

**Pelican Advisory Committee
Thursday, February 26th, 5:30PM
Pelican Library**

- I. Call to Order: 5:38 by Patricia Phillips, chair.

- II. Roll Call
Members Present:
Patricia Philips, chair. Mike Allard, co-chair. Celeste Weller, Secretary. Jamison Mork,
James Phillips, Willy Combs, Norm Carson (teleconference)

~~Members Absent (Excused):~~
~~Members Absent (Unexcused):~~
Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 5
List of User Groups Present: 7

- III. Fish and Game Staff Present: Sam Kirby (teleconference)?

- IV. Guests Present: none

- V. New Business
 - a. Review Finfish Statewide proposals

- VI. Adjourn 7:50 PM

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals March 17 – 21, 2026 Anchorage, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
162	Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries		
	0	0	No action
11	Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W. longitude		
	7	0	
163	Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis		
	7	0	
164	Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters		
	7	0	
165	Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters		
	7	0	
166	Amend statewide definition of a mechanical jigging machine		
	7	0	
167	Prohibit vessels from having other groundfish gear or equipment onboard while participating in a groundfish fishery using mechanical jigging machines or hand troll gear		
	7	0	
168	Prohibit vessels from having more than one groundfish gear type onboard when participating in a state-managed groundfish fishery		
	0	7	
169	Create a definition of groundfish coil spring or 'slinky pot'		
	7	0	
170	Reduce the permitted egg take level of each hatchery permit containing pink and chum salmon by 25% of the current permitted capacity for those species		
	0	7	
171	Amend Prince William Sound hatchery permits to reduce pink salmon egg take capacity		
	0	7	
172	Board generated regulation that places a moratorium on pink and chum hatchery production		
	0	7	Fully supported motion to support require items 1-4 before further action regarding this proposal is considered.
173	Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent		

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals
March 17 – 21, 2026 | Anchorage, AK

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
	Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose
	7	0	
174	6	1	Allow the engine of a purse seine vessel or skiff to be shut off when the purse seine is deployed
175	0	0	Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration
176	0	7	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits
177	0	7	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits
178	0	6	Modify the definition of bag limit 1 abstained vote
179	0	7	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10 fish
180	0	7	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish
181	6	1	Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear
182	0	7	Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit
183	7	0	Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession
184	7	0	Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition
186			Reduce commercial salmon fishing opportunity with drift gillnet gear in the Central District of the Cook Inlet Area Did not review
187			Close the Tsiu River and all waters within one quarter mile of the Tsiu River and Kaliakh River confluence to commercial fishing for salmon Did not review

VII.

Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: Celeste Weller
Minutes Approved By: _____

Proposal 162 - No ActionProposal 11 - All in Favor.

Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W. longitude
Crab populations are declining where trawl gear is fishing causing the king crab and opilio crab seasons to remain closed. The hard on bottom trawl gear impacts all fisheries. Bottom mapping electronics allows closer access to pinnacles, without getting hung up, however, the pinnacles where rockfish are can be ripped out over time.

Proposal 163 – combined with Proposal 164

Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis.

Proposal 164 – combined with Proposal 163

Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters.

AC action: Move/second to support proposals 163 and 164 together – All in favor

Any regulations on trawl gear and the trawl fisheries are important; there is irrefutable data that the trawl fisheries damages the seafloor.

Proposal 165 - All in favor.

Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters

The trawl industry must keep innovating how they use their gear. The use of salmon excluders will help lessen salmon bycatch. Must push the trawl fishery to get cleaner, any effort to escape salmon is a plus.

Proposal 166 - All in favor.

Amend statewide definition of a mechanical jigging machine

It is fairer if everyone is on a level playing field. This proposal brings attention to the lack of regulations and a perceived unfair advantage; it will help alleviate the unfair practices.

Proposal 167 - All in favor.

Prohibit vessels from having other groundfish gear or equipment onboard while participating in a groundfish fishery using mechanical jigging machines or hand troll gear

If Proposal 166 passes, this will address concerns, the vessel should not be allowed to have groundline aboard. The Alaska Jig Association has the background to address this gear group.

Proposal 168 - All opposed.

Prohibit vessels from having more than one groundfish gear type onboard when participating in a state-managed groundfish fishery

Not a statewide issue, it would impact all commercial longline. The Northern SE longline fishery is finally allowed to fish using pot and longline. Cannot make access unaffordable, fishermen cannot always make afford the investment, some use salmon urdies to fish resource. The proposal does not address the item (b) change – it is too vague, too many loopholes.

Proposal 169 – All in favor.

Create a definition of groundfish coil spring or ‘slinky pot’

ADFG housekeeping – ‘slinky pot’ currently lacks a definition.

Proposal 170 – Combined with Proposal 171

Reduce the permitted egg take level of each hatchery permit containing pink and chum salmon by 25% of the current permitted capacity for those species

Proposal 171 – Combined with Proposal 170

Amend Prince William Sound hatchery permits to reduce pink salmon egg take capacity

AC action: Move/second to combine proposals 170 and 171 together – All in favor

AC action: Move/second to support proposals 170 and 171 together – All opposed.

The proposals would reduce egg take at all 30 hatcheries. The hatcheries are creating fish that are flooding the markets and causes wild runs competing with enhanced fish. The enhanced chum fishery saves the troll fleet in Southeast Alaska. These proposals should not be a statewide requirement. Not enough information to make an informed judgement on proposals 170 and 171. There should perhaps be consideration to put a hatchery on the Yukon River to produce chum and king salmon. And the trawl industry can financially support the hatcheries on the western Alaska river systems. There are successful hatcheries on the British Columbia rivers the enhance wild king salmon populations.

Proposal 172 - All opposed.

Board generated regulation that places a moratorium on pink and chum hatchery production

Considerations “Items 1 – 4” need to be done before a moratorium is put in place and/or can be considered.

Proposal 173 - All in favor.

Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent

ADFG housekeeping – boundary markers were meant for seiners/net fishing. Trollers should be excluded from seine boundary markers. Will save ADFG money.

Proposal 174 - 6 to 1 in favor – motion to support approved.

Allow the engine of a purse seine vessel or skiff to be shut off when the purse seine is deployed

Did not know it is illegal, it should be the captain and skiff operator decision.

Proposal 175 – No action.

Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration

Proposals 176 - All opposed.

Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits

This would be a nightmare for enforcement. This would allow ride alongs to pump up daily bag and possession limits. It would "Game the System", provide a loophole. Once their sport fish quota is caught, the quota get reduced from commercial trollers. A resident sport fisher mixed with a non-resident sport fisher on the same vessel makes it unfair. The troll allocation should have a greater share of its allocation caught in July or earlier in the season so the allocation is not deducted from the commercial allocation so that the sport fish can exceed its allocation. The sport fish guys are fishing derby style and consequently close their quota/allocation as fast as possible. The AC has an issue with how king salmon will be recorded for this proposal.

Proposal 177 - All opposed.

Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits

Similar discussion as in proposal 176.

Proposal 178 – 6 oppose; 1 abstention.

Modify the definition of bag limit

The proposal will create a loophole. What happens when the individual is capped out for the day or the season?

Proposal 179 - All opposed.

Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10 fish

The proposal lets them keep smaller king salmon, lowers the size limit; smaller fish should not be targeted. This proposal is not appropriate; it would be a regulation nightmare for enforcement.

Proposal 180 – All opposed.

Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish

This proposal would take fish away from the resident fisher to reallocate to nonresident fishers. There is a King Salmon Management Plan for a reason.

Proposals 181 - 6 to 1 in favor – motion to support approved.

Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear

ADFG housekeeping – Need to address; have a baseline

Proposal 182 – All opposed.

Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit
Should not be a statewide proposal. Bag and possession limits should be required and define what a bow is.

Proposal 183 - All in favor.

Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession
ADFG housekeeping – This will deter the keeping of short fish that don't meet the length of fish requirement.

Proposal 184 - All in favor.

Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition
ADFG housekeeping – provides further clarification of assemblages that can be done on a species by species basis.

Motion to adjourn 7:50 PM.

Petersburg Advisory Committee
Date: Wednesday January 14th, 2026 at 6pm
Location: Petersburg Borough Assembly Chambers and Zoom

- I. Call to Order: II.
 Roll Call:

Name	Seat	Present	Excused or Unexcused
Heather Bauscher	Chair	Present	
Don Spigelmyre	Vice Chair	Present	
Megan O'Neil			Excused
Joel Randrup		Present	
Bob Martin		Present	
Nyle Thomas		Present	
Jacob Rasmussen		Present	
Ted Sandhofer	Archery	Present	
Paul Menish	Crab/Conservation	Present	
Anthony Taiber	Gillnet	Present	
David Benitz	Hunting/Trapping		Excused
Jerry Dahl	Seine		Excused
Brandon Ware	Sport/Charter	Present	
Ben Case	Sport/Personal Use	Present	
Kaleb Baird	Troll	Present	
Eric Castro	Alternate	Present	
Seth McCallum	Alternate	Present	

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 8 List
 of User Groups Present: 14

- III. Fish and Game Staff Present: 2
 IV. Guests Present: 3
 V. Approval of Agenda
 VI. Approval of last meeting minutes – Jan. 7th,2026
 VII. Reports
 a. Chair's report
 b. ADF&G

- c. Discussion of Board of Fisheries Proposal will occur
 - i. Statewide Proposal
 - 1. Comment deadline is March 2nd
- d. Other fishery and wildlife business as needed

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals March 17 – 21, 2026 Anchorage, AK Deadline March 2 nd , 2026			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-62 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
162	Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries		
11	Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W. longitude		
163	Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis		
164	Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters		
165	Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters		
166	Amend statewide definition of a mechanical jigging machine		
Opposed	0	14	Unanimously opposed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anthony Taiber (AC): This proposal may have negative impacts outside of the cod fishery. Fisheries that use bigger “jig machines” may be unintentionally negatively impacted. This proposal as written could make gear used for commercial squid fishing in SE Alaska illegal.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (AC): Too broad, these should be regional proposals to specific areas, not statewide. Could impact many fisheries in SE unintentionally.
167	Prohibit vessels from having other groundfish gear or equipment onboard while participating in a groundfish fishery using mechanical jigging machines or hand troll gear		
Opposed	0	14	<p>Unanimously opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anthony Taiber (AC): This proposal may have impacts outside of the cod fishery. Fisheries that use bigger “jig machines” may be unintentionally negatively impacted. This proposal as written could make gear used for commercial squid fishing in SE Alaska illegal. (AC): Too broad, these should be regional proposals to specific areas, not statewide. Could impact many fisheries in SE unintentionally.
168	Prohibit vessels from having more than one groundfish gear type onboard when participating in a state-managed groundfish fishery		
Opposed	0	14	<p>Unanimously opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anthony Taiber (AC): This proposal may unintentionally have impacts outside of the cod fishery. Fisheries that use bigger “jig machines” may be negatively impacted. This proposal as written could make gear used for commercial squid fishing in SE Alaska illegal. Nyle Thomas (AC): multiple gear types are necessary to carry in SE and these proposals would negatively impact SE fisherman. (AC): Too broad, these proposals should be regional to specific areas, not statewide. Could negatively impact many fisheries in SE unintentionally.
169	Create a definition of groundfish coil spring or ‘slinky pot’		
Supported	14	0	<p>Unanimously supported</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (AC): Common sense definition change to existing regulations.
170	Reduce the permitted egg take level of each hatchery permit containing pink and chum salmon by 25% of the current permitted capacity for those species		
Opposed	0	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unanimously opposed Don Spigelmyre (AC): Not a science-backed plan, there is no significant study to show that this proposal would help wild stocks.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nyle Thomas (AC): The proposals only target chum and pinks, this proposal could have economic impacts on hatcheries for other fisheries in the SE region. • Eric Castro (AC): Hatchery chum stray to wild chum runs and may have an impact. There needs to be more in-depth studies to find out the true relationship between wild and hatchery chum and pink stocks in our region before a proposal like this can be imposed. • Jacob Rasmussen (AC): Sue Doherty with Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (SSRAA) expressed that these cuts in hatchery production could jeopardize funding for the Crystal Lake hatchery to produce chinook and coho for the Blind Slough Area. This proposal is too broad and should target specific regions that have the science to prove the rational. There is not a specific and rigorous scientific study on chum and pink salmon that can show negative impacts between wild and hatchery that supports this proposal. • Bob Martin (AC): Too broad, this reduction would likely have economic impacts to SE fisheries.
171	Amend Prince William Sound hatchery permits to reduce pink salmon egg take capacity		
Opposed	0	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimously opposed • Don Spigelmyre (AC): Not a science-backed plan, there is no significant study to show that this proposal would help wild stocks. • Nyle Thomas (AC): The proposals only target chum and pinks, this proposal could have economic impacts on hatcheries for other fisheries in the SE region. • Eric Castro (AC): Hatchery chum stray to wild chum runs and may have an impact. There needs to be more in depth studies to find out the true relationship between wild and hatchery chum and pink stocks in our region before a proposal like this can be imposed. • Jacob Rasmussen (AC): Sue Doherty with Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (SSRAA) expressed that these cuts in hatchery production could jeopardize funding for the Crystal Lake hatchery to produce chinook and coho for the Blind Slough Area. This proposal is too broad and should target specific regions that have the science to prove the rational. There is not a specific and rigorous scientific study on chum and pink salmon that can show negative impacts between wild and hatchery that supports this proposal. • Bob Martin (AC): Too broad, this reduction would likely have economic impacts to SE fisheries.
172	Board generated regulation that places a moratorium on pink and chum hatchery production		

Opposed	0	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimously opposed • Don Spigelmyre (AC): Not a science-backed plan, there is no significant study to show that this proposal would help wild stocks. • Nyle Thomas (AC): The proposals only target chum and pinks, this proposal could have economic impacts on hatcheries for other fisheries in the SE region. • Eric Castro (AC): Hatchery chum stray to wild chum runs and may have an impact. There needs to be more in-depth studies to find out the true relationship between wild and hatchery chum and pink stocks in our region before a proposal like this can be imposed. • Jacob Rasmussen (AC): Sue Doherty with Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (SSRAA) expressed that these cuts in hatchery production could jeopardize funding for the Crystal Lake hatchery to produce chinook and coho for the Blind Slough Area. This proposal is too broad and should target specific regions that have the science to prove the rational. There is not a specific and rigorous scientific study on chum and pink salmon that can show negative impacts between wild and hatchery that supports this proposal. • Bob Martin (AC): Too broad, this reduction would likely have economic impacts to SE fisheries.
----------------	----------	-----------	--

173	Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent
-----	--

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals
 March 17 – 21, 2026 | Anchorage, AK
 Deadline March 2nd, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
174	Allow the engine of a purse seine vessel or skiff to be shut off when the purse seine is deployed		
175	Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration		

176	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits		
Opposed	0	14	<p>Unanimously opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (AC): This proposal goes against the precedence for fair chase in sport fishing. The current regulations ensure that no one is getting an unfair opportunity to harvest more fish over others. • Brandon Ware (AC): Sport fishing is a resource to have fun catching fish and not for subsistence. This proposal would increase harvest of a already highly pressured SE region. • Kaleb Baird (AC): This is similar to party hunting and should not be allowed.
177	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits		
Opposed	0	14	<p>Unanimously opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (AC): This regulation goes against the precedence for chase in sport fishing. The current regulations ensure that no one is getting an unfair opportunity to harvest more fish over others. • Brandon Ware (AC): Sport fishing is a resource to have fun catching fish and not for subsistence. This proposal would increase harvest of a already highly pressured SE region. • Kaleb Baird (AC): This is similar to party hunting and should not be allowed.
178	Modify the definition of bag limit		
179	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10 fish		
180	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish		
181	Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear		
182	Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit		
183	Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession		
184	Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition		
186	Reduce commercial salmon fishing opportunity with drift gillnet gear in the Central District of the Cook Inlet Area		

187	Close the Tsiu River and all waters within one quarter mile of the Tsiu River and Kaliakh River confluence to commercial fishing for salmon

VIII. Public Comment:

IX. Old Business:

X. New Business:

XI. Set next meeting date:

XII. Other:

Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: _____

Minutes Approved By: _____

Date: _____

Petersburg Advisory Committee

1/14/26 6:00-7:30pm

Meetings Minutes

Public Comments

- Emily Scott: (Alaska Healthy Habitat Alliance) supports proposals 163, 164, 165.

Board of Fish Proposals

Proposal 170 Unanimously opposed

- Don Spigelmyre (AC): Not a science-backed plan, there is no significant study to show that this proposal would help wild stocks.
- Nyle Thomas (AC): The proposals only target chum and pinks, this proposal could have economic impacts on hatcheries for other fisheries in the SE region.
- Eric Castro (AC): Hatchery chum stray to wild chum runs and may have an impact. There needs to be more in depth studies to find out the true relationship between wild and hatchery chum and pink stocks in our region before a proposal like this can be imposed.
- Jacob Rasmussen (AC): Sue Doherty with Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (SSRAA) expressed that these cuts in hatchery production could jeopardize funding for the Crystal Lake hatchery to produce chinook and coho for the Blind Slough Area. This proposal is too broad and should target specific regions that have the science to prove the rational. There is not a specific and rigorous scientific study on chum and pink salmon that can show negative impacts between wild and hatchery that supports this proposal.
- Bob Martin (AC): Too broad, this reduction would likely have economic impacts to SE fisheries.
- Supported: 0
- Opposed: 14

Proposal 171 Unanimously opposed

- Same comments

Proposal 172 Unanimously opposed

- Same comments

Proposal 166 Unanimously opposed

- Anthony Taiber (AC): This proposal may have impacts outside of the cod fishery. Fisheries that use bigger “jig machines” may be unintentionally negatively impacted.

This proposal as written could make gear used for commercial squid fishing in SE Alaska illegal.

- (AC): Too broad, these should be regional proposals to specific areas, not statewide. Could impact all of the fisheries in SE unintentionally.
- Supported: 0
- Opposed: 14

Proposal 167 Unanimously opposed

- Same comments 166,167,168
- Unintentional impacts to other fisheries, this is a regional problem not a statewide issue.

Proposal 168 Unanimously opposed

- Same comments 166,167,168
- Nyle Thomas (AC): multiple gear types are necessary to carry in SE and these proposals would negatively impact SE fisherman.

Proposal 169 Supported unanimously

- (AC): Common sense definition change to existing regulations
- Supported: 14
- Opposed: 0

Proposal 176 & 177

- Brandon Ware (AC): Sport fishing is a resource to have fun catching fish and not for subsistence. This proposal would increase harvest of a already highly pressured SE region.
- Kaleb Baird (AC): This is similar to party hunting and should not be allowed.
- Supported: 0
- Opposed: 14

Petersburg Advisory Committee
Date: Wednesday February 11th, 2026 at 6pm
Location: Petersburg Borough Assembly Chambers and Zoom

- I. Call to Order:
- II. Roll Call:

Name	Seat	Present	Excused or Unexcused
Heather Bauscher	Chair	Present	
Don Spigelmyre	Vice Chair	Present	
Megan O’Neil			Excused
Joel Randrup		Present	
Bob Martin		Present	
Nyle Thomas		Present	
Jacob Rasmussen		Present	
Ted Sandhofer	Archery	Present	
Paul Menish	Crab/Conservation	Present	
Anthony Taiber	Gillnet		Excused
David Benitz	Hunting/Trapping	Present	
Jerry Dahl	Seine		Excused
Brandon Ware	Sport/Charter	Present	
Ben Case	Sport/Personal Use	Present	
Kaleb Baird	Troll	Present	
Eric Castro	Alternate	Present	
Seth McCallum	Alternate	Present	

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: **8**

List of User Groups Present: 14

- III. Fish and Game Staff Present: 1
- IV. Guests Present: Jeff Rice ADF&G

- V. Approval of Agenda

- VI. Approval of last meeting minutes: Jan 14th. During that meeting, proposals 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 176, and 177
- VII. Reports
 - a. Chair’s report
 - b. ADF&G
 - c. Discussion of Board of Fisheries Proposal will occur
 - i. Statewide Proposal

- 1. Comment deadline is March 2nd
- d. Overview of RAC meeting
- e. Other fishery and wildlife business as needed

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals March 17 – 21, 2026 Anchorage, AK Deadline March 2 nd , 2026			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
162	Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries		
Support	10	4	Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brandon Ware (AC): Believes there is already regulations to prohibit these activities. It gets confusing when charters are involved. There are too many different regulations between the two and will be hard to enforce. • Ted (AC): Covering the costs if you don't have a boat for someone to take you out is already allowed. Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Benitz (AC): Residents without boat access should be able to pay someone to take them out to collect their subsistence allotment. • Provides opportunity for people that may not have boat access to exercise their subsistence opportunities.
11	Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W. longitude		
163	Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis		
Support	14	0	Unanimously supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common sense gear use regulations for responsible fisheries management. If boats are claiming to be Pelagic trawlers, then they need to follow the regulations that come with that.

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals March 17 – 21, 2026 Anchorage, AK Deadline March 2 nd , 2026			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
164	Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters		
Support	14	0	Unanimously supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> David Benitz (AC): Trawlers seem to be impacting the SE area and should be monitored to ensure they are following the regulations. Don Spigelmyre (AC): Monitoring data is important for this fishery. Fisherman would incur a small cost. Eric Castro (AC): The state may have a problem supporting the cost of implementing this but would ensure regulations are being followed.
165	Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters		
Support	14	0	Unanimously supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don Spigelmyre (AC): Proven regulation that works in many different fisheries. It will protect salmon especially King salmon.
173	Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent		
Support	14	0	Unanimously supported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don Spigelmyre (AC): The state is trying to make clear fishing markers. Brandon Ware: (AC): The State already does this in sport fisheries.
174	Allow the engine of a purse seine vessel or skiff to be shut off when the purse seine is deployed		
175	Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration		
178	Modify the definition of bag limit		
Opposed	0	14	Unanimously opposed

<p align="center">Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals March 17 – 21, 2026 Anchorage, AK Deadline March 2nd, 2026</p>			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (AC): This regulation goes against the precedence for chase in sport fishing. The current regulations ensure that no one is getting an unfair opportunity to harvest more fish over others. Brandon Ware (AC): Sport fishing is a resource to have fun catching fish and not for subsistence. This proposal would increase harvest of a already highly pressured SE region. Kaleb Baird (AC): This is similar to party hunting and should not be allowed.
179	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10 fish		
Oppose	0	14	Unanimously opposed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (AC): There is no scientific backing to support this broad statewide proposal. These fisheries should be managed on a regional level. This unnecessarily limits resident fishing opportunities. Don Spigelmyre (AC): This is too broad. The state has a good handle on specific areas. Jeff Rice (ADF&G): The State manages king salmon runs on a specific population and regional limits.
180	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish		
Oppose	0	14	Unanimously opposed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (AC): There is no scientific backing to support this broad statewide proposal. These fisheries should be managed on a regional level. This unnecessarily limits resident fishing opportunities. Don Spigelmyre (AC): This is too broad. The state has a good handle on specific areas. Jeff Rice (ADF&G): The State manages king salmon runs on a specific population and regional limits.
181	Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear		
Support	14	0	Unanimously supported:

<p align="center">Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals March 17 – 21, 2026 Anchorage, AK Deadline March 2nd, 2026</p>			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (AC): Supports, adds to fair chase.
182	Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit		
Support	14	0	Unanimously supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (AC): Would open up a fun new fishing method for residents. There would be no impact on salmon or trout species in freshwaters. Don Spigelmyre (AC): Supports, won't have impacts on desirable fish species. Native fish, especially salmon, are exempt and still protected with this proposal.
183	Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession		
Support	12	2	Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State proposal that shores up regulations that are currently in effect in many areas across Alaska. The standardization of this regulation will help ensure creel data. Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joel Randup and Nyle Thomas (AC): SE already has this regulation and is too broad. If other areas have an issue with this the State can utilize it on a specific area basis.
184	Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition		
186	Reduce commercial salmon fishing opportunity with drift gillnet gear in the Central District of the Cook Inlet Area		
187	Close the Tsiu River and all waters within one quarter mile of the Tsiu River and Kaliakh River confluence to commercial fishing for salmon		

VIII. Public Comment:

- David Beebe: Why are abstentions allowed? Why did the Board approve Proposal 67?
- Emily Scott Alaska Healthy Habitat Alliance, (Proposals 163-165): Pelagic trawl gear use needs to be monitored, and regulations need to be enforced. These proposals are common sense gear and regulations that will promote sustainable fisheries and habitat protections.

IX. Old Business:

- Joel Randup (AC): wants to repeal Board of Game Proposal 67. Believes it will have negative impacts on the community and deer populations. Feels that important information was left out in the Board of Game hearing.

X. New Business:

XI. Set next meeting date:

XII. Other:

Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: _____

Minutes Approved By: _____

Date: _____

Petersburg Advisory Committee

2/11/26 6:00-8:30pm

Meetings Minutes

Public Comments:

David Beebe: Why are abstentions allowed? Why did the Board approve Proposal 67?

Emily Scott Alaska Healthy Habitat Alliance, (Proposals 163-165): Pelagic trawl gear use needs to be monitored, and regulations need to be enforced. These proposals are common sense gear and regulations that will promote sustainable fisheries and habitat protections.

