

**Sitka Advisory Committee
December 14th 2017
Centennial Hall @6pm**

- I. Call to Order: [Time 06:00] by [Jon Martin]
- II. Roll Call:
Members Present: John Murray, Moses Johnson, Karen Johnson, Eric Jordan, Jon Martin, Brad Sheaffer, Randy Gluth, Jeff Feldspausch, Tad Fujioka, Dick Curran, Stacy Wayne
Members Absent: Andrew Thoms, Wayne Unger
Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 8
List of User Groups Present: Commercial Trollers, Public
- III. Approval of Agenda: Tad Fujioka, Randy Gluth Second
- IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: Nov. 29th- Randy, Stacy second. Dec 13th- Randy, Stacy second.
- V. Fish and Game Staff Present: ADF&G Grant Hagerman, Rhea Ehresmann
- VI. Guests Present: Matt Donahoe, Chris Hanson, Fred Fayette, Randy Drake, Matt Lawrie, Jason Gjertstein, Brett Young, Tyler Green, Bart Meyer, Ceri Malein, James Fischer, Caven Pfeiffer,
- VII. Old Business:

Shrimp Letter- motion to discuss Eric, Stacy second

- a. Matt Lawrie- public member – I think it's good- appreciate the recommendation.
- b. Don't know what will bring the fishery around but something needs to be done
- c. Randy- there is decline and fishery is in jeopardy. Thanks Stacy for the work you did.
- d. Eric- Tori comments- rework the letter and send it on. Example of good work by the committee. Talk with biologist and have a public meeting to address conservation issue.
- e. Stacy- agenda change-not eligible now. Correct process to get in front of the board though. Turn to management does this warrant an emergency order? Tori and Linda mentioned does this community wish to host another public meeting and comment- so community informed and has a chance to give feedback.
- f. Public- Canadian- Egg limits? Would this be useful?
- g. Jeff- Tenakee- reopened, stocks seemed to be recovering. Not sure why that happened in the first place.
- h. Unanimous- send it on!

VIII. New Business:

- Troll
 - 133- 134-
 - Proposal 133- motion to adopt Tad, John second
 - Department
 - Grant ADF&G- Changing management in 8 and 11. Basis for fishery opening and gear type on Regs discussed the proposal is more directed at Taku and Chilkat. We do address Stikine as well. It would change troll opportunities in certain area 9 12 14 in spring and change net fisher 15 11 8 depending on preseason forecast on systems listed here.
 - Private individual wrote this.
 - Concern is that they don't close sport fishing just commercial conservation must be holistic can't close it to one group pretend conservation when its actually allocation
 - Public Comments
 - Fred Fayette- Please vote against this should be the department making the decision not someone else putting this into law. If there are problems why aren't the talking about the whole sport fishing thing.
 - Grant ADF&G- we do have current regs in place over terminal fisheries and do deal with treaties for escapement before fishery occurs. This is a more restrictive way of dealing with it. Yes this does not mention sport. As far as troll goes this would close big parts troll areas for multiple species. Much of this can and is done by emergency order. We can already do this. Fully aware in advance.
 - AC comments
 - John- would you presume these plans would cover if what you have on the books is not enough? You mean action plan? Yes plan is already going to address this.
 - Eric- I agree [Department has sufficient management authority to make sure this
 - This proposal would close all trolling in the affected districts, not just trolling for kings. We have existing chum fisheries in some of these places..."
 - Tad- Does the department agree with what the proposal says that 'Years of fishing on escapement...'"
 - Ive heard ocean survival is the problem not overharvest.) Troll harvest already accounted for in projection.
 - Call to question Randy, second Karen
 - Vote support 0, oppose- 11 unanimous
 - **Motion to support Proposal 133 fails unanimously SITKA AC DOES NOT SUPPORT PROPOSAL 133**
 - Proposal 134
 - Motion to discuss Tad, second- Randy
 - NO rep present Territorial Sportsman
 - Agency-

