

Sitka Advisory Committee
December 18, 2014
Sitka Sound Science Center, 834 Lincoln Street

- I. Call to Order: 6:30 PM by John Murray
- II. Roll Call: Jessica Gill
Members Present: Jerry Barber, Dick Curran, Kim Elliot, Jeff Feldpausch, Tad Fujioka, Jessica Gill, Randy Gluth, Moe Johnson, Karen Johnson, John Murray, Bradley Shaffer, Wayne Unger
Members Absent: Cody Loomis, Brian Massey, Peter Roddy, Floyd Tomkins
Number Needed For Quorum on AC: 8

List of User Groups Present: Hand Troll, Longline, Subsistence, Alternate 1, Trapping, Alternate 2, Hunting, Seine, At-Large 1, Power Troll, At-Large 2, Processor
- III. Approval of Agenda:
No formal agenda was published, but John overview the proposals we would try to cover during the meeting. John would like to discuss a few subsistence/personal use fishery proposals this evening, if there's time.
- IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes:
Kim made a motion to approve all the minutes. Jerry seconded. 9 in favor; 2 abstain.
Meeting minutes from November 18th, December 2nd, and December 10th were approved.
Jessica will forward the minutes onto Boards Support.
- V. Fish and Game Staff Present:
Dave Gordon, Troy Tydingco, Mike Vaughn, Kyle Ferguson (Alaska Wildlife Troopers)
- VI. Guests Present:
Steve Reifentstahl, Mike Baines, Randy Langtiegne, Al Wilson, Tori O'Connell, Roger Ingman, Linda Behnken, Frank Bolivich, Jeff Farvour, Troy Denkinger
- VII. Old Business:
Charter seat elections will not be held tonight. John and Jessica did not notify Boards Support in time before elections were going to be held.
- VIII. New Business:
Kim discussed a high school scholarship for students going to college/trade school in the maritime industry.
Jerry asked about the charter seat/at-large seat. Steve Reifentstahl asked about adding an aquaculture seat, and John mentioned the possibility of a gillnet seat. Bradley mentioned it would throw off the number of seats, with split even votes if we moved outside the 15 current members. Kim suggested we approached it a little differently. Bradley asked if it was public notice or administrative hold up that barred us from holding the elections tonight. John mentioned that the issue was not letting Boards Support know about the election in a timely manner.
John asked about BOF proposal 113 and possibly bringing this up at the next meeting. Kim mentioned that she looked up the proposer group, look to be a worldwide conservation group.

Southeast and Yakutat Finfish, Jan. 23–March 3, 2015

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	123	Assign equal quota shares in the Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	3	7, 2 abstain.	<p>Wayne moved to adopt, Dick seconded.</p> <p>Wayne—processor side of things and local economy it’s something that we should be in support of. Less equipment out on the grounds to harvest the same amount of fish. Give more towards the local fishermen, and the money would stay in Sitka. Not as many tenders into town. More processing time, this could extend the processing out to 10-11days.</p> <p>Kim—thinks there’s a problem with this, and getting all the permit holders to agree, and it could be more damaging to the herring biomass. Local economy counts on seiners to spend their money every year. Doesn’t think she’ll support it.</p> <p>Moe—would like to hear the permit holders input. Every year this comes up.</p> <p>Troy Denkinger (Public)—strongly believes this equal split will leave the money in town. There are losers though- the out of town tenders and pilots. Money would stay year round and not leave.</p> <p>Dick—Should we leave this up to the permit holders?</p> <p>Tad—this would set BOF and ADF&G to manage this way regardless of if all permit holders agree.</p> <p>Kim—do they have to have 100% agreement to have quota shares?</p> <p>Troy D.—yes. The last time this came up, 80% signed off, 10% neutral, 10% strongly opposed.</p> <p>Roger Ingman (Public)—been in favor with equal splits, agrees with Troy. Mature biomass too large during test sets, and with equal quotas, they can give the fish to certain permits.</p> <p>John—if you don’t have proposal 126 pass, this won’t work?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—not necessarily. Those doing SOK would give up seine. No having to give up permits, SOK harvest biomass would be taken away from sac roe biomass.</p> <p>Kim—maybe I’m confused, but if they only want to send out a few boats, they would send out all the boats? And you could wipe out a whole population by fishing?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—wouldn’t open up the whole Sitka sound. We can still close the fishery as necessary.</p> <p>Kim—you misunderstand. One big mass of herring, you’d fit 10 boats vs. 50 boats, and you could take a bunch of them? Could you damage the biomass future with equal shares?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—if we execute a fishery in a smaller area it’s still a lot of boats. Doesn’t see anything different.</p> <p>Troy (Public)—5 boats vs. 50 boats are easier to manage. Fisherman’s perspective is that ADF&G still have control, and everyone would have been</p>

