

Summary of Actions
Alaska Board of Fisheries

**SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT
GROUNDFISH, DUNGENESS CRAB, SHRIMP, MISC.
February 20-26, 2006
Ketchikan, Alaska**

DESIGNATED REPORTER: Scott Crass

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.

PROPOSAL NO. 223

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Require punch cards for groundfish taken by guided anglers.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that the punch card would duplicate information collected on the new charter logbooks, be more difficult to enforce, and more expensive to implement. The board also noted the authors desire to withdraw the proposal. The board also noted its lack of authority to act on this proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 224

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Repeal stand down requirement between troll and groundfish fisheries.

DISCUSSION: The department noted that this is an outdated regulation and is having unintended consequences on the fishery and users.

PROPOSAL NO. 225

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Modify groundfish bait fishery regulation, close for certain species.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that high value species needed to be accounted for and rockfish must be retained and landed and reported on fish tickets. The board felt that these fish are of high value and should not be used for bait. The board went on to discuss the current scrutiny of yelloweye and lingcod management. The board also noted the fact that current lingcod stocks are strong and they make good bait.

PROPOSAL NO. 226

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Reduce demersal shelf rockfish (DSR) bycatch in longline fisheries and include sport harvest in total harvest.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 232.

PROPOSAL NO. 227

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Close commercial DSR fisheries in District 1.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that there was a small quota, and heard the department's comment that there was no need to close the area.

PROPOSAL NO. 228**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify DSR fishing seasons and season allocations.**DISCUSSION:** The department expressed support for this proposal because it could aid in orderly management of these fisheries. The board noted that this proposal allows for full utilization of directed quota and clearly separates directed fishing from halibut fishing.**PROPOSAL NO. 229****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify closed waters to taking of DSR.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted the department's intent to restore a typo in regulation and viewed this as a housekeeping proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 230****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Reduce nonresident bag and possession limits for yelloweye rockfish to one per day, two in possession.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 232.**PROPOSAL NO. 231****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit charter operators and crew from retaining yelloweye rockfish.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 232.**PROPOSAL NO. 232****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Restrict sport fishing harvest limits for yelloweye.**AMENDMENTS:** Regulatory options for attaining an 84 percent commercial and 16 percent sport allocation of demersal shelf rockfish in Southeast Alaska outside waters.**DISCUSSION:** The department noted immediate conservation concerns for yelloweye rockfish. The board considered several methods for addressing conservation concerns. The board discussed the history of this and surrounding fisheries. The board then examined the nature and numbers of bycatch. There was a discussion of possible economic impacts and how to quantify them.**PROPOSAL NO. 233****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Restrict sport fishing bag limit for guided anglers to one demersal rockfish per day in Area 1.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 232.**PROPOSAL NO. 234****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow one state possession limit for rockfish in halibut subsistence fishery.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that there was no public support for this proposal. Concern regarding reasonable opportunity for subsistence was noted.**PROPOSAL NO. 235****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow anglers to retain trophy lingcod at or above a specified size.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the department's current Emergency Order (EO) authority.

PROPOSAL NO. 236**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit lingcod subsistence fishing using spear, December 1 - May 15.**AMENDMENTS:** Language to include personal use was added.**DISCUSSION:** The department proclaimed that this regulation would protect nest-guarding males from harvest. The board examined the sexual behavior of lingcod extensively.**PROPOSAL NO. 237****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow year-round incidental take of one lingcod in halibut subsistence fishery.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that there was some concern about catch in the Sitka Local Area Management Plan (LAMP) and perhaps a bycatch limit may be appropriate at some point in the future for this area. The board also noted that there was no clear intent behind the proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 238****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Modify allocation percentages and GHL for East Yakutat lingcod fisheries.**AMENDMENTS:** Substitute language was included increasing the GHL to 225,000 pounds.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that there is some evidence that the lingcod stocks could support some increase in harvest however the directed fishery is the only sector that is routinely taking their full allocation and has exceeded its allocation during its very short seasons.**PROPOSAL NO. 239****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Increase lingcod bycatch limit in halibut longline fishery from 5 to 10 percent in Icy Bay.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the possibility that the increased percent bycatch allowance would allow for full utilization of the resource and that should longliners catch more than 5 percent they would shake less fish.**PROPOSAL NO. 240****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Modify flatfish fishery trip limit and other provisions.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that flatfish are low value species and it takes a high volume of fish to make a trip profitable as well as the current and historical makeup of the fishery. The board recognized the possibility of overharvest.**PROPOSAL NO. 241****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Designate Southeast beam trawl flatfish fishery as superexclusive.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that the quota is small for flatfish in this area and a superexclusive registration would likely control the pace of fishery. The board noted that conservation concerns while not immediate could become an issue.

