

SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT FINFISH (EXCEPT GROUND FISH)

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 01.705. Description of districts and sections. Amend this regulation to include the following:

Create a subsistence-only zone and allow a one-time per year harvest by the herring sac roe fleet for a portion of their Guideline Harvest Limit (GHL) quota in the area defined as Dog Point to Siginaka, Siginaka to Beili Rocks, Beili Rocks to Baranof Point.

ISSUE: Commercial herring sac roe harvest in 2005 in Sitka Sound from Thompson Harbor breakwater to the outside of Middle Island to the Siginaka Island group is affecting the quality of subsistence harvest for herring roe on branches and kelp.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence herring roe harvesters will continue to experience a depreciated harvest any time the commercial fleet is allowed to harvest a significant portion of its quota from one area in the most prolific traditional roe gathering areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, traditional subsistence harvesters are more likely to get their subsistence guarantee of herring roe on kelp and branches without the threat of the commercial sac roe fleet harvesting the biggest, oldest and ripest herring before they spawn on traditional subsistence media.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Traditional herring roe gatherers from all communities of Southeast Alaska and any predator species, including man, that relies on a healthy herring stock.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The sac roe fleet will not benefit from this proposal in those instances when the major portions of the biomass are staged in this proposed area. However, their vessels are larger and more able to fish open waters further away from the protected areas relied upon by the traditional roe harvester.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Gamble (HQ-05-F-170)

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 27.110(b)(1). Fishing seasons for Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend the regulation to include:

To add Area 3B as a sac roe seine area as an alternate gear for spawn-on-kelp permits.

ISSUE: To add Area 3B as sac roe purse seine area as an alternate gear for the spawn-on-kelp fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Full value will not be realized and quota will be wasted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, a choice in how to harvest the quota for maximum value.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All spawn-on-kelp fishers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Demmert (HQ-05-F-046)

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 27.110(b). Fishing seasons for Southeastern Alaska Area; and 5 AAC 27.185. Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend these regulations as follows:

Allow an alternate gear for Area 3B spawn-on-kelp fishery to be sac roe purse seine. Divide remaining quota among number of permits and allow that tonnage per permit to be taken as sac roe, with a limit of ten permits per vessel.

ISSUE: To be able to maximize the herring quota in Area 3B, to allow southern Southeast spawn-on-kelp permit holders the option to take their share of the quota as sac roe.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In times of poor market conditions, such as now when no processors are interested in Area 3B spawn-on-kelp, the fishers will not make any money as no one is buying kelp in Area 3B.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by allowing fishers to choose which form of product will be more valuable, as in the Sitka sac roe to spawn-on-kelp fishery attempt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All southern Southeast spawn-on-kelp fishers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, if the whole quota is utilized as bait, spawn or sac roe it is considered 100 percent mortality.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Demmert (HQ-05-F-047)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 27.185(j). Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend the regulation as follows:

Section 12A, the harvest limit for the spawn-on-kelp pound fishery **shall be 50 percent of the guideline harvest level plus any herring stock that is not harvested by the bait fishery.** [IS THE AMOUNT OF ANY ANNUAL GUIDELINE FOR THE TENAKEE INLET HERRING STOCK THAT IS NOT HARVESTED BY THE BAIT FISHERIES. IF THE UNHARVESTED PORTION OF THE GUIDELINE HARVEST LEVEL IS LESS THAN 50 TONS, THERE WILL BE NO SPAWN-ON-KELP POUND FISHERY]

ISSUE: Allocation of herring for spawn on kelp, spawn on kelp needs a dedicated quota in Tenakee, Area 12A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Spawn on kelp will be an unknown every year.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, roe on kelp is worth more per ton of herring than bait.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Northern Southeast spawn on kelp fishers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some bait harvesters may, for many years the bait quota goes unharvested.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Demmert (HQ-05-F-048)

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 27.160. Quotas and guideline harvest levels for Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

The harvest limit for the winter food-and-bait fishery shall be 50 percent of the guideline harvest level of the Earnest Sound herring stock, and the harvest level for the southern Southeast roe-on-kelp fishery shall be 50 percent of that guideline harvest level. The remaining unharvested portion of the winter food-and-bait guideline harvest level will be allocated to the roe-on-kelp fishery.

ISSUE: No allocation of the guideline harvest level for the southern Southeast roe-on-kelp permit holders.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will have an underutilized resource and no guarantee that there will be a roe-on-kelp fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The 229 southern Southeast roe-on-kelp permit holders, deckhands and all of the support services involved.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, there are other areas to fish winter bait.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Richard Eliason (HQ-05-F-017)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 27.185(h). Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A. and 13-C. and District 7. Amend the regulation to include the following:

Allocate 75 percent of the Area 3-B herring fishery to spawn on kelp and 25 percent to bait fishery.

ISSUE: The bait/spawn on kelp split. The bait fishery consistently harvests a small portion of their quota, while the spawn on kelp fishery can utilize it all.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In years of low quotas, the value of the fishery will not be realized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, spawn on kelp herring is worth \$1,000 per ton or more while bait is only \$300-400 per ton.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Spawn on kelp fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Maybe some bait fishermen.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Demmert (HQ-05-F-063)

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 27.160. Quotas and guideline harvest levels for Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

The harvest limit for the winter food-and-bait fishery shall be 45 percent of the guideline harvest level of the Tenakee Inlet herring stock, and the harvest level for the northern Southeast roe-on-kelp fishery shall be 45 percent of that guideline harvest level, the harvest level for the winter bait pound fishery shall be 10 percent of that guideline harvest level. The remaining unharvested portion of the winter food-and-bait guideline harvest level will be allocated to the roe-on-kelp fishery.

ISSUE: The winter food-and-bait and bait pound (tray pack) fishery in Tenakee Inlet (District 12-A) that has not taken any of the quota in the past two years and the northern Southeast roe-on-kelp fishermen do not have an allocated quota.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The lucrative roe-on-kelp fishery is last in line behind the bait and tray pack fisheries; these fisheries have not utilized the herring quota.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The 109 northern Southeast roe-on-kelp permit holders, deckhands and all of the support services involved in the city of Tenakee. The 2004 roe-on-kelp fishery (84 permits) in Tenakee has generated an exvessel value of over \$891,500 while the winter bait fishery, if the quota is taken, would be near \$80,000 spread over two boats and crew.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The one boat that does not own a northern roe-on-kelp permit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To ask for all the Tenakee quota for the roe-on-kelp and the winter bait-and-food quota can be filled at any number of other winter and bait areas.

PROPOSED BY: Richard Eliason (HQ-05-F-016)

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 27.160. Quotas and guideline harvest levels for Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend the regulation to provide the following:

Ten percent of the Sitka Sound sac roe herring guideline harvest will be allocated to the northern Southeast roe-on-kelp fishermen.

ISSUE: The possibility of an open/closed platform roe-on-kelp fishery in Sitka Sound.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The never ending threat of an open/closed platform for a roe-on-kelp fishery in Sitka Sound excluding the northern Southeast roe-on-kelp fishermen.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The 120 northern Southeast roe-on-kelp permit holders, deckhands and all of the support services involved. Subsistence fishermen. The herring biomass.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Handful of sac roe permit holders who do not hold northern Southeast roe-on-kelp permits.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Richard Eliason (HQ-05-F-018)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 27.160. Quotas and guideline harvest levels for Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Harvest rates shall be from zero to no more than ten percent of the harvestable biomass based on existing formulas.

ISSUE: Overharvests in herring sac roe fisheries. Current harvest guideline rates are not less than 10 percent and not more than 20 percent of the spawning biomass, but most often exceed these limits on the fishing grounds.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will experience a continued depletion of herring stocks throughout Southeast Alaska which will lead to a total crash if this trend is not reversed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will enhance the available stocks.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer as the biomass rebuilds toward historic levels.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Ketchikan Area Herring Action Group (HQ-05-F-195)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 27.035(c). Closure of registration areas. Amend the regulation as follows:

(c) ... Factors which may be considered include

...

(8)(7) information pertaining to the maximum sustainable **resource** [YIELD] level of herring within the registration area;

ISSUE: The term “maximum sustainable yield” has no legal definition as is left open for interpretation by both the department and commercial interests. “Maximum sustainable resource” would allow managers to harvest at levels aimed at rebuilding stocks to historic levels of abundance to this most crucial of all resources.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Commercial interests will continue to abuse this term to pressure the department to maximize herring harvests at unsustainable levels. The commercially-managed herring fisheries have never grown, or recovered to any resemblance of historic levels.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, rebuilding the size of herring stocks is a win-win for every fishery and the entire marine ecosystem for future generations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None considered.

PROPOSED BY: Ketchikan Area Herring Action Group (HQ-05-F-196)

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 27.197(a). Sections 1-E and 1-F commercial sac roe herring fishery. Amend the regulation as follows:

(a)(1) manage the commercial herring fishery so that the opportunity to fish herring in years in which the threshold level is met will **be allocated to the set gillnet fishery**; [ALTERNATE BETWEEN THE SET GILLNET AND PURSE SEINE FISHERIES; THE SET GILLNET FISHERY MUST OCCUR THE FIRST YEAR THAT THE THRESHOLD LEVEL IS MET]

Delete (a)(2), (c), (d), (e), and (f) of this section.

ISSUE: Change the West Behm Canal sac roe herring fishery to an exclusive gillnet fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Gillnet fishermen will not achieve a fair share of the southeast Alaska herring resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, gillnet herring is usually of higher quality than purse seine herring.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Gillnet fishermen, the department would have an easier fishery to manage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Purse seine fishermen will see some reduction in harvest.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions came to mind.

PROPOSED BY: Andy Wright and Arnold Enge (HQ-05-F-090)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 27.197. Sections 1-E and 1-F commercial sac roe herring fishery.
Amend the regulation as follows:

Replace the present cooperative fishery management plan mandate with a management plan that:

- a. Divides the guideline harvest level (GHL) equally among Southeast sac roe seine permit holders.
- b. Provides a matrix for consolidation of permits onto a limited number of vessels as deemed appropriate for the expected GHL.
- c. Requires the participation of all permit holders at the time of harvest.

ISSUE: An inherent problem with 51 permits fishing from 51 seine boats in a West Behm Canal sac roe herring fishery is that the catching power of the fleet is likely to overfish the GHL. To prevent this from happening, in January of 2003, the board adopted a regulation that requires that for a seine fishery to occur, a “cooperative fishery management plan” must be accepted by all Southeast Alaska sac roe purse seine CFEC permit holders. This has proven to be unworkable due to infighting among permit holders and the unwillingness by a few to cooperate with the rest. Accordingly, modification of the existing regulation is needed which will provide for a seine fishery in West Behm Canal that is consistent with best management practices and belays the concerns that the seine fleet will fish over the GHL.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Voluntary cooperation among permit holders will continue to be a problem and a very small minority, or even one permit holder will be able to hold the fishery hostage, leaving the GHL unharvested and without economic benefit to industry, communities and Alaska’s general fund.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. An equal split management scheme provides for a far less competitive harvest than Olympic-style fishing and provides time for harvesters to maximize product quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Purse seine permit holders, crews, processors, tenders and others who participate in the harvest, transportation and processing sac roe herring.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who do not want available West Behm Canal herring stocks harvested by the seine fleet.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Continued reliance on a cooperative fishery was rejected due to difficulties in getting unanimous consent as well as the yet undefined issues related to coops in light of court decisions.

PROPOSED BY: Southeast Alaska Herring Seiners Marketing Association (HQ-05-F-148)

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 27.197. Sections 1-E and 1-F commercial sac roe herring fishery.
Amend this regulation as follows:

...

(f) **If a fishery is not conducted due to insufficient spawning herring in the registration area then the gear type which was supposed to fish that year will be the next gear type to fish when the threshold level is met in subsequent years.** [THE SCHEDULE OF ALTERNATING FISHERIES UNDER THIS SECTION SHALL BE MAINTAINED. THE SET GILLNET FISHERY SHALL BE CONDUCTED THE NEXT YEAR THAT THE THRESHOLD LEVEL IS MET.]

ISSUE: In the spring of 2004 the gillnet fishery was not opened due to low spawning levels inside the registration area even though the department had forecast a return over the threshold level. Current regulations are unclear as to which gear group would fish next when the threshold level is met.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be continued confusion as to which gear group would fish next if the circumstances of 2004 are repeated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both the set gillnet and the purse seine fishermen will know which gear group would fish next under circumstance similar to 2004.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-253)

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 27.150 Waters closed to herring fishing in Southeastern Alaska.
Create a regulation as follows:

The board shall establish a herring sanctuary in that portion of Section 1F which includes waters adjacent to Cat, Duke and Mary Islands subject to the approval of the legislature.

ISSUE: When the state expanded the Kah Shakes boundary to include Cat, Mary and Duke Islands, they began fishing on herring that were observed by biologists to have moved off of Annette Island Reserve. These same stocks are managed and fished as a separate fishery. This action also later justified the state to combine this small stock with a small biomass trying to rebuild at Kah Shakes in order to meet the quota and wiped it out when it was far below threshold.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Double dipping will continue to occur at Cat, Duke and Mary Islands on herring that move off Annette Island, and any herring trying to rebuild at Kah Shakes will be wiped out as soon as the state can combine enough small stocks to reach a threshold.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. This area cannot support a commercial harvest by two entities as has been demonstrated.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone and the ecosystem (Kah Shakes could possibly have a chance to rebuild).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. There has not been a fishery in the area for over six years.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Ketchikan Area Herring Action Group (HQ-05-F-192)

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 27.150 Waters closed to herring fishing in Southeastern Alaska.
Create a regulation as follows:

The board shall establish a herring sanctuary in Section 1E (West Behm Canal) subject to the approval of the legislature.

ISSUE: The board has established a commercial sac roe fishery on a herring stock that has extreme biomass fluctuations in the absence of a fishery that managers cannot accurately forecast. Conducting any herring fishery in this area would not be sustainable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Additional pressure on these herring from commercial fishing will cause severe stress on this stock.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. This area cannot sustain a commercial harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, including the marine ecosystem.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. There has not been a fishery in this area for over 25 years.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Ketchikan Area Herring Action Group (HQ-05-F-193)

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 27.150. Waters closed to herring fishing in Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Herring may not be taken by purse seine or gillnet in Section 1-E or Section 1-F (waters adjacent to or included in West Behm Canal).

ISSUE: The board mistakenly decided to open West Behm Canal to a herring fishery based on erroneous forecasts supplied by the department which did not adequately address the level of natural predation and extreme population fluctuations. West Behm Canal herring stocks support large wild salmon runs from two major river drainages and the Neets Bay hatchery terminal area, in addition to a large influx of humpback whales, stellar sea lions and seals from adjacent areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Eventually, when (or if) the herring stock rebuilds to a minimum threshold, the department will conduct another unsustainable fishery which will take years to rebuild while causing substantial stress to this stock.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. This area cannot sustain a commercial herring fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone harvesting a species that feeds on herring.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. This area was last exploited commercially for herring over 25 years ago. More fishermen and processors suffered financial losses by trying to have a fishery that did not materialize in 2004.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Ketchikan Area Herring Action Group (HQ-05-F-194)

PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 27.110. Fishing seasons for Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Any reference to Sections 1-E and Sections 1-F adjacent to West Behm Canal should be stricken from existing regulations.

ISSUE: The board opened a sac roe fishery in West Behm Canal based on faulty information supplied by department staff. This area cannot sustain a population of herring large enough to conduct a fishery and should remain closed indefinitely.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to waste taxpayer dollars attempting to justify a fishery which, if ever opened, could take 25 years or more to recover, as has already been demonstrated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, all fisheries will benefit over time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who utilizes marine resources in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. You cannot lose income you never had.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tongass Sportsfishing Association (HQ-05-F-197)

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 39.130. Reports required of processors, buyers, fishermen, and operators of certain commercial fishing vessels; transporting requirements. Amend this regulation in the Southeast Alaska Area as follows:

In Southeast Alaska, CFEC permit holder must submit CFEC permit card to the person, buyer, company, firm or other organization so a copy of the fish ticket required under (b) of this section

can be provided before a vessel transporting landed herring leaves the fishing grounds after a fishing closure.

ISSUE: Commercial fishing tenders are not in control of the CFEC permit or permit holder and should not be held responsible during seine herring openings for landings that do not have a fish ticket.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Commercial fishing tenders will continue to be held responsible for a situation for which they have no control.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen, commercial fishing tenders, buyers, companies, firms or other organizations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Independent Tenderman's Association (HQ-05-F-070)

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 27.131. Gillnet specifications and operations for Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend the regulation to include:

(a) A vessel fishing for herring may not have more than one herring gillnet on board or operated from any vessel taking herring. A herring gillnet may not be longer than 50 fathoms. **Except two G34A sac roe herring gillnet CFEC permit holders may concurrently fish from the same vessel and jointly operate up to 75 fathoms of drift gillnet gear under this section.**

(XX) Before operating set gillnet gear jointly under this section, both permit holders shall register with the department. When two G34A CFEC limited entry permit holders fish from the same vessel and jointly operate a set gillnet gear under this section, the vessel must display its ADF&G permanent license plate number followed by the letter "D" to identify the vessel as a dual permit vessel. The letter "D" must be removed or covered when the vessel is operating with only one set gillnet CFEC permit holder on board the vessel.

(XX) When two permit holders jointly operate gear under this section, each permit holder is responsible for ensuring that the entire unit of gear is operated in a lawful manner.

ISSUE: To allow two permit holders to fish off of the same vessel with a larger increment of gear than one operator would be able to use. This would be more efficient and cost effective and would help to deal with the amount of latency in the fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishery would operate on a status quo basis. Some permit holders would not participate in the fishery due to the lack of seaworthy herring skiffs left available in the fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Permit holders who wish to more economically fish by fishing together.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Ed Hansen (HQ-05-F-186)

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 27.190. Herring management plan for Southeastern Alaska Area.
Amend the regulation as follows:

Enhance the value of Southeast sac roe seine fisheries and make an orderly fishery (per directive) to divide the quota in each area equally by the number of permits.

ISSUE: Low value, dangerous openings by boat and skiff collisions, nets run over; the fishery is not orderly.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to put life, limb and property in danger. We will not enhance the value of this fishery, it will continue to be unorderly.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by fishing closer to spawning and processing in closer local ports to reduce amount of time fish are on tenders and improve quality by local processing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Most, if not all, herring fishermen, management and processors.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Maybe one or two fishermen that beat average every year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Demmert (HQ-05-F-062)

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 27.160. Quotas and guideline harvest levels for Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend the regulation to provide the following:

Create an equal split fishery as the most workable solution. The fish would be harvested similar to the way we have been harvesting fish in Sitka when there is not enough fish for a competitive opening.

ISSUE: There needs to be a controlled harvest strategy for roe herring in Behm Canal that the department will approve.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Southeast sac roe seine fleet will not be able to harvest these fish.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Fish harvested in this way, at the end of a Sitka fishery, usually yield higher roe percentages than during a competitive fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Southeast herring seiners.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Southeast seiners who believe this should be a competitive fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Coop. Fishermen would not have control of where their individual fish went (to which market).

PROPOSED BY: Sam Mutch (HQ-05-F-089)

PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 27.195. Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery. Amend the regulation to provide the following:

- 1) Provide for a fishery that divides the annual guideline harvest level (GHL) equally among all permit holders.
- 2) Direct the department to manage the commercial harvest for a maximum roe content and quality to the extent possible considering the GHL and subsistence needs to disperse the fishery.
- 3) Provide for the consolidation of multiple permits on to fewer than 51 vessels in times of low GHLs.

ISSUE: There are three problems: 1) The Sitka sac roe seine fishery is inefficient. The current Olympic system of management encourages wasteful fishing practices as fishermen increase their catching power in an ever-escalating race for fish. Fishermen continue to invest in bigger, faster boats and heavier, more expensive gear. This has created an unnecessarily, highly competitive fishery in confined spaces over a fragile resource that could be harvested with much less effort. 2) The safety of vessels and their crews. As the stakes go up and the race for fish escalates, the risk factors for collision and personal injury increase. 3) The gross value of the fishery is substantially less than it could be. Under the Olympic system of management, fishing periods are short, often fifteen minutes or less, and many fishermen are forced to harvest low value herring with lower roe recovery rates.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Three things: 1) The gross benefit of the fishery to fishermen, tender men, processors and Southeast Alaskan communities will continue to be marginalized as the race for fish continues. 2) The potential of collision, extreme injury, or even death will continue to escalate. 3) Roe quality will continue to suffer and the gross value of the fishery will never reach its potential.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the proposed regulation changes would provide for a controller, noncompetitive harvest that would promote higher roe recoveries and better quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All harvesters would benefit from a safer working environment and all those interested in maximizing the economic value of the fishery to permit holders, crews, tenders, processors, communities, and the state's general fund.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who would like to maintain their potential to “hit a home run” in the Olympic style fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Continued reliance on a competitive fishery was rejected due to increasing safety risk factors illustrated by insurance claims and USCG citations as well as the difficulty in maximizing roe quality when “racing” for the fish. Cooperative management options were rejected due to the undefined issues related to coops in light of recent court decisions as well as the difficulties inherent in getting all permit holders into a cooperative regime.

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Herring Group (HQ-05-F-147)

PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 27.185(d). Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend the regulation as follows:

In Section 13-C, the kelp allocation is as follows: Guideline harvest range for herring in tons, in the double-permit closed pounds the kelp allocation for 600-799 tons of herring is 1,000 blades which is the same as the single permit, the 800 or more tons of herring also reads 1,000 blades the same as a single-permit

Single closed pound at the 800 ton level have a kelp allocation of 2,000 blades

- Have the double-permit closed pound:
- 100-249 tons of herring—none
- 250-399 tons of herring—400 blades
- 400-599 tons of herring—500 blades
- 600-799 tons of herring—2,500 blades
- 800 tons of herring—3,000 blades

ISSUE: To change the kelp allocation for single- and double-permit closed pound when the guideline harvest is at the top end. There is not any incentive for double permit closed pound when the guideline harvest level is at the top of the scale.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it does by giving some incentive when at the top end of the guideline harvest level it will encourage two permit holders to double up and eliminate a pound on the grounds. This would otherwise be fished in the fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen who want to fish more kelp by doubling up.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To have the blade allocation at the top end be unlimited, this was rejected because it might send the wrong message.

PROPOSED BY: Jerry Dahl (HQ-05-F-030)

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 27.130 (e). Lawful gear for Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

A pen or pound may not exceed 12,000 cubic feet.

ISSUE: The way the regulation is written we are locked into square feet of surface area and depth.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will have to get a special use permit every year in order to use a pound with a larger surface area but shallower in depth.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the test pounds have resulted in better quality of products. This is according to the Department of Fish and Game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen who want to use 20 feet by 30 feet in surface by 20 feet in depth, or 20 feet by 40 feet in surface by 15 feet in depth.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keep getting a special use permit from the department which is needless paperwork.

PROPOSED BY: Jerry Dahl, Jr. (HQ-05-F-031)

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 27.130(e). Lawful gear for Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

The measurement of a pound shall be 12,000 cubic feet regardless of surface area.

ISSUE: To be able to use different size closed pounds—use the size determination to be in cubic feet 12,000.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The space in a pen is not fully utilized by the herring.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, herring lay eggs at a certain depth, this will keep herring at kelp depth.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All pound fishers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Demmert (HQ-05-F-051)

PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 27.185. Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend the regulation to read:

When the harvest reaches the 700 ton level, the kelp allocation is 2,000 blades for double pen.

ISSUE: The kelp allocation when the harvest levels are at the top leave no incentives for a person to double up into one pen.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? You will keep taking herring at a single pound rate.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would take less herring since some fishermen might use this incentive to double up.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The fishermen who double up.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have it be an unlimited number of blades. I rejected this because it might imply a greed factor and the general public might read it and get the wrong impression.

PROPOSED BY: Jerry Dahl, Jr. (HQ-05-F-032)

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 27.185(f). Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend the regulation as follows:

(1) in Section 3-B, in the waters of San Alberto Bay, Shinaku Inlet, and San Christoval Channel north of a line from Entrance Point to the southernmost tip of Clam Island **to the lite on northern tip of Fish Egg Island Lite R4TC to Lite G3TC** to the southernmost tip of Fern Point...