			<p>allocated a certain percentage or tonnage.</p> <p>Roger (Public)—FYI, when we’ve had equal splits, processors have so many boats, and it’s split up on the # of boats the company has. Don’t have to send out 10 boats for 10 shares, can send out 1 boat to fish the 10 shares.</p> <p>Tad—2 points: 1) conservations concern, you’re assured to not go over the quota with less boats fishing. 2) from economics, the value of the permit goes up, and it’s already an expensive permit, and that might be a concern for people trying to get in the fishery.</p> <p>Dick—market might make a difference in the price of the permit.</p> <p>Jerry—this one’s similar to proposal, but likes that the 70/30 split for the management.</p> <p>John—didn’t it have to be 100% majority? Who would set the new shares?</p> <p>Tad—BOF would set new shares regardless of permit holder agreements.</p> <p>Troy (Public)—it has to be 100% between permit holders and then go to equal shares.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—it would be like Chatham black cod. We don’t manage the shares, only the openings and closures.</p> <p>Steve Reifenhohl (Public)—past BOF meetings have looked for 100% agreement from permit holders.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	124	Allow purse seine permit holders to vote on equal quota shares in the Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	3	6, 3 abstain	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Jerry—likes the idea of 70% vote, and a lot of things are already based on 50% majority. Doesn’t like that 1 or 2 permit holders can stop the other 48 from doing what they want to do, like the way it is now.</p> <p>Wayne—this is a fisherman issues, in terms of how they want to vote.</p> <p>Jerry called question.</p>
BOF	125	Reduce the harvest rate and establish a maximum guideline harvest level for the Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	4	7	<p>Tad left, voting down to 11. Jeff moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Jeff— this proposal would cap the harvest at 10%, and GHLC cap at 10,000 tons. Sac-roe fisheries are very wasteful, 12% is harvested, 88% waste. Dr. Hamada from Research Institute for Humanity and Nature gave an overview to Sitka Tribe of Alaska’s council about what’s going on with herring in Japan. In his work, he contacted Japanese processors, the herring from Canada and southeast AK is processed in China, then the roe is extracted, and the rest turned into fish meal. Lack of fish meal is hurting fish farmers. Fish meal prices have gone up tripled in the last 15 years because of Peruvian anchovy decline. This year’s price was the lowest ever, \$0.09 a pound exvessel value. Make herring least valuable fish in AK, part of this decline is due to the end user—losing some of the kazunoko users. Japanese could gift kazunoko to government officials, but government in Japan banned that. At which point are herring left more in the water? Lenfest Report found that forage fish are worth two times as much left in the water as a prey species for other fisheries. This proposal would make the market better (simple supply and demand) and increase the value of the resource. This proposal also follows the AK hatchery program- leaving more fish in the water will leave more fish for harvest and use. It will also decrease the number of fish going to feed farmed salmon. Everyone wins—more fish, markets better, keeping more fish in the water for other users.</p>

