

Sitka Advisory Committee  
January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2015  
Sitka Sound Science Center, 834 Lincoln Street

- I. Call to Order: 6:32PM by John Murray, Chairman
- II. Roll Call: Jessica Gill, Secretary  
Members Present: Jon Martin, Jerry Barber, Dick Curran, Kim Elliot, Jeff Feldpausch, Tad Fujioka, Jessica Gill, Randy Gluth, Moe Johnson, Karen Johnson, John Murray, Bradley Shaffer, Floyd Tomkins, Wayne Unger  
Members Absent: Cody Loomis, Brian Massey, Peter Roddy  
Number Needed For Quorum on AC: 8  
List of User Groups Present: Charter, Hand Troll, Longline, Subsistence, Alternates 1 and 2, Trapping, Hunting, At-Large 1 and 2, Power Troll, Conservation, Processor
- III. Approval of Agenda:  
No formal agenda, but we'll be discussing sport fishing proposals, troll proposals, and subsistence proposals.
- IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: From meeting date:  
John found minutes to be in order. Kim and Tad had comments. Kim motioned to approve minutes, Tad moved. Minutes approved.
- V. Fish and Game Staff Present:  
Grant Hagerman, Dave Gordon, Troy Tydingco
- VI. Guests Present:  
Eric Jordan, Harvey Kitka, Carl Petersen, Joel Markis
- VII. Old Business:  
None
- VIII. New Business:  
None
- IX. Next Meeting: Monday Feb 2<sup>nd</sup>. Everyone seems to be in agreement. Seine proposals will be covered.

**Southeast and Yakutat Finfish, Feb. 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	146	<b>Revise the amounts reasonable necessary for subsistence for salmon in Districts 12 and 14.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action	TABLED		<p>Jeff moved to adopt, Randy seconded. 13 voting members.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&amp;G)—in part it's housekeeping, but Customary &amp; Traditional use designation doesn't exist for Districts 11 (Cape Fairweather to Yakutat) and 16 (Juneau). Division of Subsistence is doing surveys in Angoon, and they will likely come to BOF to reduce the ANS.</p> <p>Tad—doesn't feel comfortable without knowing the revised numbers.</p> <p>Jeff and Randy withdraw their motion for adoption based on lack of information on revised ANS numbers.</p> <p>Majority vote to table.</p>
BOF	148	<b>Allow for designation of community subsistence harvesters for Hoonah residents.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	1	5, 7 abstain	<p>Kim moved to adopt, Randy seconded. Only 13 voting members.</p> <p>John—there's got to be some limits on community harvest permits.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&amp;G)—common practice throughout SE. There is state proxy permit (for blind, disabled, elderly), which is restricted to harvesting 2 permits. ADF&amp;G issues community harvest permits (CHPs) to various agencies based on abundances. Hesitation on stocks that are low, but if there's surplus fish a CHP is allowed. Way its worded is for Hoonah residents only, which could cause problem, but perhaps for only an area instead of an individual group or organization.</p> <p>John—there's not prolific runs up there.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&amp;G)—not a lot of information on the systems they're asking for.</p> <p>Jeff—any escapement data?</p> <p>Dave (ADF&amp;G)—in 2002, meetings with different parties yielded requests for more fish, and ADF&amp;G raised limits.</p> <p>Jerry called question.</p>
BOF	153	<b>Allow subsistence harvest of salmon with purse seine and gillnet gear in portions of Districts 12 and 13 near Angoon.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	3	8, 1 abstain	<p>Jeff moved to adopt, Tad seconded. 13 voting members.</p> <p>Jeff—Extraterritorial Jurisdiction petition might be influencing this and we might want to weigh in on this before it gets tossed around in the federal courts.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&amp;G)—restrictions on general permit gear near sockeye streams. Proposal wants to join gillnets together, ideally for more fish in Angoon. He suggested that if someone gets a subsistence permit, and wants to use gear outside of the permit stipulations, they can ask ADF&amp;G, and it'll be allowed.</p> <p>Tad—compared to other proposals intended to help Angoon which would eliminate commercial harvest opportunities, he likes this proposal the best.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&amp;G)—ADF&amp;G would specify locations for regulation</p>

