

Committee Chairman

tbd

Committee Members

Kory Blake

Tyler Dillon

Kelsey Hayden

Rod Jensen

Trae Lohse

Jerry McCune

John Williams

Committee Staff

Susan Bourgeois

Colette Gilmour

Cordova Fisheries Committee Meeting
March 13, 2025 @ 1:00 pm
Cordova Center Mayor's Conference Room
AGENDA

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

B. Discussion Items

1. Election of Committee Chair..... (voice vote)
2. Board of Fish proposals statewide shellfish, PWS..... (page 1)
shrimp - CDFU comments submitted Feb. 2025
2. SB108 regarding finfish farms and products..... (page 11)
3. HB116 regarding commercial fishing insurance..... (page 13)
cooperatives
4. Other fisheries issues requiring recommendations to City
Council – for future agendas
5. Informational – Council Resolution 10-24-32..... (page 15)
approved October 2, 2024, authorizing the
Cordova Fisheries Committee
6. Next meeting date/time/location

C. Adjournment

**If you have a disability that makes it difficult to attend city-sponsored functions,
you may contact 424-6200 for assistance**

Full City Committee agendas and packets available online at

www.cityofcordova.net



Märit Carlson-Van Dort, Chair, Alaska Board of Fisheries

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
PO Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811
marit.carlson-vandort@alaska.gov

February, 2025

Re: Statewide Shellfish, Prince William Sound Shrimp, and Supplemental Issues Meeting Proposals

Dear Chair Carlson-Van Dort and Members of the Board of Fisheries,

Cordova District Fishermen United (CDFU) is an industry-based nonprofit dedicated to strengthening commercial fishing in the Prince William Sound (PWS) region by advocating for the needs of community-based fishermen.

Our membership has long participated in the PWS spot prawn pot fishery and has expressed concerns regarding its modern management. In the past, there has been a concentrated effort by some fishery participants and managers to limit participation in the fishery by reducing its economic viability. Measures such as low pot limits, extended seasons, and seasonal overlaps with the salmon season have been implemented. Further restrictions are being proposed this year, not for biological reasons but as a means to reduce competition. We remain strongly opposed to this practice. Especially in the current economic climate, the Board of Fisheries should focus on improving the resilience and economic viability of our rural fisheries, through efficient and fair science-based management.

The current management strategy, in effect since 2010, is a significant departure from the historical fishery. Its triannual rotation system is unlike any other shrimp fishery management strategy on the West Coast, and sport effort is highly concentrated in two areas. This approach has likely contributed to the decline in shrimp abundance observed in Prince William Sound, by concentrating effort of both user groups rather than distributing it annually. We urge the Board of Fisheries and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) to take immediate action to

prevent the long-term closure of this fishery, rebuild the stock, and balance management measures across user groups.

We believe there are three fundamental problems with the current management strategy:

1. **Commercial fishery closure when the Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) is below 110,000 lbs.** There is no biological justification for this closure trigger, and no justification for applying it exclusively to the commercial sector. This contradicts the long-standing precedent that sport and commercial fisheries hold equal priority, and equal conservation responsibility. If the department concludes there is a Total allowable harvest and the sport fishery remains open, the commercial fishery should also remain open – and vice versa. It may be that both the Sport and Commercial fisheries could be executed sustainably at levels below the 110,000 closure trigger, *if* management strategies appropriate for low abundance levels were implemented.
2. **Localized depletion of shrimp stocks near population centers.** The TAH is set annually based on the shrimp population across the entire Sound. However, the majority of the harvest occurs in the sport fishery, which is concentrated near the ports of Valdez and Whittier. This has resulted in growing "dead zones" where shrimp populations near these towns are severely depleted, forcing fishermen to travel farther for their catch.
3. **Triannual rotation of the commercial fishery.** Under the current strategy, the commercial fleet must harvest its share of the TAH from only one-third of the area each year. ADFG survey data and CPUE (Catch Per Unit Effort) data clearly indicate that some areas of the Sound are significantly more productive than others. Nevertheless, the management strategy imposes equal harvest rates in the low-productivity Area 3 as in the highly productive Areas 1 and 2. We believe this practice could be harmful to shrimp populations. There is no biological benefit to harvesting an area every third year instead of annually. In fact, harvesting at a high rate every third year may be more damaging to the stock than a consistent, low-rate annual harvest.