PROPOSAL NO. 242**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Repeal flatfish trawl fishery regulations.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that the fishery is already on the books and should stay there as it is often difficult to reinstate fisheries once closed as well as interest in prosecuting this fishery by displaced shrimp beam trawl harvesters. The department withdrew support for this proposal, which it had submitted.**PROPOSAL NO. 243****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Establish halibut prohibitions for sport fishing businesses and guides.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that this proposal is outside of its authority.**PROPOSAL NO. 244****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Create trip limit for Pacific cod fishery.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that fishermen who harvest Pacific cod for sale to crab fishermen often take more than 15,000 pounds a week because of the short duration of the crab fishery. The common size of fishing vessels used in this fishery was discussed by the board.**PROPOSAL NO. 245****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Change Northern Southeast Inside Waters sablefish season to August 1.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted a longer season would allow for a more orderly fishery where there would be less switching between gear type and fishing. The board also examined the idea that the two additional weeks in August would allow for more "family fishing". The department stated that it needs July and early August to conduct stock assessment survey and this proposal has the potential to skew research data by moving the surveys to an earlier date.**PROPOSAL NO. 246****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify sablefish possession and landing rollover regulation.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that the overage and underage policy is working well whereas the transfer of fish is difficult to track and not often utilized.**PROPOSAL NO. 247****ACTION: Deferred to March 2006****DESCRIPTION:** Change escape mechanism for shellfish and bottomfish pots to allow for 90 thread twine.**DISCUSSION:** Enforcement expressed concern that having a variety of thread specifications would lead to confusion in identifying twine sized. The department noted that 72 and 90 size have not been tested for compliance.**PROPOSAL NO. 248****ACTION: Deferred to March 2006****DESCRIPTION:** Change escape mechanism for shellfish and bottomfish pots to allow for 90 thread twine.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed Proposal 248 concurrently with Proposal 247.

