



Submitted By
Al Plisousky
Submitted On
1/11/2014 3:25:22 PM
Affiliation
Resident

Phone
907-745-3090
Email
aplisousky@gci.net
Address
PO Box 1904
Palmer, Alaska 99645

To whom it may concern: I don't have a problem with commercial fisherman making a living, but I do have a problem with someone like myself as a single line caster only allowed 1 or 2 Silvers. I spend money also for a boat, fishing gear, boat tags, vehicle registration, parking lot fees, fuel consumption, time on the road, time scheduling with the family and also the consideration of time involved with scheduling for the short season. Could we please be a little more apprecitive of a thing called fairness instead of who has the most political clout. U guys know what's right & fair; how about using it instead of the normal waste and greed thing that haunts most of our governmental agencies. Thank U!



Submitted By
Alex Gimarc
Submitted On
1/11/2014 2:21:30 PM
Affiliation
Private Citizen

Phone
907-441-5343

Email
agimarc@ak.net

Address
11155 Bluff Creek Circle
Anchorage , Alaska 99515

Over the last decade I have watched the salmon returns into Turnagain Arm, Anchorage Bowl, the MatSu decline. I believe this is mismanagement as the Board of Fish concentrates on managing the second run of reds into the Kenai. When the run is a strong one, emergency opening after emergency opening is approved to the point where salmon runs into the Northern District are decimated. If you want to manage the second run, put the commercial fleet close to the mouth of the Kenai rather than allowing them to roam the entire inlet. Second, emergency openings on the Kenai should be a collaborative process between sportfish and commfish offices in Kenai, Anchorage and the MatSu. It should take 4 out of those 6 offices to approve an opening rather than the Kenai commfish office. The current management plan has been a disaster. Time to give the sport, personal use and subsistence users equal priority with commfish users.



Submitted By
Barry Stanley
Submitted On
1/11/2014 4:43:09 PM
Affiliation
Subsistence fishery user

Phone
907-495-5899

Email
denalifyng@alaska.net

Address
PO Box 1017
Willow, Alaska 99688

As a subsistence user of this fishery, I support Proposal 307-5 AAC 01.593, Upper Yentna River Subsistence Salmon Fishery.



Submitted By
Bill Folsom
Submitted On
1/11/2014 8:46:31 AM
Affiliation
Mat Valley AC

Phone
907 745 4339

Email
billfolsom@gmail.com

Address
PO BOX 4861
PALMER, Alaska 99645

I'm not sure the BOF is aware of the allocative criteria between fisheries set by the court as specified in AS 16.05.251(e). I say "NOT SURE" because the NORTHERN COOK INLET has been ignored as I review all 7 criteria points, especially #3 (THE IMPORTANCE OF EACH FISHERY FOR PROVIDING RESIDENTS THE OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN FISH FOR PERSONAL AND FAMILY CONSUMPTION) I HOPE IT WILL NOT BE NECESSARY TO FILE A LAW SUIT TO RESOLVE THIS ISSUE. We no longer have fish in sustainable numbers and something must be done. Stop blaming everything other than the netting of our fish once the Kenai has there escapement. !!!!!!!!!!! DRIFT MANAGEMENT IS A MUST!!!!!! Bill Folsom 47 yr. resident retired



Submitted By
Bob Estes
Submitted On
1/14/2014 11:20:34 PM
Affiliation
private

Phone
907 953 0327
Email
mobyking@alaska.com
Address
PO Box 1043
Sterling, Alaska 99672

I have sport fished the Kenai river for King salmon for 41 years. I have also fished commercially for salmon, halibut and herring.

It's easy to continue putting more restrictions on the sport fisherman, we are very concerned over the low king returns and have accepted those restrictions, but it seems the setnetters don't want to accept any restrictions placed on them.

Last year's set net season had one or two individuals using some new methods of set netting as an experiment but with all the information I've read I haven't heard any mention of how well it worked.

I think there should be a cap on the number of kings the set netters can kill and then the season is over, this can also work for the sportfishermen. If there is a strong return then ADF&G can add more time periods by emergency order.

Thanks, Bob

,



Submitted By
Brad Adams
Submitted On
1/15/2014 3:11:14 PM
Affiliation

Phone
907 398 1992
Email
akoutdooradv@gci.net
Address
P.O. Box 994
Soldotna, Alaska 99669

Mr. Chairman, and Board of Fish Members;

My name is Brad Adams, I live in Soldotna AK.

I relocated to Alaska from Oregon in the mid 1980's. At that time I was in my early 20's. I grew up in the Northwest as an avid Salmon and Steelhead fisherman. I caught my first Chinook Salmon when I was 8 years old off the Oregon coast, and have been a dedicated sportfisherman ever since!

I came to Alaska and started my own business. I guided fishing on the Kenai River for 22 years. I hold a Master Hunting Guide License in Alaska also. When I first started fishing the Kenai river in the mid 1980's I was amazed at the King Salmon fishery. Not just the number of kings that the Kenai produced, but the size of the kings in the Kenai. And the high percentage of the fish in the river that were in the 50 lb. plus range. But even at that time I was concerned about the future of these spectacular fish!! I remember as a young man going into the Fish and Game office in Soldotna and having serious discussions with the biologists about the future of these kings. Unfortunately, what I was concerned about back then has come to be!! Now we all know, that depending on which side of any argument one is on, that numbers, and statistics can be twisted and skewed to represent what we want. The bottom line is that the health of the King Salmon run in the kenai river has been on a steady decline for the last many years!! And what is most concerning to me above the actual numbers of declining Kings is the loss of the big Kings in the river.

After spending a great part of my life observing salmon runs all over the Northwest, and Alaska, I have learned that wild native salmon are very resilient creatures. With that said, I do believe that the Kings, and particularly the large, older Kings in the Kenai river are in deep peril!! I believe that if drastic measures are not taken soon, that the fish that have made the kenai river famous world wide are desperately close to becoming extinct!!

It would be worse that just shameful if the big Kings of the Kenai river become something that we can only tell our future generations about instead of letting them witness them for themselves. Now IS the time to make the necessary changes for the future of the most amazing run of wild salmon in the world!!

My testimony here today doesn't back or support any particular proposals, but just asking all of you to make the best decisions that you can to do what it takes to protect, and bring back this amazing resource.

In closing I would like to Thank all of you for your time and relentless efforts that you have put into managing the fisheries of Alaska.

Thank you,

Brad Adams,



Submitted By

Brad Carver

Submitted On

1/17/2014 12:03:58 PM

Affiliation

Former ADFG, former Kenai guide, private fisherman for the past 25 years.

Phone

(907)398-7796

Email

Akcarv@gci.net

Address

304 W. Katmai Ave
Soldotna, Alaska 99669

Proposal 186 and 187:support

i support both of these proposals, which gives the department more flexibility to manage for variable situations, which may (and will) occur.

Proposal 188 and 189: support

Both of these proposals concern the OEG of the Kenai early run kings. With the uncertainty of the accuracy of the current and past Kenai escapement numbers, we need to do all we can in river to ensure that we put enough spawners on the gravel. With the departments early Kenai king run prediction of just over 2000 returners, I think we can all agree that this is not enough to sustain this run. I am all for any conservation measures to ensure a sustainable minimum escapement is reached.

Proposal 202: support

Given the alarming trend in declining Slikok king escapement numbers, this should be a "no brainier".

Proposal 207: support

Given uncertainties in our sonar and past escapement counts, a precautionary approach is warranted. My further recommendation would be to demand a 3rd party review of our current king sonar program so we have reliable data that we can trust year after year. Since this was proposed by KRSA, maybe they could fund this instead of their typical back door lobby efforts.

Proposal 219: support

This regulation should have been in place long ago. The conservation easements have been a step in the right direction, but they have still exposed many early run mainstem spawners to over exploitation. It is time we give these fish a break. I would suggest amending the proposal to move the upper boundary down from the Soldotna bridge to the lower boundary at Slikok Creek to align it with ADFG proposal 201.

Proposal 237 and 238: support

I strongly support any move toward additional drift boat only fishing on the Kenai . This may be the simplest answer to many of the issues debated over the Kenai river in the coming years. It is undeniable that the population of the Kenai Peninsula and south central is growing. The pressure on the Kenai is not going to go away. I have been power boat fishing the Kenai since 1985, and even though I am getting older and this would limit my access and convenience, I am in total support. But this is only a stop gap measure. What really needs to happen is for us to go drift only on the Kenai , year round. This one move would do more to correct our in-river issues than anything else. Turbidity, hydrocarbons, noise, boat wake erosion, crowding, stress would all be eliminated . That is the solution to returning the Kenai back to a world class fishery. The problem is no one is willing to drop their egos and make this happen. In the meantime, we will continue to beat the river to death.



Submitted By
Brent Reimers
Submitted On
1/11/2014 3:13:30 PM
Affiliation

Phone
376-3948

Email
mreimers@mtaonline.net

Address
3141 w. spence ln.
wasilla, Alaska 99623

I have two suggestions for preserving the once great Kenai river king fishery. The first one would be, to have the East side set netters to fish no closer than 1/2 mile from the low water mark from July 7 through July 20. I believe this will allow 70% to 80% of the kings to make it to the rivers, but still allow the setnetters to fish for reds and have possibly more openings. NOTE : It has been my experience through personal observation as a fish-buyer, deck hand and sport fishing, that when the kings enter Cook Inlet, they tend to follow the coastline rather close. Many times, I have observed large kings rolling in the surf not more than 30 yards out. MY SECOND SUGGESTION, would be for the state of Alaska to buy out all the East side setnetters from Ninilchik to Kenai river at a fair market price and give them a free drift net permit. This will allow them to still fish if they want to, but will give the state more control over the targeted fish. This may seem rather extreme, but I think in the long run this plan would pay for itself and put much more money into the Alaska economy through the increase in tourism and fish license. I am sure the state legislature will be happy to spend 30 or even 100 million \$\$ to make this happen, why, they have no problem spending 300 million a year to study a gas line that (in my opinion) will never be built, and for a bonus, almost all the money will stay right here in the great state of Alaska.



Submitted By
Bruce Morgan
Submitted On
1/16/2014 8:11:16 PM
Affiliation

Phone
9072408451

Email
sampson@acsalaska.net

Address
6230 Petrified Tree Circle
Anchorage, Alaska 99507

Issue; Trying to conserve Kenai King Salmon while ESSN industry fishes;

The Dept of Fish has presented Kenai King Salmon genetic sampling that shows that not ALL ESSN sites catch the brunt of the Kenai Kings headed up the beach. Some sites catch Kenai Kings and others do not have the same impact.

While the department is pressured to conserve Kenai bound king salmon, AND allow the ESSN fishery to fish as not to starve the set netters of their opportunity to catch sockeye?

I ask the Board of Fish to review this genetic sampling data and consider allowing the set net

fishery that does not impact the Kenai escapement to fish, while closing set net sites that have proven by genetic sampling to catch Kenai bound kings.

Unfortunately, it appears that we close the entire beach for set net fishing, when only certain areas are impacting Kenai King Escapement.

NOTE;

Board of Fish; Keep in mind; the commercial fishery is owed "nothing" by owning a commercial fishing permit. Ask the department of law, they are sitting in the room with you! By owning a commercial permit the commercial permit holder is only given the opportunity to fish, when the Dept of Fish needs an avenue to prevent overescapement!!

I am not a set netter; I am a Kenai sport fisherman! BUT, I know, the pressure put on the Dept of Fish to conserve kings, while also getting pressured to allow the set net industry to fish. This is a compromise. FISH the sites that don't catch kings, and shut the others down!! At least some set netters will have an opportunity to fish!



Submitted By
Cheryl Whitney
Submitted On
1/1/2014 4:59:39 PM
Affiliation

Proposal # 237. I support this proposal.



Submitted By
Cheryl Whitney
Submitted On
1/1/2014 4:49:41 PM
Affiliation

Proposal #219. Support this proposal.

Sport fishing should **never** have been allowed in these areas.



Submitted By
Cheryl Whitney
Submitted On
1/1/2014 5:02:13 PM
Affiliation

Proposal #238. I support this proposal.



Submitted By
Chris Every
Submitted On
1/16/2014 7:18:11 PM
Affiliation

To Whom:

Lets address gillnet mesh size. With gillnets the size of the mesh usually corresponds to the size of the fish targeted. Example: Kenai Red Salmon Plan states no larger than 6" web with the average mesh size being 5 1/4". Pink Salmon Management Plan requires no larger than 4 3/4" mesh. Fisherman that fish the Kasilof Terminal Fishery tend to favor 4 1/2" web. Question: When the gillnetters from Blanchard Line south to Ninilchick recieve EO hours due to the Kasilof management plan and escapement goals. Why are they not required to fish a gear size that targets the EO orders fish? Which would be in the 4 1/2" range. Mesh size has a tremendous effect on the size of fish that is caught by a gillnet. This could be a King savings, no way to determine how much but it would be a savings.



Submitted By
Chris every
Submitted On
1/16/2014 7:52:28 PM
Affiliation

Phone
907-394-0720
Email
cpevery58@hotmail.com
Address
2515 Watergate Way
Kenai, Alaska 99611

Permit Stacking is very useful during hard times.