Sincerely,



Ezekiel Brown
Board President
ezekiel.k.brown@gmail.com

Proposals 284 - Support

-Allow catcher vessels to operate as tenders during the Kodiak District commercial Tanner crab fishery

Modern communications and reporting requirements eliminate the concerns that have restricted tenders in the past. Allowing tendering by participants in this fishery will allow fishermen to reduce fuel usage by combining their catch on one boat to run to deliver. It would also improve safety in the fishery by reducing delivery runs and giving the ability to aggregate crab on larger vessels when needed. In the current economic environment, the BOF should be considering all options to reduce fuel consumption and increase profitability of small scale fisheries. ADFG has the ability to manage a fishery in which fishery participants can also be tender vessels. Tendering by fishery participants is already allowed in every Salmon fishery in the state under the transporter regulation and in the Kodiak Dungeness fishery through a similar regulation suggested by this proposer. This regulation would allow Crab from the Kodiak fishery to be more efficiently bought by processors throughout Alaska. Transporting crab to other ports for processing is important to ensure fishermen can achieve the best price for their crab, and increase options for processing capacity, which can be an issue as we saw in the 2023 Kodiak fishery.

Proposal 300 - SUPPORT-With amendments

Modify the Prince William Sound noncommercial shrimp fishery management plan, as follows: Split the TAH for noncommercial into the same areas used as harvest areas for the commercial spot fishery

The noncommercial fishery is allocated **60% of the Total Allowable Harvest (TAH)**, but in past years, it has significantly exceeded this allocation—harvesting **146% of its Guideline Harvest Level (GHL) in 2016 and 138% in 2020**. The TAH for spot shrimp is based on the total population across the entire Sound. However, noncommercial harvest is concentrated in a small section near ports, leading to **localized depletion** of shrimp stocks in these easily accessible areas.

While this proposal is necessary to address the issue, **a slight amendment is needed**. The regulation referenced, **5 AAC 31.210(a)**, **does not include the Eastern or outer waters of Prince William Sound**. As written, the proposal would inadvertently close these areas to noncommercial harvest. While only a small portion of the noncommercial harvest occurs there, these areas can open to commercial fishing under a commissioner's permit. To prevent unintended closures, the proposal should be amended to include **5 AAC 31.210(b)** in addition to **5 AAC 31.210(a)**.

Additionally, the proposal currently requires the department to **apportion the GHL based on pot survey data**. However, the department has informed us that the pot survey **lacks sufficient stations in some areas of the Sound** and that funding is unavailable for expansion at this time. Fortunately, the department already collects **ample data from commercial and noncommercial harvest rates** across the Sound, which could be used **alongside** existing survey data to apportion the GHL more effectively. **To provide the department with flexibility, we recommend removing the reference to the pot survey, allowing them to determine the most appropriate method for distributing harvest across districts.**

Recommended Amendments to Proposal 300:

(Amendments highlighted)

5 AAC 55.055. Prince William Sound noncommercial shrimp fishery management plan:

(a) The department shall manage the sport and other noncommercial shrimp fisheries in the Prince William Sound Area as follows:

(1) The guideline harvest level for shrimp taken by pot gear in noncommercial fisheries is calculated as **60% of the total allowable harvest for the area. This GHL will be divided between each district described in 5 AAC 31.210(a) and the area described in 5 AAC 31.210(b) annually based on the estimated spot shrimp population in each district/area.**

Proposal 301- SUPPORT with amendments

Close the sport shrimp fishery when the TAH is below 110,000lbs

It is critical that conservation measures be applied equitably and effectively across user groups, based on science-based standards. We urge the board to reassess whether any harvest should be allowed on the spot shrimp stock when the TAH falls below 110,000 lbs. In late February, the commercial sector was officially closed for 2025 because the TAH is below 110,000lbs. However, the largest user group, the noncommercial sector, remains open. That management strategy implies that harvest below 110,000lbs *is* considered sustainable, and the full closure of the commercial fishery is unwarranted (see comments on Proposal 303). However, if the board believes that a closure threshold is an important management and conservation measure, and that 110,000 is an appropriate number based on stock and recruitment analysis, then that closure should apply to commercial *and* noncommercial. This proposal intends to tie commercial and sport together when

the fishery needs to be closed for stock recovery. Restricting harvest should support conservation, but the responsibility of conservation should not fall solely on the commercial fleet.

