshold but has a young age composition so it's closed. Sounds like there were a lot of age-3 fish out there throughout the region, so we could have more fisheries next year. Moe asked about Juneau area stock. Dave mentioned they're doing spawn deposition surveys (about 5-10 miles of spawn), but with budget cuts there will be reduced survey capacity on stocks that don't support fisheries. John doesn't think we're not at a point where we need this proposal, maybe in 5-10 years. Mike Svenson (public) asked about why the proposal came about—nothing is starving out there. Dave mentioned that it's a proactive way to avoid developing of fisheries based on NPFMC regulations. The FFMP is in constant with the federal plan, but the federal regulation allows for forage fish bycatch be turned into fishmeal. Jeff asked about the exemption in the current FFMP. Dave mentioned that there were current fisheries going on when the regulations was enacted. Brian motioned.</p>
BOF	210	Prohibit directed fisheries on forage fish species, for the purpose of fish meal production.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	2	8, 3 abstain	<p>Bradley motioned to adopt, Randy seconded. Jeff mentioned there has been a 30% increase in fish meal production, would like to see herring left in the water than going to fishmeal- we shouldn't be feeding farmed salmon from other markets. Floyd suggested that sticking intent in proposal is difficult to argue. Bradley mentioned that we fish with commercial intent, and we're trying to benefit society. Wayne agreed with Bradley, but perhaps when there actually is a fishmeal fishery that's when we need to address this. He's worried about restricting this fishery. Processors can't control what happens to the fish once they've been sold. Looking at a big impact on the economics of this fishery and there shouldn't be a proposal until there's a fishery on herring for fishmeal. Jeff clarified that this proposal wouldn't affect what happens to the fish once they leave Alaska, it would just prohibit making fishmeal in Alaska. Brian asked if this proposal had anything to do with herring. Jeff clarified that the FFMP has an exemption for directed forage fish fisheries, herring included. Dave Gordon (ADF&G) mentioned some information from the higher ups that BOF doesn't have the authority to regulate product form from processors. Kim Elliot (public) asked if this is a herring sac-roe fishery, could they sell them as anything they want? Dave said essentially that's what's going on. Mike Svenson (public) is insulted of the idea that commercial fishermen aren't taking care of the resource. Wayne mentioned that this is a tough market. Jon Martin arrived during the discussion. Wayne continued that Icicle seafoods and other processors make fishmeal and farmed fish—are we going to boycott them? Brian asked what happens to the herring when leaving Alaska. Jeff mentioned that the fish get turned into fishmeal after roe stripping. There was discussion about the differences between proposals 210 and 211, where there appeared to be some confusion. Wayne didn't see that a directed fishmeal fishery is on the horizon so this proposal is a little pre-emptive. Silver Bay has looked at a fishmeal plant in Sitka working with the other processors. Kim mentioned it'll be three years before this proposal can be heard again, so this is a good idea to discuss. Randy discussed the declining market for sac-roe, and getting a better price for fishmeal, so when do the fishermen say it's time to fish fishmeal now? Wayne suggested that the markets fluctuate, and eventually the market will turn around. Ty Barkinhoff (public) asked how this proposal affects NSRAA.</p>