PROPOSAL NO. 249**ACTION: Deferred to March 2006****DESCRIPTION:** Modify escape mechanisms for pot gear.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed Proposal 249 concurrently with Proposal 247. The department noted the increase use of cage style pots.**PROPOSAL NO. 250****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify use of commercial vessel in personal use shrimp fishery.**DISCUSSION:** The department submitted this proposal and considered it a housekeeping proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 251****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Change Section 3-A shrimp opening date to May.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that this proposal may greatly increase the effort in this area and other areas when they are opened separately, increasing difficulty for fishery management, and increasing gear crowding. The board heard concerns from the department that this proposal may increase shrimp mortality due to fishing during a sensitive time in the shrimp life cycle, which could lead to greater handling mortality.**PROPOSAL NO. 252****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Change Section 3-A shrimp opening date to May.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 251.**PROPOSAL NO. 253****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Change Section 3-A shrimp opening date to May.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 251.**PROPOSAL NO. 254****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Change Section 3-A shrimp opening date to May.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 251.**PROPOSAL NO. 255****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Change Section 3-A shrimp opening date to May.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 251.**PROPOSAL NO. 256****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Close commercial shrimp fishery in District 15, Taiya Inlet.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted this proposal may increase access for local sport, personal use and subsistence users and conserve shrimp stocks. However, it would decrease access for commercial shrimp harvesters. The department noted the inability to use commercial catch as an indicator of stock status if the commercial fishery closed. The board considered the department's current ability to close the fishery by EO authority.**PROPOSAL NO. 257****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Require the department to manage pot shrimp fishery for target harvest rates.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted the proponent's desire to withdraw this proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 258**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Increase upper bound of all pot shrimp Guideline Harvest Ranges.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 261.**PROPOSAL NO. 259****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow the department to keep certain statistical areas open for pot shrimp fishing when remainder of fishing area closes.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted the proponent's desire to withdraw this proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 260****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Require buoys on each end of long-lined gear with more than five shrimp pots.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the ability of shrimp harvesters to know where other shrimp harvester's gear is located allowing reduced gear conflicts. The board noted this proposal may reduce loss of gear although it will increase cost for some users if they are not already using a two buoy system.**PROPOSAL NO. 261****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify pot shrimp Guideline Harvest Ranges (GHR) to be consistent with current management.**AMENDMENTS:** Some GHRs for some districts were increased by amendment.**DISCUSSION:** The department noted the desire for added flexibility for setting Guideline Harvest Levels (GHL) within the new ranges without board of Fisheries interaction. The board discussed the idea that even though this will change the GHRs in some districts the department will still manage to the GHLs set by the department each season based on biological data, catch rates, and past fishery performance. Increase in GHRs may falsely imply upward preseason or inseason adjustment of harvest GHLs. The board recognized the work of the Southeast Alaska Pot Shrimp Task Force for developing recommendations.**PROPOSAL NO. 262****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify shrimp pot size limitations.**DISCUSSION:** The department noted that it considers this a housekeeping proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 263****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify retention of nontargeted species in Southeast shrimp beam trawl fishery.**DISCUSSION:** The department submitted this proposal and considers it a housekeeping proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 264****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify trawl gear operation regulation in shrimp fishery.**DISCUSSION:** The department submitted this proposal and considers it a housekeeping proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 265**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify operation of multiple gear types in Southeast shrimp fisheries.**DISCUSSION:** The department submitted this proposal and considers it a housekeeping proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 266****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify shrimp catcher-processor reporting requirements.**DISCUSSION:** The department considered this a housekeeping proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 267****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit shrimp fishing from registered charter vessels in Sitka Sound from May 1- through September 15.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the possibility of an increase in the availability of shrimp in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area (SSSUA) to non-charter vessels. Discussion took place on restrictions to residents and nonresidents from using a charter vessel to fish for shrimp in the SSSUA and a possible effect on the marketability of fishing charters in Sitka. The board concluded that this proposal was too restrictive.**PROPOSAL NO. 268****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Close sport fishing for shrimp in areas closed to commercial fishing.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that this proposal would increase the availability of shrimp to residents of Alaska, however it may be at the expense of charter fishing operations that currently fish in areas closed to commercial fishing.**PROPOSAL NO. 269****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit shellfish fishing from registered charter vessels in Sitka Sound from May 1- September 15.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the possibility that this proposal would reduce the amount of shellfish sport fishing effort in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area and allocate more shellfish to personal use fishers. The board also noted that charter boat operators would not be able to use their own vessels to fish for personal use shellfish, but that could be addressed with an amendment clarifying the restriction would apply only while charter clients are onboard. It considered impacts on the marketability of fishing charters and opted against the restriction because there was not a demonstrated biological problem.**PROPOSAL NO. 270****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Prohibit clients or guests of sport fishing businesses from setting or deploying shellfish gear.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that this proposal would reduce the income of charter operators and that there are currently explicit regulations regarding shellfish charter fishing. The board observed that this would be a highly restrictive proposal which would not effectively address any conservation concerns while having a possible negative impact on the economy of the region.

PROPOSAL NO. 271**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit possession of shellfish fishing gear and shellfish onboard charter vessels between May 1 and September 30.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that there are already regulations regarding guided nonresident sport shellfish harvest.

PROPOSAL NO. 272**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Close Echo Cove to commercial Dungeness crab fishing.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that this area is located near a well-used boat launch and camping area and therefore gear conflicts with personal use and sport fishers would be reduced by the adoption of this proposal. The board recalled that this area closure has been proposed at other board meetings. At those meetings, compromises were reached leaving Echo Cove open and closing other areas that are on the Juneau road system. The board discussed the one crabber who makes a living from fishing in this area and the economic impacts on said crabber if this proposal were adopted. The board noted that creating additional commercial closures will decrease the total commercial fishing grounds.

PROPOSAL NO. 273**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Close portions of Chaik Bay to commercial crab fishery.

AMENDMENTS: An amendment to clarify the exact area of closure as waters of Chaik Bay east of a line beginning at the tip of the peninsula on the north at 57° 19.280' N, 134° 28.934' W and extending to 57° 19.029' N, 134° 28.874' W.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that Dungeness crab in Chaik Bay and other bays nearby have decreased in abundance. Residents want the opportunity to catch Dungeness crab and the board noted that this is one of the few available recreational opportunities.

PROPOSAL NO. 274**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Close Funter Bay to commercial crab fishery.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that closing the commercial Dungeness crab fishery in Funter Bay would provide more personal use and sport fishing opportunities as well as reduce the amount of pots in the area. The board examined the cumulative effects of adding this closure and the importance of commercial harvest in Funter Bay.

PROPOSAL NO. 275**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Close upper Taiya Inlet to commercial crab fishery.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that many residents of Skagway had expressed concern about the continued depletion of Dungeness crab in Taiya Inlet. The board discussed resource conservation concerns and the perceived lack of enforcement. The board noted that conservation concerns can be addressed with in-season time and area closures.

PROPOSAL NO. 276

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Establish 200 pot limit for commercial crab fishery.

DISCUSSION: The department noted that a pot limit reduction could reduce gear loss and ghost fishing. The board noted the possibility this proposal would reduce the amount of gear on the fishing grounds and reduce crowding. The board also considered the idea that gear reduction would reduce conflicts between commercial fishers, and personal use and sport fishers. However the board noted that a pot limit reduction could disadvantage smaller vessels and thus have allocative implications. The board noted that some stakeholders felt gear conflicts might be reduced by opening other areas.

PROPOSAL NO. 277

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Close Taku Harbor to commercial crab fishery.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that Taku Harbor is a popular boating destination for Juneau residents and that regular visitors feel this area should be closed to commercial Dungeness crabbing to provide for a personal use and sport fishing priority because of its high use. The board declared that this was a relatively small fishery and that creating additional commercial closures will decrease the total commercial fishing grounds where there is already limited opportunity.

PROPOSAL NO. 278

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Modify crab fishing periods for Districts 1 and 2 open concurrent with other areas.

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 280.

PROPOSAL NO. 279

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Repeal buoy tag requirement for commercial pots.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that the cost to crabbers would be reduced. Enforcement noted that without buoy tags, there would be no way to enforce pot limits because Dungeness crab pots are widely distributed and enforcement would have an extremely difficult time finding and counting all of one permit holders pots.

PROPOSAL NO. 280**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Modify crab fishing periods for Districts 1 and 2 and Section 13-B open concurrently with other areas.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that the proposed season change could reduce commercial, personal use, and sport fishing conflicts in Northern and Central areas during the summer commercial season as the commercial fleet would be spread out. The weather is better in the summer and the board noted that boats from the northern areas could travel to Districts 1 and 2 to take full advantage of the fishing grounds in the area whereas traveling this distance in the fall can be very dangerous. The board also examined the possibility that catch rates may be higher in the summer because the crabs are more active. The board noted that a fall/winter commercial Dungeness fishery would avoid the female molt and mating season whereas a summer commercial season in Districts 1 and 2 would result in increased conflicts between commercial and personal use and sport fishing. The board also reviewed testimony from local processors that they would be reluctant to purchase Dungeness crab during the summer because salmon processing operations are in full swing. Also, many processors will not purchase soft shell or light crab. The board also noted data indicating that in this area Dungeness crab are not abundant, only 10 percent of the annual harvest comes from District 1 and 2.

PROPOSAL NO. 281**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Modify commercial Dungeness catcher-seller reporting requirements.

DISCUSSION: Enforcement viewed this proposal as beneficial because it would assist with enforcement of harvest reporting regulations. The board noted that catcher-sellers can estimate their catch and then amend fish tickets later to make them more accurate.