		<p>Dave (ADF&G)—would not like to have ADF&G involved in the markets, but it's simplistic to think that the decreased harvest would increase our value, because there are other sac roe fisheries. As far as leaving more fish in the water, having a hard time to see if more fish left in the water will lead to more salmon and halibut, seen a study to suggest more herring are competing with king salmon in Puget sound.</p> <p>Steve Reifentstahl (Public)—this proposal is predicated on markets of this year, if you look at gas prices now it'll suggest that it's going to be like that forever. Likely demand will increase and decrease. This is applying a biological context to economic argument. That the fishery exceeds market demand is untrue- all the herring harvested were sold. If GHF is capped, it won't necessarily increase the value. Some years in the past have had fish left in the water it would have left thousands of dollars in the water. Read somewhere that in the future there's likely to be a depression in AK's economy (because of oil production) and coastal communities are the only ones that are going to be ok. Subsistence harvest has been down, and in 2003 the biomass was 30,000 tons, but had the 2nd highest subsistence harvest. In 2004, 50,000 tons biomass had the highest subsistence harvest. Dissolves the third argument.</p> <p>Kim—questioned Steve if the fish meal Steve is using for the local fish is from Japan? Are we utilizing the product best we can in Sitka.</p> <p>Steve (Public)—fish meal he uses at his hatcheries is from a large manufacturing firm probably utilizes not much herring. The soy meal and oil used in fish feed is used in fish farms. The fish feed we used is fish oils from hake and anchovies. We've experimented with soy oils, but not preferred diets for our fish. You asked about the oils here? The infrastructure is about \$5 million for capital, not feasible with the amount harvested here in Sitka. Most of the by product from salmon goes into pet feed.</p> <p>John—for this year's quota, what percent are you aiming to harvest at?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&G)—19.7 % is target harvest rate. Based on sliding scale discussed at the last meeting, set in regulation.</p> <p>Wayne—agrees with Steve, and thinks its speculation. Good info, but not all valid. Big impact in the economy. Look at Silver Bay Seafoods' entry into the market. Business models use this fishery at a 10% harvest rate, thinks it won't be viable at that rate. Big impact, everything ever processed get sold. Value of fishery isn't always based on supply and demand.</p> <p>Bradley—what's the exchange value of subsistence product. Part of subsistence economy is trade.</p> <p>Jeff—not sure if there's been a study on the subsistence economic impacts. Lenfest report suggested herring worth two times more in supportive value to other fisheries. Asked by industry representative in spring in the Togiak fishery when the price dropped to \$50/ton.</p> <p>Bradley—off topic. Two different users will always have a conflict. One party says you have the opportunity you're not getting it, and everyone trying to assign a value to harvest. What's the fairest allocation?</p> <p>Tad—last meeting when we talked about herring proposals, we kept coming back to sanctuary from 3 years ago, [the core subsistence zone]. What was said last week is still valid today, in that we don't know if the area is working because it hasn't been in place long enough. What is the value of leaving the herring in the water-we don't know, but the Lenfest report is just an average, and it might not be particular to this situation. But if someone</p>
--	--	--

		<p>could come up with those numbers for our situation [Sitka Sound].</p> <p>Troy Denkinger (Public)—this proposal comes down to economics and I don't think we know its impacts. It comes down to economics. What we sell a herring to consumers is \$127 million in Southeast. 62% of fish processed by Sitka processors. If we went back to the 10% harvest rate like this proposal is suggesting, \$45 million lost in revenue. That's why we're so emotional. If this proposal went through 7 years ago, it would have been a loss of \$28million. Large impact, it sparks the community in the spring. Opposed because of the economics. Also, there's no science in this proposal/ economic. Increase effort you'll increase production. 2011 mentioned for subsistence harvest.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—read the Lenfest report. Great report. 3 ways to manage the fishery from the report. Good assessment, the better the harvest level. Some scientists think that harvest of 30% would be good too on forage fish. Wanted to speak to Lenfest report, because it supports the state in managing their fishery.</p> <p>Kim—has multiple feelings too. Not sure if she's the best representative for subs, because she's also a conservationist. If it came down to it, and she had to sacrifice subsistence harvesting for conservation, she would. Can only hope that ADF&G be conservative as possible for things. Concerned about the lack of 3 year olds. We have 3 years to know if the biomass is going back or forwards. We have to balance everything the best we can. My concern is for the fisheries and the environment. Not sure where to put myself in the midst of this. Not a scientist, but afraid for what's happening in Sitka. Cares about this, and all of the people involved.</p> <p>Moe—opposed to this because it's too heavily weighted to economic to even be at BOF written the way it is. When the price of pinks was so low, a lot of boats didn't fish. If we hadn't fish, and all the fish went up stream, we would have wasted a fishery. We've got to think about what herring eat too (seen them eat pink fry). All for herring stocks. Got to be a balance. 9 years ago, there as proposal to shut the fishery down saying it'll crash. He'll be the first to jump onto a proposal if the stocks' in danger, but doesn't think that's the case. Herring stocks are healthy, and the pattern has changed. Why are the subsistence users not getting their eggs? They have to change their technique. Fish are there and they've changed their patterned. This winter he's gone over 3 schools 3.5 miles wide and 3 fathoms deep. In seine seat, and knows how valuable the herring are. Opposed to proposal.</p> <p>Jeff—Lenfest has 3 tiered approach, we're at tier 2 right now. It sounds like there's agreement with supply and demand does drive herring markets. Supply has stayed steady. Not all the herring were harvested in Alaska; in Kodiak the processors left tons in the water.</p> <p>Jerry called question.</p>
BOF	126	Establish a commercial open pound herring spawn on kelp fishery in Sitka Sound.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action		No one motioned.
BOF	130	Create a commercial fishery for spiny dogfish in Southeast Alaska using pot gear.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	11	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Dick seconded.</p> <p>Dick—there’s not much of a market for spiny dogfish and a pot fishery wouldn’t make that much money. The sales probably wouldn’t even pay the fuel bill.</p> <p>John—does support the fishery, but not region wide. Would prefer to see an experimental fishery in one district before region wide fishery, but he doesn’t want to amend the proposal.</p> <p>Linda Behnken (Public)—lots of unknowns for this fishery, and spiny dogfish are slow growing sharks. Opening up a fishery without research should be done on an experimental basis.</p> <p>Dick—might be better to market by-catch from the longline fishery.</p> <p>Kim called question.</p>
BOF	131	Allow pots in commercial sablefish fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	10, 1 abstain	<p>Dick moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Dick—this proposal is for Chatham. The sablefish fishery in Chatham working well the way it is. A pot fishery would increase gear conflicts. Pots would reduce longline areas. Fishery’s going pretty well. Main concern is sperm whales. Seaswap tagged two whales and fishermen could call in and find out where the whales were and avoid them. He only had one conflict, and only took a few fish. Opposed to the proposal.</p> <p>Linda Behnken (Public)—pots tend to select for smaller fish, especially females, and they’re not sexually mature (in Bering sea). This proposal would add a growth problem. Need more research. Gear conflicts, our boats can’t do pots either.</p> <p>John—all four for all of southeast?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—this proposal is for Chatham, but the other ones are for all of SSEI (Southeast Southern Inside—Clarence Strait).</p> <p>Kim—are the fisheries run concurrently?</p> <p>Dick—in Clarence, pots and longline have separate seasons. There’s only three pot boats. It’s never been done in Chatham. Problem is that the gear, once lost, doesn’t know the season.</p> <p>Roger Ingman (Public) does the longline fishermen lose gear too?</p> <p>Linda B. (Public)—our boats aren’t strong enough to pull pots and longlines up if they get tangled (not enough horsepower).</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—pots can be longlined in SSEI. John—up north, they just don’t run a string.</p> <p>Linda B. (Public)—pots are allowed up in the Bering Sea, but the boats are bigger and can leave larger pot strings. Some situations the longliners are working with the pots, but mostly the longliners and the potters have separated to different grounds.</p> <p>Roger I. (Public)—sperm whales in the gulf, but the bad thing are the smaller boats can’t put pots on the boats. Knows the pot fishermen around Ketchikan can’t haul all the pots at once. In between pots they have one coming up, one on deck, one in the water. Knows the small boats don’t want pots because they can’t have the pots on the boat [not enough room].</p> <p>Frank Bolivich (Public)—he is a Chatham longliner for black cod. Doesn’t see a problem with the way it is now. It’s a big headache because you can’t get in touch with anyone to find out where the pot gear is (for Dungeness crab). They used to have St. Lazaria tender over there, but it isn’t there anymore because there’s not a need for the tender vessel.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>