			Jerry called the question.
<b>BOF</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>Allow party fishing in Southeast Alaska saltwater fisheries.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	2	11, 1 abstain	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Tad seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—similar proposals before, can't give ADF&amp;G's stance. Boat limit, not person limit, specific to SE.</p> <p>Jon—issues with enforcement? In charter world, may be positive and alleviate some issues within the charter fleet.</p> <p>Tad—possible on boat conflicts (whose fish is whose)? Who does enforcement write the ticket for if they have extra fish?</p> <p>Jon—Captain is responsible for adhering to limits.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—typically ticket goes to guides, but if enforcement can pin it on a particular person too, they will.</p> <p>Jon—definitely some enforcement issues, and might need some clarification before BOF.</p> <p>Floyd—do boats already bringing parties out have boat limits?</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—from a legal standpoint whoever caught the fish is responsible/owner.</p> <p>Bradley—thinks that if the proposer knew that this would pertain to a commercial guide operation, he might change the proposal.</p> <p>Jerry—common in fleet to party fish, but was illegal years ago. Consensus was that the fish you catch is your fish. And possible enforcement issues.</p> <p>Jon—thinks there is room for a little bit of clarification in this proposal for party fishing.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—possible increase in catch and release mortality with this proposal, both for groundfish and salmon.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—once you've caught your bag limit, you can continue to fish.</p> <p>Tad called the question.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>Allow the use of bow and arrow to take salmon in the Southeast Alaska Area by certified bow anglers.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	2	10, 2 abstain	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Bradley seconded.</p> <p>Jessica—is this a common practice?</p> <p>Randy—it's illegal in the state.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—there are a few places in AK that you can fish with bow and arrow. But not in SE.</p> <p>Bradley—his understanding with other states is that it's for invasive species.</p> <p>Floyd—it's been mentioned before for redoubt salmon, but thinks it's a bad idea.</p> <p>Jerry—thinks it's nice to have more bow hunting opportunities, but the bow hunters' education class would be difficult to include fishing. Doesn't like the proposal.</p> <p>Randy—different than traditional bow hunting, and you'd need deeper waters with line on the arrows. Arrow doesn't travel far because it's heavy. Probably wouldn't be used a lot, and not by a lot of people.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>Reduce the king salmon size limit from 28 inches or greater in length to 26 inches or greater in length in the Southeast Alaska Area.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	14	<p>Bradley moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Kim—used to have a lot bigger fish, and with the increase in hatcheries a</p>

			<p>27.5 inch fish will weigh as much as a 30 inch fish.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—28 inch has been around for a while and it's because it used to be a marketable size. In SE seeing a decrease in weight at age in salmon, but not sure how changing the size would affect things, because no info on size of released fish.</p> <p>Tad—his understanding was the 28 inch size limit was with regards to spawning/non-spawning fish. Proposer is a guide from Juneau, and is looking to increase number of fish his clients are taking home.</p> <p>Moe—majority of fish released are 26 inches in fleet, and if that was the case, the season would be over by now.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—it's a sport proposal the way it's written.</p> <p>Floyd—would this increase the downward trend in size at age of released fish?</p> <p>Grant (ADF&amp;G)—fish are maturing earlier, and there has been an increase in abundance of smaller fish (younger fish), and a decrease in weight at length.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—historically, raised size limit from 26 to 28 to meet treaty regulations. Smaller size will have the fishermen targeting the smaller fish.</p> <p>Kim—are the smaller fish tagged?</p> <p>Grant (ADF&amp;G)—from commercial troll fishery, the small tagged fish are mostly non-Alaskan hatchery fish.</p> <p>Bradley called the question.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>Modify the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan by eliminating inseason reductions to the annual limit.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	14	<p>Jon moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—for King salmon sport fisheries management plan ADF&amp;G has to have sport harvest 20% of harvest, minimize restrictions for sport fishers, and minimize in-season changes. In high abundance years, all fishers, resident and non-residents, have high harvest limits, but non-residents have annual limit. In low abundance, the harvest changes based on abundances, and non-resident bag limits decrease throughout season.</p> <p>Jon—management plan is for all in SE. Proposers are charter operators on the inside. Thinks the plan is working well here in Sitka, but on the inside they might have a harder time catching fish. Will not support as written.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—no allocation specifically to sport guides, and percentage of fish harvested has not changed.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—in other areas, proposal is possibly allocating fish to certain areas (on the inside).</p> <p>Tad—the limit for non-residents would stay at an average throughout the season, not high or low, if the proposal was adopted.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—we know the quota changes in advance, so we could set that average throughout the season.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>Establish nonresident annual limits for coho, sockeye, chum, and pink salmon in salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	11, 3 abstain	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—no conservation concern for these species.</p> <p>Jon—doesn't support this unless conservation concern, it would be bad for small scale operators.</p> <p>John—can see local conservation concerns, but not justified if no concern.</p>