PU Fishery is out of control, please limit the total effect of this fishery. There needs to be a total catch number assigned to this fishery. According to regulation if the PU fishery effects a preexisting fishery the board is to address the conditions.

I believe that the set gillnet fishery should be uncoupled from the in river fishery. Each fishery should be managed on the fish that is dedicated to them. We as a society need to get over what is in the other guys boat.

We need to limit the number of fish that people can take out of state, when fish are caught in a sport or PU fishery.

Our spawning grounds in all rivers in Alaska should be off limits to fishing until the upper end of the escapement goal has been acheived.

Submitted By
Chris Wichers
Submitted On
1/17/2014 11:31:41 AM
Affiliation

Alaska Board of Fisheries,

My name is Chris Wichers I am writing in response to some of the current proposals to be discussed in the upcoming 2014 board of fish meeting. I have been on the beaches of upper Cook Inlet my entire life, of 27 years, and have fished for 15 of those years. My family started setnetting in 1986 and it never crossed my mind that my older brother (who is in the air force) and I would not take over the family business. It is a wonderful way to raise a family, bringing us closer together and teaching children the value of a hard days work. However, it seems that the life I had been planning for is becoming less possible due to an ever-increasing amount of restrictions put forth on our fishery. This is also a fishery that has been proven to be sustainable without so much pressure from relatively new fisheries. I am opposed to some of the proposals put forth to the committee, which are as follows:

-I am opposed to proposal 103, which does not allow for an upper escapement sockeye goal. This proposal could close setnetters for an entire season if in river king goals are not met and completely over escape another species. This happened in 2012 to my family and others when our sites in upper Cook Inlet north of the Blanchard line were only allowed three days to fish. Sockeye were abundant but we were not allowed to harvest during the peak of the run. Thousands of dollars were lost in expenses alone. It was frustrating because sockeye were available and needed to be harvested been inadequate king salmon numbers forced us to close. Other fisheries were hurt as well, but minimally in comparison. It also makes sense that no ecosystem can support an unlimited escapement without being detrimental to future generations.

-I also strongly oppose proposal 126, which prohibits permit stacking. As I previously stated these are family operations and with increasing restrictions people are forced to find other work leaving an inadequate amount family members to support one permit per individual (i.e. my brother in the Air Force). In the past decent fishing seasons allowed for reliable crew hands that one might trust with a permit transfer. With questionable seasons it is hard enough to find a reliable crew let alone transfer a permit to one of them. The reasoning for proposing this issue is that permits were supposedly sitting idle in the past years are now being fished. This is not the case for most permits; it only puts another restriction on an almost impossibly unpredictable branch of Cook Inlet fishing.

I also urge the committee to uphold proposals that allow ADF&G the ability to manage our precious resource biologically to the best of there ability. Do not allow wording of proposals to bring our great salmon run to an end through over and under fishing. Cook Inlet salmon have been tragically caught in the middle of a civil fish war. I am asking that the committee uphold proposals allowing every user group a share but most importantly protect our salmon for future generations.

Sincerely,

Chris Wichers

Submitted By Chris, White
Affiliation
Phone 3072721337
Email cswwhite1979@gmail.com
Address 40 Road 2CD
Cody, Wyoming 82414

Dear Chair Johnstone and members of the Alaska Board of Fisheries,

King salmon management and conservation needs to be at the top of the list of priorities that you deal with at the next Board of Fisheries meeting for Upper Cook Inlet. No other issue has changed as dramatically as the disappearance of healthy runs of king salmon on the world famous Kenai River and in other rivers in Cook Inlet. Please take time to carefully consider how best manage these iconic fish - your actions will be critical in how well king salmon survive. My opinions on various proposals are as follows.

I have fished all of my life. I live in the mountainous northwest region of Wyoming, a mere 52 miles from the east gate of Yellowstone National Park. I started fly-fishing several years ago, and I have always been a catch and release fisherman. I was fortunate enough to experience the majestic Kenai River and the Alaska landscape in July of 2012. It was one of the most amazing experiences of my life. I fished for kings for 3 days on the Kenai, and I was fortunate to catch the biggest fish of my life. I cannot tell you how excited I was. It was an amazing experience. I could not keep the fish because of a very limited King Salmon run. I was not disappointed, because as I stated earlier, I usually catch and release. I could not imagine Alaska without these majestic creatures swimming in those waters. I think the preservation of these monsters need to be priority one. Not only do they provide subsistence, but they boost economy around Alaska.

It is short-sighted to manage a fully allocated resource with multiple groups wanting fish on the basis of yield instead of maximizing the overall returns. A larger pie allows more fish to be utilized by more users. Put more king salmon into the Kenai River to spawn, not less. Lowering the escapement goals for kings is not a viable or responsible long-term policy.

I support proposals:

- #188: Early-run Spawning Escapement Goal of 5,300-9,000
- #207: Late-run Spawning Escapement Goal of 20,000-40,000

When one group is restricted, all should be restricted. We should place paired restrictions upon sport, personal-use and commercial set net fisheries so that all participants share in the burden of conservation equitably in times of scarcity. Commercial set net fishermen must share in the conservation of Kenai kings; once bait and or harvest restrictions occur in the sport fishery, commercial fishermen must be restricted to regular periods only.

I support proposals:

- #209: Paired restrictions for sport, personal use (dipnet) and set net fisheries
- #211: Allows for incremental gear restrictions for set net fisheries

Alaska residents should not have to buy our fish back from commercial fishermen. There should be increased, meaningful opportunity for sport and personal-use fishing for sockeye on the Kenai River. I support the expanded use of the commercial drift-gillnet fleet to harvest Kenai and Kasilof sockeye in Upper Cook Inlet.

I support proposals:

- #169: Kenai sockeye bag limit starts at 6, not 3
- #161: Allow more sockeye to enter and spawn in the Kenai River
- #112: Raise trigger to open Kasilof beaches to set net fishing
- #156: Mandate Tuesday window closure for Kasilof set net fishing
- #248: Coho bag limit of 3 when set net fishery closes
- #126: Prohibit commercial set net fishermen from stacking (doubling) permits
- #139: Expand time for commercial drift fleet to harvest Kenai and Kasilof sockeye

Kenai River king salmon have a special place in my heart - I care deeply about them. All the best as you work towards effective solutions in ensuring their sustainability as one of the world's greatest sport fisheries. Fish On!

Sincerely,

Chris White

Chris, White
40 Road 2CD
Cody, WY 82414

Email address: cswite1979@gmail.com

Phone number: [\(307\)272-1337](tel:(307)272-1337)

Additional information about me:

I am a Non-Resident Sport Angler





Submitted By
Curtis Green
Submitted On
1/11/2014 6:28:33 PM
Affiliation
None

Phone
907-229-7408
Email
lrondog@rogershsa.com
Address
4000 E Palmdale Dr
Wasilla, Alaska 99654

It is inappropriate for the commercial fishermen to dominate the Cook Inlet salmon fishery to the detriment of the Northern Cook Inlet District. There is no excuse for one person's needs to dominate another person's needs.

if you know something is wrong, nothing makes it right!!!



Submitted By
Daniel
Submitted On
1/11/2014 2:49:25 PM
Affiliation

I would like to see more fish go into the upper Cook Inlet rivers and streams before allowing the commercial fisheries start in The Cook Inlet Region.

Thank You

Daniel K. Shaw



Submitted By
Daniel Norman
Submitted On
12/2/2013 9:16:55 PM
Affiliation

Phone
907-350-0885

Email
akdanimal79@gmail.com

Address
36045 Reef Dr
Kenai , Alaska 99611

It is time we call the guide industry what it is... and that is a commercial fishery using rod and reel. The Kenai river is being raped and pillaged by the sport users. The 26% harvest rate is twice that of the commercial fishery and that does not include the wastage called catch and release.

There needs to be limited entry for guides and kenai river king tags need to be treated as a trophy tag. The board of game has determined that areas of the state are only open to lottery systems in order to preserve trophy moose. Why does the board of fish not do the same with the kenai river. the current practice is unsustainable.

Sustainability! The set net industry has been sustainable for over 100 years, but is now under attack as killing machines. Their harvest rate is 13% or half the sport harvest. It is time to put politics aside and identify the real problem. and that is an interception problem with the trawl fleet catching tens of thousands of king salmon and raping spawning beds.

I support proposals that close the river upstream of the soldotna bridge to all fishing for king salmon. I also support proposals to limit the number of days the river is open to power boats. I believe the drift only fishing days should be 3 out of the 7 days in a week. The kenai river is under assault and it needs to be stopped



Submitted By
Daniel Norman
Submitted On
1/14/2014 9:22:38 PM
Affiliation

Phone
907-350-0885
Email
akdanimal79@gmail.com
Address
36045 Reef Dr
Kenai, Alaska 99611

Board Members,

Thank you for the chance to comment prior to the upcoming BOF meeting.

A few of the proposals that are vital to me in this fishery are proposals, 118, 119, 126, 207, 208, and 219.

I support 118 in order to balance out the inequity among the beaches of the ESSN fishery. 37 miles of beach are fishing south of the Blanchard line while the Kenai section remains closed for up to 18 days. This disparity in fishing time allows the Kasilof section to harvest a large percentage of Kenai kings prior to the Kenai section opening. During these times of low abundance, an extra burden of conservation is placed on the Kenai section. Several of the past years we have had less than 4 fishing periods, while our neighbors to the south have had 10-15 openings.

I strongly support 119 in order to modify the 1% to be enforced by beach. This ties in with my previous argument. The south beaches fish sooner. Why should the closure date for the Kenai section be tied to the Kasilof section. These fisheries have different run timing.

I strongly oppose 126. Permit stacking is vital to my family. I am an active duty soldier and am never guaranteed time off during fishing season. My wife and I both have stacked permits, but if this were to go away then I would have to transfer 2 permits out of my family and then possibly my own permit for the years I am unable to participate. We have made significant business investments into the ruling to allow stacked permits and this would negatively affect my family for no reason. There has been little additional gear added to the fishery since permit stacking was allowed.

I oppose 207 to increase the OEG of late run Kenai kings to 20,000-40,000. The department has made a scientific estimate for the OEG and we should allow this goal to remain in effect until it is proven faulty. This serves no purpose other than to allocate more fish into the river and place an extra burden of conservation upon the ESSN fishery.

I fully support 219 in order to truly protect spawning beds. Various conservation groups have aimed to protect spawning beds, but this proposal is true conservation. There is simply too much pressure on the early run king salmon and they must be protected. With the in-river harvest at twice that of the commercial catch, I think their restrictions need to be twice as severe.

I support any proposal that allows the department the greatest amount of flexibility to harvest sockeye salmon while limiting king harvest. With the times of low abundance I feel as though the ESSN fishery needs to be a focused fishery knowing that there will be severe restrictions and closures. On July 15 last year, I caught 6000 sockeye and zero kings. These are the times when the ESSN fishery needs to be very aggressive and maximize fishing time. Whether it is a Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, or Friday. When the fish show up, the ESSN go in the water with VERY short notice. The herring fishery is on a 30 minute notice. Why can't they set netters? Fish hard for 18 hours, come out for 12-18 and then go back for 12-18 more hours of fishing time. In 2012, we missed the fish by 24 hours and then we were closed for the season. In 2013 the fish showed up on a regular period, but then were gone by Thursday. We should have fished Tuesday night or Thursday to maximize our harvest of the large pulse of sockeye. The kings are not present during these large pulses of sockeye.

I would simply like to add a few comments about 29 mesh setnet gear. I fished 3 out of my 6 nets with 29 mesh gear last season. I saw little to no decline in the sockeye harvest in comparison to 45 meshes, but I did notice less kings. This supports the recent acoustic study that was just released. The kings run deeper than the sockeye. I would guess that 29 mesh nets would still harvest roughly 80% of the sockeye, but only 30% of the kings. I also would like to reference mesh size. The Kasilof sockeye are smaller fish and therefore all nets in the Kasilof section should be required to fish smaller mesh size. At least during EO time for surplus Kasilof sockeye. I think 4.75 inch mesh size is ideal for Kasilof sockeye. This will further reduce the king harvest.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to more conversations on Jan 31.





Submitted By
Daniel Wichers
Submitted On
1/16/2014 8:29:31 AM
Affiliation

Phone
3602016791
Email
wichers.daniel@gmail.com
Address
300 18th St NW
Minot, North Dakota 58703

To the honorable Alaska board of fish members,

My name is Daniel Wichers, I am a Senior Airman currently serving in my fourth of a contracted six year enlistment for the United States Air Force. My concern is in regards to proposal 126, in particular the retraction of the ability to stack permits. Commercial fishing has been a part of my life for as long as I can remember. Nearly every summer was been spent on the beaches of Alaska; watching, learning, assisting where I could as a child, and eventually becoming a captain of my own small vessel. I have always felt that fishing would be our family legacy, that I and my brother would inherit the business and one pass it on to our children. I took a break from the industry to see the world and serve my country, but when my commitment to the military is fulfilled I have every intention to return, and pick up where I left off. The continued allowance of permit stacking would ensure that the permit I previously held will still be there for me when I get back.