ISSUE: The open fishing area in Section 3B for herring pounds. The fishery happens too far away from the spawning grounds so it really contributes nothing to the local economy or the participants. It is pretty much that simple.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Right now the fishing area is an area that is not where the herring like to spawn or sometimes they do not even come there. As a result the fishing really contributes nothing to anybody.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It can dramatically improve the quality because the fishing will happen where the herring spawn like other pound fisheries, seine fisheries and gillnet fisheries. Right now the quality is very poor.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Craig pound fishery participants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Maybe subsistence people.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other solutions may be different lines but I do not want to interfere with subsistence.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Svenson

(HQ-05-F-042)

PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 27.185(c). Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend the regulation as follows:

Single permit closed pen
200-599 tons—200 blades
600-799 tons—**300 blades** [250 BLADES]
800-999 tons—**500 blades** [300 BLADES]
1000 or more tons—**800 blades** [350 BLADES]

ISSUE: Too few kelp blades for large quotas. Change kelp allocation table for Area 3-B single pens.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishers will lose money.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by allowing more product for same amount of herring.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Demmert (HQ-05-F-049)

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 27.185(f). Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend the regulation as follows:

Klawock Inlet closed north of latitude of entrance point 55° 31.088' N lat., 133° 9.022' W long., and closed south of 55° 29.216' N lat., 133° 8.776' W long., and closed south of a line from a point at 55° 30.285' N lat., 133° 10.355' W long. to Fern Point.

ISSUE: To open more consistent spawning area to Craig/Klawock pound fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Opportunity will be missed and many times the fish move around for spawning and fishermen will miss them.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by allowing access to more traditional spawn area and riper fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All southern Southeast pound fishers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, all subsistence is at south end of Fish Egg Island and the west side.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Demmert (HQ-05-F-050)

PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 27.185(t). Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend the regulation as follows:

Add to spawn deposition estimates 800 square feet of spawn for every pen with product.

ISSUE: To count one-half the surface area of net pen walls in the spawn deposition estimates or let us remove the net pens immediately after harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to bear hardship of fuel cost without reward.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Pound fishers in additional spawn mileage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Demmert (HQ-05-F-052)

PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 27.185. Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend the regulation as follows:

In a multiple pen, the pen will count as one-half unit of gear for a double pen and one-third unit for a triple pen.

ISSUE: To logically call a double pound a half unit of gear for each permit holder, since it takes two permits to be one pound.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will be unfairly considered a unit of gear with two permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Pound fishers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Demmert (HQ-05-F-053)

PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 27.185. Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend this regulation as follows:

(c) In Section 3-B, the kelp allocation **per permit holder** is as follows:

Guideline Harvest Range for Herring (tons) ...

(d) In Section 13-C, the kelp allocation **per permit holder** is as follows:

Guideline Harvest Range for Herring (tons) ...

(e) In District 7 and Section 12-A, the kelp allocation **per permit holder** is as follows:

Guideline Harvest Range for Herring (tons) ...

ISSUE: The current regulations are unclear to whether the kelp allocation is per pound or per permit holder. The intent of the regulation is per permit holder.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Herring spawn-on-kelp fishermen and department staff new to the fishery, will continue to be confused on the kelp allocations. Fishermen misinterpreting the regulation might not maximize their product when fishing a multiple-permit pound.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Herring spawn-on-kelp fishermen and the department will benefit from clarified regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-248)

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 27.185. Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend this regulation as follows:

...

(k) Before kelp or herring are added to a pound, a permit holder must plainly and legibly mark the **permit holder's** [PERSON'S] first and last name and five-digit CFEC permit number in a conspicuous place on the pound so that the marking is clearly visible. The letters and numbers used to identify a pound must be at least six inches high with lines at least one-half inch wide and must contrast with the background. If a pound is being operated as a multiple-permit pound, the first and last names and five-digit CFEC permit numbers of all **permit holders** [PERSONS] operating the pound must be placed on a single sign.

(l) A **permit holder** [PERSON] using a tow pound for transporting herring to a closed pound must permanently affix a horizontal sign stating "Tow Pound" to the top surface of the tow pound. The letters must be at least six inches high with lines at least one-half inch wide and must contrast with the background. A **permit holder** [PERSON] may introduce herring into a tow pound multiple times before transferring the herring to a spawn-on-kelp pound.

(m) A **permit holder** [PERSON] may place the **permit holder's** [PERSON'S] kelp in no more than one pound. Before kelp is introduced into a spawn-on-kelp pound, a **permit holder** [PERSON] must store the kelp in a manner that prevents herring from spawning on the kelp.

(n) On a line or structure used to suspend kelp, a **permit holder** [PERSON] shall affix a legible tag showing above the water surface that states the number of blades or fronds on that line or structure and that states the **permit holder's** [PERSON'S] first and last name. In a multiple-permit pound, each **permit holder** [PERSON] must keep that **permit holder's** [PERSON'S]

kelp on lines or structures separate from lines or structures that support kelp belonging to other permit holders.

(o) A **permit holder** [PERSON] must be physically present at the **permit holder's** [PERSON'S] pound fishing site during operation of the pound. For the purpose of this subsection, "operation of the pound" means

...

(p) A **permit holder** [PERSON] must be physically present when the **permit holder's** [PERSON'S] herring spawn-on-kelp product produced in a pound is being sold.

(q) A **permit holder** [PERSON] may transfer additional herring into a closed pound only until herring have been released or product has been harvested from the pound. After herring have been released or product has been harvested from a pound, a **permit holder** [PERSON] using that pound may not fish for herring or add kelp to the pound. A **permit holder** [PERSON] may not transfer herring into a pound after 11:59 p.m. on the fourth day following the first transfer of herring into the pound. If the commissioner determines it is necessary for the conservation of herring stocks the commissioner may, by emergency order, restrict the placement of herring into pounds.

(r) **Permit holders** [PERSONS] operating two separate closed pounds must notify the local representative of the department before connecting the **permit holders** [PERSON'S] pounds. No more than two pounds may be connected into a combined structure. After the **permit holders** [PERSONS] have connected two pounds, the **permit holders** [PERSONS] may not transfer additional herring into the combined pound. After two pounds are connected under this section, the **permit holders** [PERSONS] may drop the wall between the pounds so that herring may swim between the connected pounds.

(s) A **permit holder** [PERSON] may not retain herring in a closed pound for more than six days and must release the herring by 11:59 p.m. on the sixth day, with the first day being the day that herring are placed into the pound. When releasing herring, a **permit holder** [PERSON] must lower at least one full side of a pound's webbing at least six feet below the surface of the water to allow herring to escape.

(t) After a **permit holder** [PERSON] releases herring and harvests product from a pound, the **permit holder** [PERSON] must maintain the pound and webbing in place for at least four weeks. To optimize hatching success, the **permit holder** [PERSON] must position egg-covered webbing in its original configuration with adequate water circulation on all sides.

(u) A **permit holder** [PERSON] must release all herring from a pound operated by that **permit holder** [PERSON]. A **permit holder** [PERSON] may not retain and use herring that has been introduced into a pound as bait for commercial use, sport use, personal use, or subsistence use.

(v) After notifying the department, a **permit holder** [PERSON] may release herring from a closed pound and fish the pound as an open pound. All webbing on the closed pound must be removed. The **permit holder** [PERSON] will not be entitled to additional kelp and may operate the pound only as an open pound for the remainder of the season.

(w) A **permit holder** [PERSON] shall completely remove all pounds and associated equipment from the waters in

...

(y) Spawn-on-kelp blades or fronds belonging to a **permit holder** [PERSON] must be kept separate from spawn-on-kelp blades or fronds belonging to another **permit holder** [PERSON] until all spawn on kelp from a pound has been weighed and graded.

...

(3) The permit holder(s) are responsible for all operations of the pound or pound system.

ISSUE: By referring to "person", the current regulations are unclear to who is actually liable for the operation of the pound or pound systems.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? ABWE and the department may have problems affixing liability to the operation of the pound or pound system.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? ABWE and department personnel.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-250)

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 27.185. Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend this regulation as follows:

...

(k) Before kelp or herring are added to a pound, a permit holder must plainly and legibly mark the person's first and last name and five-digit CFEC permit number in a conspicuous place on the pound. **The sign must be vertical and the markings must be clearly visible and above the surface of the water at all times.** [SO THAT THE MARKING IS CLEARLY VISIBLE.] The letters and numbers used to identify a pound must be at least six inches high with lines at least one-half inch wide and must contrast with the background. If a pound is being operated as a multiple-permit pound, the first and last names and five-digit CFEC permit numbers of all persons operating the pound must be placed on a single sign. **The sign must be left on the pound structure or the net support system the entire time any part of the pound system is in the water.**

ISSUE: The current regulation does not specify how the sign marking the pound structure is to be placed. Some fishermen have started placing the sign on the horizontal surface of the pound. The department or ABWE personnel, who are trying to determine the permit holder(s) of the pound, have to approach very closely to the pound or sometimes get on the pound structure to identify the permit holder(s). Approaching close to the pound can be hazardous, especially in inclement weather. There are numerous ropes, chains or cables securing the pound that can foul the propeller. In addition, getting close to or on the pound can disturb the herring in the pound, which can lower the quality and value of the spawn on kelp (SOK) product.

The current regulation is unclear to how long the signs must be left on the pound structure or the structure that supports the pound net. When the herring and SOK product are removed from the pound, fishermen sometimes take the signs and/or the pound structure to the next SOK fishery to reduce costs. The pounding net must be supported and tethered by some sort of float and anchor system and identified with a sign until the required four weeks have passed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department and ABWE personnel will continue to have difficulty determining the permit holder(s) of poorly marked pounds. A loss of SOK product may occur from the disturbance of herring in the pound. The department and ABWE personnel would continue to have difficulty determining the permit holder(s) of pounding systems

after the pound structure or signs have been removed from the pound system. This poses an enforcement problem if the pounding system is left in place after the removal period.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The department and ABWE personnel monitoring the SOK fishery will not have to spend as much time determining the permit holder(s) of a pounding system. Fishermen will benefit by reducing the potential of herring being disturbed and damaging SOK product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A vertical sign may pose problems when fishermen are working on the pound structure.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-249)

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 27.185. Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7. Amend this regulation as follows:

...

(t) After a **permit holder** [PERSON] releases herring and harvests product from a pound, the **permit holder** [PERSON] must maintain the [POUND AND] webbing in place for at least four weeks. To optimize hatching success, the person must position egg-covered webbing in **the** [ITS] original **size and** configuration **of the pound structure** with adequate water circulation on all sides. **The webbing support system must be above the surface of the water and clearly marked as per 5 AAC 27.185(k).**

ISSUE: There were two new spawn on kelp (SOK) fisheries created during the January 2003 board meeting. Ernest Sound is on the Southern Southeast SOK permit and Tenakee on the Northern Southeast SOK permit. These fisheries are opened if the area has met threshold and there is quota remaining to be harvested after the winter bait fisheries are closed. The addition of these fisheries created less time between the SOK fisheries to set up pound systems. In order not to incur the costs of constructing additional pound structures, fishermen have been removing the floats from the pound structure to use them in another fishery or to prevent them from being damaged during stormy weather. They leave the web behind hanging from buoys or from some sort of float system that keeps the webbing in place for the required four weeks. The webbing support system is sometimes not marked well and can be partially or totally submerged. In addition, the webbing support systems may collapse resulting in poor circulation around the web. Clarification is needed in regards to how webbing is to be supported and marked. The current regulation does not fully address this new practice.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department and ABWE personnel would continue to have difficulty determining the permit holder(s) of poorly or unmarked web support systems. Webbing support systems left behind may pose a hazard to boaters in the area if the support system is partially or totally submerged. Less herring eggs are likely to hatch from improper circulation due to the webbing not remaining properly spread out.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The department and ABWE personnel monitoring the SOK fisheries will more easily be able to determine the permit holder(s) of each web support system. Boaters will have a reduced chance of getting web support systems and/or anchor systems in the propellers of their vessel(s). More herring eggs are likely to hatch increasing the overall biomass of the stock.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen will have an increase in cost for marking the webbing support system. They will also have increased costs for constructing a webbing support system that will ensure the webbing remains in the original configuration and size and above the surface of the water.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-251)

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 27.187. Buyer and processors reporting requirements for spawn on kelp in pounds for the Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend this regulation as follows:

(a) In Sections 3-B, **7-B, 12-A** and 13-C

ISSUE: The fisheries in sections 7-B and 12-A were new spawn on kelp (SOK) fisheries added during the January 2003 board meeting. The changes to this regulation were inadvertently omitted at that time. Therefore, this regulation needs to be changed to include the new 7-B and 12-A SOK fisheries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The SOK fisheries in 7-B and 12-A would be exempt from this regulation. The department might not receive the information needed to properly manage these new fisheries.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? ABWE and department personnel monitoring the fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-252)

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 27.132. Seine specifications and operations for Southeastern Alaska Area. Amend this regulation as follows:

In area 12A, a herring purse seine may not be more than 2,125 meshes in depth. The department may determine the maximum depth of seine in meshes annually by emergency order.

ISSUE: Since 2002, bait herring stocks in Tenakee Inlet (Section 12A) have remained deeper than the current 1,625 mesh seines are capable of fishing. The resource continues to be unobtainable leaving northern Southeast processors and fishermen without an adequate bait supply to conduct their businesses. Product must be imported from the east coast to satisfy demand.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Processors and fishermen will be required to import products not indigenous to Southeast Alaska. The premium quality, size and nature of this local resource will be substituted with product of less desirable characteristics. Processing jobs will be diminished, bait herring fishermen will lose the opportunity to participate in the bait fishery and thereby lose income. Lower quality bait will reduce catch rates resulting in increased expenses, reducing income to fishermen and deckhands.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, bait quality would be superior to bait produced in other Southeast locations due to increased fish size and location relative to distance to processing facilities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bait herring fishermen, processors, as well as fishermen being able to harvest a currently unavailable resource. The department will benefit by obtaining income by conducting a productive fishery and increasing biomass.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None, the fishery is fully utilized as a bait fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other areas to conduct a fishery considered, however, there is not enough spawn deposition to warrant conducting research or biomass or adequate supply to sustain a fishery. The other available areas open to harvesting produce herring to substandard size with little or no volume observed to conduct an efficient fishery.

PROPOSED BY: Craig Shoemaker, Troy Denkinger, Don Kalk, Tim Ryan (HQ-05-F-213)

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 01.716. Customary and traditional subsistence uses of fish stocks and amounts necessary for subsistence uses. Amend this regulation as follows:

Request a review and update of the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence use (ANS) of salmon in Southeast Alaska and Yakutat.

ISSUE: Whenever there is a harvestable surplus on fish stocks subject to customary and traditional uses as determined by the board, the subsistence statute also requires the board to determine the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence uses (AS 16.05.258). In making ANS findings, the board considers information about subsistence harvest and use patterns from the department and the public and may periodically reconsider and update these findings or address public proposals to change them.

In 1989, the board made customary and traditional (C&T) determinations covering all of Southeast Alaska communities for all fisheries. The board also established administrative ANS findings for all salmon in the Southeast Alaska and Yakutat areas. For the Southeast Alaska Area the board established an ANS range of 21,000 – 34,000 salmon and in the Yakutat Area a range of 1,200-3,000 salmon. These findings were based on subsistence permit data, biased low due to under and nonreported harvests. These findings were for such large geographic areas (Yakutat and Southeast Alaska areas) that they were not useful when examining harvest rates on small local sockeye runs.

Southeast Alaska/Yakutat, Region I, Subsistence Salmon Harvests by Management Areas 1996-2003

	Estimated Harvests, All Salmon 1996-2003											ANS Range
	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Average	min	max	
Yakutat Management Area	6,385	5,800	6,624	6,036	6,869	7,832	7,629	6,872	6,756	5,800	7,832	5,800 to 7,832
Haines Management Area	10,414	8,474	8,213	8,051	7,174	8,140	8,394	9,493	8,544	7,174	10,414	7,174 to 10,414
Juneau Management Area	9,790	8,348	8,650	7,605	5,045	6,265	4,178	10,133	7,502	4,178	10,133	4,178 to 10,133
Angoon Subsistence Area	5,345	3,841	4,154	3,295	3,219	3,549	1,532	3,240	3,522	1,532	5,345	
Hoonah Subsistence Area	4,445	4,506	4,496	4,311	1,826	2,716	2,646	6,893	3,980	1,826	6,893	
Sitka Management Area	20,108	10,487	16,876	15,604	12,933	15,278	20,225	19,382	16,362	10,487	20,225	10,487 to 20,225
Petersburg Management Area	5,841	4,583	5,506	5,325	4,120	4,798	5,905	7,345	5,428	4,120	7,345	4,120 to 7,345
Petersburg Subsistence Area	942	914	1,129	1,165	1,061	1,614	1,725	2,558	1,389	914	2,558	
Wrangell Subsistence Area	1,289	659	875	1,146	924	753	1,507	668	978	659	1,507	
Kake Subsistence Area	3,610	3,010	3,501	3,014	2,134	2,431	2,672	4,118	3,061	2,134	4,118	
Ketchikan Management Area	17,503	14,469	11,641	12,014	10,684	11,473	9,068	11,773	12,328	9,068	17,503	9,068 to 17,503
Kasaan Subsistence Area	3,944	3,381	2,448	2,343	2,429	3,134	1,526	2,161	2,671	1,526	3,944	
Craig/Klawock/Hydaburg Subsistence Area	13,559	11,088	9,193	9,671	8,255	8,339	7,542	9,612	9,657	7,542	13,559	
Totals	70,041	52,162	57,510	54,635	46,824	53,787	55,399	64,998	56,919	46,824	70,041	46,824 to 70,041

Source: Alaska Subsistence Fisheries Database. Version 3.4 for Microsoft Access. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence

All C&T findings by community throughout the state were repealed in spring 1993 because of constitutional compliance requirements. The board has since delineated geographic areas where subsistence uses will be permitted.

Southeast Alaska subsistence salmon fisheries primarily occur in terminal areas near, or in some cases within, dozens of specific drainages throughout the region. Sockeye salmon are the predominant target species but there are also harvests of other salmon species that vary in magnitude by area.

Much of the existing subsistence salmon harvest estimates and the current ANS findings is based on subsistence fishing permits. Permit data are collected yearly by stream or river system. As mentioned, the estimates are biased low due to under and non-reported harvest. Household harvest survey data collected by the department provides a more accurate estimate of the amount of salmon caught for personal consumption. Household harvest survey data are not collected on a yearly basis and most of the data were not collected by stream or river system. Department analysts have developed a system using permit data expanded to non reported permits to recommend ranges for new ANS findings for salmon harvested under subsistence regulations.

The recommended ANS ranges will be presented for the currently-used six fisheries management areas: Yakutat, Haines, Juneau, Sitka, Petersburg, and Ketchikan management areas. ANS findings based on management areas will be more meaningful and useful to management than findings for the entire region. Based on harvest data from 1996 to 2003, possible ranges for the six management areas may be 5,800 to 7,832 salmon for Yakutat, 7,174 to 10,414 salmon for Haines, 4,178 to 10,133 salmon for Juneau, 10,487 to 20,225 salmon for Sitka, 4,120 to 7,345 salmon for Petersburg, and 9,068 to 17,503 for Ketchikan (see table).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? ANS for salmon stocks with positive customary and traditional subsistence use findings in Southeastern Alaska and Yakutat area will continue to under-represent the harvest.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Managers and subsistence users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-154)

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 01.7XX. District 8 and Stikine River subsistence fishery. Create a new regulation to provide the following:

Provide regulations similar to what the Federal Subsistence Board has done for the Stikine River under federal subsistence regulations.

ISSUE: Provide a state-managed subsistence fishery for chinook, coho, and sockeye salmon in District 8 and the Stikine River. The board has made a positive C & T determination in the previous cycle, so all that is left is to provide for the fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Users will be denied the opportunity to harvest salmon for subsistence purposes in these areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All subsistence users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Southeast Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (HQ-05-F-216)

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 01.720. Lawful gear and gear specifications. Amend the regulation in the Southeast Alaska Area as follows:

Add archery and compound bow and rigged for fishing to list of legal gear for subsistence salmon, saltwater and for freshwater.

ISSUE: Add archery (compound bow and fish arrows) to the list of legal gear. This will increase the quality of the pursuit of subsistence, sport and personal use experiences.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Other states allow archery fishing, why not Alaska?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will not affect the resource, just add to the subsistence experience.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: David R. Rice (HQ-05-F-009)

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 33.384. Lynn Canal and Chilkat River king salmon fishery management plan. Amend the regulation to read as follows:

The commissioner shall, by emergency order, open sport fishing for king salmon in Chilkat Inlet north of a line extending from an ADF&G regulatory marker located approximately one mile south of Anchorage Point to an ADF&G regulatory marker directly north of Letnikof Cove boat ramp.

ISSUE: The problem we would like the board to address is the sport fishermen not having access to fish king salmon north of a line extending from an ADF&G regulatory marker located approximately one mile south of Anchorage Point to an ADF&G regulatory marker directly north of the Letnikof Cove boat ramp during years when the projected inriver run of king salmon, in the Chilkat River, is high.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The sport fishermen will be denied access to fish king salmon in key areas in the Chilkat Inlet during years when the fish returns are projected to be high.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it would improve the quality of fishing area in which to harvest the resources available.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sport fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Donald and Elli Braaten (HQ-05-F-190)

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 47.020. General provisions for seasons and bag, possession, annual, and size limits for the salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

The commissioner may, by emergency order, increase the bag, possession, and annual limits for king salmon in the waters of Chilkat Inlet north of Seduction Point.

ISSUE: During the time of abundant project fish returns, there should be an increase to annual limits along with the increased bag and possession limits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? During years of projected high fish returns, nonresidents will be restricted to their annual catch limit.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It improves the quality of fishing time for the nonresident angler.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Elli Braaten

(HQ-05-F-218)

PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 29.070. General fishing seasons and periods; 5 AAC 29.080. Management of the winter salmon troll fishery; 5 AAC 29.090. Management of the spring salmon troll fisheries; 5 AAC 33.310. Fishing seasons and periods for net gear; 5 AAC 33.331. Gillnet specifications and operation; 5 AAC 33.350. Closed waters; 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area; 5 AAC 47.030. Methods, means, and general provisions – finfish; and 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend these regulations as follows:

Establish a comprehensive abundance-based king salmon management plan for fisheries targeting Taku River King salmon in District 11 and repealing unnecessary or conflicting regulations. Issues to be addressed in the plan include conservation of Taku River king salmon, allocation among fisheries and conservation of non-Taku River king salmon and other species. The plan will include regulations to allow or restrict time, area and gear in each fishery according to varying levels of available harvestable surplus of Taku River king salmon to address the issues above. Repeal a portion of 5 AAC 33.331(d)(2). Gillnet specifications and operations: in District 11, [THROUGH THE FOURTH SATURDAY IN JUNE, SIX INCHES, EXCEPT] from May 1 through the third Sunday in June, during fishing periods established by emergency order, the maximum gillnet mesh size is seven and one half inches;...

ISSUE: Directed fisheries for Taku River king salmon were closed in the mid 1970s to conserve depressed stocks. Prior to 2005, the Pacific Salmon Treaty prevented new fisheries from targeting Taku River king salmon without the consent of both parties. Taku River king salmon have increased in abundance and, at the February 2005 Pacific Salmon Commission meeting, parties to the treaty reached bilateral agreement to allow directed fisheries to resume.

At the 2003 Board of Fisheries meeting, it was requested of the board to establish a directed gillnet king fishery in regulation which would provide the Pacific Salmon Commission leverage to negotiate a treaty deal for a directed fishery. In 2005 the board passed emergency regulations to also allow expanded sport fishery and a troll fishery an opportunity to participate in the harvest of Taku king salmon. These groups had also been displaced for conservation management to rebuild the Taku chinook salmon stocks.

Taku River king salmon runs, and harvestable surplus available to United States fisheries, are expected to vary each year with allocative consequences to fisheries. An abundance-based management plan is needed to provide the department with direction on implementing directed fisheries on Taku River king salmon under different abundance scenarios. The Juneau-Douglas Advisory Committee has agreed to develop a committee and working with the department, develop a comprehensive management plan for the board to consider this fall. Information from this year's fishery will provide much needed knowledge to work with in the development of a plan. Therefore, we do not have details available prior to the board proposal deadline.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fair allocation of Taku king salmon will not be considered in a comprehensive fashion at different abundance levels for all user groups who have foregone harvest opportunities to rebuild the stocks to a healthy level.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users will benefit from utilizing harvestable surpluses of Taku River king salmon and from clear management guidelines for each fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None, this is the only option that provides an opportunity for all users to participate in the rebuilt chinook harvests and the new directed fisheries.

PROPOSED BY: Juneau-Douglas Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-139)

PROPOSAL 124 - 5 AAC XX.XXX. Management plan for District 11 troll, gillnet, and sport fisheries. Create a new regulation to provide the following:

Develop a management plan to allow harvest of District 11 chinook by trollers, gillnetters, and sport anglers.