Board of Fish Proposals

Proposal 162 Support

- Brandon Ware (AC): Believes there is already regulations to prohibit these activities. It gets confusing when charters are involved. Too many different regulations between the two and will be hard to enforce.
- David Benitz (AC): Residents without boat access should be able to pay someone to take them out to collect their subsistence allotment.
- Ted (AC): Covering the costs if you don't have a boat for someone to take you out is already allowed.
- Supported vote: 10
- Opposed vote: 4

Proposal 163 Support unanimously

- Common sense gear use regulations for responsible fisheries management.
- Eric Castro (AC): If boats are claiming to be Pelagic trawlers, then they need to follow the regulations that come with that.
- Supported vote: 14
- Opposed vote: 0

Proposal 164 Support unanimously

- David Benitz (AC): Trawlers seem to be impacting the SE area and should be monitored to ensure they are following the regulations.
- Don Spigelmyre (AC): Monitoring data is important for this fishery. Fisherman would incur a small cost.
- Eric Castro (AC): The state may have a problem supporting the cost of implementing this.
- Supported: 14
- Opposed: 0

Proposal 165 Support unanimously

- Don Spigelmyre (AC): Proven regulation that works in many different fisheries. It will protect salmon especially King salmon.
- Supported: 14
- Opposed: 0

Proposal 173 Support unanimously

- Don Spigelmyre (AC): The state is trying to make clear fishing markers.
- Brandon Ware: (AC): The State already does this in sport fisheries.
- Supported: 14
- Opposed: 0

Proposal 178 Opposed unanimously

- Brandon Ware (AC): Sport fishing is a resource to have fun catching fish and not for subsistence. This proposal would increase harvest of a already highly pressured SE region.
- Kaleb Baird (AC): This is similar to party hunting and should not be allowed. Goes against fair chase.
- Supported: 0
- Opposed: 14

Proposal 179 & 180 Opposed unanimously

- Don Spigelmyre (AC): This is too broad. The state has a good handle on specific areas.
- King salmon fisheries should be managed on a regional level.
- Jeff Rice (ADF&G): The State manages king salmon runs on a specific population and regional limits.
- Supported: 0
- Opposed: 14

Proposal 181 Supported unanimously

- Brandon Ware (AC): Supports, adds to fair chase.
- Support: 14
- Opposed: 0

Proposal 182 Supported unanimously

- Don Spigelmyre (AC): Supports, won't have impacts on desirable fish species. Native fish, especially salmon, are exempt and still protected with this proposal.
- Support: 14
- Oppose: 0

Proposal 183 Supported

- Joel Randup and Nyle Thomas (AC): SE already has this regulation and is too broad. If other areas have an issue with this the State can utilize it on a specific area basis.

- State proposal that shores up regulations that are currently in effect in many areas across Alaska. The standardization of this regulation will help ensure creel data.
- Support: 12
- Opposed: 2

Other Business:

Joel Randup (AC): wants to repeal Board of game Proposal 67. Believes it will have negative impacts on the community and deer populations. Feels that important information was left out in the Board of Game hearing.

PWS/Valdez Advisory Committee
Monday, January 26th, 2026
Zoom Only

I. Call to Order: [Time] by [name of chair/acting chair]

II. Roll Call

Name	Present	Excused/Unexcused
Nick Crump	Yes	
Dan Eames	Yes	
Bruce Bowman	Yes	
Patrick Day	Yes	
Brett Wilbanks	Yes	
Jens Saxum	Yes	

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 4

List of User Groups Present:

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:

Heather Scannell, Jeremy Botts, Martin Schuester, Todd Johnson, Joe Loboy.

IV. Guests Present:

Mike Wells, Rowan Miller, Thane Miller, Justice Cousins, Hope Finley.

V. Chair Report

Nick made a report discussing elections to add new members and elect new officers.

VI. Approval of Agenda

VII. New Business

- a. Member Elections for 2 expiring seats, 9 vacant seats, and 2 alternates
 - i. Expiring Seats: Dan Eames and Nick Crump

Nick Crump nominated himself to be re-elected to the committee, seconded by Brett Wilbanks.

Dan Eames nominated himself, seconded by Pat Day.

Thane Miller nominated by Rowan Miller, seconded by Patrick Day.

Rowan Miller nominated by Rowan Miller, seconded by Nick Crump.

Justice Cousins nominated by Thane Miller, Seconded by Nick Crump.

Hope Finley was nominated by Thane Miller, seconded by Nick Crump.

All nominees were elected by unanimous consent.

b. Officer Elections

Nick Crump nominated himself for chair, seconded by Dan Eames.

Dean Eames nominated for Vice Chair by Thane Miller, seconded by Jens Saxum.

Rowan Miller nominated for Secretary by Thane Miller, seconded by Bruce Bowman.

All officer nominations were confirmed by unanimous consent.

c. Public Comments

No Public Comment.

d. Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish Proposals

i. Starting with proposals 170-172

ii. Other proposals as requested

e. Other Fish and Game Business as Needed

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p>			
<i>Subsistence Fisheries</i>			
162	Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries, as follows		
Oppose	0	10	Motion to oppose by Dan Eames, Seconded by Justice Cousins. The overall sentiment of discussions was that there shouldn't be any

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			unnecessary impediments limiting lawful users' access to the resource. Motion to oppose passes by unanimous consent
<i>Commercial Fisheries</i>			
<i>Groundfish Gear and Closed Waters</i>			
11	Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W. longitude, as follows		
Oppose	4	5	Motion to oppose by Thane Miller, seconded by Pat Day. Brett Wilbanks, Dan Eames, and Bruce Bowman mentioned they support this proposal due to concerns with habitat protection and bycatch from trawling while Hope Finley suggested we take no action on this proposal because of its vague and arbitrary nature. Motion to oppose this proposal went to a roll call vote which ended with 4 votes to oppose the motion, 5 votes to support the motion, and one abstention by Justice Cousins because he didn't feel comfortable voting on an issue outside of PWS.
163	Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis, as follows		
Oppose	4	5	Motion to oppose by Pat Day, seconded by Thane Miller. Brett Wilbanks expressed his support for monitoring bottom contact by trawl gear to reduce impact on habitat and reduce bycatch. Rowan Miller questioned the feasibility and legality of electronic monitoring. Marin Schuster of ADFG provided some context and information about implementation costs. Ultimately, the motion to oppose passed 5 to 4 with one abstention by Justice Cousins because he didn't feel informed enough to comfortably weigh in on this issue. Main concerns are about the feasibility of the technology and the fiduciary burden on the state (ADFG).

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
164	Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters, as follows		
Oppose	4	5	Motion to support made by Bruce Bowman, seconded by Brett Wilbanks. Discussions revolved around concerns for protecting habitat and limiting bycatch. Martin Schuster commented that costs for this would be on ADFG and would run into funding constraints without help from the legislature. The committee voted to oppose the proposal 5 to 4 with one abstention by Justice Cousins. Although the committee voted to oppose this proposal it was a close vote and the committee mostly agrees with the conceptual sentiment that technological advances have potential to reduce bycatch, potential harm to the seafloor habitat, and could help improve the public's trust in how this fishery is prosecuted. Main concerns are about the practicality of the technology and the fiduciary burden on the state (ADFG).
165	Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters, as follows		
Support	5	2	Motion to support made by Rowan Miller, seconded by Brett Wilbanks. Dan Eames and Bruce Bowman noted that technology development often follows regulatory requirements. Further discussion from Martin Schuster (ADFG) was centered around what salmon excluders are, how they're theoretically used, how many king salmon are usually caught as bycatch, when observers are used onboard trawlers or at the processing plant, and what the observer program looks like. Motion to support passed with 5 in favor, 2 opposed, and 3 abstentions by Pat, Hope, and Nick due to not feeling there was enough information to make an informed decision.
166	Amend statewide definition of a mechanical jigging machine, as follows		

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
No Action			The committee voted to take no action.
167	Prohibit vessels from having other groundfish gear or equipment onboard while participating in a groundfish fishery using mechanical jigging machines or hand troll gear, as follows		
No Action			The committee voted to take no action.
168	Prohibit vessels from having more than one groundfish gear type onboard when participating in a state-managed groundfish fishery		
No Action			The committee decided to take no action.
169	Create a definition of groundfish coil spring or 'slinky pot,' as follows		
Support	10	0	Motion to support, with amendments, by Brett Wilbanks, seconded by Justice Cousins. The committee supported this proposal with the amendment that the definition should end at "collapsible frame" without restricting the number of openings. Motion to support this proposal passed by unanimous consent.
170	Reduce the permitted egg take level of each hatchery permit containing pink and chum salmon by 25% of the current permitted capacity for those species, as follows		
Oppose	0	10	Motion to oppose by Patrick Day, second by Bruce Bowman. Discussions revolved around the significant and unnecessary economic harm it would cause to regional stakeholders including commercial fishermen, charter fishermen, the surrounding communities, the hatcheries themselves, etc. The proposal lacks any substantiated, conclusive hard evidence to support its theoretical claims. Brett expressed that although he will be supporting the motion to oppose, he still had concerns about possible ecological concerns hatcheries may have on PWS, but public comments from VFDA CEO Mike Wells seemed to mostly satisfy his concerns. Overall, the sentiment was this proposal would not help fisheries in

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			other areas; it would only harm PWS fisheries. Motion to oppose this proposal passed 10-0.
171	Amend Prince William Sound hatchery permits to reduce pink salmon egg take capacity, as follows		
Oppose	0	10	Motion to oppose made by Patrick Day, seconded by Thane Miller. Discussions revolved around there only being unsubstantiated speculation that hatchery fish are having any negative effects on wild stocks. Research on this topic is ongoing through the wild/hatchery interaction study being conducted by the Prince William Sound Science Center. Rowan Miller referenced other studies that have shown that while straying is natural, it's also a self-regulating issue, which is why after 50 years of hatcheries in PWS there are still many unique distinguishable genetic stocks of wild fish. ADFG biologist Heather Scannell noted that her observations of PWS wild stocks indicate they are healthy. VFDA CEO Mike Wells also made comments opposing this proposal. Motion to oppose this proposal passes 10-0.
172	Board generated regulations that places a moratorium on pink and chum hatchery production		
Oppose	1	9	Motion to oppose by Thane Miller, seconded by Patrick Day. Discussion started off by discussing how there's already a comprehensive system and process in place for issuing or amending hatchery permits through regional planning teams and the commissioner of ADFG. A moratorium issued by the board of fish would sidestep that entire process and may raise unnecessary legal challenges to its authority. Also, hatchery expansion is limited by factors such as developable sites with sufficient fresh water supplies and the enormous costs associated with expanding infrastructure to accommodate more fish, therefore current hatchery operations are already near max capacity due to these constraints. Ultimately, the motion to oppose this proposal passed 9 to 1 with 9 members

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			agreeing that the proposal was unnecessary and unwarranted, while Brett voted to support the proposal only with the intent to continue researching and studying these concerns.
173	Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent, as follows		
Support	10	0	Motion to support made by Patrick Day, seconded by Dan Eames. Dan stated that there are instances where this has already been done informally where latitude and longitude were used instead of physical markers. The Committee voted to support this proposal by unanimous consent.
174	Allow the engine of a purse seine vessel or skiff to be shut off when the purse seine is deployed, as follows		
Support	6	3	Motion to support by Hope Finley, seconded by Justice Cousins. Dan raised concerns about engines not starting in certain situations. Thane called the current regulation “silly” and unnecessary. This would allow people to set their seines or let it set while they sleep at night. In opposition, Pat stated that he didn’t support this proposal as a seine net is used as an anchor at times, even though that is illegal. The abstention vote didn’t know enough to decide. Motion to support this proposal passes 6 support, 3 oppose, 1 abstain.
<i>Dipnet Gear Definition</i>			
175	Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration, as follows		
Oppose	0	10	Motion to oppose by Bruce Bowman, seconded by Jens Saxum. Thane Miller and others supported reducing mesh size but not the rope restriction. Bruce noted that this was directed at the Copper River. The rope issue also is more for control than for added depth. The Committee voted to unanimously oppose this proposal.
<i>Sport Fisheries</i>			
<i>Bag and Annual Limits</i>			
176	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits, as follows		

Oppose	2	8	Motion to oppose by Thane Miller, seconded by Bruce Bowman. Thane stated that this is supposed to be fishing, not harvesting, so you should stop fishing once your individual limit has been met. Jens Saxum raised concerns that it will be the same number of fish brought back in the bag limit but less unnecessarily thrown back. Brett stated that this would allow for more successful charter trips.
<h2>Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting</h2> <p>March 17-March 20, 2026 Anchorage, AK Comment Deadline March 2, 2026</p>			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			Bruce makes a differentiation between harvesting and sports fishing. Thane makes a distinction between the idea of an individual limit and a boat or group limit. Motion to oppose this proposal passes 8 to 2.
177	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits, as follows		
Oppose	0	10	Motion to oppose by Brett Wilbanks, seconded by Thane Miller. Motion passes by unanimous consent. Same comments as for proposal 176.
178	Modify the definition of bag limit, as follows		
Oppose	0	10	Motion to oppose by Patrick Day, seconded by Thane Miller. Dan Eames noted that some people have disabilities and need someone to assist them with holding the pole and reeling in the fish, but Pat noted that people with disabilities can fish by using a proxy. Some other discussions suggested the proposal lacks sufficient detail and could be abused. Motion to oppose this proposal passes by unanimous consent.
179	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10 fish, as follows		
Oppose	0	9	Motion to oppose by Rowan Miller, seconded by Justice Cousins. Rowan suggests that the proposal is too broad and ambiguous. Motion to oppose this proposal passes with 9 votes to oppose and one abstention by Bruce Bowman.
<i>Possession Requirements</i>			
180	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish, as follows		

Oppose	0	10	Motion to oppose by Bruce Bowman, seconded by Rowan Miller. Motion to oppose by unanimous consent. Same comments as proposal 179.
<i>Sport Fishing Gear</i>			
181	Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear, as follows		
<h2>Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting</h2> <p>March 17-March 20, 2026 Anchorage, AK Comment Deadline March 2, 2026</p>			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
Support	4	2	Motion to support was made by Rowan Miller, seconded by Bruce Bowman. Bruce noted it clarifies that fishing requires direct human involvement. Motion to support this proposal passes with four votes to support, two votes to oppose, and four people abstained. Those that abstained did not know enough about artificial means to fish to make any voting decisions.
182	Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit, as follows		
Support	10	0	Motion to support this proposal made by Jens Saxum, seconded by Justice Cousins. Motion passes by unanimous consent. The Committee saw no reason not to use a bow to target invasive species that have no bag limits: whitefish, suckers, northern pike.
183	Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession, as follows		
Oppose	0	10	Motion to oppose made by Thane Miller, seconded by Pat Day. Bruce noted the proposal is probably meant for species like Ling Cod which have length requirements, the way the proposal is written would include all fin fish and therefore it's too unclear and he can't support it. Justice expressed concerns about processing fish immediately after catch. General discussion was about the pros and cons of waiting to process your fish until you get to the dock for inspection, however there was sympathy for law enforcement's ability to identify number of caught fish. Motion to oppose this proposal passes by unanimous consent.

Definitions			
184	Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition, as follows		
Support	10	0	Motion to support was made by Rowan Miller, seconded by Pat Day. Considered a housekeeping proposal by the department. Motion to support this proposal passes by unanimous consent.
<h2>Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting</h2> <p>March 17-March 20, 2026 Anchorage, AK Comment Deadline March 2, 2026</p>			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
186	Reduce commercial salmon fishing opportunity with drift gillnet gear in the Central District of the Cook Inlet Area		
No Action			The committee didn't take this matter up.

VIII. Select representative for Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish meeting (March 16-20, 2026)

The committee selected Nicholas Crump to represent the committee at the board of statewide board of fish meeting in Anchorage in March, 2026.

IX. Set next meeting date for Board of Game southcentral proposals

The next committee meeting to discuss board of game proposals was scheduled for February 12th at 5:00 pm.

X. Other

XI. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn by Thane Miller. Seconded by Dan Eames.

Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: **Nick Crump**

Minutes Approved By: _____

Date: _____

**Seldovia Advisory Committee
Friday, December 19th, 2025
Seldovia Multipurpose Room**

I. Call to Order: 6:05 pm by Michael Opheim (MVO)

II. Roll Call

First Name	Last Name	Present	Excused/ Unexcused
Michael	Opheim	x	
Stephen	Payton	x	
Jevon	Chartier		excused
Walt	Sonen	x	
Alvin	Swick	x	
Bryan	Chartier	x	
Keith	Swick	x	
Liz	Diament	x	
Jordan	Cameron	x	
Chris	Pollock		excused
Chance	Collier	x	

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 6

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:

Leila Williams, Jason Herreman, Chris Bottom

IV. Guests Present:

none

V. Approval of Agenda

MVO

VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

MVO

VII. Reports

a. Chair's report

none

b. ADF&G:

i. Jason Herreman – Deer planting, goat hunts, Kalgin hunts

c. Others

none

VIII. Public Comment

none

IX. Old Business

X. New Business

- a. Elections: 4 seats expiring, 4 vacant seats, 2 alternates
- b. Board of Game Southcentral Region Proposals
- c. Board of Fish Bristol Bay Region Proposals
- d. Other Fish and Game Business as Needed

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting March 20-March 25, 2026 Kodiak, AK Comment Deadline March 6, 2026			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
<i>Regionwide & Multiple Units</i>			
70	Restrict hunters who take a nanny in Units 6, 7, 14C, or 15 from hunting goats in Unit 6, 7, 8, 14C and 15 for five regulatory years		
support	9	0	The Seldovia AC agrees with restricting hunters that take nannies in any unit should be restricted.
71	Establish an average annual historic human harvest value for sheep to consider if sheep populations are important for providing high levels of human consumptive use		
Na			
72	Establish intensive management (IM) findings for sheep populations, and population and harvest objectives, in the Southcentral Region as follows		
Na			
73	Define the terms “permanent dwelling”, “publicly maintained trail/road” and “developed recreational facility” for the purpose of bear baiting as follows		
Na			
74	Count a wounded bear against a hunter’s bag limit regionwide		
Na			
75	Require an online trapping education course for trapping in the Southcentral Region		
Na			

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
87	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15B caribou drawing hunt DC608, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Na			
88	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C caribou drawing hunt DC618, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Na			
90	Change the bag limit for the general season moose hunts in Units 7 and 15 to include 10 legal antler points on at least one side, in addition to the current antler restrictions		
Na			
91	Shift the moose hunting season and the motorized vehicle restriction in Unit 15C from September to October		
Na			
92	Shift the moose hunting season on Kalgin Island in Unit 15B, from August 20 – September 20 to September 1 - 25		
oppose	0	9	
93	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C moose drawing hunt DM549, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Na			
95	Reauthorize the antlerless moose season on Kalgin Island in Unit 15B		
support	9	0	
96	Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 15C		
support	9	0	
97	Eliminate the restriction on motorized vehicles for hunting moose in the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C		
Na			
98	Clarify the types of roads motorized vehicles are allowed to drive within the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area of Unit 15C during the moose season, and exclude the south side of Kachemak Bay		
support	9	0	The Seldovia AC supports the Homer ACs proposal on this topic as it covers the same concerns as ours, proposal 99.
99	Allow motorized vehicles to hunt moose in the area south of Kachemak Bay and south of Fox River within the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C		
support	9	0	The Seldovia AC supports this proposal we developed

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
100	Adjust the Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C to exclude the south side of Kachemak Bay. Additionally, clarify the types of roads motorized vehicles are allowed to be utilized during the moose season; restrict the use of motorized vehicles for all big game		
Na			
101	Allow motorized vehicles to hunt moose in the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C		
Na			
102	Remove the motorized vehicle restriction for hunting moose within the Lower Kenai Controlled Used Area in Unit 15C		
Na			
103	Allow the use of motorized vehicles to hunt moose on the weekends only, after the first week of the season within the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C		
Na			
104	Allow the use of motorized vehicles for moose hunting from 10 p.m. to 5 a.m. during September 16-19 and September 22-25, in the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C		
Na			
105	Close Dall sheep hunting on the Kenai Peninsula in Units 7 and 15		
na			
106	Change the general season sheep hunts in Units 7 and 15 to registration hunts with hunt areas set by ADF&G		
Na			
107	Change the Dall sheep hunts in Units 7 and 15 to drawing hunts with season dates of August 10 – September 20		
Na			
108	Change all or some of the general season sheep hunts in Units 7 and 15 to archery only hunts		
Na			
112	Create a registration archery only hunt for goat in Units 7 and 15, prior to general registration hunts		
Na			
125	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG354, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Na			
126	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG356, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Na			

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
127	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG357, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Na			
128	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG358, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Na			
129	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG359, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Na			
130	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG360, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Na			
131	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG361, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Na			
132	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG362, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Na			
133	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG363, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Na			
134	Shorten the resident hunting season, reduce the bag limit from three to one, and require registration permits for hunting black bear in a portion of Units 7 and 15. Additionally, close the nonresident season		
Na			
135	Change the 2015 Board of Game findings to manage the mortality cap in Units 7 and 15 from a calendar year to a regulatory year or split the mortality cap into spring and fall caps		
Na			
136	Change the management of the RB300 brown bear mortality cap in Units 7 and 15 from a calendar year to a regulatory year		
Na			
137	Remove the current harvest cap for the RB300 hunt in Units 7 and 15		
Na			
138	Reduce the brown bear hunting season in Units 7 and 15 by 15 days		
Na			
139	Shorten the brown bear hunting seasons in Units 7 and 15, and divide the RB300 hunt into spring and fall hunts, with each having separate caps		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
Na			
140	Restrict hunters who take a sow brown bear in Units 7 and 15 from hunting RB300 for two to four years		
na			
141	When the lynx trapping season is open in Units 7 and 15, season dates will be December 15 through the last day of February		
na			
142	Lengthen the trapping and hunting seasons for lynx in Units 15 and 7		
na			
143	Lengthen the trapping season for lynx in Units 7 and 15		
na			
144	Lengthen the trapping season for lynx in Units 7 and 15 to align with Units 6 and 14C		
na			
154	Change the bag limits for sea ducks in Unit 15C		
na			

Alaska Board of Fisheries Bristol Bay Region Meeting
 January 13-January 18, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline December 29, 2025

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
<i>Regionwide & Multiple Units</i>			
61	5 AAC 06.391. Nushagak District King Salmon Stock of Concern Management Plan. Repeal provisions allowing commercial fishing, adopt date specific provisions for opening commercial fisheries based on king salmon inriver projected run size, and prohibit the retention of king salmon in the sport fishery		

Alaska Board of Fisheries Bristol Bay Region Meeting January 13-January 18, 2026 Anchorage, AK Comment Deadline December 29, 2025			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
oppose	0	9	The provisions suggested in this proposal are unreachable and unreasonable given current king salmon numbers. This would hinder the commercial fishery from operating more then it already does.
62	5 AAC 06.391. Nushagak District King Salmon Stock of Concern Management Plan. Prohibit commercial fishing in the Nushagak District until June 28 or until the minimum escapement goal of 55,000 king salmon are counted at the Portage Creek sonar		
oppose	0	9	The provisions suggested in this proposal are unreachable and unreasonable given current king salmon numbers. This would hinder the commercial fishery from operating more then it already does.
69	5 AAC 06.391. Nushagak District King Salmon Stock of Concern Management Plan. Adopt a recovery goal for Nushagak River king salmon		

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Meeting March 17-March 20, 2026 Anchorage, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
<i>Regionwide & Multiple Units</i>			
167	5 AAC 28.050. Lawful gear for groundfish. Prohibit vessels from having other groundfish gear or equipment onboard while participating in a groundfish fishery using mechanical jigging machines or hand troll gear		
support	9	0	The AC agrees that a vessel should only be allowed to carry one gear type as described in this proposal. This would align with other fisheries and ensure good practices.

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Meeting March 17-March 20, 2026 Anchorage, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
186	5 AAC 21.353 Central District Drift Gillnet Fishery Management Plan. Reduce commercial salmon fishing opportunity with drift gillnet gear in the Central District of the Cook Inlet Area		
oppose	0	9	The AC feels restricting these fisheries further would not help the problem stated in this proposal.

XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting

XII. Set next meeting date

XIII. Other

XIV. Adjourn
7:47 pm

XV. Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: Stephen Payton_____

Minutes Approved By: Michael Opheim_____

Date: 12/29/2025_____

Seward Advisory Committee
Thursday, November 13th, 2025
Seward Community Library & Zoom

I. Call to Order at 7:00 PM by Jim McCracken

II. Roll Call

First Name	Last Name	Present	Excused/ Unexcused
James (Jim)	McCracken	X	
Dianne	Dubuc	X	
Andrew	Bacon	X	
Nathan	Smith	X	
Maile	Branson	X	
Kenn	Carpenter		Unexcused
Mark	Clemens	X	
Bob	White	X	
W. C.	Casey	X	
Arne	Hatch		Excused
Derek	Branson	X	
Jim	Hubbard		Excused

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 6

III. Fish and Game Staff Present:

Chris Bottom – ADFG Area Wildlife Biologist

Leila Williams – ADFG Board Support

Britany Blaine-Roth – Area Management Biologist Sportfish

IV. Guests Present: Carrie Ann Mueller – Board of Game

V. Approval of Agenda

VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

VII. Reports

a. Chair's report

b. ADF&G

Britany Blaine-Roth reported that ADFG Sportfish staff surveyed Coho in our area for the first time since 2019. Staff counted 1,100 fish in lagoon and adjacent drainages. Survey showed good numbers in other area streams: Clear Creek, Box Canyon, Salmon Creek. In response to a question, Blaine-Roth stated that ADFG-stocked hatchery fish return the following year.

Chris Bottom reported a strong moose harvest this year. 454 moose harvested on the Kenai Peninsula, 10-12% were sub-legal size. Bear hunting was slightly down, and did not have to close brown bear season. The Department transplanted black tail deer to the Fox River flats. Dubuc asked what the long-term goal of deer repopulation is. Bottom replied that over time, the hope is a sustainable food supply, similar actions in Kodiak and PWS took 19 years before opening a hunt.

c. Others

VIII. Public Comment - none

IX. Old Business - none

X. New Business

a. Elections for 4 expiring seats for terms ending 06/2028 and 1 alternate: Carpenter relocated out of state and will not be seeking re-election. The four other members up for reelection were present and willing to run for an additional term. There were no others present seeking election to the Seward Advisory Committee. The Committee voted by unanimous consent to elect Andrew Bacon, Mark Clemens, Bob White, and Derek Branson

b. Election of Officers

Motion: (Dubuc/Bacon) Nominate Jim McCracken Chair, Diane Dubuc Vice Chair, Andrew Bacon Secretary

c. Current Board of Fisheries Proposals: Bristol Bay, Statewide Finfish – *Discussion notes and vote sheets attached*

d. Current Board of Game Proposals: Southcentral Region- *Discussion notes and vote sheets attached*

e. Other Fish and Game Business as Needed - Kid Fish Report: Event was successful this year. About 100 kids attended. This event had good community support both in participation and business donations of food and prizes for participants.

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p>			
<i>Subsistence Fisheries</i>			
44	Limit the number of king salmon retained as homepack in the commercial fishery and in the subsistence fishery and report all king salmon harvested, as follows		
<i>Commercial Fisheries</i>			
<i>Eastside Management</i>			
45	Extend the date in which commercial fishermen must register or re-register in the Naknek-Kvichak District, as follows		
46	Amend the dates described in the <i>Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan</i> , as follows		
47	Amend the dates in which commercial fishing may be allowed by emergency order in the Naknek-Kvichak District, as follows		
48	Modify the fishing period ratio between the set gillnet and drift gillnet gear groups, and change the distance in which gear associated with set gillnet fishing must be removed in Kvichak River Special Harvest Area, as follows		
49	Modify the fishing period ratio between the set gillnet and drift gillnet gear groups, based on gear type specific participation in the Kvichak River Special Harvest Area, as follows		
50	Incorporate fish quality considerations into commercial salmon fishery management decisions in Bristol Bay, as follows		
51	Allow extra drift gillnet to be carried on board the vessel in the Kvichak River Special Harvest		

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
	Area, as follows		
52			Create an Upper Egegik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan, as follows
53			Close a portion of the Egegik District to mitigate illegal fishing activity, as follows
<i>Westside Management</i>			
54			Repeal the Nushagak River Coho Samon Management Plan, as follows
55			Repeal the <i>Nushagak River Coho Samon Management Plan</i> , as follows
56			Remove the sunset date and permanently adopt current defined offshore locations in the Nushagak District set gillnet fishery, as follows
57			Adopt offshore locations used in the Nushagak District set gillnet fishery for the drift gillnet fishery, and prohibit drift gillnet gear from coming into contact with set gillnet gear, as follows
58			Modify the trigger to open the Wood River Special Harvest Area when the total run is estimated to be over 5 million fish, as follows
59			Ensure drift gillnet fishing opportunity in the Wood River Special Harvest Area, regardless of allocation, as follows
60			Increase the length of a set gillnet in the Wood River Special Harvest Area, as follows
<i>Nushagak District king salmon management (6 commercial, 3 sport)</i>			
61			Repeal provisions allowing commercial fishing, adopt date specific provisions for opening commercial fisheries based on king salmon in-river projected run size, and prohibit the

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			retention of king salmon in the sport fishery, as follows
62			Prohibit commercial fishing in the Nushagak District until June 28 or until the minimum escapement goal of 55,000 king salmon are counted at the Portage Creek sonar, as follows
63			Amend the <i>Nushagak District King Salmon Stock of Concern Management Plan</i> , as follows
64			Open the Wood River Special Harvest Area to drift and set gillnet gear until one of the king salmon stock of concern triggers is met, as follows
65			Remove Wood River Special Harvest Area from Nushagak District allocation calculations, and amend <i>Nushagak District King Salmon Stock of Concern Management Plan</i> to include set gillnet specific provisions, as follows
66			Modify the sport fishing gear allowed in <i>Nushagak District King Salmon Stock of Concern Management Plan</i> , as follows
67			Modify the sport fishing gear, size restrictions and area open for king salmon in the Nushagak River drainage, as follows
68			Adopt an optimal escapement goal for Nushagak River king salmon, as follows
69			Adopt a recovery goal for Nushagak River king salmon, as follows
<i>Fishing Districts</i>			
70			Extend the northern boundary in the Ugashik District, as follows
71			Reestablish a General District Salmon Management Plan, as follows
72			Reestablish a General District Salmon Management Plan, as follows

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
73	Reestablish a General District Salmon Management Plan, as follows		
74	Reestablish a General District Salmon Management Plan, as follows		
<i>Gear Specifications</i>			
75	Allow permit stacking in the Bristol Bay commercial salmon drift gillnet fishery, as follows		
76	Allow permit stacking in the Bristol Bay commercial salmon drift gillnet fishery, as follows		
77	Allow permit stacking in the Bristol Bay commercial salmon drift gillnet fishery, as follows		
78	Allow permit stacking in the Bristol Bay commercial salmon drift gillnet fishery, as follows		
79	Increase offshore operation distance for set gillnets in Ugashik District, as follows		
80	Allow joint venture set gillnet fishing operations in Bristol Bay, as follows		
81	Allow the use of stationary, non-entanglement nets to harvest salmon in the Bristol Bay Management Area, as follows		
<i>Vessel Specifications</i>			
82	Amend multiple vessel specifications and adopt additional vessel specifications, as follows		
83	Extend the overall length of a vessel registered for salmon net fishing in Bristol Bay, and modify multiple vessel specifications, as follows		
84	Increase the overall length of vessels registered for salmon net fishing in Bristol Bay, as follows		

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
85			Remove vessel length and include in a separate regulation, as follows
86			Include a reference to overall vessel length in the definition of trim tabs, as follows
87			Define refrigerated seawater transom cooler and include in vessel specification and operations, as follows
88			Remove anchor roller specifications, as follows
89			Increase the allowable size of an anchor roller, as follows
90			Add gillnet roller specifications, as follows
91			Amend the definition of an outdrive guard, as follows
<i>Fishing Periods, Seasons, and Reporting</i>			
92			Close the Naknek-Kvichak District to commercial fishing on July 25, as follows
93			Increase commercial fishing time in the Togiak District, as follows
94			Remove the time limitation for fishing in the Togiak District, as follows
95			Modify early season registration requirements, as follows
<i>Sport Fisheries</i>			
96			Prohibit the use of multiple hooks in the Naknek River drainage, as follows
97			Prohibit the use of bait and multiple hooks while sport fishing for rainbow trout and char and prohibit fish from being removed from the water prior to release in the Naknek River drainage,

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
	as follows		
98			Modify the king salmon annual limit in the Naknek River, as follows
99			Prohibit sport fishing for king salmon in a portion of the Naknek River, as follows
100			Prohibit sport fishing for king salmon in a portion of the Naknek River, as follows
101			Prohibit the use of bait and multiple hook sin the Egegik and Ugashik drainages, as follows
102			Reduce the area open to sport fishing for king salmon and modify the dates that bait is allowed in the Togiak River drainage, as follows
103			Prohibit the placing of any substance in the water for the purpose of attracting fish by scent (chumming), as follows
104			Modify gear to barbless hooks in Morine, Kulik, American, and Brooks drainages, as follows
105			Adopt a Bristol Bay King Salmon Management Plan, as follows

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
-----------------	----------------------	--	--

Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
<i>Subsistence Fisheries</i>			
162	Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries, as follows		
<i>Commercial Fisheries</i>			
<i>Groundfish Gear and Closed Waters</i>			
11	Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W. longitude, as follows		
163	Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis, as follows		
164	Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters, as follows		
165	Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters, as follows		
Support	8	0	(Dubuc/Clemens) Salmon excluder requirements would set a good example for salmon conservation. It would not be a burden to the industry. Smith stated that Canada has been using them. White abstained, stating reason that the trawl fishery should be eliminated entirely.
166	Amend statewide definition of a mechanical jigging machine, as follows		
167	Prohibit vessels from having other groundfish gear or equipment onboard while participating in a groundfish fishery using mechanical jigging machines or hand troll gear, as follows		
168	Prohibit vessels from having more than one groundfish gear type onboard when participating in a state-managed groundfish fishery		
169	Create a definition of groundfish coil spring or 'slinky pot,' as follows		
170	Reduce the permitted egg take level of each hatchery permit containing pink and chum salmon by 25% of the current permitted capacity for those species, as follows		

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
Support	9	0	(White/Dubuc) - moved to discuss and vote on proposals 170-172 as a group. Discussion about the increase in hatchery operations in PWS over time, emphasized increase in rate of output since the 1989 oil spill. Dubuc stated that hatcheries have driven development of this fishery that operates more along the lines of harvesting than fishing. Discussed straying issues affecting wild populations along the North Gulf Coast. Discussed lack of hatchery committee meetings, as specified in paragraph 3 in the proposal book, and members questioned why the lack of meetings on this important issue. The Seward Advisory Committee urges the Board of Fish hatchery committee to be empowered to meet more frequently to discuss this topic.
171	Amend Prince William Sound hatchery permits to reduce pink salmon egg take capacity, as follows		
Support	9	0	<i>(see above)</i>
172	Board generated regulations that places a moratorium on pink and chum hatchery production		
Support	9	0	<i>(see above)</i>
173	Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent, as follows		
174	Allow the engine of a purse seine vessel or skiff to be shut off when the purse seine is deployed, as follows		
<i>Dipnet Gear Definition</i>			
175	Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration, as follows		
<i>Sport Fisheries</i>			
<i>Bag and Annual Limits</i>			
176	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits, as follows		
Oppose	0	9	(Dubuc/Casey) – moved to discuss and vote on proposals 176-178

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			as a group. Discussed party fishing issues being difficult to manage on deck, and how the dynamics of different groups affect things. Discussed release mortality being generally low. Discussed that fishing charters are marketed as a fishing experience, not a promise to fill the freezer. McCracken noted that State of Alaska does not have regulatory authority on halibut, complicating bag/possession of State managed vs. Fed managed fish
177	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits, as follows		
Oppose	0	9	(see above)
178	Modify the definition of bag limit, as follows		
Oppose	0	9	(see above)
179	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10 fish, as follows		
Oppose	0	9	(Dubuc/Casey) – moved to discuss and vote on proposals 179-180 as a group. Dubuc stated that this should be a locally managed decision, and that local Area Management plans should be applied. Group consensus that this proposal shouldn't be considered at a statewide meeting, its too broad reaching.
<i>Possession Requirements</i>			
180	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish, as follows		
Oppose	0	9	(See above)
<i>Sport Fishing Gear</i>			
181	Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear, as follows		
182	Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit, as follows		
Support	9	0	(Dubuc/White) – Noted that the proposer had brought this forward multiple times in the past and that it should be considered. Discussed that this would apply only to fish that have no limit.

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
183	Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession, as follows		
Oppose	0	9	(Dubuc/Clemens) – The Committee asked the fish biologist if the impetus behind this proposal was lack of data samples, to which she replied that it was mainly enforcement related. Discussion then related to how current regulations like leaving the fish skin on as an identifier and having minimum fillet lengths for lingcod are sufficient.
<i>Definitions</i>			
184	Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition, as follows		
Support	9	0	(Smith/Dubuc) Discussed that this would align definitions across the state, and that this would open up harvest opportunity for an additional type of rockfish, i.e. one DS, one Slope, and Pelagic

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
Regionwide & Multiple Units			
70	Restrict hunters who take a nanny in Units 6, 7, 14C, or 15 from hunting goats in Unit 6, 7, 8, 14C and 15 for five regulatory years		
71	Establish an average annual historic human harvest value for sheep to consider if sheep populations are important for providing high levels of human consumptive use		
72	Establish intensive management (IM) findings for sheep populations, and population and harvest objectives, in the Southcentral Region as follows		
73	Define the terms “permanent dwelling”, “publicly maintained trail/road” and “developed recreational facility” for the purpose of bear baiting as follows		
74	Count a wounded bear against a hunter’s bag limit regionwide		
75	Require an online trapping education course for trapping in the Southcentral Region		
Cordova Area – Unit 6			
76	Reduce the nonresident bag limit to one deer in Unit 6		
77	Change the nonresident goat hunts in Unit 6D from drawing permits to registration hunts		
78	Create a fall season, archery registration goat hunt within the Unit 6D, RG248 hunt area, with a bag limit of 1 billy		
79	Shorten the nonresident hunting season for moose in Unit 6A		
80	Create a new drawing hunt in Unit 6D, along the Richardson Highway from Valdez to milepost 25		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
81	Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C		
82	Shorten the spring hunting season for black bear in Unit 6D by 10 days		
83	Increase the resident bag limit for the RL065 black bear hunt in Unit 6 to two bears		
84	Shorten the season for black bear hunting in Unit 6D		
85	Restrict hunters from shooting big game from a boat in Unit 6 without a permit		
<i>Kenai Peninsula Area – Units 7 & 15</i>			
86	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 caribou drawing hunt DC001, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	(Clemens/Dubuc) moved to discuss and vote on proposals 86-88 as a group. There was lengthy discussion about the numerous proposals by Mr. Van Arsdale and their intent to allocate a greater share of hunt permits to resident hunters. The Committee discussed the proposal with the wildlife biologist in attendance. Recognizing that the content of each proposal is identical, except for different hunt numbers inserted, the Committee discussed whether to vote on all Van Arsdale’s proposals at one time, but the consensus was to instead look at them in smaller groups throughout the meeting. Within these meeting minutes, discussion of Mr. Van Arsdale’s proposals will reference back to this one. Each of the proposals received a motion and a second to adopt, which will be noted in the minutes, then to the vote.
87	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15B caribou drawing hunt DC608, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
88	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C caribou drawing hunt DC618, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
89	Open an early season, archery only moose hunt in Unit 7		
Oppose	1	8	(Dubuc/White) – Dubuc supports opening up opportunity to bowhunters. White concerned with animals getting hit and not recovered, doesn't see need to split hunts between user groups. Smith not enough moose abundance.
90	Change the bag limit for the general season moose hunts in Units 7 and 15 to include 10 legal antler points on at least one side, in addition to the current antler restriction		
Opposed	0	9	(White/Clemens) – Discussion about the intent of the proposal. In response to questions from the committee, ADFG wildlife biologist commented that it would add a lot of complexity to the existing regulation.
91	Shift the moose hunting season and the motorized vehicle restriction in Unit 15C from September to October		
Opposed	0	9	(White/Smith) – White stated that moving the hunt back into October would have a negative effect on meat quality. There was discussion about increased harvest resulting from more favorable environmental conditions to hunters. ADFG biologist echoed concerns with increased harvest due to these factors.
92	Shift the moose hunting season on Kalgin Island in Unit 15B, from August 20 – September 20 to September 1 - 25		
93	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C moose drawing hunt DM549, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	(Dubuc/Clemens) – see discussion proposal 86
94	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 moose drawing hunt DM210, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	(Dubuc/Clemens) – see discussion proposal 86
95	Reauthorize the antlerless moose season on Kalgin Island in Unit 15B		
96	Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 15C		
Support	9	0	(Casey/Clemens) – The Seward Advisory Committee votes annually to reauthorize this hunt, discussion limited to acknowledging that ADFG supports this hunt

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
97	Eliminate the restriction on motorized vehicles for hunting moose in the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C		
98	Clarify the types of roads motorized vehicles are allowed to drive within the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area of Unit 15C during the moose season, and exclude the south side of Kachemak Bay		
99	Allow motorized vehicles to hunt moose in the area south of Kachemak Bay and south of Fox River within the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C		
100	Adjust the Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C to exclude the south side of Kachemak Bay. Additionally, clarify the types of roads motorized vehicles are allowed to be utilized during the moose season; restrict the use of motorized vehicles for all big game		
101	Allow motorized vehicles to hunt moose in the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C		
102	Remove the motorized vehicle restriction for hunting moose within the Lower Kenai Controlled Used Area in Unit 15C		
103	Allow the use of motorized vehicles to hunt moose on the weekends only, after the first week of the season within the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C		
104	Allow the use of motorized vehicles for moose hunting from 10 p.m. to 5 a.m. during September 16-19 and September 22-25, in the Lower Kenai Controlled Use Area in Unit 15C		
105	Close Dall sheep hunting on the Kenai Peninsula in Units 7 and 15		
Oppose	0	9	(Smith/Casey) - Discussed support of ADFG management of full curl hunts, biologists can manage by EO if necessary.
106	Change the general season sheep hunts in Units 7 and 15 to registration hunts with hunt areas set by ADF&G		
Support as amended	9	0	(Smith/Clemens) - Smith supports registration hunts because it provides additional harvest data (Smith/Casey) - amended subsection (4) to delete the language including resident hunters, so this would apply only to nonresident hunters.
107	Change the Dall sheep hunts in Units 7 and 15 to drawing hunts with season dates of August 10 – September 20		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
Oppose	0	9	(White/Smith) – White stated that he does not support the limitations of a draw hunt. Discussion acknowledging that ADFG management practices of a general season and only full curl rams is biologically sound.
108	Change all or some of the general season sheep hunts in Units 7 and 15 to archery only hunts		
109	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the DS150 sheep drawing hunt in Units 7 and 15A to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
110	Open a drawing permit hunt for goat in an area of Unit 7, east of the Russian River, south of Kenai River and West of Copper River		
111	Create a new registration, archery only hunt for goat in Unit 7 Remainder		
112	Create a registration archery only hunt for goat in Units 7 and 15, prior to general registration hunts		
Oppose	0	9	(Casey/White) - Casey generally opposed to creating new hunts that benefit an individual user group. All hunters may participate in the general hunt using whatever legal methods and means they prefer.
113	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG332, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	(White/Dubuc) – moved to vote on proposals 113-133 as a group, referencing our discussion of proposal 86
114	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG334 to UP TO 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
115	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG338, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
116	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG339, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
117	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG342, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
118	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG343, to “up to” 20% of the		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
	available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
119	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG344, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
120	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG345, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
121	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG346, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
122	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG347, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
123	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG351, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
124	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 7 goat drawing hunt DG352, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
125	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG354, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
126	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG356, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
127	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG357, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
128	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG358, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
129	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG359, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
130	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG360, to “up to” 20% of		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			the available permits
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
131			Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG361, to “up to” 20% of the available permits
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
132			Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG362, to “up to” 20% of the available permits
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
133			Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 15C goat drawing hunt DG363, to “up to” 20% of the available permits
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
134			Shorten the resident hunting season, reduce the bag limit from three to one, and require registration permits for hunting black bear in a portion of Units 7 and 15. Additionally, close the nonresident season
135			Change the 2015 Board of Game findings to manage the mortality cap in Units 7 and 15 from a calendar year to a regulatory year or split the mortality cap into spring and fall caps
136			Change the management of the RB300 brown bear mortality cap in Units 7 and 15 from a calendar year to a regulatory year
137			Remove the current harvest cap for the RB300 hunt in Units 7 and 15
138			Reduce the brown bear hunting season in Units 7 and 15 by 15 days
Oppose	0	9	(White/Clemens) – White stated that this would result in lost opportunity during a part of the season where there are good options to select a bear over bait
139			Shorten the brown bear hunting seasons in Units 7 and 15, and divide the RB300 hunt into spring and fall hunts, with each having separate caps
140			Restrict hunters who take a sow brown bear in Units 7 and 15 from hunting RB300 for two to four years
141			When the lynx trapping season is open in Units 7 and 15, season dates will be December 15 through the last day of February

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
142	Lengthen the trapping and hunting seasons for lynx in Units 15 and 7		
143	Lengthen the trapping season for lynx in Units 7 and 15		
144	Lengthen the trapping season for lynx in Units 7 and 15 to align with Units 6 and 14C		
145	Establish trapping and snaring buffers along specific roads and pullouts in and around Cooper Landing in Unit 7		
Oppose	0	9	(White/Clemens) moved to discuss and vote on proposals 145-149 as a group. Discussion noted that these proposals had been discussed by our committee and voted down in the previous meeting cycle, and that they are substantively the same. The reasons these proposals are not supported have to do with a mix of enforcement difficulty, some opposition to the size of the setbacks being proposed, and that dog owners ought to be responsible and in control of their pets. There was also discussion and recognition of unethical trapping being a problem.
146	Establish trapping and snaring buffers along specified trails and trailheads in and around the Cooper Landing Area in Unit 7		
Oppose			(See above)
147	Establish trapping buffers along two areas of Kenai Lake beaches near Cooper Landing, in Unit 7		
Oppose			(See above)
148	Require signs be posted at all access points to active trapping in Unit 7		
Oppose			(See above)
149	Establish trapping and snaring buffers along highway pullouts, backcountry access points, and winter trails in the Summit Lake Recreation Area in Unit 7		
Oppose			(See above)
150	Require identification tags on traps and snares in Unit 7		
Support	7	2	(Clemens/White) – Discussion of this proposal picked up from the previous re: trapping, with supporting comments citing trapper accountability, similarity to shrimp pot tagging requirements, and that anonymity would be maintained by having a tag ID# as opposed to a person's name and phone number.
151	Close all beaver trapping within the Deep Creek and Anchor River drainage south to but excluding the Fox River drainage in Unit 15C, for five years		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
152	Close all beaver trapping in the Anchor River drainage in Unit 15C for five years		
153	Close the Anchor River drainage in Unit 15C to beaver trapping		
154	Change the bag limits for sea ducks in Unit 15C		
<i>Anchorage Area – Unit 14C</i>			
155	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C goat drawing hunt DG852, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	(Clemens/Casey) – discuss proposals 155-158
156	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C goat drawing hunt DG854, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
157	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C goat drawing hunt DG856, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
158	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C goat drawing hunt DG858, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
159	Create archery only, registration permit hunts for goat in Unit 14C		
160	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C moose drawing hunt DM422, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	(Bacon/Clemens) – discuss proposals 160-168
161	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C moose drawing hunt DM423, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
162	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C moose drawing hunt DM424, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
163	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C moose drawing hunt DM427, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
164	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C moose drawing hunt DM428, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
165	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C moose drawing hunt DM430, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
166	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C moose drawing hunt DM446, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
167	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C moose drawing hunt DM447, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
168	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C moose drawing hunt DM448, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
Support	9	0	<i>(ref. proposal 86)</i>
169	Create a moose drawing permit hunt within the Eagler River Management Area in Unit 14C, with additional restrictions		
170	Close the RM445 moose hunt in Unit 14C to nonresidents		
171	Create a new registration archery moose hunt in Unit 14C, East Form Eklutna area		
172	Include wounded moose to count towards bag limits for all hunts in the Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson Management area in Unit 14C		
173	Shift the season dates of the DM211 antlerless moose hunts in the Twentymile/Placer River drainages in Units 7 and 14C to October 1-30, to avoid overlap with the DM210 bull hunt		
Opposed	0	9	(White/Smith) White discussed having many years of experience hunting in this area and stated that he has rarely encountered other hunters, does not believe the amount of hunting a warrant shifting the dates and is opposed to this proposal.
174	Reduce the resident sheep harvest to one ram every other year in the general harvest hunt areas in Units 7 and 14C. Additionally, limit the application period to every other year and change the nonresident permit allocation		
175	Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt area in Units 7 and 14C		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
Support	7	2	(Casey/Smith) – noting that the Seward AC votes on this annually, little discussion was given to the proposal, the two dissenting votes were also cast in accordance with past reauthorizations of this hunt.
176	Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 14(C)		
177	Extend the season for the DS140 and DS240 sheep hunts in Unit 14C by five days		
178	Split the DS141 sheep drawing hunt in Unit 14C into two hunt periods		
179	Remove the East Fork Eklutna from the sheep hunt area for DS124, DS125, DS126 and DS224 in Unit 14C		
180	Expand the DS123 sheep hunt area in Unit 14C, available to resident and nonresident hunters. Additionally, exempt the nonresident quota; issue only one permit for any ram, and lengthen the season		
181	Allow 2 nd degree kindred sheep hunters to hunt under their relative’s permit for sheep in Unit 14C		
182	Change the nonresident sheep permit allocation in Unit 14C so that at least one permit is issued for each of four hunt areas		
183	Extend all hunting seasons for black and brown bear in Unit 14C to June 15		
184	Create a resident, black bear hunt for Highland Mountain in Unit 14C, October 1 – October 31		
185	Increase the number of drawing permits for the DL455 black bear hunt in Unit 14C		
186	Include wounded black bear to count towards the bag limit for the DL455 hunt		
187	Increase the bag limit for black bear to three, in Unit 14C Remainder		
188	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C brown bear drawing hunt DB468, to “up to” 20% of the available permits as follows		
189	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C brown bear drawing hunt DB470, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
190			Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 14C brown bear drawing hunt DB477, to “up to” 20% of the available permits
191			Create an archery only, drawing permit hunt for brown bear in Unit 14C
192			Establish an archery only, registration brown bear hunt in the Chugach State Park Management Area in Unit 14C
193			Change the DB468 brown bear draw hunt for the Eklutna Lake Management Area in Unit 14C to a registration hunt
194			Extend the brown bear hunting season in Unit 14C Remainder to June 30
195			Allow same day airborne take of black and brown bears at bait stations in Unit 14C Remainder
196			Restrict bear baiting within five miles of the Knik River Road in Unit 14C Remainder
197			Require identification tags on traps and snares in Unit 14C
<i>Kodiak Area – Unit 8</i>			
198			Shorten the nonresident hunting season for deer in Unit 8 Remainder
199			Increase the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8 Remainder
200			Increase the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8 Remainder from one to two bucks
201			Increase the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8 Remainder to two bucks
202			Change the bag limit for deer in Unit 8 for Guide Use Areas 08-01, 02, 26, 27, and 28, to two bucks only though December 1, and antlerless deer after December 1
203			Increase the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8 Remainder from one to three
204			Increase the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8 Remainder to two bucks

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
205	Change the season dates and bag limits for deer hunting in Unit 8, Ugak Bay, Saltery Cove and Rough Creek		
206	Change the road system boundary for deer hunting in Unit 8, from the mouth of the Saltry River to the mouth of Wild Creek		
207	Change the bag limit for deer in Unit 8 for Guide Use Areas 08-01, 02, 026, 027, and 028, to require a fork on at least one side		
208	Prohibit the take of fawns or does with fawns in Unit 8		
209	Require nonresidents to hunt elk with a guide in Unit 8		
210	Reallocate elk permits in hunt areas DE715, DE717, DE721, DE723, and RE706 and limit RE706 tags issues in Port Lions and Ouzinkie to one per household		
211	Extend the elk registration hunt in Unit 8, to December 31		
212	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE702, to "up to" 10% of the available permits		
213	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE704, to "up to" 10% of the available permits		
214	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE711, to "up to" 10% of the available permits		
215	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE713, to "up to" 10% of the available permits		
216	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE721, to "up to" 10% of the available permits		
217	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE723, to "up to" 10% of the available permits		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
218	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE715, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
219	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 elk drawing hunt DE717, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
220	Extend the subsistence goat hunting season in Unit 8 to March 31		
221	Lengthen the season for the RG480 goat hunt in Unit 8, to start August 1		
222	Change the bag limit for hunting goat in Unit 8 to one billy only, and require horns to be sealed		
223	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG471, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
224	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG472, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
225	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG473, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
226	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG474, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
227	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG476, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
228	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG478, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
229	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunt DG479, to “up to” 20% of the available permits		
230	Extend the season for the RG480 goat hunt in Unit 8, to start August 1st		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
231			Limit the nonresident permit allocation to 10% for the Unit 8 goat drawing hunts DG471, DG475, DG473, DG474, DG476, DG478, and DG479
232			Establish an allocation for resident and nonresident goat drawing permits for North Kodiak Island in Unit 8
233			Change the boundary for the Unit 8 brown bear drawing hunts DB 106/206/136/236
234			Shorten the spring brown bear season on Kodiak Island in Unit 8, to start April 20
235			Count a wounded bear against a hunter's bag limit in Unit 8
236			Remove the sow restriction and penalties for resident hunters in Kodiak brown bear hunt areas 8 thru 16, and institute a sow skull size restriction for resident hunters
237			Require all nonresident hunters to apply for Unit 8 brown bear drawing permits and reallocate unused nonresident permits to residents
238			Require resident hunting brown in Unit 8, to complete an online education course specific to Kodiak Island brown bear
239			Reduce the bag limit for sea ducks in Unit 8, and require harvest reporting
240			Reduce the bag limit for taking fox in Unit 8 and prohibit the use of night vision for hunting
241			Open a year-round season for trapping mink in Unit 8
242			Extend the trapping season for river otter in Unit 8 to end April 15
243			Require all snares set in the Kodiak Road system within Unit 8, to include breakaway mechanisms
244			Require identification tags on traps and snares set along the Kodiak road system within Unit 8
245			Prohibit the use of all artificial light and infrared devices for hunting in Unit 8

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting
 March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
246			Prohibit the use of infrared devices for hunting in Unit 8
247			Allow the use of artificial light for taking fox under a trapping license
248			Prohibit the use of electronically enhanced night vision for taking furbearers in Unit 8
<i>Reauthorizations for Antlerless Moose Hunts and Brown Bear Tag Fee Exemptions for Other Regions</i>			
249			Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemptions for the Central and Southwest region
250			Reauthorize resident grizzly/brown bear tag fee exemptions throughout Interior and Northeast Alaska
251			Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A
252			Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunts in Units 14A and 14B
253			Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 17A
254			Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 18
255			Reauthorize a fall antlerless hunt during September and a winter any-moose season during February in a portion of Unit 19D
256			Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20A
257			Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20B
258			Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting seasons in Unit 20D
259			Reauthorize a winter antlerless moose season during March in a portion of Unit 21D
260			Reauthorize a winter antlerless moose season during part of February and March in Unit 21E
261			Reauthorize the resident antlerless moose season in Unit 26

XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting
(Casey/Clemens) moved to authorize Dubuc to attend Board of Fish meeting, and passed by unanimous consent.

Discussion of upcoming Board of Fish meeting in Seward, December 2026, and forming a subcommittee to plan for the meeting. Dubuc, Clemens, McCracken, Hubbard, and Smith volunteered for the subcommittee

XII. Set next meeting date – no meeting date was formally set.

XIII. Other

XIV. Adjournment: 10:00 PM by the Chair

Minutes Recorded By: Andy Bacon
Minutes Approved By: Jim McCracken
Date: 02/09/2026

Sitka Fish and Game Advisory Committee

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals March 17 – 21, 2026 Anchorage, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p>			
162	Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries		
No Action			<p>Discussion focused on whether this practice is already effectively prohibited under current law and what qualifies as “commercial transport.” Members questioned whether the proposal targets water taxis or air taxis, and whether existing prohibitions on subsistence guide services already address the issue. Several participants expressed uncertainty about how the proposal would apply in practice. Concerns were raised about the definition of “commercial transportation” and whether it could unintentionally include situations such as reimbursing a friend for gas or fuel after being transported to a subsistence harvest area. There was also uncertainty about whether hiring a boat or plane for access would undermine the subsistence nature of the activity. With limited clarity on the scope, enforcement implications, and whether a regulatory gap actually exists, members expressed hesitation to support the proposal. The group ultimately voted to take no action, with no opposition.</p>
11	Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W. longitude		
Support	13	0	<p>Although the proposal falls outside the committee’s immediate area, members engaged in broader discussion about trawl impacts. John noted his primary concern remains salmon and suggested other upcoming proposals may better address regional priorities. Stacey clarified that the proposal’s intent is to address trawl impacts on golden crab. Several members expressed strong concerns about bottom trawling and habitat damage. Steve suggested supporting the proposal as an opportunity to formally state opposition to bottom trawling, even if the issue is outside the area. Dick raised concerns about bottom damage and halibut impacts, and Kent added that pelagic trawl gear is frequently on the bottom, echoing concerns raised in Proposals 163–165. Norm emphasized that the Bering</p>

			<p>Sea serves as nursery grounds for species that migrate through the Gulf and down to Canada, meaning impacts extend well beyond one region.</p> <p>Karen supported the proposal as a way to slow habitat damage affecting the entire coastline, citing reports of significant halibut mortality associated with trawling and research showing migration along the West Coast. Kent noted that while federal Amendment 80 cannot be addressed at the state level, there is an opportunity to weigh in on state proposals—particularly 164 and 165—regarding real-time gear monitoring to keep pelagic trawl gear off the bottom. The motion to support Proposal 11 passed unanimously</p>
163	Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis		
Support	13	0	<p>Emily introduced proposals 163-165 together, emphasizing that they establish clear, enforceable, and verifiable rules for pelagic trawl gear, improving transparency and reducing habitat and bycatch impacts. She noted that the State of Alaska’s definition of pelagic trawl states that it does not contact the seabed or use protective devices that make it suitable for fishing on the bottom. Proposal 165 would require salmon excluders as a baseline best practice to reduce avoidable salmon bycatch.</p> <p>Kent asked about excluder effectiveness, and Emily explained that Chinook excluders are standard, with newer development for chum-specific excluders. Devon and Woody discussed the reality that some “pelagic” gear can contact the bottom and that gear could be built to operate on the seafloor even if labeled pelagic. AC members noted that current gear definitions allow flexibility, but the proposals create a clear verification pathway.</p> <p>Members noted concerns raised by the industry, including claims that Proposal 163 could presume guilt, monitoring costs for Proposal 164, and operators’ claims that they do not fish on the bottom. AC members emphasized that these proposals establish measurable compliance and accountability rather than punitive rules. Norm and others highlighted the high volume of product and discards in state waters, supporting stronger regulation. Members framed the proposals as a first step toward broader state and federal alignment in defining and managing pelagic trawl gear which is operating on the seafloor.</p>
164	Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters		
Support	13	0	See comments on 163

165	Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters		
Support	13	0	See comments on 163
166	Amend statewide definition of a mechanical jigging machine		
Support	13	0	<p>Proposal 166 would add specific dimensional limits to the statewide definition of a mechanical jigging machine. ADF&G staff noted the concern comes from the Kodiak jig fishery, where some vessels are alleged to be using longline-style gear under the jig allocation, potentially gaining a competitive advantage. Although directed at Kodiak, the change would apply statewide, including Southeast fisheries targeting black rockfish, lingcod, and Pacific cod.</p> <p>ADF&G staff clarified that while Kodiak faces competition concerns, Southeast does not currently experience the same level of conflict. Kodiak's Pacific cod fishery allocates 50% of the Guideline Harvest Level to jig gear, and disputes center on whether some operators are fishing more efficiently by mimicking longline methods. Current regulations already limit vessels to six jig machines, 30 hooks per machine, and 500 total hooks, but there is no size or diameter limit in regulation.</p> <p>AC discussion reflected concern about creating statewide restrictions for a regional issue and potentially forcing Southeast fishermen to modify equipment unnecessarily. Others noted possible loopholes involving multiple baited hooks deployed in a longline-style configuration while labeled as jigging. Ultimately, despite reservations, the motion to support Proposal 166 passed unanimously, 13–0.</p>
167	Prohibit vessels from having other groundfish gear or equipment onboard while participating in a groundfish fishery using mechanical jigging machines or hand troll gear		
Oppose	0	13	<p>AC discussion raised concerns about practicality and enforcement. Members noted that many vessels carry multiple gear types for efficiency and flexibility, including combining longline, pot, troll, and subsistence gear. Concerns were raised that the proposal would create unnecessary inconvenience, particularly for combo operations or those setting subsistence gear while engaged in another fishery.</p> <p>Members felt Proposal 166 already addressed the core concern and that additional restrictions were unnecessary. The motion to support failed unanimously, 0–13.</p>

168	Prohibit vessels from having more than one groundfish gear type onboard when participating in a state-managed groundfish fishery		
Oppose	0	13	<p>Discussion centered on enforcement versus regulation. Members expressed concern that the proposal would create complications across multiple fisheries and set a problematic precedent. Many Southeast vessels routinely carry and use multiple gear types (e.g., pots and hooks for halibut and black cod, longline and slinky pots, troll gear with other equipment), and the proposal could significantly disrupt common fishing practices.</p> <p>ADF&G noted that the proposal would impact several Southeast-directed fisheries, including rockfish, lingcod, Pacific cod, and black cod. Members concluded that if improper activity is occurring, enforcement should address it, not add additional regulation. The motion to support Proposal 168 failed unanimously, 0–13.</p>
169	Create a definition of groundfish coil spring or ‘slinky pot’		
Support	13	0	Housekeeping proposal, passed unanimously
170	Reduce the permitted egg take level of each hatchery permit containing pink and chum salmon by 25% of the current permitted capacity for those species		
Oppose	0	13	<p>AC discussion highlighted significant economic and ecological implications. Hatchery operators and processors stressed that reductions could seriously impact profit, co-op operations, and broader salmon programs, including coho and king salmon releases. Early findings from Prince William Sound indicate high proportions of hatchery-origin chum in some streams, raising concerns about interactions with wild stocks. However, field sampling shows stray rates decline with distance from hatchery release sites, and not all wild straying is captured.</p> <p>Committee members questioned the Board of Fisheries’ authority to enact such reductions, noting that legal jurisdiction over hatchery broodstock may not extend to production cuts of this magnitude. Concerns were also raised about the public versus organizational ownership of hatchery fish. Ultimately, the AC opposed the proposal, which failed unanimously, 0–13.</p>
171	Amend Prince William Sound hatchery permits to reduce pink salmon egg take capacity		
No Action			Out of Area
172	Board generated regulation that places a moratorium on pink and chum hatchery production		
Oppose	0	13	AC discussion noted that the proposal lacked a clear regulatory mechanism and that existing processes allow the commissioner to manage production through established agreements. Legal authority questions were raised about whether

			<p>the Board of Fisheries can enact such a moratorium, and members noted that current coordination between operators and the state is functioning.</p> <p>Concerns were also raised about the vague language of the proposal and its potential to create new regulatory complications. While some members saw merit in modernizing processes, the AC concluded that the proposal was outside their authority and not necessary. The motion failed unanimously, 0–13.</p>
173	Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent		
Support	13	0	Housekeeping proposal, passed unanimously
174	Allow the engine of a purse seine vessel or skiff to be shut off when the purse seine is deployed		
Support	13	0	The AC’s Seine representative concluded that allowing fishermen to shut off engines when desired poses no issue and expressed support for permitting it.
175	Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration		
Oppose	0	13	<p>Committee discussion focused on regional applicability and impacts. Members noted that local dip nets are already within legal size limits (around 4.5-inch stretch), and reducing mesh further could increase bycatch of smaller sockeye without effectively conserving Chinook. Concerns were raised that a statewide mandate could unnecessarily burden subsistence and personal use fisheries, particularly in areas like Redoubt where selective harvest of larger sockeye is common. The mesh design and net construction were also discussed, with members noting that nets are triangular and partially suspended by rope, allowing anglers to control handling and size selectivity.</p> <p>Several members, including Woody and Emily, emphasized that this proposal should not be applied statewide, as local fisheries do not face the same conservation concerns cited elsewhere.</p> <p>The AC voted by unanimous consent to oppose the proposal and comment that it shouldn’t be applied statewide and would harm our region.</p>
176	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits		
Oppose	1	14	<p>Discussion noted that this proposal differs from the following 2 proposals because it specifically prohibits crew from contributing their harvest to clients. The discussion centered on whether pooling would simplify the “first person to hook the fish” rule and reduce catch-and-release mortality, or instead increase</p>

			<p>harvest and create enforcement and allocation problems, particularly in Southeast Alaska where resident and non-resident limits can differ.</p> <p>ADF&G staff explained that bag limits are currently managed on an individual basis and serve as a primary conservation tool. Moving to vessel limits could increase harvest, particularly by allowing continued fishing once some anglers reach their limits. In areas with resident preference limits, pooling could effectively blur those distinctions. Jake noted that while there might be minor reductions in release mortality in some slot-limit scenarios, overall harvest would likely increase, potentially requiring more restrictive management in the future.</p> <p>Enforcement raised significant concerns about implementation. Pooling limits would make it difficult to determine responsibility when a vessel exceeds allowable catch. Under a vessel limit, individual accountability becomes unclear, and in an over-limit situation, everyone on board could potentially be cited. He also noted complications involving crew-retained fish, residency distinctions, and statewide differences in species rules. Current regulations clearly assign responsibility to clients and guides; pooling would make enforcement more complex and, in some scenarios, “virtually impossible.”</p> <p>There was extensive AC discussion regarding all 3 proposals (177-179). Supporters argued the current regulation is widely misunderstood and inconsistently applied, particularly regarding who “hooks” the fish first. They contended pooling would reduce unnecessary catch-and-release mortality, especially for king salmon and yelloweye, and better accommodate families and physically limited anglers. Opponents countered that the proposal could increase harvest, weaken residency distinctions, complicate enforcement, strain allocations during low-quota seasons, and effectively legitimize practices that may already be occurring but are not legal. Several members characterized the proposal as a slippery slope away from individual accountability in sportfishing.</p>
177	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits		
No Action			See comments on 176
178	Modify the definition of bag limit		
Oppose	3	12	<p>Proposal 178 would modify the definition of bag limit by allowing a fish to count toward the limit of “any person taking part in the catch,” rather than strictly the person who originally hooked it. Unlike Proposals 176 and 177, it does not explicitly create a boat wide pooling system but instead attempts to address situations where someone assists in landing a fish for youth, elderly anglers, or others in need of physical assistance.</p>

			<p>Luke, the proposal author, explained that current regulations tie the fish to the person who first hooks it, which can create problems when rods are in holders and someone must initially grab and crank the reel before handing it to the intended angler. He argued the rule is widely misunderstood and unintentionally violated. His intent was to clarify that assisting should allow the fish to count toward the bag limit of someone actively participating in the catch. He emphasized the proposal was about fairness and accessibility, not increasing harvest.</p> <p>Enforcement (Tim) acknowledged Luke’s intent and stated the current regulations are workable but could benefit from clarification. However, he cautioned that the phrase “any person taking part in a catch” is vague and could be abused. He warned that, in practice, the language could function similarly to a boat limit by allowing anglers who had already reached their limit to hand off fish to someone else who had not. Tim suggested that clarifying what constitutes “assistance” might be more appropriate than altering the bag limit definition itself, but noted that making such language enforceable would require multiple subsections.</p> <p>Committee discussion reflected divided views. Supporters saw the proposal as a narrower and less problematic alternative to vessel pooling. They argued it would allow guides, deckhands, and others to assist physically limited anglers without fear of technical violations. Opponents, however, viewed the language as overly broad and potentially creating the same enforcement and allocation concerns raised under Proposals 176 and 177. Several members expressed concern that the wording could effectively allow fish to be transferred to someone who still needed that species, thereby functioning as a de facto boat limit. Others worried about giving the Board a proposal with vague language to fix how they see fit later.</p> <p>While many members appreciated the intent, several stated they could not support the proposal as written.</p>
179	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10 fish		
Oppose	0	15	<p>ADF&G staff explained that the department does not currently have data on how many anglers harvest more than ten kings annually, as sport anglers are not universally required to report total seasonal catch. The proposal could reduce harvest in areas without existing annual caps, but it could also restrict opportunity in times or places of abundance, particularly in Southeast Alaska, which accounts for a large share of sport-harvested king salmon. The department already has emergency authority to reduce bag, possession, or annual limits when conservation concerns arise.</p>

			<p>Committee discussion focused on regional impacts and management flexibility. Several members opposed applying a blanket statewide limit, arguing it would disproportionately affect Southeast fisheries and restrict the department's ability to liberalize harvest in hatchery or surplus situations. Concerns were raised that the proposal appeared designed for a different region (Southcentral) but would be imposed uniformly statewide. Members also questioned the 20-inch minimum size, with one noting it would allow anglers to quickly reach the annual limit on smaller fish, complicating management. Others pointed out that nonresidents already face annual limits in some Southeast fisheries and that the proposal could unintentionally override or conflict with existing regional frameworks.</p> <p>One member noted conceptual support for annual limits in finite or high-pressure fisheries but the overall conclusion was that the proposal as statewide mandate was inappropriate. Overall, the committee viewed the proposal as overly broad, lacking supporting data, and unnecessarily restrictive.</p>
180	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish		
Oppose	0	15	<p>ADF&G noted that Proposal 180 was similar to 179 but reduced the annual limit to five king salmon and required electronic recording or annual reporting to the department. It also did not include the 20-inch minimum provision.</p> <p>Because it raised the same concerns regarding statewide application, management inflexibility, and lack of harvest data, the AC discussion reflected the same opposition expressed under Proposal 179.</p>
181	Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear		
Support	15	0	<p>ADF&G staff explained that current regulatory wording does not fully match statute, and this change would improve clarity. Enforcement noted the issue arose in part from cases where anglers clipped gear directly to downrigger cables, effectively creating an illegal hand-gurdy setup. The proposal was described as a technical fix for clarity and consistency.</p> <p>ADF&G clarified the intent is not to prohibit downriggers, but to ensure gear remains attached to a rod rather than directly clipped to a downrigger cable.</p> <p>Questions were raised about how the change would apply to herring jigs and spearfishing gear. Jake and Tim clarified that separate regulations specifically authorize multi-hook herring and smelt gear and recognize spearfishing as lawful sport fishing gear, subject to standard bag and size limits.</p>
182	Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit		

No Action			Out of Area
183	Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession		
Oppose	1	14	<p>ADF&G staff (Jake) indicated the primary purpose of Proposal 183 is to improve enforcement and biological sampling—specifically recovering tags, measuring length and weight, and accurately identifying species such as rockfish. In Southeast Alaska, similar requirements are currently implemented seasonally through emergency order and this proposal would apply the concept statewide.</p> <p>Committee concerns centered on practicality and scope. Members questioned whether anglers would be prohibited from filleting species such as black rockfish before returning to port and whether the proposal was overly broad for species not requiring intensive sampling. Questions were also raised about bait exemptions and whether the existing list of allowable bait species was comprehensive. Jake clarified that specific bait species (e.g., herring, chum salmon, pink salmon, certain whitefish) and fish scraps are already authorized, and these are generally not the conservation focus of the proposal.</p> <p>ADF&G staff noted that the department is reviewing the language and it may be amended before final action, particularly regarding whether a statewide requirement is necessary and how “processed or prepared for human consumption” should be defined.</p> <p>Additional concerns included how the rule might apply to larger vessels that remain at sea for multiple days and freeze fish onboard, and whether the language created contradictions such as requiring fish to remain intact until processed while also requiring processing for human consumption. Members felt the proposal, as written, was overly strict and potentially problematic in practice.</p>
184	Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition		
Support	15	0	House keeping proposal, supported with unanimous consent
186	Reduce commercial salmon fishing opportunity with drift gillnet gear in the Central District of the Cook Inlet Area		
No Action			Out of Area
187	Close the Tsiu River and all waters within one quarter mile of the Tsiu River and Kaliakh River confluence to commercial fishing for salmon		
No Action			Out of Area

**Sitka Fish & Game Advisory Committee
February 18, 2026
NSRAA & Zoom**

I. Call to Order: 6pm by Chair Wayne

II. Roll Call

Members Present:

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

III. **Fish and Game Staff Present:**

Jake Wieliczkiwicz (ADFG Sportfish), Monica Matz (ADFG SF)

***Jake clarifies that they will not comment until sportfish next week

IV. **Guests Present:**

Keith Nyitray (grant manager/ED Sitka maritime heritage society), Adam Olson (NSRAA), Mark Holst

V. **Approval of Agenda**

- Letter in support of subsistence
- Letter in support of HB93
- BOF Statewide Subsistence proposal 162

- BOF Statewide Groundfish/Commercial Proposals 11, 163-174
- Who will attend statewide finfish March 17-20?

John: Requests to add an agenda item for the next meeting. Requests AC support for a letter to ADFG Sport and ADFG Commissioner on Stocks Of Concern management within the sportfish sector. It's taking too long to get SOC rebuilt & certain gear users using catch and release in corridors where others avoid. We need to put more restrictions in there.

Steve M/Emily S to approve agenda

Approved

VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes N/A

VII. Reports

- Chair's report
- ADF&G
- Others

VIII. Public Comment

Keith: Sitka Maritime Heritage Society is eligible for \$2.3 million grant through Murkowski from CDS for the Japonski island boathouse haulout. Grant would be to completely rebuild marine ways inside out. Request LOS from the AC & individuals. The application deadline is 2/27.

Stacey asks John about the scope of our letter writing - John would like to review the rules.

Dick M/ Kent S to draft an LOS for SMHS

AC Comment:

Steve Ramp - There's a direct link between AC and project

John: Suggests the author uses the definition of ACs to guide if it's appropriate

Kent: Asks what the public use would be?

- Keith: One boat at a time but yes, public use. Nothing over 40 ft. As a non-profit, rates will be cheaper. It is a part of our community.

Schuyler: Reach out to the sustainability commission

- Keith: Yes, we have. Unfortunately, the timeline is too tight for approvals. Allowed to submit 5 letters of support. Even half of the grant would go a long way. Marineways are the most important part of the restoration.

Stacey: Reviews the AC mission statement which includes "consulting with others."

Could apply under consulting with others.

Moe: Likes the idea but far outside our mission. Won't support the AC letter.

Keith: sitkamaritime@gmail.com if individuals would like to submit a letter, please reach out.

Steve: Asks if Keith is willing to withdraw request

Keith agrees.

Letter in Support of Federal Subsistence Management Program (FSMP):

Devon: John asked to write a DOI letter on behalf of the AC and would like to discuss if that's appropriate

Stacey: Asks Devon to provide an overview

Devon: The purpose would be submitting an individual comment to DOI addressing the recent review of the FSMP. There was a petition by Safari Club International which intended to have the Federal Subsistence Board (FSB) & FSMP reviewed. Areas of review include: number of seats, way in which RAC members are elected, role of ADFG in federal process, and others. There's a lot which is concerning and would wonder if we want to express our general priority for subsistence, support for FSMP or whether we would want to be addressing various points of concern.

Stacey: Part of the petition would return control of subsistence to the state?

Schuyler: Yes

Devon: Not intentionally but yes. The concern stems from the petition which SCI submitted. We'd have to return it to primary managers (AK)

Stacey: Alaska can't manage to subsistence priority which is a reason why we would want to write a letter and why we should write a letter on it

M Emily/S John for Devon to submit a letter on behalf of the AC to DOI

Kent: Part of it would be specific comments - like deference to ADFG, whether locals are included in RAC. What would our specific focuses be?

Stacey: This is what our AC should decide now. What is the AC interested in commenting on specifically?

Steve: Goal is to speak out in opposition of the SCI petition?

Devon: I was hoping we could come to that consensus.

Emily: Clarifies that we would be commenting on the review process itself, not the petition. We would comment on the areas of review identified by DOI.

Steve: We want to specify opposing specific things including the makeup of the Board and turning control to state

Devon: We want to preserve recent changes that the board has made in the last several years.

Kent: And support ANILCA and the promise it has made.

John: Is the letter going to the administration?

Emily: It's going to secretary of the interior

Devon: Since we have another meeting coming up, can I write a draft and then we can suggest edits.

Norm: I have a hard time just drafting a letter and sending it. I'm in support of protecting subsistence rights. It's just what exactly are we trying to address?

Stacey: Just trying to get approval to draft the letter.

Emily withdraws motion

Devon to present a draft of the letter at the next meeting.

Letter of support for HB 93:

John: The bill has passed in the house, going into the senate. We could either write Stedman or the whole senate. Himschoot was here and presented it to us. We already voted on it, could we use what we had for the house and carry over to the senate?

Stacey: The bill is changing requirements for in-state hunting and fishing licenses to be the same as PFD. Easy for law enforcement to check eligibility. Under current regs, you don't have to be in the state much to qualify for resident status.

Steve: Revoice my opposition to this bill - I think it's a bad bill for the same reasons. Too many loopholes so it will prevent long term residents from obtaining a license. Unless it's ammended at the senate level, it'll leave a lot of people out of resident licenses.

John: Propose we bring the old letter to the next meeting and discuss if we want to repurpose.

Woody: The bill has significantly reduced requirements at this point.

Steve: I'll take another look

Kent: Coming from POW seeing a lot of abuses from permanent fishing and hunting licenses you get at 65. Folks who qualify but didn't live in state nor intend to are abusing that privilege. A clean fix would be aligning the requirements with those of the PFD. Makes sense to me that the privilege in the state stays in the state. Qualifications should be at least as stringent as the PFD.

John: I haven't looked at the new bill so I'd like to do that before submitting the letter but I'm still in support of it. It's been vetted by a lot of ACs and communities.

Steve: Would like to table

Stacey: Clarifies testimony could be Monday

Steve motions to table, no second

John: If it's Monday, it's not gonna happen. I'd be prepared to come up with a letter addressing the base of what we commented before.

IX. Old Business

Report from Steve Ramp on Unguided Rental Boat Issue

- Steve: Was asked by Himschoot to be the AC rep for the unguided rental boat issue. We already submitted a LOS. There were representatives from SEAGO, ALFA, and other businesses who rent boats. Goal is to come up with an agreed upon definition of rented

sportfishing vessels. Asked Steve to submit our AC definition (from BOF). A couple changes made to our definition - foresees a bill being generated to define the group.

Officer Election

- John takes over as Chair
 - Election for the Chair Seat: Steve nominates Stacey, Stacey accepts.
 - Unanimous consent - Passes
- Stacey takes back role as Chair
 - Election for VC: Steve nominates John, John would like to pass the torch to a younger representative but would be happy to continue to serve until Fall
 - Unanimous Consent - Passes
- Election for Secretary:
 - Devon/Schuyler nominate Emily, Emily accepts
 - Unanimous consent - Passes

X. New Business

1. BOF Statewide Proposal 162
2. BOF Statewide Proposals 11, 163-174

PROPOSAL 162: Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries

Steve M/John S

Devon: This would prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries. They say below that subsistence fishing guide services are already prohibited in the state so I think these are referring to water taxis or air taxis?

John: I don't have enough knowledge about harvesting subsistence foods to know if this is being done or not. Would Redoubt count? I'm not familiar with it.

Stacey: Asks for ADFG comment, received no response

Steve: Against this proposal, haven't convinced me it's not currently against the law

Stacey calls on Patrick Baum: Troller and chair of Elfin Cove AC. One thing that came up for our AC in this discussion was that if you're needing to hire a boat and go out. If you're paying, is it really subsistence?

Woody: I don't know if that's going to apply to giving someone gas money, etc. If your friend has a plane and flies you into a lake and you buy their fuel they can be in trouble for that. I don't know how that would be. I wouldn't comment because I don't see a direction for it that's clear.

Norm: I'd pause as well that something is going on we don't have an understanding of. I'm hung up on commercial transportation definition. Is it all encompassing or is it narrow? Water taxi vs giving a friend gas money when you don't have a boat.

Dick M to take no action/ Schuyler seconds, no opposition

PROPOSAL 11: Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W longitude

John: This proposal is outside our area and specific to crab habitat. Other upcoming proposals may better address our concerns. Emphasized he is more concerned about salmon.

Stacey: The intent is to address trawl impacts on golden crab.

Steve M/Woody S to support Proposal 11

Steve: I know how strongly some members of our AC feel about trawling and habitat damage impacts. This could be a proposal where we state on record that we're opposed to bottom trawling. Even though it's not our area, it's a big issue.

Dick: Expressed concern about bottom damage and impacts to halibut.

Kent: Agrees with Dick, stating that pelagic trawl gear is on the bottom about 90% of the time and that concerns mirror those raised in Proposals 163–165.

Norm: The Bering Sea is well known as nursery grounds, with fish migrating down the Gulf all the way to Canada, meaning impacts extend beyond one species and therefore affect our region.

Kent: Notes we cannot comment on Amendment 80 federally but we have a chance to weigh in on state proposals, particularly 164/165 regarding real-time gear monitoring in Prince William Sound to keep gear off the bottom. That's what is happening, pelagic trawl is on bottom.

Karen: Supports the proposal, citing that it would slow down damage being done which is affecting our whole coastline. References reports of approximately 800,000 halibut (around 5 lbs each) killed by trawlers in 2025 and noted science shows these fish migrate along the West Coast.

Woody calls to question Proposal 11

Passes 13-0

PROPOSAL 163: Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis

Dick M/Kent S to take up Proposal 163

Stacey asks Emily to introduce on behalf of proposer - Emily suggests commenting on 163-165 together

Emily: Alaska Healthy Habitat Alliance submitted 3 proposals (163 through 165) which advance a straightforward and essential principle for Alaska fisheries management: when the State defines a gear type and sets operating standards, those standards must be clear, enforceable, and verifiable on the water. This is particularly important for fisheries with large operational footprints and the potential for substantial habitat and bycatch impacts. Under Alaska regulation, pelagic trawl gear is defined as gear that does not contact the seabed or use protective devices that make it suitable for fishing on the bottom. That's clear, fair, and widely understood. These proposals just make sure those rules are actually enforceable. Proposal 163 establishes a common-sense framework: if a gear type is defined by how it is fished, compliance must be verifiable. Specifically, 163 would treat pelagic trawl gear as bottom-contact gear unless operators can demonstrate, through enforceable verification methods, that the gear is not fishing on the seafloor. Proposal 164 is essential because it provides what the current regulatory system lacks: a practical verification method that makes the existing pelagic definition enforceable. Monitoring is not about punishment; it is about measurable compliance, transparency, and reducing conflict. Proposal 165 would require the use of salmon excluders in

pelagic trawl nets, a common sense measure already standard in federal waters. Proposal 163 would redefine pelagic trawl gear as bottom trawl until operators can prove they are not fishing on the seafloor. Proposal 164 would require seafloor monitoring technology on pelagic trawl nets to verify compliance with state regulations. Proposal 165 would require the use of salmon excluders in pelagic trawl nets, a common sense measure already standard in federal waters. As a cohesive package, proposals 163-165 would: convert the pelagic trawl definition from a paper standard into an enforceable operating standard; establish a verifiable compliance pathway through monitoring and clear protocols; require salmon excluders as a baseline best practice to reduce avoidable salmon bycatch risk; improve fairness across gear types by reducing gray areas and ensuring consistent accountability and restore public confidence by replacing “trust us” with proof.

AC Discussion:

Kent (to Emily): How effective are salmon excluders?

Emily: I don't have numbers on how effective they are. I know that they are effective based on testimony and scientific review at Council. The issue with some of the tech is if you are trying to test the efficacy but testing in areas without salmon and not seeing salmon how do you quantify that. Chinook excluders were first and as of recently, there is more development for chum specific excluders as well.

Devon: Pelagic trawl operators don't have any protective or chaffing gear on their net?

Emily: They are legally required not to by the state definition.

Devon: But they do because they are fishing on the bottom (not pelagic)?

Emily: If the gear is designed for bottom contact, rollers/chaffing gear are needed for the operation. If they are operating as “pelagic,” they are not intending to hit bottom. So clearly, that gear would prove that the operator is targeting the bottom.

Woody: You are allowed to build your gear however you want. You can build your pelagic trawl so when you come in contact with the bottom, it won't tear up and lose your trawl. Build your pelagic trawl so it works on the bottom too. Basically, that's my understanding. I don't know if there are pelagic trawlers actively using that.

Stacey calls on Patrick: Some things I heard today from UFA - claiming that 163 would be “guilty til proven innocent” that's something you've been going against. On 164, they were claiming the monitoring couldn't handle the environment and required \$10k per piece. Then they were claiming that they don't go on the bottom.

Steve: Is there any reason we can't vote on all 3 as a group?

Stacey: We can

John: Spoke with a biologist out of Homer. In the PWS fishery there's a 700-1,000 king salmon allocation. AK peninsula fishery, parallel fishery west of Alutian chain. It's a parallel fishery federally and state.

Stacey: If we can get something like this in state waters, it would be then easier to impose the same regulation in federal waters - show it can work and make it stronger.

Rhea: Not familiar with trawl fishery so no ADFG comment

Norm: I'm happy with voting on all 3 together and would be in favor. Folks saying 3 billion pounds of product and 12 million lbs of discards last year, unacceptable number in our book.

Stacey calls on Patrick Baum (public): Potentially implementing could help down the line and that was one thing that was said over and over. These are just the first domino. That gave me some hope.

Dick: Halibut are historic lows and having a hard time sharing as it is woody - big fan of burden of proof is on prosecution but halibut

John calls to question 163-165 and asks for unanimous consent

Passes 13-0

PROPOSAL 164: Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters

PROPOSAL 165: Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters

PROPOSAL 166: Amend Statewide Definition of a Mechanical Jigging Machine

Proposal 166 would add specific dimensional limits to the statewide definition of a mechanical jigging machine, criteria that do not currently exist in regulation. The issue appears to stem from concerns in the Kodiak jig fishery but would apply statewide.

AC Discussion:

John asked Rhea (ADF&G) whether the AC should take up the proposal and whether it affects their area.

Rhea: Explains that while the issue is geared toward the Kodiak jig fishery, a statewide change would also apply to Southeast fisheries (black rockfish, lingcod, rockfish). Currently, there is no diameter limit in regulation; this proposal would add one.

Steve asks Rhea: Is it a problem in Southeast?

Rhea: Southeast does not face the same level of competition seen in Kodiak. The concern in Kodiak involves vessels potentially using longline drums as jig machines, gaining an unfair advantage. Suggested that if this is the case, it may be more appropriate as an area-specific solution.

Woody stated his intent is to vote against the proposal and send it back to Kodiak

M Woody/S Kent to take up Proposal 166

Norm: There is growing sportfishing pressure for rockfish in Southeast and mechanically raising and lowering gear to deep depths does not differ much in practice.

Woody expressed concern that local fishermen could be forced to replace equipment for an issue not currently relevant in Southeast. Suggested addressing it later if it becomes a competitive problem.

Kent asked Rhea to clarify how longline gear could be used to jig.

Rhea: Longline gear is not legal in this fishery. The concern is that some operators may be deploying multiple hooks in a manner resembling longlining while claiming to jig. Regardless, passage of the proposal would change the jig gear definition statewide.

Steve: Proposals 166, 167, and 168 all appear to be aimed at addressing the same regional issue, effectively reserving the fishery for traditional jig vessels. Suggests considering them together if taken up.

Stacey: Supports staying focused on Proposal 166 and opposed adding restrictions not currently needed in Southeast.

John: Defining gear is not inherently problematic and could be amended later if necessary.

Woody: Sees a loophole: vessels anchoring and deploying multiple baited hooks in a longline-style configuration while calling it jigging.

Rhea: In Kodiak state waters, the Guideline Harvest Level (GHL) for Pacific cod is based on 12.5% of the Central Gulf of Alaska ABC, split 50% to pot gear and 50% to jig gear vessels. The dispute centers on vessels allegedly fishing more efficiently with longline-style gear under the jig allocation. Longline gear is not legal in this fishery. Approximately 2.83 million pounds were harvested between January 1 and April 4 by 63 jig vessels in Kodiak. In Southeast, only three vessels participate in the Pacific cod fishery using longline hooks.

Kent: Are participants generally on smaller vessels?

Rhea: Assumes they are similar in size to Southeast vessels; in Kodiak Harbor, many jig boats are 30-40 feet. Clarifies current limits: no more than six jig machines per vessel, no more than 30 hooks per machine, and no more than 500 aggregate hooks total. There is no vessel size limit.

Schuyler Calls to Question Proposal 166

Passes 13-0

PROPOSAL 167: Prohibit vessels from having other groundfish gear or equipment onboard while participating in a groundfish fishery using mechanical jigging machines or hand troll gear

M Emily/ S Schuyler to take up Proposal 167

John: I'm in favor, it's more of a definition thing to me. Gillnet gear while trolling and a troller said it's not that big of a deal - no one's putting gillnet gear on their troll wire.

Norm: Referred to 168, reserved comments

Schuyler: I would have to take my gurdys off if I want to put a subsistence skate out. If I have hand troll gear on my boat but want to set a subsistence halibut skate, then I'd have to take all my gear off the boat. This seems like an enforcement issue.

Woody: I combo longline, etc, horribly inconvenient one type at a time. Have what you want on your boat.

Kent: 166 solves the problem already.

Stacey Calls to question Proposal 167

Fails 0-13

PROPOSAL 168: Prohibit vessels from having more than one groundfish gear type onboard when participating in a state-managed groundfish fishery

Norm: Enforcement issue not regulatory issue. If nefarious things are happening, changing the regulation isn't going to fix that. Both of these proposals, if passed, could set bad precedents for other fisheries. Multiple boats in the fishery using pots and hooks, trollers that have dinglebar gear on, etc - this could get complicated really fast so I'm not in favor of either one of these.

Stacey: Many use both longline gear and slinky pots

M Dick/S Woody to support Proposal 168

Dick: It's a common practice to be using pot and hooks - halibut/black cod, combo trips.

Rhea: This would impact directed rockfish, directed lingcod, pcod, black rockfish, chatham and clarence black cod.

John Calls to question

Fails 0-13

PROPOSAL 169: Create a definition of groundfish coil spring or 'slinky pot'

Rhea: Housekeeping proposal. Asked at 2025 BOF to define slinky pots which have become common in groundfish fisheries as well as crab and shrimp.

John calls to question and asks for unanimous consent

Passes 13-0

PROPOSAL 170: Reduce the permitted egg take level of each hatchery permit containing pink and chum salmon by 25% of the current permitted capacity for those species

M Schuyler/S Kent to take up Proposal 170

Schuyler: Large impact on profit and non-profit hatcheries across the state. It's been an ongoing battle from Fairbanks AC.

Adam: Will only take up hatchery proposals statewide now - been kicked around by multiple meetings targeting seeking regions. A proposer 1,000 miles away production cuts to our fish impacts them

Schuyler: Defacto understanding - no increase in ask for chum and pink. Chum and pink in PWS - 2 generations, fitness, straying. Preliminary findings in PWS and SE

Devon: Worked as a technician on the chum project 5-6 years ago, early findings showed high proportions of hatchery-origin chum in some streams (e.g., 83% in Fish Creek). Expressed concern that hatchery-origin fish may be replacing or competing with wild stocks more than previously recognized.

Kent: Is that measured in the current study?

Adam: Field sampling for the chum project has concluded. Findings show a sliding scale of stray rates - higher closer to hatchery release sites and lower farther away. Much of the sampling occurred near release sites, and not all wild straying is captured, as salmon naturally colonize through straying and many fish are unmarked without close-range genetic identification.

Norm: As a processor and as a representative of a co-op owned by members. These hatchery fish are keeping our fleet alive. We are highly dependent on these returns. It's viable and important to the industry. From the processor side - aquaculture makes up 90% of worldwide salmon production . Gonna cost us market share and when you lose market share, it's really hard to get it back.

Steve: Made aware that BOF has a standing committee on hatcheries and have been well aware of issues and have been working on it.

Emily asks Adam about context: Commissioner reduced crawfish by 25% - in response to political stress

Schuyler: Emphasizes that chum production locally underwrites other programs, including coho and king salmon releases benefiting multiple user groups. Organizations could struggle to maintain those programs if chum production is reduced.

Adam: There's a big question about the board's authority on this topic - if they have the legal right to pass a regulation like this. Legal opinion on what sets up - jurisdiction applies to

broodstock how many fish they take out of the wild system. Some board members think it extends past that, but there is a new lawyer on the ADFG team.

Devon: Are hatchery fish considered the property of the organization?

Adam: Hatchery fish are managed for the public but may be considered property of organizations in certain defined areas, similar to fish becoming private property once lawfully harvested from common waters.

Devon: Same way that a fish caught by a fisherman becomes that person's property?

Adam: Anywhere in the common property, yes.

Stacey Calls to question and asks for unanimous consent

Fails 0-13

PROPOSAL 171: Amend Prince William Sound hatchery permits to reduce pink salmon egg take capacity

Schuyler motions to take up Proposal 171. It's important to comment one way or the other.

No second

M Schuyler/S Norm to oppose and apply comments from 170 to 171

Devon: Doesn't feel comfortable opposing 171 - still confused how we should be voting on out of area proposals. For example, 11 wasn't in our area but had impacts on the fish swimming into our habitat.

Woody: Regulations are swimming this way.

Kent: Current research underway is going to show information of ecosystem levels of fish?

Adam: Outstanding question is a genetic fitness answer. Crosses in PWS of pink - reduced fitness in the first generation but didn't have 2nd. Hypothesis is that fitness would disappear with the 2nd generation.

Kent: Any outstanding research following carrying capacity?

Adam: Peer review publications looking at that a bit.

Moe: I don't think we should take this up. Not the same as 11 because it included statewide. Unlike trawling our halibut in their environment, we have a right to comment but this one, I don't think we have any business commenting on it.

Steve: How does someone vote if they agree with Moe?

Schuyler withdraws motion

Take no action because it's not in our area.

PROPOSAL 172: Board generated regulation that places a moratorium on pink and chum hatchery production

Adam (NSRAA): Proposal doesn't cite a mechanism to do this. Nothing in regulation to insert this language into, just the comprehensive management plan. Triggers for it being removed are very vague. This, again, is another authority question. The operators and the state have cited that the commissioner has the authority to do this through other established processes. Commissioner makes final approval - clear delineation in regulation. Discussions about submitting an RC agreement between operators and department regarding the de facto moratorium - no one is requesting more production.

Devon: Are these similar to BOF southeast 156?

Adam: New proposer (KRSA). 171 is specific to stray rates in the comprehensive plan but no specifics about single stream or region wide. They don't survey every single stream.

Stacey: How does the AC feel about addressing the legality of it for the board?

Adam: Just pointing it out that it is a question - board members have expressed that concern before but there's a different makeup now.

Devon: Does the authority for the stage of life salmon is in change for that species as it goes into the ocean?

Adam: Yes, if not in area. Authority to allocate those fish.

Devon: When it comes back through, does it have to be in freshwater to become property of the hatchery?

Adam: Specific board approved designated areas at the discretion of the operator. SHA (special harvest areas) defined in board regulation

Steve: First sentence gets me to vote against it - the proposal is not well written based on that.

Stacey: Listening to Adam, there's a process in place for the commissioner to control this.

There's good communication between the groups and it seems to be working. It's not something the Board is in charge of. This would be a new regulation altogether since it's not in there. Opening up a new can of worms. giving board authority which they aren't exercising right now.

John: I agree with some of the stuff that's in here, though it's above my pay grade. If it moves it to the modern world, I think that's a good thing. I think parts of them are straying. Dogs moving around. Updating things is a good idea. I'm not in support either way. I will be voting against it.

Stacey calls to question

Fails 0-13

PROPOSAL 173: Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent

Moe: This would help with the really remote marker locations like Whale Bay or on private property with markers on the shore where it would take good weather to fly in and change the boundary line. A few markers are on private property. If you want to move the line inward, you'd move by GPS position. If I went down there, the markers are still on land but lines would be further up the bay. If they are unable or don't want to move them, they wouldn't have to.

Stacey calls to question and asks for unanimous consent

Passes 13-0

PROPOSAL 174: Allow the engine of a purse seine vessel or skiff to be shut off when the purse seine is deployed

Moe: It doesn't really matter to me either way. There's a few (not many) where shutting the engine off might help but 99.99% of the time, it wouldn't make a difference.

Kent: What was it in there for originally? To avoid some collapse in the net? Why would they make it illegal to turn your engine off?

Moe: I don't know. If you shut it off the fish will move a bit better, not spooked. But not enough to worry about a regulation. I would support it. There may be fishermen who want to shut their engine off when doing their round halls. I don't see any issue with it so I support it.

Stacey calls to question

Passes 13-0

Proposal 175 Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration

Steve M/Woody S to take up Proposal 175

Emily: Shouldn't be statewide

Dick: Does anyone know what the stretch is for dipnets here?

Woody: I'd guess 4.5 stretch

Adam: Would this apply to redoubt?

Devon: Yes

Steve: Why would we make things more difficult for subsistence or personal use fishing?

Woody: You'd catch a lot more jacks which is a big thing at Redoubt. Bigger mesh they'll shoot through most of the time.

Devon: I don't see an issue with smaller mesh size like Redoubt where you end up with a lot of small fish, unless you're selectively harvesting bigger sockeye.

Woody: I think most nets are already legal

Schuyler: Talked to LFS and the company that makes them hasn't responded to questions.

Woody: This just shouldn't be statewide.

Stacey: The point is citing a conservation concern for chinook in the rivers - Catch and release.

Woody: That mesh is so small - they want to go down to 3 something? It's already under 5. I use a 7 for kings and a 6 is fine but anything under - they'll bounce right off. That's so tiny, I don't know why they'd want that?

Kent: Is there a limit to the link?

Woody: It's like a triangle - the mesh is partially suspending rope to basket and handle can control it.

John: I suggest we take no action - it wouldn't affect our area.

Schuyler asks for unanimous consent to oppose and to comment that it shouldn't be statewide, it would hurt our region.

Fails 0-13

XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting

Emily & Schuyler will represent the AC at the Statewide meeting.

XII. Set next meeting date

Meeting Set for Wednesday, February 25th at 6pm

XIII. Other

Adjourn at 845 pm

Sitka Fish & Game Advisory Committee
February 25, 2026
NSRAA & Zoom

I. Call to Order: 6pm by Chair Wayne

II. Roll Call

Members Present:

Stacey Wayne Shellfish (Chair)

Schulyer Mace Hand Troll

Moe Johnson Seine

Steve Ramp Resident Sportfish

Devon Calvin Subsistence

Emily Scott Alternate (Secretary)

Karen Johnson At Large

John Murray Power Troll (Vice Chair)

Lance McCutcheon At Large

Kent Barkhau Hunting

Dick Curran Longline

Woody Cyr Trapping

Norm Pillan Processor

Scott Wagner Alternate

Aaron Prussian Conservation

Greg Kain Charter

Luke Bastian Guide

Members Absent (Excused):

Members Absent (Unexcused):

III. **Fish and Game Staff Present:**

Jake Wieliczkiwicz (ADFG Sportfish), Monica Matz (ADFG SF), Tim Hall (wildlife trooper)

IV. **Guests Present:**

Mark Holst (troll)

V. **Approval of Agenda**

BOF Sport Proposals 176-184

M Steve/S Norm

Approved

VI. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes**

M Norm/S Kent

Approved

VII. Reports

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

VIII. Public Comment

IX. Old Business

Letter to DOI regarding Federal Subsistence Program Review

Devon presents draft of letter

M John/Woody S to submit letter on behalf of the AC

John: Suggests changing "native communities" to "rural communities"

Kent: I picked that up too. I'm not really sure about the line between ANILCA. ANILCA promises subsistence access to native or rural communities?

Devon: Yes, I think it would be rural. I was trying to emphasize this obligation the Federal government has for Alaska native people. Not trying to exclude non-Native subsistence users so I can definitely change that. I will change to "rural" communities and users.

Stacey: The longstanding tradition of Alaska Native people harvesting these foods - would be appropriate to include both Alaska Native and rural communities.

Karen: Can we change "waters off southeast Alaska" to Alaska waters - I'm assuming we're concerned about all of it?

Luke: Last sentence - I fully believe in subsistence priority but I think the people being paid to study these things have a conservation concern and this should come first.

Stacey: Last meeting some discussion according to AK statute, disallows priority from one group to another so without federal authority running Alaska, we couldn't prioritize rural communities. Does that make sense?

Luke: Yes, it's very confusing

Devon: Consider changing, specifying which sorts of things we would not want deferred to the state of Alaska - subsistence regs? Or perhaps language is vague in letter?

Steve: No, leave it broader as written for the purpose of this letter

Kent: Clarifies how conservation is addressed in the letter - does a good job of summarizing our concerns

Devon: We would like to say we would not like them to defer to the state of AK

Stacey: Why don't we just say that? And the paragraph then describes what that means. If you want to quote the state statute which disallows the priority, you could.

Norm: I don't have any suggested changes. I wanna make sure we are able to read a final version of this before we take the vote.

Devon: Just a few sentences I could read and the rest will be the same.

John: 3rd paragraph is reaffirming what is going on now. We should maybe just leave it as is - I didn't realize that was in question.

Stacey: Clarifies this will go to secretary of the interior

Luke: Would like to remove last half of Roadless Rule
Passed with Unanimous consent

Letter of support for HB 93:

Stacey: We couldn't find the old letter we had submitted so John rewrote. Stacey reads the draft.

Kent M/Dick S to submit draft letter

Steve: I remain opposed to this, I did research it there were 3 amendments proposed in house and all 3 failed so no changes to the original. As written, this bill would create a group of longlived Alaskans who've lived here a long time, pay taxes, and have licences here but due to lifestyle, don't make the 180 day cumulative rule. If passed as written, these people would not be eligible for a resident hunting and fishing license in any other state. Under the PFD it's cumulative, not consecutive absence.

John: There was one change - I believe Thatcher told me it had to do with postponing implication for gear. Something to do with the enforcement. Nothing to do with the bill itself.

Stacey: So if it did pass, they wouldn't implement it for a year.

Steve asks Tim Hall's opinion: I can't make comments because I don't know the history of the bill. There's a legislative liaison who deals with that.

Passes 14-1

X. New Business

1. Roadless Rule
2. BOF Sport Proposals 176-184

Roadless Rule:

Stacey: Andrew wants us to comment on the Roadless Rule. The administration is looking at opening the Tongass up to industrial old growth logging again. We sent comments last time this came up, about 7 years ago. Andrew said SCS is meeting with USFS and trying to work on revising the land management plan in a positive way - happy with changes from last administration. The new management plan has no language about the relationship between Tongass and fish population and no subsistence priority. The new plan doesn't need to show how the plan would protect subsistence.

Kent: They eliminated provisions for fish populations?

Stacey: No longer acknowledging the health of Tongass is connected to fish populations. Fisheries are not mentioned, only timber.

M Stacey/S Aaron to write a letter asking to acknowledge fish is connected and subsistence is a priority.

John: I just sort of caught wind of it in the last few days and haven't had a chance to make heads or tails of it.