- ADF&G- close troll april 15 through June 15th. Different by linking to Juneau area Taku river fish.
 - Public:
 - Department already has the authority to do what it needs to do. Don't need a reg for this.
 - AC
 - Tad: What does Juneau sport fishery mean?
 - Agency- large part of district 11 closed to sport fishery. We made some conservation restrictions and were concurrent actions with sport fish to be consistent. Same deal much is done by emergency order. The sport fishery has a substantial catch of Taku fish, hence the Emergency Order. This proposal asks for troll closures in areas with high effort on highly mixed stocks- not very high percentage of Taku fish caught in some of these areas."
 - John question, Randy- second
 - **Vote: Support- 0, oppose-11 unanimous—SITKA AC OPPOSES PROPOSAL 134**
- 172—184
 - Proposal 172
 - Discuss, john- Tad second
 - NO rep
 - Agency- r
 - ADF&G- Remove current restrictions in spring fishery. Right now harvest caps are based on hatchery fish percentage. Down in Ketchikan area this proposal would remove treaty cap restrictions. This is a direct migratory corridor of one of stocks of concern. Have had restrictions in those fisheries for unuk river for conservation. Having trouble with the hatchery fish but difficult time for that.
 - Matt- Charlies intent- board of SSRAA, Problems getting aquaculture fish. I think we opposed at ATA seems like we just cant do this right. Maybe in the future we can work to get better access to the hatchery fish but understand conservation concern.
 - Advisory Council
 - Eric- Real killer whale problem too- I oppose this'
 - **Tad- out of our area- Table Tad, second Eric SITKA AC TAKES NO POSITION ON PROPOSAL 172**
 -
 - Proposal 173- NSRAA troll reps
 - Motion to adopt Tad, second- Eric
 - Troll Rep- Eric- Chum troll plan adopted 6-9 years ago in Ketchikan, reason we adopted this so the department could manage hatchery fish in this area in icy strait. We catch mostly hatchery fish. Purpose is to roll this over. At present sunset every three years. This proposal removes sunset. Its gone on high percentage of hatchery fish. Very little by catch. Big problem chums are not always available to bit. No allocation or conservation concern in this area
 - Agency- no problems its worked well should continue.
 - Public- Support this. Going ahead we will need more opportunities other than wild fish.
 - Tad- I support this good opportunity for trollers we should support

- Motion to Stacy, second- Randy
- Vote support- 11, unanimous **SITKA AC SUPPORTS PROPOSAL 173**
- Proposal 174- NSRAA
- Motion Eric tad second
 - Sponsor Eric- southeast cove- should start having good returns start harvesting these fish. Enlarged the area based on advice of seiners over there. The proposal Give trollers an opportunity to harvest these chums as they are returning late june early july
 - Agency- new opportunity for toll fishery in face of conservation restrictions in the next few years. Could be a new fishery opportunity. Mostly no problem. Concern with size of area. Some wild system stocks that could be impacted. We could work out the details at the board of fish arena. It is a migration corridor for wild stocks headed to lynn canal. Potential for wild stock interception but early to tell could use more data on this.
 - Jeff Feldpausch- tag data does exist on these fish. North Chatham, icy straight. Does show some interception hatchery chum. Both seine and troll fishery
 - Public Comment- Troller perspective we support this. Whats happening with NSRAA and hatchery production. Allocation issue Troll way outside of there allocation going to be way worse (terminal areas don't work cant catch them) Cooperative attempt to deal with this and provide opportunity on non wild fish without inciting a gear war.
 - Matt Lawrie- important opportunity for trollers please support in faith that I will get worked out with department
 - AC
 - Tad- particularly if spring opportunities are going to become more limited
 - Call question Randy, second Stacy
 - Vote- support 11 unanimous **SITKA AC SUPPORTS PROPOSAL 174**
 -
- Proposal 175- put forth by department
 - John move to adopt, Randy second
 - Agency- oversight in development of management plan did not prohibit keeping kings on board no reg that say if area closed to chum can't have kings on board
 - Public – no comment
 - AC
 - Tad- amendment- “when fishing for chum salmon {in an area closed to king salmon}.
 - Agency- good catch
 - Amendment is good
 - Called question Randy, Jeff second
 - Vote on as amended support-11 unanimous **SITKA AC SUPPORTS PROPOSAL 175**
- Proposal 176- Tad, second Randy
 - ATA rep- Tad
 - ATA wanted to add Crawfish Inlet to the list of areas that are open to chum trolling during the time when most waters are closed to trolling due to concerns over coho.”

- Agency-
 - ADF&G- provide addition opportunity to trollers for chum salmon during Coho Closure. Not too much concern here
 - (Eric Jordan left)
 - Public- support for same reasons
 - AC
 - Mo- concern with expanded line- Agency says should be free of wild fish. I was thinking more conservatively but did have concern with that expanded area.
 - Agency- SHA area? Outside the inlet? Trolling only in extra area. If there are problems agency could go to nonretention if there is an issue. Likely will be a learning curve as this is a new area.
 - John call queston Mo second
 - Vote support 10- unanimous **SITKA AC SUPPORTS PROPOSAL 176**
- Proposal 177
 - Motion Tad, Randy second
 - Sponsor ATA- Tad- harvest hatchery Coho when traditionally closed to Coho which is for allocation and conservation issue. Now with Hatchery fish no conservation issue and there should be no allocation issue. Written to be very flexible. Able to be changed from year to year depending on how the Coho are coming back. When I drafted this, I had a few potential areas in mind. The first was in front of the Klawock Hatchery. Virtually no other hatchery stocks all klawock hatchery fish. Also thinking opportunity in Sitka Sound if Salmon lake fish do well. Might be opportunity in Deep Inlet too (THA) don't get to fish there often but if the one day a week happens during coho closure have to let those go.
 - Agency- fishery conducted during Coho conservation period and help Trollers get some allocation back. There is some concern of interception of wild stocks. Allows flexibility work with hatchery areas that department not as concerned about with good coho production. Flexibility allowed by this department could restrict boundaries to lessen concern.
 - Public- we support this. If department can work with this you should support it.
 - Advisory Council
 - John- this is already done like Hidden Falls?
 - Sort of- preseason we don't really know operating off of forecast. This would have to a preseason determination. Yes Hidden falls similar but has set boundaries and hasn't been very productive. Yes additional opportunity would be provided by this. Klawock release is having a huge impact on troll allocation. We could look to places like this to provide more opportunity.
 - Randy- I would like to see some more defined boundaries if we open this it could lead to some issues. Not sure if this is really something we should do.
 - Motion John, Randy
 - Vote support- 7, oppose 2, abstain- 1
 - Proposal 178 motion Randy, John second
 - Rep not here
 - Agency- line would be moved after reach a certain amount of hatchery fish.
 - Public Comment- Matt Donahue- when fishery closed early so many fish around trollers felt that the Sitka area to more than their share of the fish. More than half the boats fishing in the Sitka area not from Sitka. Not a valid comment. Also at that time

everyones catch was up. We have GHL in the winter when we catch that it closes. They caught the fish and they closed it. To close Sitka would reallocate fish to other areas. It would really hurt the area that established the winter fishery. We were not out of our historic percentage. Its an allocation issue and it doesn't happen very often. We/I oppose this.