Recommended Amendment to Proposal 301:

This proposal does not restrict subsistence harvest, and if passed, it would likely result in increased participation in the subsistence fishery. If the board adopts this proposal, we urge them to direct the department to ensure that subsistence harvest remains within the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence, as previously determined by the board (9,000–15,000 lbs).

Proposal 303- SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENTS

Remove the 110,000lbs TAH closure trigger on commercial

We support this proposal to remove the 110,000 lbs TAH closure trigger on commercial harvesters, if the board determines that any harvest can occur sustainably below this level. Since the management plan currently allows noncommercial harvest below 110,000 lbs, it would be more appropriate to develop strategies for limited commercial and noncommercial harvest at times of low abundance, rather than full closure of one sector and zero change in another. Removing this trigger will allow ADFG to sustainably manage this fishery in times of low abundance using harvest limitation strategies for both user groups, adjusted for abundance. Keeping this fishery alive year to year provides some economic stability by allowing fishermen and processors to maintain their markets, while still maintaining strategies for conservation

We ask that the board request Department input as to an appropriate TAH closure trigger that is less than the current 110,000 lbs, that could be appropriately applied to both the sport and commercial sector. Rather than the sport sector alone operating below 110,000. We would also request Department input on management mechanisms that could restrict harvest by all user groups at times of low abundance, rather than eliminate one sector's opportunity. We believe that could be achieved through some amendments to this proposal.

If a version of this proposal were to pass, we hope that in season reporting would be required across all user groups in the future to ensure sustainable in season management of this resource during all estimates of shrimp populations in the Sound.

Proposal 304- Oppose

Delay the season opening by two weeks in the noncommercial and commercial shrimp fisheries

We oppose delaying the season start date as it is purely allocative and is not likely to have an impact on the harvest of egg-bearing shrimp. The proposer claims that a higher percentage of egg-bearing shrimp are caught early in the season and that this indicates the shrimp have not yet dropped their eggs. However, it is well documented in spot shrimp fisheries that the larger female shrimp are harvested first and the size and female sex percentage decreases as the season progresses. The decrease in egg-bearing shrimp after the first two weeks of the season is a function of having a fishery, not the calendar date.

The shrimp in PWS act quite different from the shrimp in SE and we would caution the board from assuming their egg-bearing season is identical. PWS shrimp live at almost twice the depth of SE shrimp and seem to hold eggs for a far less consistent portion of the year. There also seems to be a large season-to-season variation in timing of egg dropping.

Moving the season start into May will severely limit our membership's ability to participate as the season will overlap with the salmon season. If the board does choose to shorten the season length we would suggest an earlier closure as we have seen evidence that the shrimp do start to put on eggs close to September and the shrimp go through molt mid-summer. Additionally if season dates are changed, effort should be made to separate the commercial and noncommercial season to reduce gear conflict and the potential for misreporting.

Suggest season dates: Commercial April 15th- May 15th, Noncommercial May 15th- August 15th

If the board must set a season start date of May 1st we ask they also include a season end date of May 15th to ensure our membership can fully participate before the salmon season begins.

Proposal 305- SUPPORT

Prohibit noncommercial shrimp participants from carrying additional shrimp gear

This board ruled on a very similar proposal during the PWS Finfish Meeting in December 2024. Proposal 44 sought to allow subsistence fishing vessels in the Copper River salmon fishery to carry more than the legal limit of gear, including a spare net, in case of loss or damage. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game

opposed that proposal, stating that it “*increases the potential to illegally deploy additional gear and enforcement would be challenging due to the size of the fishing area.*” The board agreed with this assessment, and the proposal failed unanimously (0-7).

We support that decision and see no meaningful difference between a subsistence salmon fisherman carrying a spare net and a sport shrimp boat carrying spare pots. Allowing excess gear creates the same enforcement challenges and opportunities for abuse.

We urge the board to pass this proposal and close the spare pot loophole to ensure fair and effective management of the noncommercial shrimp fishery.

Proposal 306- SUPPORT

Reporting requirements for Registration E

CDFU strongly supports timely reporting in all fisheries. Even when immediate data is not essential for fishery management, daily reporting enhances accuracy and allows managers to detect concerning trends early.

We recognize that some opposition to Proposal 306 stems from concerns that eliminating the mid-season closures currently used to collect harvest information could accelerate the pace of the fishery. However, this perspective is primarily held by a small segment of the fleet that direct-markets shrimp locally. This group of direct-marketers has influenced PWS shrimp fishery regulations and management in ways that extends the season to their advantage, often at the expense of our members and the timely, effective prosecution of the fishery. For example, in 2021, it took 124 days to harvest a 70,000-pound GHL—a clear indication of inefficiencies in the current system.

