

Sitka Fish & Game Advisory Committee
December 4, 2024
NSRAA & Zoom

I. Call to Order: 6pm by Chair

II. Roll Call

Members Present:

Stacey Wayne	Shellfish (Chair)
John Murray	Power Troll (Vice Chair)
Schulyer Mace	Hand Troll
Kent Barkhau	Hunting
Moe Johnson	Seine
Dick Curran	Longline
Steve Ramp	Resident Sportfish
Lance McCutcheon	At Large
Woody Cyr	Trapping
Aaron Prussian	Conservation
Karen Johnson	At Large
Scott Wagner	Alternate
Greg Kain	Charter
Devon Calvin	Subsistence
Luke Bastian	Guide
Joel Martin	Alternate

Members Absent (Excused):

Members Absent (Unexcused):

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:

Troy Tydingco-Sitka ADFG Sportfish, Aaron Dupuis-ADF&G Comfish, Jake Wieliczkiek ADFG sportfish staff, Anthony Wallock - ADFG biologist, Monica Matz (sportfish)

IV. Guests Present:

Matt Donahoe (ATA), Cherri (ATA), Norm Pillan (SPC), Kim (SEAGO), Jeff Farvour (resident), Cody Cowan (ATA), Mike Vaughn (troll), Kate Sullivan, Ben Campen

V. Approval of Agenda

M/S to approve agenda

- Stacey proposes to look at Steve's testimony for rental boat issue
- Matt (ATA) brought in a proposal for a king salmon management plan - Stacey proposes we go over it briefly.
- Devon would like to address individuals who are confused about what the board does when there is a tie, specifically regarding 179. Also, noted that the full AC

wasn't present to vote. Wondering what can be done to get a more representative recommendation off to the BOF.

- Stacey proposes to clarify this procedure.
- John: Are we covering dive and sport?
 - Stacey: Any other sport proposals we haven't talked about?
 - Stocks of Concern are sport and commercial so kind of a toss up. Specifically (125 and 126)
 - King Salmon Management - next week
 - 2 more salmon proposals to cover (Tad's) - 132&133
 - BOF Agenda will be put out later this week
- Stacey proposes to add who is going to BOF

Approved unanimously

VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Kent move

Aaron seconds

Approved unanimously

John nominates Norm Pillen to the processor seat

Norm: Grew up in PA, lifelong commercial fishermen started hand trolling. Owns the Sea Lion tender and is nearly 40 yr member of SPC. Served several terms as board member, chairman and now president. Tad was a good friend of mine, being aware that he held this seat I wanted to throw my name in the hat.

Norm elected unanimously

Steve's testimony: Work session at BOF chose not to include our unguided rental boat - next NPFMC at the December meeting will testify again and let them know we still want to take action. I plan to attend this week/next via zoom. I shared with Stacey my draft testimony so I wanted to confirm with the rest of the AC that I would not be overstepping. This is an ongoing old business so I would not need a vote but I would like anyone's comments.

Stacey: Please reach out to Steve if you have any questions or comments.

Steve: I added the substance of our meeting with the Commissioners and his concerns about responsibility of logkeeping, sharing his desire to do something at his level to solve this problem.

Matt Donohoe's Revised KSMP:

AC King Salmon Management Plan task force will take this under consideration for the next meeting. This was written by territorial sportfish but ATA supports it. It's only 2 tiers below and above the threshold number. No need for all the extra language.

John: The committee will get back to us at the next meeting.

On Proposal 179 in terms of procedure:

Stacey: Devon's desire would be to bring back 179 for the full AC to vote on. We follow RROO if you want to reconsider, you need to find someone who voted against it to bring it back for reconsideration. So you would need to ask for reconsideration from someone who opposed it in the original vote. Devon was also wondering if there is another way to get it brought back up. If you have a proposal and it might be a tie, ask to vote last and vote against it so you have the power to bring it back at a later time. That's a strategic thing to do but I don't know if there is another way to bring that back up.

Steve: Are you sure it's those who vote in opposition to? I was under the impression it would have to be someone who voted for it.

Stacey: No, it has to be someone in opposition.

Devon: During a tie, the no votes are the majority and therefore you must be a part of the "majority"

John: I concur with Steve - when I wanted to bring back 108 I needed someone in the affirmative.

Stacey: We can look it up and read about it and at the next meeting, anybody can motion to amend a proposal. A previously defeated proposal, anyone can motion to amend it.

(Tommy Gamble): There was great testimony provided already so I won't add more new information but I am asking in favor of bringing proposal 179 back up. I missed the last meeting where you talked about co-management. In 2006-2007 I worked as a liaison - it is not a favorable position. If you do a motion to renew, perhaps think about the area that is there and where you can manage in-season. You can make it a proposal and then make a decision vs allowing the harvesters to do so. Let it be demonstrated that we could all work together as user groups to co-manage the resources right. Add everything else later. Is it possible to get this back when they have time to consider this information appropriately? I think the area is important enough and if it is a closure let it be temporary.. Again it would be a motion to renew. The next meeting is perfectly fine Madame Chair.

Steve: I voted in favor of that proposal but I'm uncomfortable with someone publicly testifying about a proposal we tied on.

Stacey: Persons to be heard can really speak about anything but we will move on.

BOF Attendance:

Stacey: We're trying to have AC members there to testify about discussion, how we voted and ask BOF questions. Who is planning to attend?

Devon, Scott, Norm (co-chairing IPHC advisory board so I will get out by the 30/31 following that meeting), John is a maybe (going for half of it - specifically king salmon and herring), Emily Scott, Woody Cyr (try to go for kings), Lance will not be there, Luke might go, Stacey will go for some of it but not all of it.

Dive Proposals:

On Proposal 212:

John moves to approve 212

Kent seconds

SEARDFA - Kate Sullivan (works for commercial dive fishing association out of Ketchikan):
With the cost of gas, there can only be 2 divers on a vessel to fish for geoduck. Instances where ASFG set a lower guideline harvest for that week and if its 400-500 lbs far away, it becomes cost-ineffective for 2 divers to go out. Interest is to allow (case-by-case for ADFG) in instance where there is a small quota left for geoduck, proposes to have 4. Dive association has to pay for paralytic shellfish sampling before opening then there is a 5 day window for sampling and if it's a single area and say 8k lb it still costs \$1700 + \$900 to ship to the lab in Anchorage. Processors are on hold. Only allowing 2 divers in low GHF situations is not efficient for divers, processors or the dive association. Limited fishery where ADFG set to 400 lb and had 1200lb left in one area outside of Ketchikan but wasn't cost effective so only 400 lb caught. This happens every year.

ADFG Comments:

Aaron: This would allow ADFG to increase from 2-4. It would reduce the number of vessels present in the fishery and make it more efficient for everyone involved. I do not anticipate any problem with this.

Public Comment:

AC Comment:

Kent (to Aaron): In the case where there were 4k lbs not harvested in the last opening - what happens to that quantity of geoducks? Does it roll over into the next week?

Aaron: If there's any GHF leftover at end of season it rolls over to next time the area is open. Not necessarily lost forever but would be a loss for that specific year if it goes unharvested.

Kate: Without another regulatory pss test (costing \$1700-\$2500) - it can't roll week to week without another test.

Lance (to Kate): When you say on a case-by-case that's per area or per boat?

Kate: Yes, per area. If ADFG isn't comfortable increasing # of divers on vessels because it's 45 min from Ketchikan port then in that week they wouldn't have to go to the 4 divers, could just keep it at 2 or 3. In these very far away areas when the trip limit is reduced and cost is high for 2 divers, it gets cost prohibitive now that costs have gone up so much.

Luke (to Aaron): Why is there normally a 2 diver limit?

Aaron: To control effort. And to manage harvest levels in a particular opening.

Call to question Proposal 212

Motion Passes 15-0

John moves to adopt Proposal 213

Woody seconds

Kate: In commercial geoduck, nothing has changed in management and 213 and 214 and 215 are really looking at the fact that we have a dramatically changed ecosystem driven by otter migration and predation and exploding population (half of carrying capacity in SEAK). Honestly, we're looking at the sunset of the geoduck fishery unless we can adapt commercial management or increase the ability to manage sea otter populations. Our ability to do anything with sea otters is extremely limited, we're looking at geoduck management. On 213 - on the lower bound of 90% CI so during biological surveys it's put into a formula and currently we're using the most conservative side. Several years ago we brought a similar proposal for cucumbers which did pass at BOF. Geoducks live longer so I acknowledge there are more biological aspects but using this lower CI would still be conservative. Increase GHl while continuing to protect geoduck species.

Stacey: Do sea otters predate on geoducks?