- AC
- Tad- after looking at this. I can see this would not trigger very often. Leaving much of the sound open would help stretching the catch out could help with the price and spread out to more of the boats in the fllet. Smaller boats may have trouble fishing this line in bad weather
- Mo- Terrible proposal misor management 2allocatative in fish and boats. May have 150 boats on the line and then eliminate that line, they will go to craig, shilkof, coronation- these places cant handle that number of boats. Not enough fish for them too. This proposal cant handle prosperity. Better to catch the fish and then have the season close than to not get the quota. The fishermen are here because this is where the fish are,. this is where the herring area, that's why I live here that's why the fish get caught here. Spent hours on herring. There is a spring fishery for these boats. Don't want to see the winter fishery get turned into the spring fishery. Some of us like this winter fishery: less boats and the weather is bad and its fun. Don't want to be around all the other boats. Peaceful don't get the score but do just fine. If this is changed no area to go to get away. Not in favor of either of these.
- Matt- Public- this is draconian moving the line 10 miles, not insignificant very significant and
- Chris Hanson- I agree in Mo- I purposely invested in a boat that can fish the winter line. I moved my entire operation to fly fish from here and get best price for my fish this is why I am here.
- Mo- Fishery is already spread out over five months, plenty of time and plenty of opportunity as is.
- Call question Brad, Randy second
- Vote support 1, opoose 8, abstain- 1
 - Motion to support fails **SITKA AC OPPOSES PROPOSAL 177**
- Proposal 179
 - Motion to adopt Tad randy second
 - NO rep present
 - Agency-
 - Public- Proposers of this no longer support it. Its complicated. There are triggers based on percentages of catch. When number is reached on overall catch. Gave all areas other than Sitka an additional 5% and took away 10% from Sitka of historic winter catch. It's a reallocation of the winter fishery. The guys that propose this no longer support it because fo whats going on with King salmon. AC in Craig decided shouldn't supoport it this cycle. I don't support this its unfair and not logical another draconian move of the winter line. Its just a bad idea.
 - AC

- Tad- in comparison to last proposal much more complicated in appearance. Another way to disguise an attempt to hit Sitka. Sitka trigger way more sensitive than triggers in other areas. Cant confirm that intent.
- Matt- I can confirm it,
- Tad- I will not support this
- Mo- I don't support this- Line should be moved back out. People forget after a few nice weather years. Still have bad weather in April. Lots of good things have been done to extend winter fishery already I don't think that needs to be done. I don't know about the part saying about the improvement in quality- fish are subject to bruising in bad weather. Haha.
- Matt- heck craig would have been closed last year under their own proposal
- Question Randy
- Vote support 0- , oppose 10 unanimous prop fails
-
- Proposal 179
Move Tad, Randy second

- Sponsor,Tad- catching more Columbia fish instead of local hatchery fish. Reduce triggers in years of high abundance. Could be concerns for wild stocks. Because spring fisheries are managed to take into considerations those concerns. Don't see a problem there. If there are concerns its flexible to close what you need to with Emergency Order.
- Agency- several years ago we did have issues with accessing hatchery fish because of abundance of treaty fish. Spring troll harvest cap all determined by local hatchery fish. Makes it difficult. Asking to liberalize this a bit and move to next tier for more fish. Liberalizing all harvest- concerns for all wild fish. Within treaty fish is also wild stock harvest. Yes monitored in season but definitely concerned in liberalizing this at a time of conservation concern.
- Public Comment- I support it.
- AC-
- John- May not matter with things that are about to happen. Motion to table, Randy second- no objects
- **SITKA AC OPPOSES PROPOSAL 179**
-

- Proposal 181-
 - John Murray sponsor- 70- 60%
 - Motion to discuss Randy, Stacy second
 - John I would like to amend this- Take some time to look at these
 - Changing it to just make it a straight 60/40. Pulls the high abundance language out and preseason abundance language out. There was a suggestion that I take this to BoF and use it as a vehicle for further action. Felt strongly that it's a good idea. Doesn't necessarily hurt to put it in. For new fisherman and those that miss the first king opening. If you have more fish in August opening you could have another shot. Having that opportunity is important especially for up and comers. Helps giving them a foot up. Add into number 6- could help to support new fisherman coming into the fishery.