BOF	132	Add pot gear as a legal gear type for permits currently limited to longline gear for commercial sablefish harvest in Southern Southeast Inside Subdistrict fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	8, 3 abstain	Dick moved to adopt, Randy seconded. John—this is the Clarence fishery? Mike (ADF&G)—yes. Dick—are these proposals (132/133) the same? Are they already doing pots? Would rather let the fishermen in Clarence handle it. Never had problem catching fish or longlining when fishing down there. Should be decided by participants, doesn't think that there's many fishermen in Sitka for pots in SSEI. Kim called question.
BOF	133	Add pot gear as a legal gear type for permits currently limited to longline gear for commercial sablefish harvest in Southern Southeast Inside Subdistrict fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			No Comment (see above).
BOF	134	Add pot gear as a legal gear type for commercial sablefish permits currently limited to longline gear in the Southern Southeast Inside Subdistrict fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			Dick—kind of the same as 132/133? Mike (ADF&G)—we grouped them all together. Would give option for seiners to jump onto pot boat. No one motioned.
BOF	135	Update and clarify the areas where sablefish may be taken with longline gear in the Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	11	0	Dick moved to adopt, Kim seconded. Mike (ADF&G)—we consider this housekeeping. We only manage in NSEI and SSEI so having regulation written the way it is would have possibly for outside fishing and there's not. People are only allowed to retain black cod with tags in outside (not SSEI or NSEI). East Yakutat is not defined in regulations. Clean up in reg. Jerry called question.
BOF	136	Establish 50 fish harvest limit for personal use sablefish fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	11	0	Dick moved to adopt, Kim seconded. Dick—there's two proposals. This was put in because there was a permit requirement for personal use fishery. Come up with limit that would be a generous limit per person: 250lbs/permit/person. That's probably a good estimate for use. 370 hooks is typically two longline skates. Set two skates and you could come up with 50 fish. If you set 10 skates, you could catch too much fish. There's no limit right now. Similar to salmon proposals. Kim—concerned but trying to understand. Has received a few fish from a commercial guy, because she can't get them herself. Worried about people going to harvest for people that can't them themselves (elders, disabled, etc). Wondered how it affects do-gooders. Dick—it's per person, so they can bring more people with them. They could do a proxy. Maybe a breakout session in BOF. He just wants to set some limit so people don't get 50,000 lbs. John—in personal use can you do proxy? Mike (ADF&G)—statewide allow proxies, but mostly for blind, above a certain age, or disabled. Proxy may not process more than two times the daily bag limit. That's how it is now. Roger Ingman (Public)—but you can give personal use fish way. How many hooks are we talking about? Dick—350 hooks (2 commercial skates) per permit.