Kate: Otters predate all of our commercial dive fisheries. We are seeing similar to what Sitka is seeing. Otters dig mounds to get the geoducks/everything else. We've probably lost more than 50% of annual GHl on outside of POW. In the next cycle when they resurvey, we will lose anything on POW side. Huge detriment to Craig. Sitka has lost pretty much all of your GHl over the last decade. ADFG can point to sea otter predation when these declines happen. In areas without sea otters (Ketchikan), when fish and game survey in non-otter predated areas, GHls are stable or increased. It's a very stark contrast. In 2012, BOF was reluctant to manage based on sea otters. But fundamentally our fishery has changed and we're looking at closures, buy-backs and we feel like we need to try something different.

Stacey: BOF passed the midpoint proposal on cucumbers - do otters also eat cucumbers?

Kate: Cucumbers have a shorter life span. They were willing to go to the high point of the CI but through outside conversations they went back to the midpoint to be more conservative. We can try this and if it doesn't work, we can go back to the low point.

ADFG Comments:

Aaron: This would require the GHl be calculated 2% at midpoint instead of lower bound.

Commissioner can modify these procedures based on productivity. If this were to pass, it would eliminate the main benefit to comfort uncertainty around estimates. GHls would rise for all areas and the safeguard would be removed. Uncertainty & estimates will sometimes be high but current methods help against setting unsustainable harvest levels. Geoducks live up to 160 yrs old with low recruitment rates, making them vulnerable to overfishing. Point estimate is used in BC assessment however that rate is lower than the 2% vs 1.2-1.8%. Since BC stocks have higher recruitment, it would be inadvisable to make ours lower. The only area in Sitka that has been closed is Simon's Bay. Last time it was surveyed in 2015 it did not meet the biomass threshold. Not sure if it was otter driven. This was written by stock assessment biologists.

***reading from unreleased department comments

AC Discussion:

John (to Aaron or Kate): What does this mean: "There would remain annual confusion as to whether ADF&G is managing for the lower end of the confidence level or the mid-point."

Kate: We want to know if we can solidify this in regulation

Aaron: Currently not in regulation in the way it is for sea cucumbers/urchins so this would put something in regulation.

Kate: Currently uses lowest bound of CI but two other dive fisheries where that has been in regulation but not for geoducks. It would be nice if it was consistent. Maybe we look to increase that to the midpoint.

Kent (to Aaron): What sort of different lb-wise does that make to the fishery GHL? Is it a significant increase or decrease?

Aaron: I can't offer that number off the top of my head but the lower bound is more conservative.

Kate: Biostatisticians argue the midpoint of the 90% CI is still conservative. We don't have those numbers either but maybe that's something we should figure out before BOF.

Norm (to Kate): Concern about sea otter predation - it sounds like you're looking for an increase in opportunity? So what are you really after - an increase or a stability in a fishery being challenged by predation?

Kate: When the dive fisheries were established and the management plan was developed, it's been status quo ever since but hasn't been status quo in ecosystem conditions. In areas where there is no predation by otters, can we go to the midpoint of the CI, increase the productivity while still being conservative of the geoduck stock?

Luke: Hard time supporting this without understanding what kind of change of numbers

Kent: I would reflect the same opinion.

Steve (to Kate): You mentioned an amendment to restrict to just areas suffering from predation? That could be something to allow more of us to vote in support of this. Right now, I agree with Kent & Luke.

Kate: If already below the 30% threshold, it would be moot in those areas closed. But in areas still open and that don't have otter impacts - would it be more palatable to identify those regions that are not as impacted?

Aaron: The Department's position would not change on this.

Steve: Moves to amend 5 AAC 38.142 Southeastern Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.
(g) The guideline harvest level for each area [areas not experiencing sea otter predation] will be calculated as two percent of the most recent estimated biomass, using the mid-point of the one-sided 90 percent confidence interval, per year.

Lance seconds

Steve (to Kate): How would that feel to your org?

Kate: Spoke with ADFG about this - this makes more sense to allow a still conservative but less conservative as they are not impacted by otters. This is something I would be willing to amend and bring forward.

Kent: What's the likely outcome of expansion of sea otter predation? Are these areas currently not affected going to see more predation in the next period?

Aaron: I don't know. Tough to say.

Luke: I think that opens up another bag of worms. How will you quantify areas with or without predation?

Schuyler: Just getting in the weeds of this - ADFG haven't surveyed Simons since 2015 so maybe wouldn't come up for survey.