The reality is that the spot shrimp market is global and highly competitive. There is no issue with absorbing PWS’s relatively small harvest over a shorter time frame. In contrast, the Southeast Alaska shrimp fishery consistently lands 400,000–550,000 pounds in just a two-week season.

Implementing daily reporting will bring PWS shrimp management in line with other pot fisheries, improving efficiency and reducing unnecessary costs for participants incurred during closures.

Proposal 307- SUPPORT

Align the season start time of the Prince William Sound noncommercial and commercial shrimp fisheries

CDFU does not support any fishery opening by regulation at 12:00am as midnight openers create a dangerous situation with vessels setting gear in the dark.

Proposal 308- Oppose

Lawful shrimp pot gear

We strongly oppose this arbitrarily low pot limit. At the SE BOF meeting in February you saw proposal 224 to lower the pot limit in SE from the 140 allowed. The department in their comments on that proposal stated *“The department is concerned that reducing the number of pots may increase the incidence of hauling pots twice a day, which would increase the handling and mortality of small shrimp”*

Shrimp pots have a minimum mesh size in order to allow the small shrimp to escape. However, the undersized shrimp do not leave the pot immediately and if the pot is hauled too soon after setting it will have a high proportion of undersized shrimp.

The pot limit under current regulations is set by the department each year with a maximum of 100. CDFU has repeatedly brought up concerns with the small pot limits in PWS resulting in multiple hauls a day. In the shrimp fishery in years when the department sets the pot limit at 25 pots it is not uncommon for boats to haul their pots 2 or 3 times a day. This is not what is best for the resource, with regard to the increased handling and mortality of small shrimp.

Proposal 310- SUPPORT

Remove the triannual rotation

The current practice of setting a Sound-wide GHL and then allowing harvest in only a small portion of Prince William Sound each year is biologically unsound and contradicts well-established principles of sustainable fisheries management — particularly given the life cycle of shrimp and harvest dynamics in a pot fishery. There are two major flaws with this approach:

1. Unsustainable Harvest Timing

Instead of spreading out harvest pressure evenly over time, the current system allows for a massive harvest every three years in a single area, rather than smaller, sustainable harvests annually across all districts. If we removed the arbitrary district

boundaries and were presented with the two options below, the smaller, annual harvest would be the more sustainable approach.

- Opening the entire Sound once every three years with a 300,000 lb quota, or
- Opening the entire Sound annually with a 100,000 lb quota—

Shrimp pot fisheries naturally target the largest, oldest shrimp first, and as fishing pressure continues, the catch shifts to smaller, younger shrimp. The goal of responsible shrimp management is to maximize harvest of old, large shrimp that are near the end of their lifecycle while ensuring enough younger shrimp remain to replenish the population. The current rotational system fails in this regard, as it forces excessive pressure on localized populations in single years, rather than allowing for a balanced, steady harvest across all areas. This significantly increases the likelihood of depleting the younger shrimp in a single area, which would contribute to the long-term decline of the stock.

2. Mismatched Districts with Unequal Shrimp Populations

The existing district boundaries do not reflect the true distribution and productivity of shrimp populations. Under the current system, each district is treated as if it holds an equal proportion of the total shrimp biomass, when in reality, some areas (such as Area 3) have significantly lower shrimp abundance than others. By forcing a full GHM onto areas with lower productivity, we risk overexploitation and long-term depletion of these stocks.

A Better Approach

We support this proposal because it eliminates the ineffective tri-annual rotation and replaces it with a more adaptive and sustainable system—one that distributes harvest more evenly and ensures management decisions are based on real shrimp population densities and habitat conditions, rather than arbitrary geographic divisions that don't take those critical ecological factors into consideration. We encourage the board to adopt this change and work toward a shrimp management plan that prioritizes long-term sustainability over short-term convenience.

Proposal 311- SUPPORT

Allow vessels participating in the Prince William Sound shrimp pot fishery to also operate as tenders, as follows:

We support this proposal as it aligns with existing practices in other fisheries, such as salmon, where catcher boats are permitted to act as tenders under the transporter regulation. Allowing the same flexibility in shrimp fisheries would streamline operations and improve efficiency.