I humbly thank the board of fish members for taking into consideration my small story, and for all their hard work and dedication to ensuring that this fishery continues.

Respectfully,

Daniel Wichers SrA USAF



Submitted By
Dave Atcheson
Submitted On
1/16/2014 6:15:08 PM
Affiliation

Phone
907-398-4216
Email
daveatcheson@hotmail.com
Address
P.O. Box 145
Sterling, Alaska 99672

Prop. 190, 191 Oppose. Eliminating the slot limit and liberalizing a resource that is having a difficult time making minimum escapements does not make sense.

192, 193 Support. Makes sense on a conservation basis.

202 Support. This makes sense as a conservation measure, with regard to declining numbers of Chinook spawning in Slikok Creek.

220 Support, as this approach would help conserve Chinook by providing a spawning sanctuary and allow for genetic diversity.

237, 238, 239 Support, Highly support. Drift boat use on the Kenai R. is much more "habitat friendly", and the large number of motorized vessels are responsible for much of the turbidity and erosion issues we are now facing on the Kenai River. Additional drift boat use will also serve to protect our spawning and rearing habitat areas. The use of drift boats, while a pleasant quiet activity, will also have less negative impacts on the resource.

240 Oppose. Why would anyone choose to eliminate perhaps the only fishery on the Kenai that does NOT damage habitat?

242, 243 Support. These proposals would limit damage from boat wakes, engine exhaust, and would limit stress on spawning salmon.

245. Support. There are plenty of opportunities to fish red salmon below the power lines, this would create and maintain a world-class trout fishery.

252, 253. Support. Makes sense to protect spawning trout.

259 Oppose. Strongly Oppose. This is an assault on the private angler. Terrible idea!

260 Oppose. Another assault on the private angler.

Thank you.



Submitted By
David Wichers
Submitted On
1/16/2014 11:27:32 PM
Affiliation

Phone
907-283-5780

Email
dnjwichers@gmail.com

Address
PO Box 1728
Kenai, Alaska 99611

~~TO: Alaska Board of Fish Members

My name is Dave Wichers, I have been an eastside setnet fisherman since 1986, and I fish in the K-Beach area north of the Blanchard line. I raised my family in the summer on the beaches of Cook Inlet. It was always my hope to hand our fishing operation over to my two sons. My younger son is still fishing with us, however my older son decided to join the military for a 6 year service term. His intent is to come back to fishing when his service is up. Permit stacking has helped us to keep the permits in our family name while he is away. Therefore, I oppose proposal #126 that would eliminate permit stacking. In my opinion, this is another way for the commercial sports fishing association to try and make it difficult for the setnet fishing families of Cook Inlet. If there is concern of over harvest, why is there not a limit on the commercial guides on the Kenai River or limits on the number of dipnet fisherman that can fish the Kenai River? Both of these user groups have grown at a tremendous rate. The Cook Inlet setnet permits are limited entry, most of the permits are owned and operated by families and have been in their families for many years. The north of the Blanchard line K-Beach setnet fishery has given up a great amount over the years, in 2012 our area fished only one 1 period in July and 2 periods in August. That being said, I support proposals 116 which would eliminate the 1% rule in August. I also support proposals 115 & 118 which could allow some fishing time to our beach. I strongly oppose proposals 103 which prioritizes achieving lower goals over exceeding upper goals and 207 with regards to King Salmon OEG. I support proposals 166 to eliminate windows and 236 to protect in river habitat.

Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns.

Sincerely,
Dave Wichers



Submitted By
Denise Caposey
Submitted On
1/11/2014 2:43:03 PM
Affiliation
School Teacher

Phone
9079833110

Email
dcaposey@gmail.com

Address
PO Box 63
1.3 Mile Dyea Road
Skagway, Alaska 99840

As an educator in Alaska, I ask that the State Board of Fish and Game please consider the future generations of Alaskans when planning for King Salmon regulations. I applaud the conservation efforts and research that goes into setting limits, but would like to see more fairness in the Sport vs Commercial Fisheries.

Alaskans have traditionally relied on Salmon as a staple and the Kenai Kings need protection as their numbers are dropping dramatically. I would like to see more research in ocean studies to determine the impact that commercial fishing as well as resource development is having on our fisheries.

Sincerely,

Denise Caposey, Skagway, Alaska



Submitted By
Dennis Effenbeck
Submitted On
1/17/2014 11:34:31 AM
Affiliation
set netter

Phone
907-394-0944
Email
dennis-of-ak1@hotmail.com
Address
37275 moser st.
soldotna, Alaska 99669

Proposal #219) I agree the Spawning bed's need to be protected. Guide's have been fishing on these ground's for ever and we need to stop this abuse of the resource.

Proposal #126) No , I don't agree with this. The use of more than one permit is essential to me staying in business.

I would like to fish when the fish are available not on scheduled fish day's. The king salmon is the main concern of everyone, and the fact's are the King salmon do not run in the big run's of Red salmon. Allowing set netter's to fish for Abundance rather than set days is the most effective way to harvest Red salmon with the least amount of King salmon harvested. Dureing years of low abundance of King's, restrict set netter's to two net's or change the mesh size to say 29 mesh and let us fish when the run's are on the beach instead of closeing us down. I have went to shallow gear and I catch just as many red's as I did with 45 mesh net's and I catch less king's. It's also a benefit to the fishermen to use shallow gear. You have less hang up's on rock's, you don't have to Swing your gear up's for high water tide's, and it's easier to work the gear dureing rough weather.

As for the King Salmon , we need to start treating the king as a trophy fish, it need's to be on a drawing type permit just like other big game/ trophy's. The guide's have had there way with this Fish for to long . We need to protect the King Salmon in there spawning bed's. I am tired of hearing the guide's are losing income because of the king salmon closures. These guide's make money from every species in the river not just from one . (king) They even make income off the dip net fishery. As a set netter I target one species, the Red Salmon. When I catch a King Salmon, it's NOT a bycatch. I am entitled to catch the king, I just don't target them. It's time the State of Alaska does what is best for the King Salmon and not worry about the guide's income. They have plenty of resource's beside's the King Salmon. I would personally like to see the Kenai River shut down to all King Salmon fishing for 5 year's to see what kind of impact the sportsman actually have on the King. The ADFG could save the King Salmon if they took a stronger stance on saving the species and less concern with the guide's greed to exploit the King Salmon.



Submitted By
Dennis Randa
Submitted On
1/11/2014 8:52:25 AM
Affiliation

Phone
907-252-1289
Email
denrand@randafishing.com
Address
P.O. Box 3055
Soldotna , Alaska 99669

Comment to the Alaska Board of Fishery regarding Kenai River Proposals:

- 220 (establish Chinook salmon spawning sanctuary)
- 242 (restrict motor size to 10 hp or less)
- 243 (eliminate outboard motor exhaust discharge into water)

My name is Dennis Randa. I have resided on the Kenai Peninsula since 1974 when I moved here from Oregon. I worked as a journeyman process instrument technician until discovering I could make a living indulging my childhood obsession: fishing. I started guiding anglers in 1984 using a drift boat on the Kenai and Kasilof Rivers. I also began entertaining my quest for knowledge about the fishery resource and the management surrounding it. I worked for over 10 years on the Kenai River Special Management Area citizen's advisory board. I spent 12 years on the Cook Inlet Region Citizens Advisory Council's environmental monitoring committee. In the early 1990s I lobbied for monies and successfully conducted 2 water quality analysis efforts to establish a data base for the Kenai River.

The Kenai River was established by the Alaska Legislature as a unit of the state park system in 1984; Alaska Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation (DPOR) was directed to protect and preserve the fishery resource of the Kenai River. Main problem (apparent) was the overlapping authority of Alaska Department of Fish and Game Habitat Division (Habitat). It was intended for the agencies to work together to avert conflict, but that didn't happen, court action, and agency infighting resulted eventually with DPOR put in their place as an agency of social authority left to protect the riparian areas of the river above the mean high water line. Water the essential fishery habitat was left to an ineffective Habitat Division with restricted authority and budgets.

Presently fishery managers (ADF&G) have limited authority and money. Often these folks fall short of any ability to address those issues that fall outside of their (legal) scope leading to failure to assess important causal sources which effect to drive the resource into decline. Whether it be failing to control point and non-point sources of contamination which effect the biological chain of life from which the fishery derives sustenance. Or from failing to understand the implication of human behavior such as the accumulative impacts of over 700 outboard motor's exhaust being vented into the water directly over the heads of fish endeavoring to procreate. And what of the vagaries associated with normal fish behavior being disrupted by dragging hooks through the fish as they go about procreation in what, before our entry into the equation, would normally be a quiet natural habitat where their ancestors evolved essentially as the top predator in that watery food chain. Now they find themselves in an inescapable environment where there are outboard motor driven predator operated boats swarming over them daily without any sanctuary from those pressures.

While I was conceiving and drafting these proposals my goal was to reduce the chaos of what has become a play ground for people and not a habitat for a fishery. And I was very aware of the implication of allocation actions. My intention is not to take away access from anyone but to alter the behavior of the angling public and reduce stress on the fish.

It is from my experience and a desire to prevent what now seems to be an inescapable parasitic human relationship with wild Chinook salmon that I crafted three proposals I believe are essential for the continued well being of wild Kenai River Chinook salmon.

Proposal 220 is intended to provide spawning sanctuary below the Soldotna Bridge by closing every other mile to angling for Chinook salmon. . Dept data suggests this area is historically 150% more productive per mile than above the bridge. but present management



essentially opens this entire area for harvesting Chinook salmon. These fish deserve sanctuary protection areas with a minimum of un-natural disturbance without which they won't be able to replicate those runs we have come to depend on. There is a genetic component to this as well, by not providing protections in the lower Kenai we risk eliminating genetic components contributed by those areas. I am proposing the board close every other mile to angling for Chinook salmon.

Proposal 242 would restrict the horsepower used by boaters on the Kenai River to 10 horsepower or less. Intent of this action is to alter the behavior of anglers and reduce the impacts of those activities on the fish. Salmon occupying the river do not have a choice of avoiding exposure to this what can only be described as chaos of boats churning the water as well as 'noise pollution' introduced into their environment. Arguably motor noise is disruptive to a creature whose most sensitive organ is their lateral line system, an organ which sensitivity enables them to sense when predators are about and also to sense the presence of prey, again arguably their most critical sensory organ. An argument raised against this is the boat wake issue. I believe, and this is after 30 years of observing boat wake impacts from the guide's seat of a McKenzie rowing dory, that slow moving low energy boat wakes do not directly impact the river's banks and cause very little disturbance. Especially when compared with high speed, high energy boat wakes directly impacting the shore. This will in effect make the Kenai a one way river but it does not disallow using the motor to move up stream. I used a 9.9 hp four stroke outboard for guided fishing on the Kenai for over 10 years, I only used the larger motor when moving longer distances up and down the river. I never felt that a fish was lost or a client suffered from using the smaller motor to fish. A boater can motor up river with a 10 hp, it is their decision on how much time they would invest to do so. There aren't any places other than the upper Kenai Canyon (closed to motors) and Nap Towne Rapids that would preclude moving upstream using a 10 hp motor

Proposal 243 would establish a time after which we no longer introduce our outboard motor exhaust directly into the river. Sound has been determined to be a stressor. When evaluating stress on humans and other animals it is found that pregnant females suffer high birth mortality and low birth weight. Why would stress not have similar affects upon our fishes? There have been many studies conducted to evaluate the impacts of sound on marine animals, none of which have found sound to be harmless and most often determined to be very detrimental to these creatures. Is there any reason to consider otherwise the impacts of sound on creatures in fresh water environs? Why do we continue to treat so disrespectfully a creature like the Kenai Chinook salmon we claim to value so highly?

I present these proposals hoping we can sustain a fishery in an urban area such as has developed along the Kenai River. Sustaining the riparian (near shore grass/brush) areas is not sufficient to protect a Chinook salmon fishery that is under siege from increasing population wanting access and opportunity to harvest these fish. Managers are apparently unable to deal with the accumulative impacts of this parasitic siege behavior. If we cannot find a way to achieve a more "symbiotic relationship" the alternative appears to be complete closure of the fishery after which, assuming the fishery recovers, we reopen it to the same management methods and means that are now failing, thus driving a cyclical boom/bust that cannot be good in any way.

It is a conservative approach that would ask those using the river for fishing and other activities to be prepared to substantiate their activity not be harmful to the fishery's long term viability. Presently we are allowing behaviors assuming they are not harmful. I believe this is folly and must not continue. Considering the challenges these fish are facing now on the high seas from incidental commercial taking and possibly poor environmental conditions we need to provide the Chinook salmon (indeed all salmon) returning to the Kenai River with the best possible conditions within which to procreate.

Finally, if we are not prepared to take extraordinary means to protect the Kenai River Chinook salmon we do not deserve them. We must honor these wild Kenai River Chinook salmon and the habitat in which they reside and from which they evolved. It appears to me we are not doing either.

Thank you for considering my proposals.