- Agency- Hes just pulling out the abundance trigger. So I think this is allocative. One thing that adding fish to august as a positive. Larger targets allow for longer fishing period. Longer openings allow for easier management and adjust accordingly. First opening can be really influenced by weather. Positive on this would be easier to hit our targets. Department has determined more wild fish are caught in August and harvest of wild fish could go up in August.
- Matt Public AT- At does not support a 60/40 or even 50/50. People have designed their opprtation for the 70/30 split. Department determined by genetic analysis August 9% says more wild fish. Wire tag data says August fishery has a lower percentage than July fishery. Another reason- same as way Craig dropped theirs. For trollers it's a divisive issue. We don't need to be divided further going into this BoF.
- Chris Hanson- not the time to go to this type of split. Would limit the departments ability to manage this. Depend on longer periods of July fishing. I don't see how this is a bargaining chip. Only people involved in this are trollers. Doesn't make sense to me.
- Matt=Next season looks pretty grim don't think we should making these changes right now, even though I do think the 60/40 split would be better. Better for price etc. It is just a bad time to adjust how the King fishery is done. Speaking against my own interests.
- Chris- We didn't get a second opener and I don't want a high percent taken away. It was bad enough to lose that 30 percent don't want any higher risk to lose. Not a good time. Low king abundance, not time to mess with percentage.
- Bart- I agree with John. My son just got a troller missed july opener here. This would be an improvement for my son to have opportunity in August. In the future people who gp to other areas and still wish to participate in troll fishery here would be beneficial.
- Matt- There are some that would prefer to take 100 in the first opener so as not to lose the percent that was meant for the second opener. Don't want a repeat of last year. I agree with Chris. Bad year for this proposal. Allocative because many boast don't fish second opener, go do tuna instead. Largest number of boats are in the first opening. Change the allocations to the boats.
- Randy- That's still related to a choice that the troller is making. Why is this divisive we are speaking to a preference. Should be irrelevant
- Matt Lawrie- has more to do with the area where the fish are caught than allocation
- Agency- Allocation- It could favor certain parts of the region due to where fish are at different times.
- Tad- I recall that the big winners were the southend guys, Sitka guys do pretty good cuz price is better. Didn't effect catch so much as better price per pound. IF there is concern that higher percentage of kings caught in July is spawning fish. May be better to catch more fish in August to have less impact on the fish stocks.
- Matt- Agency data is not done these thinsg are not published. They are supposed to have this available during comment period. Biggest problem the trollers have is that we don't have this information ahead of time. Very uncomfortable over this
- Agency- Backed up in publishing cuz we are short staffed with funding cuts.

- John Murray- In my experience there is not as much wiggle room with in season management in July. Usually less days than more days. I represent Sitka AC. I don't want to take it all in July. As far as allocation- its choice. Up to the boats. I agree with the August opener comment but that is a wild card. Hopefully that does not happen again
- Stacy- Grant when you spoke to difficulty of management- Hard to set number fo days to hit target. Good to have more days- more survey time fly.
- Chris we did 60% in 4 days, later on 21 days to catch.
- Agency- one of the publications not published yet- mixed stock analysis- on average 05-2016 troll king fishery in july vs august is wild se stock. 6% in july 9% in August. Moving 10% into a time that would have more impact on wild se stock. Majoriy of the fish caught during these times are not Alaska fish.
- Public- always division in how to do it get it done in the bignning g. Better to have the 60/40 split is what we have found over the years. If they think they are missing out that is their plan and their choice at that time of year. Should keep 60/40.
- Matt Lawrie- I agree most people in Sitka would support this although I don't think I support the amendments. I liked the original plan because otherwise in years of low abundance it could be a disaster.
- Public- most people in Sitka like the split season plan. Less spawners caught.
- Mo- question for Grant 2015- summer quota and how much was it exceeded 60000 fish? Entire summer allocation taken in july. Target was exceed by 30 %
- Mo Comments- If that happened in any other fishery lots of red flags and debate. Big supporter of the department that is significant. What the heck happened? Im in favor of the 60/40 it keeps getting brought up but always gets shot down. If second opener 10% larger it would be easier to hit that target rather than go over. May help in years of low abundance. Not an allocation issue it's a choice. Better to have lots of options. Take it from a seiner- overlap the opening is better because people spread out. It would be good for the troll fishery too. Help the management. If adjusted by 10% it will impact the seiners. Same if more the start date back. Im in favor of this. If you are having a conservation concern that's why you have two openers. Take it all now does not equal out to future fish. Worse attitude is that we are missing out and should have taken it then. No- if you take too much going to loose a lot more
- Matt Donohoe- make up of the fish is the question.
- Call the question Randy, second Brad
- Vote as amended support 9, opposed-1
- Motion to support passes **SITKA AC SUPPORTS PROPOSAL 181**
-
- Proposal 182
- Motion to adpt John, Tad second
 - Rep not available
 - Agency- We get lots of calls about how come we don't know when the closure will happen. Put in regs so people know if this will take into effect. We have a few assessments to decide with a conservation closure is needed. Juneau sport area evaluated as well. Adjust the start date of the second closure. If we know