			Jeff mentioned that it's only for forage fish. Moe suggested our task as committee members and as ADF&G is to have healthy herring and other stocks. It's not our job to dictate what happens to the product. Fishermen still have to fish, even if the market is terrible because they have bills to pay. Jeff asked if the fishery wanted to fish for fishmeal and call it a sac-roe fishery in the fall, would that be allowed. Dave mentioned that it would be a problem with regards to limited entry and the CFEC would have to look at permits to fish for something other than sac-roe. Jon mentioned he's not a fan of the fishery, but not sure if this proposal is the way to get at it. Similar to listing Alexander Archipelago wolf as endangered as way to reduce logging. Brian called the question.
BOF	211	Prohibit the production of fish meal from whole forage fish.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	5	8	Brian moved to adopt, Floyd seconded. Jeff called the question, citing the discussion from proposal 210.
BOF	212	Repeal or modify the requirement to designate a single salmon net registration area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	10, 2 abstain	Moe moved to adopt, Brian seconded. Dave Gordon (ADF&G) mentioned that you can only register for one salmon area a year, even if you have a permit for different areas. You can fish gillnet in one area with your permit, and then fish seine in another area with another permit. ADF&G doesn't see it as anything that would make it difficult to manage salmon in these fisheries. Moe suggests it will add new boats in Southeast, especially given the buy-back tax program, causing more strain on the full-time fishermen in SE. Brian called the question.
BOF	213	Clarify possession and landing requirements for Pacific cod and walleye pollock.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			No motion to adopt.
BOF	214	Specify that bycatch in excess of the allowable amount will be surrendered to the state and donated to charity and establish fines for bycatch in excess of the allowable amount.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	2	6, 4 abstain	Brian moved to adopt, Jerry seconded. Mike Vaughn (ADF&G) suggested that bycatch is forfeited and enforcement deals with fines. In Southeast, fishermen have to keep DSR rockfish with full retention. They can sell up to 10% for that bycatch. In Federal waters, it's retained by the person or given away (they can't sell it). Brian asked about the retention of kings in the federal groundfish fisheries, and Mike Vaughn replied that those fish are donated or tossed overboard. Frank Bolivich (public) was worried that any time bycatch is given away it's a slippery slope to targeting and selling the bycatch. Jerry called the question.
BOF	215	Establish a 58' overall length limit for vessels participating in South Alaska Peninsula parallel walleye pollock fishery using trawl gear.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			No motion to adopt.
BOF	216	Establish a state waters walleye pollock purse seine fishery in Southeast Alaska.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TABLED			Jeff moved to adopt, Dick seconded. Dick asked why it was put forth out of cycle. Jeff agreed and thinks some strings were pulled to get it on the statewide meeting. Mike Vaughn (ADF&G) was unsure about how this proposal was brought forth out of cycle. A commissioner's permit was issued to two fishermen to see if pollock could be caught with seine gear in Prince William Sound and there was limited success in it. One permit was allowed for Southeast. There is a pollock TAC in the federal waters which is largely unfished (less than .5% of the allowable biological catch). John asked about bycatch in the PWS fishery. Mike mentioned there was some salmon bycatch, which was released healthy. Part of the permit is experimental, and there would be observers on board (because it's a pollock fishery). Matt Donahoe (public) asked about a management plan for a commissioner's

			<p>permit. Mike mentioned that it doesn't exist for test fisheries. Matt Donahoe thought this proposal is a little premature. Mike thinks the permit was issued before the proposal was put forth. Jeff asked about the expiration of the permit and if there was any harvest. Mike mentioned they did not actually fish, but they did a "test" to see if there was a possibility of catching these fish with a seine net. Wayne liked that we can start the dialogue about it. Frank Bolivich (public) mentioned that it the proposal is preemptive. Floyd suggested that a 200,000 lb trip limit seems a little high for a commissioner's permit. Dick suggested there's not enough information to start a fishery, and maybe extend the commissioner's permit. Maybe with more information, the proposer can go to BOF and create a management plan in-cycle. Moe agreed with Dick, and would move to table. Brian seconded the motion to table it. The group voted to table the proposal with a 9-3 vote. Jeff questioned how the proposal got added to the Statewide agenda and would like clarification on it.</p>
BOF	126-2014-2015	<p>Establish a commercial open pound herring spawn on kelp fishery in Sitka Sound. <i>(Proposal 126 from the 2015/2016 Meeting Cycle was tabled by the board for continued deliberations at the March 2017 Statewide Finfish meeting.)</i></p>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12	<p>Jeff moved to adopt, Randy seconded. Brian asked about the public comment period mentioned in the letter from the CFEC regarding this proposal. Elaborate test fishery occurred in 1998-1999. Randy asked Dave Gordon (ADF&G) if the test fishery coincided with the Hoonah Sound SOK fishery. Hoonah Sound fishery started in 1990. Why was Sitka Sound included in the Hoonah Management Area? Dave mentioned the proposal was brought up in 1996 to BOF, but there were questions about gear conflicts, etc. How to convert the poundage of herring roe to herring poundage. After conducting a test fishery, proposers went back to the BOF, but the proposal was declined—proposer wanted a bigger fishery than everyone else wanted. There was a working group in 2003, but after that it was determined to drop it. Successful test fishery, but just didn't work. The idea was to determine at the start of each season to do only SOK instead of sac-roe, and the fishermen couldn't participate in both fisheries. Kim Elliot (public) had a question about where the kelp was coming from. Dave mentioned it was found outside of Sitka. Bradley mentioned turbidity as an issue for the SOK market from Sitka, Kim agreed. Jeff questioned the methodology to move sac-roe quota to SOK fishery. Dave replied that would be up to the BOF for allocation. The simple math of eggs on kelp=herring removed from quota doesn't work as well as it sounds. Mike Svenson (public) gave a history of the BOF/CFEC action. Jeff questioned the proposer's conservation concern, and how would this proposal impact past fishery participants (before sac-roe fishing started). Brian called question.</p>

Adjournment: 9:19pm

Minutes Recorded By: Jessica Gill, Secretary
Minutes Approved By: John Murray, Chairman
Date: February 9, 2016