PROPOSAL NO. 282**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Close sport fishing for Dungeness crab in areas closed to commercial fishing.

AMENDMENTS: Clarification of the areas to be closed included as substitute language.

DISCUSSION: The board examined the original intent of closing areas to commercial Dungeness crab fishing was to provide more Dungeness crab harvest opportunities to personal use (resident) fishers and also noted that some areas that have been closed to commercial Dungeness crab fishing are being utilized by lodges with sport fishing clients. The board also discussed a possible disparity in gear between sport charter and resident personal use.

PROPOSAL NO. 283**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Change open fishing periods for geoducks from Monday-Tuesday to Wednesday-Thursday.

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the possibility that this proposal would limit the department's ability to be flexible in prosecuting this fishery and that the department needs this flexibility with the paralytic shellfish poisoning (PSP) protocol.

PROPOSAL NO. 284**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Implement fair start notice for areas certified for live harvest.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that the author of the proposal had expressed a desire to withdraw the proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 285**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Equal shares for geoduck GHL.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that the value of the fishery may increase and the pace of the fishery may slow down resulting in a safer fishery and that the potential exists for a year round fishery which may result in the ability to control amount of product on the market. The board also recognized that the top harvester's income may be significantly reduced and that permits that are currently not being fished may re-enter the fishery speeding up the fishery. The board heard concerns from enforcement officers regarding the lack of ability to enforce this fishery and the possibility of high-grading. Concerns regarding low growth rates, high maximum age, and susceptibility of over harvest of geoducks were also raised.

PROPOSAL NO. 286**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify commercial closed waters for geoducks.

DISCUSSION: department submitted and noted that this housekeeping proposal. The board noted concern expressed by industry regarding their ability to identify geoduck mariculture sites coincident with commercial harvest areas.

PROPOSAL NO. 287**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Modify red urchin transporting requirements.

AMENDMENTS: Language was included to allow the commissioner Emergency Order authority in order to address concerns by the department of Law.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that this proposal allows unprocessed red urchins to leave Southeast Alaska without a transport permit and have a fish ticket submitted from out of state.

PROPOSAL NO. 288**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Extend urchin fishing periods.

AMENDMENTS: Substitute language was included to change the opening until eight p.m.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that this proposal will allow more fishing time. The board noted that the department currently increases fishing time by EO authority and that this proposal would put current practices into regulation.

PROPOSAL NO. 289**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Repeal sunset clause in urchin processing vessel observer requirement.

AMENDMENTS: Substitute language was included to remove the requirement of an onboard observer at the commissioner's discretion.

DISCUSSION: The department opposed the proposal due to concerns regarding collecting biological data, under reporting of harvest, harvest accounting, and high-grading issues. The board noted that this proposal permanently alleviates the need for an onboard observer whereas the department has expressed a desire to retain onboard observation.

PROPOSAL NO. 290**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Modify Forrester Island urchin survey protocol.**AMENDMENTS:** Language clarifying the proximity which survey data must be collected to the time of harvest was added.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that biomass assessment survey cost savings to the industry and department would occur with adoption.**PROPOSAL NO. 291****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Modify reporting requirements for dive fisheries.**AMENDMENTS:** This proposal was amended to include only geoducks.**DISCUSSION:** The board heard comments from the department that logbook data provides the department with locations of unidentified geoduck clam beds and further defines existing beds improving biomass surveys. The board noted that this may increase geoduck clam GHL.**PROPOSAL NO. 292****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify commercial closed waters for scallops in Yakutat Bay.**DISCUSSION:** The department noted this was a "house keeping" proposal and the board agreed.**PROPOSAL NO. 293****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Change open fishing periods for sea cucumbers to Sunday-Monday.**DISCUSSION:** The department noted this proposal may interfere with PSP testing for the geoduck fishery. The board expressed concerns that this proposal may increase participation causing a reduction in the season due to approaching the GHL faster.**PROPOSAL NO. 294****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Extend second day sea cucumber opening from 12:00 to 3:00 p.m.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted increased weekly fishing time may result in a decrease in the overall season length as well as potential allocative issues.**PROPOSAL NO. 295****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Extend second day sea cucumber opening from 12:00 to 3:00 p.m.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 294.**PROPOSAL NO. 296****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Extend sea cucumber fishing periods.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 294.**PROPOSAL NO. 297****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Reduce commercial sea cucumber closed waters in Section 3-B.**AMENDMENTS:** The closed water areas were more clearly defined by substitute language using longitudinal bearings.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that divers may realize an expanded GHL if this new area is surveyed and found to have commercial quantities of sea cucumbers. The board discussed the probable benefits to sea cucumber stocks if this proposal was adopted.