Submitted By
Don Johnson
Submitted On
1/15/2014 9:09:31 AM
Affiliation

Phone
907 262 7893
Email
ccpwow@gci.net
Address
36160 Schultz Street
Soldotna, Alaska 99669

Alaska Board of Fisheries, We appear to have very little information regarding where our Kenai River king salmon migrate to out in the ocean, I therefore have been requesting that our ADF&G establish a juvenal king tagging program to study these migration routes but the ADF&G has informed me that no such fish tagging technology exists. I have located archival fish tagging technology which appears capable of this tagging and study process at a business called Star-Oddi. Star-Oddi is located in Iceland. This tagging technology appears to use the earth's magnetic field along with internal navigation to plot and locate fish migration routes. I am asking that the board request that the ADF&G immediately investigate this technology and determine if may be applied to tracking Kenai River, king salmon. I have listed below some of the magnetic archival fish tagging technology information and internet links. If you have additional questions please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you, Don Johnson Soldotna, Alaska 99669 ccpwow@gci.net 907 262 7893 -----
----- DST magnetic - compass, tilt, temp & depth logger Magnetic, tilt, depth & temperature Overview Key features Earth's magnetic field strength data displayed in addition to compass heading, tilt (3-D axis), acceleration, depth and temperature Used for geolocation analysis of fish and for monitoring movements of buoys and underwater gear Available with an adjustable housing that keeps the logger in a fixed position inside and allows for more flexible mounting options as well as protecting the logger Available with a tag holder kit when used in fish tagging projects Available with various pressure ranges up to 3000 m Description The DST magnetic is a small data logger / archival tag that measures and records earth's magnetic field strength (in three directions), tilt (in three directions), acceleration, temperature and depth. From the magnetic field strength measurements a relative magnetic field vector is calculated, which can be put into models to find longitude and latitude of the tagged fish. It is also a useful tool for recording compass directions. DST magnetic is also used in studies of various gear and equipment. Measurements are stored in the logger's internal memory with a real time clock reference for each measurement. The advantage of the DST magnetic is that it has the third vector for magnetic field strength (3-D magnetic). DST magnetic has full compass heading tilt correction so accuracy is maintained when tilting away from its horizontal position. When used on fish the tag can either be implanted or attached externally, for studying their habitat movements and migration routes. For external tagging Star-Oddi can provide a specially designed DST fastener kit LINKS Research papers using Star-Oddi sensors - <http://star-oddi.com/Home/Aquatic-Fisheries-Research/Scientific-Papers/> Sensors, DST and data loggers for industry research & monitoring - Star-Oddi You are here : Products > Products DST magnetic - compass, tilt, temp & depth logger Key features Earth's magnetic field strength data displayed in addition to compass heading, tilt (3-D axis), acceleration, depth and temperature Used for geolocation analysis of fish and for monitoring movements of buoys and underwater gear Available with an adjustable housing that keeps the logger in a fixed position inside and allows for more flexible mounting options as well as protecting the logger Available with a tag holder kit when used in fish tagging projects Available with various pressure ranges up to 3000 m <http://www.star-oddi.com/products/default.aspx?sensor=Magnetic%20field%20strength%20%28Compass%29> -----
----- Star-Oddi Skeidaras 12, 210 Gardabaer, Iceland Tel: +354 5336060 www.star-oddi.com baldur@star-oddi.com Tel: +354 533 6060 Fax: +354 533 6069 <http://www.star-oddi.com/Contact/>



Submitted By
Dwight Kramer
Submitted On
1/15/2014 8:13:50 AM
Affiliation
KAFC

Phone
907-283-1054
Email
dwimar@gci.net
Address
230 N Fern St.
Kenai, Alaska 99611

Save The Kings by Les Palmer Peninsula Clarion 11-8-2013

By [Les Palmer](#)

During the 2013 fishing season, when both sport and commercial fishing were restricted to ensure that enough king salmon made it up the river to spawn, the importance of healthy king salmon runs should've become clear to all concerned.

To me, this was the year that realization really hit home that virtually everyone living on the Kenai Peninsula depends to some degree on healthy runs of this one salmon, the king. Whether other salmon runs are weak or strong, life goes on with some semblance of normalcy. But when king runs are weak, nobody's happy.

Ensuring that every river gets adequate spawning escapements for the five species of salmon has become a nightmare for fishery managers and the Alaska Board of Fisheries. Due to the nature of commercial fishing in Cook Inlet, where fishing is done with gill nets on mixed stocks, king salmon are taken incidentally to fishing for other salmon species, mainly sockeye. In order to provide adequate spawning escapement of kings, fishery managers sometimes find it necessary to restrict all fishing, not only in-river sport fishing for kings, but also Cook Inlet gill-net fishing for sockeyes. This causes financial distress to some fishermen, who have come to depend on fishing for a livelihood, and anguish to the tens of thousands of us who enjoy fishing for and eating king salmon.

Once in every three years, the Board of Fisheries sits down and tries to make things better for salmon in Upper Cook Inlet by coming up with new regulations. They're doing it again early next year. Browsing through the proposals for new regulations they'll be considering for the Kenai River, I came across some real doozies. They include everything from banning fishing from boats from 10:00 p.m. to 4:00 a.m. in May, June and July, to dumping in hatchery kings. The Kenai already has so many regulations, you need to have a lawyer with you to fish it. I shudder to think that the fish board might approve a proposal that will do little or no good, and that might even do harm.

However, among the dozens of proposals, a few would actually improve the lot of the river's king salmon. One such is Proposal No. 219, by the Kenai Area Fisherman's Coalition. This group's idea: Close sections of the Kenai River to sport fishing for king salmon during July. "Spawning Conservation Area 1" would be between the Moose River and Skilak Lake, and would be closed to fishing for king salmon from July 1 through July 31. The primary purpose of creating this closed area would be to protect the spawning kings of the early run, numbers of which have severely declined severely in recent years.

According to the proposal, "Funny River weir data indicates about a 70% decline since 2006 and Slikok Creek weir data shows an 80% decline since 2004 with very few females returning. We believe the main stem component of the ER may be in even more peril because they enter the fishery in May and June and are vulnerable to harvest longer than any other segment of the Kenai River king salmon population."

Present regulations allow anglers to fish in known spawning areas, while the salmon are spawning. Spawning salmon that are paired up and highly territorial when on their spawning redds are at their most vulnerable. They'll chase anything that approaches them, even something as small as a tiny, artificial salmon egg. These spawning areas are well known, especially by a few guides and local residents, and they are fished hard. Sad to say, 60-pound-plus kings in their purple-red spawning colors are considered "trophies" by anglers who don't know any better, or who think any large fish gives them bragging rights, no matter how or when it's fooled into biting.

"Spawning Conservation Area 2," from the Sterling Highway Bridge in Soldotna to the Moose River, would be closed to fishing for king salmon from July 10 through July 31. Says the proposal about Area 2: "The Area 2 closure would protect both [early-run] and [late-run] fish that spawn in that area. Roughly 80% of the [early run] are tributary spawners and they are protected once they reach the tributary areas, however, almost all of the [late run] are main stem spawners and there is currently no spawning sanctuary area afforded to them."

In the past decade or so, I've noticed fewer and fewer kings rolling in holes on the Kenai where I used to see "colored-up" kings roll a lot, while waiting to spawn. While this sort of observation means little or nothing to biologists and fishery managers, it means something to me and others who spend time on the river. It means there aren't as many kings as there used to be. Whatever the reason, fewer kings are surviving to spawn.

Proposal 219 would definitely and significantly increase the number of king salmon that survive to spawn in the Kenai River. I'm all for it.



Submitted By
Dwight Kramer
Submitted On
1/13/2014 9:11:10 AM
Affiliation
KAFC

Phone
907-283-1054
Email
dwimar@gci.net
Address
230 N Fern St.
Kenai, Alaska 99611

Kenai Kings Need More In-river Spawning Protection

Dwight Kramer - Alaska Dispatch - Dec. 15, 2013

In recent years we have seen a troubling pattern of near record low returns of both early and late run Kenai River Chinook salmon. We believe the declines in statewide Chinook fisheries are largely due to marine survival issues, however, we also feel that part of our Kenai River decline can be linked to in-river harvest patterns, fishing on middle river mainstem spawning fish throughout July, insufficient spawning area protections, selective harvest of our larger age-class fish, and multiple years of over-harvest of the population due to biased high sonar counts.

History seems pretty clear that factors such as population growth, increased use, commercialization and development make it difficult for us to sustain indigenous wild Chinook salmon populations. Unless we alter our behavior we will join the long list of streams dependent on hatchery-produced fish. We will not be able to sustain the high-density fishery that has developed on the Kenai unless we consider a more conservationist approach of protecting production to secure future run strength sustainability.

In order to provide for recovery and certainty in future Kenai River King salmon production, Kenai Area Fisherman's Coalition, a private angler "Joe Fisherman" group, has forwarded proposal #219 to the Board of Fisheries (BOF) for consideration during their February Upper Cook Inlet (UCI) BOF meeting.

This proposal would allow the season to start normally so that everyone along the river has an opportunity to fish for Kings, but then as the season progresses two permanent spawning conservation areas would occur, in a timely fashion, as fish move upriver to the middle section. The lower river would remain open throughout the entire season for a vibrant sport fishery to continue.

The first, Spawning Conservation Area 1, would commence starting July 1 and would close the waters from the Moose River to Skilak Lk. for fishing for King salmon. This closure is designed mainly to protect Early Run (ER) Chinook stocks which have seen a much steeper decline than the Late Run (LR). Funny River weir data indicates about a 70% decline since 2006 and Slikok Creek weir data shows an 80% decline since 2004 with very few females returning. We believe the mainstem component of the ER may be in even more peril because they enter the fishery in May and June and are vulnerable to harvest longer than any other segment of the Kenai R. King salmon population. They are also the largest fish in the ER and have been targeted throughout the years by selective harvest.

ADF&G research indicates that the median spawning date for ER mainstem fish is around July 20. This means that they are the only segment of our Chinook return that isn't afforded protection during spawning. All of our tributary fish are protected once they reach the sanctuary areas of the tributary mouths and the LR Chinook don't spawn until around the middle of August and the season closes July 31 so they are protected. We even have a spawning closure period for rainbow trout.

The, Spawning Conservation Area 2, would commence July 10, from the Sterling Hwy. Bridge in Soldotna upstream to Moose River. This closure would protect both ER and LR fish that spawn in that area. Almost all LR Kings are mainstem spawners and there is currently no spawning sanctuary area afforded to them. This closure would provide an area of certainty for LR spawning production.

We believe these types of pro-active conservation measures are both prudent and necessary as we face the future of a growing population with increased demands on our King salmon resources. This more conservative management approach reduces several current aspects of our fishery that continue to jeopardize our ability to protect the quality and sustainability of our King salmon stocks.

1) Selective harvest of our largest fish would be greatly reduced because of these protective spawning areas. Recent data suggests there may be a link between multiple generations of selective harvest practices causing a shift in the genetic character of the stocks, resulting in a general reduction in the size of fish because of a shift in the age / sex composition of returning adults. Additionally, smaller returning fish producing fewer eggs reduce the aggregate spawning contributions and future recruitment. Researchers also suggest that improvements would be slow to materialize and require multiple generations within a new selection regime.

2) Catch and release (C&R) mortality would also be reduced by establishment of these spawning conservation areas because fishing for Kings would no longer occur in these important spawning areas. C&R mortality occurs often in our fisheries because we sort through a lot of fish looking for the big "bragging rights" and trophy fish. It also occurs more often lately by regulation when our fisheries are limited to C&R restrictions. Research also indicates that there are several negative factors that can occur when fish are disturbed on their spawning

beds and some released fish are stressed to the point that they may not spawning at all.



3) Sonar counting irregularities would not matter as much if we had established spawning protected areas. So into question what our actual mainstem spawning component really is on an annual basis. Until we can have more confidence in sonar reliability it is paramount that we operate on a more conservative path. Our inability to accurately count our Kings by the use of sonar and test netting are well documented and bring into question our production models. We have changed our Kenai king escapement goals four times in the last decade alone.

Our organization believes this will be the most important Kenai River proposal before the BOF at their upcoming UCI meeting. It presents us with a real opportunity to change our management philosophy on the Kenai to a strategy that offers the best chance at recovering our King populations, bring back the larger age class fish and provide long-term sustainability for future generations to enjoy.

We don't know what the future holds for our King salmon populations in the marine environment so it becomes our responsibility to provide this resource with the best options we can for in-river survival and future propagation.

Submitted By
Dwight Kramer
Submitted On
1/10/2014 8:25:57 AM
Affiliation
KAFC

Phone
907-283-1054
Email
dwimar@gci.net
Address
230 N Fern St.
Kenai, Alaska 99611

The human element

Posted: January 9, 2014 - 4:19pm Peninsula Clarion

By [Les Palmer](#)

With an important Board of Fisheries meeting in the offing, I feel the urge to comment on some nagging king salmon issues.

In recent years, we've seen what happens when king salmon returns to Cook Inlet are poor. Virtually every fishery is adversely affected. In 2013, anyone with an interest in either sport or commercial salmon fishing lost fishing opportunity. The cultural and economic impacts to Kenai Peninsula communities were staggering.