Fresh shrimp must be frozen or sold within three days of harvest, and it is inefficient for multiple shrimp boats to make frequent trips back and forth to town. Consolidating the catch on a single vessel would significantly reduce this logistical burden, saving time and resources, and increasing safety at sea.

Given the relatively low volume in shrimp fisheries, many operators cannot afford a dedicated tender vessel. Allowing catcher boats to serve dual functions would greatly increase the profitability of the fishery and help make it more economically viable.

Additionally, this change would benefit processors from more remote locations, such as Cordova, by allowing them to better compete in the market. Increased competition could lead to higher prices paid to fishermen, ultimately benefiting the entire industry.



**SB108: FINFISH FARMS AND PRODUCTS
SECTIONAL ANALYSIS**

Version A

Section 1: amends the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) definition for “agricultural facility” to include a finfish farm.

Section 2: amends the DNR definition for “agricultural operation” to include finfish farming.

Section 3: amends the powers and duties of the Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) Commissioner to authorize the permitting and regulation of finfish farming.

Section 4: conforming amendment referencing the new statute for finfish farm permits in the Board of Fisheries authority statute that prohibits adoption of regulations or taking action regarding the issuance, denial, or conditioning of a finfish farm permit or the construction or operation of a finfish farm – consistent with existing language for aquatic farm and hatchery permits as well as aquatic stock acquisition permits.

Section 5: conforming amendment clarifying the Board of Fisheries may not adopt regulations for the rearing and sale of fish from private ponds; this activity is now authorized under the new statutory framework for finfish farms.

Section 6: conforming amendment exempting permitted finfish farm activities as well as a person or vessel employed in an activity under these permits from other fish and game statutes related to different uses of fish and wildlife resources such as hunting and fishing permits, licenses, and vessel registration – consistent with the current exemption for aquatic farm and hatchery permits as well as aquatic stock acquisition permits.

Section 7: conforming amendment to exempt finfish stock and finfish farm products from purchasing, identification and other requirements that apply to fish processors and buyers and commercial fishing permit holders – consistent with existing statutory language for aquatic farm products and stock from aquatic stock acquisition permits.

Section 8: amends the Finfish farming prohibited statutes to allow the growing or cultivation of finfish under the newly created finfish farm permits.

Section 9: adds new sections for finfish farm permits and related definitions. The permits are triennial and subject to restrictions set out in this section, including the Alaska Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, permit terms and conditions necessary to protect natural fish and wildlife,

application fees, and regulations adopted in consultation with the Department of Environmental Conservation governing all aspects of finfish farming. This includes eligibility, location, operations, disease control, finfish stock and products, and any other matters necessary to implement this section and protect wild stocks of fish and game in the state. This section also requires all finfish at or sold from a farm to be triploid (sterile). The definitions limit this aquatic farming activity to bony finfish species except for salmon and an inland, closed-system water body enclosed within an escape-proof barrier.

Section 10: conforming amendment to exempt permitted finfish farm activities from the statutes that regulate entry into Alaska’s commercial fisheries – consistent with existing language for aquatic farm and hatchery permits as well as aquatic stock acquisition permits.

Section 11: conforming amendment to the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute’s definition of “seafood” to include finfish farm products.

Section 12: conforming amendment to the powers and duties statutes for the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Commissioner to authorize the permitting and regulation of finfish farms, including standards and conditions of operations, restrictions on chemical use, monitoring products for compliance, and other requirements into existing authorities for aquatic farms and hatcheries.

Section 13: adds finfish farms to the Alaska Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act statute authorizing an officer or employee designated by the DEC commissioner to inspect a factory, aquatic farm, or establishment of a DEC permit holder.

Section 14: adds finfish farms to the Alaska Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act statute authorizing the DEC commissioner or agent to have free access to a factory, warehouse, or establishment in which foods or cosmetics are manufactured, processed, packed, or held for introduction into commerce to inspect for violations and secure samples.

Section 15: conforming amendment to add definitions for finfish farm and finfish farm products to the Alaska Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Section 16: conforming amendment adding language to uncodified law requesting the revisor of statutes to change section heading of AS 16.40.210 from "Finish farming prohibited" to "Finfish farming prohibited without a permit" – consistent with section 8 of this bill.

Section 17: immediate effective date.

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE



House Fisheries Committee

House Bill 116: Sponsor Statement

Version I

"An Act exempting from insurance regulation cooperative agreements entered into by two or more persons engaged in commercial fishing for the purpose of paying claims or losses."

House Bill 116 would allow for member-owned commercial fishing insurance cooperatives based in Alaska to form without being considered an insurer.

Specifically, the bill would allow commercial fishermen to enter into a cooperative insurance agreement to pay claims arising from liability or damage to a vessel without having to comply with Title 21, the State's insurance code.

There are already three such insurance pools operating in Alaska; however, they are based in Washington State, which already has a carve out for commercial fishermen in its insurance code. This legislation would simply allow similar organizations based in Alaska to form, pool their funds, and establish a commercial fishing insurance cooperative.

Rising costs and availability of insurance serve as a barrier to operating for Alaska's aging commercial fishing fleet. Underwriters have been raising premiums on individual vessels and have become increasingly selective of which vessels they insure. Insurance pooling can provide a more attractive, lower risk alternative for underwriters, as well as lower costs for our fishermen.

With operating costs at an all-time high and fishing markets at an all-time low, House Bill 116 seeks to provide lower cost insurance alternatives for Alaska's commercial fishing fleet.

If you have any questions, please contact my staff, Matt Gruening at 465-3271 or matt.gruening@akleg.gov.

HOUSE BILL NO. 116

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

THIRTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY THE HOUSE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES BY REQUEST OF THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE EVALUATING ALASKA'S SEAFOOD INDUSTRY

Introduced: 2/26/25

Referred: House Special Committee on Fisheries, Labor and Commerce

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 **"An Act exempting from insurance regulation cooperative agreements entered into by**
2 **two or more persons engaged in commercial fishing for the purpose of paying claims or**
3 **losses."**

4 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

5 *** Section 1.** AS 21.03.021 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

6 (l) This title does not apply to two or more persons engaged in commercial
7 fishing activities who enter into a cooperative agreement with each other to pool
8 contributions for the purpose of paying claims or losses arising from

9 (1) a liability claim against a commercial fishing business operated by
10 a member of the pool; or

11 (2) the loss of or damage to a vessel or machine used in a commercial
12 fishing business that is owned or leased by a member of the pool.

**CITY OF CORDOVA, ALASKA
RESOLUTION 10-24-32**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORDOVA, ALASKA,
DISBANDING THE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE FISHERIES
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, CONSOLIDATING THE ROLES OF THOSE TWO
COMMITTEES, AUTHORIZING ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CORDOVA FISHERIES
COMMITTEE (CFC) AND TASKING THE CFC WITH THE CONSOLIDATED ROLES**

WHEREAS, the Fisheries Advisory Committee and the Fisheries Development Committee have not been actively meeting for several years; and

WHEREAS, The Cordova City Council discussed, then directed the consolidation of the two committees into one committee; and

WHEREAS, the Fisheries Advisory Committee that was most recently re-authorized via Resolution 01-20-04 and the Fisheries Development Committee that was most recently re-authorized via Resolution 11-19-51 are hereby disbanded; and

WHEREAS, The City Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska does hereby authorize establishment of the Cordova Fisheries Committee (CFC); and

WHEREAS, one role of the CFC is to advise City Council on fisheries related issues in the Prince William Sound area or elsewhere if pertinent to Cordova or Cordovans; and

WHEREAS, another role of the CFC is to work with State and Federal agencies towards the development of new commercial fisheries in the Prince William Sound area and to support expansion of existing commercial fisheries in the Prince William Sound area; and

WHEREAS, the CFC is now authorized to have a membership of seven with preference given to Area E Commercial Fishing Permit holders and also to attempt to maintain membership including representation from some or all of the following agencies, organizations, and/or job titles: ADF&G, a Fisherman's Union, the Aquaculture Industry, the Processing Industry, Marine Transportation Industry, a Fisheries Education Professional; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Cordova Municipal Code Chapter 3.50 – Advisory Boards and Committees, a member shall be nominated by the Mayor and confirmed by the Council and a member shall be a resident of the greater Cordova area and be a registered voter with the state of Alaska; and

WHEREAS, the CFC shall remain in force until such time Cordova City Council deems the Committee is no longer needed.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska, hereby determines that the Fisheries Advisory Committee and the Fisheries Development Committee are no longer needed and therefore, are disbanded; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska hereby authorizes establishment of the Cordova Fisheries Committee (CFC) to consolidate the roles of the aforementioned disbanded committees.

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 2nd DAY OF OCTOBER 2024.



David Allison, Mayor

ATTEST:

Susan Bourgeois, CMC, City Clerk