early on we can open King retention period sooner better because earlier we decide that the more fish are around.

- Public- better to keep it as is and allow the flexibility with the department.
 - Tad- steady decline in the kings that are out there the longer it takes to decide to open that. If we are concerned about our fish its better to allow catch earlier to get more Columbia river fish than Alaska fish.
 - John- I agree with Fred- seems pretty limiting. I don't know why he even chose Tuesday.
 - Randy calls question second Jeff
 - Vote: support 0, oppose- 10 unanimous
 - **SITKA AC OPPOSES PROPOSAL 182**
- Proposal 183
 - Motion to discuss Tad, Randy second
 - Agency- proposing here- there is a no trolling zone outside of the dangerous river in Yakutat because mouth of river moved and adjust boundary to reflect that. Southern boundary trying to move it westward another 2 mile- possible oversight. So this would decrease closed area to fix that from before.
 - Public- 2 cycles ago. One or two or three rivers converged and protected area around Situk. Move marker to adjust closed area to reflect the river, but they did not adjust the other side. Restore the historic fishery. Area before sea tuck and ocean cape- very productive and very valuable ground. Asking for some of that back. Very weather sensitive area.
 - Brad Sheaffer left
 - AC
 - Jon- I think we should support other AC when they propose things like this
 - Tad agree: Like require handtroll vessels being used to sport fish to cover up the "HT" letters that designate them as handtrollers."
 -
 - John question Stacy second-
 - Vote support 8, oppose- 0, abstain-1
 - Proposal 184
 - John motion Tad second
 - Agency- allow downriggers in conjunction with sport rods as legal gear for hand trolling for spring and summer in addition to winter
 - Public- Manual downriggers only?
 - AC
 - Randy- Any reason to not support this? Agency- use of downriggers would allow for more precision. Troopers generally oppose to keep separation between gear groups. Difficult to visually discriminate what they are doing. Increase in contact to figure out what they are doing. Could also impact visual surveys for sport vs commercial could artificially inflate commercial data which could impact harvest rates.
 - Jon- There is a way to determine but would require more contact. Fin clip etc. Don't buy that concern.
 - Tad- If you fly over the cape could determine vs Commercial based on how many appear to be mooching vs trolling. If your only issue is distinguishing hand troll vs sport. Add a provision to visually distinguish. Pretty solid ground to think Sitka hand troll fleet support this.

- Call to question Stacy, Jeff second
 - Vote support 9- passes unanimously **SITKA AC SUPPORTS PROPOSAL 183**
- December 20th Troll Proposals not necessary- we got through all of them. Grant to speak about King Conservation plan next Wednesday.
 - Grant- recommendation for King Conservation not established yet and they are not done with that yet. The Board has not yet seen the plan. We can absolutely answer questions about conservation and data and where the stocks are at. We could give a broad scope of what is being recommended the problem is the level of detail that could be addressed. Once it has been finalized it will come back to the AC to discuss.
 - If he is unable that meeting can be rescheduled
 - Can we use that time to discuss sport props that were not discussed
 - Adjourn Stacy, Randy second 08:55

Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: __Heather Bauscher_____
Minutes Approved By: __Full AC_____
Date: __Dec 27th, 2017_____