			<p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—conservation concerns are regionally. Local stock concerns are addressed through emergency orders.</p> <p>Jon—this proposal is for saltwater.</p> <p>Jeff—possibly proposal has come out of Kake with charter fleet wiping their runs in pillar bay.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>Establish nonresident annual limits for coho, sockeye, chum, and pink salmon in fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	1	7, 6 abstain	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Randy seconded.</p> <p>John—similar as proposal 159, but for freshwater.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—no conservation concern for a particular species, and when ADF&amp;G does have a conservation concern, ADF&amp;G issues emergency orders.</p> <p>Jon—possible conservation concerns for coho in freshwater with a possible increase in guide operations.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>Prohibit multiple hooks and barbed hooks in all fresh waters of the Yakutat Management Area.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	14	0	<p>Jerry moved to adopt, Kim seconded.</p> <p>Jerry—proposal from Yakutat AC. In favor because it could reduce mortality of catch and release fish.</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—no conservation concern in these fish/area.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—thinks barbless hooks makes a huge difference in catch and release, and that the Yakutat AC has a good idea here.</p> <p>Kim—in support based on conservation and fish health.</p> <p>Jon—do barbless hooks reduce mortality?</p> <p>Troy (ADF&amp;G)—yes and higher reduced mortality when fishing without bait.</p> <p>Jon—important to note that sport fishermen weren't opposed to this proposal.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>Allow commercial salmon drift gillnet gear in Southeast Cove Terminal Harvest Area.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	2	6, 6 abstain	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Tad—proposal doesn't make sense. Gillnetters are already far ahead in their allocation. Doesn't think it needs to be put into place at this time.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—gillnetters want to be included in additional or new opening areas.</p> <p>John—doesn't think this is a BOF proposal; UGA should be able to meet with the Regional Planning Teams for this proposal.</p> <p>Kim called the question.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>Modify commercial seine and troll fishing schedules in Southeast Cove Terminal Harvest Area.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action	TABLED		<p>Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Tad—Chum Trollers Association (CTA) proposal. Trollers need block of days to be effective. SE Cove is new fish, and this was an attempt to maximize the benefit to the troll fleet. Run peaks about mid-July.</p> <p>Jeff—peak was consistently about 20<sup>th</sup> of July. Area would be good for trollers, with bright fish.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—thinks fleet would want a seine opening at least once a week.</p> <p>Tad—10 day block would be better, once a week openers wouldn't have fish</p>

			<p>enough buildup.</p> <p>Eric J. (Public)—would really like some consistency and collaboration from all gear groups when coming to BOF.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&amp;G)—this proposal is just a chum opener.</p> <p>Moe—not in favor of block closures. In the past, it’s not clear if the effort will be there. Fishing could be messy with block closures and fish building up.</p> <p>Carl Petersen (Public)—no opening this board cycle, because fish will be there for cost recovery for the first two years. Would like to have 5 day contiguous troll openings.</p> <p>Jeff—seiners might be getting a chance at the fish in Hidden Falls before they go to SE Cove.</p> <p>Moe—there could be a possibility for giving the trollers the first 72 hours. A lot of sentiments were repeated from Proposal 176.</p> <p>Eric J. (Public)—suggests the AC make a motion to change the schedule from 5 days troll, 2 days seine. Up until June 8, seine openings at SE Cove same time as openings at Hidden Falls, then after June 8, 5 days troll, 2 days seine.</p> <p>Dave (ADF&amp;G)—would not be open for chum outside THA.</p> <p>Kim—Table discussion on hidden falls/deep inlet/se cove so gear groups can discuss.</p> <p>Moe moved to table, Wayne seconded. Majority vote to table.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>Modify the winter boundary line for the commercial salmon troll fishery.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	8, 6 abstain	<p>Tad moved to adopt, Dick seconded.</p> <p>Grant (ADF&amp;G)—proposal continuation from 2003 Yakutat proposal. Safety concerns at that time fishing so close to the reef. Winter harvest for kings has gone up from 4% to 10% of winter catch with the 2003 lines. After discussing with proposer, the actual area is about ½ mile further. 2003 line is 26 miles, addition is an extra 30 square miles.</p> <p>John—might support if fishing is after January. Can’t support with size of area.</p> <p>Eric Jordan (Public)—if the AC adopts this, you can have very large winter king catches, which can have huge repercussions.</p> <p>Kim called the question.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>Correct regulatory language to clarify a contribution rate of Alaska hatchery-produced salmon for the spring salmon troll fisheries.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	14	0	<p>Kim moved to adopt, Jerry seconded.</p> <p>Grant (ADF&amp;G)—spring troll fishery management plan. Managed based on Alaska hatchery production.</p> <p>Jessica—clarification on if proposal would increase hatchery production.</p> <p>Grant (ADF&amp;G)—no, it would just do some housekeeping on the regulation.</p> <p>Jerry called the question.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>Change the sunset date in the District 12 and 14 Enhanced Chum Salmon Troll Fishery Management Plan.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Action			<p>Bradley left, voting members down to 13. Tad—225, 226, 227 all pretty similar and in the interest of time, he’d like to move to adopt 227 and comments for 227 echo thoughts for 225 and 226.</p>
<b>BOF</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>Remove sunset clause from District 12 and 14 Enhanced Chum Salmon Troll Fishery Management Plan.</b>	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	13	0	Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded. Eric Jordan (Public)—recommends discussing 226 in addition to discussion on 227. Tad—comments from 227 apply here. Tad called question.
<b>BOF</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>Remove sunset clause from District 12 and 14 enhanced commercial chum salmon troll fishery and allow fishing 7 days per week.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	13	0	Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded. Tad—proposals to make Chatham fishery a more viable fishery, and remove sunset clause. Proposal 227 changes the openings to 7 days. At 4 days, it doesn't work because of lack of tenders in the area. Originally at 4 days to removed conflicts with Juneau sport fleet, but didn't see any there when he fished. Would allow fleet to follow fish through Icy Bay east. Grant (ADF&G)—227 would give more time to trollers, allocative. ADF&G is in favor of continuing management plan. Kim called question.
<b>BOF</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>Close the commercial troll fishery for coho salmon from August 1–10.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	11, 2 abstain	Tad moved to adopt, Jerry seconded. Grant (ADF&G)—10 day mandatory regional troll closure to allow fish to pass to Angoon for additional harvest opportunities for resident. Tad—seems excessive to close Yakutat to Ketchikan for just Angoon. Grant (ADF&G)—for coho, those systems aren't monitored. Indicators with coded wire tags in northern streams, which have been within or above escapement goals within the last decade. Berner's River and Auke Creek are the indicators for NSEI. Proposal eliminates existing closures based on stock assessments, and the whole region would shut down for 10 days. Jeff—any subsistence data from Angoon with ANS/subsistence needs not being met? Grant (ADF&G)—limited subsistence harvest data, 2012 study: 314 coho by rod and reel, 530 sport caught coho. Majority of fish caught in saltwater. John—seen ADF&G have closures when needed, and if there was a need, we'd have one. Seems like overkill. Kim called question.
<b>BOF</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>Restrict commercial salmon fishing with troll gear in Section 15-C beginning July 1.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12, 1 abstain	Tad moved to adopt, Randy seconded. Tad—vindictive proposal, contrary to 1994 agreement for hatchery fish. In July, that district is managed for sockeye not king or coho. Grant (ADF&G)—little to no effort by troll in this area. Kim—the regulation doesn't specify species. Eric Jordan (Public)—proposal speaks to sub-legal king mortality, but he believes the gillnetters should not mention by-catch mortality. Tad—reducing the number of days open in this proposal for troll will essentially kill trolling in this area. Kim called the question.
<b>BOF</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>Reduce the area open to commercial salmon fishing with troll gear in Naha Bay during the summer.</b>	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	0	12, 1 abstain	Tad moved to adopt, Kim seconded. Eric Jordan (Public)—millions of hatchery chum returning to Neets Bay, but fish come into Naha Bay, and acts as a fish trap, and fishery goes on for about 10 days. Doesn't think the fish there are at that time are Naha fish, they are Neets fish. This proposal wouldn't conserve Naha Bay fish at all. It's a hatchery chum fishery. Grant (ADF&G)—no conservation concern in Naha Bay. Jerry called question.
<b>BOF</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>Clarify power troll gear specifications regarding hand troll gurdies and fishing rods.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	12	1	Kim moved to adopt, Jerry seconded. Grant (ADF&G)—Housekeeping. Level of detail is much more detailed in hand troll versus power troll regulations. Proposal would help alleviate questions about power troll legal gear. Would not change regulation at all. You cannot fish hand troll from power troller. Some questions regarding the regulation itself were asked. Tad—ATA hand troll rep generous, and suggested that if the power troller wants to fish with hand troll gear, they should go for it (more expensive permit). Grant (ADF&G)—this does not change the regulation at all. Kim called the question.
<b>BOF</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>Allow downriggers as legal commercial salmon hand troll gear for the entire year.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support	13	0	Kim moved to adopt, Tad seconded. Kim—has a hand troll permit, and it's getting hard for her to hoist lines and downriggers by hand. Doesn't believe too much impact on fishery if was allowed. Tad—ATA unanimously supported this proposal in past. Jerry called the question.

X. Adjournment: 9:53 PM by John Murray.

Minutes Recorded By: Jessica Gill, Secretary  
Minutes Approved By:  
Date: