

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS
ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES

Kodiak Finfish
January 7 – 10, 2005
Anchorage, Alaska

DESIGNATED REPORTER: Sherry Wright

This summary of actions is for information purposes only and is not intended to detail, reflect or fully interpret the reasons for the board's actions.

GROUND FISH

PROPOSAL NO. 1

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Increase the GHL for Cook Inlet Pacific cod fishery to 6 percent of the federal Central Gulf TAC.

AMENDMENT: Allocation of the TAC to this area is increased to 3.75 percent within the GHL.

DISCUSSION: The proposal was deferred to the January 2005 Kodiak meeting due to protocol with the North Pacific Management Council to allow time for comments. Pot gear allocation has been met in four of the past seven years, as pot gear has generally been more effective in harvesting than jig gear. Legislation is under consideration to allow the board more tools to deal with total allowable catch proposals. This will put into regulation what is already in place in the step-up plan; it may cause the highest GHL to be reached sooner.

PROPOSAL NO. 2

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Include a vessel size limitation of 58 feet in Cook Inlet.

AMENDMENT: Prior to September 1, no more than 25 percent of the total GHL can be taken by vessels over 58 feet.

DISCUSSION: The proposal was deferred to the January 2005 Kodiak meeting due to protocol with the North Pacific Management Council to allow time for comments. This offers protection to those vessels that have historically participated in the fishery.

PROPOSAL NO. 5

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Allow a directed hook-and-line commercial shark fishery and allow sale of sharks taken as bycatch

AMENDMENTS: Notwithstanding 5 AAC 28.084, spiny dogfish may only be taken under the conditions of a commissioner's permit. For the purposes of this subsection, spiny dogfish is considered miscellaneous groundfish.

DISCUSSION: The proposal was deferred to the January 2005 Kodiak meeting due to protocol with the North Pacific Management Council to allow time for comments. Fish ticket data only identifies delivered catch, and reporting of at-sea discards is not required but some is available from agency survey efforts. Spiny dogfish are highly migratory. When these fish inhabit an area, it tends to be in large congregations. The approach of using a commissioner's permit provides adequate fishery management controls while elements of a fishery management plan are developed. Elements on a permit may include requiring an observer on request, safety decal from US Coast Guard. Size restrictions, depth of area are also set out in the miscellaneous groundfish regulations allowed by the department. There is already a fairly high level of spiny dogfish bycatch in the halibut longline fishery. By providing a directed fishery during the current harvest of halibut and sablefish, harvest is not expected to be excessive.

PROPOSAL NO. 7

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Limit the directed rockfish jig fishery to black rockfish, and implement a logbook requirement.

AMENDMENT: Include the pelagic shelf rockfish instead of only black rockfish.

DISCUSSION: The proposal was deferred to the January 2005 Kodiak meeting due to protocol with the North Pacific Management Council to allow time for comments. Management authority for black rockfish extends from shore through the adjacent federal waters. Recent department surveys have started exploring an appropriate fishery-independent approach to develop an index of black rockfish abundance. The NPFMC may consider transferring management authority for dark rockfish, another pelagic species, in adjacent federal waters, to the state. Logbook data will allow the department to monitor rockfish removals on an appropriate scale and enhance the ability to detect localized trends.

PROPOSAL NO. 8

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Require full retention of all rockfish bycatch in directed groundfish and halibut fisheries.

DISCUSSION: The proposal was deferred to the January 2005 Kodiak meeting due to protocol with the North Pacific Management Council to allow time for comments. Elements of this proposal are identical to regulations adopted for Prince William Sound rockfish. Requiring full retention of all rockfish captured encourages more complete reporting of rockfish bycatch. The state would benefit through more complete documentation of rockfish mortality.

PROPOSAL NO. 9

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Adopt a management plan for sablefish in Cook Inlet that includes July 1 registration deadline, logbook requirement and GHL divided equally among registered participants.

AMENDMENT: A vessel fishing in the Cook Inlet sablefish fishery defined in 5 AAC 28.310 may not land or have onboard more than 3,000 pounds of sablefish within two consecutive days. Remove registration deadline.

DISCUSSION: The proposal was deferred to the January 2005 Kodiak meeting due to protocol with the North Pacific Management Council to allow time for comments. Adoption of a management plan that slows the pace of the fishery may reduce lost gear and enhance safety in the fishery by providing a more extended opportunity to fish. More reliable management for the GHL will improve long-term sustainability of the harvest. Logbook data will provide more specific catch location information in addition to effort data.

PROPOSAL NO. 11

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Open a new directed longline fishery for spiny dogfish in Cook Inlet meeting.

DISCUSSION: The proposal was deferred to the January 2005 Kodiak meeting due to protocol with the North Pacific Management Council to allow time for comments. The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 5.

PROPOSAL NO. 65

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Allow retention of subsistence lingcod and rockfish up to the daily bag limit on other gear.

DISCUSSION: The proposal is supported locally. The board agreed that rockfish are customarily retained for subsistence uses if there is incidental take during other subsistence fisheries such as halibut. The board has a positive C&T determination for rockfish. Rockfish typically do not survive once brought up from lower depths, so this action would eliminate unnecessary waste.

PROPOSAL NO. 66

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Realign the Kodiak Management Area and PWS Area boundaries.

DISCUSSION: The oversight leading to undescribed waters between the Kodiak and PWS management areas occurred in 1997 when management area descriptions were revised and the Central Gulf of Alaska area was divided among three management areas. However, since 1997, harvest that occurred between 150° and 149° W. longitude has been attributed to the Kodiak area

in the statewide fish ticket database. This proposal is consistent with current catch reporting, will not impact state-managed fisheries, and is considered housekeeping by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 67

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow groundfish in state waters to only be taken with pot and jig gear.

DISCUSSION: The department lacks the staff, resources, and funding to develop fishery management plans and actively manage every species of groundfish that occurs within state waters. The NPFMC currently manages dusky rockfish in the Gulf of Alaska. The board is working on creation of a groundfish fishery rationalization framework. The BOF has established a stakeholder rationalization task force.

PROPOSAL NO. 68

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Open state waters Pacific cod jig fishery March 15.

DISCUSSION: The opening date has varied over the eight-year history of this fishery. The opening has been structured to occur at a specified time following the closure of the federal Pacific cod season. The board prefers to keep the status quo and spread out the fleet effort instead of piling up the cod fleet later in the season. The board saw merit in aligning seasons with federal openings.

PROPOSAL NO. 69

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Open state waters Pacific cod jig fishery April 1.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 68.

PROPOSAL NO. 70

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Establish Pacific cod super-exclusive registration by gear type.

DISCUSSION: The number of vessels that have used both gear types within a registration. Many of the vessels that have participated in both jig and pot fisheries to maximize the amount of time in which they can access the Pacific cod resource given the shorter seasons and increased economic importance of the Pacific cod fishery. This would unduly limit that participation. The jig quota has not always been utilized, so the board saw no conservation problem.

PROPOSAL NO. 71

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Establish Pacific cod super-exclusive registration by gear type.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 70.

PROPOSAL NO. 72

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Establish Pacific cod super-exclusive registration by gear type and registration area.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 70.

PROPOSAL NO. 73

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Establish Pacific cod super-exclusive registration by gear type to include longline gear from the parallel Pacific cod fishery.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 70.

PROPOSAL NO. 74

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Limit other fishing gear onboard vessels fishing Pacific cod with jig gear.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 75.

PROPOSAL NO. 75

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Limit other fishing gear onboard vessels fishing Pacific cod with jig gear.

AMENDMENT: In the Kodiak Area, a vessel utilizing mechanical jig gear to take groundfish may not have more than 250 hooks deployed or onboard.

DISCUSSION: This allows for some vessel operators that use their longline ground line to set and retrieve the anchor used to keep the vessel from drifting while fishing. Board intent is not to increase the amount of hooks allowable, but to clearly define the number of hooks as a maximum aggregate of 250.

PROPOSAL NO. 76

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Restrict vessel size to 58 feet or smaller for the state waters Pacific cod jig fishery.

DISCUSSION: There are few large vessels over 58 feet participating in the jig fishery. Because of that, economics will dictate who participates in the jig fishery; this fishery is self limiting. The proposal could have negative economic effects.

PROPOSAL NO. 77

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Reallocate Pacific cod harvest by a gear type in excess of the GHIL to remaining gear type in the following year.

AMENDMENT: In the Kodiak Management Area state waters Pacific cod fishery: if, prior to the Sept. 1 rollover, either the pot or the jig fishery exceeds their percentage of quota allocation in any year, the amount of pounds in excess of their quota the prior year would be reduced from the pounds allocated to that sector in the following year and added to the quota of the other sector.

DISCUSSION: The department supports measures to allow gear types to achieve their respective allocations, but stated that the amendment would not improve the ability to manage or help each meet their allocation. The board noted the volume of proposals received on this issue shows concern by users, and that the calculation within the amendment was not difficult to make. However, the board is concerned about complicating management. There may be unforeseen allocative effects as the GHIL varies from year to year, and penalty provisions may affect the total allocation to any gear group. Board believes the department can work toward better management of the allocation with the current tools. The department committed to increasing communication with processors, and shorten the advance notice when it can.

PROPOSAL NO. 78

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Reallocate Pacific cod harvest by pot gear in excess of the pot gear GHIL to jig gear in the following year.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 77.

PROPOSAL NO. 79

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Manage the state waters Pacific cod pot fishery for 75 percent of allocation, with a trip-limit mop-up of the remaining 25 percent.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 77.

PROPOSAL NO. 80

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Manage the state waters Pacific cod pot fishery for 75 percent allocation, with a trip-limit mop-up of the remaining 25 percent.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 77.

PROPOSAL NO. 81

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Manage the state waters Pacific cod pot fishery for 75 percent allocation, with a mop-up of the remaining 25 percent in the fall.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 77.

PROPOSAL NO. 82

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Harvest the state waters Pacific cod pot fishery in two portions, 75 to 80 percent in the spring, and 20 to 25 percent in the fall.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 77.

PROPOSAL NO. 83

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Close state waters Pacific cod pot fishery 100,000 to 500,000 pounds below the GHL, mop-up any remaining quota, and adopt overage penalty provisions

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 77.

PROPOSAL NO. 84

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Reduce state waters Pacific cod pot fishery pot limits.

DISCUSSION: The proposal attempts to slow down the pace of the fishery. The board believes that the current 60 pot limit is a workable number. In other fisheries a reduction of pots resulted in operators lifting their gear more frequently, thus achieving the same harvest. The board recognized the need to improve information flow from processors and fishermen as the central issue in the department's ability to control harvest in this area.

PROPOSAL NO. 85

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Establish a logbook requirement for black rockfish.

DISCUSSION: This would allow the department to track accurately harvest by specific location over time and would help prevent depletion in certain habitats. The 5 percent is applied per delivery. Sport fish charter logbooks are already prepared for the 2005 regulatory season, so it was too late to add this requirement to the sport fishery.

PROPOSAL NO. 86

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Increase black rockfish incidental harvest limits for jig gear until GHL achieved and require logbook if incidental harvest exceeds 5 percent of landing.

AMENDMENT: A vessel operator holding a valid groundfish registration using mechanical jig or hand troll gear for fisheries other than the directed black rockfish fishery may not sell or have onboard more than 2,500 pounds (round weight) of black rockfish, including split fish ticket deliveries. In addition, vessel operators may not sell more than 5,000 pounds (round weight) of black rockfish, including split fish ticket deliveries, in a five-day period. All vessel operators shall register with ADF&G for a specific black rockfish section. All black rockfish taken in excess of 2,500 pounds (round weight) must be sold, weighted, and reported on a department fish ticket. All proceeds from the sale of black rockfish in excess of 2,500 pounds (round weight) shall be surrendered to the state. Vessels retaining more than 5 percent of black rockfish shall be subject to the black rockfish logbook requirements for Kodiak area.

DISCUSSION: The department will identify by registration those vessels harvesting an excess amount and will be restricted in their weekly limit. Board supports the conservation efforts of the department.

PROPOSAL NO. 87

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Redefine the time period for the black rockfish directed fishery weekly trip limit.

DISCUSSION: The board found that existing regulations are working. The current regulations help the department stay within GHLS.

PROPOSAL NO. 88

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Increase the black rockfish weekly trip limit.

DISCUSSION: Board believes that areas farther out have lower quotas and populations, and would be subject to overharvest. The board also had concerns about enforcement officer's ability to enforce if this proposal were enacted. Keeping the 2,500 trip limit is a management tool to ensure sustainability of the resource.

PROPOSAL NO. 89**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow black rockfish fishers to simultaneously hold a registration for the state waters Pacific cod jig fishery.

DISCUSSION: The department's ability to track vessels participating in black rockfish would be compromised by allowing vessels to participate in both the black rockfish and other groundfish fisheries simultaneously. The board also referred to its discussion under proposal 86.

HERRING***Area coordinates, Lines, Closed waters, Dates*****PROPOSAL NO. 90****ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Standardize the Kodiak Area description for herring fisheries.

DISCUSSION: When the board last defined the Kodiak area in the commercial salmon regulations a slight disparity resulted in the herring area description. The board saw this as housekeeping.

PROPOSAL NO. 91**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Use GPS for all regulatory coordinates.

DISCUSSION: This action will relieve confusion among the Kodiak commercial herring fleet and make existing boundary lines more enforceable.

Gear specifications and definitions**PROPOSAL NO. 92****ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Reduce purse seine gear depth to 600 meshes.

DISCUSSION: There would be significant costs to participants involved in hanging a new seine or adapting an old net. This would reallocate herring to seiners who work with spotter pilots in shallower areas. There may be potential for more reckless fishing and overharvest if the fleet were forced to fish in smaller areas in shallower waters. The board believes it is unfair handicapping the fleet by requiring shallower seines for a problem specific to an area, and favored as a management tool short-term openings and closures.

PROPOSAL NO. 93**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Reduce purse seine gear depth.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 92.

Sac Roe—Harvest Strategy**PROPOSAL NO. 94****ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Allow fishing periods to be established by emergency order.

DISCUSSION: Updates the current regulation on how the department has managed the fishery since 2002. This will provide for an orderly harvest.

PROPOSAL NO. 95**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Amend the harvest strategy to allow for quality products.

AMENDMENT: Allow department to open a section to both gear types to achieve allocation, while striving for the highest quality product.

DISCUSSION: Board believes department should manage for the highest roe quality possible. This further addresses the achievement of allocations in the Uganik District. Fishery performance in 2003 in the Uganik Districts various sections was poor except for the Village Island Section which is a seine-only area. This action puts into regulation the successful management schemes the department has in place in other areas.

PROPOSAL NO. 96**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Require permit holder registration.

DISCUSSION: The department can more effectively manage the herring sac roe fishery by implementing a registration permit for late season fisherman. This will enable the department to keep track of where the fleet is fishing.

PROPOSAL NO. 97

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Allow both seine and gillnet gear to operate in the same section.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 95.

PROPOSAL NO. 98

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Allow both seine and gillnet gear to operate in the same section.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 95.

Food-and-Bait

PROPOSAL NO. 99

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Amend the food and bait season opening date.

DISCUSSION: An earlier opening of the fishery would permit the fleet to catch bait for the lucrative and largest market for Kodiak bait herring: the Bering Sea Red King Crab Fishery. Fishermen could receive a high price for herring from this market.

SALMON

Subsistence

PROPOSAL NO. 100

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Modify the customary and traditional findings.

AMENDMENT: Update amounts necessary for subsistence for salmon, rockfish, lingcod and other finfish in the Kodiak Management Area, based on the last 10-year average.

DISCUSSION: This proposal breaks out rockfish and lingcod amounts needed for subsistence from salmon and other finfish.

PROPOSAL NO. 101

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Use GPS for all regulatory coordinates.

DISCUSSION: This would eliminate confusion among the Kodiak subsistence fleet and make existing boundary lines more enforceable. Board believes that the GPS is a universal system.

PROPOSAL NO. 102

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Standardize the Kodiak Area description.

DISCUSSION: This would standardize the Kodiak Area description for subsistence into regulation and enhance enforcement of Kodiak boundary lines.

PROPOSAL NO. 103

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Close Shafaka Cove to gillnet gear after September 30.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that the subsistence priority does not apply to stocked fish. The proposal does not provide a method to harvest any remaining enhanced coho salmon that may stray if unable to enter Mission Lake.

Sport Fishing

PROPOSAL NO. 104

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Standardize the Kodiak Area wild trout regulations.

AMENDMENTS: In remote zones: the statewide standards were adopted (daily bag and possession limit of two per day, only one 20 inches or greater in length, and an annual limit of two fish 20 inches or greater in length). All special provisions in the remote zone, including the April 1 – June 14 spawning ground closure, were repealed. In the road zone: catch-and-release only, all

year long. In the freshwater of the road zone: only unbaited artificial lures are allowed from November 1 – April 30, except for stocked lakes, Chiniak and Barry's Lagoons. Catch-and-release restrictions do not apply in stocked lakes, which continue to have a daily bag and possession limit of 10 fish, only one may be 20 inches or greater in length.

DISCUSSION: Board supports adoption of the statewide bag and possession limits for conservation purposes.

PROPOSAL NO. 105

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Allow chinook salmon fishing in the Lake Rose Tead drainage.

DISCUSSION: Since there is no longer a stocking program there is no longer a need to protect King Salmon in the Lake Rose Tead drainage. The area can to be open to allow stray fish from the Monashka Creek and road systems stocking programs to be harvested.

PROPOSAL NO. 106

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Require a minimum distance between sport and commercial gear.

AMENDMENT: In Uyak Bay District of the Kodiak Management Area, sport fish guides and/or their clients shall not engage in sport fishing from a vessel that is tied or attached to commercial fishing set gillnets or associated anchor lines when set gillnets are actively fishing or otherwise interfere with set gillnet active fishing.

DISCUSSION: Because of the increase of lodges and sport fishing effort in the Uyak Bay area, the problem of potential interference needs to be addressed.

PROPOSAL NO. 107

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Create an Ayakulik River King Salmon Management Plan.

DISCUSSION: Board believes adoption of the recommendations of the workgroup are warranted. The board wrote a finding to accomplish this goal.

Area coordinates, Lines, Closed waters, Dates

PROPOSAL NO. 108

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Use GPS for all regulatory coordinates.

AMENDMENTS: The board amended the original proposal in accordance with new information.

DISCUSSION: Board considers this a housekeeping proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 109

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Redefine section lines in the Afognak and Southwest districts.

AMENDMENTS: Further defines the boundaries.

DISCUSSION: Clarifies and simplifies regulations, reduces enforcement problems and allows greater opportunity for fishermen to target specific salmon runs when the section is open to fishing.

PROPOSAL NO. 110

ACTION: Carried as amended.

DESCRIPTION: Clarify closed waters descriptions.

AMENDMENTS: Defines the closed water boundaries. (RC 9 – strike reference to Prop 109 in first sentence)

DISCUSSION: Several regulatory descriptions of closed waters would be changed slightly, in order to protect the salmon buildup areas at stream mouths and to clarify and/or simplify identification of closed water areas. Enforcement uses GPS equipment on aircraft, unlike the equipment commonly used on board fishing vessels. Board prefers to deal with this issue in one of the Paul's Bay proposals.

PROPOSAL NO. 111

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Amend all the management plans fishing seasons, dates and species.

DISCUSSION: This proposal allows the commercial salmon season to open June 1 instead of June 5. Conflicts may occur concerning the management of commercial salmon fisheries during years in which run timing or strength is different than when the management plans were crafted. An example is the past several seasons where minimum escapement goals were exceeded at Karluk prior to the June 5 opening on Kodiak's Westside. Lack of authority for the department to act could lead to overescapement, which could harm future production. Harvest of salmon in excess of escapement needs may be foregone, with a loss of revenue due to curtailed fishing opportunities. Provides island-wide consistency and an ability to fish when an early, strong run of salmon appears or is forecast.

Gear specifications and definitions

PROPOSAL NO. 112

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Amend the definition of when a purse seine has ceased fishing.

DISCUSSION: Provides a standardized definition between salmon and herring purse seine fisheries in the Kodiak area.

PROPOSAL NO. 113

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Amend purse seine gear length and web size.

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the efficiency of using one size of seine webbing for the entire seine. The board believes that allowing a total of 250 fathoms of seine would increase gear efficiency and reallocate fish from gillnet to seine gear. In several areas of the Kodiak Management Area, purse seine and gillnet fishermen are in direct competition for available salmon resources.

PROPOSAL NO. 114

ACTION: Tabled to work group

DESCRIPTION: Establish a troll fishery in the Kodiak Area.

DISCUSSION: Since the troll fishery would be targeting coho salmon, concern was expressed about the effects on the sport fishery and the fully-utilized chinook fishery. Further concerns were raised about interception of Cook Inlet stocks. Positive aspects about a troll fishery for coho may be the higher value for a quality product, and participation by salmon fishermen currently inactive because of low prices if higher prices for quality fish are offered. A troll fishery has lower overhead costs. Department believes the potential increase in gear and effort, the uncertainty of effects of such a fishery on local and nonlocal stocks are more fully explored and addressed, and the complexity of the effects of this proposal with regard to the Pacific Salmon Treaty. Board is not authorized to determine who may participate; that authority rests with CFEC. Board stated this proposal fits the definition of a restructuring proposal. The board decided to charge to a workgroup consisting of members Dersham, Heyano and Jensen to continue looking at this proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 115

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow salmon joint ventures in the Kodiak Area.

DISCUSSION: Board agreed there would be unknown ramifications for the fishermen behind the combined nets. There was concern about participants holding more shoreline with "dummy sets" and that it could cause problems between set netters and seiners on Kodiak's Westside. Access to any unoccupied leased fishing sites of a joint venture member would be limited. In addition, allowing joint ventures may be beyond the authority of the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 116

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow setnets to be constructed of seine webbing.

DISCUSSION: The board found this proposal may create a high production fish trap with serious allocation issues.

Cape Igvak Fishery

PROPOSAL NO. 117

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Amend Cape Igvak fishing periods in consideration of the Chignik fishery.

DISCUSSION: Adoption would make it difficult to achieve Kodiak's allocation under the Cape Igvak Management Plan.

Westside Fishery

PROPOSAL NO. 118

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Amend the fishing period times to earlier openings and longer duration.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 111.

PROPOSAL NO. 119

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit retention of chinook salmon under certain circumstances.

DISCUSSION: The board provided the department with an additional tool to curtail the harvest of king salmon when these sections are opened to target sockeye and pink salmon. The 28-inch limit makes it easier to spot the king salmon. Because of the limited area involved, this action will not place undue hardship on the fleet.

Alitak Fishery

PROPOSAL NO. 120

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Modify section lines in the Alitak and Moser Bay sections.

DISCUSSION: This proposal makes it easier to locate the lines and avoids confusion.

PROPOSAL NO. 121

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the rolling fishing period times.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 122

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the allocative objectives of the plan.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on action taken on proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 123

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify the allocative objectives to a set allocation.

DISCUSSION: The department would have difficulties managing for this detailed allocation. It is hard to know during the salmon season how many fish will return. Board sees progress in regard to marketing plans of area fishermen and plans that address quality of the product. There are still significant hurdles that need to be met by the stakeholders. Board restructuring panel is looking at statutory issues and proponents were encouraged to follow up at subsequent meetings for that process.

PROPOSAL NO. 124

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Alitak Bay Management Plan.

AMENDMENTS: Increase fishing time in various sections to achieve escapement and harvest objectives of salmon stocks returning to the Humpy-Deadman section systems, and the Horse Marine, Frazer, Akalura, and Upper Station systems.

DISCUSSION: Board intent is to equalize opportunity between user groups in the area. This proposal helps stabilize management by providing more flexibility for the department to eliminate mandatory closures should an overescapement become a concern throughout the season, and to promote orderly fisheries.

PROPOSAL NO. 125

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Allow an exclusive Olga/Moser Bay set gillnet fishery.

DISCUSSION: The board referred to its discussion on proposal 123, and took no action based on action taken on proposal 123.

PROPOSAL NO. 126

ACTION:

DESCRIPTION: Allow a set gillnet cooperative fishery in Olga/Moser Bay.

DISCUSSION: The board referred to its discussion on proposal 123, and took no action based on action taken on proposal 123.

PROPOSAL NO. 127

ACTION:

DESCRIPTION: Allow a set gillnet cooperative in Olga/Moser Bay to use fish traps.

DISCUSSION: The board referred to its discussion on proposal 123, and took no action based on action taken on proposal 123.

Afognak Fisheries

PROPOSAL NO. 128

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Amend the closed waters area at Pauls Bay to remove reduced markers.

DISCUSSION: Adoption of this proposal would take a management tool away from department needed to harvest surplus fish under some circumstances. The board also referred to its discussion under proposal 110.

PROPOSAL NO. 129

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Amend the closed waters area at Pauls Bay.

DISCUSSION: Board expressed opposition due to allocative aspect and concern of conflicts having the mop-up line so close. The board also referred to its discussion under proposal 110.

PROPOSAL NO. 130

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Amend the timeframe and harvest caps in the North Shelikof Management Plan.

DISCUSSION: Kodiak sockeye stocks have increased since this management plan was adopted and implemented. However, the board sees no compelling reason to change the plan. Concern of interception of Cook Inlet fish was discussed. Fisheries are managed based on local stock.

Miscellaneous Fisheries

PROPOSAL NO. 131

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Change all terminal harvest areas to special harvest areas.

DISCUSSION: Cost-recovery fisheries could occur in these areas on enhanced Kodiak Regional Aquaculture Association (KRAA) stocks if needed, without the delay of procuring special authorizations. This is a housekeeping proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 132

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Allow the use of live fish pens.

DISCUSSION: This action gives department authority to institute registration and reporting requirements, as well as other limitations or requirements regarding construction and operation of net pens used to hold live salmon prior to processing. Board expressed concern about the numbers and locations of pens in an area, and concern for overharvesting. There has been an increase in interest in direct marketing by area commercial salmon permit holders. There has been discovered a demand for high quality, fresh or fresh frozen salmon. This is similar to action taken by the board in the Chignik cooperative fishery.

PROPOSAL NO. 432

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate sport fish harvest record requirements for shellfish fisheries.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action taken based on action taken on proposal 454.

PROPOSAL NO. 454

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate sport fish harvest record requirements for shellfish fisheries.

DISCUSSION: The reporting requirement is not needed as a relatively small sport angler harvest occurs. That harvest effort is already recorded on the statewide harvest survey.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Afognak Lake sockeye Stock of Concern

In the Kodiak Management Area (KMA) the Afognak Lake sockeye salmon was been identified in October 2004 as a candidate for a stock of concern. The department recommended lowering the Afognak Lake SEG of 40,000 to 60,000, to a BEG of 20,000 to 50,000 fish. The department's goal is to determine stock status, continue to monitor adult sockeye escapement to Afognak Lake through the use of a fish weir, to be operated annually on the Afognak River. Based on the Sustainable Salmon Fisheries Policy, the board found this sockeye stock does not fit the definition of a stock of concern.

Finding for Ayakulik River King Salmon Sport Fishery

Interim measures adopted by regulatory agencies in response to the problems and concerns cited by stakeholders are a reasonable, measured approach that properly addresses the social issues affecting the Ayakulik River king salmon sport fishery. Voluntary camp closures adjacent to popular fishing locations benefits all king salmon anglers.

Emergency Petition: Alagnak River sockeye set gillnet 2005 commercial salmon season.

Board finds that this petition does meet the emergency petition criteria, as a harvest may be foregone without action by the board. The board scheduled action at the Statewide King/Tanner Crab meeting in March 2005.

Board generated proposal: State waters pollock fishery in Aleutian Islands, Western Gulf, and Cook Inlet Management Areas

The board generated a proposal to consider sea lion protection areas in state waters pollock fishery in the Aleutian Islands, Western Gulf of Alaska, and Cook Inlet Management Areas. The board scheduled action at the Statewide King/Tanner Crab meeting in March 2005. The board will notify the NPFMC in order to consult prior to the March meeting.

Reports on Board Committees

The Sitka Herring Open Pound Workgroup met and did not find consensus to pursue the open pound fishery. The issue is considered complete by the board.

The PWS Allocation Committee is scheduled for another meeting January 11. Will find whether there are points of consensus and encourage the committee to submit proposals for the next cycle as needed.