Norm: Along the same lines, hearing from Kate & Aaron that there are concerns about stock levels. Sea otters are highly migratory and not paying attention to regulations so I think that opening up areas that could potentially end up with otters while trying to maintain a stock level is a challenge to me.

Call to Question Amendment 1 to Proposal 213:
Fails 14-1

Call to Question Proposal 213:
Fails 14-1

Kate suggests talking about 215 first -
John moves to adopt 215
Kent seconds

Kate: This proposal looks at original biomass estimate - 30% below that estimate the fishery closes. ADFG has changed what the original biomass estimate is based on what they have - so sometimes that changes. In regulation, it is the original biomass estimate. As a pilot project, we are interested in doing something similar to BC. They have, with their management department, gone into areas experiencing ecosystem changes and done a revised biomass estimate based on

current biomass. Then they set a much reduced harvest level with more biological surveys in those areas to ensure they aren't harming the overall population. They have done this long enough to have data come back showing fisheries can return to these areas - based on current biomass taking into consideration current ocean conditions. We're asking ADFG to do a pilot project with us in a couple areas.

Aaron: Combined comments for Proposals 214/215. 214 would allow reopening after 5 years with standard 2 per whereas 215 would reopen sea otter impacted areas at 2 per. Est biomass is less than 30% determined by first stock assessment. Commissioner may modify it if ADFG receives information supporting the modification. ADFG would have authority to reopen fisheries when biomass is under 30% or on stocks substantially reduced with harvest rate of less than 2. Levels of harvest that are not sustainable.

Public Comment:

AC Comment:

Joel to Kate - What is the harvest age/size of a geoduck? If they live 160 years then how in 5 years would they come back?

Kate: Variable on substrate and other conditions. They can live up to 160 years but those are outliers. They are long-lived but in the wild in productive areas it might be 5-7 years to reach harvestable size.

Lance (to Aaron): What is current vs original biomass

Aaron: Original was the first estimate the department did when the geoduck beds were first being explored. Current is successive surveys.

Lance: Would the reason to not resurvey be that they are slow to grow?

Aaron: Surveyed every 11-12 years on rotation.

Steve (for Aaron): If this were to pass, would this require the department to conduct more frequent surveys? And how would it be paid for?

Aaron: I don't have the language in front of me but if ADFG was going to reopen the areas, I would imagine there would have to be a survey done before being reopened. Can't speak to how they are paid for.

Steve: Department pays for surveys to establish GHs.

Kate: Commercial dive are the only group to write checks to ADFG to pay for management costs. 2 years ago, the cost for geoduck management increased significantly but in the meantime we've lost about 50% of our harvest areas due to sea otter predation. I'm saying when fish and

game closes the areas they claim it's due to sea otters. We pay fish and game for survey and management costs every year. Our costs for geoducks increased but areas for harvest have decreased.

Call to question Proposal 215:

Fails 0-15

Kent moves to take up Proposal 216:

Luke seconds

Kate: Simple language clarification - "you cannot fish commercially for geoducks in waters permitted as a mariculture site." It should be changed to specify it's mariculture for geoducks.

Aaron: Clarify language to ensure geoduck permit holders can harvest geoduck clams on mariculture waters not designated. This is a good thing.

Public Comment:

AC Comment:

Call to Question Proposal 216:

Passes 15-0

Steve moves to take up 217

John seconds

Lance: 217 would allow weekly openers to include Sundays 8-3 to allow for flexibility. They want to add another full day to the openers - for context, it's currently M-T 8-2 and 8-12 so they want to add another day from 8-3. Talked to a few divers about this with mixed reviews - most were against this, seems like for people making their primary income for the year you can get it no problem.

Aaron: It would add an extra day - starting in Nov, managers can expand to provide additional opportunities which have enough GHL remaining. Roughly 2k lb limit and many reach that limit within the current timeframe. By allowing an extra day while retaining the trip limit, probably won't risk going over GHL. Those who wouldn't meet their limit with normal 11 hours so it could result in a shorter season.

Public Comment:

Ben Campen: Local diver for cucumbers. Personally, I am against this. It removes any competition from the fishery, giving more than ample time.

AC:

Devon (to Ben): Why is it important to have the competitive aspect for a fishery which you have quota for?

Ben: People who are well prepared and more productive divers should be rewarded for that aspect rather than unproductive diving. If you're a more productive diver, the total GHF will go farther so you might get more time when other permit holders don't get theirs.

Woody (to Aaron): What % of divers don't make the 2k lb limit each week?