Aaron: Including other uses which pertain to fish and wildlife like guiding, tourism would be important.

Kent: Road building also opens us up to potential mining and other development

Passed with Unanimous Consent

PROPOSAL 176 Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits

Jake (ADFG): This proposal is looking to change how we currently manage things from an individual bag and possession limit to pooling those across the vessel. This one particularly prohibits any crew from giving their harvest to their clients. Currently, the way we manage things, whoever engages the fish first that means hooking it. That fish is then part of their bag and possession limit. With this change, we would expect to potentially see an increase in harvest. There's the potential for decreased harvest in some fish with slot limits where you're releasing less fish, but again, that's offset by the ability to pull pool bag limits. This would let residents and non-residents pool bag limits across the boat. Especially in areas where we have preferential bag limits for residents down here in Southeast Alaska, this would allow them the ability to theoretically continue fishing and hand the rod off to somebody else, which could increase their ability to harvest fish. Right now, the state uses bag and possession limits as one of our management tools on an individual basis. So putting this to a vessel limit could result down the road in more restrictive management actions as we just seek to offset and manage that.

M/S to support 176

John: Would the crew be able to capture the bag limit?

Jake: 176 has provisions to prohibit the crew. As you all are probably aware, if you've read through some of these, we have a few that are similar proposals to this that don't state that. But this one specifically prohibits the crew from giving their harvest to their clients.

Stacey: What's the current practice?

Jake: Current practice is species are delineated. For species like king salmon and halibut, crew are not allowed to catch. I would have to double check specifics but I think it's limited to pelagic rockfish. From what we see on the docks, that is rare and it's really restrictive.

Luke: For crew the restrictions are for lingcod, yelloweye, non pelagic rockfish, etc. I don't think it's common for people to go out. This is prohibiting crew from giving their fish to their clients.

Stacey: The main change is they can pool bag limits regardless of residency.

John: In the state's definition, the definition of bag limit means maximum legal takeof fish per person per day. That's what they want to change here.

Stacey: So you can keep fishing until everyone reaches their limits.

Steve asks Tim to comment: There are some significant enforcement issues with this. Not clear to me how you would understand if a vessel was over the bag limit. For example, if there were 7-8 people on board, potentially including guides, who would be responsible for the violation at that point? Everyone points fingers at everyone else. Leaves us in a position to enforce the law on everybody the same. Gets very onerous for everyone involved. Not clear to me in this one how the crew would mark fish that they're not allowed to give away. In the field, it would be difficult to determine what was crew fish and what wasn't. This is a statewide regulation so for the guided industry, the species crew can retain might be different in other areas. In Southeast, guides and crew can retain salmon other than king salmon up to their current limits.

Steve asks Tim to speak on enforcement impacts: It would seem to me to be more complex. There's already issues with that. And it seems like this would just further mask that issue. It would be virtually impossible to enforce it, which I think is the point of this and maybe not to avoid the law, but to legalize what's happening at times.

Woody: If you pull up to a charter boat, board them, look at fish - there's one king salmon that's 27in instead of 28in, who gets the ticket? The operator or the one that caught the fish?

Tim: The answer to that is yes. It can be variable depending on the circumstances.

The regs are clear. In the instance of a guide or charter vessel, the guide is responsible for the client's violations, or at least to report them trying to stop them. So the client is responsible, as is the guide in that scenario.

Luke: I guess I'm having trouble seeing how it would be more troublesome.

Stacey to Tim: Say 2 residents get 2 king salmon, 2 non-residents each get one king salmon.

That's six fish. But you're saying that you can board a boat and cite them even if they have six fish because it could be that the non-resident actually caught two of the fish. And there's a way to tell that?

Tim: I think the scenario is that we board the boat and there's eight king salmon on board. Currently, we can enforce that. We may have observations that would assign some of those fish to somebody. Statements would do that under this proposal. It's just a vessel on it. So when they are over the limit, you know, take the guide out of it. Who's responsible? If it's Tim Hull and his two buddies that are doing this, who gets to take it? Everybody gets the ticket. There's no individual bag limit anymore. Therefore, nobody's really responsible.

John to Tim: At the beginning of the proposal it says "allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limit." What is the definition of bag limit? Is there a definition? Is there a difference between bag limit and a possession limit

Tim: Yes, the possession limit could be 6 cohos a day, 12 in possession. So if you fish more than 1 day, you could end up with 12 in an unprocessed state.

John: What you're saying is 6 a day is the bag limit, you can't have more than one day can you?

Tim: Yes but under the possession limit it would be more than one day. Would have to involve more than one day.

John: Do they have to be processed/frozen?

Tim: That's a complex question. With coho, they can't be filleted or mutilated for a good portion of summer, so they would have to not be processed if they're returning to port. In any case shouldn't have more than 12 in your possession unprocessed for 2 days of fishing..

Jake: A bag limit is the daily limit. Say it's one fish a day which would be your bag limit with a possession limit of two. So you're allowed to harvest one of those fish within a calendar day. Then the next day, if the possession limit is 2, you could harvest that additional bag limit of one for a total possession limit of two. The summary of the language is essentially that until it's processed and preserved in a condition where it's fit for consumption. I believe it's 14 days out. So this means if you not just cut up and put into bags, not just, you know, lightly salted but like heavily salted, filleted and frozen hard if you have a boat that's capable of doing that. But in general, if you're opening up that cooler and there's a fish in there, that's still in your possession limit.

Stacey: Lets circle back. Do we want to support this pooling?

Luke: The way it is currently, whoever touches the rod first, it goes under the bag limit. If the rod goes off and you hand it to someone but I'm a guide, it goes to my bag limit, that's not what I'm there for. Whether it's charter or sport, if you hand it to the kid then it's their bag limit. That seems complicated. One guy catches a fish and goes to fish and catches the same fish it has to be released. Most people in this town don't know the regulations work this way. I think it's

already complicated. I think this would clear it up. I had 4 anglers on board and I'm a stickler to the rules. For anglers, we left town for 2 days. Kings were good 3rd guys got keepers 4th guy got shaker and shook it. Luke tried to stay away from catch and release but they wanted to and they kept catching and releasing shakers. He had caught and released 22 shakers. But his friends got big fish which is silliness. It happens on a daily basis. The pooling of the catch is commonly done already and we just need to clean it up.

Steve: 176 allows boat limits for bag and possession 177 boat limits for just bag limits 178 doesn't do anything with boat limits, it just lets someone assist a client to help with fish.

Jake: If I may interject real quick, 177 does allow for the daily bag or possession limit to be pooled. The difference between 176 and 177 is that 177 omits the part that prohibits the crew from pulling their bag limit or adding to the catch. So 176 is day and bag limits and no crew adding to the catch. 177 is day and/or bag and possession limits with crew included. And then 178 is any person taking part in the fish. You can pool your limits.

Steve: It's not pooling it. That's not what 178 says. It just says that, like Luke was saying, say you had a kid who is not very big, not very strong. And the charter captain hooks the fish and reels it in and the kid gets to keep it. It can't be a captain's bag limit anyway, if it's a king, because you're not allowed to keep them. But as Luke said, with 178 as written, if he grabs a rod and hooks the fish and hands it to the client, the fish has to be let go because he can't keep a king. And the client didn't hook the fish.

Emily: I will probably have the same comments for all three proposals. I appreciate breaking them down and what is different about them but I have the same concerns about all three. I don't see this making anything clearer or less complicated. I think what I'm hearing from the department and enforcement is that these proposals wouldn't accomplish that. I don't think it's appropriate to allow something illegal to be happening just because it's happening and it's confusing. I've heard a lot of concern about these proposals from other southeast residents that align with some of the things that I'm feeling about this. And I also think that encouraging behavior of this catch-release fishery is not good for conservation of the stocks either. I've spoken with charter fishermen who are residents year round here who say that their clientele is much more interested in catching the fish themselves and having that experience, rather than leaving with a certain number of fish. And I just think that we should stay away from encouraging this bag limit promise and encourage industry to be more focused on the experience and conserving our stocks. I just think all these proposals are a really slippery slope.

Kent: Anticipated effect is that the proposal is going to increase harvest for all. And, you know, with the private boats and charter boats and unregulated unguided boats will all fall the same. So we have a bit of a problem with kind of an unconstrained charter model. And you know, it's just going to increase harvest and make things hard, right? I want to vote against all three.

John: I'm still confused about the crew but kind of see what their intent is. I'm not sure if it's to get more fish or because it's a practice that's happening and they want to legitimize something that is happening that very well is illegal. You know, there's cohos around, you can catch cohos, but you don't keep any more kings. You don't get to transfer them so I'm not too keen on this proposal.

Luke: I don't think there would be any increase in harvest since it's already going on in 99% of the boats out there already. There would be a decrease in catch and release mortality.

Woody: The regs are currently whoever touches the rod first hooks the king salmon but the king salmon is hooked before anyone touches the rod. Really it's the person who owns the boat or is driving the boat whose limit should be affected by that. It's going to be That seems like a very loose way for that to be someone's fish. As far as I can tell, the individual bag limit seems much simpler and straightforward to enforce than a boat limit.

Schuyler: I'm not in support of this proposal. No differentiation between residency and nonresidency. Especially around here where things can be closed for residents or non residents, anyone who has a resident on board can keep fishing. For some of those reasons, I'm not in support.

Dick: Worried about catch limits, staying within allocation.

Greg: To what Tim addressed there on enforcement, not knowing who's catching what when boarded. And he gave a couple different scenarios. But, you know, when King Salmon, lingcod Yelloweye, Sablefish - those all have to be marked on your license. So if he gets on a boat and he's asked who caught this, it should be on their license. So he should know who caught what fish. Not guessing. With a box full of fish, who's got what. It should be marked on their card when boarded. And that'll identify the person that caught those fish. And there's a lot of scenarios which this is hopefully trying to fix a broken rule that a lot of people don't know about and does get, you know, maybe abused. Let's say somebody king salmon fishing on day one and they mark a fish and they get boarded on day three. Well, and there's two fish again. It goes back to where that fish is marked. That fish was marked on day one of the trip. So he'll know who caught those fish. And I think that point is being kind of missed there. I do like 176 out of the three. I think it addresses all the issues. And again, this is not promoting more catch and release. We're trying to eliminate catch and release, especially in King Salmon and also Yelloweye. I'll give you an example. When we go out and we halibut fish and we anchor, as many guys know that sport fish, a lot of times you get some bycatch to start with yelloweye coming in or biting before the halibut move in and if I can pool my yelloweye I with a group because typically it might be three, four, five yellow wire caught before the halibut will push those fish out of there. I'm not having to send down yelloweye because one guy retains his fish. I do like the release device however, I think they work well if they are used right. The assisting part is important for kids and older people getting tired halfway up and need help. Encouraging families to fish with kids.

Emily: John had asked about the intent of the proposal, and I had talked to the author of the proposal. And from a high level point of view, the Homer charter industry is very different from Southeast. The model and the character of what they're doing. They're really promoting these experience-led excursions and rather than selling the bag limits. These are people who are not in support of the over-capitalizing of this industry the way that we are seeing in Southeast. So folks in Elfin Cove, Petersburg, Ketchikan and myself are concerned about how this would impact our Southeast charter catch. Even though the intent of this proposal was in good faith, I just don't see it resulting in any conservation of species or clarity here in our fleet and only see risk of increased catch.

Steve: I started tonight not sure how I was going to go on 176 or 177. And I've decided now. I think it creates too many problems. So I'm going to vote no on both of those. But on 178, I do agree with Luke who authored it, that a captain or deckhand should be able to allow someone who physically isn't as strong as a full grown man, reel in a fish of a lifetime and have that

experience and have it be legal to do so to, to help them. So I'm going to vote in support of Luke's proposal 178 but not the other two.

John: I'm trying to read a few times regarding what a crew should do. So right now, I don't think they're allowed to have any kind of bag limit. I'm almost positive that's the case in King salmon. So you got a statewide reg. So that would supersede what we have down here, which would actually increase the catch if the crew, you know, some of us take two, so they have a captain and a crew. So you can take two more king salmon. So to me that's an issue when we're talking about low quota seasons, it just exacerbates the issue. So I'm definitely not in favor of 176.

Greg: I don't like additional crew catches either.

Stacey: So they cannot share any fish with clients? With all species?

Tim: Yes, with a transfer of possession form after the fact. They wouldn't be able to retain a number of species but the ones they do retain, they could potentially gift those fish.

Stacey: And your read of this proposal is this would stop that

Luke: I'm not in support of anything that's going to allow the crew to catch fish to give to their clients. I don't think we need that. And that's prohibited in this one. Well.

Greg: I'm not in support of anything that's going to allow the crew to catch fish to give to their clients. I don't think we need that. And that's prohibited in this one.

Stacey: Does this proposal allow crew to share fish?

Luke: This one prohibits it. I don't know if it's specifically prohibited currently.

Stacey asks Tim about sharing silvers with clients: They could with a transfer of possession form after the fact. The species they are allowed to retain could transfer.

Luke: Speaker 3: one other difference between the three. When I wrote 178, I wrote it rather than having a boat that fish could go in the bag limit of anybody actively participating in the catch, because I don't think it should go to somebody who's, you know, taking a nap in the cabin.

Greg: Just just for some clarification for everybody. And I'll use coho as an example. If I have four clients and I go out and I'm fishing for silver salmon, a six fish limit, I catch 24 fish anytime before that. The crew cannot fish a rod. Okay. Once the client's bag limits are filled, then I could pick up a rod and fish a rod myself or a deckhand and catch my six fish. So you could not fish prior to that, only once the limit is retained for the boat. Then if I chose to through a transfer permit, I could give those fish to the clients.

Tim: To clarify - the current regulation does not prohibit guides and deckhands from fishing like before the clients retain their bag limit. It prohibits the amount of rods that can be used from the boat. Meaning at no point can you ever use more than the amount of paying clients you have on board on a guided trip. So if you have four paying clients, if one of them is taking a nap in the cabin, a guide or a deckhand could fish and catch his limit. Even if those were the first fish of the day.

Greg: I stand corrected, I guess in my sense it's always 4 guys and I catch after they quit.

Tim: I think that's a good way to do it but it's not regulated.

Moe: I'm opposed. Seems like it's designed to circumvent the rules in place and legalizing unethical fishing activity. If you've got one person left to get their fish and 6 other people trying to get it with him, that's 6 lines in the water. That's not even sportfishing anymore. It's gotten so far away from the original definition of sport fishing.

Stacey calls to Question

Fails 1-14

PROPOSAL 177 Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits

Jake: This proposal omits provisions about charter captains or crew sharing their harvest.

Everything we just talked about which the first proposal prohibits, this one would not prohibit that.

Stacey: Suggests carrying over vote and comments from 176 & take no action

Take no Action - See comments from 176

PROPOSAL 178 Modify the definition of bag limit, as follows: new recording

Luke: Basically said everything already. If you have a fish that gets hooked, it belongs to whoever touches it first. Whether that person is allowed to have a bag of that fish or not, or they already have their catch for the day. A lot of times we'll have the rod holders and, you know, when the fish bite somebody has to crank on it. Otherwise the fish gets away. So you know, if you have an elderly person that can't get there very fast, well then it takes forever to hook a fish. And, you know, like I said before, one of the things that I did differently than this is that it can go on the bag limit of somebody taking part in the catch. So you know, whether it's the person netting it or the person protecting the rod or the one that ended up halfway, I think that's reasonable. Whether I'm fishing with clients or my kids. And, you know, personally, I don't care if I catch a fish or not. I'd rather watch my kids catch it. That's kind of the spirit behind the thing. And I think it's a very common thing that people don't understand what the rule is, and they're breaking the rule without meaning to. I think this cleans it up.

Tim: I think Luke's intent is what he said, to clarify that hooking the fish isn't necessarily defined. I've said at meetings that charter fishermen with little kids or elderly folks can assist them in getting a rod out of rod holder. So, I see it as less of an issue in the field doing enforcement but it sure could be abused. I think there's a significant chance that the phrase "any person taking part in a catch" is a little generic.

Stacey asks if Tim has better language which would accomplish Luke's goal

Tim: I don't but the scenario I've heard tonight about pulling a rod out of a rod holder to hand to an 8 year old isn't hooking the fish in and of itself. Hooking the fish takes some kind of action. Assisting a person isn't defined. Maybe what we're looking for is clarification of what assistance is rather than doing away with the individual bag limit. I still believe that making the individual bag limit into a boat limit effectively causes enforcement complexity and allows people to violate, if they're so inclined.

Woody: Do you feel the current regulations are inadequate for enforcement?

Tim: I feel like we can work with the current regulations as they are. I certainly wouldn't argue with clarity in the law in any instance.

Luke: My feelings on the current way it's defined, you're catching fish on a jig or whatever method. If I hook one and hand the rod to someone, I don't see why that should be prohibited. Word of mouth - I do know captains In Ketchikan, say they've been prosecuted for handing a rod to a client. The wording currently allows too much interpretation.

Aaron: So maybe I don't see what a new definition looks like. I see the current regulation but do you have a sense of what a new one would be?

Luke: Original is person originally hooking the fish I wrote any person taking part in catch.

Stacey: Trooper Hall is saying this could be the same result as the other proposals. 646

John: The rule would still say not keeping the king salmon.

Luke: It wouldn't apply to non charter folks. So it wouldn't be the same issue. We could word it to where it becomes a part of the person originally hooking the fish. The main opposition is that the person might have a very minor role in catching the fish.

Stacey: What I was hearing Trooper Hall say is that essentially, this could be the same result as the previous two proposals, because you got your limit and you're fishing and you see that it's a king and you're like, oh, you don't have a king. It looks legal. I'm handing it to you. That could be taking part. Now it's your, really just becomes a boat limit. I was looking for other language that wouldn't allow that behavior but it doesn't sound possible.

John: This might work in southeast, because if we have the rule set up the way they are now, you wouldn't be allowed to keep the king salmon or halibut or those other two species you mentioned, but in other places that might be legal. I don't really feel like we can spare two more fish for the crew.

Stacey: That's currently the regulation

Steve: What if you reworded the proposal to kind of get out of the way from the whole bag limit thing and just put in regulation that a guide or deckhand may assist a client in hooking and reeling.

Luke: I don't think that would apply to sport fishermen like non charter folks which is the same issue.

Steve: I mean we could work it to where it becomes a part of the bag limit of the person originally hooking the fish however, others may assist that person in making their catch.

Luke: The main opposition we have currently is that the person may have a very minor role in catching the fish.

Stacey: The way it's written now, it is essentially a boat limit because you could use it to transfer that fish to the person who still needs that species. There's no element of the limit because as Moe was saying, it's essentially six hooks that are potentially in the water.

Emily: I am still opposed to this. I really don't think it's different at all. In the effect of what would happen if this was passed. I understand the situation. I think we're just straying really far from what we're voting on and what happens next. And if the issue we're trying to address with the concerns that have been talked about is like taking your grandkids or grandma fishing, there's got to be a different avenue to do that than writing something that's extremely vague into statewide regulation. I would assume this would disproportionately impact people who are not your grandkids and grandmas trying to get their king salmon. So I appreciate the intent. I appreciate the discussion, but I just feel like we're straying far from the point here.

Steve: I'm still in support. Because I think what Luke is trying to do is honorable, and it's allowing either boat owners that aren't charters or charters to provide a fishing experience for people who physically aren't able to do it as well as the rest of us. I think it's an honorable pursuit, and I think I would recommend we pass this and let the Board of Fish hammer out the language.

John: Inclined to support it since it's the less onerous of the three and one of these will probably get picked by the Board. There's a chance to write some amended language in your public comments.

Moe: I like the intent of the proposal but can't vote for it as written. I think the description needs to be changed, not the bag limit. I agree with Tim's comments on this one.

Aaron: I really appreciate the intent and it seems fairly clear I just don't want to make it more complicated, inadvertently than it already is. If you leave it to the Board, will they muddy this one up or take it up?

Stacey: Steve had suggested just leaving the original language, the person originally hooking it. So we know who's bag limit we're talking about. And maybe we could add language that said, though others may assist an angler who would not be able to bring the fish on board without assistance or something. We make it very clear that others may assist an angler who would not be able to bring the fish on board without assistance. I don't know if he said something like that, Tim, if that would be enforceable?

Tim: I think a clear definition of what assistance is allowed would be helpful.

Luke: It seems more muddy - you'd have to define who requires assistance and what kind of resistance is allowed.

Tim: To make it enforceable, you'd need a couple subsections.

Stacey: I want to vote for this but can't as written.

Emily: I was just gonna Echo what Mo and Aaron were saying. One that I'm not comfortable with giving the Board something super vague and letting them work it out. I don't think that's worked out well for us in the past. And to answer what John was saying about about them going to inevitably take up one of these three. I have heard from the proposers of 176 that the proposers of 177 will be getting behind 176 so all the charter associations will likely be angling for 176, which we opposed.

Stacey calls to question

Fails 3-12

Proposal 179: Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10

M/S to support 179

Jake: This would establish a statewide annual limit of ten king salmon, 20in or greater in length. All king salmon retained would have to be recorded on the back of your license. And then you can have her or a harvest record card in case you don't have a paper license. Currently, it's unknown how many individuals catch more than ten king salmon a year, but it may reduce overall harvest of kings in areas where annual limits do not already exist. This may also reduce harvest opportunity when there is a surplus available. Likely the largest impacted area for this is going to be Southeast Alaska, where we harvest a significant proportion of the sport fishery kings. This would restrict our ability to liberalize in areas of hatchery kings. When we have an abundance. This may unnecessarily restrict us. The department already has emergency authority to reduce bag possession and annual limits of king salmon, as well as require reporting when necessary. And I am happy to answer any questions.

Luke to Jake: ADFG doesn't have an estimate on how many fish this would save?

Jake: We don't require all sport anglers to report their catch at the end of the season. There's currently no requirement unless required in a permit condition or things like that.

Steve: I'm the resident sport fishing guy. Just goes right at us. And the non residents because it doesn't differentiate. And if you read it closely, it doesn't say that non residents couldn't catch ten kings a year. Well right now in southeast that's not allowed. Also it talks about salmon

greater than 20in. I think that this was written for a south central area and slammed into the statewide board meeting. And I'm against it. It's not the right proposal for what they're intending to do.

Luke: I'm opposed to a regulation that doesn't allow ADFG to manage areas of higher abundance accordingly. Will affect residents more than nonresidents. I'm not in support.

John: It seems contradictory to me. The annual limit of 10 then talks about significant chinook declines, how does numerizing something, not interpreted to increase any local bag and possession limits.

Stacey: He does say this regulation shall not be interpreted to increase any regional or local bank possession or annual limits, but rather to limit anglers by taking more than ten. So it says right in there, you can't use it to increase anything. It's just meant to stop people from taking more than ten. And they don't. You know, we don't know how many people take more than ten if it's even an issue or, you know, but saying that it would certainly have to use that then in like the hatchery fishery and stuff like that, they would impose that really well.

Devon: Is this intended for residents? Is there already an annual limit for nonresidents?

Luke: In this area there is. It was 1 daily and 1 annual last year for nonresidents. Residents have a daily limit.

Devon: At Redoubt there's an annual limit since it's a finite place and there's a lot of people fishing. I'm kind of surprised I like the idea of an annual limit, even for residents.

Moe: I'm opposed. Especially the 20 inch limit, that's ridiculous it should be 28 inches. It would be easy to go out and get your 10-20 inch fish in Eastern Channel in the winter in a week. It would be detrimental to ADFG management if there's a large portion of 20 inch fish coming out of the water.

John: The way I see it might work is like the Homer Winter King fishery. Those are fish that are from BC/WA that go up to feed. They're not catching most Southcentral fish, mostly treaty fish and I can't support something like that.

Dick: We have to manage things differently here versus King Cove or somewhere. It doesn't make sense for the state.

Stacey calls to question

Fails 0-15

PROPOSAL 180 Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish

Jake: Similar to the previous proposal but brings the limit from 10 to five and require all retained king salmon to be electronically recorded or annually reported to ADFG. Without the 10-20 inch limit.

Stacey calls to question and asks for unanimous consent to oppose as per 179

Fails with unanimous consent

PROPOSAL 181 Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear

M/S to support 181

Jake: This is a department proposal. Currently, the language i doesn't align with the statutory definition of sport fishing found in Alaska statute 16. They're pretty similar. Where the big difference comes into place is where sport fishing is defined, it says sport fishing may only be conducted by the use of a closely attended single line. And what we're looking to change is right

now it says, a closely attended line. We're looking to add in, held in hand or attached to a fishing pole or rod. So currently we don't have that held in hand or attached to a rod. Of course, the intention of this is not to try and prohibit downriggers or things like that. It's just to get you know, the regulation in line with Alaska statute.

Luke: Under current regulation, you could fish a downrigger without a rod?

Jake: The answer is no but it doesn't currently fit the regulatory language that would allow you to still keep clipping your fishing rod into your downrigger and sending it down.

Tim: Part of where this came from is folks clipping gear directly to a downrigger cable, effectively making it into a hand gurdy which is not allowed a couple of different ways. But I think in the interest of clarity, this is a good fix and probably partly comes from one of my somewhat recent cases where exactly that was happening. And the court ultimately agreed, but it was much more onerous for everybody than it needed to be.

Norm: For clarification, I'm just looking at this and it's not really the intent of this change to address, but what about herring jigs when you have 8 or 10 hooks on there? It's not called out on this. I mean, if you were just reading this, you know, as it's written that if you were fishing a line that had multiple. Hooks on it beyond what they've listed here, that you could be subject to penalty or fine. I'm just kind of curious. Maybe. Maybe Tim has an answer for that. I mean, it would be easy to say we recognize the herring jig, and we're not going to write you up for it, but it's not listed here.

Tim: There's a separate regulation. And off the top of my head, I don't remember if it's a southeast or a statewide rig that allows herring jigs specifically. So it's in regulation. It's not an issue.

Greg: Where does sport spearfishing fit into sport fishing gear or would it fall under this?