During the March 2005 Board of Fisheries meeting on this issue the Alaska Trollers Association (ATA) suggested that a working group be tasked with developing a management plan. We still believe that a group approach is the best avenue, as it will provide all interests a chance to share information and perspectives. It is important to minimize user conflict, while allowing all fisheries.

If the local advisory committees have not come up with a broadly supported option by the time the board meets, we request a working group of all the users be formed early in the meeting in hopes of reaching a workable solution.

ISSUE: In the mid 1970s, chinook stocks in the Taku River were returning in low numbers. Directed troll and gillnet fisheries in District 11 were denied access to Taku River chinook as part of a rebuilding program. Sport anglers also suffered some restrictions. Since that time, the run has rebuilt and is very healthy. Harvest sharing provisions between Alaska and Canada were recently negotiated by the Pacific Salmon Commission. Now Alaska needs a management plan so that trollers, gillnetters, and sport anglers can share the benefits of rebuilding this important run of fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen would continue to be unnecessarily restricted and/or prevented access to a healthy resource.

Both the seafood industry and the State of Alaska lost income as they worked to recover Taku River chinook. It is important to recapture this revenue stream through a management plan that maximizes harvest of Alaska's treaty share by all those who had a stake in rebuilding.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All affected user groups and the State of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A well-articulated management plan will not harm anyone.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? ATA has ideas, but as opposed to drafting fixed proposals, we will work on a more specific plan with the local advisory committees, willing fishermen and groups prior to the 2006 Board of Fisheries meeting.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-05-F-229)

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 29.090. Management of the spring salmon troll fisheries. Amend the regulations as follows:

Trollers will be allowed access to all of District 11-A; 11-B and 11-C when there is a directed king fishery where the Taku fish do not count towards the treaty.

ISSUE: Access to the directed king fishery in District 11 and hatchery kings in District 11.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The trollers will not be given an opportunity to access fish that they have a historical history of catching before the fishery was closed to all users for conservation, the harvest will not count towards the troller's share of treaty fish. Historically, all of District 11 was open for trolling. Currently, there is a hatchery operating in District 11 that there is not any targeted spring hatchery access areas open for these fish. Trollers are below their goal range for enhanced fish and this would provide an opportunity to catch hatchery fish along with Taku kings that would not count towards the treaty catch.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Trollers produce a better quality fish that provides a higher exvessel price than other commercial gear types.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trollers will get a chance to harvest a share of the District 11 kings.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Roger Gregg (HQ-05-F-161)

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC XX.XXX. Management plan for District 8 troll, gillnet, and sport fisheries. Create a new regulation to provide the following:

Develop a management plan to allow harvest of District 8 chinook by trollers, gillnetters, and sport anglers.

During the March 2005 Board of Fisheries meeting on this issue the Alaska Trollers Association (ATA) suggested that a working group be tasked with developing a management plan. We still believe that a group approach is the best avenue, as it will provide all interests a chance to share information and perspectives. It is important to minimize user conflict, while allowing all fisheries.

If the local advisory committees have not come up with a broadly supported option by the time the board meets, we request a working group of all the users be formed early in the meeting in hopes of reaching a workable solution.

ISSUE: In the mid-1970s, chinook stocks in the Stikine River were returning in low numbers. Directed troll and gillnet fisheries in District 8 were denied access to Stikine River chinook as part of a rebuilding program. Sport anglers also suffered some restrictions. Since that time, the run has rebuilt and is very healthy. Harvest sharing provisions between Alaska and Canada were recently negotiated by the Pacific Salmon Commission. Now Alaska needs a management plan so that trollers, gillnetters, and sport anglers can share the benefits of rebuilding this important run of fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen would continue to be unnecessarily restricted and/or prevented access to a healthy resource.

Both the seafood industry and the State of Alaska lost income as they worked to recover Stikine River chinook. It is important to recapture this revenue stream through a management plan that maximizes harvest of Alaska’s treaty share by all those who had a stake in rebuilding.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All affected user groups and the State of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A well-articulated management plan will not harm anyone.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? ATA has ideas, but as opposed to drafting fixed proposals, we will work on a more specific plan with the local advisory committees, willing fishermen and groups prior to the 2006 Board of Fisheries meeting.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-05-F-227)

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 33.310. Fishing seasons and periods for net gear; 5 AAC 33.331. Gillnet specifications and operations; 5 AAC 33.350. Closed Waters; 5 AAC 33.381. District 6: Wrangell Narrows-Blind Slough Terminal Harvest Area salmon management plan; 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area; 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area; 5 AAC 47.030. Methods, means, and general provisions – finfish; and

5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend these regulations as follows:

Establish an abundance-based management plan for fisheries targeting Stikine River king salmon in District 8 and repeal unnecessary regulations. Issues to be addressed in the plan include conservation of Stikine River king salmon, allocation among fisheries, and conservation of non-Stikine River king salmon and other species. The plan will include regulations to allow or restrict time, area and gear in each fishery according to varying levels of available harvestable surplus of Stikine River king salmon to address the issues above.

This proposal also repeals unnecessary regulations, including the existing closed area and gear regulations in brackets below:

5 AAC 33.331. (d) **Repeal.** [(1). IN DISTRICT 8 FROM THE SECOND SUNDAY IN JUNE THROUGH JULY 18, SIX INCHES, EXCEPT DURING PERIODS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER FOR BLIND SLOUGH FOR THE HARVEST OF KING SALMON WHEN NO MAXIMUM MESH SIZE WILL APPLY;],

5 AAC 33.350. (i)(3)(B). [BEFORE THE THIRD SUNDAY IN JUNE AND] after the first Saturday in August, waters inside a line from Babler Point to Hour Point along the shore of Wrangell Island to Point Highfield to the southern end of Liesnoi Island to the southern end of Greys Island to the small island near the eastern entrance to Blind Slough to the nearest point on Mitkof Island to the prominent point of Mitkof Island nearest Coney Island to the northern end of Coney Island to a point 500 yards north of Jap Creek on the mainland shore.

5 AAC 33.381. (d) **Repeal** [DUE TO HARVEST OBJECTIVES IN THE TERMINAL HARVEST AREA, THE WATERS OF FREDERICK SOUND EAST OF A LINE FROM BOULDER POINT TO POINT HIGHLAND ARE CLOSED TO COMMERCIAL SALMON FISHING FROM APRIL 16 THROUGH MAY 31.]

5 AAC 47.021. (h) **Repeal.** [IN THE PETERSBURG/WRANGELL VICINITY, IN THE WATERS OF GREY'S PASSAGE ENCLOSED BY A LINE FROM BABBLER POINT TO POINT HIGHFIELD TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED AT THE EASTERN ENTRANCE TO BLIND SLOUGH, TO THE MOUTH OF JAP CREEK ON THE MAINLAND SHORE, SALMON MAY BE TAKEN ONLY FROM JUNE 15 – APRIL 15.]

ISSUE: Directed fisheries for Stikine River king salmon were closed in the late 1970s to conserve depressed stocks. Prior to 2005, the Pacific Salmon Treaty prevented new fisheries from targeting Stikine River king salmon without the consent of both parties. Stikine River king salmon have increased in abundance, and, at the February 2005 Pacific Salmon Commission meeting, parties to the treaty reached bilateral agreement to allow directed fisheries to resume. In March 2005, the board approved an emergency regulation to implement directed commercial and sport fisheries for Stikine River king salmon. The 2005 emergency regulation will expire before the 2006 season. The department cannot reopen directed fisheries on Stikine River king salmon after 2005 until the board modifies existing regulations.

Stikine River king salmon runs, and harvestable surplus available to U.S. fisheries, are expected to vary each year with allocative consequences to fisheries. An abundance-based management plan is needed to provide the department with direction on implementing directed fisheries on Stikine River king salmon under different abundance scenarios.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Harvestable surpluses of Stikine River king salmon will be foregone unless a comprehensive management plan is developed for District 8.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users will benefit from utilizing harvestable surpluses of Stikine River king salmon and from clear management guidelines for each fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-236)

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation to include:

In years of high abundance of chinook salmon on the Stikine, when there is a directed commercial fishery, the nonresident bag limit is two per day, with an annual limit of four. Resident bag limit is three per day, with no annual bag limit.

ISSUE: Concentration of charter fishermen in District 8 targeting the meat fishery due to no annual limit. Nonresidents going over their annual limit in other areas, claiming caught in District 8. Gillnetters and trollers curtailed for years to rebuild run.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A loophole in the nonresident annual bag limit will be opened for abuse. Increase in run is increase in opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident sport fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident meat fishermen who are paying for their vacation with Alaskan salmon.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To keep annual bag limits the same as adjacent areas. Believe in years of high abundance all should benefit.

PROPOSED BY: Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-115)

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 29.090. Management of the spring salmon troll fisheries; and 5 AAC 33.310(c)(3). Fishing seasons and periods for net gear. Amend these regulations as follows:

Southeast Alaska troll and gillnet fishery will open on the first Monday in May, in Area 8, for king salmon and will be regulated by time open and emergency order.

ISSUE: The gillnet and troll king fishery in Area 8 was closed in 1977 to rebuild the stocks. They are rebuilt now and we want our fishery back. We have an agreement with the Canadians. We want all user groups treated equally, no special interests. Seven day a week sport fish, gillnets and troll same place, same time.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The troll and gillnet fishery will not be able to catch their quota of Stikine River king salmon.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Benefits trollers and gillnetters who gave up 28 years of fishing time in Area 8 to rebuild the stock of king salmon whose fishery began in the 1940s and 1950s.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Carl E. Crome (HQ-05-F-028)

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 33.331(d). Gillnet specifications and operations. Amend the regulation as follows:

(d)(1) in District 8 [FROM THE SECOND SUNDAY IN JUNE THROUGH JULY 18,] six inches [EXCEPT] during periods established by emergency order [FOR BLIND SLOUGH FOR THE HARVEST OF CHINOOK SALMON WHEN NO MAXIMUM MESH SIZE WILL APPLY;]

ISSUE: We are attempting to get our targeted fishery for Stikine River chinook salmon reestablished in District 8. The maximum mesh size restriction of six inches was developed for District 8 when conservation of Stikine River chinook was a concern in the 1970s. The Stikine chinook have exceeded their lower escapement goal since 1985 and far exceeded the upper escapement goal since 2001. While we do not think the option to use the maximum size mesh restriction should be removed as a tool for the department to use in the event that the escapement falls below acceptable level in the future, we do feel the maximum size specified in this regulation should be applied by emergency order, and not made a blanket application to District 8 as the regulation currently stipulates.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The gillnet fleet will not be able to use nets of an effective mesh size to catch chinook salmon when the Stikine River chinook salmon fishery is reestablished.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will have no effect on this issue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The gillnet fleet because it will be able to use an efficient mesh size net when the conservation of Stikine chinook is not a concern.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The sport and sport charter community fishing the District 8 area may see some impact as the proper sized net will result in more chinook being taken by the gillnet fleet.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We can really see only the proposed solution and leaving the current regulation unchanged with its blanket restriction on net size.

PROPOSED BY: United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters (HQ-05-F-034)

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 33.310(c). Fishing seasons and periods for net gear. Amend the regulation to read as follows:

(c)(3) District 8 opens on the **first Monday of May** [SECOND SUNDAY OF JUNE];

ISSUE: The targeted chinook salmon fishery in District 8 has been closed for conservation reasons since 1977. The stocks have rebuilt and escapements have significantly exceeded the upper boundary escapement level for the past three years. A sharing agreement is now in place between Alaska and Canada for the harvest of the Stikine River stock. United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters would like this fishery reestablished in regulation. To minimize conflicts with sport and sportcharter fishermen, we believe the fishery should be restricted to Monday through Friday and not conducted during federal or state holidays.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A significant resource will not be utilized and the considerable income potential represented by this fishery will be lost to the gillnet fleet. If Alaska's portion of the allowable catch is not harvested for whatever reason, the Alaska negotiating position will be weakened. There is also the possibility that, considering the large size of the expected return, damage could occur to the spawning grounds due to the number of fish escaping into the Stikine system.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The gillnet fleet which historically had a fishery on this stock of fish. There will be more chinook salmon available to processors which will support community processing jobs. There is also a market demand for these fish and if Alaska cannot provide product to satisfy this market demand, our farm salmon competitors will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There will be fewer fish for the sport and sport charter fisheries to catch.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The options are very limited here. The board must either reestablish gillnet access to the Stikine stock of fish passing through District 8 or leave it closed as is currently the situation. The department, as in other salmon fisheries, will control fishing time by emergency order based on run strength.

PROPOSED BY: United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters (HQ-05-F-035)

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 33.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Amend the regulation to provide the following:

(x) For the conservation of steelhead, drift gillnet gear may be modified by means that are deemed appropriate.

ISSUE: Directed king salmon gillnet fisheries may impact stocks of spring run steelhead.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In the event there is a negative impact from the directed king salmon gillnet fisheries, steelhead stocks in District 108 could be hurt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would not directly improve the quality of king salmon in this fishery. However, if it aids in the conservation of steelhead stocks, the sustainability of the directed gillnet king salmon fishery would be improved.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Steelhead sport fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Drift gillnet fishermen may see some decrease in efficiency of their gear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Large closed areas in District 8 might solve the problem if it develops, but this would be too disruptive to the gillnet fishery.

PROPOSED BY: United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters (HQ-05-F-040)

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 29.090(b). Management of the spring salmon troll fisheries. Amend the regulation as follows:

(b) The department shall manage the spring troll fisheries to target Alaska hatchery-produced king salmon **while not directly targeting Stikine and Taku rivers king salmon in Districts 108 and 111...**

ISSUE: Harvest allocation of Taku and Stikine rivers king salmon between the drift gillnet and troll fisheries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The drift gillnet fleet will not receive adequate sharing of the Southeast Alaska king salmon resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Drift gillnet fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Troll fishermen would not realize an increase above their present fisheries.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We did not consider other sharing arrangements as the troll fishery currently has 31 hatchery troll fisheries available to them throughout Southeast Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters (HQ-05-F-045)

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 29.090. Management of the spring salmon troll fisheries. Amend the regulations as follows:

Trollers will be allowed access to all of District 8 when there is a directed king fishery where the Stikine fish do not count towards the treaty.

ISSUE: Access to the directed king fishery in District 8.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The trollers will not be given an opportunity to access fish that they have a historical history of catching before the fishery was closed to all users for conservation. The harvest will not count towards the troller's share of treaty fish. Historically, all of District 8 was open for trolling.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Trollers produce a better quality fish that provides a higher exvessel price than other commercial gear types.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trollers will get a chance to harvest a share of the District 8 kings.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Roger Gregg (HQ-05-F-160)

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 33.381(b). District 6: Wrangell Narrow-Blind Slough Terminal Harvest Area salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

When projected return of king salmon is 1,000 fish, or greater, the resource will be shared equally between commercial and sport fishing until closed by emergency order.

ISSUE: Distribution of king salmon return to Crystal Lake Hatchery based on funding provided to hatchery from commercial fish taxes and sport fishing should be 50/50.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued unfair distribution of king salmon resource at Crystal Lake Hatchery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, more prime salmon available for harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone wins when resource shared on an equal basis.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: William R Glover (HQ-05-F-029)

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 29.060(b)(5). Allocation of king salmon in the Southeastern-Yakutat Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Sport anglers are allowed 50 percent of the total king salmon allocation.

ISSUE: The problem is unequal allocation of king salmon between sport and commercial users.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Prevent fair access of king salmon by sport anglers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The products produced generate more money to local and state economies than the current situation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresident anglers will be able to catch their own fish rather than purchase commercially-caught kings (which many anglers prefer to do). State and local economies will benefit by the increase in business generated by nonresidents visiting the state.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A minimum number of commercial trollers but the dollars lost to local economies by commercial fisheries will be made up by nonresident anglers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Roesch (HQ-05-F-022)

PROPOSAL 137 - 5 AAC 29.060 (b). Allocation of king salmon in the Southeastern-Yakutat Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

(b)(2) drift gillnet fishery: [7,600 KING SALMON] **2.9 percent of any annual king salmon harvest ceiling established by the Pacific Salmon Commission or the department;**

ISSUE: The gillnet fleet catches chinook salmon incidental to pursuing our normal fisheries which target chum and sockeye salmon. The only exceptions to this are targeted terminal harvest area openings and the fishery on the Taku and possibly the Stikine River if agreement can be reached with the Canadians. During periods of high abundance of chinook, the gillnet harvest can exceed the fixed quota ceiling of 7,600 fish. This can result in the department using night closures and/or time and area restrictions for the normal chum and sockeye fisheries in order to keep the number of chinook caught within the quota allocation. The gillnet fleet would like to avoid this situation as much as possible. We are proposing to change the allocation from a fixed ceiling of 7,600 chinook to 2.9 percent of the Alaska all-gear allocation. The management of chinook harvest under the Pacific Salmon Commission (PSC) has moved from the old fixed ceiling limit of 263,000 chinook to an abundance based system. Under the current abundance based system, we believe it makes more sense to use a percentage-based relationship to establish the gillnet harvest limit such as the board adopted for the seiners several board cycles ago. The 2.9 percent that is proposed is derived from the relationship of the existing gillnet fixed ceiling of 7,600 chinook divided by the old total all gear allocation of 263,000 fish. Preliminary numbers from the 2004 season indicate that the gillnet fleet caught 21,645 chinook of which 9,345 were “treaty fish” that counted against the Alaska quota. If the proposed 2.9 percent relationship had been applied to the 2004 all gear quota of 383,536 chinook, the allowable catch for the gillnet fleet would have been 11,122 fish, removing the

potential need to restrict our sockeye and chum targeted fisheries. We are very willing to be limited by a lower harvest number when the abundance number is lower and the percentage relationship results in smaller number of chinook than the existing 7,600 chinook limit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Gillnet fisheries targeting chum and sockeye may be unduly restricted if the incidental catch of chinook salmon during periods of high abundance is projected to exceed the existing 7,600 fish quota.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal should have no effect on the quality of fish caught in our fishery or the products produced from those fish. Time and/or area closures limiting the number of incidental chinook caught would reduce the quantity of chum and sockeye caught resulting in a general loss of income to the fleet as well as fewer fish being available to processors who rely on gillnet fish for part, or all, of their production.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In years of high abundance, the gillnet fleet would receive a few more chinook salmon than the current fixed limit. More importantly, the gillnet fleet would benefit from the reduced necessity to restrict normal chum and sockeye fisheries in order to limit the number of incidental chinook taken in those fisheries. In years of low abundance, the number of fish the troll and sport fisheries could take would be slightly increased as the percentage allocation would be less than the fixed ceiling of 7,600 chinook.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? We do not think this change will disadvantage any of the other fleets.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The only other practical solution is to maintain the current fixed ceiling of 7,600 chinook salmon. As stated above, this could result in night closures and/or restrictions during periods of high abundance if the number of incidentally caught chinook threatened to exceed the fixed ceiling.

PROPOSED BY: United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters (HQ-05-F-033)

PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 47.055(b)(1). Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan; and 5 AAC 29.060. Allocation of king salmon in the Southeastern Yakutat Alaska Area. Amend these regulations as follows:

Increase the sport allocation to 30 percent.

ISSUE: The problem is the unfair allocation of Southeast king salmon harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? During years of low abundance, sport anglers will be unable to access a fair share of the Southeast king salmon harvest, resulting in instability of the sport fishing industry.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, sport caught fish are generally consumed or processed the same day they are caught.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers will benefit. The increase in allocation will help to insure stability of a minimum of a one king daily bag limit for residents and nonresidents during years of low abundance.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Depending on how the harvest is allocated, some net and troll harvesters will catch less king salmon in Southeast Alaska.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The status quo is inherently unfair.

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Charter Boat Operators Association (HQ-05-F-125)

PROPOSAL 139 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

Provide for a “sliding allocation” level for sport and troll fisheries. During low abundance index (AI), sport allocation could run from preseason AI projection between 20 to 30 percent, and the troll allocation could run between 70 to 80 percent, to total 100 percent. In high abundance years with projected sport underage of 10,000 fish, which could not be harvested by sport anglers in that year, these fish could be transferred and harvested by the troll fleet after September 1. This scenario would allow full utilization of the PSC treaty quota by department managers, without antagonizing either group. Historical harvest levels by both groups indicate that in the long-term the percentages balance.

ISSUE: Sport fishing opportunity and harvest stability for Southeast king salmon. Harvest records indicate sport anglers usually underharvest king salmon in years when the AI is above 1.5, and overharvest when the AI is below 1.1. Under the current “uncoupled” scheme and abundance levels, sport anglers do not have the capability to harvest 20 percent at one and two king daily bag limits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If long-term abundance levels continue above 1.5, sport anglers will not harvest their fair share (with one fish daily bag limit for nonresidents and two fish daily for residents).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Increasing consumption of wild king salmon by sport anglers will increase the demand for wild-caught king salmon over farmed salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups will benefit in the long-term. Trollers will benefit in years of higher abundance.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trollers in years of lower abundance.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo was rejected because it does not allow the sport fish sector to access previous year’s underage, or fully access the 20 percent allocation in years of higher abundance.

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Charter Boat Operators Association (HQ-05-F-165)

PROPOSAL 140 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

If the preliminary postseason sport fishing harvest data shows harvest was below the 20 percent allocation (underage) for a specific year, all or a maximum of 3,000 fish should be put in the “bank” for a future year, when harvest exceeds the 20 percent allocation. If the postseason abundance index (AI) is equal to or exceeds the preseason AI of the previous year, after banking 3,000 fish, any fish left over shall be allowed for potential harvest in the following May and June. During May and June, the daily bag limit for nonresidents would increase from one to two, followed by increasing the daily bag limit for residents from two to three, until the underage is achieved.

If the preliminary postseason harvest data shows harvest was above the 20 percent allocation (overage) for a specific year, any previously “banked” fish will be applied to the overage. Harvest restrictions will not be implemented that will reduce harvest opportunity below a one fish daily bag limit for nonresidents and residents, and not less than three fish annually for nonresidents, except for severe conservation concerns, that will result in exceeding the 20 percent allocation by more than 7.5 percent for three consecutive years, coupled with projected abundance indices below 1.0.

ISSUE: Lack of adequate sport fishing management “tools” in the Southeast king salmon management plan.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport anglers in Southeast Alaska may be denied harvest opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Increasing consumption of wild king salmon by sport anglers will increase the demand for wild-caught king salmon over farmed salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers will be assured the opportunity of a one king daily bag limit. Charter and lodge businesses will have marketing stability and be able to remain competitive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo was rejected because it does not allow the sport fish sector to access previous year’s underage, or fully access the 20 percent allocation in years of higher abundance.

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Charter Boat Operators Association (HQ-05-F-164)

PROPOSAL 141 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

The plan should be revised in accordance with the “uncoupling” provision.

- 1) Any reference to an annual harvest limit for nonresident anglers be removed.
- 2) Section (b)(1): manage the sport fishery to attain **up to a six year running** average harvest... The beginning of the six year running average should be 2003, which was when the uncoupling began.
- 3) Section (b)(2) add, **except as provided for in (b)(1).**

4) Rewrite (c) as follows: When the king salmon abundance index (AI) is great than 1.2, the commissioner shall, by emergency order, implement the following management measures: (1) a resident bag limit of two king salmon; (2) a nonresident daily bag limit of one or two king salmon during all or parts of May and June, to make up all or any portion of an underage from the previous year, provided the post season AI is equal to or great than the previous year's preseason AI, and the forecast for the current year is stable or increasing. Harvest restrictions will not be implemented that will reduce harvest opportunity below a one fish daily bag limit for nonresidents and residents, and not less than a three fish annual limit for nonresidents, except for severe conservation concerns, that will result in exceeding the 20 percent allocation by more than 7.5 percent for three consecutive years, coupled with projected AI below 1.0.

ISSUE: The Southeast sport fishing king salmon management plan (plan) needs to be amended. At the 2003 board meeting, the department announced a desire to “uncouple” sport anglers and commercial trollers, which removed the “payback” provision of each user group. PSC managers advised the department that by uncoupling, each user group could, if necessary for stability, primarily in low abundance years, exceed their allocation by up to 7.5 percent. The department was further advised that any overage would have to be made up in the long-term.

The plan provided for a two king daily bag limit for residents at AI above 1.2; and a one king daily bag, and three king annual limit for nonresidents, with no provision to increase either one when abundance levels are higher. Consequently, the department could not allow sport anglers additional harvest opportunity in 2003, 2004 and 2005, and sport harvest was only 13.8 percent, 17.1 percent and XX percent, respectively.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will not be able to increase harvest levels in higher abundance years. Instead of “banking” underages of the sport fish harvest for stability in lower abundance years, the underages can be lost in making up for commercial troller overages, in the long-term (even though these groups were supposedly uncoupled).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Wild kings harvested by nonresident sport anglers increase the demand for, and value of, wild salmon, stimulating economic growth in all businesses associated with sport angling on state and local levels. It also increases demand for commercially-caught king salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers will be able to better access the allocation. With increased marketing opportunities for May and June, all businesses associated with sport angling, on state and local levels will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo was rejected because it does not allow the sport fish sector to access previous year’s underage, or fully access the 20 percent allocation in years of higher abundance.

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Charter Boat Operators Association and Petersburg Charter Boat Association (HQ-05-F-122)

PROPOSAL 142 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation to include the following:

Add a tool to the southeast king salmon management plan that would manage for the month of May and/or June or a portion thereof, to access the previous year's sport fishing allocation underages.

ISSUE: Sport anglers are not able to fully access the 20 percent king salmon allocation thereby leaving thousands of fish on the table. The nonresident annual limit discriminates unfairly against nonresident sport anglers. This negatively affects state and local economies. As nonresidents can buy as many kings as they desire, this creates an unfair business practice between commercial and sport charter users.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The sport fishing sector will continue to be unable to fully access their 20 percent king salmon allocation and continue to leave thousands of fish on the table; continued loss of potential local and state revenues; nonresidents will go to other markets that are more attractive such as Canada.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The nonresident who is able to harvest and consume their catch will do as good a job of increasing the demand and value of wild Alaskan king salmon, as the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute. Information spread by word of mouth is the best way to promote the demand for wild Alaskan king salmon everywhere.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The sport fishing sector would be able to more fully access the 20 percent allocation of king salmon. Additional business activity would be created, benefiting local and state economies by increasing revenues from out-of-state dollars brought in during the month of May and/or June, which is typically slower than the rest of the season. The nonresident sport anglers who would like to fish for kings longer than three days, or come more than once a year to Southeast Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Local residents may perceive increased competition for the resource, however this will only allow the sport fishing sector to more fully access the allocation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo does not allow the sport fishing sector to access previous year's underage, or fully access the 20 percent allocation in years of higher abundance.

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Charter Boat Operators Association (HQ-05-F-127)

PROPOSAL 143 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

In years of high abundance, or when an underage exists from previous years, liberalize methods/means to allow sport fishers two rods October through April.

ISSUE: The king salmon management plan lacks the tools to allow the department to increase harvest opportunity in years of high abundance.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The sport fish allocation will go unharvested and sport fishers will be denied opportunity. Underage will continue to accrue which may not be useable in low abundance years.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It gives sport fishers better opportunity to harvest high quality winter fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sport fishers but mostly residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Liberalize bag/possession limits in the general summer season, rejected as possibly being too effective and causing instability in the sport fishery/disproportionate harvest by nonresidents or disproportionate harvest by area.

PROPOSED BY: Petersburg Charterboat Association (HQ-05-F-112)

PROPOSAL 144 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

No annual king salmon limit for nonresidents in Southeast Alaska. Increase daily bag limit to two king salmon per day for the month of May during times of higher abundance index levels.

ISSUE: The discrimination against nonresident sport fish anglers king salmon daily bag limit for the month of May and annual limits for king salmon. This is a denial of access and participation in fulfilling sport fish quotas in years of higher abundance. Increasing decline of early season revenues for local economies, specifically May.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Loss of local and state economics, as other regions such as British Columbia become more attractive to nonresident anglers with higher bag and possession limits for king salmon.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Wild king salmon harvested by nonresident sport anglers promote enhanced value and demand for wild king salmon stimulating economic growth in all industries associated with sport angling on a local and state level. This also enhances demand for commercial-caught wild king salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local economic structure becomes more stable with longer seasonal employment. State economies benefit from longer influx of out-of-state monies. Creates an enhanced marketing tool for local sport fishing businesses for a time of year that has become increasingly harder to maintain economic stability. Allows for extended seasonal revenues for local support businesses of the sport fish industry. Promotes the possibility of multiple trips in one year to Southeast Alaska resulting in increases to, across the board, economic growth and stability. Allows increased access for nonresident anglers to the 20 percent allocation in years of higher abundance.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Attaining the full 20 percent sport allocation harms no one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo. The current regulations do not allow sport fishermen to fully access the 20 percent allocation in years of higher abundance.

PROPOSED BY: Linda Slifer (HQ-05-F-130)

PROPOSAL 145 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

Add the following options to the Southeast king salmon management plan’s toolbox:

- a) An annual limit of six chinook for nonresidents.
- b) During the month of May only, provide for a daily bag limit of two chinook for nonresidents.
- c) Manage for the month of May (and/or June or a portion thereof) to access the underage from previous year’s sport fishing sector allocation.
- d) And, those fish caught in May would not go against the nonresident annual limit when abundance index is 1.5 or greater.

ISSUE: During years of higher abundance for chinook salmon, sport anglers have been unable to reach the 20 percent allocation due to the limitations placed on nonresident sport anglers. This leaves thousands of fish “on the table” that anglers are simply unable to access due to the current king salmon management plan. Additionally, it is becoming harder to entice nonresident sport anglers to travel and spend money in Southeast Alaska, especially during off-peak periods such as the months of April and May.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? During years of higher abundance, the sport anglers will continue to be unable to reach the full allocation. Many nonresidents will choose to travel and spend money elsewhere by going to other markets that are more attractive (have more liberal bag and possession limits) such as Canada, to fish for chinook salmon. The Southeast Alaska sport fishing tourism season will have a continued loss of potential local and state revenues.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Wild king salmon harvested and consumed by nonresident anglers will have personal value, thus promoting the demand for wild Alaskan king salmon around the United States.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport fishing sector would be able to more fully access the 20 percent quota of king salmon. Additional business activity would be created during a slower time of the season, benefiting local and state economies by increasing revenues from out of state dollars brought in during the month of May (and/or June). May is typically much slower than the rest of the season for us here in Southeast Alaska. The nonresident sport anglers who would like to fish for kings longer than three days, or come more than once a year to southeast Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Local residents may perceive increased competition for the resource, however these options for solutions are allowing the sport fish sector to more fully access their allocation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo will not work because it is getting harder to market Southeast Alaska to nonresident sport anglers due to the current king salmon management plan and the other available competitive fishing vacation destinations. Status quo does not allow the sport fishing sector to access previous years underage, nor fully access the 20 percent allocation in years of higher abundance. No annual king salmon limit for nonresidents would successfully eliminate preferential treatment of residents; however, the proposed options for solutions are more conservative and would still positively affect local and state economies.

PROPOSED BY: John Belcher (HQ-05-F-146)

PROPOSAL 146 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

No annual king salmon limit for nonresidents, with a daily bag limit of two kings during times of higher abundance.

ISSUE: The sport fishing sector has not been allowed to fulfill its allotted king salmon quota during years of higher abundance. Current king salmon harvest restrictions prohibit nonresidents from having an equal opportunity to harvest king salmon. There are no protocols that allow an increase to the sport fishing sector's king salmon quota during years of higher abundance, although they have plenty of tools to diminish their quota during years of lower abundance.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Kings left on the table during years of higher abundance may be allocated to the commercial salmon fleet thus infringing upon the protocol for dividing the allowable catch between sport and commercial users. Greater friction between sport and commercial salmon fishermen. Loss of revenue for local and state businesses as other destinations where bag limits are more generous, such as Canada, become more attractive.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, nonresidents will be able to spend more time fishing in Alaska, giving them the opportunity to see more of our unique state and shop in our towns. Salmon caught and eaten by a nonresident will have a greater personal value thus helping to strengthen the demand for wild Alaskan salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local and state businesses and nonresident anglers. Local revenues will increase by a greater influx of nonresident anglers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Commercial troll fishers may appear to suffer, since they have been reaping the benefits of excess kings during years of higher abundance. In reality both sport and commercial sectors will only be accessing their allotted quotas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered the status quo, but it does not allow the sport sector to reach its allowable quota of kings during years of higher abundance. Nonresident commercial fishermen have no limit on the amount of homepack king salmon they may bring home. Prohibits a nonresident sport fisherman from making multiple or extended fishing trips in Southeast Alaska for kings.

PROPOSED BY: Dennis Cook (HQ-05-F-151)

PROPOSAL 147 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

An annual king limit of six for nonresidents, with a daily bag limit of two kings during times of higher abundance.

ISSUE: The sport fishing sector has not been allowed to fulfill its allotted king quota during years of higher abundance. Current king salmon harvest restrictions prohibit nonresidents from having an equal opportunity to harvest king salmon. There are no protocols that allow the department to increase the sport fishing sector's king quota during years of higher abundance, although the department has plenty of tools to diminish the quota during years of lower abundance.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Kings left on the table during years of higher abundance may be allocated to the commercial salmon fleet thus infringing upon the protocol for dividing the allowable catch between sport and commercial. Greater friction between sport and commercial salmon fishermen. Loss of potential revenue for local and state businesses, as other destinations with more generous bag limits, such as Canada, become more attractive.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, nonresidents will be able to spend more time fishing in Alaska, giving them the opportunity to see more of our unique state and shop in our towns. Salmon caught and eaten by a nonresident will have a greater personal value, thus helping to strengthen the demand for wild Alaskan salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local and state businesses and nonresident anglers. Local revenues will increase by a greater influx of nonresident anglers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Commercial troll fishers may appear to suffer since they have been reaping the benefits of excess kings during years of higher abundance. In reality, both sport and commercial sectors will only be accessing their allotted quotas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Dennis Cook (HQ-05-F-162)

PROPOSAL 148 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

An annual limit of six chinook salmon and a daily bag of two chinook salmon for nonresident fishermen only during the month of May.

ISSUE: During years of higher abundance of chinook salmon, sport anglers are often unable to reach the 20 percent allocation due to the limitations placed on nonresident sport anglers. This leaves many fish “on the table” that anglers are simply unable to access due to the current king salmon management plan. Additionally, it is becoming harder to entice nonresident sport anglers to travel and spend money in Alaska, especially during off-peak periods.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? During years of higher abundance, the sport anglers will continue to be unable to reach the allocation. Many nonresidents will choose to travel and spend money elsewhere, such as Canada, to fish for chinook salmon. The sport fishing tourism season will be limited, stunting employment and economic growth.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Wild kings harvested by nonresident sport anglers increase the demand for, and value of, wild salmon. This stimulates economic growth in all businesses associated with sport angling on a state and local level. It also increases demand for commercially-caught king salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local and state economies benefit. Nonresident sport anglers who can come to Alaska in May benefit. Local businesses that are directly and indirectly connected to the sport fishing industry benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Resident sport anglers may perceive competition for chinook salmon during the month of May, however in years of higher abundance, sport anglers have been unable to reach the 20 percent allocation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo will not work because it is getting harder to market Alaska to nonresident sport anglers due to the current king salmon management plan and other competitive destinations. No annual king limit for nonresidents would successfully eliminate preferential treatment of residents, however, the proposed solution is more conservative and would still positively affect the local and state economies.

PROPOSED BY: Theresa Weiser (HQ-05-F-163)

PROPOSAL 149 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Allow the department to increase the annual bag limit to four fish for nonresidents in years of very high abundance.

ISSUE: The Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan (plan) needs to be amended. At the 2003 Board of Fisheries meeting, the department announced a desire to “uncouple” sport anglers and commercial trollers harvest, which removed the “payback” provision of each user group. Pacific Salmon Commission managers advised the department that by uncoupling, each user group could, if necessary for stability, primarily in low abundance years, exceed their allocation by up to 7.5 percent. The department was further advised that any overage would have to be made up in the long-term.

The plan provides for a maximum of three king annual limit for nonresidents at an abundance index above 1.2 with no provision to increase annual limits when abundance levels are much higher. Consequently, the department could not allow sport anglers additional harvest opportunity in 2003 and 2004, when the sport harvest was only 13.8 percent and 17.1 percent, respectively.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will not be able to increase harvest levels in higher abundance years and meaningful portions of the sport fish quota will not be harvested.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Wild kings harvested by nonresident sport anglers increase the demand for, and value of, wild salmon, stimulating economic growth in all businesses associated with sport angling on a state and local level. It also increases demand for commercially-caught salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers will be able to better access their allocation. With increased marketing opportunities for May and June, all businesses associated with sport angling, on state and local level, will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo was rejected because it does not allow the sport fish sector to access previous year’s underage nor fully access the 20 percent allocation in years of higher abundance.

PROPOSAL 150 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

Eliminate the annual king salmon limit for nonresident sport anglers and promote equality amongst nonresident user groups.

ISSUE: The disparity between a nonresident sport angler and a nonresident commercial fisherman, and how this negatively affects state and local economies. A nonresident sport angler is limited to an annual harvest of three king salmon. A nonresident commercial fisherman can commercially harvest and take as many king salmon home as he wishes, in homepacks. Furthermore, a nonresident visitor to Alaska can buy and export as many king salmon as desired.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The nonresident commercial fishermen will continue to have the legal right to fill their homepacks with as many king salmon as they wish. The nonresident sport angler will only be allowed to harvest three king salmon, or less, annually. State and local revenues will be minimized because nonresident anglers are attracted to British Columbia, which has more liberal king salmon bag and possession limits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Increasing consumption of wild king salmon by sport anglers will increase the demand for wild caught king salmon over farmed salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local and state economies will increase by attracting nonresident sport anglers who want the opportunity to catch more than three king salmon per year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The total sport catch will not change significantly. Trip lengths of three days may be replaced by four or five day visits, but the total season remains about four months.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered limiting the number of king salmon a nonresident may purchase and limiting the number of kings taken for homepacks to three, but it seemed more reasonable to equalize matters by removing the three annual limit for only nonresident sport anglers.

PROPOSAL 151 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

Nonresident sport anglers shall be allowed an annual bag limit of six chinook in Southeast Alaska.

ISSUE: Restrictive chinook bag limits for nonresident sport anglers are discriminatory in nature. Current regulations create unfair competition; the commercial fishing industry is given preferential treatment because nonresidents can buy as many commercially-caught chinook salmon as they wish, but are limited to keeping three or less per year, by rod and reel. Moreover, nonresident commercial fishermen are eligible to retain more than three chinook salmon per year. Finally, in

years of higher abundance, the sport anglers may not meet their 20 percent allocation due to the limitations placed upon nonresident sport anglers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This discriminatory practice will cause many nonresidents to choose to travel elsewhere, such as Canada, to fish for chinook. As a result, state and local economies will suffer and many small businesses that depend on dollars generated by nonresident sport anglers will be forced to close.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Wild kings harvested by nonresident sport anglers, increase the demand for, and value of, wild salmon, stimulating economic growth in all businesses associated with sport angling on a state and local level. It also increases demand for commercially caught king salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nonresidents who are visiting Southeast Alaska for an extended period benefit. Local businesses that are directly and indirectly connected to the sport fishing industry benefit. Local and state economies benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Resident sport anglers may perceive increased competition, however in years of higher abundance, sport anglers have been unable to access their full allocation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo will not work because it is getting harder to attract nonresident sport anglers due to other competitive markets. No annual king limit for nonresidents would successfully eliminate preferential treatment between nonresident sport anglers and nonresident commercial fishermen. However, the proposed solution is considered more conservative.

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Charter Boat Operators Association (HQ-05-F-153)

PROPOSAL 152 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulations as follows:

Alaska Residents:

Daily Bag Limit – per Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan

Possession Limit - same as nonresident annual limit as defined by the Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan

Nonresidents:

Daily Bag Limit – per Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan

Possession Limit – annual limit as defined by the Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan

ISSUE: This is a companion proposal to another submitted by Alaska Trollers Association (ATA). Support by ATA for this proposal is likely to be contingent upon the results of our other proposal on the possession limit definition.

If the board adopts ATA’s proposal to change the Southeast possession limit definition, then it will become necessary to address the annual limit on king salmon for nonresident anglers, so as not to disrupt the current management plan. ATA’s possession limit proposal would ensure that a person can only take back to their domicile the equivalent of the possession limit. While that allows 12 each of coho, chum, and pink salmon, we recognize that in some years it would restrict the

nonresident angler to just two chinook. This is not our intent. ATA supports the current regulatory provisions that define the annual nonresident chinook limit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If ATA's possession limit definition proposal passes and this proposal fails, nonresident anglers would be allowed to take home fewer chinooks than the current management plan provides. This is not our intent.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who would enjoy a higher possession limit of king salmon in most years than they do now.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The nonresident angler would still have the same level of access to king salmon as they do now.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-05-F-232)

PROPOSAL 153 - 5 AAC 47.030(g). Methods, means, and general provisions – finfish.
Amend the regulation as follows:

(g) Repeal to allow operators and crew members working on a charter vessel to retain king salmon.

ISSUE: Operators and crew members working aboard charter vessels in Southeast Alaska are the only group of licensed Alaskan sport fishers who are denied the right to fish even when no resource or allocation concerns are present.

Prior to 1997, operator and crew member rod use and king salmon retention was regulated by the department through inseason emergency orders based on resource levels. In 1997, the board codified a prohibition of rod use and king salmon retention by charter vessel operators and crew; it was perceived that resource and allocation issues would persist indefinitely.

However, in the last three seasons, 2002, 2003, and 2004, resource levels in southeast Alaska were plentiful enough that these issues did not exist. Had it not been codified, operator and crew rod use and king salmon retention probably would have been allowed by the department. Now, in 2005, resource levels are so plentiful that in the Juneau area the department has allowed resident and nonresident sport fishers to fish for king salmon with two rods and retain three fish per day. Still, in this time of plenty, operators and crew are prohibited from retaining king salmon or fishing with their own rod.

Many operators and crew members work seven days a week inseason and time not spent on the water is spent on vessel maintenance. Most have little other time to fish for personal consumption. By repealing this regulation, operators and crew would be able to fish for themselves when the boat is not full and resources are plentiful. The department will still have the option of using operator and crew rods and king salmon retention as a management tool when necessary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Licensed and legal Alaskan fishers (operators and crew of charter vessels) will continue to be denied the right to fish even when resource levels are abundant and allocation issues are not present.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Licensed legal Alaskan fishers who work on charter vessels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Rick Bierman (HQ-05-F-224)

PROPOSAL 154 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska king salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

At the start of statistical week 20, bag limits in the Ketchikan area water, including all troll hatchery access corridors, will be two fish for nonresident and four fish for resident. (Troll data shows that on or about statistical week 20, the Ketchikan area is at a 50 percent or greater hatchery catch rate.)

ISSUE: One fish bag limit for nonresident and two fish limit for resident in an area where there are four commercial hatcheries that raise king salmon and 100,000 kings are raised for sport fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport fishers will continue to miss the opportunity to catch high quality king salmon.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would allow sport fishers to harvest more king salmon when they are a higher quality—silver bright, not black with pale meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sport fishers that fish the Ketchikan area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo but I do not want to continue to catch black and pale meated king salmon.

PROPOSED BY: Donald E. Westlund (HQ-05-F-187)

PROPOSAL 155 - 5 AAC 33.364. Southeastern Alaska Area Salmon Enhanced Salmon Allocation Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Reduce hatchery production of pink and chum salmon in Southeast Alaska by at least 50 percent of the 2003 production. This reduction is only what the hatchery management promised the board and the governor in RC 360 at the January 2001 board meeting.

Note: A similar proposal is submitted for the Prince William Sound Area.

ISSUE: Enhanced salmon, pink and chum, replacing wild stocks. Competition from hatchery salmon in the marine environment on wild stocks.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wild stocks will continue to be at low abundance.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All wild stocks of pink, chum and sockeye salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? In the long run, all fishers in Alaska.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Virgil L. Umphenour (HQ-05-F-184A)

PROPOSAL 156 - 5 AAC 33.200. Fishing districts and sections; 5 AAC 33.310(c)(3). Fishing seasons and periods for net gear and 5 AAC 33.330. Gear. Amend these regulations as follows:

Establish two corridor areas in District 108(b) to be opened by emergency order. Corridor area A is described as follows: that portion of District 108(b) south of latitude 56° 20.54' N in Zimovia Strait. Corridor area B is described as follows: that portion of District 108(B) north of the area A boundary to a line from 56° 23.00' N lat, 132° 24.10' W long on Woronkofski Island due east to Wrangell Island and east of a line from Reef Point on Woronkofski Island due south to Etolin Island. When opened by emergency order, a minimum six inch mesh restriction will be required.

ISSUE: To produce the highest quality chum salmon, it is desirable to harvest hatchery chums in common property fisheries before they end up in a terminal harvest area. One opportunity to do this is in the areas of District 108 described in this proposal. Chum salmon bound for the Anita Bay remote release area are known to migrate through these areas of District 108. In years of low sockeye abundance, fishing these smaller areas of 108 with minimum six inch mesh net will conserve sockeye while providing opportunity to harvest hatchery chum while they are still in better condition than they would be if harvest was delayed until they could be caught in the Anita Bay terminal harvest area.

This proposal was considered and failed at the 2003 Southeast finfish meeting. The reasons the board gave for turning down the proposal were 1) the board was particularly concerned with Stikine River sockeye and local wild chum small stream escapements and 2) no need to put into regulation what the department already has the authority to do via emergency order. These issues concerning this proposal are addressed in the following sections of this problem statement.

1) Wild stock interception and local escapements: The use of a minimum six inch mesh net restriction is well established by the department for sockeye conservation while permitting harvest of chum stocks. This has been done occasionally in District 101 and extensively in District 115 and is in the regulation book for this purpose.

The test fishery conducted in 2001 and 2002 using a six inch minimum net shows a very effective harvest on chum salmon with a minimum bycatch of sockeye.

Southern Southeast Alaska Aquaculture Association (SSRAA) has committed to conduct stream surveys on the local chum systems in the Anita Bay area that are the basis of the board's concern. SSRAA personnel will report findings and observations to the department in a timely manor such that the department can restrict this hatchery access fishery if a problem develops with the escapement of these chum stocks.

2) No need to put in regulation what the department already has authority to permit by emergency order: The department has not routinely permitted openings in common property areas based only on the presence of concentrations of hatchery stocks. The vast majority of salmon openings are based on the strength of wild stocks and if some hatchery stocks are caught, so much the better. In this proposal USAG is asking that the board allow a fishery based on the strength of hatchery stocks returning to Anita Bay with the provision that Stikine sockeye and local chum stocks can be protected. The best example of a regulation that is focused on harvest of hatchery stocks outside of a terminal area is 5AAC 29.090 outlining management of the spring chinook troll fisheries. The philosophy of this fishery is the same as that asking for establishment of the District 108 corridor fisheries.

At the board's 2003 finfish meeting it accepted proposal 303 which opened a portion of Behm Canal to trolling July 1 for the expressed purpose of harvesting hatchery chums returning to Neets Bay. While a regulation change was required in this case to change the permitted start date for trolling in Behm Canal, this proposal also delineated a specific area for this hatchery access fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The opportunity to harvest hatchery chum salmon during periods of sockeye conservation in a common property area rather than waiting for them to arrive at the Anita Bay terminal harvest area will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this will have a significant impact on quality. It is well established that the earlier chum salmon can be harvested after they return to southern inside waters the better quality the flesh will be. Once they are in inside waters the chum roe is mature and the longer the wait before harvest, the lower the value of the carcass. The lowest value for chum flesh comes from fish that must be harvested in terminal harvest areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The gillnet fleet will benefit from this opportunity in this gillnet common property area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fewer fish will pass through the fishery into the terminal harvest area resulting in less fish available for the seine and gillnet fleets to catch in the Anita Bay terminal harvest area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are two other fairly obvious solutions. The first is to do nothing which results in a loss of opportunity for the gillnet fleet and the resultant harvest of lower quality chum salmon when they are caught later in the Anita Bay terminal harvest area. The second is to adjust the area to make it either larger or smaller. We believe the proposal includes the area of higher concentrations of hatchery chum salmon while minimizing any impacts on wild stocks. It is also of sufficient size to accommodate the number of boats that normally fish in the District 108 fishery.

PROPOSED BY: United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters (HQ-05-F-036)

PROPOSAL 157 - 5 AAC 29.XXX. Southeast Alaska chum and sockeye salmon allocation plan. Create a new regulation as follows:

Management guidelines for allocating pink, chum, and sockeye salmon between the commercial net (purse seine and gillnet) fisheries in Southeastern Alaska are established in 5 AAC 33.363(h) and are not altered by this section. The historical harvest allocations (1960-2004) between the commercial troll and net fisheries in Southeastern Alaska are xx percent troll and xx percent net for chum salmon and xx percent troll and xx percent net for sockeye salmon. While the percentages between the troll and net fisheries may vary from season to season, given fluctuations in salmon abundance and the distribution and limitations of fisheries management, the department shall manage the fishery to maintain these allocation guidelines over the long term. In that management the department (1) may not disrupt any of the traditional commercial fisheries upon which this historical allocation is founded; (2) may make inseason adjustments to attempt to achieve these historical harvest allocation guidelines.

ISSUE: In recent years the troll fleet has become more aggressive in harvesting chum salmon, a traditional net species. Efforts also continue to increase the effectiveness of trolling in the harvest of sockeye salmon. Some years ago the trollers asked the board to set an allocation for coho salmon based on historic catches (5 AAC 29.065) and the board approved that request. We believe it is now appropriate for the board to establish comparable guideline harvest percentages for chum and sockeye salmon for the troll fleet. These percentages should be developed by the department and be based on the same criteria as established in 5 AAC 29.065.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The troll fleet will continue to increase its harvest of chum or sockeye salmon when economics favor these species, and increased allocation arguments will develop between gear groups. It is best to set these allocations before a shift in species targeting further intensifies gear conflicts.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All commercial salmon fleets as it would clarify allocation guidelines and reduce future allocation disputes.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The troll fleet to the extent that there is a continuing desire to increase its share of the chum or sockeye harvests.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The no-action alternative was considered, but that approach would leave the respective fleets uncertain of the allocation balance between them and would set the stage for a more intense conflict in the future. We considered including pink salmon in the mix, and this may be a good thing to do. We decided not to include pink salmon as their current value is such that gear conflicts are unlikely to develop over that species soon.

PROPOSED BY: United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters (HQ-05-F-039)

PROPOSAL 158 - 5 AAC 33.310(c). Fishing seasons and periods for net gear. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

When trolling is permitted in hatchery access fisheries under 5 AAC 29.090 in District 108, gillnetting will be permitted in the same areas of District 108. The time permitted for the gillnet hatchery access fishery will be equal to the time permitted for the troll hatchery access fishery.

ISSUE: When escapement numbers do not permit a directed gillnet fishery for king salmon in District 108, we believe it is fair that gillnetters be permitted to participate in the hatchery access fisheries that take place in District 108. This is a gillnet district; gillnetters along with all other commercial fishermen have paid for the hatchery king salmon; gillnetters historically had a king salmon fishery in District 8; and we believe it is equitable to allow gillnetters to fish the hatchery access areas in District 108.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Gillnetters will continue to be excluded from fishing opportunities in their area in a king salmon fishery they historically had access to.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Gillnetters who want to fish their traditional king salmon fishery in District 108.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trollers, as the department may allow less time or area for the hatchery access fisheries with the increased effort from the gillnetters fishing in the area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Do nothing is always an option to maintain the status quo but would not provide gillnetters an opportunity to participate in their traditional fishery.

PROPOSED BY: United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters (HQ-05-F-041)

PROPOSAL 159 - 5 AAC 33.370(b). District 1: Neets Bay Hatchery salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

(b)(5) from the second Sunday in June through **August 15**, [THE THIRD SUNDAY IN JULY] the area described in (b)...

ISSUE: The Neets Bay Special Harvest Area (SHA) is effectively split in half relative to managing common property fisheries in Neets Bay after the third Sunday in July when the boundary of the SHA is moved further inside the bay to the eastern tip of Bug Island. The abundance of chum salmon builds to a peak at about August 1 and continues for another several weeks. As a part of a complex negotiated allocation of Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association's (SSRAA) production between the three gear groups of Southeast, the SSRAA board established a troll sanctuary fishery in the Neets Bay SHA with a harvest target of 200,000 summer chum salmon. Meeting and not exceeding the harvest target is an essential factor in this allocation. With current regulations, SSRAA cannot open the entire inner portion of the bay in order to optimize harvest and opportunity if the outer bay cannot be closed once the harvest target is met and SSRAA does not control the outer portion of the bay after mid-July. This classic Catch 22 forces SSRAA to act conservatively, not opening the inner bay to trolling in those years when there is significant interest in this fishery, which consequently discouraging participation and limits success, when the opposite is the desire of the SSRAA board.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In two of the past four years, the relative price and abundance of summer chum salmon versus coho salmon made terminal chum trolling attractive to a number of Southeast trollers. Because we cannot control the entire bay after mid-July, the need to manage the fishery conservatively so that the harvest target is not exceeded discourages both participation and the effectiveness of trollers. Consequently, individual fishermen do not meet their goals nor does SSRAA meet its goal of 200,000 fish harvest.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Improved quality is not the purpose of the proposal, but implementation of the proposed change in regulations would improve the quality of fish harvested. If SSRAA could open the entire bay, the harvest would be completed earlier in the run when the fish are generally brighter and larger. With current regulations, trollers are sometimes confined to the outer portion of the bay, some fishing through the entire run, as fish get progressively darker and smaller.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The troll fleet, particularly the portion of the fleet that fishes chum salmon. It is also possible trollers remaining in the traditional offshore coho salmon fishery will benefit as some trollers concentrate on chum, in essence spreading the fleet and taking some pressure off the coho salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? We do not believe anyone will suffer from the proposed change. There is no traditional common property fishery for wild fish in Neets Bay during this period. Trollers who might have chosen to fish chums in the open area outside Bug Island (one boat in 2004) would not be stopped from also fishing in the inner portion of the bay as well as the outer portion unless effort and abundance suggested harvest would exceed 200,000 fish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Historically we have managed the Neets Bay SHA in partnership with the department. Relative to this specific issue, we have asked the department if they would consider using emergency order authority to help us manage to meet the harvest target. We concur with their assessment that this is not the appropriate use of emergency order authority and that the issue is best addressed through the Board of Fisheries process.

PROPOSED BY: Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (HQ-05-F-096)

PROPOSAL 160 - 5 AAC 33.372. District 1: Nakat Inlet Terminal Harvest Area salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

Rewrite the Nakat Inlet Terminal Harvest Area salmon management plan creating an exclusive gillnet and troll gear fishery at Nakat after 2007 as described below. The Nakat Inlet Terminal Harvest Area salmon management plan will remain as it is written through 2006.

In 2007 the Nakat Inlet Terminal Harvest Area will be open to gillnet and troll gear through August 31. After August 31 seiners will be included and the Nakat Inlet Terminal Harvest Area will be managed by the current plan (gillnet/seine rotational fishery) from September 1 until September 17 and open on a continual basis for gillnet, troll and seine gear from that date through November 10, 2007.

From 2008 forward the Nakat Inlet Terminal Harvest Area will be open only to the gillnet and troll fleets, as follows:

- (a) The management plan in this section allows for a harvest of hatchery produced chum and coho salmon in Nakat Inlet by the gillnet and troll fleets.
- (b) The department, in consultation with the Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (SSRAA), shall manage the waters of Nakat Inlet between 54° 50' N. lat. and 54° 56' N. lat. from June 1 through November 10 and set the fishing times for the gillnet and troll fleets as follows: salmon may be taken by gillnet and troll only in periods established by emergency order.
- (c) All waters within 500 yards of the terminus of Nakat Lake Creek (101-11-39) are closed to the taking of salmon.
- (d) A drift gillnet operated in the special harvest area may not exceed 200 fathoms in length.
- (e) Salmon may be taken in the special harvest area under sport and personal use fishing regulations at any time. A personal use permit issued under 5 AAC 77.682 must include the following conditions:
 - (1) salmon may be taken for personal use only by drift gillnets;
 - (2) a drift gillnet operated for personal use may not exceed 50 fathoms in length; and
 - (3) the annual bag and possession limit for personal use is 25 salmon.

ISSUE: Through the past several years, largely because of several Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund grants, SSRAA has increased the production of chum salmon. An increase in production, and subsequently increasing the numbers released at different sites, alters the balance in allocation between the three Southeast Alaska salmon gear groups. After several years of negotiation, the gear group representatives on SSRAA's Board of Directors agreed on a plan they believed would retain the approximate current allocation balance. This included: a chum troll sanctuary fishery in Neets Bay, expanding the release at the Anita Bay SHA (seine and gill net rotational fishery), increasing the release at Neets Bay (significant percent of return intercepted primarily by the seine fleet), doubling the release in the Kendrick Bay SHA (to 20 million fish, exclusive seine fishery), and changing the Nakat Inlet SHA from a seine/gillnet rotational fishery to an exclusive gillnet fishery. The change will take place in two steps; in 2007 Nakat will be exclusively a gillnet area until September 1 and from that point through September 17, when it is open continuously for both gear types, the historic gillnet and seine rotation will occur. In 2008 the Nakat Inlet SHA will become an exclusive gillnet fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If these changes are not implemented current increases in the release of chum salmon at various sites would result in a change in the allocation of SSRAA's production between the three fleets.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal is meant to address an allocation issue, not to alter quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The gillnet fleet will benefit directly related to this proposal. Indirectly, all the gear groups will benefit as this proposal is a part of a larger allocation plan that is coupled with an increase in production by SSRAA.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer as the seiners are compensated for the loss of opportunity in the Nakat SHA by the increased abundance of fish in seine fisheries of SSRAA-produced fish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A major goal of the gillnet fleet in the negotiation surrounding the allocation of new production was to make the Nakat Inlet SHA an exclusive gillnet

fishery. From their perspective this is the critical action in the manipulation of SSRAA terminal harvest areas that will retain the historic allocation of SSRAA-produced fish.

PROPOSED BY: Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (HQ-05-F-097)

PROPOSAL 161 - 5 AAC 33.364. Southeastern Alaska Area Enhanced Salmon Allocation Management Plan. Amend the regulation to include the following:

Add a new section—the regional planning team (RPT) shall evaluate the annual harvest of salmon stocks from enhancement projects to determine the amount of enhanced fish contributed to common property fisheries by the hatchery associations. The evaluation of allocation between the common property uses and the hatchery association shall be based on five-year increments as a rolling average, beginning with 2005. The amount of enhanced fish contributed to common property fisheries will be determined by the department based on the data from the year end hatchery operator reports.

ISSUE: Fishermen do not have a place to deal with the issue of the amount of hatchery enhanced fish taken for common property uses compared to cost recovery. The Southeast Alaska Enhanced Allocation Plan has a board finding (#94-02-FB) that provides goals and background to the allocation plan that is the basis of the goal ranges for the individual gear groups. Performance goal number one provides the amount of fish a hatchery facility should contribute to common property uses after broodstock. The amount of fish contributed to common property fisheries by the hatchery facilities is one of the factors that affects allocation between gear groups and should be considered at the same time as the gear groups are evaluated.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen will be frustrated without a place to turn for dealing with hatchery associations and the amount of fish that is being provided for common property uses. What we are requesting would provide a place for the discussion to occur. The process that the RPT uses for the Southeast enhanced allocation plan has not harmed the gear group that was above their goal range but tried to work with the associations to provide opportunities for the gear group that has been below their goal range. We believe that the RPT should be tasked with looking at the amount of common property fish a hatchery association is providing for common property as part of the allocation plan between gear groups. In the past, the board has been approached with proposals they did not have the authority to act upon and the legislature has been approached by individuals. We believe that this regulation change would be an option that would allow the discussion to occur without an absolute regulation or law in place that could harm hatcheries. This process acknowledges the long term planning involved in hatchery production.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishermen will have a clear knowledge of where they can discuss amount of hatchery contribution to common property fisheries.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Only option that is logical to allow the discussion of hatchery contributions and the effect it has on the allocation plan.

PROPOSAL 162 - 5 AAC 33.376. District 13: Deep Inlet Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Early season chinook salmon fishing in the Deep Inlet Terminal Harvest Area (THA) will be managed separately from the existing Deep Inlet THA management plan, which was developed to access hatchery chum salmon. The early management for chinook would not require a 2:1 ratio for gillnet:seine fishing. Boundary modifications may be made to protect traditional troll drags in the outer area of the THA. A provision may be made to allow trollers into the area on gillnet fishing days if gillnet participation falls below a threshold level.

Fishing schedules would be set by the NSRAA Board of Directors

Early season fishing management would be in effect from May 1 until mid- to late-June when the chum salmon begin returning in large numbers.

ISSUE: Early season management of Deep Inlet THA for chinook salmon harvest to provide greater access to hatchery chinook.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fewer chinook will be harvested by the commercial fleet and more will be harvested by hatchery cost recovery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There may be some increase in quality, as the fish will be harvested sooner than would be the case if they escaped the fishery and were harvested for cost recovery. The main benefit would be allowing a greater percentage of fish to go to the common property harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Primarily the gillnet fleet and to a smaller extent the seine fleet.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There could be a slight reduction in troll harvest in this area, but this is addressed to some extent by a THA boundary modification.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Management under the same regulations as the existing Deep Inlet THA plan with two seine, four gillnet, one troll days per week. This would regulate two seine days per week when in fact there is little interest for seine participation in the early fishery. Seine effort would probably be nonexistent until mid-June. A separate and more flexible management plan for early season fishing would allow gillnet (and some seine) access with less impact on the troll fishery which has traditionally used the area.

PROPOSAL 163 - 5 AAC 40.042(a). Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association Special Harvest Area. Amend this regulation as follows:

(6) Silver Bay, for chum salmon:

(A) before 12:01 a.m. July **22** [24] and after **12:01 a.m. the day before** the coho salmon fishery is **reopened** [CLOSED] in August, or August 20 if the coho salmon fishery is not closed in August closure, the Silver Bay Special Harvest Area for chum salmon is the waters of Eastern Channel and Silver Bay enclosed by a line from Entry Point Light, to the southernmost tip of Harris Island, to the southernmost tip of Galankin Island, to Simpson Rock Light, to the southernmost tip of Makhnati Island, to Sentinel Rock, to the westernmost tip of Cape Burunof, to a point west of Pirates Cove at 135° 59.35' N. lat., to the westernmost tip of Long Island, to the westernmost tip of Emgeten Island, to the westernmost tip of Error Island, to the northernmost tip of Luce Island, and to the westernmost tip of Silver Point;

(B) from 12:01 a.m. **July 22 to 12:01 a.m. the day before** [JULY 24 THROUGH] the end of August coho salmon fishery closure specified in (A) of this paragraph, or August 20 if there is no coho closure, the Silver Bay Special Harvest Area for chum salmon is the waters of Eastern Channel and Silver Bay south of a line from Entry Point Light to the southernmost tip of Harris Island, to the southernmost tip of Galankin Island, and east of a line from Galankin Island to the northernmost point of Silver Point; **and the waters of Sitka Sound enclosed by a line from the southernmost tip of Galankin Island, to Simpson Rock light, to the Makhnati Island buoy, to Black Rock, to the southernmost tip of Neva Island, to the northernmost tip of Sasendi Island, from the southernmost tip of Volga Island, to the northernmost tip of Galankin Island.**

(7) Deep Inlet: the waters of Deep Inlet, Aleutkina Bay, and contiguous waters south of a line from a point **on the westernmost end of Cape Burunoff at 56° 59.04' N. lat., 135° 23.23' W. long.**, [WEST OF PIRATES COVE AT 56° 59.35' N. LAT., 135° 22.63' W. LONG.] **to a point west of Cape Burunoff at 56° 59.11' N. lat., 135° 23.59' W. long., to a point a half mile west of the westernmost tip of Long Island at 57° 00.17' N. lat., 135° 22.69' W. long.,** to the westernmost tip of Long Island, to the easternmost tip of Long Island, to the westernmost tip of Emgeten Island, to the westernmost tip of Error Island, to the westernmost tip of Berry Island, to the southernmost tip of Berry Island, to the westernmost tip of the southernmost island in the Kutchuma Island group, to the easternmost tip of the southernmost island in the Kutchuma Island group, to the westernmost tip of an unnamed island at 57° 00.30' N. lat., 135° 17.67' W. long., to a point on the southern side of the unnamed island at 57° 00.08' N. lat., 135° 16.78' W. long., and then to a point on the Baranof Island shore at 56° 59.93' N. lat., 135° 16.53' W. long.;

ISSUE: Not enough area and time to access chums for cost recovery; this results in having to wait until fish have gotten more mature (dark) before harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Cost recovery goals may not be reached. Quality and commensurate prices will decrease. May have to interrupt terminal harvest area (THA) rotational fisheries.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, we will have a better chance of getting cost recovery while fish are still of good quality. We will also have a better chance of completing the cost recovery harvest earlier, which will reduce restrictions on commercial fishing in the Deep Creek THA, resulting in a higher quality for the commercial catch.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All participants in the Deep Inlet fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Could be some conflict with trollers, however, both parties (NSRAA and the Chum Trollers Association) are committed to making this work.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keeping fishery closed until cost recovery is done, but this would result in decreasing the value of the commercial fishery.

PROPOSED BY: NSRAA and Chum Trollers Association (HQ-05-F-215)

PROPOSAL 164 - 5 AAC 33.374. District 12: Hidden Falls Hatchery Terminal Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(b) Purse seine and troll openings will be managed by emergency order to harvest king and chum salmon returning to the Hidden Falls Hatchery in excess of broodstock and cost recovery needs.

(c) From April 15 through June 30, chum and king salmon may be taken by troll and purse seine gear as follows:

(1) purse seine openings will be limited to a maximum of two fishing days per week in the terminal harvest area **in order to harvest surplus chum salmon;**

(2) In the event that weekly seine openings or mid-week openings scheduled in the Southeast Alaska Purse Seine Fishery Management Plan do not occur [IF MANAGEMENT ACTIONS ARE NECESSARY] to achieve chum salmon broodstock and cost recovery goals, **then** [THE PURSE SEINE AND] troll fisheries for the harvest of chum salmon will be closed, [;] **provided more than seven days remain prior to the July 1 general troll season opening; troll fisheries for king salmon may continue however chum salmon caught must be released immediately and may not be retained or sold;** [THE DEPARTMENT SHALL ALSO MANAGE THE HIDDEN FALLS TERMINAL HARVEST AREA TROLL FISHERY FOR KING SALMON TO PROHIBIT THE HARVEST OF CHUM SALMON AND THE PURSE SEINE FISHERY FOR KING SALMON WILL NOT BE OPENED;]

(3) **Prior to June 30** [IF NECESSARY TO ALLOW TROLL GEAR ACCESS TO KING SALMON] the waters of Kasnyku Bay west of a line from North Point to the westernmost tip of Round Island and north of the latitude of the westernmost tip of Round Island may be closed to purse seine fishing **in order to provide troll gear access to king salmon.**

(d) Beginning July 1, king and chum salmon may be harvested by troll and purse seine gear as follows:

(1) during troll and purse seine **fishery** [GEAR] openings, areas within the terminal harvest area may be closed to protect chum and king salmon broodstock **or to provide for cost recovery;**

(2) to limit the troll fishery harvest of chum salmon in the terminal harvest area, **the number of chum salmon on board a troll vessel or recorded on a fish ticket shall not exceed the number of king salmon.** [THE DEPARTMENT SHALL MANAGE THE TROLL GEAR FISHERY SO THE HARVEST NUMBER OF CHUM SALMON OR ANY VESSEL DOES NOT EXCEED THE HARVEST NUMBER OF KING SALMON.]

ISSUE: The existing regulatory language is ambiguous. It is not clear what “if management actions are necessary” means in the regulation since management actions are taken throughout the season in order to provide opportunity when surplus fish are available. It is also not clear when the department should close troll fisheries for chum salmon, since troll effort is generally small or unknown, management actions to close the seine fishery are most likely taken in very late June with only a few days before the spring troll fishery season ends. A simple solution is simply to provide an area that is open for troll fisheries for king salmon and closed to seine until June 30.

Provisions in (d) providing for consideration of broodstock, but not cost recovery after July 1 are not consistent with provisions in (b) provide for consideration of both broodstock and cost recovery

throughout the season. An effort is made to redraft the language so the intent is clear without changing allocation aspects or original intent.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be misunderstandings about how the Hidden Falls Terminal Harvest Area is to be managed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seiners, trollers, NSRAA, the department.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Rewrite the entire plan addressing troll and seine fisheries as separate sections.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-270)

PROPOSAL 165 - 5 AAC 33.376. District 13: Deep Inlet Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(d) For gillnet fisheries prior to July 1 The department by emergency order may establish a minimum mesh size of six inches in order to protect local sockeye salmon stocks in the area from excessive harvest. Measurement of mesh size shall be determined according to 5 AAC 33.331(f).

ISSUE: The NSRAA board has requested that the department open Deep Inlet THA fisheries in May and June to provide net gear access to hatchery king salmon migrating through the area. Because such fisheries were successful in 2002-2004, the Northern Southeast Regional Planning Team has recommended that the commissioner amend the hatchery permit to allow release king salmon directly into Deep Inlet THA. The department would like to ensure that ongoing or expanding early season THA fisheries do not pose a threat to wild sockeye salmon stocks. The department is recommending that this problem can be addressed with a gillnet mesh restriction in the Deep Inlet THA prior to July 1. The department has implemented 6 inch minimum mesh restrictions in traditional common property drift gillnet areas in Districts 11 and 15 to limit the harvest of sockeye salmon in those areas so many fishermen have already obtained gillnets of this mesh size.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wild stocks of sockeye passing through the Deep Inlet THA in may and June may be over harvested. The department may find it necessary to close portions of the THA to commercial fishing to avoid over harvest of wild stocks. The NSRAA permit allowing king releases into Deep Inlet THA would need to be reevaluated.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence fishermen may benefit since there would be less likelihood of local area closures at sockeye fishing sites. Gillnet fishermen may benefit by increased harvest of hatchery king.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer if this solution is adopted. Gillnet fishermen would catch fewer sockeye, but that may be offset by increased harvest of hatchery king. Some gillnet fishermen may need to purchase a new six inch mesh net, but many have this gear now for use in other fisheries.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered restricting area within the THA to protect sockeye, but that would have substantially diminished access to hatchery king. Considered if seine THA fishery should also be restricted, however, initial catch records show less seine harvest of sockeye than gillnet in June.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-271)

PROPOSAL 166 - 5 AAC 33.310(c). Fishing seasons and periods for net gear. Amend the regulation as follows:

Salmon may be taken by gillnets in the following locations only during fishing periods established by emergency order **that start on Sunday** [THAT START AT 12:01 P.M. SUNDAY AND CLOSE BY EMERGENCY ORDER].

ISSUE: It may be beneficial for some gillnet districts to have a start time other than the currently required 12:01 p.m. time specified by current regulations. We propose to remove this requirement and have the start time directed by emergency order.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will have no flexibility to adjust the starting time for the gillnet fishery in order to take advantage of specific situations that may exist in some districts that could lower costs or improve quality for fishermen and/or processors.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If an earlier start time was chosen for a specific district, it may be possible for a tender to return a load of fish to the plant early Monday morning after the deliveries from one full day of fishing. With the current requirement for the noon start time, a tender accumulates 1.5 days of fish and delivers them to the plant on Tuesday morning. A revised start time could result in fresher fish being delivered to the plant for processing resulting in an improvement in quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen and processors who see a possibility to improve their quality or efficiency by having the fishery begin at a time other than noon on Sunday.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? If the fishermen and processors were interested in trying a different start time and the department used a different time, those favoring the current start time of noon would suffer from the change.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There is not much choice, the gillnet fishery is either provided with the opportunity for choosing a different start time or the regulations remain as they are.

PROPOSED BY: United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters (HQ-05-F-037)

PROPOSAL 167 - 5 AAC 33.366(a)(2). Northern Southeast seine salmon fishery management plans. Amend the regulation as follows:

(a)(2) the department shall close the seine fishery in District 12 north of Point Marsden during July after **10,000** [15,000] sockeye salmon are taken;...

ISSUE: The gillnet fisheries have suffered time, area and mesh restrictions for sockeye conservation for Chilkoot Lake sockeye, especially the early run. Interception of Speel Lake sockeye adversely impacts the gillnet fleet’s ability to prosecute its terminal harvest fishery for Snettisham sockeye. This is because harvest cannot begin in the terminal area until escapement to Speel Lake is assured.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The gillnet fleet will continue to suffer from the impacts of the Hawk Inlet shoreline area interception fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The gillnet fleet fishing in districts 111 and 115.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The seine fleet fishing in District 112.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Remain with the current situation. This was rejected as we believe it is time to lessen the impacts that are occurring on the gillnet fleet fishing in districts 111 and 115.

PROPOSED BY: United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters (HQ-05-F-038)

PROPOSAL 168 - 5 AAC 33.3xx. Seine vessel size in Southeastern Alaska Area. Create a new regulation as follows:

Repeal the 58 foot limit on salmon purse seine vessels in Southeast Alaska.