			<p>Roger I. (Public)—What about personal use halibut? Can you proxy?</p> <p>Kyle Ferguson (AWT)—new to this.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—any halibut caught here would have to be released. Based on gear limits for personal use halibut.</p> <p>Linda Behnken (Public)—that’s why. Under personal use halibut you can only fish 36 hooks, but under personal use black cod there’s no regulation.</p> <p>Kyle (AWT)—logic to follow other regulations.</p> <p>Linda B. (Public)—just wanted to put an upper bound on it.</p> <p>Kyle (AWT)—confusion with state and federal. With federal halibut, most people follow those regulations. Keep it consistent.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—distributed handout, permits for personal use fishery from 2012-2014, but 2013 was the only full year of data. Proposal affects personal use fishery, so it’ll only affect the areas around Ketchikan and Juneau. No personal use fish in the subsistence area.</p> <p>John—as far as Sitka, we’d fall under the limit?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—in state waters, yes. Can subsistence fish in hatched areas; in areas not hatched, you can only fish personal use (referring to handout).</p> <p>John—was this an oversight?</p> <p>Linda B. (Public)—wading into subsistence it’s worse than personal use. Just wanted to get a control on personal use fishing in southeast.</p> <p>Bradley—seafood serving size is rarely over 6oz if you weigh it. 250lbs is a lot of fish.</p> <p>Dick—that’s a lot of fish.</p> <p>Bradley—too much of an opportunity to sell black market fish.</p> <p>Kim—regarding number of hooks. 350 hooks is how many commercial skates?</p> <p>Dick—commercial on his boats is about two skates. Can catch about 25 fish.</p> <p>Tori O’Connell (Public)—easy to set to skates because they’re tied together Don’t need to adjust gear.</p> <p>Jeff called the question.</p>
BOF	137	Establish an annual limit and gear restriction in the personal use sablefish fishery.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	11	0	<p>Dick—we talked about both of these proposals (136/137) at the same time.</p> <p>John—question for ALFA. Are you going to try to put it in subsistence regulations?</p> <p>Linda Behnken (Public)—little bit of a stretch to say they have Customary and Traditional use because of the ability to catch sablefish. If we can make headway on personal use, but it’s a heavier lift for subsistence. Jerry moved to adopt, Kim seconded. No discussion.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	138	Require groundfish fishermen using dinglebar, mechanical jig, or hand troll gear to report the specific location of fishing operation by latitude and longitude in logbooks and clarify the reporting of amount of hooks fished to be consistent with that information requested in the logbook.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	10	0	<p>Bradley left. Kim moved to adopt, Dick seconded.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—long established reporting requirements for logbooks in the longline fishery. Jig fisheries are prosecuted differently, no start/end position of gear. Jig logbook is to nearest bay or headland. The info provided is slim by nearest head or bay. From lingcod fishery in Fairweather grounds it’s reported at Lityua Bay 50 miles away. Trying to report to nearest statistical area. Nothing like narrowed down for lingcod. The proposal will help to address where effort is and the amount of fish where</p>

			<p>they are. In regulations, it's required to report number of hooks and number of hooks per line. Difficult to distinguish for staff what the data is coming in as. Logbook asks for total amount of hooks fished. The proposal will allow us to get data that's more straight-forward.</p> <p>John—is the data very confidential? People not keen to give away favorite spots.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—we take confidentiality seriously, sealed stamped envelopes for logbook mail in.</p> <p>Roger Ingman (Public)—if you give lat/lon, would you micromanage versus opening a huge area?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—there's no directed fishing inside, but it's prosecuted from International Border to Cape Suckling, all managed in different areas.</p> <p>Roger I. (Public)—would you think about opening only one smaller area in the district?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—we open entire mgmt. area.</p> <p>Roger I. (Public)—would it change the way you're managing? Is it good for the fishermen to give a lot of data?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—in the Demersal Shelf Rockfish fishery, we used that lat/lon data to determine habitat. We don't know how we'll use the data, but we don't have any data now, so it's hard to assign fish ticket data to districts. Level of detail now is minimal. Trying to gain more info on the resource. There's no stock assessment for lingcod. How we used the data is probably limitless.</p> <p>Kim—firm believer in the more info we have the better the fishery.</p> <p>John—unintended benefited, say east Yakutat, and a whole bunch of effort focused on one area, and maybe we can divide the district into smaller bits. Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	139	Define mechanical jigging gear separate from dinglebar troll gear and establish limits on hooks to be used.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			No one motioned.
BOF	140	Increase minimum commercial lingcod size limit to 30 inches from tip of snout, or 22.75 inches from front of dorsal fin, to tip of tail.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	10	<p>Dick moved to adopt, Jeff seconded.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—we didn't introduce this. History for 27 inch size limit was in 1989 protecting sexually immature females and nest guarding males, which was info from BC. Population declined, so minimum 27 inch size limit was put into place. No fecundity study to show what this effect would have to the spawning biomass. Surveys between 1995 and 2005 indicate 1% of fish sampled were in this length range. Longliners tend to catch larger fish. Bulk of harvest would be out of the range suggested. Data from directed fishery show that sampled 20% lingcod of directed fishery were under 30 inches. This change wouldn't affect longliners so much but would impact the directed fishery and by-catch.</p> <p>Jeff—does it address any conservation concerns by ADF&G?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—no, we think populations are doing well, and there's little trauma to the undersized fish release, though some mortalities.</p> <p>Dick—would the proposal increase handling mortalities?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—depends on where they're fishing. Would have some mortality, and some handling mortality.</p> <p>John—quotas in EYAK filled, but in SSEI?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—no, most of the quota remains. Last year about 10-15,000</p>