Jake: On the last question for herring and smelt, we have separate clauses in there. I believe the language for sport fishing gear where it lists, you know, the one line with two hooks. It says unless otherwise stated for herring or smelt and saltwater, you can use up to 15 or less unbaited single or multiple hooks. Spear fishing gear is also allowed within sport fishing regulations. All other things like bag limits and size limits still apply to those. But that is an authorized sport fish gear.

Stacey calls to question and asks for unanimous consent

Passes with unanimous consent

PROPOSAL 182 Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit, as follows:

Steve: Moves to take no action as it does not affect species in our area.

No Action

PROPOSAL 183 Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession

M Aaron/S Luke

Jake: This is a department proposal to keep fish intact. Primarily, it's aiming at recovering tags, lengths, rockfish, and identification. The things that are hard to do on a mutilated fish. Many of you are familiar with that here in Sitka, we do this through emergency order during the summer months, largely for our creel samplers to recover those tags to get our lengths and weights and

things like that. And this is aiming to do that statewide. While I don't have any current updates on it, I do know that this is being reviewed by the department to be potentially rewritten. Because of those discussions about whether a statewide requirement of this is necessary. So there are no guarantees, but down the line either through RC or in another way, this may be amended by the state. But again, there's no promises on that. But it's just essentially the state looking to do what we do down here in the southeast through EO for enforcement and sampling efforts.

Steve: I read this a lot to figure it out. We would no longer be able to fillet black rockfish before we hit port?

Jake: As I understand it, yes

John: When you said EO authority, so let's say you had an EO could the EO say except black rockfish. Why would you have to sample a rockfish at all? Could you EO it that way too? The intent seems overly strict. For some species it makes sense but others, I'm not sure.

Jake: I'd have to double check our authority on that. It would probably be pretty rare for the state to EO against its own directives in the administrative code. I think what you brought up is already being addressed in our review of this.

Norm: It includes that species which are used as bait are exempt. Does ADFG have a list of bait fish and are confident that it is comprehensive enough to not worry about fish that don't fit that bill.

Jake: We do have a list of that herring, chum salmon, pink salmon, whitefish species with no bag or annual limit. As well as the heads, tails, fins, closely trimmed skeleton and viscera of legally caught sportfish can also be used as bait. So that's like your scraps basically. But we have a prescribed list of those fish. And I think the intent of that fish you can use as bait are not so much of a conservation concern. They're likely not the intent of what this proposal is looking to to gain information or enforcement actions on

Norm: Does any part of this design to maybe address for lack of a better term, floating processors, you know, big boats that go out and anchor up and spend days in harbor and could potentially fillet fish and put them in the freezer. Would this regulation help to address that? I don't know how much of a concern that is. A while back it was a big topic at IPHC with Halibut and not keeping the carcasses. And I think they got that dealt with. But I'm just wondering if this might be applicable to that concern.

Jake: So halibut are managed outside of the state. You know that's a federal fishery. So there are different prohibitions on that. You know even filleted halibut that you would have frozen inside of your freezer count towards your limit on those bigger boats. For the state, if you're going to be able to freeze those hard and get them out of your possession you know, it's not in your possession limit, but I can say that the some of the language there specifically processed or prepared for human consumption that's a bit of language that we are also reviewing about what that would entail. And how to address that.

Steve: That's another concern I got, Jake, is it says until a finfish has been processed or prepared for human consumption, you can't mutilate, but you got to mutilate it to prepare it for human consumption. So. That doesn't jive at all.

Stacey: I'm feeling opposed, it seems problematic.

Stacey calls to question

Fails 1-14

PROPOSAL 184 Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition

M/S

Jake: We manage within the sport fishery for pelagic rockfish. Those are the water column rockfish, you know, ones like your blacks, your yellow tails. We also have two different delineations. Slope, which is the deeper water rockfish like short rigger as well as our demersal shelf rockfish that includes ones like yelloweye China copper. So what this language is looking to do currently as our sport statewide definition reads, it just reads pelagic and rockfish. So we're just looking to further break that down to say pelagic slope and DSR rockfish, which are how we currently manage the fisheries. Anyways. This helps them align with the commercial fishery definitions as well. It doesn't look to change the way we manage them. It's not going to affect bag limit possession, anything like that. It's not going to change, which is in each category. It's just acknowledging that we have a little bit better language now to talk about our rockfish.

Stacey calls to question and asks for unanimous consent

Passes with unanimous consent.

PROPOSAL 186 Reduce commercial salmon fishing opportunity with drift gillnet gear in the Central District of the Cook Inlet Area

No action - out of area

PROPOSAL 187 Close the Tsiu River and all waters within one quarter mile of the Tsiu River and Kaliakh River confluence to commercial fishing for salmon

No action - out of area

XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting

Emily & Schuyler will represent the AC at the Statewide meeting.

XII. Set next meeting date**XIII. Other**

Adjourn 8:27 by Chair

Meeting Agenda

**Susitna Valley Advisory Committee
February 2, 2026
Talkeetna Library, Talkeetna, AK (5:00 pm)**

- I. Call to Order:
- II. Roll Call (Need 4 members for a quorum)
Bryan Kirby, Steve Harrison, Robert Gerlach, Eli Hoffman, TIm Buechle,
Mark Burcar, Todd Kingery, Dave Fish
Members Present: Steve Harrison, Robert Gerlach, Eli Hoffman, TIm Buechle, Mark
Burcar, Todd Kingery, Dave Fish
Members Absent (Excused): Bryan Kirby
Members Absent (Unexcused):
- III. Fish and Game Staff Present:
 - a. Cory Stantorf, Leila Williams
- IV. Guests Present:
 - a.
- V. Approval of Agenda
- VI. Approval of Minutes from 12/8
- VII. Public Comment
- VIII. New Business
 - a. BOF Proposals [Link to Statewide](#)
 - i. 162, 170, 171, 172, 173, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183
 - ii. Any others that are brought to the table
 - b. BOG Proposals [Link to Proposal Book](#)
 - i. 73, 74, 175, 176, 195, 196, 197
 - ii. Any others that are brought to the table
- IX. Select representative(s) for board meeting: None
- X. Set next meeting date: None
- XI. Other
- XII. Adjourn

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
<i>Subsistence Fisheries</i>			
162	Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries, as follows		
	7	0	
173	Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent, as follows		
	7	0	
<i>Sport Fisheries</i>			
<i>Bag and Annual Limits</i>			
176	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits, as follows		
	0	7	
177	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits, as follows		
	0	7	
179	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10 fish, as follows		
	0	7	
<i>Possession Requirements</i>			
180	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish, as follows		
	0	7	
<i>Sport Fishing Gear</i>			
182	Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit, as follows		
	7	0	

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
183	Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession, as follows		
	7	0	

Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: Steve Harrison

Minutes Approved By: Bryan Kirby

Date: 03/02/2026

Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road Advisory Committee
February 27th, 2026
Slana School & Zoom

I. Call to Order: 5:06 pm by Ernie Charley/Chair

II. Roll Call

No	First Name	Last Name	Seat Designation	Present/ Excused/ Unexcused
1	Ernie	Charley	Chistochina	Present
2	Lauree	Bertrand	Undesignated	Excused
3	Amanda	Abraham	Undesignated	Present
4	Susan	Entsminger	Alternate	Present
5	William "Cole"	Ellis	Alternate	Excused
6	Susan	Martin	Mentasta	Present
7	Tim	Olson	Undesignated	Present
8	Thomas	Abraham	Undesignated	Present
9	Eddie	Green	Undesignated	Present

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 4

List of User Groups Present:

III. Fish and Game Staff Present: Leila Williams

IV. Guests Present: Marjie Lodwick, Linda Bates

V. Approval of Agenda: Motioned by Susan, Seconded by Amanda: Agenda Accepted unanimously

VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

VII. Reports

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

VIII. Public Comment

IX. Old Business

X. New Business

- a. Elections – 3 expiring seats and 2 alternates
 - i. Tim Olson
 - ii. Thomas Abraham
 - iii. Amanda Abraham
 - iv. Alternate: Susan Entsminger
 - v. Alternate: Cole Ellis

Motioned to keep to vote in all existing chairs to remain as is. Motioned by Susan, Seconded by Ernie. Passed unanimously. All chair members voted in to their current chairs. Amanda staying the secretary.

- b. Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish Proposals
- c. Other Fish and Game Business as Needed

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
Subsistence Fisheries			
162	Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries, as follows		
Support	5	2	Support no issues with proposal / Oppose: need more clarification to big to be state wide. Needs to be more specific.
Commercial Fisheries			
Groundfish Gear and Closed Waters			
11	Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W. longitude, as follows		
Support	7	0	Protecting king crab
163	Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis, as follows		
Support	7	0	It protects by catch and sea floor

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
164	Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters, as follows		
Support	7	0	It protects bycatch and sea floor
165	Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters, as follows		
Support	7	0	It protects by catch and sea floor
166	Amend statewide definition of a mechanical jigging machine, as follows		
No Action			
167	Prohibit vessels from having other groundfish gear or equipment onboard while participating in a groundfish fishery using mechanical jigging machines or hand troll gear, as follows		
Support	7	0	It prevents both long line and jigging. Can't do both.
168	Prohibit vessels from having more than one groundfish gear type onboard when participating in a state-managed groundfish fishery		
Support	7	0	It prevents both long line and jigging. Can't do both.
169	Create a definition of groundfish coil spring or 'slinky pot,' as follows		
Support	7	0	Need the definition in Regulation
170	Reduce the permitted egg take level of each hatchery permit containing pink and chum salmon by 25% of the current permitted capacity for those species, as follows		
Support	7	0	Need to limit eggs permitted to be released by hatchery. Too many Pink salmon
171	Amend Prince William Sound hatchery permits to reduce pink salmon egg take capacity, as follows		
Support	7	0	Need to reduce the number of eggs the hatchery releases
172	Board generated regulations that places a moratorium on pink and chum hatchery production		
support	7	0	It will positively affect wild stock salmon
173	Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent, as follows		
Support	7	0	Keeps people with in a safe boundry
174	Allow the engine of a purse seine vessel or skiff to be shut off when the purse seine is deployed, as follows		

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
Oppose	0	7	Needs to be worded differently. Not clear on type of vessels/ fish species
<i>Dipnet Gear Definition</i>			
175	Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration, as follows		
Support	7	0	Amend: Need to take out Chinook and have only all salmon. All salmon to use 4 ½ in dipnet.
<i>Sport Fisheries</i>			
<i>Bag and Annual Limits</i>			
176	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits, as follows		
Oppose	0	7	Unnecessary
177	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits, as follows		
Oppose	0	7	Unnecessary
178	Modify the definition of bag limit, as follows		
Oppose	0	7	Fish and Game can't enforce or would be unable to enforce
179	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10 fish, as follows		
Oppose	0	7	Need to get out of the Emergency Order First
<i>Possession Requirements</i>			
180	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish, as follows		
Oppose	0	7	Need to get out of the Emergency Order First
<i>Sport Fishing Gear</i>			
181	Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear, as follows		
Oppose	0	7	Very unclear about ice fishing and gear like tip ups
182	Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit, as follows		
Support	7	0	Another ,method and means to fish

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
183	Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession, as follows		
Support	7	0	Fish and Game can regulate
<i>Definitions</i>			
184	Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition, as follows		
Oppose	0	7	Each rock fish species needs to stay seperate
186	Reduce commercial salmon fishing opportunity with drift gillnet gear in the Central District of the Cook Inlet Area		
No Action			
187	Close the Tsiu River and all waters within one quarter mile of the Tsiu River and Kaliakh River confluence to commercial fishing for salmon		
Support	7	0	Because of the change in the river it is benefiting the commercial fishing, Need to support protecting the salmon

XI. Select representative for board meeting? Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish meeting is Tuesday, March 17-Saturday, March 21. The AC rep nomination is due Monday, March 2nd, the same deadline as the AC comment deadline.

Tim Olson agreed to do attend both online or in person on behalf of the board.

XII. Set next meeting date?

XIII. Other

XIV. Adjourn Motioned by Amanda, Seconded by Tim. Motion passes unanimously

XV. Adjournment: 6:43

Minutes Recorded By: Amanda Abraham

Minutes Approved By: Ernie Charley

Date: 2/27/2026

**Tyonek Advisory Committee
Friday, February 27th, 2026
Tyonek Tribal Center & Zoom**

- I. Call to Order: 1:29pm by Donnie Standifer, Jr.
- II. Roll Call

Members Present:

Name	Title	Present/Excused/Unexcused
Donald Standifer, Jr.	Chair	<u>P</u>
Elizabeth Standifer	Vice Chair	<u>E</u>
Alex Pfoff	Secretary	<u>P</u>
Nicole Swenson		P
Donald Standifer, Sr.		<u>P</u>
Robert Stephan, Sr.		<u>P</u>
John Standifer		E
Terry Jorgenson		<u>A</u>
Cassandra Kroto		<u>P</u>
Michaelene Stephan		P
Julieanna Bismark		<u>P</u>
Steven Standifer		<u>E</u>
Emil J McCord	Alternate	A
Mike Braun	Alternate	<u>A</u>

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 7

List of User Groups Present: Andy Wizik (Tyonek Tribal Conservation District), Laurie Stuart (Tyonek Tribal Conservation District)

- III. Fish and Game Staff Present: Caroline Brown (Subsistence), Colton Lipka (Commercial), Sam Oslund (Sport Fish), Jackie Keating (Subsistence), Oliver Querin (Sport Fish), Lucas Stumpf (Commercial), Leila Williams (Boards Support)
- IV. Guests Present:
- V. Approval of Agenda: moved by Robert Stephan, Sr., seconded by Alex Pfoff
 - a. Approved Unanimously
- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: moved by Robert Stephan, Sr., seconded by Michaelene Stephan
- VII. Reports
 - a. Chair’s report
 - b. ADF&G

c. Others

VIII. Public Comment

IX. Old Business:

- a. Continue Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish Proposals
 - i. Proposals 163-165 tabled to this meeting

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 21, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p>			
Subsistence Fisheries			
162	Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries, as follows		
Oppose	0	8	The proposal language states “ ‘subsistence fishing transportation services’ means to provide transportation services for...physically transporting the subsistence fisherman during any part of a subsistence fishing trip.” There needs to be clarifying comment that this proposal would not affect modes of transportation such as airline flights, like Spernak Airways, to get to a place that would not be accessible otherwise. The potential interpretation of this proposal is too broad and wiggly that could put people of Tyonek at risk.
Commercial Fisheries			
Groundfish Gear and Closed Waters			
11	Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W. longitude, as follows		
Support	8	0	Concerned about trawling gear collecting bycatch of other fish.

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 21, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
163	Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis, as follows		
TNA			Robert Stephan, Sr. had to leave after this vote, bringing the number of voting members to 7. Non-pelagic gear has a detrimental effect on the ocean floor habitat, which could then have a bottom-up effect anything that may be feeding on the ecosystem out there. Even though it doesn't affect salmon directly, it could affect the bigger picture (Cook Inlet-bound salmon downstream).
164	Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters, as follows		
TNA			See comments for proposal 163.
165	Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters, as follows		
Support	7	0	The effectiveness of excluder requirements, but AC supports anything that can be tried to mitigate the salmon bycatch problem.
166	Amend statewide definition of a mechanical jigging machine, as follows		
TNA			
167	Prohibit vessels from having other groundfish gear or equipment onboard while participating in a groundfish fishery using mechanical jigging machines or hand troll gear, as follows		
TNA			
168	Prohibit vessels from having more than one groundfish gear type onboard when participating in a state-managed groundfish fishery		
Support	7	0	This would deter trawling by limiting the types of gear to drag.
169	Create a definition of groundfish coil spring or 'slinky pot,' as follows		
Support	7	0	Would help with management, regulation, and enforcement .
170	Reduce the permitted egg take level of each hatchery permit containing pink and chum salmon by 25% of the current permitted capacity for those species, as follows		
TNA			

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 21, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
171	Amend Prince William Sound hatchery permits to reduce pink salmon egg take capacity, as follows		
TNA			This proposal is not feasible for the department to implement.
172	Board generated regulations that places a moratorium on pink and chum hatchery production		
Support	7	0	This proposal would freeze hatchery production, which members support.
173	Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent, as follows		
Support	7	0	Housekeeping proposal by the department.
174	Allow the engine of a purse seine vessel or skiff to be shut off when the purse seine is deployed, as follows		
TNA			
<i>Dipnet Gear Definition</i>			
175	Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration, as follows		
TNA			
<i>Sport Fisheries</i>			
<i>Bag and Annual Limits</i>			
176	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits, as follows		
Oppose	0	7	Times when people would be on a charter in Homer. A resident who has a king stamp that shares a charter with people that do not have a king stamp could retain the fish in some cases, which is currently not legal but still happens. So one person good at fishing could catch the limit for the whole boat and increase harvest.
177	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits, as follows		
Oppose	0	7	See comments for proposal 176.
178	Modify the definition of bag limit, as follows		
Oppose	0	7	A person could go out with a bunch of their buddies, hand the rod to somebody, and really up the number of fish you take out of the water in an unfair manner.
179	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10 fish, as follows		

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 21, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
Oppose	0	7	It does not make a distinction for sport fishing, but author intends to make it strictly for sport fishing. Does not have clarifying language currently that does not set this limit to subsistence fishing.
<i>Possession Requirements</i>			
180	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish, as follows		
Oppose	0	7	Can't speak to the limits for other regions. See comments for proposal 179.
<i>Sport Fishing Gear</i>			
181	Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear, as follows		
Support	7	0	Housekeeping proposal for the department.
182	Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit, as follows		
Support	7	0	AC supports all ways to get rid of invasive species, especially northern pike.
183	Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession, as follows		
Support	7	0	Fish & Game clarified that fish that are used as bait are exempt from this proposal.
<i>Definitions</i>			
184	Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition, as follows		
TNA			
186	Reduce commercial salmon fishing opportunity with drift gillnet gear in the Central District of the Cook Inlet Area		
Support	7	0	Aligns in support of this proposal due to being specific to Central District drift gillnet fishery and has potential to intercept Northern District fish and Susitna District fish.
187	Close the Tsiu River and all waters within one quarter mile of the Tsiu River and Kaliakh River confluence to commercial fishing for salmon		
TNA			

- X. New Business
 - a. Tyonek AC Generated Cook Inlet Fishing Proposals
 - b. Other Fish & Game Business as Needed

- XI. Select representative for Board of Fisheries statewide finfish meeting
 - a. Robert Stephan, Sr. made a motion to allow Chair Donnie Standifer, Jr. to appoint future representatives to future board meetings.

- XII. Set next meeting date for Tyonek Advisory Committee generated proposals? Or with NVT council for counter measures for 2026 Fish & Game Chinook Management Plan?
 - a. Submit letter in conjunction with NVT council to Board of Fisheries statewide finfish meeting regarding subsistence fishing cutbacks

- XIII. Other
 - a. Leila to reach out to Tanana Chiefs Conference about how TCC partners with Fish & Game to manage their fisheries without facing severe cutbacks

- XIV. Adjourn at 5:05pm

- XV. Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: Alex Pfoff
Minutes Approved By: Donald Standifer, Jr.
Date: 03/02/2026

Unalaska/Dutch Harbor Advisory Committee

Meeting at the Unalaska Library 1000 10-10-2025 Teleconference/online via Zoom ONLY
 Join Online: [Zoom Link](#) | By Phone: 253 215 8782 or 888 475 4499 | Meeting ID: 854 5638 5286

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order: Chair Coleman called the meeting of the Unalaska/Dutch Harbor Advisory Committee on October 10, 2025 at 1007 am.

- II. Roll Call
 Members Present: Dustin Dickerson, Vice Chair Tim Mahoney, Roger Rowland, Frank Kelty, Chair Shari Coleman
 Members Absent: Secretary Jeff Hancock, Chris Price
 Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 4

- III. Fish and Game Staff Present: Ethan Nichols, Area Management Biologist; Asia Beder, Assistant Area Management Biologist; Natalie Romo, Boards Support

- IV. Guests Present via Zoom: Dan Martin, Alaska Boat Company; Angel Drobnica, APIDCA; Ernie Weise

- V. Approval of Agenda: Rowland moved to approve the agenda with second by Mahoney. Hearing no objection, the agenda was approved by consensus.

- VI. Reports: none

- VII. Public Comment: none

- VIII. Old Business: none

- IX. New Business
 - I. Approval of minutes from 03/26/2025. Rowland moved to approve the minutes, second by Kelty. No changes were made and the minutes approved without objection.
 - II. Fisheries update. Nichols gave an update on BSAI crab fisheries and Beder reported on state water cod fisheries.
 - III. Statewide Groundfish Proposals at AC’s discretion

<i>Proposals 1-8</i>	<i>Proposal Description: Proposals 1-8 all spoke to increasing the Western Gulf Of Alaska Pacific Cod under 60 foot Pot Cod Allocations</i>	
<i>Support</i>	<i>Opposed</i>	<i>Voting Notes Motion to take no action on proposals 1-8 (motion Kelty / second Rowland).</i>

5	0	Unalaska AC deemed that these proposals do not affect our local fisheries and that we should not speak to Proposals 1-8. Dickerson spoke out in support of small-vessel fleet.
Proposal 9	Closed waters in Bering Sea-Aleutian Islands	
<i>Support</i>	<i>Opposed</i>	Motion to support: Kelty/ second Dickerson
0	5	Rowland said that this Proposal would reduce the area that fish are currently being harvested by upwards of 70%
Proposal 10	Change Area O season open date	
<i>Support</i>	<i>Opposed</i>	Motion to support: Kelty/ second Rowland
0	5	Kelty stated that the Area O fishermen would lose the month of February which is prime fishing time and catching fish later in the season would affect fish quality
Proposal 11	Close state waters to trawl gear West of 170 West	
<i>Support</i>	<i>Opposed</i>	Motion to support: Rowland/ second Coleman
1	4	Rowland supported the protection of crab habitat. Kelty said there was no definite information on habitat impacts due to trawl activity and discussed the economic impact of reduced trawler activity. Coleman also expressed concern about closing an area based on inconclusive data. Dickerson questioned this area being abundant with juvenile crabs. Public comment: Martin said that they represent several Golden King Crab vessels, and they did not approve of the proposal.

- IV. Selection of an AC member to represent AC at BOF meeting: none.
- X. Set date of next meeting: Membership meeting is TBD.
- XI. Committee comments: none
- XII. Adjournment: Having completed all items on the agenda, Chair Coleman adjourned the meeting at 1112

These minutes were approved by the Vice Chair and Chair on October 13, 2025.

**Whittier Advisory Committee
Thursday, January 22nd, 2026
Zoom Only**

I. Call to Order: 1806 by David Pinguoch

II. Roll Call

Members Present:

Name	Present	Excused/Unexcused
David Pinguoch	X	
Brett Wilbanks	X	
James Norris	X	
Brett Roth	X	
Jody Mason	X	
Gordon Scott	X	
Brad von Wichman	X	
Bruce Bowman	X	
Jon van Hying		Excused

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 5

List of User Groups Present:

III. Fish and Game Staff Present: Charlotte Westing, Heather Scannell, Martin Schuster, Todd Johnson, Leila Williams, Brittany Blane Roth

IV. Guests Present: Forest Jenkins

V. Approval of Agenda: Jody Mason made a motion to approve the agenda. Bruce Bowman amended the agenda to add Proposals 166,167,168,175,176,177,178,179 and 180 then seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

VI. Reports

a. Chair's report: No real report. David did say we would have elections and any other add on discussions at another meeting.

b. ADF&G:

i. 2025 Non-commercial Shrimp Harvest Report: Brittany Blane Roth gave a report that the 2025 GHF was 48,000 and the actual catch 54,000, so we were over by 12%. Martin Schuster reported that there was a survey in October of 2025, however the numbers have not been released yet.

c. Others

- VII. Public Comment: Forest Jenkins talked about his concern for the Proposals pertaining to hatcheries and their effect on the Coastal communities and all sectors of the fishing community, commercial, sport and subsistence.

- VIII. Old Business

- IX. New Business
 - a. Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish Proposals 11, 162-165, 169, 170, 181, and 184
 - b. Board of Game Southcentral Region Proposals 70, 74, 76, 77, and 82-84
 - c. Other Fish and Game Business as Needed

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p>			
Subsistence Fisheries			
162	Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries, as follows		
Oppose	2	6	<p>Bruce Bowman made a motion to oppose the proposal and Jody Mason 2nd the proposal.</p> <p>Opposition: There is a concern that Alaskan residents might only be able to fish under a subsistence license in the future, so the implications of this proposal could interfere in that process and prohibit Alaskans from getting fish. May be more appropriate for the Copper River district and not statewide. One member is opposed to any attempts to restrict transportation services for residents trying to utilize their right to fish. It's cheaper to charter than to maintain a working boat, and it would be safer for individuals, so there is an economic impact in this proposal. There are also concerns that this</p>

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			<p>proposal may have unforeseen consequences on regulations in the future.</p> <p>Support: There is an OR part of this proposal that speaks to utilizing guiding services to participate in the subsistence fishery. This proposal would prohibit guiding services to be used for the activity of subsistence fishing, which members in favor of the proposal agree with.</p>
<i>Commercial Fisheries</i>			
<i>Groundfish Gear and Closed Waters</i>			
11	Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W. longitude, as follows		
Support	8	0	Brett Roth made a motion to support and Brett Wilbanks 2 nd the motion. This proposal aims to protect brown crab and halibut from bottom draggers. Few boats participate in the groundfish fishery out there, but the fishery is lucrative with black cod and halibut plentiful in the area.
163	Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis, as follows		
Support	8	0	Bruce Bowman made a motion to support the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. Language of this proposal presumes trawl gear will have contact with the bottom and requires monitoring. Department would be forced to come up with protocol to deal with bottom contact.
164	Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters, as follows		
Support	8	0	Bruce Bowman made a motion to support the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. Monitoring devices for nets are already available and federal legislation (SB3269) is being introduced to require them.