ISSUE: Repeal the 58 foot limit on salmon seine vessels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will not be able to efficiently produce higher quality and different products.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, more room to process and handle fish better.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who wants to improve their boats.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one; 58 foot wood boats are pretty much worthless now.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Demmert (HQ-05-F-054)

PROPOSAL 169 - 5 AAC 33.374. District 12: Hidden Falls Hatchery Terminal Harvest Area salmon management plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

The first 4,000 sockeye salmon harvested in the Hidden Falls Hatchery terminal harvest area each season shall be distributed fresh to the communities of Angoon and Kake. (A “Chatham Area Management Task Force” should be formed to address problems and solutions.)

ISSUE: Declines in escapements and terminal area abundance of sockeye stocks in the Chatham Strait area is leading to conservation concerns and problems meeting subsistence needs. The principal cause is the increased purse seine effort and sockeye harvest in the Hidden Falls Hatchery terminal harvest area and other Chatham Strait area fisheries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sockeye stocks important to households in Angoon and Kake (i.e., Kanalku, Kook, Sitkoh, Falls, Gut Bay, Kutlaku, etc.) will be overfished and need years of disruptive restrictions in commercial, sport and subsistence fisheries to rebuild.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The combined subsistence and commercial seine harvest pressure on Chatham area sockeye stocks will be reduced and it will be easier to maintain healthy escapements and runs. Traveling by skiff to and from subsistence sites in Chatham Strait is a safety concern for local residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users will benefit. Angoon and Kake residents could choose to meet their subsistence needs for sockeye by fishing either at traditional sites or from slush ice totes on the community dock. Commercial seiners could continue targeting wild and hatchery chum and pink stocks without undue disruption. Hatchery operations would not be unduly disrupted. The need for special restrictions on commercial, sport, and subsistence users would be reduced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hatchery and commercial seine fishers would forgo income from a portion of the sockeye harvested in fisheries targeting hatchery chum salmon but this is a reasonable win-win solution for subsistence, sport, commercial, and hatchery user groups.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Doing nothing will likely further conservation concerns for local sockeye stocks and result in disruptive federal actions to provide for conservation and a meaningful preference for subsistence users as mandated by ANILCA Title VIII.

PROPOSED BY: Floyd Kookesh (HQ-05-F-140)

PROPOSAL 170 - 5 AAC 33.366. Northern Southeast seine salmon fishery management plans. Amend the regulation as follows:

Hatchery sockeye will not be included in the 15,000 cap.

ISSUE: The July Hawk Inlet fishery has a 15,000 sockeye cap. The cap should not include hatchery sockeye that were developed after the 15,000 ceiling was instituted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Seiners will continue to lose access to wild pink salmon harvests and will continue to lose fishing time.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seiners.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Gillnetters may catch a few less sockeye but they will also have less pinks to catch and release.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No limit on sockeye was one solution but it was thought that gillnetters would object.

PROPOSED BY: Southeast Alaska Seiners Association (HQ-05-F-217)

PROPOSAL 171 - 5 AAC 29.120. Gear specifications and operations. Amend the regulation as follows::

Delete paragraph (e): [NO MORE THAN TWO TROLL GURDIES AND FOUR FISHING RODS MAY BE ON BOARD ANY SALMON HAND TROLL VESSEL. A DOWNRIGGER MAY NOT BE USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH A FISHING ROD.]

(g) For purposes of this section,

(1) a troll gurdy **or downrigger** is a spool-type device that is designed to deploy and retrieve troll lines, weights and lures; [THE TERM "TROLL GURDY"

(A) INCLUDES A DOWNRIGGER: AND

(B) DOES NOT INCLUDE A REEL ATTACHED TO A FISHING ROD;]

(2) a hand troll gurdy is a troll gurdy **or downrigger** powered by hand or a hand crank [THAT IS NOT MOUNTED ON OR] **and may be** used in conjunction with a fishing rod...

...

(4) Add: **an electric powered downrigger is considered a power gurdy and may not be used in conjunction with a fishing rod.**

ISSUE: The restrictions of downriggers used by hand trollers and the limit of four fishing rods on board. Hand trollers need to carry spare rods. Hand trollers use different rods for catching different species of fish (example: commercial hand lining halibut).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This regulation creates a hardship on hand trollers who use sport rods.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hand trollers and halibut hand liners.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Floyd C. Peterson (HQ-05-F-014)

PROPOSAL 172 - 5 AAC 29.120(b)(2). Gear specifications and operations. Amend the regulation as follows:

No more than two troll gurdies or two downriggers may be on a hand troll vessel. Only one fishing rod may be used in conjunction with each downrigger in use.

ISSUE: The prohibition of more than four fishing rods on a hand troll vessel, and the prohibition of the use of downriggers with fish rod line attached on hand troll vessels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hand trollers will have to store rods used for halibut fishing off the boat, and if a rod or reel breaks will be limited to less gear until returning to port, and when trolling in shallow water will continue to lose gear because of inability to control fishing depth precisely.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This would reduce gear loss by hand troll fishermen now restricted to rods only, and would allow multiple rods to be stored onboard hand troll vessels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown. This would have minimal, if any, affect on total harvest of kings.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The only practical method to control line depth precisely is with the use of a downrigger. There is no need to limit the total number of rods onboard since there are limits on number of lines which may be fished. No changes in the number of hooks that can be fished at a given time are proposed.

PROPOSED BY: Jerry L. Fulkerson (HQ-05-F-015)

PROPOSAL 173 - 5 AAC 29.120(e). Gear specifications and operations. Amend the regulation as follows:

(e) No more than two troll gurdies or two downriggers may be on a hand troll vessel. Only one sport rod may be used in conjunction with each downrigger in use. [AND FOUR FISHING RODS MAY BE ON BOARD ANY SALMON HAND TROLL VESSEL. A DOWNRIGGER MAY NOT BE USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH A FISHING ROD.]

ISSUE: The prohibition of more than four fishing rods on a hand troll vessel and prohibition of the use of downriggers with fishing rod line attached on hand troll vessels. There is no difference between a troll gurdy and a downrigger.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hand trollers will have to store rods used for halibut fishing off the boat and when trolling in shallow water with fish rods will continue to lose gear because of inability to control fishing depth precisely.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This would reduce gear loss by hand troll fishermen now restricted to rods only and would allow multiple rods to be stored on hand troll boats.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown. This would have minimal, if any, effect on total harvest of king salmon.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The only practical method to control lure depth precisely is with use of a downrigger. There is no need to limit the total number of rods onboard since there are limits on number of lines which may be fished. No changes in the number of hooks that can be fished at a given time are proposed.

PROPOSED BY: Jerry Fulkerson and 19 Hoonah Residents (HQ-05-F-025)

PROPOSAL 174 - 5 AAC 29.120(b)(2). Gear specifications and operations. Amend the regulation as follows:

(b)(2)(A) from each hand troll gurdy: only one line, typically suspended from a trolling outrigger pole, to which multiple leaders and hooks may be attached;

(b)(2)(C) a maximum of two lines, one each from two fishing rods, may be attached to a single hand-powered downrigger; [AN AGGREGATE OF FOUR FISHING RODS OR AN AGGREGATE OF TWO HAND TROLL GURDIES MAY BE OPERATED]

(b)(2)(X) an aggregate of two hand troll gurdies in conjunction with two trolling outrigger poles or an aggregate of four fishing rods in conjunction with two hand-powered downriggers may be operated.

ISSUE: The current prohibition of using a hand-powered downrigger in conjunction with a fishing rod on a hand troll vessel for commercial salmon fishing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will continue to make it difficult for smaller hand troll vessels that cannot carry hand troll gurdies and trolling outrigger poles but fish with four fishing rods and line weights, to consistently fish the allowable gear as efficiently as the larger hand troll vessels fitted with hand troll gurdies and trolling outrigger poles.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Only by shortening the time the harvested catch spends in the vessel. In other words, the small hand troll vessel fishing with fishing rods and downriggers would likely fish more efficiently as compared to using line weights, catch more fish (particularly kings) and be offloading their catch more frequently.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Owners of smaller hand troll vessels commercial fishing using the four fishing rod configuration gear option.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Ronald D. McIrvin (HQ-05-F-057)

PROPOSAL 175 - 5 AAC 29.120(e). Gear specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

Legal hand troll gear west of Cape Spencer: Four hand troll gurdies can be used outside state waters from August 1 to the summer troll closure.

ISSUE: Since approximately 1980, the hand troll fleet has been restricted to the use of two gurdies. Since that time, over half of the hand troll limited entry permits and the salmon stocks have greatly increased. Resolution (79-57-FB) by the board, dated December 11, 1979, stated that the troll catch would be allocated to result in an approximately 80/20 split (power/hand troll). Over the last ten years this split has averaged 94/6.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hand trollers will continue to be unnecessarily restricted in their efficiency. With increased costs of fuel, this efficiency is critical to the viability of the fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hand troll fleet fishing west of Cape Spencer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, as this fishery will target coho salmon which have had abundant runs in recent years resulting in large surpluses.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Beginning regulation on July 1. Coho are not consistently abundant until August.

PROPOSED BY: Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-209)

PROPOSAL 176 - 5 AAC 29.100(c)(3). Management of the summer salmon troll fishery. Amend the regulation as follows:

Commercial trollers are required to use barbless hooks during nonretention days for king salmon.

ISSUE: Mortality in commercially troll caught king salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued mortality and waste of king salmon which will result in fewer kings for both commercial and sport fishermen.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, there will be less mortality and waste of the valuable king salmon resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, commercial and sport users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 177 - 5 AAC 29.120(e). Gear specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

Four gurdies are allowed in the hand troll fishery.

ISSUE: Since approximately 1980, the hand troll fleet has been restricted to the use of two gurdies. Since that time, over half of the hand troll limited entry permits have been eliminated and the salmon stocks have greatly increased. In a resolution (79-57-FB) by the board, dated December 11, 1979, it was stated that the troll catch would be allocated to result in an approximately 80/20 split (80 percent power troll/20 percent hand troll). The hand troll catch over the last ten years has averaged 6 percent.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hand trollers will continue to be unnecessarily restricted in their efficiency. With the increased cost of fuel, this inefficiency is critical to the viability of the fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hand trollers and the economy of Southeast Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other suggestions.

PROPOSAL 178 - 5 AAC 29.080. Management of the winter salmon troll fishery; and 5 AAC 29.100. Management of the summer salmon troll fishery. Amend these regulations as follows:

5 AAC 29.080. Management of the winter salmon troll fishery.

(e) A person that participates in the winter salmon troll fishery must offload all fish from the person's vessel before participating in the spring salmon troll fishery.

5 AAC 29.100. Management of the summer salmon troll fishery.

(e) A person that participates in the summer salmon troll fishery must offload all fish from the person's vessel before participating in the winter salmon troll fishery.

ISSUE: Currently the only regulation in place that requires salmon caught during one fishery be offloaded prior to fishing in the subsequent troll fishery is 5 AAC 29.090. Management of the spring salmon troll fisheries. The proposed regulation would place the same requirements on salmon caught in the winter and summer fisheries and would prevent misreporting of catches into the wrong fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Harvests in the winter and spring fisheries may be misallocated into the wrong fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. This regulation will improve the department's ability to gather and accurately report harvest data.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-260)

PROPOSAL 179 - 5 AAC 29.070(b). General fishing seasons and periods. Amend the regulation as follows:

Have the spring experimental troll openings as occurred in 2002. If new areas beyond those in 2002 are contemplated, the department or local advisory committee is required to appoint a local task force with equal representation from troll, sport, guided sport and subsistence users, to resolve and minimize potential user conflicts.

ISSUE: Expansion of the spring experimental troll fishery. During the 2003 board meeting, the board asked trollers how the board could help the trollers be more competitive. One result was the expansion of the experimental troll openings to areas important to sport anglers. Although conflicts were minimal, continued expansion of areas and time (from one day per week to up to seven days per week) could negatively impact other users, especially those close to high population centers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Conflicts between several user groups.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit from increased communication between user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Charter Boat Operators Association (HQ-05-F-123)

PROPOSAL 180 - 5 AAC 29.090. Management of the spring salmon troll fisheries. Amend this regulation as follows:

A spring fishery for chinook salmon will occur during the months of May and June in the Yakutat area. A total quota of 1,000 chinook will be allocated to the fishery. Explanation: The intent of the fishery will be to determine the catch rates and stock composition of chinook in Yakutat Bay during May and June. The fishery will be designed to sample in one day per week openers until the quota is filled.

ISSUE: There is a high abundance of both hatchery and wild chinook salmon in Yakutat waters during the months of May and June that are unavailable to the local fleet for harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The small fleet in Yakutat will not have the proper data to analyze the composition of a spring chinook opener. This situation is denying Yakutat fishermen equitable access to seasonally abundant chinook stocks.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There are four processors operating in Yakutat. These businesses are focusing on high quality direct markets. Given the small harvest, extra care could be taken to produce high quality product. Yakutat has formed a branding association to champion “Yakutat Wild Alaska Salmon.” This harvest could be marketed as a high-value limited edition fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The small fleet located in Yakutat, associated processors and the department.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The quota represents 0.24 percent of the total chinook allocation. There will be little or no effect on other treaty participants as recent abundance levels are extremely high.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One day a week openers were suggested by department managers. Given the existence of local chinook allocations and that insufficient data exists, uncapped harvest was deemed inappropriate.

PROPOSED BY: Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-210)

PROPOSAL 181 - 5 AAC 29.090. Management of the spring salmon troll fisheries. Amend the regulation as follows:

Develop criteria that would allow the department to combine areas where appropriate. It is important that treaty caps be combined in these blended areas, so as not to penalize fishermen. Once criteria are established, the department could work with industry to determine which areas are appropriate to combine. This can easily be achieved during the spring fishery meetings that the department conducts throughout the region each year.

ISSUE: Develop criteria for combing spring troll fishery areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There are currently more than 30 actively managed spring troll areas. A few of these areas split traditional troll drags and gear must be picked up to cross short expanses and continue fishing. The fish from each area must be kept separate. As these fisheries have matured, it has become evident that the fish harvested in some adjacent areas are of the same mix, which makes disrupted fishing patterns, accounting headaches, and added management complexity unnecessary for both fishermen and the department.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It is not inconceivable that some time and area considerations would improve the quality of the fish harvested and ATA typically advocates harvesting fish in peak condition. However, this is not the intent behind the proposal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen and the department by easing management complexity and thereby minimizing confusion and accounting issues.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-05-F-228)

PROPOSAL 182 - 5 AAC 29.090(d)(1)(D). Management of the spring salmon troll fisheries.
Amend this regulation as follows:

Here is our preference, with the comparison to the existing regulations:

Proposed Hatchery Percentage	Proposed Treaty Fish Cap	Current Hatchery Percentage	Current Treaty Fish Cap
<25%	1,000	33%	1,000
26-35%	2,000	33-50%	3,000
36-50%	3,000	51-66%	5,000
51-66%	5,000	>66%	Unlimited
>66%	Unlimited		

ISSUE: ATA recommends that another level be added to the hatchery percentage and treaty fish caps that currently drive spring troll fisheries closures.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some areas that actually wind up with a good showing of hatchery fish might be shut down prematurely, because the hatchery proportion of the harvest is too low early on, the cap on treaty fish has been reached because of high abundance, etc. Trollers might be unable to optimize access to hatchery fish they pay to produce.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trollers and fishery managers. The additional level would provide fishery managers more flexibility as they manage the hatchery access fisheries. Trollers could harvest more hatchery fish, which do not count against the quota, while not significantly increasing the catch of treaty chinook during that timeframe.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who might be concerned about saving treaty chinook for the summer fishery. However, we believe the anticipated increase in hatchery harvest will make taking a few extra treaty fish worthwhile.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-05-F-230)

PROPOSAL 183 - 5 AAC 29.090. Management of the spring salmon troll fisheries. Amend this regulation as follows:

(f) In Cross Sound, in the waters of Section 14-A west of the longitude of Point Dundas, south of the latitude of Point Dundas and east of the longitude of the southern tip of Taylor Island to 58°10' N. lat., then east to Althorp Rock Light, then north to the light at the entrance to Elfin Cove, pink and chum salmon may be taken from Monday through Friday each week beginning on the second Monday in June through June 30 [29].

ISSUE: This is a housekeeping proposal that would update the regulation to reflect the actual closure date for the Cross Sound pink and chum fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Actual management actions would be different than what is in regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trollers who fish in the Cross Sound pink and chum fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None, this is a housekeeping proposal that clarifies how the fishery is actually managed.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-261)

PROPOSAL 184 - 5 AAC 29.025(a). Waters of frequent high king salmon abundance. Amend the regulation as follows:

(3) waters off the west coast of Yakobi Island between the latitude of 58° 05 N. near Yakobi Rock [YAKOBI ROCK AT 58° 05.17" N. LAT.] and the latitude of Cape Cross at 57° 55' N. lat., to a distance of one mile from the main shoreline of Yakaobi Island;

ISSUE: I would like the board to change the one mile off of Yakobi Rock from 58° 05.17' N. to 58° 05 N. This would make the line easier to monitor and easier for the trollers to interpret.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many trollers will not stay outside the one mile when those waters are closed. They will still cheat to catch coho and shake kings. It makes it difficult for us honest ones to fish that area correctly and efficiently.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All the honest trollers all the king salmon which may be in the area. The department, if they send someone out to police it as at Cape Cross before that line was changed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All the trollers tht go over that latitude line now. They would have to join the others or go elsewhere.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I stress 58° 05 N. as that is on all charts. It is clear cut and standard. There would be no room for error.

PROPOSED BY: Kathleen Warm (HQ-05-F-007)

PROPOSAL 185 - 5 AAC 29.100. Management of the summer salmon troll fishery. Amend the regulation as follows:

The department shall keep high abundance areas closed during the summer. The summer ratio shall change to 60-40 percent. The department shall also have the discretion to make inseason management changes (including opening high abundance areas) if it appears the catch rates are not on target to reach the allocated number of chinook salmon.

ISSUE: The current 70-30 percent summer troll chinook salmon catch ratio creates a market glut that depresses prices and results in an unnecessary level of fish mortality during nonretention days.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The troll fleet will continue to receive low prices for summer chinook salmon. The issue of mortality will continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal goes to the heart of the quality issue. The current Olympic style summer fishery lowers the overall quality of the product. More salmon go into the freezer, thus lowering prices.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The troll fleet, overall, benefits. The economic future of the troll fishery depends on leveling the peaks and filling the valleys of our supply chain, thus creating a more stable price for fishermen. In addition, the troll fleet will be seen as being proactive in dealing with the controversial issue of chinook salmon mortality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who focus on high abundance areas in the summer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? IFQs. Initial allocation too controversial, too expensive to set up and run. Ratio/bag limit fisheries—too complicated and problematic.

PROPOSED BY: Chris Carroll (HQ-05-F-091)

PROPOSAL 186 - 5 AAC 29.100(e). Management of the summer salmon troll fisheries. Amend the regulation as follows:

(e) In District 8: the weekly fishing periods for trolling are the same as for the drift gillnetting **except that in statistical area 108-10 the fishery is open seven days a week.**

ISSUE: Open 108-10 after July 1 for salmon trolling to allow for harvest of Anita Bay chum salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trollers will not have fair and equal access to catch Anita Bay chum salmon.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of the chum salmon harvested in this area will be better than the quality in the terminal harvest area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chum salmon trollers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-117)

PROPOSAL 187 - 5 AAC 29.070(b)(3). General fishing seasons and periods. Amend the regulation as follows:

Change the troll season opening from the traditional July 1 date to mid-July or August 1.

ISSUE: The current July 1 troll opening is inconsistent with management objective 6 in the troll management plan and regulatory guide for king and coho salmon, and leads to a higher mortality rate during a nonretention time period.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be a high rate of king salmon bycatch mortality during a nonretention time in the commercial troll fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it better achieves management objective 6, minimizing the bycatch mortality of king salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone and the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Charter Boat Operators Association (HQ-05-F-124)

PROPOSAL 188 - 5 AAC 29.110. Management of coho salmon troll fishery. Amend the regulation as follows:

(a) Coho salmon may be taken from June 15 through September **30** [20] [HOWEVER, THE COMMISSIONER, IN YEARS OF HIGH COHO SALMON ABUNDANCE, MAY EXTEND, BY EMERGENCY ORDER, THE COHO SALMON FISHERY IN ANY PORTIONS OF DISTRICTS 1-16 FOR UP TO TEN DAYS AFTER SEPTEMBER 20].

ISSUE: The troll coho fishery is managed for abundance, yet closes on a fixed date of September 20 with an option for managers to extend the season to September 30. The requirement that the department close the fishery prior to extending the season has, at times, created logistical difficulties for the fleet, processors, buyers and the department. It makes more sense for the department to manage the troll coho fishery as it does other abundance based fisheries, by leaving it open through

September 30 unless conservation issues warrant an earlier closure of the region or a partial closure to protect certain districts. 5 AAC 29.110 (c) and (d) provide the commissioner the authority to close the fishery for conservation concerns.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen will, at times, lose opportunity because they do not realize that the fishery will be reopened and have taken their gear apart and left the fishing grounds by the time the announcement is made. Also it makes for more difficult planning on the processor's part.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trollers and processors as it will be a cleaner process to close a district-subdistrict if the coho abundance is insufficient to warrant remaining open.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some members of other gear groups might not like the change.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Juneau-Douglas Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-138)

PROPOSAL 189 - 5 AAC 29.110. Management of coho salmon troll fishery. Amend the regulation to include the following:

If there are no wild stock concerns in the area, we propose an opening that mirrors the current spring chinook area in Behm Canal, from Bushy Point to Indian Point. The fishery would begin immediately after the summer troll coho fishery closes and continue through October 7.

ISSUE: Neets Bay Hatchery coho often return in large numbers after the troll coho fishery is closed. Trollers would like to access some of these fish along with the other gear groups.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trollers will continue to lose access to this hatchery stock they help pay for.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local trollers and their communities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? SSRAA might lose a few cost recovery fish, but would still benefit financially from increased landings of their coho.

Since we are requesting a very small fishing area, and the troll fleet has chronically lagged behind on hatchery allocation, it is unlikely that this fishery would significantly disadvantage the other fleets.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo, but many of our members have requested better access to late returning hatchery stocks.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-05-F-231)

PROPOSAL 190 - 5 AAC 29.010. Description of area for salmon troll fishing. Amend the regulations as follows:

Unless otherwise specified in this chapter, a person may operate troll gear in the waters of **the Gulf of Alaska** [SOUTHEAST ALASKA-YAKUTAT AREA] east of the longitude of **Cape St. Elias at 144 degree 10' W. longitude** [CAPE SUCKLING (144° W. LONG.)] and north of the International Boundary at Dixon Entrance.

ISSUE: Access to traditional trolling grounds. The troll permit is a statewide permit that was restricted to the Southeast area for conservation reasons and has never been allowed the chance to return to traditional grounds.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trollers will be prevented access to a historical fishing area that they were restricted from for conservation reasons. This area opened back up will also provide better and safer anchorages to boats fishing in the Cape Suckling area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Trollers produce a better quality fish that provides a higher exvessel price than other commercial gear types.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial troll fleet, in particular those trollers trying to fish the Cape Suckling area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Requesting all state waters to be reopened. Asking for this area to be opened for coho only with king salmon between Cape Suckling and Cape St. Elias to be released.

PROPOSED BY: Roger Gregg (HQ-05-F-158)

PROPOSAL 191 - 5 AAC 29.080. Management of the winter salmon troll fishery. Amend the regulation as follows:

(a) The department shall manage the winter salmon troll fishery so that the harvest of king salmon does not exceed a guideline harvest level of 45,000 fish **plus the number of Alaska hatchery chinook estimated by the department to have been harvested during the winter troll fishery** with a guideline harvest range of 43,000 to 47,000 **plus Alaska hatchery add-on.**

ISSUE: The value of Alaska winter season troll king salmon is up to three or more times higher than the value of Alaska summer season troll king salmon. During the winter troll season, about 10 percent of the harvest is Alaska hatchery king production. Currently that percentage is “added-on” to the summer quota. The department has the tag sampling ability to accurately estimate the number of Alaska hatchery kings caught during the winter season and “add-on” that number to the winter season when they are more valuable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An Alaska winter troll-caught king salmon is usually worth considerably more per pound than summer king salmon. Marketing personnel

indicate that week to week access to these high value winter king salmon through April helps sell and adds value to fresh halibut, rockfish, and lingcod as wholesalers work with their steady suppliers. Continuing the supply of Alaska troll-caught king salmon on a year-round basis solidifies the Alaska troll salmon market niche and adds value to the hatchery access harvest in May and June. Action by the board to enact this or a similar proposal will result in economic gain and opportunity for Alaska trollers, troll chinook marketers, and trolling communities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal will improve the quality of the resource harvested and products produced. Managing the troll harvest of Alaska hatchery king salmon to optimize the value is the purpose of this proposal. The troll fishery has traditionally been managed to suit the internal allocation conveniences of various segments of a highly diversified fleet both in terms of geography and lifestyle interests in when they want to fish. Adding the Alaska hatchery kings caught in the winter to the winter harvest optimizes their value as opposed to adding them to the summer when they are not as valuable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Consumers, trollers, seafood marketers, Southeast communities, the State of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Trollers who prefer to limit their troll season to July and August will have about 5,000 less king salmon available for the summer share of the quota. This will cost them part of one day of king salmon fishing in July.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The idea for this proposal came from a Sitka department troll and ATA port meeting in 2004. A great deal of the conversation and information at the port meeting was about how to optimize the value of troll-caught salmon and how the troll fleet needed to look at everything from harvest patterns to fish handling to better serve what the market wants instead of asking the market to accommodate our complex life style and internal allocation disputes. This proposal will add value to the troll fishery, troll communities, and marketers.