Aaron: We could figure that out, but most in the Sitka area get it. Depends on productivity of the area too.

Norm: Potential challenge - an extra day may put more pressure on those productive areas.

Steve: What does age have to do with this proposal?

Ben: I'd say it's irrelevant. In the Sitka fleet, there are a handful of divers in their 60s who are very productive.

Lance: We only really have a couple close areas to fish and if those get shut down we are pretty much done for the season. I don't think our divers are traveling south to Ketchikan. If you're prepared, you want more time in the long run.

Stacey: If we added a day, would it make it more likely out of area people would come?

Lance: Not necessarily, I just think it would end up closing the areas quicker. It doesn't seem like something we need to do.

Steve: This is one of those dangerous fisheries (fatality wise), if this proposal does nothing to harm the resource but gets everyone home a week or two before storms, I support it.

Kent: So you're saying fewer trips, shorter season?

Steve: Yes, it would get them off the water later in the winter which I think is a good thing.

Woody: Not sure about the market but having your harvest spread out is probably better.

Schuyler: If you have more days out there, lots of guys drop out when easier spots close.

Call to Question Proposal 217:

Fails 2-2-13

218:

Lance: Intros the proposal

Public Comment:

Ben: Against this proposal for stock health reasons, like Aaron said about spawning time. It's a full 6 month season - if those lbs can't be caught in that time frame, its probably better for the

stock. Most areas in SEAK, will be done by end of November but in productive regions it goes pretty quickly.

AC Discussion:

Lance (to Aaron): How much effort happens in March?

Aaron: Not much, I can only speak to the Sitka area. The only area we've had go to March 31 is Crawfish/West Crawfish where there are only a handful of divers going out.

Call to question Proposal 218:

Fails 2-13

On Proposal 219:

Lance: Clarifying language - trying to address that divers underwater send up cucumbers and a lot of times the deckhand pulls it onto the boat without the permit holder. It seems like a no-brainer to me.

Kate: 219 and 220 address the same issue. 219 adds language to protect divers and 220 is to clarify about possession.

Aaron: Currently, regs don't define possession where permit holder is not required to be on vessel. This would clarify the permit holders during or after a sea cucumber opening. Notes there has never been an issue when legal harvest concerns. Advises the board to define possession then it should also be defined for cucumber and geoduck as well.

Luke (to Aaron): If this were to be put into place would it be harder to enforce actual infractions?

Aaron: I'm sure there have been odd situations for divers but personally, I have not heard of any issues as the regs are right now.

Stacey calls to Ben

Ben: I don't see anything wrong with it but like Aaron was saying, I don't know if that opens up issues with enforcement. Having a hard time making up my mind about that honestly.

AC Discussion:

Steve: According to both these proposals, dive vessel drops divers off at different bay. Does this really happen?

Ben: Yes, there are tank divers that have two divers. I wouldn't say a different bay but a ¼-½ mile away.

Kent: Any current regulation to have license or tag on the bags coming to the surface?

Aaron: Not to my knowledge

Ben: People use different methods - corks or buoys or just a bag exchange with their tender boat. It's pretty varied.

Kent: There's no legal tags required from the department?

Aaron: No.

Norm: This seems like an enforcement question and no one from enforcement is present so, being new to the AC process, does enforcement participate?

Stacey: Yes, if we anticipate we want their opinion they will come. And definitely at BOF.

Kate: Talked about this with sea cucumber committee and Ketchikan ADFG biologist and in one specific area this has become an issue where both divers and crew members have had issues with enforcement saying "you're not in direct contact with your product." I think it would be important to have someone from enforcement comment. What I understand is that what is currently in regulation is out of step with how it is implemented and has resulted in issues with enforcement. I felt it would be good to proactively correct/clarify before ticketing does occur.

Steve (to Aaron): Does this change how you prosecute the fishery at all? No effect on the resource?

Aaron: Nothing would change from a management standpoint

Lance: Wondering if we should postpone this vote and call in an enforcement agent to weigh in?

Lance moves to postpone 219 and 220

Steve seconds

Passes unanimously

Lance moves to take up 221

Lance: This appears to be in line with prior geoduck proposal. Seems like some of the aquaculture sites are acquiring cucumbers and claiming them as their own? Aaron?

Aaron: This would prohibit aquatic farms where commercial sea cucumber fisheries occur. As of 2023, 5 aquatic farms and 2 aquatic farm hatcheries to rear cucumber in AK and to-date no reported sales from these farms. Not sure where they are. The department does not have any concerns about this that I am aware of.