I believe we'll eventually learn that the low king salmon returns we're now experiencing are of a cyclical nature, or due to something else in the vast and complex marine environment, mostly beyond human control. The same or similar cycles have no doubt occurred many times in the past. What's different about this time — and what makes this issue so complicated and frustrating — is the human element.

In the early 1800s, humans had little impact on Pacific salmon. We hadn't yet blocked, diverted or polluted the streams that salmon require for breeding and rearing. In the ocean, we hadn't yet invented the gear and means to efficiently locate, harvest, store and ship salmon. The salmon's coastal habitat was mainly uninhabited, and humans had little effect on salmon or their fresh-water habitats. If salmon could talk, they'd probably say these were the good-old days. Those days were numbered when the first salmon canneries were established in the Northwest, in the 1860s.

We've learned a lot about salmon — what's left of them — since the 1860s, but there still is much we don't know. This might be a good thing. If we knew everything about salmon, we'd be trying to find a way to further "optimize" the harvest, so we could kill as many as possible, or so we could hook and play with as many as possible.

Regarding the Cook Inlet drainage, the human element has dramatically changed in the past few decades. There now are far more of us vying for salmon in both the marine and fresh-water salmon fisheries than there were only a few decades ago. What's worse, there will be far more of us in the not-so-distant future.

What we actually have is a people problem that's being framed as a king salmon problem. Call it what you will, the only sure fix is to reduce human impact on Alaska's salmon.

There should be fewer permits and less gear fishing commercially in Cook Inlet. A reduction of permits and gear should've been done years ago. A buy-back should be done now, while the state has the ability. What better use of the Permanent Fund than to protect our most valuable renewable resource?

There should be less commercial use of not only the Kenai River, but of all Alaska's waters. Sport fishing on the Kenai has become industrialized to the point where it's destructive. Selling someone a fishing trip on a "world-class" river is a joke that's less funny — and less profitable — with each passing year.

The number of guides and rental boats on the Kenai River should be limited. Now, with the numbers reduced due to poor king returns, would be a good time to do it. Like the intense commercial fishing in Cook Inlet, guides put more fishing pressure on the Kenai River than this river can tolerate. The public would support this action, and the remaining guides would be better off for it.

State, federal and private funds should be used to make the Kenai River more drift-boat friendly, and the number of power boats on the river at any one time should be reduced and limited. No one can say with a straight face that salmon thrive with power boats running over their spawning grounds day and night.

While it may be arguable whether reducing human activity in the Cook Inlet drainage will help restore the area's king salmon runs from their present dismal state, the positive effects of such action would reach far into the future. I would hope that lawmakers and others with the ability to shape the destiny of Alaska's salmon will look forward to this future and act accordingly.

Les Palmer can be reached at les.palmer@rocketmail.com.



PC 355
2 of 2

Submitted By
Dwight Kramer
Submitted On
1/8/2014 8:24:51 AM
Affiliation
KAFC

Phone
907-283-1054
Email
dwimar@gci.net
Address
230 N Fern St
Kenai, Alaska 99611

Another Drift Only Day

Peninsula Clarion Dec. 19, 2013

By [Les Palmer](#)

Right after “too many guides,” the most common complaint I hear about king salmon fishing on the lower Kenai River is that it’s “too crowded.”

Other than having a poor run of kings, the only way to reduce crowding is to allow fewer boats on the lower river in July, when use is heaviest.

The number of boats could be controlled by requiring a permit to fish from a boat.

It wouldn’t be the first time permits were used to control boat traffic. Part of Oregon’s popular Rogue River has been regulated by federal permit for years, with lottery winners getting the permits. The part of the upper Kenai River that runs through federal land is currently regulated by federal permit, the purpose of which is to limit commercial use, including fishing guides. To date, the feds haven’t required non-commercial users to have permits, but it could happen.

However, requiring a permit to fish from a boat for Kenai kings would be a major inconvenience for users. If a healthy run of kings came in one year, permits would be greatly in demand the next. Competition for permits would be fierce. If you wanted to take Uncle Joe fishing on the Kenai when he comes to visit next summer, you might end up having to take him elsewhere.

A less onerous way to reduce crowding on the Kenai would be to add another day of non-motorized fishing to the existing “drift-only” Mondays in May, June and July. Anyone who is on or near the Kenai on Mondays during these months will attest that the river is definitely different on the days when fishing from motorized boats isn’t allowed. The river is far less crowded. Other benefits are that boat wakes, boat traffic, engine noise and water pollution are reduced. When sockeyes are running, some motorized traffic occurs on Mondays, but it’s nothing compared to the other six days of the week.

I bring this up now because the Alaska Board of Fisheries will be considering proposals to add another “drift-only” day when the board meets in January. Proposal 237 by the City of Kenai and Proposal 238 by the Kenai Area Fisherman’s Coalition propose like solutions to the issues of turbidity, erosion, safety and fishing pressure on the Kenai. Although guided fishing from boats isn’t allowed on “drift-only” Mondays, both proposals would allow it on “drift-only” Thursdays.

I heartily support adding another “drift-only” day. In the interest of full disclosure, I don’t own a drift boat, and I fish from one only on rare occasions. I’d likely be one of the people who don’t fish for kings on “drift-only” days.



Submitted By
Dwight Kramer
Submitted On
1/4/2014 1:52:15 PM
Affiliation
KAFC

Phone
907-283-1054
Email
dwimar@gci.net
Address
230 N Fern St
Kenai, Alaska 99611

King of a dream

January 2, 2014 – Peninsula Clarion By Les Palmer

On Tuesday night of this week, New Year's Eve, I caught a 55-pound king salmon. The event was so exciting that I woke up and couldn't get back to sleep.

I've dreamed about fish and fishing before, but this time was different. It didn't involve fishing, hooking or boating a big fish. Instead, it was only about having a king salmon in my possession, taking it home and eating it.

It's likely that I dreamed up this fish because I couldn't have it in the real world. The only king salmon I caught in 2013 was a small "feeder" king, taken in March on a charter boat out of Homer. Like most other people who were concerned about the poor runs of Kenai River kings in recent years, I didn't fish for them in 2013.

Thinking about this dream on the day after, I realized that it focused on what was most important to me about salmon fishing: the use of salmon for food. It's outrageous that salmon can be caught and released just for "sport," killing about one for every 15 caught while having fun and getting a photo of a "trophy" fish. And it's even more outrageous that catch-and-release of kings is allowed during runs when it's doubtful that the spawning escapement is adequate to sustain the stock.

Trouble is, a large and influential group not only wants to be able to catch and release king salmon, but needs to do so. In the 1970s, I considered commercial fishermen to be the main adversaries of those of us who like to fish with rod and reel, but no more. The biggest threat now is the sport-fishing industry, as represented by Kenai River guides and the Kenai River Sportfishing Association (KRSA).

So many guides now depend upon the Kenai River, they seriously impact other fisheries whenever the Kenai is restricted. Without catch-and-release fishing, fishing guides have little to sell their clients during years of poor runs. In years when an insufficient number of kings enter the Kenai to ensure an adequate spawning escapement, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game issues Emergency Orders. "EOs" that close the Kenai to king salmon fishing and EOs that allow only catch-and-release fishing make the fishery unpredictable. When it's unpredictable for two or three years in a row, guides start looking for other ways to make a living.

In 2002, Kenai River guides and the KRSA tried to ban all harvest, making the early run exclusively a "fun" fishery. "Catch-and-release only" for early-run Kenai River kings came very close to becoming regulation. Instead, with an aim to make the fishery more "stable and predictable," the Board of Fisheries slashed nearly all of the early-run harvest. Together with a non-retention, 40- to 55-inch "slot limit," the board slashed the annual early-run harvest to one-sixth of what it had been in prior years, from an average of 6,900 fish to less than 1,200. This action marked the first time ever that a traditional Alaskan salmon harvest fishery had been replaced by a catch-and-release fishery. This regulation triggered years of conflict and divisiveness in the community, some of which lingers still.

At the February 2002 fish-board meeting, KRSA board member and fishing guide Pat Carter told the Anchorage Daily News, "The Kenai is so special it shouldn't just be treated as another meat fishery."

In the Clarion (Feb. 15, 2002), KRSA executive director Brett Huber said about the Kenai's king salmon fishery, "Perhaps it's time to treat this like other trophy fisheries, like we do with rainbow trout."

When local residents became fully aware of the ramifications of the new regulation, that the fast-growing sport-fishing industry was now powerful enough to sway the board into making catch-and-release a priority for king salmon, they became deeply concerned. If the board would do this on the Kenai River, they could do it anywhere. Were we now going to start managing Alaska's salmon like trophy trout, just catching and releasing them for sport? If so, as guide numbers increased, all accessible salmon fishing could end up being managed not for a harvest, but exclusively for fun fishing.

Those of us who consider the catching and eating of salmon almost a holy ritual drew a line in the sand. Realizing that the guides were in it

mainly for the money, and that state bureaucrats weren't going to help, we set out to change the regulation and opportunity for harvest. It took several months, but we eventually convinced the fish board that most Alaskans wanted salmon on their dinner table more than they wanted Kenai River fishing guides to have stable and predictable jobs.



Eleven years have passed since the guides and KRSA tried to make playthings of Kenai River kings. The danger that they could again convince the fish board to do this is greater than ever. If they decide to try when the board meets in Anchorage later this month, they should remember what happened in 2002. "Joe Fisherman" won't idly sit by while the industry converts the Kenai River king salmon fishing to "catch-and-release only." Taking home a king salmon should be more than just a dream.

Submitted By
Dwight Kramer
Submitted On
12/28/2013 7:43:30 AM
Affiliation
KAFC

Phone
907-283-1054
Email
dwimar@gci.net
Address
230 N Fern St.
Kenai, Alaska 99611

Circle Hooks & Barbless Hooks

Peninsula Clarion Oct. 17, 2013

By [Les Palmer](#)

My recent column about proposals for regulating fish hooks generated some reader response.

Pete Rosko, the avid fisherman and fishing guide who invented the Crippled Herring, Kandlefish and Sonic BaitFish jigs, thinks there ought to be a federal law requiring that all hooks being fished with natural bait be single and barbless.

Corey Wilcox wrote that he has been fishing with circle hooks for sockeye salmon for years. He claims that he rarely hooks a sockeye anywhere other than in the mouth, maybe one or two per season.

As anyone who fishes for sockeyes with hook and line soon learns, they seldom bite. This reluctance on the part of the fish poses a dilemma for anglers. To legally harvest a sockeye with sport-fishing gear in freshwater, it must be hooked in the mouth. Anglers catch most sockeyes by "lining"—pulling a line through the fishes' mouths, sometimes called "flossing." While trying to catch a limit, it's common for anglers to snag several fish. I've had days when I hooked a dozen or so reds, and not one was hooked in the mouth.

"Some people have expressed concern they won't hook as many fish with circle hooks, and I have to agree that they're correct," Wilcox says. "You won't hook fish in the belly, back, tail, or dorsal fin, so yes, that's correct. However, I haven't failed to obtain a limit whenever the fish were present in decent numbers."

Circle hooks don't require "setting," and tend to hook fish in the corner of the jaw. This is another good thing about them when used for sockeye fishing, he says.

"Because I'm not 'setting' the hook, there are less projectiles flying around the airspace on the river, which I believe is something we all benefit from," he says.

After an incident that happened to him this summer, Wilcox has crimped the barbs on his circle hooks.

"I was a bit perturbed one afternoon when an adjacent fisherman netted my fish and then proceeded to crimp my barb without asking," he said. "I indicated that I appreciated his assistance with the netting, but not so much his mutilation of my tackle. He insisted that I was going to like it once I tried it, and begrudgingly I had to admit later that I did."

I see several obvious benefits of using barbless circle hooks for sockeye fishing, including:

- fewer fish being mutilated or forced to wear an assortment of flies to the spawning grounds, and fewer fish becoming exhausted and dying from being "played";
- less gear lost to snagged fish;
- no valuable fishing time wasted in laboriously pulling in snagged fish that have to be released;
- going barbless causes less mutilation and stress to fish that for some reason must be released;
- barbless hooks are easily removed from the mesh of salmon nets;
- and barbless hooks are easily removed from human flesh, resulting in less pain and fewer trips to the hospital emergency room.

Wilcox says he typically uses a snelled 2/0 Gamakatsu "Nautilus" circle hook and a small-size Lil' Corky for floatation.

In the past two years, more and more anglers have been using barbless circle hooks for sockeyes. Next chance I get, I plan to give them a

try.



For more info, do a Google search for "circles for sockeye." You'll should get a hit on a thread on the Alaska Outdoor Forum that has everything you need to know, and more.



Submitted By
Dwight Kramer
Submitted On
1/15/2014 2:44:47 PM
Affiliation
KAFC

Phone
907-283-1054
Email
dwimar@gci.net
Address
230 N Fern St.
Kenai, Alaska 99611

Kenai Area Fisherman's Coalition

Kenai, Ak

Board of Fisheries

Please accept our comments on Upper Cook Inlet (UCI) proposals in preparation for your UCI finfish meeting scheduled for Jan. 31 – Feb. 13, 2014.

Proposal 103 – To prioritize achieving the lower end of all escapement goals shall take priority over not exceeding the upper end of any escapement goal.

We are **Oppose** to this proposal. This is not conceivably possible in Cook Inlet where you have upwards to 35 escapement goals. This would mean that if Fish Creek in the Matsu wasn't making its escapement goal you could close down the CI drift fleet regardless if the Kenai was anticipating to go way over its Sockeye goal. Another good example would be if the LR Russian River Sockeye were late and the run timing numbers appeared like the Russian might not make their goals then you would have to shut down all downstream Kenai River Sockeye fishing. This just doesn't make any sense and is unworkable with the vast amount of mixed stock goals that we have.

Proposal 186 & 187 – To change the wording in the Kenai ER King Salmon Mgt. Plan regarding the wording SHALL to May for liberalizing the fishery.

We **Support** these proposals. The department has to have flexibility when restricting or liberalizing our fisheries.

Proposal 188 – Maintaining the Kenai River ER OEG at 5,300 – 9,000

We **Support** this proposal. Any lower escapement goals may put this run in jeopardy because of the nature of the quality of the escapements rather than merely the numbers.

Proposal 189 – Raise the ER King salmon escapement goals to an OEG of 9,000 – 14,000

We **Support** this proposal. This may be a necessity to raise the quality of the escapement. We are currently experiencing a low female return and a low 1.4 age class return that negatively affects the spawning potential of our ER returns.

Proposal 190 – Proposal aims at liberalizing the King fishery and eliminate the slot limit.

We **Oppose** this proposal. There is nothing in this proposal that enhances conservation of our ER King salmon resources. Eliminating the slot limit and liberalizing the fishery based on the pre-season **Forecast** rather than in-season projections. It doesn't make any sense to suggest liberalizations on a resource that is having a difficult time making minimum escapements with the poor quality of its spawning component.

Proposal 191 – To repeal the ER slot limit

We **Oppose** these proposals. The author obviously has a low regard for the conservation of this resource and a high regard for his own financial well-being.

Proposal 192 – Modify the slot limit from 46-55in to 42-55in

We **Support** this proposal. The slot limit of 46-55in only saves about 13% of our 1.4 females. By lowering it to 42-55 we would then save about 65% of our 1.4 females which account for our largest age class of big fish.



Proposal 193 – Modify the slot limit to 42-55in and retain the slot limit through July 31

We **Support** this proposal. We support this proposal for the reasons stated above. Additionally, in the Kenai River we have a large and intense sport fishery so by removing the slot limit prior to July 31 we nullify much of the savings the slot limit provided.

Fish in the 42-55in category do not have to be retained to have a trophy value as most taxidermists have plastic molds to fit any size and girth of King salmon.

Proposal 194 – Only King salmon under 42in may be retained

We **Support** this proposal. This would be a good step to help reverse some of the impacts of selective harvest of our biggest fish. Perhaps this will help rectify some of the shifts in age class returns we have been experiencing.

Proposal 197 – Start the ER & LR with no bait and C&R until the department can project that the escapement goals will be reached

We **Support** this proposal. We would only support this proposal if the department projection mentioned includes anticipated harvest.

Proposal 198 – Start the ER & LR seasons with C&R then liberalize and increase bag limits and gear types depending on run size

We **Oppose** this proposal. We are not in favor of increasing the bag limits or length of the season. Some runs may meet the numbers to exceed the goals but the quality of the spawning component may be lacking in the numbers of large fish or the female component.

Proposal 199 – Allow C&R instead of closing the fishery when not expected to meet the escapement goals

We **Oppose** this proposal as written because it sets a bad precedence for escapement goal management.

Proposal 201 – By ADF&G to use Slikok Cr. sanctuary as the lower demarcation point instead of the Soldotna Bridge for ER restrictions to extend no bait in that area until July 15

We **Support** this proposal. We would like to see the "July 15" date changed to July 31. If this restriction is deemed necessary to protect ER spawners then why would you end it on July 15 when the ER mainstem spawning takes place generally July 20 – July 31? The slot limit 46-55 will have to be amended if the new slot of 42-55 is accepted.

Proposal 202 – KAFC proposal to extend the upriver Skikok Cr. boundry by 200yds

We **Support** this proposal as written.

Proposal 206 – To close all King salmon fishing above the Soldotna Bridge

We **Support** this proposal in concept but feel it is too restrictive.

Proposal 208 – To change the LR Min. escapement goal back to 17,800

We **Support** this proposal. With the problems we are encountering in enumerating actual fish with our sonar mechanisms it may be beneficial to have a slightly higher goal for conservation concerns.

Proposal 209 – Paired restrictions between sport & commercial when goal is in question and liberalizations when goal is projected to be exceeded

We **Oppose** this proposal. These provisions were rejected by the task force because it nullified the flexibility of the department to manage the fisheries under various scenarios that occur in-season. The commissioner already has the authority to do all of this and has demonstrated a will to do so depending on the situation with regards to conflicting management plans. The liberalizations mentioned could be destructive to the run quality if it resulted in more harvest than anticipated.

Proposal 210 – Establish LR BEG of 12,000 – 28,000 and delete habitat and EO provisions

We **Oppose** this proposal. To low of escapement numbers and habitat provision (G) needs to remain in place to assure habitat issues are not being ignored.

Proposal 211 – Establish set gill net restrictions to meet escapement goals

We **Oppose** this proposal. We believe the current time and area restrictions are working well and easier to manage to. Having to



Proposal 213 – If the Kenai sport fish restrictions go to C&R then the ESSN fishery is closed

We **Oppose** this proposal. There may be times when small windows of opportunity come up for a large pulse of Sockeye to be available for harvest by the ESSN without taking very many Kings in the process. We agree with the current regs. Whereby if the SF is closed then so is the ESSN.

Proposal 219 – KAFC Spawning area conservation areas proposal

We **Support** this proposal as written. Will put in an RC KAFC Position Paper on this proposal.

Proposal 222 – No use of eggs (Roe) for King salmon fishing in the Kenai R.

We **Support** this proposal. Data illustrates that the Kenai R. King salmon harvests have a disproportional amount of females over males. We believe this is caused by a culture of fishing whereby we kept females more often to gather roe for future trips. We can no longer support this practice in a declining fishery. Anglers have found a great deal of success nowadays using sardine wrapped plugs over eggs. This is a conservative measure that needs attention.

Proposal 224 – Require barbless hooks when bait is prohibited

We **Support** this proposal. We would actually like to see the entire Kenai R. go barbless for all species. Our rainbows are getting tore up from multiple releases and as long as we utilize the slot limit or C&R as restrictive measures then release mortality is going to be a factor. Fish are easier to release with a barbless hook with less damage. This would also be a safety factor in our crowded red fishery as barbless hooks are much easier to remove from the skin.

Proposal 225 – Modify the Kenai R. annual limit to be 2 fish as long as only one is over 28in in length

We **Support** this proposal. We are experiencing both low run strength numbers and a high percentage of small male jacks in our age comp data sets. This would be a good conservation measure to help us recover our stocks.

Proposal 226 – End proxy fishing on the Kenai R. Kings salmon stocks

We **Support** this proposal. In these times of low abundance and conservation there is no place for proxy fishing.

Proposal 227 – Require the department to demonstrate a significant savings of fish when restricting the sport fishery

We **Support** this proposal as written.

Proposal 233 – Prohibit sport fishing within the Centennial Campground boat launch lagoon

We **Support** this proposal as a safety measure.

Proposal 235 – Require the department to conduct habitat assessments on UCI rivers related to sport or personal use fishing

We **Support** this proposal. On the Kenai River we have growing PU and sockeye sport fisheries but ADF&G is doing less habitat assessment work than in the past. These assessments are critical for our growing fisheries. Both of these fisheries are particularly more detrimental to habitat destruction than our other in-river fisheries.

Proposal 236 – Require submissions of findings and proposals for loss of riparian habitat as it relates to the Late Run Sockeye Mgt. Plan

We **Support** this proposal. This is the largest and growing shore based fishery that we have on the Kenai R. and it is causing a lot of bank damage during the act of fishing and transporting fish and gear to and from bank locations.

Proposals 237 & 238 – To add another drift day on Thursdays for both guided and unguided anglers

We **Support** these proposals. It is time to consider more habitat friendly drift boat use on the Kenai R. High density motorized vessel use is responsible for much of the turbidity, erosion and safety issues we are now experiencing on the Kenai River. With growing populations and more demands on our fisheries we will have to move towards more drift boat use to protect our spawning and rearing habitat areas. The use of drift boats can also accommodate more people in a pleasant quiet setting with less negative impacts on the resource.

Proposal 239 – To add an additional drift day on the Kenai R.

We **Support** this proposal for the reasons stated above.

Proposal 240 – To eliminate drift boat Monday

We **Oppose** this proposal. The author of this proposal tries to justify this action as a conservation measure to allow Kings to move upriver. Why would anyone choose to eliminate the only habitat friendly fishery on the Kenai? If he felt so strongly about this as a conservation

measure then why wouldn't he have offered to do it on one of the other six motorized days? This just doesn't make sense.



Proposal 241 – Prohibit fishing from a vessel on the Kenai R. from 10:00pm – 4:00am May-June –Jul,

We **Oppose** this proposal. It serves no useful purpose as fishing is very light during these hours. These hours are important, however, for private anglers that can only fish before or after work. We consider this as direct assault on private anglers.

Proposal 248 – Start the 3 Coho bag limit Aug. 15 as opposed to Sep. 1

We **Oppose** this proposal. ADF&G does not enumerate Coho in the Kenai R. therefore they need the full 30 days of Aug. to evaluate the run strength before the Sep. liberalizations to a bag limit of 3 Coho. These runs are always up and down in run strength and this provision could have negative effects on spawning numbers of Coho. We believe this is a self serving proposal to enhance fishing opportunities for Coho fishing fund raising events KRSA now puts on in the last two weeks of August.

Proposal 252 & 253 – Open Rainbow trout year around below the Upper Killey and extend the Rainbow trout spawning closure area

We **Support** these proposals as written.

Proposal 259 – Eliminate Drift Boat Monday and allow guides to fish on private angler Sunday and reduce fishing hours to 6:00am – 10:00pm and allow guides to fish any of these hours

We **Oppose** this proposal. This is the biggest assault on private anglers by a guide that we have ever seen. Over the years, as the guide industry grew, it became apparent that many private folks were being displaced off of the river by the increases in guide activity and crowding aspects. Because of this private anglers have been allowed to fish without guide's presence from 6:00pm – 6am daily and on the private angler days of Sunday and Drift Boat Monday. Except for greed, why would anyone suggest to eliminate the only habitat friendly vessel use day on the river? Private, mom & pop anglers, appreciate the time they have on the river without the guide activity. By nature of their business and need to produce fish for customers, guides are much more mobile and active, in their quest for fish, than most private folks so a lot of private people simply choose not to fish when the guides are on the river. These guide hour restrictions were also put in place to equalize the harvest between the user groups.

Proposal 260 – Allow guides to fish 7 days a week with 5 starts on the Kenai R.

We **Oppose** this proposal. See Proposal 259 opposition reasoning. Also, 5 days a week is plenty of time for in-river commercial operations. This is another infringement on private angler fishing times.

Proposal 261 – To allow 5 anglers to fish from a guide vessel in July as long a one is 18 yrs old or younger

We **Oppose** this proposal. When the 50hp provision was adopted it was based on a boat wake study that illustrated the Willie predator (the favorite of most guides) was the biggest wake producer because of its hull design and width. With considerations for erosion problems and turbidity related to boat wakes it was determined that for the busiest month of guiding and boat use the guide boats would be limited to 5 total occupants. Some teens are bigger than adults so this could contribute to many negative affects on habitat. It would also produce larger wakes than usual affecting smaller boats fishing in the vicinity of fast moving and heavy wake producing boats. This proposal should be opposed on the habitat issues alone.

Proposal 263 – Allow fishing for Coho from a guide vessel on Labor Day Monday

We **Oppose** this proposal. During the last long weekend of the summer, private anglers look forward to the Labor Day Monday Coho fishing because they don't have to compete with guides over the best fishing holes. It is not too much to ask that private folks are allotted one day (Mondays) during Coho season where they can fish without the guide presence on the river. Guides can still fish guided trips for trout upstream of the Moose River on Mondays so it's not like they don't have the opportunity to make money on Mondays in the fall.

Proposal 264 – Allow guides to fish for Coho on Mondays after Sept. 1

We **Oppose** this proposal for the same reasons stated in our opposition to proposal 263.

Proposal 278 – PU proposal prohibiting liberalization of the fishery to 24hrs but allowing increased harvests instead

We **Support** the portion of this proposal prohibiting the fishery to be open for 24hrs. After attending the City of Kenai work session on the PU fishery it was very apparent that the City needs time allotted to them on a daily basis to rake the beaches, provide access for dumpster exchanges and access for toilet sump trucks. There are thousands of people on the beaches nowadays so it has turned into a logistical nightmare for the City of Kenai to provide these services. ADF&G offers no support in these efforts so the least they can do is help the City out by not opening the fishery to 24hr fishing. The dip-netters will still have plenty of opportunity to get their fish.



Respectfully Submitted,

Dwight Kramer

Chairman – Kenai Area Fisherman's Coalition

283-1054



Submitted By
Ed Schmitt
Submitted On
1/13/2014 6:43:05 AM
Affiliation

Phone
9072603386

Email
schmitt.edward@gmail.com

Address
319 Riverside Drive
Soldotna, Alaska 99669

I wish to strongly support Proposal 238. The noise and congestion on the Kenai river is enough to drive anyone to distraction. I live on the river and would support total ban on motor boats. The motor boat traffic has made a day on the river anything but peaceful and enjoyable. The constant whine of motors and the buffeting of the wakes destroy any illusion of a pleasant river trip.



Submitted By
Edward Schmitt
Submitted On
1/13/2014 6:33:27 AM
Affiliation

Phone
9072603386

Email
schmitt.edward@gmail.com

Address
319 Riverside Drive
Soldotna, Alaska 99669

I wish to support Proposal 219. I have witnessed the progressive reduction to the early run kings for years and can't stress enough the need to seriously start protecting them. We can't continue to let some in river user groups continue to decimate this resource.



Submitted By
Elizabeth Fread
Submitted On
1/11/2014 8:55:50 AM
Affiliation

Phone
907.354.7759

Email
Beth@BethsValleyViews.com

Address
1981 S Jensen Rd
Palmer, Alaska 99645

The Mat-Su Fisheries have been suffering from a lack of fish. The situation has become so dire that some of the subsistence fishers I know are having trouble making it through the winter. One of the many benefits of being Alaskan is that you can harvest your own food, thereby reducing the requirement to get assistance from government. In this instance, we need to PLEASE pay attention to the needs of the individuals over the needs of the commercial fisheries.

thank you for your attention to this - bethf

Submitted By
Erys Katherine Tea
Submitted On
12/19/2013 5:39:50 PM
Affiliation

Phone
907-283-6551
Email
ak49kate@gmail.com
Address
P.O. Box 288
Kenai, Alaska 99611-0288

My comments are regarding the proposals addressing the personal use fishing, dipnetting.

Proposal #269: Oppose. I strongly oppose any measures to extend the hours of personal use dipnetting on the Kenai River beyond what is in place now; especially a 24 hour extension. It is unnecessary and brings to the area an increase in all of the problems already being experienced by the users of the fishery and local residents. Additionally, strain is put on the City of Kenai, area law enforcement which includes the Kenai Police Dept as well as the Alaska State Troopers for the south side of the Kenai River.

Proposal #271: Support. Regulations regarding the personal use dipnetting of fish need to be enforced as written. There is no reason that the users of this fishery should not be held to the same standards of following the rules that all others are required to follow whether fishing or hunting, etc. How can a fishery be managed effectively if accurate numbers are not available?

Proposal #272: Support. The fish are a resource that belongs to the residents of Alaska and proof of residency should be required and enforced for the personal use dipnetting fishery.

Proposal #274: Support. There should be strict consequences for abusing the personal use dipnetting fishery. At the present time it is a free-for-all that is putting undo pressure on many agencies and individuals trying to deal with the enormous increase in those dipnetting. Accountability is critical to management of the fishery and for the proper allocation of resources to the agencies responsible for not only the fishery but also for the safety of the participants and everyone living in the proximity of the fishery.

Proposal #278: Support: The current opening times is more than adequate; 6:00 AM until 11:00 PM. 24 hour openings are completely unnecessary to manage the fishery and add tremendous stress on the agencies responsible for sanitation, safety, waste removal, and traffic that come with the personal use fishery. The entire fishery as it stands now is largely unfunded and a cobbled together best effort to meet the needs of the personal use participants and the area residents impacted by the influx of incredibly large numbers of people would be further compromised. The fishery as it is with the existing hours is out of control and 24 hour openings compound the problems that have yet to be solved. There is no reason that the personal use dipnetting fishery ever needs to be open for 24 hours; other solutions should be explored. The fishery as it is now is a major accident and tragedy waiting to happen.

Proposal #279: Support. While the existing hours are what they are, I support reducing them as proposed to 7AM to 7PM. That is adequate time for individuals to fish and would assist in better overall management of the waste removal, safety, traffic, and general disruption to residents living in proximity to the fishery.

Proposal #280: Agree with the portion to close personal use fishery if the commercial fishery is closed; Disagree with any 24 hour opening provision for any reason.

Proposal #282: Oppose. Extending the current dates of the personal use dipnetting fishery would only serve to add to the problems that are already overwhelming the local resources responsible for not only the fishery and enforcement of regulations, but also the agencies responsible for sanitation, waste removal, safety of the participants, traffic, and other potential risks such as fire or other emergencies. All of the agencies responsible for not only the fishery but all of the ancillary needs to support a safe fishery for the participants and local residents, have budgets they need to adhere to. The City of Kenai and greater Kenai Peninsula community agencies and departments do not need additional unpredictable budgetary demands placed upon them that they are required to meet. The entities involved don't have the funding and staffing necessary for a safe fishery now; adding days that the fishery is open would only serve to make what is largely out of control now even worse.

Proposal #285: Support. We don't need any additional destruction of the Kenai River banks due to watercraft use.

Thank you,

E.Katherine Tea



Submitted By
Francis V Estalilla
Submitted On
1/12/2014 2:41:20 PM
Affiliation

Proposal 219... SUPPORT as amended

The Kenai River is the only road accessible stream in Cook Inlet with 50 miles open to king salmon fishing. Every other river has a meaningful and well defined "deadline" to protect spawners that have travelled upstream beyond the deadline. Anchor River has the lower river fork, Ninilchik and Deep Creek has the lower two miles, Kasilof has the Sterling Highway bridge, Ship Creek has the dam, and all of the Mat-Su valley streams have the Parks Highway. These deadlines are LOW enough in the system to provide meaningful protection to keep fishermen from harvesting fish on their spawning grounds. ALL EXCEPT THE KENAI. Because the vast majority of king salmon spawning activity takes place downstream of Skilak Lake, the current Skilak Lake deadline offers no meaningful spatial protection.... mainstem spawners remain vulnerable to harvest for the ENTIRE fishing season. This is especially detrimental to early-timed mainstem spawners which are disproportionally exploited because of their extended exposure to the fleet, essentially their ENTIRE adult streamlife.

Proposal 219 creates a mainstem spawning sanctuary, appropriately timed in 2-stage fashion to protect spawning kings. **However the lower boundary for Conservation Area 2 does not go far enough. It should be extended downstream to include the existing Slikok sanctuary.** This deadline makes more sense, especially in this time of reduced king salmon productivity. ADFG in recent years has had to close this reach of the Kenai River in the past 3 seasons by emergency order. Of particular note is ADFG's own Proposal 201 which seeks to amend all language citing the Soldotna bridge demarcation and instead using the bottom of the Slikok sanctuary as the new demarcation. Passage of Proposal 219 as amended would make it more consistent with ADFG's Proposal 201.

Proposals 192 and 193... SUPPORT as amended.

These proposals both deal with expansion of the NON-retention slot limit. The so-called "protection" offered by the current 46-55" slot limit is pointless and reduced to near-irrelevance. The size range is WRONG and the timing is WRONG. There is virtually no protection offered for female king salmon when 95% of them remain in the harvestable pool of kings. A much bigger slice of the "big fish pie" needs protection and the needs protection ALL SEASON LONG and RIVER-WIDE. These proposals will help to ensure that this happens. However, the lower boundary of the slot limit does not go far enough in these proposals. **Please consider further expansion of the range to a lower boundary of 40 inches.**

Remember that the original impetus for the slot limit was protection of the largest, oldest fish... the ones that have been depleted to alarmingly low numbers, particularly large females. The 50%-ile for hens occurs at 39.4 inches, and for bucks it happens at 40.6 inches. For the sake of round numbers, let's call it good at 40 inches across the board. 40 inches is the natural breakpoint that provides nearly proportionate protection for males and females within the NON-retention slot. It also takes the physically biggest half of the kings out of the harvestable pool of fish. More importantly, it protects nearly half the spawning hens from harvest.

Proposal 197... SUPPORT

While the exact language required to implement the spirit of this proposal is not complete, conceptually it is a very good proposal that deserves the Board's attention and diligence in crafting the appropriate language for its implementation.

Conceptually this proposal seeks to start each new Kenai River king salmon season with C&R to have the smallest possible impact until the run-size can be assessed in-season to determine whether it can be liberalized to support any directed harvest. The idea is to start slow and conservative with the least possible exploitation. A baseline C&R fishery can provide ADFG with a meaningful in-river index of run-strength (CPUE) independent of the controversial sonar program, while killing VERY few fish as release mortalities. If the run-strength supports it, then ADFG may allow incremental liberalization of harvest by emergency order. On the flip side, if the run-strength warrants it, the fishery would be closed by EO. In this time of poor king salmon productivity, this is a more precautionary approach than the current practice of allowing directed harvest up front and later finding that ADFG now needs the dead fish in that front-loaded harvest to achieve spawning escapement. As the proposer stated, there is no way for us to "un-kill" those fish after the fact.

It should be noted that ADFG has already implicitly endorsed this precautionary concept when it started the 2013 season with C&R by emergency order. It should be standard operating procedure. Just get it done.



Submitted By
Frank Mullen
Submitted On
1/16/2014 10:15:02 AM
Affiliation

Kenai kings face long odds, but it's not too late

Posted: January 15, 2014 - 3:44pm | **Updated:** January 15, 2014 - 3:45pm

By [Frank Mullen](#)

January 15, 2014 - 07:44pm

Kenai kings face long odds, but it's not too late

The Kenai king controversy has connected some dots for me. I was born in Alaska in 1950 and raised on the banks of the Kenai River. I have collected empirical data ("a source of knowledge acquired by means of observation") with regard to Kenai kings and the Kenai River for 63 years. I have witnessed the changes: the tendency over the past 40 years towards overuse, overharvest, and in-river habitat destruction.

There have been all kinds of warning signals for many years that the Kenai king (and more importantly, the in-river habitat) is in distress, but the Board of Fisheries has not looked at the big picture, preferring instead to tinker with "small ball" actions such as slot limits or the use of barbless hooks or escapement goals.

The fact that Kenai kings for 40 years have been not only interrupted but aggravated on their in-river spawning habitat by up to 600 boats per day seems to be of little concern to the regulators. There is no sanctuary for spawners. Why would it be a mystery that Kenai kings are in trouble?

The serious erosion of the river bank caused by large boats throwing off wakes all summer long has received little discussion. The riverbanks are a critical part of fish habitat. In my lifetime I have observed the slow motion destruction of the riverbanks. Where there once were continuous mats of grass, alders and vegetation, there are now major gaps where cobble exists and the finer particulates have been washed away by boat wakes. In the area of the river that I haunted as a youngster, I estimate that 30-40 percent of the original riverbank is now gone. Yes, this is empirical data. I am unaware of a scientific study that verifies this, but you need only look at other river systems in Alaska (the upper Kasilof, for instance) to develop a comparison to the destruction that has occurred on the Kenai.

While connecting the management dots, take a look at razor clam populations on the East side of Cook Inlet. This was once a vibrant and productive area, as any "old timer" would attest to. Today, the clams are few and small.

The cause? From my empirical notebook, in a word, overharvest. For 40 years, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Fisheries maintained bag limits that were too generous and not sustainable. For 40 years, every series of low tides between April and September brought many thousands of diggers to these clam beaches. We heard occasional assurances from the "clam scientists" that all was well, or that a winter storm was the problem. The real problem: Clams were harvested at a rate that was not sustainable. They were unable to reproduce at a rate that would provide for return to abundance. The Board of Fisheries took no corrective action until recent years, and now it may be too little too late.

With no adequate science, the short term interests of the harvester took precedence over any thought of maintaining a sustainable clam population. We have reached such a point of decline due to inadequate management that, until we begin acting and legislating for the benefit of a particular species and its habitat rather than merely slowing its decline, its eventual demise becomes a probability.

Most species require a minimum biomass in order to remain healthy and dodge the occasional curveball from Mother Nature. Consider herring in Prince William Sound. The Exxon Valdez oil spill knocked them for such a loop that they still have not recovered. Seemingly, since no one knows what that tipping point is, fish and game managers should always err on the side of the species in question.

As a general empirical statement, the Board of Fisheries has made decisions over the years based not on good science or conservative intent, but based on politics and constituent pressure. The hatchet job done by a sport fish group on a sitting board of fish member who was reappointed last year is example enough about how "the political game" is played.

Hundreds of examples of mismanagement over time exist, and it is unfortunate that those examples go unheeded by our resource managers. Both coasts of the United States illustrate examples of deficient or nonexistent management. Fish species that once were prolific are now nonexistent or endangered.

It could be argued that people a hundred years ago were unaware of the negative consequences of overharvest, habitat destruction and lack of sound management, but that is not an excuse today.

In the case of the Kenai king, the in-river habitat went from pristine in the mid 1970s to adversely impacted today. I watched it happen. The massive numbers of boats (up to 600 per day), gear and fishing pressure has virtually eliminated any possible sanctuary for a spawning

king.