PROPOSED BY: Chris Carroll and John Murray (HQ-05-F-098)

PROPOSAL 192 - 5 AAC 29.080. Management of the winter salmon troll fishery. Amend the regulation as follows:

Delete the following: [(b)(3) IN DISTRICT 11, KING SALMON MAY BE TAKEN ONLY...(B) THROUGH MARCH 31;]

ISSUE: District 11 access to winter kings. A similar proposal was heard in 2003 and was denied on the basis of being a violation of the Pacific Salmon Treaty. With the new negotiated fishery, these area should be opened for the full winter fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo of the existing fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Trollers produce a better quality fish that provides a higher exvessel price than other commercial gear types.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trollers will get a chance to harvest winter kings in District 11.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There are not that many individuals that fish during the winter and it should be possible for the sport fleet and a small troll fleet to coexist in an area as large as District 11.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Roger Gregg (HQ-05-F-159)

PROPOSAL 193 - 5 AAC 01.660. Fishing seasons and periods; and 5 AAC 30.310(a)(2). Fishing seasons. Amend these regulations as follows:

Gillnetting for salmon at the mouth of the Situk River may occur June, July, August, September, and ends on September 30.

ISSUE: The gillnetting of coho salmon at the mouth of the Situk River during the month of October. This practice also catches steelhead trout.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The steelhead trout fishery will eventually die out or become so few in numbers that the sport fishery will disappear.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will save the steelhead and the steelhead sport fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People of Yakutat, steelhead fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Gillnetters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Stop all gillnetting.

PROPOSED BY: Dr. Terry Braden (HQ-05-F-024)

PROPOSAL 194 - 5 AAC 30.310(a). Fishing seasons. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

(a) Salmon may be taken by set gillnets only as follows:

...

(2) in the Yakutat District

(A) in the Alsek River and waters three-quarters of a mile on either side of the river mouth seaward to the outermost bar at mean low tide, from the **second Sunday in May** [FIRST MONDAY IN JUNE] until closed by emergency order;

(B) in the Dangerous River and in Yakutat Bay south of 59° 40' N. lat., from the second **Sunday** [MONDAY] in June until closed by emergency order;

(C) Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet, Lost River and Yakutat Bay north of 59° 40' N. lat., from the third **Sunday** [MONDAY] in June until closed by emergency order;

...

(E) in the East River and waters two miles on either side of the river mouth seaward for a distance of 500 yards, and in the remainder of the district, from the fourth **Sunday** [MONDAY] in June until closed by emergency order.

ISSUE: The emphasis on the salmon market in recent years has been on fresh product delivered early in the week to markets in the lower 48. The fishermen now receive the highest prices for this fresh product. Product reaching the market later in the week gets frozen, with a subsequent lowering of prices to fishermen. For years Yakutat set gillnet fishing seasons have been opened on Monday, while gillnet fisheries in Southeast Alaska and Cordova have opened on Sunday. By opening on Monday, Yakutat set gillnet permit holders lose one day in the competition for the best fish prices.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Yakutat gillnet permit holders will continue to get salmon to market one day later in the week than other gillnet permit holders around the state, with a resulting loss of income.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Yakutat set gillnet permit holders who will be able to compete for the best salmon prices on an equal basis with other gillnet permit holders.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have the department set fishing seasons in the Yakutat Area to open on Sundays by emergency order, as was done in 2004. Rejected, as changing the regulation prevents the need for repetitive emergency orders.

PROPOSED BY: Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-206)

PROPOSAL 195 - 5 AAC 30.320. Fishing periods. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Salmon may be taken by set gillnets during the open fishing seasons only as follows:

(1) in the Yakataga District, from 9:00 a.m. **Sunday** [MONDAY] through 9:00 a.m. **Wednesday** [THURSDAY], except in the Tsiu River salmon may be taken only from 9:00 a.m. **Sunday** [MONDAY] to 9:00 a.m. **Monday** [TUESDAY] and from 9:00 a.m. **Tuesday** [WEDNESDAY] to 9:00 a.m. **Wednesday** [THURSDAY];

(2) in the Yakutat District

(A) from the season opening through the first Sunday in August, salmon may be taken only from 6:00 a.m. **Sunday** [MONDAY] through 6:00 p.m. **Tuesday** [WEDNESDAY], except that

(i) in the Alsek River and adjacent open ocean waters, salmon may be taken only from 12:01 p.m. **Sunday** [MONDAY] through 12:00 noon **Thursday** [FRIDAY], and

(ii) in the East River and adjacent open waters, salmon may be taken only from 12:01 p.m. **Sunday** [MONDAY] through 12:00 noon **Wednesday** [THURSDAY];

(B) from the first **Sunday** [MONDAY] in August until the closing date, salmon may be taken from 12:01 p.m. **Sunday** [MONDAY] through 12:00 noon **Wednesday** [THURSDAY];

ISSUE: The emphasis on the salmon market in recent years has been on fresh product delivered early in the week to markets in the lower 48. The fishermen now receive the highest prices for this

fresh product. Product reaching the market later in the week gets frozen, with a subsequent lowering of prices to fishermen. For years Yakutat set gillnet fishing seasons have been opened on Monday, while gillnet fisheries in Southeast Alaska and Cordova have opened on Sunday. By opening on Monday, Yakutat set gillnet permit holders lose one day in the competition for the best fish prices.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Yakutat gillnet permit holders will continue to get salmon to market one day later in the week than other gillnet permit holders around the state, with a resulting loss of income.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Yakutat set gillnet permit holders who will be able to compete for the best salmon prices on an equal basis with other gillnet permit holders.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have the department set weekly fishing periods in the Yakutat Area to open on Sundays by emergency order, as was done in 2004. Rejected, as changing the regulation prevents the need for repetitive emergency orders.

PROPOSED BY: Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-207)

PROPOSAL 196 - 5 AAC 30.365(c)(5). Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River king salmon fisheries management plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Add the following provisions for the Situk River king salmon fishery:

(5)(x) manage the commercial set gillnet fisheries in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River based on sockeye run strength;

(5)(xx) increase allowable gear in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River set gillnet fisheries to include one net, not to exceed 20 fathoms, with mesh size not smaller than seven and one-half inches and no more than 45 meshes deep, for the directed taking of king salmon during periods both open and closed to the retention of sockeye.

ISSUE: The biological escapement goal (BEG) for Situk River king salmon is 730 large (three-ocean and older) fish, with a range of 450 to 1,050 fish. The Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River king salmon fisheries management plan provides guidelines to the department in an effort to preclude allocation conflicts between the various user groups of the king salmon resource. The measures to be taken to manage the king salmon fishery are outlined in an ascending scale of escapement scenarios. The first three scenarios address projections of low abundance, or fewer than 730 fish. The department is directed to institute various restrictions in the sport fishery and to establish “non-sale” restrictions in the set gillnet fisheries. The fourth addresses a projection of escapement that falls within the BEG range, and directs the department to manage the set gillnet fishery based on sockeye run strength.

The final scenario, (5), addresses escapement projections of greater than 1,050 large king salmon. The intent of the plan is quite clear, “the department shall manage the commercial, sport, and subsistence fisheries as necessary to harvest large king salmon in excess of the biological escapement goal.” And yet, beyond the inference that the set gillnet fishery will be managed based on sockeye run strength, the plan provides no further direction on the implementation of management measures concerning the commercial fishery. The only management options discussed involve the sport fishery. Both user groups participate in conservation measures as outlined in the low abundance scenarios of the plan, but commercial fishermen are currently excluded from harvest opportunities as outlined in the high abundance scenario without adjustments to time and gear. In 2003 king salmon projections for the Situk River were above 1,050 fish. The department, by emergency order under 5 AAC 30.311, Gillnet specifications and operations, did increase allowable gear to include the use of “king gear.”

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Commercial set gillnet permit holders will continue to lose king salmon harvest opportunities during periods of high king salmon abundance.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial set gillnet permit holders.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, as all user groups will have more harvest opportunity under the high abundance scenario.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-208)

PROPOSAL 197 - 5 AAC 30.310. Fishing seasons. Amend this regulation as follows:

...

(2) in the Yakutat District

(A) in the Alsek River and waters three-quarters of a mile on either side of the river mouth seaward to the outermost bar at mean low tide, from the first Sunday in June until closed by emergency order, **except that beginning the second Sunday in May the commissioner may open, by emergency order, through the first Saturday in June, set gillnet fishing periods in the Alsek River subject to the following provisions**

(i) set gillnet fishing periods are subject to the provisions of the Pacific Salmon Treaty as specified in 5 AAC 33.361;

(ii) fishing periods will begin at 12:01 p.m. from the second Sunday in May through the first Saturday in June;

(iii) notwithstanding 5 AAC 75.003(2)(A), when the set gillnet fishery is opened under this paragraph from the second Sunday in May through the first Sunday in June, the commissioner may, by emergency order, increase the sport fishery bag and possession limits and liberalize method and means of harvest for salmon;

...

ISSUE: The Alsek River historically sustained a commercial fishing season for king salmon beginning in early May. That fishery was closed in the early 1960’s to allow king salmon stocks to rebuild, and has never reopened. Both the Stikine and Taku rivers in Southeast Alaska have similar fishing histories. The Pacific Salmon Treaty requires bilateral agreement between the U.S. and

Canada prior to implementing directed fisheries on transboundary river king salmon stocks. In anticipation of such an agreement, regulatory language was adopted during the February 2003 board meeting allowing the commissioner to open the Taku River in May (5 AAC 33.310 (4)(A)(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)). No fishery regimes were agreed to during the 2004 Pacific Salmon Commission meeting but in February 2005, the Transboundary Panel of the Pacific Salmon Commission reached bilateral agreement to open directed fisheries for Stikine and Taku River king salmon in May. The panel did not reach agreement to open a directed commercial fishery for king salmon on the Alek River due to poor abundance projections for 2005 but agreement was reached to conduct an assessment test fishery for king salmon on the Alek. The department suggests that regulatory language be adopted to accommodate a May opening for king salmon fisheries on the Alek River in anticipation of bilateral agreement within the Pacific Salmon Commission.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Yakutat gillnet permit holders and sport fishermen will not be able to participate in king salmon harvest opportunities on the Alek River in years of high abundance and in accordance with 5 AAC 33.361.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Yakutat set gillnet permit holders and sport fishermen who will be able to take advantage of harvest opportunities for king salmon in the Alek River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish & Game (HQ-05-F-262)

PROPOSAL 198 - 5 AAC 33.394. Landing of Steelhead; 5 AAC 30.XXX. Landing of Steelhead. Amend these regulations as follows:

(X) the commissioner may, by emergency order, require that each CFEC permit holder shall report, on an ADF&G fish ticket, at the time of landing, the number of steelhead taken but not sold in Southeast Alaska and Yakutat areas.

ISSUE: Steelhead taken but not sold in commercial gillnet, purse seine and troll fisheries are not currently accounted for. Existing regulations (5 AAC 39.265) authorize the department to require, by emergency order, all steelhead caught to be retained and reported. However, the department does not have the authority to require reporting without also requiring full retention. If this proposal is adopted, the new authority would be used during times and in certain areas where the information is needed for management or stock assessment purposes.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will not have the ability to require reporting without also requiring all steelhead caught to be retained. The current authority to require full retention would likely increase mortality of steelhead because some steelhead caught in net and troll fisheries are likely released unharmed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users will benefit from more complete information to use for stock assessment and fishery management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-237)

PROPOSAL 199 - 5 AAC 47.020. General provisions for seasons and bag, possession, annual, and size limits for the salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Increase the coho daily bag limit to ten fish per day with no annual limit.

ISSUE: Under usage of the coho resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It allows for better utilization of the coho resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It does not improve the quality but it allows anglers increased access to the coho resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sport anglers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Roesch (HQ-05-F-020)

PROPOSAL 200 - 5 AAC 47.022. General provisions for seasons and bag, possession, annual and size limits for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Steelhead fishing is catch-and-release only.

ISSUE: Steelhead stocks have not rebounded to pre-1992 levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Stocks of steelhead will continue to decline, especially in light of newly implemented federal subsistence harvest regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, more adult steelhead.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sport anglers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Anglers desiring trophy mounts may utilize fiberglass replicas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo. Rejected because it offers no aid in rebuilding stocks.

PROPOSED BY: Tongass Sportfish Assoc. Chapter of Trout Unlimited (HQ-05-F-064)

PROPOSAL 201 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area; and 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend these regulations as follows:

Possession limit in Southeast Alaska means the maximum number of fish a person may have in possession until returning to their domicile.

ISSUE: Preserved fish are not now counted as part of the sport fish bag and possession limit. This has become increasingly problematic as more guided sport fishing businesses freeze, can or otherwise have sport-caught product processed as a service to their clients. It is not uncommon to see individuals at local airports with large stacks of 50 pound boxes full of processed fish. In effect, not counting processed fish means there are no possession limits for nonresident sport anglers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Overlooking preserved fish in bag and possession limit tallies enables large numbers of sport-caught fish to be transported out of the region. Some question exists as to whether or not processed fish are accurately counted.

Sport fish data is not collected and tabulated during the season as rigorously as commercial fisheries data. Creel census is not conducted at many of the area lodges, where some of the biggest nonresident harvest occurs. Final sport fish data is not available for a year or more after the fish are taken and has sometimes been revised substantially upward from inseason estimates. This makes it difficult to believe that the state has a handle on precisely how many fish are harvested and leave the state.

While taking fish beyond bag and possession limits might not be a conservation concern in years of high abundance, it could put the resource and other users at risk when stocks are less abundant. It is important for the health of the resource that department managers have accurate fisheries data inseason.

Allowing anglers to exceed bag and possession limits creates unrealistic expectations for guides and clients with respect to how much product is available to them. This will lead to unnecessary frustration and conflict between users if the resource is in short supply.

By disregarding bag and possession limits in this manner, the state is essentially giving priority access to guided clients.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The department and enforcement will be better able to track the number of fish harvested, which could be beneficial to management. Harvesters who abide by

the recognized bag and possession limits will benefit, and in years of low abundance, the resource will be better protected by an increased ability to monitor how much is being taken.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those individuals who are currently harvesting, or enabling the harvest of, fish in excess of the possession limit.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Harvest sharing on some species, particularly in years of low abundance. However, modifying the possession limit definition is thought to be a way to alleviate future conservation concerns, while still provide ample sport fishing opportunity and avoiding a more complex management system.

Please note: This proposal is being offered with a companion proposal specific to chinook salmon, in order to avoid disrupting the annual harvest limit provisions for nonresidents, which is not our intent.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-05-F-233)

PROPOSAL 202 - 5 AAC 47.030. Methods, means, and general provisions—finfish. Amend the regulation as follows:

It is illegal to release salmon caught that are injured beyond survivability (high scale loss, lost or injured eye, split lower jaw, bleeding from the gills, and listless or dead fish). To release a dying/dead fish is intentional wanton waste regardless of size or species. A dying/maimed or dead fish must be retained and counted towards the bag limit or tagged with a bycatch tag.

Now implementing, there is an enforcement problem due to the multiple species available and caught on the same gear in the same waters. Once a fisherman has caught the limit of one species, he/she continues to fish in the same manner for other species. In doing so it is inevitable he/she will continue to catch the species for which the limit has been reached and will be over the limit when one is injured beyond survival. There is a need for a bycatch tag, purchased at any licensed vendor. To be allowed to fish for more than one species after a limit is caught, fishermen must possess a bycatch tag, or tags. If a fisherman has a limit and does not wish to keep any more fish but wants to continue to fish catch-and-release, a bycatch tag must be possessed. One tag is good for one fish only. Multiple tags may be purchased and used in one day. The bycatch tags must be attached to the fish before the fisherman can continue to fish. An untagged fish is considered over limit and the fisherman will be cited.

ISSUE: I would like the board to address the high rate of king salmon mortality in undersized fish or bycatch in the fishing grounds of Taiya Inlet. When there is a 28-inch restriction in effect, the feeder kings are here in large numbers. These fish range in size from ten to twelve inches to over 40 pounds. They are full of energy, their scales almost fall off and they feed viciously, many times swallowing lures and bait. These fish are a lot different than a mature fish that is thick skinned with a tough mouth. These feeder kings are thin skinned and tender mouthed and during their battle on a line, many times end up with more damage and a higher mortality rate than the mature fish.

This being said, I would like you to know that as many as 50 to 60 shakers are caught per day, sometimes many more. By not being able to keep these shakers we are forced to throw back dead, dying and maimed fish. This is hygrading and wanton waste, an unnecessary killing of kings under 28 inches. The size restriction is causing the death of several fish just to keep one. The size restriction is also reducing the resource in huge numbers statewide where these fish are available.

This tactic would not work on moose or deer and it does not work on feeders; it increases the number of jack kings. It does not increase our fish population anywhere; it mandates intentional wanton waste of small kings without benefit. Most people fishing for these fish are aware of the problem and are satisfied with a smaller fish. Although everyone likes a big fish, no one likes wasting a dead fish. This is a sin to a fisherman and being unnecessary, it is a crime.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaska kings may be fished-out in some places where they gather in the summer months. In Taiya Inlet where 80 percent of the kings are ivory, it would be a shame to see this subspecies fished out. This 28-inch restriction forces many people to commit a crime against the fish and many will commit the lesser crime against the state. This can cost everyone a lot of money debating cases. With hundreds of thousands of people visiting Taiya Inlet this year from the ships and many more Yukon residents coming down, it is possible the fishery will suffer if the restriction is not lifted. Without the kings all of our predators, including me, will disappear. The fishery will need more enhancement which will cost a lot of money, time and resources spent on something that could be prevented. All resources and fisheries will be directly affected if this preventable problem is not solved correctly.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will help increase the overall number of kings in this type of fishery. It will end the state-induced intentional wanton waste. It will allow more fish to be consumed and a lot more satisfied king salmon fishermen, instead of wasteful or poaching fishermen. A bycatch tag would also generate a considerable income for the state. It would allow more resources to be available to other fisheries. It would increase the respect, awareness and care shown for the kings and tactics used in handling and harvesting the fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All of our marine habitat and creatures that depend on king salmon. All commercial and sport fishermen. State of Alaska resources. Tourism. King salmon and all other species covered by a bycatch tag.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hygraders and wasteful fishermen that do not respect the fisheries. Jack kings.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Barbless hooks—it is not the barb that injures the fish, it is the hook and the fight. Lowering bag limit still does not change the mortality rate. People will still hygrade and fish all day until they catch a fish big enough for themselves, turning loose multiple legal dying fish.

PROPOSED BY: Monte Mitchell (HQ-05-F-078)

PROPOSAL 203 - 5 AAC 47.030. Methods, means, and general provisions—finfish; and 5 AAC 75.026. Use of sport-caught fish as bait. Amend these regulations for Southeast Alaska area as follows:

Allow incidental catch of sport caught pink salmon to be used for sport fish or sport shellfish bait. If there seems to be some concern regarding quantity, then the board could limit the amount of sport caught pink salmon for bait to be no more than the sport fisherman’s daily pink salmon bag limit.

Under the provisions of AS 16.05.831(b) The commissioner, upon request, may authorize other uses of salmon that would be consistent with maximum and wise use of the resource. Under definitions (36) “bait” means any substance applied to fishing gear for the purpose of attracting fish by scent,

including fish eggs in any form, natural or preserved animal, fish, fish oil, shellfish, or insect parts, natural or processed vegetable matter, and natural or synthetic chemicals.

ISSUE: Sport anglers are not allowed to use incidental catch of pink salmon for bait for bottom fishing, or as shell fishing bait. Sport anglers must buy commercially-caught pink salmon to use for bottom fishing or shell fishing bait. Sport anglers should not be forced to buy commercially caught pink salmon when there are no conservation or allocation issues associated with this species. Furthermore, there is the appearance of the board being inconsistent with allowing or not allowing which user groups can use a salmon species as bait.

Additional Comments: Sport anglers are not required to buy herring for bait. Sport anglers can go out and catch their own herring with rod and reel (their standard equipment to fish with) and use their sport caught herring for bait in all sport fisheries if they so choose. There is no conservation or allocation issue associated with sport caught herring or sport caught pink salmon. In fact there was an increase in the daily bag limit for pink salmon to twelve, during the 2004 season. The volume of either of these resources caught by the sport fishery is minimal, proven by creel census data. The board has authorized allowing commercial fishers to catch chum salmon solely for the purpose of stripping roe from the females, and allowing them to discard the carcasses of both the dead males caught incidentally, and the female chum salmon after roe has been extracted. None of the salmon meat has been required to be utilized.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This will continue to create unfair and discriminatory use of a resource among user groups. This creates an unfair practice because sport anglers are not allowed to catch pink salmon for bait, yet are allowed to purchase “pink salmon caught commercially” for bait. Furthermore, current regulations will continue to give the appearance of the board being inconsistent, permitting one user group to do something, and prohibiting another user group from doing the same thing. Sport anglers are forced to pay for a resource that has no conservation or allocation issues. The temptation by sport anglers to abuse an existing unfair regulation would remain. Furthermore this is a discriminatory restriction to sport anglers because commercial fishers are allowed to catch their own pink salmon and use them on a much larger scale/volume for bait, for their own fishing endeavors, such as crabbing, shrimping, longlining, etc.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would be another way to utilize the fishery resource, provide diverse fishing opportunity, optimize economic benefit, and optimize recreational fishing opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sport anglers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Charter Boat Operators Association and
Petersburg Charter Boat Association

(HQ-05-F-128)

PROPOSAL 204 - 5 AAC 47.030. Methods, means, and general provisions—finfish; and 5 AAC 75.026. Use of sport-caught fish as bait. Amend these regulations for Southeast Alaska area as follows:

Allow incidental catch of sport caught chum salmon to be used for sport fish bait or sport shellfish bait. If concerns arise, the board could limit the amount of sport caught chum salmon for bait to be no more than the sport fisher's daily chum salmon bag limit.

Under the provisions of AS 16.05.831(b) The commissioner, upon request, may authorize other uses of salmon that would be consistent with maximum and wise use of the resource. Under definitions (36) "bait" means any substance applied to fishing gear for the purpose of attracting fish by scent, including fish eggs in any form, natural or preserved animal, fish, fish oil, shellfish, or insect parts, natural or processed vegetable matter, and natural or synthetic chemicals.

ISSUE: Sport anglers must buy commercially-caught chum salmon to use as bottom fishing bait or shell fishing bait. Sport anglers are not allowed to use incidental catch of chum salmon for bottom fishing, or shell fishing bait. Sport anglers should not be forced to buy commercially-caught chum salmon when there are no conservation or allocation issues associated with this species, and there is a great abundance of chum salmon each year in our waters.

The board has authorized allowing commercial fishers to catch chum salmon solely for the purpose of using them for bait.

The board has authorized allowing commercial fishers to harvest chum salmon solely for the purpose of stripping roe from the female chum salmon, and allowing them to discard the carcasses of both the dead males caught incidentally, and the dead female chum salmon after roe has been extracted. And none of the salmon meat has been required to be utilized.

Furthermore, there is the appearance of the board being inconsistent, permitting one user group to do something, and prohibiting another user group from doing the same thing. For example: It would be illegal for a sport angler to catch a chum salmon, strip the roe out to consume, and throw the unused chum salmon carcass overboard—even in the same area commercial fishers are allowed to do this. Another example of inconsistency with regulations is: resident and/or nonresident commercial fishers can legally keep whatever they want for "homepack" which would include being able to strip chum salmon for the salmon roe only, discard the carcass, and none of the salmon meat has been required to be utilized. There is more monetary value to be gotten out of an individual chum salmon (resource) that has been caught by a guided angler on a rod and reel and then allowed to be used for bait, than if that same fish were to be commercially caught, died and was discarded because it was a male and had no roe.

Additional comments: Sport anglers are not required to buy herring for bait. Sport anglers can go out and catch their own herring with rod and reel (their standard equipment for fishing) and use their sport caught herring for bait in all sport fisheries if they so choose. There is no conservation or allocation issue associated with sport caught herring or sport caught chum salmon. The volume of either of these resources caught by the sport fishery is minimal, proven by creel census data.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This will continue to create unfair and discriminatory usages of a resource among user groups, because sport anglers are not allowed to catch chum salmon for bait, yet are allowed to purchase commercially-caught chum salmon for bait. Current regulations will continue to give the appearance of the board being inconsistent. Sport anglers are forced to pay for a resource that has no conservation or allocation issues. Temptation by sport anglers to abuse an existing unfair regulation would remain. Discriminatory restriction on sport anglers will continue as commercial fishers are allowed to catch their own chum salmon and use them on a much larger scale/volume for bait for their own fishing endeavors such as crabbing, shrimping, longlining, etc. And lastly, the nonresident commercial fisher can continue to do

“homepacks” of chum roe and waste chum carcasses, while the sport fisher is prohibited from doing the same.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would be another way to utilize the fishery resource, provide diverse fishing opportunity, optimize economic benefit, maximize another use for the resource, and optimize recreational fishing opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sport anglers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Charter Boat Operators Association and
Petersburg Charter Boat Association (HQ-05-F-129)

PROPOSAL 205 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

In remote “trophy cutthroat lakes” (excluding Turner Lake) the daily bag and possession limits shall be two fish with a nine-inch minimum size limits, only one of which may be 25 inches or longer. (“Remote” as used in this proposal refers to those lakes for which primary access is by aircraft).

ISSUE: Since 1994, cutthroat harvest in twelve high recreational value lakes in Southeast Alaska has been severely restricted by regulation (25 inch minimum size; one fish daily bag/possession limit). Only a small fraction (less than 1 percent) of mature cutthroat in these lakes, classified by regulation as “trophy cutthroat lakes,” are 25 inches or larger and few of these are taken. These regulations are not required for conservation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A significant, sustainable harvest of these cutthroat populations, and the associated recreational experiences, will continue to be foregone each year.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If adopted, this regulation would improve the quality of recreational experiences for many sport fishermen who enjoy the overall experience of being at a remote lake with family or friends—enjoying the solitude, observing wildlife, and catching and eating a few fresh trout.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those people for whom the total recreational experience of being at a remote lake, catching and eating a few trout, and teaching their kids or grandkids how to fish is more important than catching a “trophy” fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This new regulation would probably have no significant adverse effect on anyone. Fishermen who desire to catch a “trophy” fish could still fish for trophy cutthroat trout in these lakes. Due to limited access to these remote lakes, primarily by aircraft, the proposed regulation would result in the harvest of only a small percentage of available mature cutthroat trout, most of which would be much smaller than trophy-size fish. Furthermore, the

resulting harvest would be within the range of sustainable harvest rates for similar trout populations and thus should not cause any conservation problems.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Melvin C. Seibel (HQ-05-F-103)

PROPOSAL 206 – 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Repeal 5 AAC 47.021 (2). This regulation allows a bag and possession limit of two coho salmon 16 inches or greater in length in Yakutat Bay. If this regulation is repealed, the bag and possession limit for coho salmon 16 inches in length would be six fish, consistent with region wide regulations.

ISSUE: The existing bag and possession limit for coho salmon in Yakutat Bay is in error. The regulation appeared about 1988 as an unintended administrative error and has continued unnoticed until recently. There are no conservation concerns for the coho salmon in this area, and no reason that the general regionwide regulation should not apply. The department considers this a housekeeping proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the existing regulation is enforced, sport coho harvest will be unnecessarily restricted in Yakutat Bay.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers that fish in the Yakutat Bay and desire to harvest more than two coho salmon 16 inches or greater in length. All anglers will benefit from more consistent regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-238)

PROPOSAL 207 - 5 AAC 47.023(b)(6). Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend this regulation as follows:

Sport fishing gear on the Situk River will be restricted to single hook only.

ISSUE: Anglers using treble hooks are wounding nontargeted species. Fish are more likely to foul hooked with treble hooks since the river, a small stream, and the fish become very dense when they gather in holes.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have higher than necessary mortality rates of our fish stock, due to being foul hooked by treble hooks.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport, commercial and subsistence fishermen as well as the fish stocks.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. It will not reduce the effectiveness of legal anglers. The only one that will suffer is the illegal angler that uses illegal means of securing their fish using treble hooks.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase state troopers on the river, but this will not solve the problem of foul hooked fish. As previously mentioned, the Situk River is a small stream with a high density of fish that lends itself to high foul hooking rates when using treble hooks.

PROPOSED BY: Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-211)

PROPOSAL 208 - 5 AAC 47.023(c)(1). Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation in the Chilkoot River drainage as follows:

Fishing hours from June 1 through August 31, 6:00 a.m. through 9:00 p.m.

Fishing hours from September 1 through October 31, 7:00 a.m. through 7:00 p.m.

ISSUE: People fishing in the dark, people failing to comply with voluntary area guidelines, inconsistent fishing times lead to excluding brown bears from fisheries resources.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Chilkoot River corridor will continue to have more conflicts than necessary between user groups and bears.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allows anglers to fish with better visibility, to watch for bears, resulting in a safer experience for anglers and bears. Fish will not be taken while being cleaned or stored.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers and bears. Anglers have a safer fishing experience and bears get to access fish resources more consistently.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who like to fish in the dark and have unsafe encounters with bears.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Monitors, guides and public have spare time encouraging angling times in daylight hours. This has worked to lessen conflicts between bears and people but presently there is no remedy for the few who fish very late and usually in the darkness.

PROPOSED BY: Tim McDonough (HQ-05-F-157)

PROPOSAL 209 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Special management regulations for the following waters: Mud Bay Creek, Chicken Creek, and Freshwater Creek on Chichagof Island and Teardrop Creek on the east side of the Chilkat Peninsula. Single hook, no bait, with a daily bag limit of four Dolly Varden, none of which may exceed 20 inches in overall length.

ISSUE: As freshwater fishing pressure has increased on streams near Juneau and Hoonah, the opportunity to catch larger-sized Dolly Varden has declined. Given the improved access and increased use of the waters specified in the solution suggested above, the current regionwide regulations regarding means of take and bag/possession limits for Dolly Varden do not provide sufficient protection to ensure future opportunities to catch large Dolly Varden. Special regulations for Dolly Varden on selected streams should be adopted.

The Southcentral region currently has a plan in place, 5 AAC 61.014, which provides for the establishment of special management areas for Dolly Varden. The criteria and provisions of that plan should be adopted for the Southeast region as well. Each of the three streams listed above meet the criteria for special regulations, as stated in 5 AAC 61.014. If adopted, these regulations would still provide ample opportunity for harvest while ensuring the continued existence of large Dolly Varden available in these streams.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Anglers will continue to have fewer opportunities to catch large Dolly Varden. The maintenance of sustainable populations may become a problem in the future as declines in large spawners are seen.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, diverse recreational fishing opportunities will be protected by maintaining the existence of large Dolly Varden in these streams.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers looking for more and bigger fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anglers who use bait only and/or with to retain ten Dolly Varden per day. However, harvesting Dolly Varden and the opportunity to use bait is available in many other streams.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Catch-and-release only for streams mentioned: would not allow for the retention of fish for personal consumption. 2) Allow bait to be used in the fall only to accommodate those bait fishing for silvers. Because of the high rate of mortality encountered when bait is used, and because Dolly Varden are fall spawners, an excessive number of large, spawning Dolly Varden would be incidentally killed by those targeting silvers with bait. Would counteract the purpose of the proposed regulation. 3) Barbless hook requirement: too controversial.

PROPOSED BY: Andrew Audap (HQ-05-F-065)

PROPOSAL 210 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area; and 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and

means for the fresh waters of the of Southeast Alaska Area. Amend these regulations to read as follows:

The entire Peterson Creek drainage is entirely a catch-and-release fishery. This includes the water 150 yards off the outfall of the Peterson Creek salt chuck except during the chum salmon run during which time chum salmon may be retained in salt water and snagging is legal.

ISSUE: There is no catch-and-release area in Juneau. This type of fishery is preferred by many sport fishers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A catch-and-release fishery will remain unavailable to Juneau anglers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of sport fishing will be improved for the many anglers preferring catch-and-release. Peterson Creek has the only steelhead run in Juneau, and diminishing runs of coho salmon and cutthroat trout. Numbers and size of these fish can only be enhanced by catch-and-release regulations. Peterson Creek, because of its small size and limited runs of steelhead, coho salmon and cutthroat trout is particularly vulnerable to overfishing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport fishers who prefer catch-and-release.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anglers who prefer to keep fish. Consumptive fishers have many other areas to fish as well as the salt waters off Peterson Creek during the chum run.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered other Juneau roadside waters but believe the Peterson Creek fishery is both small and vulnerable.

PROPOSED BY: Tony Soltys (HQ-05-F-074)

PROPOSAL 211 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Fresh water regulations to prohibit snagging and use of bait in Peterson Creek would be placed in effect for waters 150 yards beyond the outfall. These regulations are in effect just a few feet upstream from the outfall. Snagging of chums during the months when no steelhead or coho salmon are present would be permitted beyond the outfall.

ISSUE: Snagging at the outfall of Peterson Creek is a problem for the majority of anglers who fish there. Snaggers degrade the sport fishing experience. Their methods alarm fish, and interfere with sport fishing methods. Snagging is dangerous to other anglers in the immediate vicinity. Fishing locations are limited and anglers must fish even closer together than at DIPAC where a snagger hooked a person in the eye last year. Snaggers can also easily cast across the outfall to hook people there accidentally. Because snagged fish often escape mortally wounded, many fish are wasted and will die before they can be caught or before they can spawn. Peterson Creek is a small drainage with a very vulnerable small run of steelhead and a declining run of coho salmon. Wasting fish here is particularly poor management.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There are few opportunities for Juneau roadside fishers for good sport fishing. Peterson Creek has the only significant steelhead run in Juneau and also produces quality silver salmon and cutthroat fishing throughout its drainage. Snaggers could easily reduce the size of these runs because the fish are very easily snagged at the Peterson Creek outfall as they mill around waiting for enough water to enter the salt chuck. They definitely reduce the success and enjoyment of the vast majority of anglers who use sport fishing methods. The safety issue is also quite relevant.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality and safety of the sport fishing experience is improved. Salmon and steelhead trout will not be wasted because of snag wounds.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport and personal use fishermen employing sport fishing techniques.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Snaggers who are a very small minority of users. They would continue to have access to chum and pink salmon beyond the outfall.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Making this a discretionary administrative action. I believe it is too expensive and unlikely that this location could be effectively monitored, particularly during the evening and on weekends. There are too many demands on department personnel. The runs of steelhead and coho last for many weeks and Peterson Creek is “out the road”.

PROPOSED BY: Tony Soltys (HQ-05-F-075)

PROPOSAL 212 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area; and 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend these regulations as follows:

Create a small area in the Fish Creek estuary, downstream from the Fish Creek Pond (where the majority of snagging currently takes place), where spin and fly anglers can fish. The area is defined by department markers located 400 feet on either side of the mouth of Fish Creek and extends out to Gastineau Channel navigational marker number 20. Snagging or attempting to snag fish in this area is prohibited. All fish hooked elsewhere than in the mouth must be immediately released. Likewise, the use of gear intended for snagging fish is prohibited.

ISSUE: There is a diminishing opportunity for sport anglers (spin caters and fly fishers) to pursue hatchery-released king salmon at Fish Creek on Douglas Island. Over the last several years there has been an increase in conflicts between snagging and non-snagging salmon fishermen in the Fish Creek estuary. The primary issue is incompatibility of snagging gear with traditional sport fishing methods, although safety is also an issue.

Methods: At Fish Creek, spin-cast and fly fishermen’s efforts are primarily focused on the small stretch of stream between the saltwater and the Fish Creek Pond. The most common method is to cast straight across the stream and fish down and across the current. Since anglers are often spaced only a few yards apart a great deal of cooperation between anglers has been required and, for the most part, achieved. However, snagging can be accomplished by casting in any direction. As a result, a single snag fisherman, casting upstream across the lines of non-snagging fishermen, can essentially prevent multiple other anglers from fishing. This has become a common occurrence.

Safety: In the Fish Creek area, anglers use both sides of the stream to access the water. Despite being a small stream, at high tide levels conventional anglers cannot cast all the way across the stream. Hence, anglers on opposite shores do not interfere with each other. A two-ounce snagging hook, on the other hand, can be cast all the way across the stream. These are heavy, barbed, treble hooks and the proximity of their landing area is often a safety concern. These hooks also frequently sail out of the water at the end of the retrieve due to the aggressive methods employed. As a result, fishermen on both banks are endangered by this method.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Spin and fly anglers will not have access to stream fishing for king salmon in the Juneau area. Fish Creek is the only area in Juneau where river fishing is available for king salmon. This fishery has grown rapidly and is a very popular sport fishery. However, a small group using snag gear, moving up and down the bank behind the other anglers and casting over their lines, can effectively stop the other anglers from fishing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers using traditional sport fishing methods. This will provide a diversity of opportunity for sport fishers and allow a growing group of anglers to target king salmon in a river.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few snag fishermen will not have access to this small area. However, they will still have the Fish Creek Pond (where the greatest number of king salmon congregate), all saltwater areas, and the DIPAC hatchery area to target king salmon.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered a gear restriction allowing only single, unweighted hooks. However, this would prevent the use of many traditional spinners and spoons as well as some flies.

PROPOSED BY: Brad Elfers, David McKenna, Chris Zimmer (HQ-05-F-076)

PROPOSAL 213 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area; and 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend these regulations as follows:

Create a small area around Salmon Creek downstream from the Egan Drive bridge where spin and fly anglers can fish. Snagging or attempting to snag fish is prohibited along the shoreline between a department marker located on the point east of the Northland Services dock to a department marker located on the west side of the Salmon Creek bridge. This no-snagging zone shall extend 150 feet out into salt water. All fish hooked elsewhere than in the mouth must be immediately released. Likewise, the use of gear intended for snagging fish is prohibited.

ISSUE: There is a diminishing opportunity for sport anglers (spin casters and fly fishers) to pursue hatchery-released silver salmon at Salmon Creek in Gastineau Channel near Juneau. Over the last several years there has been an increase in conflicts between snagging and non-snagging salmon fishermen in the Salmon Creek area. The primary issue is incompatibility of snagging gear with traditional sport fishing methods, although safety is also an issue.

Methods: At Salmon Creek, spin-cast and fly fishermen's efforts are primarily focused on the small stretch of creek downstream from the Egan Drive bridge and at the mouth of Salmon Creek. The most common method is to cast straight across the stream and fish down and across the current. Since anglers are often spaced only a few yards apart a great deal of cooperation between anglers has been required and, for the most part, achieved. However, snagging can be accomplished by casting in any direction. As a result, a single snag fisherman, casting upstream across the lines of non-snagging fishermen, can essentially prevent multiple other anglers from fishing. This has become a common occurrence.

Safety: In the Salmon Creek area, anglers use both sides of the stream to access the water. Despite being a small stream, at high tide levels conventional anglers cannot cast all the way across the stream. Hence, anglers on opposite shores do not interfere with each other. A two-ounce snagging hook, on the other hand, can be cast all the way across the stream. These are heavy, barbed, treble hooks and the proximity of their landing area is often a safety concern. These hooks also frequently sail out of the water at the end of the retrieval due to the aggressive methods employed. As a result, fishermen on both banks are endangered by this method.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Spin and fly anglers will not have access to stream fishing for hatchery silver salmon in the DIPAC hatchery area. Salmon Creek is the only area in proximity to the hatchery where traditional sport fishing methods can take place away from those using snag gear. This fishery has grown rapidly and is a very popular sport fishery. However, a small group using snag gear, moving up and down the bank behind the other anglers and casting over their lines, can effectively stop the other anglers from fishing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers using traditional sport fishing methods. This will provide a diversity of opportunity for sport fishers and allow a growing group of anglers to target silver salmon returning to the DIPAC hatchery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few snag fishermen will not have access to this small area. However, they will still have the entire beach near the hatchery (where the greatest number of king salmon congregate) and all saltwater areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered a gear restriction allowing only single, unweighted hooks. However, this would prevent the use of many traditional spinners and spoons as well as some flies.

PROPOSED BY: Brad Elfers, David McKenna, Chris Zimmer (HQ-05-F-077)

PROPOSAL 214 - 5 AAC 47.021(g)(4). Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area; and 5 AAC 47.023(g)(6). Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend these regulations as follows:

Rescind the closure of the sockeye sport fishery in the Sitkoh Lake drainage and Sitkoh Bay.

ISSUE: In the early and mid-1990s the Sitkoh sockeye sport and subsistence fisheries were closed due to low escapement survey counts and concern from the public. Beginning in 1995 the

department began conducting mark recapture experiments to estimate the Sitkoh Lake sockeye escapement. These estimates of escapement indicated that the Sitkoh Lake sockeye population is healthy and a harvestable surplus is available. In 2001 the subsistence fishery was reopened. To date, the sport fishery has not been reopened.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Anglers will not have the opportunity to harvest sockeye salmon in the Sitkoh drainage or from Sitkoh Bay.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers who want to harvest sockeye salmon in the Sitkoh drainage or Sitkoh Bay.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-066)

PROPOSAL 215 - 5 AAC 47.023(g)(4). Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Modify existing Starrigavin Creek salmon regulations to allow for a pink salmon sport fishery. The pink salmon bag and possession limits would mirror regionwide fresh water pink salmon limits.

ISSUE: Fresh water sport fishing opportunity for Starrigavin Creek pink salmon is not being provided although escapement surveys indicate there is a harvestable surplus.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport anglers on the Sitka road system will continue to have limited fresh water sport fishing opportunity for pink salmon.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers on the Sitka road system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-067)

PROPOSAL 216 - 5 AAC 47.023(g)(4). Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation to read:

Modify existing Indian River salmon regulations to allow for pink salmon sport fishery upstream of the Sawmill Creek Road bridge. The pink salmon bag and possession limits would mirror regionwide fresh water pink salmon limits.

ISSUE: Fresh water sport fishing opportunity for Indian River pink salmon is not being provided although escapement surveys indicate there is a harvestable surplus.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport anglers on the Sitka road system will continue to have limited fresh water sport fishing opportunity for pink salmon.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers on the Sitka road system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-068)

PROPOSAL 217 - 5 AAC 47.023(g). Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Allow the retention of king salmon in all fresh water systems draining into the Sitka Sound Special Use area. Bag limit would be five kings over 28 inches and five kings less than 28 inches per day.

ISSUE: Hatchery produced king salmon stray from local Sitka hatcheries into local streams and are surplus to hatchery and biological needs.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Anglers will only have the opportunity to harvest king salmon in the Sitka area streams where the department has observed king salmon and opened them to the retention of king salmon by emergency order.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will improve the quality of the king salmon harvested since anglers will have the opportunity to harvest them as soon as they enter fresh water.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers who want to harvest king salmon in Sitka area streams.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Sitka Advisory Committee (HQ-05-F-069)

PROPOSAL 218 – 5 AAC 47.023(h)(1)(A-B). Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend regulations for the Blind Slough sport fishery as follows:

(h)(1)(A) only unbaited, artificial lures may be used from November 16 - **May 31** [JUNE 14].

Repeal (h)(1)(B) and replace with: **Except during periods established by emergency order, a person may not intentionally snag, attempt to snag, or retain a salmon** [A PERSON MAY RETAIN A SALMON THAT IS] hooked other than in the mouth.

ISSUE: Snagging for salmon of all species is currently allowed in Blind Slough near Petersburg year round. The board adopted the current regulation in 1989 to provide additional opportunity to harvest surpluses of hatchery king salmon returning to the Crystal Lake hatchery (CLH). Since 1989, the practice of snagging and releasing unwanted king salmon in Blind Slough has increased, particularly late in the season after fish turn dark. In 2003 and 2004, broodstock goals were not attained. During years of low runs and when weather and water conditions lead to large die-offs, the practice of snagging and releasing salmon exacerbates shortages in broodstock. Current regulations provide for the use of bait only during the mid and latter portion of the run.

The department is proposing these changes with the intent to continue providing liberalized opportunities to catch and harvest hatchery king salmon, yet provide greater management flexibility so that broodstock needs at CLH are attained. If this proposal is approved, the earlier opportunity to use bait will provide anglers increased harvest opportunity for king salmon earlier in the run. The department would allow snagging by emergency order during years when king salmon surplus to broodstock needs are available for harvest. During those years, snagging would be allowed in season to provide additional harvest opportunity when catch rates decline but reduce damage and stress to maturing broodstock.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Large numbers of pre-spawning king salmon will be repeatedly snagged and released during mid- to late summer, and lower numbers will survive to be spawned later. If no changes are made to the existing regulations, it will be necessary for the department to enact longer summer sport fishing closures during low run years to ensure broodstock needs are met, or rely on other hatcheries to provide eggs necessary to fulfill annual egg-take goals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of king salmon produced at the CLH.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anglers that prefer to snag fish year round.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fixed periods of closures to snagging were considered. However, this option was rejected because managers could not respond to variations in run strength from year to year, or when indications suggest possible shortages.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-240)

PROPOSAL 219 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Reduce the sport fishing bag and possession limits from six sockeye salmon per day with 12 in possession, to three per day with six in possession for the Sweetwater Lake drainage (Prince of Wales Island), and close a small portion (approximately 260 meters of stream) of Hatchery Creek to sport fishing from June 1 through July 31.

ISSUE: Observations by department staff and reports from the public indicate a decline in the number of sockeye salmon returning to Hatchery Creek in the Sweetwater Lake drainage. Upstream salmon migration in Hatchery Creek is partially obstructed by two falls at river mile 1, where salmon concentrate and are vulnerable to harvest by sport and personal use fishermen. Statewide harvest survey (SWHS) data and onsite observations indicate an increase in sport fishing effort and sockeye salmon catch and harvest at the falls over the past decade. Similar trends have been observed in the personal use fishery.

In 2003 and 2004, the department issued sport fishing emergency orders and modified personal use fishing harvest limits to reduce pressure on Hatchery Creek sockeye salmon. In response, anglers have been observed shifting to other areas of the drainage to harvest sockeye. Onsite observations conducted in 2003 and 2004 indicated a continued decline in the number of sockeye returning to Hatchery Creek.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Escapements will continue to decline and likely be insufficient to sustain current harvest levels, reducing future harvest opportunities by all user groups.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Sport anglers who, in the short term, want to harvest more than three sockeye per day in the Sweetwater drainage or harvest sockeye from proposed closed areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reducing the bag limit in the sport fishery without closing the areas adjacent to the falls. However, this would not address catch-and-release mortality that occurs.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-235)

PROPOSAL 220 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Allow only three coho per day in the Harris River (unit 2).

ISSUE: Lowering the limit on coho salmon in the Harris River from six to three fish per day.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The number of fish will continue to decline. These are wild fish and cannot sustain current limits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. If not addressed the run may/will continue to decline.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who are concerned about falling wild fish numbers. All will benefit as at the rate now, if continued, there may not be fishable numbers in coming years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dan Arrant (HQ-05-F-012)

PROPOSAL 221 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Close Harris River to bait use year-round.

ISSUE: Bait fishing as it is now on the Harris River (unit 2) should be banned.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? I believe silver salmon will continue to decline. These are wild fish and cannot take the pressure.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? These fish are very easy to catch using bait.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sport fishermen as at current regulations, too many fish are being caught by out-of-state fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Not open for bait until October 1 instead of September 15, but believe total ban would be best.

PROPOSED BY: Dan Arrant (HQ-05-F-011)

PROPOSAL 222 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area. Amend the regulation as follows:

Repeal special provisions (5 AAC 47.023(k)(7)) that apply to trout in One Duck Lake.

ISSUE: One Duck Lake (a small pond a few acres in size on Prince of Wales Island) has special provisions for trout, but the lake contains no fish. In 1997, the lake was stocked with hatchery rainbow trout to provide opportunity for kids fishing day. Stocking was discontinued and there are no plans to stock this lake in the future. The department considers this a housekeeping proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unnecessary regulations will continue to remain in place.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers will benefit from simpler, more concise regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-05-F-239)