Public Comment:

Kate: As of right now, if someone starts a farm getting a 10 yr lease with the state to grow oysters or kelp, they can add other species to their list of allowable harvest or propagation. We had an instance in Ketchikan where an oyster farm was started and then kelp & cucumbers were

added in that area. Taking the naturally settling sea cucumbers which would settle on bottom. We feel like this is allocating what should be naturally settling sea cucumbers to a private farm and not allowing them to become a resource. If a farmer is going to start an aquatic farm, they should not be allowed to add on cucumbers just because they are settling in their private farm. They have not been sold but are used as a tourist attraction. We do not know much about settlements in SEAK - have invested money into research on this. If we have an area that is productive, it should be protected for the commercial sector not an oyster farm.

AC Comment:

Woody: How do they farm cucumbers? Is there a way to exclude cucumbers from the benthos that are community property?

Kate: No way right now to mark it as farm or wild raised sea cucumber. Right now the reg is that those settled in gear can be kept. No way to know if a farm is going to the bottom or just settling in their gear. BC is actively working on how to mark hatchery vs wild cucumbers but as of now there is no way to distinguish.

Woody: Benthos that is common property habitat vs what is a farm. Is there a way to physically separate those on benthos or naturally occurring.

Lance: Wild cucumbers are wandering onto these farms and then the farmers are keeping them? It seems like they aren't taking very many of them but on the other hand, that could set a precedent.

Steve: In support on principle, similar to why we voted against a Sitka sac roe herring permit holder to shift in a given year. I see they have an aquaculture permit to a competitive dive fishery. On principle, I will vote in support.

John: I suggest we table the whole thing, if Ketchikan wants to vote on it but Sitka doesn't have anything.

Aaron: In Sitka there are areas approved for oysters/kelp and geoduck site.

Steve: What Aaron said - there's nothing to stop those permit holders to add cucumbers to their site.

Norm: I agree. Even though we don't have any here currently, it would be short sighted to not make a decision now.

Kent (to Kate): In BC, were there efforts to mark and do they have an active nursery for cucumbers?

Kate: They're doing research on aquaculture for cucumbers. Concerned about the inability to mark. We have talked to them and ADFG to try to do age & marking studies. One of the biggest

barriers to distinguish. In AK, once a farm is allowed to put these on their farm site they can just say they were grown in the oyster gear.

Kent: Are the Canadians actually growing cucumbers or just thinking about it?

Kate: There are a lot of proposals to start doing that but BC is in research mode before allowing that to happen.

Stacey (to Kate): How big is this farm you're talking about?

Kate: Some are 500 acres, some are less or more. It's a significant infrastructure that they then have 10 years to do certain things. They can amend, add species, without any regulations.

Call to Question Proposal 221:
Passes 12-3

Next Meeting:

- Proposals 125-126 for SOC
- 132-133 for Tad's fork length proposals
- 169
- Only 2 dive proposals left for next week
- shellfish
- Remaining troll proposals
- KSMP

Stacey: Old Business/start with king salmon management plan & troll at next meeting.
Then move to shellfish second and go back to enforcement questions for those proposals tonight
then go onto shrimp.

Greg: 1)What was the proposal number for downrigger and 2)What was the stuff Matt brought in from territorial sportsmen?

- John will email it to Greg

Cody(ATA): Would you like me to connect you to Larry Edfelt? Larry, myself and Matt all worked on the KSMP and can make sure Larry will be there to answer questions.

Stacey: It's not a proposal in the book so it's not on our agenda. I offered that our AC task force looking at 109 could incorporate those ideas into it.

Cody: I'm sure Matt and I will be there but if anyone on AC wants to talk to Larry (author), I can get you his contact.

Steve: ATA submitted their proposal and now have an amendment that is a total rewrite and they can submit that with their proposal. I think coming to us with it is not the way to go, we already addressed their original proposal.

Greg: Agrees with Steve

Kent: Our subcommittee could ask questions if they see fit while they're in process.

John: It's a stretch for me personally, if parts could be additions to 109 but it's basically writing the same proposal.

Move to adjourn

Adjourned

VII. Reports

- a. Chair's report
- b. ADF&G
- c. Others

VIII. Public Comment

IX. Old Business

-

X. New Business

XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting

XII. Set next meeting date

-

XIII. Other

Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: _____

Minutes Approved By: _____

Date: _____