PROPOSAL NO. 298

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Repeal commercial sea cucumber closed waters in District 12 Hidden Falls.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that divers may realize an expanded GHZ if this new area is surveyed and found to have commercial quantities of sea cucumbers.

PROPOSAL NO. 299

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Clarify commercial sea cucumber closed waters in Section 13-B.

DISCUSSION: The board noted the department considered this a housekeeping proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 300

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Clarify commercial sea cucumber closed waters in District 3.

DISCUSSION: The board noted the department considered this a housekeeping proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 324

ACTION: Deferred to March 2006

DESCRIPTION: Specify legal size for Dungeness crab to be expressed in inches.

DISCUSSION: This proposal was discussed concurrently with Proposal 247.

PROPOSAL NO. 399**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Establish Aleutian Islands District Pacific cod management plan**AMENDMENTS:** Amendments addressing the implementation of this proposal by Emergency Order as well as a determination that overage be surrendered to the State. Also included was a requirement for all vessels to report daily pacific cod poundage taken.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed what kinds of vessels (gear types, sizes) will be eligible to participate in this fishery allowing for pot, jig, hand troll, longline and non-pelagic trawl gear types. It noted that small vessels have not taken advantage of the current state regulations for a small boat fishery near Adak. The board defined the seasonal apportionments of Pacific cod quota to participants. The board noted that seasonal apportionment is an SSL (stellar sea lion) protection measure and that apportionments would slow the annual removals. The board questioned whether all current federal SSL protection measures (e.g. closures) should be retained. The board considered other factors that may affect Aleutian Islands fisheries including a pending Exempted Fishing Permit for an experimental pollock fishery (February 2006 Council meeting issue). This issue was discussed but the department noted that the EFP pollock fishery should not have an effect on the Pacific cod fishery. Also considered was a phase-in of Pacific cod quotas in a step-up fashion similar to how the Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod state-waters fishery developed which allows state-waters fishery participants to gear-up to attain the allocation for a new fishery. The board described the requirements for observers on participating vessels and noted the proposal does not contain an observer requirement for any vessel in the state-waters fishery. However, bycatch levels were presumed to be very small in this fishery. The board recognized that this fishery is fully allocated and examined various possible economic impacts. The board noted that this proposal is allocative in nature and had an extended debate on the current economic status in Adak and the board's responsibility to aid the economic situation in the region. The department clarified the interaction with the federal waters fisheries. This change was adopted as a permanent regulation as well as an emergency regulation so that it could be implemented immediately.**PROPOSAL A****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Exempt Southeast Alaska from the guiding principals for groundfish regulations.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the need for continuing to have the guiding principles for groundfish regulations (5 AAC 28.089) in codified regulation. It concluded that the principles were all factors the board would regularly take into account when acting on groundfish proposals.**PROPOSAL B****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Change crab and bottomfish pot twine requirements from 60 to 90 thread in Southeast Alaska.**DISCUSSION:** The department noted several enforcement concerns due to the inability to distinguish twine types. The department of law noted concerns with meeting legislative criterion. The board discussed methods and funding for research into twine breakdown rates.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Salmon Industry Restructuring Panel Report The board reviewed the final report presented by the Salmon Industry Restructuring Panel. It also adopted a modified version of the report, and forwarded the two reports to the legislature.

Resolution on commercial fishing cooperatives The board adopted a resolution in support of legislation to authorize the Board of Fisheries to allocate to commercial fishing cooperatives (2006-245-FB). This action was prompted by the state Supreme Court ruling in the Chignik case that clarified limits on the boards authority in regard establishing fishing cooperatives.