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
165	Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters, as follows		
Support	8	0	Bruce Bowman made a motion to support the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. See comments on proposals 163 and 164.
169	Create a definition of groundfish coil spring or 'slinky pot,' as follows		
Support	8	0	Brett Roth made a motion to support the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. This proposal would provide a needed definition for slinky pots used in black cod fishery.
170	Reduce the permitted egg take level of each hatchery permit containing pink and chum salmon by 25% of the current permitted capacity for those species, as follows		
Support	6	2	David Pinquoch made a motion to support the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. There was much discussion about cutting Pinks and the effect it would have on the local economy. Forest commented that cutting Pink production would affect the hatchery's ability to raise other salmon species, financially. Everyone else was more concerned with the environmental impacts they have noticed in the past 20 years. Brett commented that the hatchery's should concentrate on raising less smolt longer for a better survival rate.
171	Amend Prince William Sound hatchery permits to reduce pink salmon egg take capacity, as follows		
Oppose	0	8	Brett Wilbanks made a motion to oppose the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. This proposal is very similar to proposal 170 but less specific in language. This proposal is viewed as being too restrictive in what it is asking for.
172	Board generated regulation that places a moratorium on pink and chum hatchery production.		
Support	6	1	Bruce Bowman made a motion to support the proposal and Brett Wilbanks 2 nd the motion. This proposal would maintain current levels

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			without increasing production, described as a “safety net” to prevent expansion. This proposal would also require the state to conduct research on impacts.
175	Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration, as follows:		
Oppose	0	7	Bruce Bowman made a motion to oppose the proposal and Jody 2 nd the motion. The proposal aimed to restrict dip nets from being tied for stabilization when fishing from boats. One member uses a line to hold his dip net while operating his boat.
<i>Sport Fishing Gear</i>			
181	Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear, as follows		
No Action			Expressed concern about potential misinterpretation of the language regarding holding rods. There is also confusion about the language regarding hooks. The proposal aims to align statute and codified regulations. Couldn't act on proposal due to lack of clarity.
<i>Definitions</i>			
183	Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspect while in possession, as follows.		
<u>1 abstained</u> Oppose	1	6	Brett Wilbanks made a motion to support the proposal with an amendment to the language which would state: Until a finfish has been processed or prepared for human consumption, a person may not mutilate or otherwise disfigure it in a manner that would prevent the determination of species or the determination of the length of the fish. Amendment proposed: to limit the regulation to fish where length is a requirement. Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. Several argued that there was no good definition of processed or prepared.
184	Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition, as follows		

Alaska Board of Fish Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting

March 17-March 20, 2026 | Anchorage, AK | Comment Deadline March 2, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
Support	8	0	David Pinguoch made a motion to support this proposal and Bruce Bowman 2 nd the motion. Members thought of this proposal as a housekeeping change.

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting

March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<p><i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i></p> <p><i>Regionwide & Multiple Units</i></p>			
70	Restrict hunters who take a nanny in Units 6, 7, 14C, or 15 from hunting goats in Unit 6, 7, 8, 14C and 15 for five regulatory years		
Support	7	0	Jim Norris made a motion to support the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. Member Brett Roth left the meeting at this point, changing the voting number of members from 8 to 7. The proposal would restrict hunters who take a nanny goat in one area from hunting in any other area of Region 2 for 5 years.
71	Establish an average annual historic human harvest value for sheep, to consider if sheep populations are important for providing high levels of human consumptive use as follows:		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting

March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
Support	7	0	Bruce Bowman made a motion to support the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. This proposal was described as a housekeeping proposal for the department.
72	Establish intensive management (IM) findings for sheep populations, and population and harvest objectives, in the southcentral region as follows:		
Support	7	0	Bruce Bowman made a motion to support the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. See comments on proposal 71.
74	Count a wounded bear against a hunter's bag limit regionwide		
Support	7	0	Bruce Bowman made a motion to support the proposal and Jim Norris 2 nd the motion. The proposal would make it illegal across all units to wound a brown bear and not cut your tag. Some members questioned why some areas specifically state wounded bears count as harvested while others don't.
75	Require an online trapping education course for trapping in the southcentral region as follows:		
Support	7	0	Bruce Bowman made a motion to support the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. There was expressed support from members for online education for trappers. One member noted the importance of education given incidents of traps near dog parks.
<i>Cordova Area – Unit 6</i>			
76	Reduce the nonresident bag limit to one deer in Unit 6		
<u>1 abstained</u> Oppose	2	4	David Pinguoch made a motion to oppose the proposal and Jim Norris 2 nd the motion. Biologist provided data showing non-residents take very few deer in Unit 6. There was a concern about Kodiak transporters moving to Prince William Sound if Kodiak limits are reduced. A suggestion was made for a two-deer limit, which might be more appropriate than a one-deer limit.
77	Change the nonresident goat hunts in Unit 6D from drawing permits to registration hunts		
Support	6	1	David Pinguoch made a motion to support the proposal with an amendment, that nonresident hunters must have a guide/client agreement, and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. This was recommended by Charlotte Westing.
82	Shorten the spring hunting season for black bear in Unit 6D by 10 days		

Alaska Board of Game Southcentral Region Meeting

March 20-March 25, 2026 | Kodiak, AK | Comment Deadline March 6, 2026

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
Support	5	2	Bruce Bowman made a motion to support the proposal and Brad Von Wichman 2 nd the motion.
83	Increase the resident bag limit for the RL065 black bear hunt in Unit 6 to two bears		
Oppose	0	7	Dave Pinquoch made a motion to oppose the proposal and Bruce Bowman 2 nd the motion.
84	Shorten the season for black bear hunting in Unit 6D		
Support	5	2	Brad Von Wichman made a motion to support the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. One member argued that shortening the fall season would be more effective at protecting female bears.
85	Restrict hunters from shooting from a boat in Unit 6 without a permit as follows:		
Oppose	2	4	Bruce Bowman made a motion to oppose the proposal and Jody Mason 2 nd the motion. The proposal would align Unit 6 with Units 1-5 where this regulation already exists. One member shared personal experiences with unsafe shooting from boats. This proposal may be too restrictive and is also poorly written.

- X. Select representative(s) for board meeting: **Please note that the meetings overlap**
- Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish, 03/16/26-03/20/26 (Deadline to submit AC rep by 03/02/26, same as comment deadline)
 - Board of Game Southcentral Region, 03/20/26-03/25/26 (Deadline to submit AC rep by 03/06/26, same as comment deadline)
- No representatives were chosen for either meeting.**
- XI. Set next meeting date, also determine when to have elections
- Other things to consider: Cook Inlet proposals for next year
 - Call for Proposals out with proposals due by **April 10th, 2026**
 No date was set.
- XII. Other Dave Pinquoch made a motion to nominate Jon Van Hying for ADFG's service award for his 36 years of service. The vote was unanimous in favor of the nomination.
- XIII. Adjourn The meeting was adjourned at 2120 by David Pinquoch.

XIV. Adjournment:

Minutes Recorded By: Jim Norris
Minutes Approved By: Dave Pinguoch
Date: 01/27/2026

**Wrangell Fish and Game
Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 11, 2025 at 6:30 p.m. at the Nolan Center & Via Zoom**

I. Call to Order: Call to Order: 6:30 PM by Chris Guggenbickler

II. Roll Call

Name	Position	Absent/Excused, Unexcused, Present
Chris Guggenbickler	Chair	Present
Tom Sims	Vice Chair	Present via Zoom
David Rak	Secretary	Present
Alan Reeves	Member	Absent/Excused
Robert Rooney	Member	Present
Marlin Benedict	Member	Absent/Excused
Jared Gross	Member	Present
Jason Rooney	Member	Present
Dave Brown Sr.	Member	Present
Winston Davies	Member	Present
Brett Stillwaugh	Member	Present
John Yeager	Member	Present
Travis Bangs	Member	Present, arrived late
Scott McAuliffe	Member	Absent/Excused
Ryan Reeve	Member	Present
Mike Ottesen	Alternate	Present
Jordan Bunes	Alternate	Absent/Excused

Members Present: 13

Members Absent (Excused): 4

Members Absent (Unexcused): 0

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 8

List of User Groups Present:

III. Fish and Game Staff Present via Zoom:

Sam Kirby, Board Support

Frank Robins, Area Biologist

Carri Anne Mueller, AK BOG
Alisha Seward, AST

- IV. Guests Present: Charlie Hazel, David Powell, Chuck Jenkins, Jim Jenkins, Dani Gross, Tim Hunt, Bruce Smith, Brian Rooney, and Patricia Phillips via Zoom.
- V. Approval of Agenda
Board of Game Southeast Proposal
Return to Proposals 57 and 58
Return to Proposals 64 - 69
Board of Fisheries Statewide Proposals
- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
- VII. Reports
- a. Chair's report: None
 - b. ADF&G: During discussion
 - c. Others: None
- VIII. Public Comment: None
- IX. Old Business:
- Board of Game Southeast Proposal
- Return to Proposals 57 and 58
 - Return to Proposals 59 – 69, the Moose proposals
- Board of Fisheries Statewide Proposals
- X. New Business per agenda:
Southeast Federal Advisory Committee
Discuss upcoming Federal Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) proposals:
A motion was made and seconded to send a letter to the RAC opposing the civil twilight regulation for harvesting big game. The AC opposes the federal proposal for the same reasons it opposes proposal #1 to the AK Southeast Regional Meeting of the BOG, January 23-27, 2026. See the minutes from the Wrangell AC Meeting on Monday, December 8, 2025.
- Discussion of FS on logging road access for hunting, gathering, and recreation:
A motion was made and seconded to send a letter to the USDA Forest Service, Tongass National Forest, expressing interest in maintaining dock facilities and National Forest system road access for hunting, gathering, and recreation activities. The docks at Roosevelt and St. John Harbors on Zarembo island are needed for safe access for hunting and other subsistence activities. Chris Guggenbickler will write the letter.

Board of Game Southcentral Proposals – there are some Regional/Multi Unit proposals that might be interesting to look at (Proposals 73 and 74).

Proposal 73 would define the term: Permanent Dwelling for hunting and fishing.

Proposal 74 would count a wounded bear against the hunter’s bag limit, and require them to cut their harvest tag.

Other issues brought up that pertain to pertinent Fisheries and Game issues

- XI. Select representative(s) for board meeting: Chris Guggenbickler will attend BOG meeting
- XII. Set next meeting date: TBA
- XIII. Other
- XIV. Adjourn

Alaska Board of Game Southeast Region Meeting Proposals January 23-27, 2026 Wrangell, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
START OF MEETING MINUTES FOR 12/11/25.			
57	Change the season, bag limit, and permit requirement for hunting elk on the Zarembo Island in Unit 3		
SUPPORT	11	1*	The Wrangell AC supports its proposal to allow bull elk on Zarembo Island with at least 3 points on one antler to be harvested between the first Saturday in November and the third Sunday in November annually. Action began and was tabled on 12/8/2025; and discussion was continued as follows: It was pointed out that the recent/current heavy snow includes the winter range on Zarembo. In winter the elk and the deer migrate to the west side of Zarembo (away from the Stikine wind), and both species compete on the same winter range.

Alaska Board of Game Southeast Region Meeting Proposals January 23-27, 2026 Wrangell, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			<p>The larger elk would decimate the elk, hurting the survival of the deer herd. Again, stressing the importance of the the Zarembo deer herd to feed the community of Wrangell. It was again stressed the need to harvest more elk from Zarembo Island, and that increasing the harvest from one to two drawing permits is would not be enough.</p> <p>Another explanation of the ADF&G proposal to increase the number of drawing permits from one to two for bull elk on Zarembo was provided: Two bull elk drawing permits would equate to approximately 10% of the estimated bull elk, and 1% of the estimated total elk herd. This should be sustainable. Some AC members feel the choice between proposals 57 and 58 is between 2 options: Manage for a sustainable herd, or wipe out the elk on Zarembo.</p> <p>*The minority voter feels the elk herd could be managed best using drawing permits, and ADF&G should increase the number of drawing permits to between 7 and 10 permits annually.</p>
58	Open a registration hunt for elk on Zarembo Island in Unit 3		
OPPOSE	0	12	<p>The AC opposes this proposal submitted by a Wrangell resident to allow for the harvest of one elk on Zarembo Island by registration permit between August 1 and November 30 annually.</p> <p>Action began and was tabled on 12/8/2025; and discussion was continued as follows:</p> <p>The AC supports its own proposal 57. Its desire is to increase the harvest of bull elk on Zarembo, but feels proposal 58, allowing the harvest of any elk, would not be sustainable. Some AC members feel the choice between proposals 57 and 58 is between 2 options: Manage for a sustainable herd, or wipe out the elk on Zarembo</p>
59	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 3, elk drawing hunt DE318, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
No Action			
60	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 3 elk drawing hunt DE321, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
No Action			

Alaska Board of Game Southeast Region Meeting Proposals January 23-27, 2026 Wrangell, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
61	Limit the nonresident permit allocation for the elk drawing hunt DE323, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
No Action			
62	Limit nonresident permit allocation for the Unit 3 elk drawing hunt DE324, to “up to” 10% of the available permits		
No Action			
63	Adjust the season dates for the DE318 elk hunt in Unit 3, and open a new drawing hunt in September		
OPPOSE	0	12	The AC opposes this proposal because it believes it would not be sustainable to hunt elk with a rifle during the rut in September. The AC does not favor shorting the archery season and add a rifle hunt in September. The AC supports the ADF&G concern for decreasing the herd by increasing the hunt. The elk harvest on Etolin has been declining over the past 15 years, because the herd is declining. Calf production and herd recruitment is a problem.
64	Eliminate the regulation that excludes broken, damaged, or altered antlers from the definition of spike-fork antlers for Units 1B, 1C and 3		
SUPPORT	13	0	The AC supports its proposal to eliminate the regulation that excludes broken, damaged, or altered antlers from the definition of spike-fork antlers. In the past moose antlers were illegally altered by hunters. That problem has decreased. The AC feels that if an antler in velvet is damaged naturally while growing, it should be allowed as a broken antler. Antlers altered by a hunter should be delt with by AST. Natural breaks to antlers would be included as a legal animal. It would be up to AST to prove a broken antler was man made. ADF&G reported that the bull moose harvest on the river with the current antler restriction has been stable for several years. Bull moose harvest on Kuiu and west Kupreanof Islands has been increasing. Generally, the Stikine harvest (1B) has been younger bulls, with older bulls harvested in other areas of Unit 3. The density of hunters for the small area of the Stikine is greater, than other areas that are a larger area. Note: AC Member Travis Bangs joins the meeting increasing the voting members from 12 to 13.

Alaska Board of Game Southeast Region Meeting Proposals January 23-27, 2026 Wrangell, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
65	Remove the antler restriction for the moose hunt in Units 1B and 3 and replace with a shorter, any bull hunt in October		
OPPOSE	1*	12	<p>The AC opposes this proposal submitted by a Wrangell resident to remove the antler restriction and shorten the season to 2 weeks for the moose hunt in Units 1B and 3. The AC feels this proposal would be mute if proposal 65 was adopted by the Board.</p> <p>It is felt that the BOG would not change the regulations on a moose hunt that is doing very well. If it's working the BOG would not change the regulation. There has been record bull moose harvest in the past few years for Units 1B and 3. But some people are fearful to hunt and make a mistake in antler identification/determination. Eliminating the antler restriction would make the hunt easier and less confusing. A typical moose hunting on the Stikine river was described as a few bulls get shot during the first days of the season, followed by 10 to 15 days when very few bulls are seen and harvested. Once the rut starts the hunt become very productive for harvesting bull moose. This proposal would include the most productive days of the rut in the hunting season. With no antler restriction all bull moose would be eligible and legal to harvest. This would result in an unsustainable level of harvest and a decline in the moos herd. While an open hunt, with no antler restrictions, would be the only regulations not to vilify legal hunters. A motion to table the proposal, and not vote on it, failed: 2 support and 11 oppose.</p> <p>Emphasis was made to the BOG to pass proposal 64 to eliminate the regulation that excludes broken, damaged, or altered antlers from the definition of spike-fork antlers.</p> <p>*The minority voters feel an effort is needed to alleviate the hunter vs enforcement conflict, stop moose poaching, and end illegally killed moose abandoned in the field.</p>
66	Change the bag limit for hunting brown bear in Unit 3 to one bear every regulatory year		
SUPPORT	13	0	The AC supports this proposal because they believe there is a need to increase the harvest of brown bears in Unit 3, and decrease the population of bears. With the restriction of harvesting a brown bear every 4 years, hunters pass on bears

Alaska Board of Game Southeast Region Meeting Proposals January 23-27, 2026 Wrangell, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			as they seek a larger bear. With the possibility of harvesting a bear every year, more bears would be harvested because hunters would not pass on a bear knowing they would have to wait 4 years to seek a larger one. It is noted that this harvest would be open to residents only as there is currently no non-resident season for brown bears in Unit 3.
67	Repeal the Petersburg Road System Closed Area in Unit 3, and add the area to the Petersburg Management Area, to allow for big game hunting by archery only		
No Action			
68	Repeal the Blind Slough Closed Area in Unit 3, and add the area to the Petersburg Management Area, to allow for big game hunting by archery only		
No Action			
69	Extend the grouse hunting season in Unit 3, to close June 15 instead of May 15 end		
No Action			
262	Moose harvested under the horn restriction in 5 AAC 85.045 Units 1(B) and 3 will be Judged for legality by a committee.		
SUPPORT	13	0	The Wrangell AC supports its proposal despite the Board not having authority to determine the process.

END BOARD OF GAME SOUTHEAST PROPOSALS

BEGIN BOARD OF FISHERIES STATEWIDE FINFISH PROPOSALS

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals March 17 – 21, 2026 Anchorage, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
<i>Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.</i>			
162	Prohibit commercial transport services in subsistence fisheries		
No Action			
11	Close state waters to commercial groundfish fishing with trawl gear west of 170° W. longitude		
No Action			
163	Define all trawl gear operated inside state waters as non-pelagic and develop new performance and monitoring standards to allow state-waters pelagic trawling to occur on a case-by-case basis		
No Action			
164	Establish bottom contact monitoring requirements for pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters		
No Action			
165	Establish salmon excluder requirements for all pelagic trawl gear operated inside state waters		
No Action			
166	Amend statewide definition of a mechanical jigging machine		
No Action			
167	Prohibit vessels from having other groundfish gear or equipment onboard while participating in a groundfish fishery using mechanical jigging machines or hand troll gear		
No Action			
168	Prohibit vessels from having more than one groundfish gear type onboard when participating in a state-managed groundfish fishery		
No Action			
169	Create a definition of groundfish coil spring or 'slinky pot'		
No Action			
170	Reduce the permitted egg take level of each hatchery permit containing pink and chum salmon by 25% of the current permitted capacity for those species		
OPPOSE	0	13	The AC opposes this proposal as it is similar to a past proposal 156 in the Alaska Board of Fisheries Southeast and Yakutat Finfish and Shellfish from January 28-February 9th, 2025. The AC opposed proposal 156 and feel it is simply an anti-hatchery proposal, not based on science. Hatchery programs are reviewed and approved by the Regional Planning Team (RPT) which is a public process. The reduction to the hatchery fish would harm the economics of many SE Alaska communities. The all users would be negatively impacted, and SRAA would be negatively impacted. Hatchery fish

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals March 17 – 21, 2026 Anchorage, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
			benefit all users. Also see following: A Resolution Of The Wrangell Fish And Game Advisory Committee Opposing Proposal 156 from 12/17/24.
171	Amend Prince William Sound hatchery permits to reduce pink salmon egg take capacity		
No Action			
172	Board generated regulation that places a moratorium on pink and chum hatchery production		
No Action			
173	Provide emergency order authority to define fishing boundaries when regulatory markers are lost, destroyed or otherwise absent		
No Action			
174	Allow the engine of a purse seine vessel or skiff to be shut off when the purse seine is deployed		
No Action			
175	Modify dipnet mesh-size and configuration		
No Action			
176	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits		
OPPOSE	0	13	The AC opposes this proposal and proposal 177 because they would increase the opportunity to take fish on a sport charter. It believes the sport charter take of fish should not be increased. If all the members of the charter do not catch their limit, that's just the way it is; that's fishing. There is special emphasis to not increase the charter sport take of king salmon.
177	Allow anglers fishing from the same vessel to pool bag and possession limits		
OPPOSE	0	13	The AC opposes this proposal and proposal 176 because they would increase the opportunity to take fish on a sport charter. It believes the sport charter take of fish should not be increased. If all the members of the charter do not catch their limit, that's just the way it is: that's fishing. There is special emphasis to not increase the charter sport take of king salmon.
178	Modify the definition of bag limit		
OPPOSE	0	13	The AC opposes this proposal because it believes the person who sets the hook owns the fish, others cannot help catch the fish.
179	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of 10 fish		
OPPOSE	0	13	The AC opposes this proposal because it believes that king salmon less than 28 inches are too small to keep. The current local king salmon limit is 28 inches, and that should be maintained.
180	Establish a statewide annual limit for king salmon of five fish		
OPPOSE	0	13	The AC opposes this proposal because it believes the limit should be greater than 5 fish, and there needs to be accommodation of hatchery fish vs wild stocks in determining the limit.

Alaska Board of Fisheries Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals March 17 – 21, 2026 Anchorage, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
181	Align regulatory and statutory language for sport fishing gear		
No Action			
182	Establish bow fishing as lawful sport fishing gear for species without a bag or possession limit		
No Action			
183	Amend regulations requiring conditions of fish available to inspection while in possession		
No Action			
184	Align the sport fish definition of rockfish with the statewide definition		
No Action			
186	Reduce commercial salmon fishing opportunity with drift gillnet gear in the Central District of the Cook Inlet Area		
No Action			
187	Close the Tsiu River and all waters within one quarter mile of the Tsiu River and Kaliakh River confluence to commercial fishing for salmon		
No Action			

Resolution #001 included below concerning Proposal 170(156).

The Wrangell AC SUPPORTS Resolution 001, all members are in favor.

Comments, Discussion: The Wrangell Fish and Game Advisory Committee strongly opposes past Proposal 156 and the current Proposal 170, and urges the Board to reject proposal 170 to prevent detrimental impacts on Southeast Alaska’s hatchery programs, coastal communities, and fishery-dependent livelihoods.

WRANGELL FISH AND GAME ADVISORY COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION NO. 001

A RESOLUTION OF THE WRANGELL FISH AND GAME ADVISORY COMMITTEE

OPPOSING PROPOSAL 156 TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE JANUARY 28 - FEBRUARY 9, 2025, ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES MEETING

WHEREAS, The Alaska Boards of Fish and Game established regional Advisory Committees to serve as local subject matter experts for their respective regions; it is both

appropriate and essential that the Boards prioritize these committees' expertise and rely on their informed recommendations when making decisions; and

WHEREAS, Southeast Alaska's salmon hatchery programs have successfully operated for almost 50 years, supplementing wild salmon harvests and supporting commercial, sport, subsistence, personal use, and cultural fisheries, which are vital to the economic and social fabric of local communities; and

WHEREAS, these hatchery programs, operated by the Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (SSRAA), Douglas Island Pink and Chum, Inc. (DIPAC), and Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (NSRAA), play a critical role in supporting approximately 4,200 jobs, \$219 million in labor income, and \$576 million in annual economic output, benefitting over 14,000 Alaskans who depend on hatchery salmon for their livelihood; and

WHEREAS, Proposal 156 seeks to reduce hatchery production of pink and chum salmon by 25%, posing a significant risk to the hatchery-supported ecosystem in Southeast Alaska and threatening the stability of salmon resources relied upon by commercial, sport, and subsistence harvesters, as well as local communities for food security, cultural traditions, and recreational opportunities; and

WHEREAS, a reduction in hatchery production would jeopardize food security and access to salmon for subsistence, personal use, and sport fisheries, directly impacting the cultural practices, heritage, and economic stability of communities across the region; and

WHEREAS, the current scientific data on the impact of hatchery fish on wild salmon populations remains inconclusive and does not justify the significant cuts proposed in Proposal 156; and

WHEREAS, Alaska's hatchery system operates as a nonprofit model, funded through cost recovery and enhancement taxes, and adheres to stringent public permitting and scientific standards to ensure wild salmon populations are protected while benefiting all user groups; and

WHEREAS, Proposal 156 introduces unnecessary regulatory oversight that would conflict with the proven balance between hatchery and wild stock management achieved under existing frameworks, complicating long-term planning and financial stability for hatchery operators; and

WHEREAS, Southeast Alaska hatchery programs represent a long-standing partnership between private nonprofits and the state, providing significant economic, cultural, and social benefits while maintaining sustainable practices that protect wild salmon stocks;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE WRANGELL FISH AND GAME ADVISORY COMMITTEE THAT:

Section 1. The Wrangell Fish and Game Advisory Committee strongly opposes Proposal 156, scheduled for consideration at the January 28 - February 9, 2025, Alaska Board of Fisheries meeting, and urges the Board to reject this proposal to prevent detrimental impacts on Southeast Alaska’s hatchery programs, coastal communities, and fishery-dependent livelihoods.

Section 2. The Wrangell Fish and Game Advisory Committee reaffirms its support for SSRAA, DIPAC, and NSRAA, recognizing their essential contributions to sustaining salmon resources critical for local economies, cultural practices, and the continued availability of salmon for all user groups.

Section 3. The Wrangell Fish and Game Advisory Committee calls upon the Alaska Board of Fisheries to prioritize science-based, objective assessments for hatchery management and collaborate with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, hatchery operators, and local stakeholders to ensure management decisions reflect the economic, cultural, and ecological value of Southeast Alaska’s hatchery programs.

XV. **OTHER NEW BUSINESS:** None

Adjournment: 9:10 PM

Minutes Recorded By: David Rak
Minutes Approved By: Chris Guggenbickler
Date: 01/07/2026