			<p>pounds left in the central gulf fishery. That harvest depends on lingcod prices, and on salmon.</p> <p>Roger Ingman (Public)—maybe if it's not used we should close it.</p> <p>Linda Behnken (Public)—the existing size limit was shown to protect the stock and to throw in a proposal to change it just because seems silly.</p> <p>Jeff called question.</p>
BOF	141	Allow commercial salmon fishermen using troll gear in Sitka Sound to retain up to two lingcod per trip for personal use.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	12	0	<p>Tad was present during this proposal (taken up before he left), allowing us to have 12 voting members. Tad moved to adopt, Randy seconded.</p> <p>Tad—two separate but related issues. Trollers able to retain by catch lingcod in the LAMP. Issues with trollers near the LAMP, but choosing to not keep lingcod so they can fish in the LAMP later in that trip. Difficult for enforcement to allow retention without possession. Attempt to get at both issues. Something as restrictive as two fish per trip might address conservations concerns, and maybe even restrict to home pack. ADF&G can make that a requirement. Came out from a proposal three years ago.</p> <p>John—question for trooper, and Mike (ADF&G). What if this went through and you would cut off the dorsal fish/other fin? Made it so it's not a saleable fish.</p> <p>Kyle Ferguson (AWT)—like the way you'd ID a sport caught king? Not sure, new the AWT, but thinks that would work.</p> <p>John—did the original regulation come up because of a concern for local lingcod abundance. Still an issue?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—only commercial user able to retain was halibut fishermen during the 1997 survey. Status of lingcod in LAMP?</p> <p>John—I know some of the concern about the LAMP fishery.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—lingcod population decline in the early 90s and area wide lingcod stocks are doing well.</p> <p>Tad—area wide lingcod stocks are doing well, but central Southeast troll outside quota has rarely been taken. Is that because fish and retention was assumed?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—no, because it was assumed prior to 2000.</p> <p>Bradley—is there a reason why you don't want to sell your by-catch?</p> <p>Tad—I'd rather be able to keep one to eat at home than not to be able to keep it all, or not even be allowed to troll in the LAMP because I had a lingcod onboard. Market is there.</p> <p>Kim—are people coming home every day from the LAMP and you could be catching two fish per day? For subsistence/personal use, I've been fishing out there. Every day is a trip. Doesn't have a problem with taking fish home to eat it, and most of these are smaller boats that would be coming in daily.</p> <p>Tad—the person actually catches by-catch in the LAMP or by the boats that are fishing outside the LAMP and occasionally coming in to finish a trip. By-catch rates are not high, but can cause an end to a trip (2-5 lingcod per year). Increase in landings would be fish caught outside the LAMP who thought they might fish later in the LAMP. The Central Southeast Outside troll by-catch allocation was based on data from years with unlimited by-catch. Since by-catch has been prohibited in the LAMP, have haven't reached the by-catch allowance.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—addressing this proposal, it seems to asked as personal use</p>