Yes, offshore trawlers catch Kenai kings. Yes, setnetters and other commercial fishermen intercept a few Kena that explains the dramatic failure of the early run of kings in the Kenai which has not had any commercial fishing pressure for more than 50 years. Since it took 40 years to bring the in-river habitat to its current disarray, will it take 40 years to repair it? Maybe not, if fisheries managers are bold and decisive with rulemaking that includes drift only fishing and sanctuaries for spawning kings.

Many of the errors of the past may be too late to correct. Let's make sure it is not too late for the Kenai king salmon, which will undoubtedly be gone soon if the in-river riparian habitat is not protected and corrected. The Board of Fisheries must not gamble on the future, but take decisive action to improve the in-river spawning habitat.

Frank Mullen was born on a homestead on the banks of the Kenai River and is the son of one of Soldotna's first families. Mullen has been a sport and commercial fisherman all his life, a businessman and served on the Kenai Peninsula Borough Assembly for three terms. He lives in Homer.



Submitted By
Franklin Waldron
Submitted On
12/17/2013 11:16:59 AM
Affiliation

I am in support of proposals 219 and 221. Local landowners are already doing our part to conserve streamside king habitat. Performance of spawners after catch and release is questionable. Restrictions within the spawning beds are in order. We also need to protect the kings that holdover in the river before entering Slikok creek and other feeder streams the kings use for spawning beds.



Submitted By
G.M. Rein
Submitted On
1/16/2014 8:11:07 AM
Affiliation
Setnetter

Chairman Johnston and Board of Fish Members,

Proposal 126-I am opposed to this proposal. This proposal would eliminate permit stacking in Cook Inlet. At the 2011 BOF meeting, without a sunset clause, permit stacking was enacted for Cook Inlet setnetters. A lot of the discussion was to give the fishery a chance to be more economically viable. Fishermen make business decisions based on the actions of the 2011 BOF. According to ADF&G staff, in 1990 before area registration, there were 454 reported landings in the ESSN fishery. It is common practice to have multiple permit operations to sell on only a few limited entry cards. So logic would say that there were more than 454 permits fishing on the Eastside in 1990. In 2013 there was 449 permits registered in the ESSN fishery. Of those 449 permits, 350 reported landings. With permit stacking there are less permits fishing on the ESSN than 23 years ago. With permits already purchased for the 2014 season and associated State of Alaska shore fishery leases paid, to have permit stacking be eliminated would cause a great hardship to our fishery.

Proposal 118. I support this proposal that would let N-K Beach fish a limited fishery the first week of July. This area until 1997 was always a harvester of Kasilof sockeye that are abundant on the beach during this time of year.

Proposal 117 & 119. I support both of these proposals. The way that regulations are now, it would be rare that the ESSN fishery would ever fish past August 7 or so. Some years the August component is very important. In 2006, in the Kenai/East Forelands sec 64% of there season total of sockeye was harvested in August. This time in August is very important to the North Beaches.

Porposal 103. I am stongly opposed to this proposal. This is not needed in regulation.



Submitted By
G.M. Rein
Submitted On
1/17/2014 6:32:09 PM
Affiliation
Setnetter

Chairman Johnston and Board of Fish Members,

Yesterday the pre-season forecast for Kenai River Late Run King Salmon was announced-19,700. During this time period of such low abundance, the Tuesday window should be eliminated and regular periods shouldn't be mandatory, for the ESSN fishery. It is imperative that the BOF gives ADF&G the direction to fish when sockeye are abundant on the beaches.

Since 1999 thru 2013, in those 15 years, there were 11 days when the Kasilof section harvested over 80,000 sockeye. The dates ranged from July 15 to July 22.

Since 1999 to 2013, in the Kenai/ East Forelands sections, there has been 21 days with a harvest over 80,000 sockeye. The dates ranged from July 13 to July 24.

With few King Salmon available for harvest, it would seem that from July 13 to July 24 would be the time period that the peak abundance of sockeye will be on the beaches. With the addition of the North Test Boat, it gives ADF&G a valuable indicator when the bulk of the sockeye run will be hitting the beaches.

G.M. Rein



Submitted By
GARY DUBUISSON
Submitted On
1/10/2014 9:11:51 PM
Affiliation

Phone
907-345-9637
Email
gary.dubuisson@hotmail.com
Address
13300 Alpine Drive
Anchorage, Alaska 99516

To Whom It May Concern,

I have fished the Kenai Peninsula river fisheries for going on twenty years. I haven't noted an appreciable increase in sports fishermen on the Kenai River, Anchor River, Ninilchik River, or Deep Creek in the past. I have also never noted any difficulty in catching king salmon upstream of other sports fishermen on any of these rivers. The one thing I have always noted was that when the commercial fishing opened, it was like a door closing on fish entering any of these rivers.

I am 100% for efforts to bring back the king salmon populations in these rivers, but I am 100% against putting all the onus and restrictions upon the sports fishermen with no changes to the commercial fishery, especially the on east side of Cook Inlet. Put the same restriction on them that we sports fishermen have, you catch 5 kings and you're done for the year or something to that effect.

Sincerely,

Gary Dubuisson
13300 Alpine Drive
Anchorage, AK 99516



Submitted By
GARY HOLLIER
Submitted On
1/15/2014 3:10:08 PM
Affiliation
ESSN-SELF

Dear Members of the Alaska Board of Fish,

I am against proposal 126. This proposal seeks to eliminate permit stacking in Cook Inlet.

Cook Inlet is a far different fishery than Kodiak or Bristol Bay. I have yet to hear of a fisherman who is against permit stacking. Permit stacking is really the first regulation, in along time that has helped setnetters in Cook Inlet.

The BOF at its 2011 meeting made permit stacking legal for setnetters in Cook Inlet. There were many compelling reasons, military service, family operations, economic value, etc.

The most compelling reason for permit stacking was to help "distressed" fisheries in the State of Alaska. With low abundance of King Salmon to Cook Inlet, the past three years, the ESSN fishery is at best "distressed". In 2012 the fishery fished ONE day in July, to harvest sockeye. In 2013 the set net fishery, north of the Kasilof section fished SIX days. With a pre-season projection of 19,700 King Salmon returning to the Kenai River in 2014, the fisheries out-look is bleak. After the economic failure of the 2012 season it was almost impossible to find crew for the 2013 season. I don't see this changing for 2014.

This provision was not to be sun setted. In fact there was testimony from CFEC that if this went into regulation, that they would like to see it stay in effect, as "flip-flopping" back and forth was not ideal for the agency.

On a personal front, my family bought two permits and associated State of Ak shore fishery leases that went together. These permits and sites were in our fishery area. We then stacked these permits. We did this based on BOF action regarding permit stacking for Cook Inlet in 2011.

All of our family permits and shore fishery leases are current and purchased for the 2014 season.

To have permit stacking be not allowed would create quite a "distressing" situation for our family operation.

Thank you,

Gary L. Hollier

Kenai, AK



Submitted By
GARY HOLLIER
Submitted On
1/15/2014 2:34:57 PM
Affiliation
SELF

Dear Members of the Alaska Board of Fish,

First of all I would like to say that I am in favor of proposal 117 which would eliminate the 1% rule in the ESSN fishery. There is no need for the 1% rule as Coho stocks on the Eastside of Cook Inlet are stable.

If this doesn't happen I am in support of proposal 119. This proposal seeks to have the 1% rule applied by section. The Kasilof section and the Kenai/East Forelands section.

The Kasilof section harvest of sockeye by August 1 is 95% complete.

In the Kenai/ East Forelands sections the harvest of sockeye by August 1 is 85% complete.

This is an equity issue. The Kasilof section starts by regulation on or after June 25, the Kenai/East Forelands section start on or after July 8. Since 1999 the Kasilof section has fished an average of 23.5 days/year. The Kenai/East Forelands sections have fished an average of 12 days per year.

With fewer sockeye harvested in the Kasilof section, in August, and with current regulations, it is hard not to have the 1% rule go into effect every year before the season ending date of August 15.

Basing the 1% rule on the two different sections harvest of sockeye, helps to balance the inequity in fishing times of the two areas.

The Kenai Peninsula Fishermen's Association Board of Directors voted in favor of this proposal

Thank you,

Gary L. Hollier

Kenai, Ak



Submitted By
GARY HOLLIER
Submitted On
1/15/2014 2:08:30 PM
Affiliation
SELF

Members of the Alaska Board of Fish,

I am in support of proposal 117. The BOF at the 2008 & 2011 meeting put into regulations that a pink plan and a provision to fish regular periods, from August 10-15, in the ESSN fishery. With the addition of other regulations the ESSN fishery since 2008 (expect for 2010 due to only one day of fishing in July), would not have had the opportunity to fish thru the end of the season due to the 1% rule.

There is no reason for this plan as Cook Inlet Coho stocks are stable. With this plan it gives little opportunity to fish pink salmon, on even years, that are at or near an all time high for price.

Thank you,

Gary L. Hollier

Thank you,

Gary L. Hollier

Kenai, Ak.



Submitted By
GARY HOLLIER
Submitted On
1/15/2014 1:01:44 PM
Affiliation
SELF

Members of the Alaska Board of Fish,

I am in support of proposal 118. This proposal seeks to add fishing time to North Kalifonsky Beach (statistical area 244-32). This area was at one time a traditional harvester of Kasilof sockeye. It is asking for a minimal fishery, fishing two- eight hour periods . The period would run for one hour before high water, thru the full ebb and close no later than one hour after low water. Fishing almost exclusively on the ebb, will harvest Kasilof River sockeye that are abundant on the beach during this time of the year.

The proposers are requesting that the maximum depth of net not to exceed 29 meshes. It is my opinion that this depth of gear would harvest good Kasilof sockeye numbers, while having minimal impact on King Salmon. During the 2013 season, half of my gear was shallow nets. My sockeye harvest per net, in shallow gear, was close or almost equal to my 45 mesh deep gear. With low King Salmon numbers last year, and with a small harvest of them on my sites, it was hard to quantify the savings in King Salmon. What I can say is I saw less kings caught in shallow nets than deep nets.

Last year I offered to pay ADF&G employees to be observers in my skiffs, to help quantify the King and sockeye harvest in my gear. I didn't work out.

If this proposal is put in regulation, I again would again offer to pay two ADF&G employees, or contractors of the Dept. to drive the beach from the Blanchard Line (south end of stat area 244-32) to the regulatory marker on the south side of the Kenai Rlver (north end of stat area 244-32). North Kalifonsky Beach is about four miles. The ADF&G employees would check salmon catches from skiffs when they land on the beach. I believe that this would be valuable information for the Dept, in order to evaluate 29 mesh gear.

Thank you,

Gary L. Hollier

Kenai, Ak.



Submitted By
GARY HOLLIER
Submitted On
1/15/2014 12:23:45 PM
Affiliation
SELF

Members of the Alaska Board of Fish,

I am in support of proposal 219. This is an excellent proposal that helps protect King Salmon in some of their spawning areas. In the Kasilof River fishing for king salmon above the Sterling Highway Bridge has protected spawning King Salmon in that system for years. It is a great idea to do the same thing in the Kenai River.

Thank you,

Gary L. Hollier

Kenai, Ak.



Submitted By
Gary Hollier
Submitted On
1/17/2014 9:04:49 AM
Affiliation
ESSN-Self

Dear Members of the State of Alaska Board of Fish,

I am against proposals 150, 154 and 155. These proposals seek to give additional fishing time for the Kasilof section. Since 1999 the Kasilof section has fished on average (24 days) two times the amount of the Kenai/ East Forelands sections (12 days). These proposals would increase this inequity in fishing times between the fishing sections.

I am in favor of proposal 166. This seeks to make the mandatory Tuesday window a floating window between Monday pm and Thursday am. I fish on North-Kalifonsky Beach (244-32). Since 1999 the Kasilof section has fished 56% of the time on Wednesday, the day before the regular schedule period on Thursday. South Kalifonsky Beach (244-31) is part of the Kasilof section, it is next to (244-32). There are times when the Kasilof section has fished Wednesday - thru the night and thru the regular period on Thursday. When this happens it is brutal for any build up of sockeye on N-K Beach. The best option, to give flexibility for ADF&G, would be to get rid of the Tuesday window altogether.

I would like to address the Kenai River Late Run King Salmon Management Plan. My thoughts are for times of low abundance of King Salmon to the Kenai River. With a pre-season projection of 19,700 King Salmon, all user groups will face restrictions. This will be a difficult season for all, including ADF&G. I believe that in-river actions should implement a plan in the ESSN fishery. The BOF should give direction to ADF&G to fish some modification of gear in the ESSN fishery, if the in-river fishery goes to Catch & Release. I have fished 29 mesh gear, I have found that this gear catches good numbers of sockeye, while harvesting less king salmon than a traditional 45 mesh deep net. As an ESSN fisherman I would like ADF&G to have the tools to fish us so that the beaches can harvest 1 million plus sockeye with a minimal amount impact on king salmon.

I am against proposal 130. I agree with the concept to have set net fishermen register in the section that they want to fish. Yet during times of low abundance of king salmon, I believe that this proposal might cut down on fishermen and the Dept's ability to harvest sockeye on abundance.