			<p>not commercial. That wouldn't change the issue of commercial/personal use fish onboard the boat. 10 by-catch lingcod caught outside the sound, can't tell the difference between the commercial/personal use fishing.</p> <p>Jeff—wanted to make sure there's not a problem with enforcement. Can't have other fish on board.</p> <p>Moe—do you think we can do commercial by-catch in the LAMP? Doesn't think there's high enough by-catch.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—the last round this proposal went through the BOF process ADF&G was against, because there's no stock assessment and we don't know what the impact would be. Ran data on 2013 troll season, 1,350 troll salmon landings attributed to LAMP during open by-catch. When by-catch closed, 1,900 may or may not be from the LAMP. JUST salmon landings.</p> <p>Kim—can you catch and release lingcod? With that device for rockfish?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—lingcod don't have that problem like rockfish do, some mortalities with release, but do much better than rockfish.</p> <p>Steve Reifentstahl (Public)—how do you do the biological assessment inside/outside LMAP.</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—no stock assessment for Southeast lingcod, rely on fish tickets and logbooks.</p> <p>Steve R. (Public)—you sense the biomass is increasing?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—over the years we've had anecdotal reports. We don't feel there's a problem, but we don't have the stock assessment program. John—any numbers on D-class boats harvest?</p> <p>Mike (ADF&G)—has some numbers for 2001-2014. Lingcod catch in the halibut fisheries (commercial, subsistence/sport), average round pounds in LAMP was 1,645 longline catch pounds for commercial. Sport caught-8,500lbs/year. Subsistence fishery 15,400 lbs. Total for all groups is roughly 25,500 pounds.</p> <p>Jerry called question.</p>
BOF	142	Repeal Sitka Sound Special Use area lingcod regulations.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	9	0	<p>Kim moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—housekeeping proposal. Regulations on book for sport lingcod. Sitka sound special use area were more conservative, but now they are less conservative.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	143	Require all anglers releasing nonpelagic rockfish to release them at depth, and require at least one deep water release mechanism on board vessels used by sport anglers.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	1	8	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G) overviewed the deep water release mechanisms used by charter fleet. Charter has to take fish down to 100 ft or depth of capture, whichever is shallower.</p> <p>Roger Ingman (Public)—how much weight does it take to send a yelloweye down?</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—About 5 lbs for medium size fish. Some mechanisms are designed for adding multiple weights. Sportfish website has a link for a video for all of the mechanisms.</p> <p>John—what do you do to go out to catch a rockfish (charter goes out each day).</p> <p>Jerry—go out whenever possible, not always targeting bottomfish. Likes the idea of releasing at depth, but not like the idea of adding more gear to the boat. Likes it for conservation.</p>

			<p>Kim—bought one because thought it was going to come in regulations soon.</p> <p>Troy—no current definition for a release mechanism. Up to AWT for enforcement. Proposal would require all anglers to have some release device.</p> <p>Kyle (AWT)—proposal would be for saltwater. It would be handy to have a bucket with some line to throw over.</p> <p>Kim called the question.</p>
BOF	144	Repeal mandatory retention requirements for nonpelagic rockfish.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	1	8	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Jeff seconded.</p> <p>Jerry—fact that you have to keep each one as you catch it is negative. What if I don't want to keep rockfish, just salmon? While I'm trolling, I don't want to have to stop and release them at depth.</p> <p>Tori O'Connell (Public)—no high grading in mandatory retention.</p> <p>Jerry—in that sense I like it. There's one thought, the 80% survivability/100% mortality [a statistic mentioned in the proposal] is true.</p> <p>John—Rockfish so hard to fillet, but doesn't see the waste issue.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
BOF	145	Repeal Sitka Sound Special Use Area and Ketchikan Area nonpelagic rockfish regulations.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	9	0	<p>Jeff moved to adopt, Karen seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—similar to lingcod proposal. Sitka sound special use area has less conservative regulations than regional regulations. This regulation isn't necessary.</p> <p>John—call this housekeeping?</p> <p>Troy (ADF&G)—yes.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>

IX. Meeting: 6th of January for next meeting? Elections on the charter will occur, and the discussion about the seat will occur at the next meeting.

X. Adjournment: 9:36 PM

Minutes Recorded By: Jessica Gill, Secretary

Minutes Approved By:

Date: