

PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 01.616. Customary and traditional subsistence uses of fish stocks and amount necessary for subsistence uses. Reclassify the Chitina dipnet fishery as a subsistence fishery as follows:

Reclassify the Chitina Dipnet Fishery as a State of Alaska subsistence fishery.

ISSUE: In the 2003 Board of Fisheries meeting in Cordova the Board classified the Chitina Dipnet Fishery as personal use, changing it from a subsistence classification. This decision was made based on incorrect and incorrectly presented data. This decision was based on an analysis of "users" rather than "uses" as required by the Joint Board's subsistence policy and procedure. The board's decision was further complicated when the department said in testimony that "the department did not need to follow legislative intent" in its procedures and that it was permissible to approve a policy that opposed specific legislative intent. The board must review this information again as the last administrative relief possible so that this issue can be moved to the Alaska Court System.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We feel it is wrong for the Joint Board to approve a procedure that would lead to a decision that is directly opposed to stated Legislative intent. In this case, the Chitina Dipnet Fishery was used as an example of the type of activity that would be protected as Subsistence under the state law. (Legislative discussion 1978.) The board should not make classification decisions in opposition to legislative intent. The board is vulnerable for not following its policy (examination of "users" rather than "uses"). The Board of Fisheries should be able to reach the correct classification upon review and set the record straight.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The over 10,000 Alaskan families who participate in the Chitina Dipnet Fishery because of a higher priority for fish for Alaskans to eat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The dipnet fishery would not harvest any additional fish under a Subsistence classification. If and when the salmon escapements are forecast, estimated or counted to be below the total allocation for the Copper River, the dipnet fishery would have a higher priority.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Filing to ask the Alaska Court to review the decision of the Board of Fisheries in 2003, rejected to provide an opportunity to review and correct the classification administratively.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee

(I-08F-009)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____
ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____
DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 01.6xx. New section. Determine customary and traditional use of rainbow trout/steelhead trout, Arctic char/Dolly Varden, Arctic grayling, burbot, lake trout, whitefish, pike and other non-salmon fish in the Upper Copper River/Upper Susitna River area as follows:

5AAC 01.6XX Customary and traditional subsistence use of fish stocks in the Upper Copper River / Upper Susitna River Drainages.

The Alaska Board of Fisheries (board) finds that the following fish stocks are customary and traditionally taken or used for subsistence:

Rainbow trout/steelhead trout, Arctic char / Dolly Varden, Arctic grayling, burbot, lake trout, White Fish, Pike and other finfish.

ISSUE: Under state laws, the Board is required to do customary and traditional use determinations, and has done so for most fish stocks. However, the Board has not made customary and traditional use determinations in the Upper Copper River /Upper Susitna management areas. There is no customary and traditional use finding for the following non-salmon fish species: rainbow trout / steelhead trout, Arctic char / Dolly Varden, Arctic grayling, burbot, lake trout, White Fish, Pike and other non-salmon finfish. The Ahtna People have customarily and traditionally used fresh water fish species. Fresh water fish was boiled, fried, frozen or hung to dry and eaten during the winter season.

Fresh water fish were harvested throughout the Ahtna Region. This is just a list of a few water bodies where fish were harvested: “Creek near Cobb Lake, Crosswind Lake, Ewan Lake, Gene Lake, Fish Creek, Fish Lake, Game Trail Lake, Hogan Hill Lake, Horseshow Lake, Indian Pass Lake, Jack Lake, Lake Louise, Mendeltna Creek, Mentasta Creek, Mentasta Lake, Mineral Lake, Moose Lake, Mud Lake, Paxson Lake, Poplar Creek, stream into MacCalaren River, Slana river, Susitna River, Susitna Lake, Suslota Lake, Tanada Creek, Tanada lake, Tangle Lake, Tolsona Creek, Tyone River systems and Tyone Lake and Twin Lakes” (See work cited for information on complete report). Works cited: William E. Simeone and James Kari, *The Harvest and Use of Non-Salmon fish species in the Copper Basin, Alaska* (ADF&G 2004), 22, 30.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will not have customary and traditional use determination of the above mentioned fresh water lake fish.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. It is a C&T determination proposal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Ahtna People will have C&T Determination of rainbow trout/steelhead trout, Arctic char/Dolly Varden, Arctic grayling, burbot, lake trout, White Fish, Pike and other finfish. We will not have priority use of these fresh water lake fish. We have customarily and traditionally used these fish since time immemorial.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer by a C&T Determination of fresh water lake fish given to the Ahtna People. All residents of Alaska will still be able to fish in the lakes in the Copper Basin.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary and Traditional Committee

(SC-08F-015)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 01.625 (b). Waters closed to subsistence fishing. Open Crosswind Lake to subsistence uses as follows:

Open Crosswind Lake to subsistence users.

ISSUE: Currently, Crosswind Lake is open to sports fishing, but isn't open to subsistence uses.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Ahtna People will not be able to subsistence fish for fresh water fish in Crosswind Lake. This lake used to be an ideal place to harvest Humpback/round Whitefish, Arctic Char Grayling, Lake/rainbow trout, and burbot.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. This is a newly created subsistence fishery in Crosswind Lake.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All state residents will be able to fish in the Crosswind Lake, if it is open for subsistence fishing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, they can still fish under sport fishery in Crosswind Lake.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary and Traditional Committee (SC-08F-014)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 01.616. Customary and traditional subsistence uses of fish stocks and amount necessary for subsistence uses. Amend the regulation to restrict subsistence king salmon gillnet fishery in Copper River Delta area as follows:

Gillnetters in the Copper River Delta cannot continue to be granted to harvest large numbers of Chinook salmon under liberal subsistence guidelines.

ISSUE: Subsistence gillnet fishing by residents of Cordova. This use should not qualify for a positive customary and traditional finding based on demographic changes in the users and the use.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence privileges will continue to be granted to non-subsistence users. If the Chitina dipnet fishery does not qualify under the board's application of customary and traditional, the Cordova gillnet fishery cannot qualify the board should request a report from Subsistence Division similar to the report from the 2003 report in customary and traditional for Chitina.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Gillnetters living in Cordova who do not qualify under the eight criteria for customary and traditional.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Kramer

(HQ-08F-241)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 01.620(x). Lawful gear and gear specifications. This proposal would amend the regulation as follows:

(x) A buoy attached to one end of gillnet subsistence fishing gear must have printed on it the first initial, last name, and address of the subsistence permit holder, or the ADF&G number of the vessel used to operate the gear, in numbers and letters that are
(1) at least one inch high;
(2) in a color that contrasts with the background; and
(3) plainly visible when the gear is in the water.

ISSUE: The current subsistence fishing regulations allow for inadequate marking of subsistence drift gillnet gear. Currently kegs are sometimes marked with ballpoint or “Sharpie” pens in small letters that are illegible without close scrutiny.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Derelict gear, abandoned gear and illegally set gear will continue to be difficult to identify quickly and accurately by FWP officers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Legal subsistence permit holders will benefit through improved regulatory enforcement as FWP officers better invest their time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08-F-318)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 01.640. Marking of subsistence-taken fish. This proposal would amend subsection (a) and add a new subsection as follows:

(a) A person may not possess salmon taken under the authority of an Upper Copper River District [OR COPPER RIVER DISTRICT] subsistence permit unless both tips (lobes) of the tail fin (caudal) have been removed from the salmon before the person conceals the salmon from plain view or transports the salmon from the fishing site.

(x) A person may not possess salmon taken under the authority of a PWS area subsistence permit unless both the top and bottom lobes of the tail fin (caudal) have been completely removed from the salmon before the person conceals the salmon from plain view or transports the salmon from the fishing site.

ISSUE: The current subsistence fishing regulations allow for inadequate marking of subsistence caught salmon in Area E. Currently regulation specifies that “both tips (lobes) of the tail fin (caudal)” must be removed before transporting the fish from the harvest site or concealing it. “Tips” is vague in meaning and allows for inadequate, (but legal) marking to take place. This makes clear identification of subsistence caught fish from Area E that may illegally enter the commercial market problematic for FWP officers and fish buyers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence harvested fish may enter the commercial market without clear marks identifying them as subsistence caught fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Legal subsistence permit holders will benefit through improved regulatory enforcement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08-F-321)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 7 – 5 AAC 01.645(b). Subsistence bag, possession, and size limits; and 5 AAC 01.620(b)(3). Lawful gear and gear specifications. This proposal would amend the regulation as follows:

5 AAC 01.645(b) In the Copper River District and other locations open to commercial salmon fishing [AND IN CONFORMANCE WITH COMMERCIAL SALMON FISHING REGULATIONS,] the annual subsistence salmon...

5 AAC 01.620(b)

.....

(3) in salt water by gillnets **as described in 5 AAC 01.010(c)** and seines **no longer than 50 fathoms in length and 100 meshes deep with a maximum mesh size of 4 inches, and in compliance with 5 AAC 24.330;**

ISSUE: Currently the legal subsistence gear types for districts in PWS are not described clearly in 01.465(b). This proposal seeks to clarify within the subsistence chapter the legal gear.

Gear types legal in specific areas will be more clearly identified by referencing the section (5 AAC 24.330) in the Lawful Gear and Gear Types section of the commercial section that specifies this. In addition, legal gear dimensions will be more clearly identified by referencing the general regulation for gillnet size (5 AAC 01.010(c)) and identifying a legal size for subsistence seine gear outside of the Tatitlek and Chenega areas where it is specified in 01.648(a)(2) and (b)(2). Currently there is no general subsistence regulation describing a subsistence beach or purse seine net.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everybody who participates in these fisheries will benefit through clearer and better organized regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08-F-319)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 01.647. Copper River Subsistence Salmon Fisheries Management Plans. Allow early May subsistence fishing in Copper River district as follows:

Part J, Section (2) salmon may be taken from **May 1** [MAY 15] through September 30.

Part 3, Section (A) from **May 1** [MAY 15] until two days before the commercial opening of the Copper River District, seven days per week;

ISSUE: Fish start to build up in the ocean in front of the barrier islands in the end of April on some years, and it wouldn't be hurting for people to be able to get their subsistence early. It could also be useful information for deciding when to enact the two inside closures.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be no documentation of the early returning salmon to the area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local users who otherwise never have time to go out to get their subsistence.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Babic

(HQ-08F-008)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 01.610. Fishing seasons. Amend the regulation to open subsistence season May 10 in Copper River District as follows:

Subsistence Copper River District, open subsistence May 10 7:00 a.m. for 12 hours until commercial season opens, then current regulations would remain in effect.

ISSUE: Subsistence Fishery (gillnet) Copper River District subsistence season open concurrently with commercial openers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Commercial fishermen who are subsistence users will continue to only be able to participate in the fishery as a personal use participant.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All subsistence users, commercial fishermen form Area E, residents only.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Tom Carpenter

(HQ-08F-285)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 01.610(x). Fishing seasons; 5 AAC 01.647. Copper River Subsistence Salmon Fisheries Management Plans; and 5 AAC 01.648. Prince William Sound Subsistence Salmon Fisheries Management Plans. This proposal would amend these regulations as follows:

5 AAC 01.647(j) **Repealed.**

5 AAC 01.647(j) [SALMON MAY BE TAKEN FOR SUBSISTENCE PURPOSES IN THE WATERS OF THE COPPER RIVER DISTRICT DESCRIBED IN 5 AAC 24.200, ONLY AS FOLLOWS:

(1) SALMON MAY BE TAKEN ONLY WITH GILLNETS NO LONGER THAN 50 FATHOMS;

(2) SALMON MAY BE TAKEN ONLY FROM MAY 15 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30;

(3) FISHING PERIODS ARE

(A) FROM MAY 15 UNTIL TWO DAYS BEFORE THE COMMERCIAL OPENING OF THE COPPER RIVER DISTRICT, SEVEN DAYS PER WEEK;

(B) DURING THE COMMERCIAL SALMON FISHING SEASON, ONLY DURING OPEN COMMERCIAL SALMON FISHING PERIODS;

(C) FROM TWO DAYS FOLLOWING THE CLOSURE OF THE COMMERCIAL SALMON FISHING SEASON UNTIL SEPTEMBER 30, SEVEN DAYS PER WEEK.]

5 AAC 01.648(a)(3), (a)(4), (b)(3), and (b)(4) are **repealed.**

5 AAC 01.648(a)(3) [SALMON MAY BE TAKEN ONLY FROM MAY 15 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30;

(a)(4) FISHING PERIODS ARE,

(A) FROM MAY 15 UNTIL TWO DAYS BEFORE THE COMMERCIAL OPENING OF THE SOUTHWESTERN DISTRICT, SEVEN DAYS PER WEEK;

(B) DURING THE COMMERCIAL SALMON FISHING SEASON, ONLY DURING OPEN COMMERCIAL SALMON FISHING PERIODS;

(C) FROM TWO DAYS FOLLOWING THE CLOSURE OF THE COMMERCIAL SALMON SEASON UNTIL SEPTEMBER 30, SEVEN DAYS PER WEEK;]

5 AAC 01.648(B)(3) [SALMON MAY BE TAKEN ONLY FROM MAY 15 THROUGH OCTOBER 31;

(b)(4) FISHING PERIODS ARE,

(A) FROM MAY 15 UNTIL TWO DAYS BEFORE THE COMMERCIAL OPENING OF THE EASTERN DISTRICT, SEVEN DAYS PER WEEK;

(B) DURING THE COMMERCIAL SALMON FISHING SEASON, ONLY DURING OPEN COMMERCIAL SALMON FISHING PERIODS;

(C) FROM TWO DAYS FOLLOWING THE CLOSURE OF THE COMMERCIAL SALMON SEASON UNTIL OCTOBER 31, SEVEN DAYS PER WEEK;]

5 AAC 01 is amended by adding a new section to read:

5AAC 01.610(x) Salmon may be taken for subsistence purposes in the waters of Prince William Sound described in 5 AAC 24.200, only as follows:

(1) salmon may be taken only from May 15 through October 31;

(2) fishing periods are

(A) from May 15 until two days before the commercial opening of that salmon district, seven days per week;

(B) during the commercial salmon fishing season, only during open commercial salmon fishing periods in that district;

(C) from two days following the closure of the commercial salmon fishing season in that district through October 31, seven days per week.

ISSUE: Fishing seasons are described separately under area management plans where they could be described in the general section. The fishing seasons outlined in the area management plans in PWS are nearly identical and would be better placed for clarity in the general Fishing seasons section (5AAC 01.610).

Currently, the ending dates for the subsistence seasons vary slightly in regulation. These are September 30th for the Copper River Subsistence Management Plans and the Tatitlek portion of the Prince William Sound Subsistence Fisheries Management Plans, and October 31 for the Chenega portion of the latter mentioned plan. The recommended language would change the ending date for both the Copper River and the Tatitlek subsistence fisheries to October 31.

In addition, 5 AAC 01.647(j) not only identifies the fishing season for the Copper River District, but also the legal subsistence gear type. The department has submitted a proposal to add a reference to 5 AAC 24.330 that defines legal gear types in the various districts in the Lawful gear and gear specifications of the subsistence chapter.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Prince William Sound and Copper River Area subsistence users will benefit from simplified regulatory language.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-317)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 01.648. PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND SUBSISTENCE SALMON FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PLANS. Amend regulation as follows, to eliminate the restriction on where subsistence permits may be issued.

- (a) (7) [PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED ONLY AT CHENEGA BAY VILLAGE.]
- (b) (7) [PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED ONLY AT TATITLEK VILLAGE.]

PROBLEM: This is a housekeeping proposal. The current regulation prohibits issuing subsistence permits for the subsistence salmon fisheries in Prince William Sound described in 5 AAC 01.648 except in the remote communities of Chenega Bay and Tatitlek. This prohibition was adopted prior to 1989, when only residents of these communities were eligible to participate in these subsistence fisheries. Since 1989, any Alaska resident may participate in these fisheries after obtaining a subsistence permit. In practice, since 1990, the department has issued permits for these fisheries in Cordova in addition to Tatitlek and Chenega Bay.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulation will require that subsistence fishery participants obtain permits in two remote locations, and the department practice of issuing permits in more accessible department offices will be out of compliance with the regulation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone wishing to participate in Prince William Sound subsistence salmon fisheries.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08F-062)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 01.630(e)(6). Subsistence fishing permits and 5 AAC 01.620 Lawful gear and gear specifications. This proposal would amend the regulation as follows:

Move 5 AAC 01.630(e)(6) to 5 AAC 01.620(c)(7).

ISSUE: This proposal is to clarify the regulations and provide easier access for all stakeholders.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Stakeholders in this fishery will benefit through better organized regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08-F-320)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 1.620. Lawful gear and gear specifications. Increase distance between fishwheels from 75 feet to 300 feet in Glennallen Subdistrict as follows:

Part C, Section (5)

a person may not set or operate a fish wheel within 300 feet of another fish wheel.

ISSUE: 75 feet is very close together when you think about all 1,000-1,200 fish wheels in the Glennallen subdistrict All crammed into mostly a few accessible key spots. 300 feet is still close but gives fish more of a chance to make it through.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the distance was increased to 300 feet it would drastically help give weaker stocks a chance to make it through. During a subsistence opener the fish wheels, are so effective especially when they cram in between one another in key spots that not many fish make it through on those days. So if a weaker stock happens to be going through to the Upper Copper, on one of those days they have a slim chance to make it there.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It gives the weaker less dominant stocks in the river a much better chance to make it all the way to the upper ends of tributaries that they spawn in.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who fish above fish wheels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who like to squeeze in between other fishermen.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Babic

(HQ-08F-006)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan. Prohibit dipnetting within 30 feet of fish wheel as follows:

Put harassment law reference in fishing regulations as is in hunting regulations page 21. On dipnetting and fishwheel permits; add: **Dipnetting within 30 feet of an operating fishwheel is prohibited.**

ISSUE: Dipnetters placing nets directly in front of an operating fishwheel. This violates as 16.05.790 hunter harassment law “intentionally obstructing or hindering another person lawful fishing.”

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hostilities between parties involved and potential for bodily harm.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, ensures equal chances for harvesting fish. Defuses potential hostilities beforehand.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Did ask them to move. Some did, some refused considered throwing them in the river or physically moving them. Decided fishing was better than jail.

PROPOSED BY: David A. Kacal

(I-08F-014)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 15 – 5 AAC 01.630(e)(9) Subsistence fishing permits and 5 AAC 01.645(a). Subsistence bag, possession, and size limits. This proposal would amend the regulation as follows:

Move 5 AAC 01.630(e)(9) to 5 AAC 01.645(a) and delete the current language in that section.

ISSUE: This proposal is to clarify the regulations and provide easier access for all stakeholders.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Stakeholders in this fishery will benefit through better organized regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08-F-322)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 01.645. Subsistence bag, possession, and size limits. Revise annual limits for subsistence fishery in Glennallen Subdistrict as follows:

Season limits for Subsistence salmon fishing in the Glennallen subdistrict 9

- (a) ... One person 15 salmon only 5 will be Chinook
- (b) ... two person 30 salmon
- (i) ... total of 50 salmon for a permit issued to a household with one person
- (ii) ... total of 100 salmon for a permit issued to a household of over one person

ISSUE: The current harvest limits for the Glennallen subdistrict subsistence fishery are not sustainable with unlimited participation in the fishery now allowed since the McDowell decision. There should be a consistent harvest limit on all subsistence fisheries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be an inconsistent limit between subsistence fisheries in the Glennallen subdistrict and the Cordova subdistrict. Over harvest and waste of resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal does not address quality of commercial products.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users because better management of the resource will ensure a sustainable run into the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Urban subsistence participants who want to catch more than the proposed limit. Most urban users can be provided adequate salmon with the proposed limits. Rural users can participate under the Federal guidelines for rural residents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Tier II system. Not considered adequate as it will be too labor intensive. Federal regulations provide for larger limits for rural residents with C&T.

PROPOSED BY: Ernie Allen

(SC-08F-030)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 01.630. Subsistence fishing permits. Eliminate permits for additional subsistence salmon in Glennallen Subdistrict as follows:

Repeal Part E, Section 9, Part D.

ISSUE: Currently anyone in the state can apply for and receive a permit for 200 salmon for a single person household, and 500 salmon for a 2 person household. This is a premium natural resource and if in the future just one person for every currently registered fishwheel in the Glennallen subdistrict. Received a 2 person permit like this it would solely account for every fish at the current goal. Also for a family of two to consume 500 salmon even of small to average size would require eating approximately 5.5 pounds of salmon fillet each day all year long. With limits already as generous as 5 king salmon plus 25 red salmon for a one person household, or 55 for 2 people plus 10 more per each additional member, that's 2.5 pounds of fillets for each member of the family per week, why would you need more than this?

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With growth like there is going on all over Alaska, and the accessibility of the river system, with person taking 200 or 500 salmon wouldn't be sustainable. Also, if the problem isn't solved large amounts of fish will be wasted every year.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes it improves the quality of the fish by paying more attention to each fish, getting the most out of them. Also, by having far less wasted in the garbage every May.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local people who already fish under federal permits, and will still be entitled to 500 salmon permits, but will have less competition from others.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Babic

(HQ-08F-005)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 24.360. Copper River District Salmon Management Plan. Modify Copper River management by adding monitoring programs as follows:

(b) The Department shall manage the Copper River District commercial salmon fishery, the Chitna subdistrict Personal use Fisher, the Glennallen Subdistrict Fishery, and the sport fishery to achieve an inriver goal of salmon, ...

The Chitna Subdistrict Personal Use Fishery, The Glennallen Subdistrict Subsistence Fishery and the sport fishery will be monitored closely by the department using the following methods:

(1) The department will establish a daily reporting system for these fisheries.

(2) Weekly summary and comparison of catch rates to predict.

(3) Weekly aerial survey of index spawning streams and comparison to expected historic levels. If the commissioner determines additional conservation measures are necessary to achieve the escapement goals, the commissioner may be emergency order, use the following management measures.

(4) Restrict fishing time.

(5) Restrict bag limits.

ISSUE: In the Copper River Management Plan, the department is only managing the commercial par of the fishery. If we are to make certain that the fish make it all the way to their spawning beds, there must be tools put in place that allow Fish and Game to control these other fisheries also.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fish will continue to pass the Miles Lake Sonar, and be counted as if all of them were going to make it to the spawning beds. As you can see it would help a lot if there were tools such as weekly aerial surveys to start compiling data that would be very useful in comparing future runs to. Also letting Fish and Game have subsistence catch numbers quickly would help them to make in season adjustments to fishing. Why only regulate one of the four different gear user groups on the river.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the proposal will help to better manage the fisher, up to date to current conditions, and keep it sustainable for years to come.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who uses the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Any one could possible suffer if the runs were extraordinarily weak, but that would be better than wiping out an already weak run.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Babic

(HQ-08F-010)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 01.630. Subsistence fishing permits. Require daily reporting of subsistence salmon harvests in Glennallen Subdistrict as follows:

Revise regulations to require daily harvest reporting for subsistence salmon fishing in the Glennallen subdistrict.

ISSUE: The current harvest reporting system does not provide timely or accurate harvest data and significantly under-reports harvest. This puts the fishery resource at risk because over harvest can occur without a system in place to track it. The significant harvest in these fisheries warrants daily harvest reporting for responsible management. State harvest records indicate substantial increase in participation. Limited reporting systems under-report harvest. Daily harvest reporting will allow responsible management of this valuable fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unreported harvest will continue. Management decisions will be made with inaccurate and untimely data. Minimum biological escapement levels will be jeopardized. Over fishing will not be managed. Harvest in excess of allocation levels will continue to occur. Allocation decisions will be made with inaccurate information. Spawning escapement will be overestimated putting the salmon runs at risk of collapse to the detriment of all user groups and the public.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Daily harvest reporting will allow better management of the resource and this will insure that the resource is sustainable. Daily harvest data will allow better information for timing of participation in the fishery over time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users because better management of the resource will insure a sustainable run into the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Users who have a difficult time with daily reporting. This can be overcome with a compliance assistance program and a strong education component.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Staying with the current system. Current system is not working. Current post season harvest reporting systems has a 6 month to a year lag time, is questionable as to accuracy, significantly under reports harvest and provides little in season data to managers and the public.

PROPOSED BY: Bill Webber, Jr.

(SC-08F-031)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 01.630. Subsistence fishing permits. Change reporting period for Glenallen Subdistrict from October 31 to within 48 hours from catch as follows:

I would like to change the reporting time from October 31 to 48 hours from the time the fish are landed till they are reported to the department.

(e) The following apply to Glennallen Subdistrict subsistence salmon fishing permits:

(3) permits must be returned to the department [NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 31] **48 hours from the time the fish are landed** , or a permit for the following year may be denied as provided in 5 AAC 01.015(c).

ISSUE: At this time permits can be returned to the department until October 31, this means there is no way of knowing what has been harvested until after the date.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With the current reporting system there is no way to know what has been landed until after October 31.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, more fish will be reported and the run progress would be easier tracked during the season. It will provide a better basis for upriver management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People that are concerned about what the catches are on the upper rive during the fishing season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People that have to report what they harvest when they harvest it.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Check station, or more river enforcement.

PROPOSED BY: Tyee Lohse

(HQ-08F-013)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 01.620. LAWFUL GEAR AND GEAR SPECIFICATIONS.

Allow retention of rockfish and lingcod taken incidentally in other subsistence fisheries as follows:

(h) Groundfish may be taken only by a single hand-held line, or a single longline, none of which may have more than five hooks attached to it, **except that lingcod taken incidentally in another subsistence finfish fishery may be retained for subsistence purposes subject to the limitations described in 5 AAC 01.610(f) and 5 AAC 01.645 (d), and rockfish taken incidentally in another subsistence finfish fishery may be retained for subsistence purposes subject to the limitations described in 5 AAC 01.645(e).**

PROBLEM: This proposal addresses the mandatory discarding of rockfish and lingcod taken in the subsistence halibut fishery. Subsistence regulations for the Prince William Sound Area specify that groundfish, including rockfish and lingcod, may only be taken by a single hand troll, single hand-held line, or a single longline, none of which may have more than five hooks attached to it. Current federal subsistence halibut regulations allow for the use of up to 30 hooks per person, for eligible individuals who have obtained a Subsistence Halibut Registration Certificate from the National Marine Fisheries Service. Subsistence halibut fishers occasionally catch rockfish and lingcod on subsistence halibut gear with more hooks than currently allowed under state subsistence regulations for groundfish in the Prince William Sound Area. This proposal would allow subsistence-caught rockfish and lingcod to be retained up to the daily bag limit in the Prince William Sound Area when harvested with gear that is legal in other subsistence fisheries but not allowed for the directed harvest of rockfish and lingcod. The Board of Fisheries has found that rockfish and lingcod in the Prince William Sound Area outside the boundary of the nonsubsistence area defined in 5 AAC 99.015(a)(5) are customarily and traditionally taken or used for subsistence, and has established amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence uses of these fish stocks (5 AAC 01.616(c)(d)).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence halibut fishers would continue to be unable to legally retain rockfish and lingcod caught while legally subsistence fishing for halibut with more than five hooks. Discard of rockfish and lingcod would result in waste of a resource used for subsistence purposes. Additional subsistence harvest effort on rockfish and lingcod could result if subsistence fishers are required to discard their incidental harvests in the subsistence halibut fishery.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People subsistence fishing for halibut, rockfish, and lingcod.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-334)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan. Increase annual limit of sockeye salmon when surplus is available as follows:

Supplement the basic limit for a family of more than two: May take ten (10) sockeye for each additional family member after the original limit of thirty (30) salmon have been taken.

ISSUE: Delete the supplement that permits the taking of ten additional sockeye salmon when a weekly surplus of 50,000 or greater exists in the Chitina Sub-District. Paper work, tracking and notification are not justified by the few additional fish harvested – which would be well within present allocation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen will have to wait week by week to see if 50,000 fish have passed the counter.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Families of more than two people who harvest additional salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A single/individual dip-netter.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leave as-is.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee and Chitina Dipnetters Association (I-08F-004)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan. Change time period for assessing sonar counts to trigger supplemental periods in sockeye personal use fishery as follows:

When the Department determines a consecutive seven day period of 50,000 or more harvestable salmon, the Commissioner shall establish by emergency order, seven day consecutive periods during which the Department shall issue a supplemental permit for ten additional sockeye salmon to a permit holder who has met the annual limit. Further supplemental periods will only be triggered by an additional 50,000 or more harvestable surplus occurring after the last day of the seven day period which triggered the previous supplemental period.

ISSUE: Currently the supplemental periods for the Chitina Personal Use Dip-Net Fishery are triggered by a weekly (Monday-Sunday) harvestable surplus of 50,000 or more salmon. If the daily surplus, as established by the Miles Lake Sonar, begins on a Wednesday and 50,000 or more harvestable surplus pass the counter by the following Monday no supplemental period is triggered because the 50,000 target did not occur during a consecutive Monday-Sunday period.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Personal Use Dip-Netters will be denied a supplemental period only because the 50,000 or more harvestable surplus did not occur during a specific Monday-Sunday period.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chitina Personal Use Dip-Netters will likely see more occurrences of supplemental periods during run periods of high harvestable surplus.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one since these fish are harvestable surplus.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee and Chitina Dipnetters Association (I-08F-005)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management. Restrict additional permits for Chitina Subdistrict personal use fishing if commercial harvests are restricted as follows:

Section (F) The maximum harvest level for the Chitina Subdistrict personal use salmon fishery is 100,000-150,000 salmon, not including any salmon in excess of the inriver goal or salmon taken after August 31. If the Copper River District commercial salmon fishery is closed for **8** [13] or more consecutive days, the maximum harvest level in the Chitina Subdistrict is reduced to 50,000 salmon **and no supplemental permits for additional salmon may be issued for the rest of the year.**

ISSUE: If the run was weak enough to have to close the commercial fishery for even a week of fishing, it is unjustifiable to keep all in river harvest the same, or issue additional supplemental permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? During a run that is weak enough to warrant closing the commercial fishery for 8 or more consecutive days

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it helps in times of shortage as a safeguard against over harvesting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Babic

(HQ-08F-007)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan: and 5 AAC 52.024. Harvest record required; annual limit. Increase personal use limit for king salmon and change recording requirement as follows:

Raise the king salmon limit in the Personal Use Fishery to four (4) kings per permit (family), after the first king is harvested, require each additional king to be recorded on the back of a permittee's sport fish license by date and identified by adding "PU"(it is now required to record kings harvested in the sport fishery). Kings recorded on the sport fishing license count against the seasonal Sport Fishing limit for the Gulkana and Klutina Rivers. This proposal would take away the perceived "need" to catch additional kings for the freezer by sport fishing. No allocation changes would be required.

ISSUE: King salmon limit in the personal use "family" permit fishery on the Copper River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? For two-thirds of the season families commonly fish for red salmon in the personal use fishery including the one king salmon they are allowed. The sport fishing licenses needed for the PU fishery allows each family member to harvest four king salmon in Copper River sport fishery. Instead of requiring those who want more than one king to have to participate in two upriver fisheries, allow them to choose which fishery to harvest from. Alaskan families limited to one king in the PU fishery often head north stopping to sport fish for another king or two to obtain the amount they feel is necessary for the freezer. The impact to the sport fishery streams, mainly the Klutina and Gulkana, is significant on most weekends. This is a growing activity and will continue to negatively impact the sport fishery in time. Personal use kings are mixed stock with respect to spawning streams with up a high percentage headed for spawning streams like the Chitina River where they have no sport fishing harvest. Most sport caught kings are taken in the Gulkana and Klutina with a much lesser harvest on other streams (Chistochina, Tonsina, Tazlina) are not part of the additional harvest.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? These fishermen are fishing on the same resource. There is high potential to raise the sport harvest because of large groups of fishermen taking additional fish. The Copper River Chinook escapements are not high in recent years (since the establishment of the escapement goals). Less fish would be caught in total if they could be caught in the PU Fishery. Kings bound for non-sport fishing streams would be harvested in PU. Quality would be better because the fish are much lower in the drainage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The sport fishermen in the Copper River Drainage would benefit by not having competition from PU fishermen on sport fishing streams.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One king for each dip-netter rather than per permit. If the same dip-netter goes sport fishing on the way home, his limit is one in possession. This could result in a larger harvest over-all and cause re-allocation.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee

(I-08F-007)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan. Require record of fish caught and passengers transported for boat use in personal use fishery as follows:

A boat having transported personal use fisherman will record and keep record of the people transported, fish species, amount retained, and area caught.

ISSUE: The commercialization of the personal use dipnet fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The continued lack of data on the effects of guide/transporters on the personal use fishery, i.e. expanded area and effort.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of the Copper River salmon resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides disguised as taxi vessels.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limit guides. Board of Fisheries has no authority.

PROPOSED BY: Shawn Gilman

(HQ-08F-040)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan. Open the Chitina River to dip-netting as follows:

(h) For the purposes of this section, the Chitina Sub district consists of all waters of the mainstream Copper River from the downstream edge of the Chitina-McCarthy Road Bridge downstream to an east-west line crossing the Copper River as designated by ADF&G regulatory markers located approximately 200 yards upstream of Haley Creek. **And all waters of the Chitina River downstream of the confluence of the Kuskulana River.**

ISSUE: The recent radio telemetry study done by ADF&G has confirmed that very large numbers of salmon run up the Chitina River. This is a run of salmon in a major river that is now unused by in-river fishers. By allowing dip netting in the Chitina River it would spread out the effort over a larger area while not increasing the overall take. Shifting some of the dip net fishery to the Chitina will also ease some of the pressure on runs bound for Upper Copper Sport and Subsistence fisheries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The large run of salmon bound for the Chitina River will be under-utilized.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents that want to get away from the crowds on in the Copper dip-net fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Also allow a state subsistence fish-wheel fishery.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee; Matanuska. Valley Advisory Committee; Fairbanks Advisory Committee, and South Central Alaska Dip-netters Association
(SC-08F-026)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 27.310. Fishing seasons and periods for Prince William Sound. This proposal would amend the regulation as follows:

(b) **From October 1 through January 31, herring may be taken for food and bait only during periods established by emergency order** [HERRING MAY BE TAKEN FOR FOOD AND BAIT FROM OCTOBER 1 THROUGH JANUARY 31].

ISSUE: Currently the spring sac roe season, the spring spawn on kelp not in pounds and the spawn on kelp in closed or open pounds are only open during periods established by emergency order (5 AAC 27.310 (a, c, and d)). However, the food and bait fishery is open from October 1 through January 31 (5 AAC 27.310 (b)). The difference means that the department must specifically close the food and bait fishery each season. The herring fishery has been closed for twelve of the last fourteen seasons because the population has been below the 22,000 ton threshold of spawning biomass. This amendment would make all the regulatory language and management of Prince William Sound herring fisheries consistent.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to close this fishery annually until the Prince William Sound herring population rebounds from the current trend of below threshold spawning biomass.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Area E commercial herring permit holders will benefit from the increased clarity of the regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08F-330)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 28.210. Fishing seasons for Prince William Sound Area. Expand season for sablefish in Prince William Sound area to four months as follows:

(b) Sablefish may be taken in the inside district from **May 1 through August 31** [APRIL 7 THROUGH MAY 15 AND AUGUST 1 THROUGH AUGUST 21 IN ANY YEAR AFTER 2003]. There is no open fishery for commercial sablefish fishing in the outside district.

ISSUE: Historically PWS sablefish were harvested in the early spring probably to coincide with the Asian holidays and markets. This is no longer a significant factor, but the intense depredation by PWS orcas is now the major issue at this time of year. Once salmon begin appearing in the region in May the orcas focus on this food source and do not interact with the sablefish harvesters over the summer. Concepts that were used when this was a ‘derby fishery’ no longer need be applied to a limited entry fishery. In recent years approximately 30% of the annual quota is taken in the two month spring period and 70% taken in the one month late summer period.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There is a fear that the amount of sablefish taken by orcas in the March and April period will eventually be subtracted from the harvest available to the fisherman. Biologists acknowledge that the actual amount of fish depredated by orcas is unknown and could only be estimated. There may be negative opinions and actions expressed by organizations and persons who see any interaction between marine mammals and fishermen and their gear as an issue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It appears that the buyers in Cordova, Seward, Whittier, and Valdez are satisfied with the quality of the product as it is harvested now and that this change would not have any negative effect on that quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The majority of the PWS sablefish permit holders would have a longer season and solid block of time to pursue the fishery with no or minimal orca conflicts. Organizations or persons who see the interaction between fishermen and marine mammals as a negative issue. Those who combine sablefish and halibut harvests on the same trip will find more halibut to harvest in the summer months. The four month season still allows for dispersed fishing effort and a chance for the fish to move around.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Persons who fish in other areas of the state who are only able to fish their PWS black cod permit in the early spring. ADF&G may need to have additional resources to continue their dockside sampling program with a somewhat longer season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? It has been suggested that getting a large number of boats to ‘pulse’ fish in the early spring would spread out the individual risk of orca depredation. This has been rejected because under the limited entry system people tend to follow their own schedule of fishing and want no loss to orcas. The status quo does not address the orca situation and for the past few years has resulted in emergency orders to lengthen the August season to allow for the harvest of the remaining 70% of the quota. Emergency orders are not a desirable way to manage this type of limited entry fishery. Pot fishing for sablefish has not proven to be very efficient or cost effective as a harvest method in this fishery though it does eliminate the depredation loss.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Herbert (HQ-08F-018)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 28.210. Fishing seasons for the Prince William Sound Area. Modify season dates for sablefish fishery in Prince William Sound to reduce whale interactions as follows:

5 AAC 28.210 Fishing seasons for Prince William Sound Area

(b) Sablefish may be taken in the inside district from April 15 through August 31 in 2003, and from **April 15 through August 31** [FROM MARCH 15 AND MAY 15 THROUGH AUGUST 21 IN ANY YEAR AFTER 2003].

ISSUE: Killer Whale depredation in the PWS Sablefish Fishery has made it increasingly difficult for permit holders to harvest their annual quota under the current season structure. March 15 through May 15 and August 1 through August 21. These opening and closing dates agreed upon by ADF&G and fishermen in 2002 were thought to provide adequate time for the harvest of Sablefish in the newly created quota fishery. However, with documented whale depredation occurring in each and every year since this regulation was adopted, (most notably in March and early April), an adjustment to the current fishing season is warranted. Eliminating the closure from May 15 through July 31 would provide new fishing opportunity in the summer months when increased vessel traffic and the arrival of other food sources are believed to reduce whale interactions. There are absolutely no biological reasons that would prevent this fishery from remaining open throughout May, June and July. Furthermore, being a quota fishery, there are not conservation concerns. And finally with the waters of PWS already open to longlining (for the Halibut IFQ fishery) from early March through November 15 there would be no additional burden placed on enforcement officers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Permit holders will continue to attempt to harvest their quota in the early season when the risk of losing sablefish and halibut to whales is high.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All permit holders, sablefish resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Permit holders who wish to begin fishing March 15. Killer whales seeking a free lunch.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Season open April 15 – November 15. Unclear if ADF&G would support it.

PROPOSED BY: Richard Casciano, Cordova District Fishermen United (HQ-08F-155)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 28.220. Permits for Prince William Sound Area (a) and 5 AAC 28.272. Sablefish harvest, possession and landing requirements for Prince William Sound Area (e),(f).

5 AAC 28.220. Permits for Prince William Sound Area (a). Repealed

5 AAC 28.272 is amended by adding new subsection to read:

(e) prior to landing sablefish, fishermen must provide the department with at least 6 hours prior notice by telephoning a dedicated number specified by the department at the time of registration and reporting 1) location of landing, 2) buyer or processor, 3) estimated time of arrival, 4) estimated number of pounds of sablefish onboard, and 5) specify if the catch is whole or dressed fish.

(f) sablefish longline log sheets as issued at the time of registration, must be completed, signed and returned to the department within 10 days after each landing, either by mail to ADF&G (P.O. Box 669, Cordova, AK. 99574), or fax to a number specified by the department at the time of registration.

ISSUE: This proposal would remove the commissioner's permit requirement from regulation 5 AAC 28.220(a) and add provisions of the commissioner's permit to regulation 5 AAC 28.272 as follows:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Provisions of the commissioner's permit will remain without the authority of regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not applicable

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen and others that are considering participating in the fishery will benefit from the availability of a complete regulatory reference.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-343)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 28.210(c) Fishing Seasons for Prince William Sound Area. Allow retention of lingcod in the Prince William Sound groundfish fisheries as follows:

5 AAC 28.210. Section C: **The directed lingcod fishery will open July 1 to December 1. Vessels engaged in any PWS groundfish fisheries and in possession of any State of Alaska groundfish permit may retain up to 10% dressed weight of lingcod as bycatch in other directed fisheries. This amendment to 5 AAC 28.210. Section C will commence 1/1/2009 and expire 12/31/2012.**

ISSUE: Section 1 of 5 AAC 28.089 states: conservation of the groundfish resource to ensure sustained yield which requires that the allowable catch in any fishery be based upon the biological abundance of the stock.

5 AAC 28.210. Section C pg. 29 Section C states lingcod may be taken only from July 1 through December 31. The problem the board needs to address is that the PWS Lingcod fishery is not being managed in accordance with 5 AAC 28.089. Anecdotal evidence strongly suggests that the lingcod biomass could support a fishery far greater than what is currently allowed. Such evidence further suggests that lingcod populations are expanding rapidly westward. Current lingcod TACs are derived from an average of the catches of the previous years and have no relation to the actual biomass either current or former.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? ADF&G assessment of lingcod stock abundance will continue to have no basis in reality.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Our local biologists who will finally receive the data necessary to make a realistic assessment of lingcod stocks.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Waiting for ADF&G to make a survey and come up with a realistic stock assessment. So far that has not been effective.

PROPOSED BY: Robert A. Smith (HQ-08F-111)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 55.xxx. New section. Allow retention of lingcod caught incidental to drift gillnet salmon fishery when lingcod season is open as follows:

(j) In the Copper River and Bering Districts, legal sized lingcod that are caught incidentally in the drift gillnet salmon fishery may be retained and possessed for personal use or sale when the lingcod season is open. Lingcod retained for personal use or sale must be reported on the fish ticket.

ISSUE: Clarify regulations regarding the retention and possession of lingcod caught incidentally in the Copper River and Bering River Districts of the Copper River drift gillnet salmon fishery. Lack of clarity in the regulations results in wastage, non-reporting of harvest, and fisheries violations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Drift gillnet salmon fishermen will remain uncertain about when they can retain their incidental catch of lingcod, whether they can retain any size of lingcod, and whether or not the incidental catch can be sold. This results in a waste of the resource, and the take of lingcod goes unreported.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Drift gillnet salmon fishermen, processors and consumers will benefit from the increased utilization of the resource. ADF&G will benefit from improved reporting of the incidental catch of lingcod.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who participate in the directed fishery for lingcod, or harvest lingcod incidental to halibut, will see a reduction in their catch if the incidental catch in the drift gillnet salmon fishery comes out of the total commercial GHL.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow the retention of all legal sized lingcod regardless of whether the lingcod season is open. Rejected because it creates an incentive to retain fish that could be returned alive before spawning is completed, and because it is inconsistent with season dates for the directed lingcod fishery.

PROPOSED BY: Cordova District Fishermen United, Groundfish Division (SC-08F-034)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 28.267. Prince William Sound Pacific Cod Management Plan.
Amend regulation to allow for open and closures by emergency order in the Pacific cod fishery follows:

5 AAC 28.267 section B will be amended to read as follows: Each year the commissioner shall open and close, by emergency order, a parallel season in PWSA to coincide with the initial federal season in the federal **Eastern** [CENTRAL] Gulf of Alaska Area. The commissioner shall open and close, by emergency order, the parallel season during which the use of the small gear allowed in the federal **Eastern** [CENTRAL] Gulf of Alaska Area Pacific Cod season is permitted unless use of that gear is prohibited under 5 AAC 28.050 or 5 AAC 28.230.

ISSUE: Under current Pacific cod management the Prince William Sound (PWS) parallel season is managed to coincide with the initial federal season in the federal Central Gulf of Alaska area. Because the PWS parallel P cod season now typically close before the P cod biomass is present in PWS, catches of P cod in PWS have declined from a high of 1.35 million pounds in 1992 to 10,223 pounds in 2005. Additionally the current PWS guideline harvest level (GHL) is 10% of the Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area (EGOA) total allowable catch (TAC) but management mirrors fishing seasons in the Central Gulf of Alaska Area (CGOAA). This management regime is in conflict with 5 AAC 28.089. Guiding principles for groundfish fishery regulations section 5 which states “extension of the length of fishing seasons by methods and means and time and area restrictions to provide for maximum benefit to the state and to the regions and local areas of the state.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The PWS parallel season will continue to not exist due to the fact that it’s management coincides with the CGOAA instead of the EGOAA so the PWS GHL will continue to remain untouched.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Pacific cod fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered waiting for ADF&G to adhere to 5 AAC 28.089 Section 5 more closely but that strategy has been ineffective.

PROPOSED BY: Robert A. Smith (HQ-08F-108)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 28.267. Prince William Sound Pacific Cod Management Plan.
Modify opening of Pacific cod fishery as follows:

5 AAC 28.267 section B will be amended to read as follows: Each year the commissioner shall open and close, by emergency order, a parallel season in PWS Area **east of a line at 147° west longitude** to coincide with the initial federal season in the federal **Eastern** [CENTRAL] Gulf of Alaska Area. Each year the commissioner shall open and close, by emergency order, a parallel season in the PWS Area **west fo a line at 147° longitude** to coincide with the parallel season during which the use of the same gear allowed in the federal Central Gulf of Alaska Area Pacific Cod season is permitted unless use of that gear is prohibited under 5 AAC 28.050 or 5 AAC 28.230.

ISSUE: Under current Pacific cod (P cod) management the Prince William Sound (PWS) parallel season is managed to coincide with the initial federal season in the federal Central Gulf of Alaska area. Because the PWS parallel P cod season now typically close before the P cod biomass is present in PWS, catches of P cod in PWS have declined from a high of 1.35 million pounds in 1992 to 10,223 pounds in 2005. Additionally the current PWS guideline harvest level (GHL) is 10% of the Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area (EGOA) total allowable catch (TAC) but management mirrors fishing seasons in the Central Gulf of Alaska Area (CGOAA). This management regime is in conflict with 5 AAC 28.089. Guiding principles for groundfish fishery regulations section 5 which states “extension of the length of fishing seasons by methods and means and time and area restrictions to provide for maximum benefit to the state and to the regions and local areas of the state”.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The PWS parallel season will continue to not exist due to the fact that its management coincides with the CGOAA instead of the EGOAA so the PWS GHL will continue to remain untouched.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Pacific Cod fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered waiting for ADF&G to adhere to 5 AAC 28.089 Section 5 more closely but that strategy has been ineffective.

PROPOSED BY: Robert A. Smith

(HQ-08F-109)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 28.267. Prince William Sound Pacific Cod Management Plan. Allow retention of Pacific cod in Prince William Sound halibut fishery as follows:

5 AAC 28.XXX PWS Pacific Cod Management Plan Section J. **Vessels engaged in longlining halibut in PWS Area may retain P cod if they are in possession of a miscellaneous finfish permit and the state waters season is open or a parallel season is open.**

ISSUE: Current management is in conflict with 5 AAC Section 2 which reads: minimization of bycatch of other associated fish and shellfish and prevention of the localized depletion of stocks. It is also in conflict with 5 AAC Section 5. The problem is that vessel engaged in longlining halibut are required to discard Pacific Cod (P cod) or forfeit proceeds to the state even though the state waters fishery is open.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The PWS Guideline Harvest Level (GHL) will continue to not be reached and vessels harvesting longline halibut will be required by ADF&G to continue to discard P cod caught during halibut fishing in spite of the fact that P cod GHL's have never been reached and in spite of the fact that 5 AAC 28.089 Section 2 mandates the minimization of bycatch and spite of the fact the 5 ACC 28.029/section 5 allows maximum benefit to the state and to regions and local areas of the state.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Vessels who target both P cod and halibut.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The PWS P cod fleet which currently does not exist.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Waiting for management policies which more closely adheres to 5 AAC 28.089. This solution was rejected because such a strategy has not been proven effective.

PROPOSED BY: Robert A. Smith

(HQ-08F-110)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 20.xxx. New regulation. Allow incidental harvest of Pacific cod in directed halibut fishery and state waters blackcod fishery in Prince William Sound as follows:

In the directed halibut fishery and the State waters blackcod fishery in the PWS management area, the allowable incidental catch of Pacific cod shall not exceed 20% of the round weight of halibut and sablefish on board the vessel. In these fisheries the combination of all other retained incidental groundfish species shall not exceed 20% of the round weight of halibut and sablefish on board.

ISSUE: Increase the retention and utilization of Pacific cod caught incidentally in the directed halibut and blackcod fisheries in PWS. Pacific cod caught incidentally in these fisheries are sometimes harvested in excess of the 20% incidental catch rate that is allowed for all groundfish species combined. This results in the waste of the resource because fish are discarded at sea. At the same time, in recent years the resources has not been fully harvested in either the Federal parallel fishery or the State waters fishery. The harvest of Pacific cod in the Federal parallel fishery has declined from over 1 million pounds in the early 1990s to under 100,000 lbs in recent years, because the TAC is caught by the fleets out west before the fish move into PWS. In the State waters Pacific cod fishery, the harvest has been consistently under the GHL; in 2002 there was no harvest, and in 2007 only about 1/3 of the GHL was taken.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Pacific cod, which are not fully harvested under either the directed Federal parallel fishery, or the directed State waters fishery, will continue to be harvested in excess of the allowable incidental catch rate and discarded at sea. This is a waste of the resource and a loss of income to fishermen at a time of rising costs and strong Pacific cod prices.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen who participate in the directed halibut fishery and state waters blackcod fishery in PWS. Processors, communities and consumers of Pacific cod. ADF&G and NMFS benefit from improved reporting of the Pacific cod harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There is a potential for an increase in the amount of lingcod to be retained because the bycatch rate of Pacific cod would be separated from all other groundfish species. Any increase in the lingcod catch would come off the lingcod GHL. The regulations of rockfish retention would stay the same. The increase in Pacific cod retention would not come off the State waters GHL, it would come off the Federal TAC in the CGOA, under current regulations. The new regulations are not likely to increase effort in the directed halibut fishery in PWS because it's not significant enough to attract new effort.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase the aggregate incidental catch rate for all groundfish species from 20% to 40%. Rejected because it would significantly increase the allowable catch for lingcod, and is not as clean a solution as separating the incidental catch allowed for Pacific cod from that allowed for all other species.

PROPOSED BY: Cordova District Fishermen United, Groundfish Division (SC-08F-036)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 28.267. Prince William Sound Pacific Cod Management Plan. Amend the regulation to open eastern section of outside district of Prince William Sound Area to harvest of Pacific cod during state waters pot and jig fishery as follows:

5 AAC 28.267 section (e) part (3). Pacific cod may be taken in all waters of the Prince William Sound district as described in 5 AAC 28.205.

ISSUE: The Eastern section of the outside district of the PWS areas as described in 5 AAC 28.205 is closed to the harvest of P-Cod during the state waters pot and jig fishery. There is no biological or allocative reason for this closure.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Participant in the state waters P-cod fishery will be denied opportunity to fish this area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Participants in the Prince William Sound state waters P-cod fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Curt Herschleb (HQ-08F-247)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 28.250 (b). Allow fishing for Pacific cod in state waters near Cordova as follows:

And within Orca Bay, east of a line from Johnstone Point north to Knowles Head, except for those areas closed to protect crab stocks.

ISSUE: Waters closed to pot fishing for Pacific cod restrict fishing opportunities closer to Cordova for smaller vessels that may wish to participate in the State waters Pacific cod fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishing opportunities in general will remain restricted, and harvest of the State waters GHL for Pacific cod will remain low. In the State waters Pacific cod fishery, the harvest has been consistently under the GHL; in 2002 there was no harvest, and in 2007 only about 1/3 of the GHL was taken.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen from Cordova, particularly in smaller vessels, who are looking for fishing opportunities. Processors, the community, and consumers of cod.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one that we can think of.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open a larger area in the eastern portion of Prince William Sound. Rejected because waters in much of the eastern PWS are deeper than 75 fathoms, and there would likely be concerns over impacts on crab stocks.

PROPOSED BY: Cordova District Fishermen United, Groundfish Division (SC-08F-035)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 28.220(b). Permits for Prince William Sound Area and 5 AAC 28.263(e),(f),(g),(h). Prince William Sound Pollock Pelagic Trawl Management Plan.

5 AAC 28.220(b). Permits for Prince William Sound Area. Repealed.

5 AAC 28.263 is amended by adding new subsections to read:

(e) A participant must check-in prior to fishing, and check-out prior to departing the management area. Participants must also check-in prior to fishing a new management section. Check-in and check-out contacts are specified by the department at the time of registration.

(f) Catch reports must be submitted to the department as specified at the time of registration.

(g) Log sheets, provided by the department at the time of registration, must be completed immediately following each tow, with signed copies submitted within 10 days after each landing to the department's Cordova office by U.S. mail or via fax.

(h) The commissioner may require an onboard observer on a vessel during fishing operations.

ISSUE: This proposal would remove the commissioner's permit requirement from regulation 5 AAC 28.220(b) and add provisions of the commissioner's permit to regulation 5 AAC 28.263 as follows:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Provisions of the commissioner's permit will remain without the authority of regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not applicable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen and others that are considering participating will benefit from the availability of a complete regulatory reference.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-342)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 28.210. Fishing seasons for Prince William Sound Area. Open commercial season year round for skate in Prince William Sound and Copper River Delta as follows:

The state waters of the Copper River Delta and Prince William Sound would be open year round to a commercial skate fishery.

ISSUE: Open a skate fishery. There is not a skate fishery because the skate were given to the trawl fleet as by catch. Allowing the trawlers to catch skate doesn't do one bit of good for Cordova.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Cordova will continue to suffer economically. The skates on the Copper River Delta and PWS are feeding on millions of small crab. The trawl fleet doesn't work the Copper River Delta and PWS. The crab stocks will not recover until some of the predators are harvested.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would help the crab come back.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local communities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Bob Henrichs

(SC-08F-041)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 28.084. Fishing seasons, landing requirements, and utilization for sharks; and 28.2XX. New section. Allow retention of spiny dogfish in longline fishery as follows:

5 AAC 28.084(b) For the purpose of this section sharks are species of the order *lamniformes*, *squaliformes* and *carcharhiniformes*, **with the exception of spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*).**

5 AACXXX Vessel longlining in the PWS Area with a miscellaneous finfish permit may retain spiny dogfish.

ISSUE: Current miscellaneous finfish management is clearly in conflict with Section 1 of 5 AAC 28.089 Guiding Principles for Groundfish Fishery Regulations which states: conservation of the groundfish resource to ensure sustained yield, which requires that the allowable catch in any fishery be based upon the biological abundance of the stock. 5 AAC 28.089 Section 2 Current miscellaneous finfish management may also be in conflict with Section 5 of 5AAC 28.089 which states: extension of the length of fishing seasons by methods and means and time and area restrictions to provide for the maximum benefit to the state and to regions and local area of the state. Populations of spiny dogfish have proliferated throughout the PWS Area to the point that they are adversely impacting both longline and salmon fisheries. Dogfish may also be negatively affecting species such as shrimp, crab and herring. Currently dogfish is only allowed to be retained as bycatch with other species whose biological abundance is unrelated to dogfish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Dogfish will continue to proliferate, ADF&G will continue to require that this resource be wasted and other fisheries and other species will continue to be negatively impacted.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Miscellaneous finfish fishermen. All fisheries negatively impacted by spiny dogfish, any species that may be negatively affected by dogfish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Waiting for management in accordance with 5 AAC 28.089 but such strategies have not been proven effective.

PROPOSED BY: Robert A. Smith

(HQ-08F-106)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 28.089. Guiding principles for groundfish fishery regulations.
Delete portions of groundfish guiding principles as follows:

5 AAC 28.089 – delete Sections 1, 2, and 5.

ISSUE: Current management is not in compliance with Section 1 of 5 AAC 28.089 which requires conditions etc. based upon biological abundance. Current management is not in accordance with Section 2. Current management is not in accordance with Section 5.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Eventually fishermen will read the regulation book and see that ADF&G is begging to get sued.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local biologists who do not and have not complied with 5 AAC 28.089 in the PWS Area for the last 15 years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The same people who have been suffering for the last 15 years with no Pacific cod, no lingcod, no shrimp, no crab, so skate, and no dogfish fisheries.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? It would be much safer for the state and ADF&G to just delete these sections since trying to get local biologists to comply with 5 AAC 28.089 is about as easy as trying to poke a cat out from under a porch with a wet rope.

PROPOSED BY: James O. Smith

(HQ-08F-107)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 31.260 Prince William Sound Pot Shrimp Fishery Management Plan. Establish a commercial shrimp pot fishery management plan as follows:

Establish a commercial shrimp pot fishery management plan.

ISSUE: The Prince William Sound (PWS) shrimp pot fishery was closed by emergency order from 1992 until 2000 when the Alaska Board of Fisheries adopted a regulation closing the fishery. The department has annually conducted shrimp pot surveys from 1989 until the present. Survey catches have slowly increased and this proposal seeks to establish a commercial shrimp pot fishery management plan that uses survey data to identify criteria under which a fishery could occur, and establish management controls necessary for the redevelopment and sustainability of the fishery through the board process. Management plan elements will consider season dates, gear definitions and limits, fishing and closure areas, catch reporting requirements, potential user group conflicts and key components of shrimp life history.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The fishery will remain closed until such time as a management plan is implemented.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resource users that wish to know when a fishery will occur.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08F-341)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 31.210. Shrimp pot fishing seasons for Registration Area E; and 5 AAC 31.260. Prince William Sound Pot Shrimp Fishery Management Plan. Open a commercial pot shrimp fishery and require exclusive registration as follows:

Open the commercial pot shrimp fishery. Seasons separated by three days from the sport season. We suggest April 1 to May 12, and September 4 to December 15. Set a GHL according to past commercial fishery performance until a new management plan is adopted. Require exclusive registration such that commercial pot shrimp vessels registered for PWS may not participate in the PWS Sport harvest. Create sport fish exclusive zones near ports

ISSUE: The commercial spot shrimp fishery in PWS has been closed while the stock has been rebuilding. Now the resource is strong and the commercial fishery should be reopened.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The shrimp resource will not be of any benefit to commercial harvest, and it will not be exploited to a sustainable level. The shrimp stocks could over produce and then spiral into a boom – bust cycle.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? At this time, PWS sport shrimp can not make it to market. This commercial harvest will allow this excellent product to get to market, therefore being a great improvement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishermen will have an opportunity to economically benefit. Consumers will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Having the commercial and sport fisheries overlap. This would be good, but could cause gear conflicts and enforcement problems.

PROPOSED BY: Whittier Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-08F-009)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 31.210. Shrimp pot fishing seasons for Registration Area E. Open commercial spot shrimp fishery in Prince William Sound as follows:

Open the commercial spot shrimp fishery in PWS.

ISSUE: The commercial spot shrimp fishery in PWS has been closed while the stock has been rebuilding. Now the resource is strong and the commercial fishery should be reopened.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be no utilization of a strong resource. The shrimp stocks could over produce and the spiral into a boom-bust cycle.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. If left closed, the resource could overproduce and overwhelm the available habitat and food chain, and then consequently crash in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishermen will economically benefit. Consumers will benefit by availability of the product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keeping the Commercial fishery closed. This would not be fair to commercial fishermen, to not allow them to harvest from a strong resource.

PROPOSED BY: Gordon Scott

(SC-08F-020)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 31.230 Permits for shrimp trawling in Area E and 5 AAC 31.23X Prince William Sound shrimp trawl harvest and reporting requirements.

5 AAC 31.230. Permits for shrimp trawling in Area E. Repealed

5AAC 31.23X is added to read:

(a) No more than 20% by weight of the shrimp in possession may be pink shrimp or other pandalid species

(b) Fishermen must report the current trip shrimp harvest and discard by species and area to ADF&G in Cordova within 24 hours of the completion of each trip to a phone number as specified by the department at the time of registration.

(c) log sheets issued by the department, must be completed and returned to the department office in either Anchorage or Cordova with each fish ticket.

(d) the commissioner may require an onboard observer on a vessel during fishing operations.

ISSUE: This proposal would remove the commissioner’s permit requirement from regulation 5 AAC 31.230 and add provisions of the commissioner’s permit to regulation 5 AAC 31.23X as follows:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Provisions of the commissioner’s permit will remain without the authority of regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not applicable

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen and others that are considering participating in the fishery will benefit from the availability of a complete regulatory reference.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08F-344)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 31.215. Shrimp pot guideline harvest ranges for Registration Area E. Set spot shrimp guideline harvest level at or near level set in mid 1980s as follows:

Until a new management plan may amend it, set the PWS Spot Shrimp GHL at or near the level it was set at in the mid 1980s when the effort on the fishery increased dramatically.

ISSUE: The PWS Spot shrimp resource is strong, but there is not a management plan in place. A GHL needs to be set until a management plan is in place.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The fishery could be over or underexploited.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This GHL should allow for a sustainable fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The stock of the fishery will benefit from a conservative approach towards sustainable yield.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Set a GHL somewhat lower. Rejected because the historical GHL should be adequate for sustainable yield until a management plan is in place.

PROPOSED BY: Gordon Scott

(SC-08F-019)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 55.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Prince William Sound Area; and 5 AAC 31.206. Area E registration. Require exclusive registration for sport or commercial participation in spot shrimp fishery as follows:

Require exclusive registration (or some other method) for the PWS spot shrimp commercial fishery such that vessels and/or persons who are registered are not permitted to participate in the sport fishery, and vice-versa.

ISSUE: There is concern that opening PWS spot shrimp to commercial fishing will draw too many participants.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The sport shrimp fishermen could also fish commercially and create large amounts of commercial effort, making the fishery very hard to manage.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not directly. But there would be fewer gear conflicts, which could contribute to less gear loss, and thereby less resource wasted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Management of the fishery will benefit as there will be less of a rush into the commercial fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Commercial operators will not be allowed to sport harvest shrimp.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limiting the amount of pots for commercial fishing. This would reduce the economic incentive for commercial fishers, essentially making the commercial fishery just a glorified “sport” fishery.

PROPOSED BY: Gordon Scott

(SC-08F-018)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 31.205. Description of Registration Area E districts and sections.
Modify boundary between Central and Northwest sections in shrimp fishery as follows:

1) Central Section waters of the inside district east of 147° 30.00 W long.

3) Northwest section. The remaining waters of the inside District west of 147° 30.00 W long. and south of 60° 30.00 N lat.

ISSUE: The present boundary line between Central and Northwest section does not accurately divide shrimp populations to the confining bottom contours.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Effort in the affected areas will not be spread evenly, increasing fuel consumption, while decreasing the accuracy of catch per unit data, as it relates to area population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The change in the central section will allow better calculation of tow time to catch quantity, thus increasing quality and escapement of small shrimp.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? ADF&G and trawl shrimp fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Moving the line to 147° 40.00 would put Unakwok and Northern Knight Island into Central Section, complicating things unnecessarily.

PROPOSED BY: Whittier Fish and Game Advisory Committee

(SC-08F-012)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 31.210. Shrimp pot fishing seasons for Registration Area E; 5 AAC 31.221. Shrimp trawl fishing seasons for Registration Area E; and 5 AAC 55.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Prince William Sound Area. Allow sport and commercial seasons for shrimp to run concurrently as follows:

Set the sport and commercial seasons to overlap or run concurrently.

ISSUE: There is concern about allowing the Spot Shrimp fishery to take significant numbers of Egg bearing shrimp.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The health of the fishery’s future should be ensured more by trying not to fish during historical periods when the shrimp are about to release their eggs.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The harvested shrimp should be a higher quality as the eggs are mainly discarded in the market place. The resource would be more protected as more eggs would hatch, and juvenile recruitment would be greater.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource will be benefited by more eggs hatching

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There may be more gear conflicts between sport and commercial operators.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limiting the amount of pots for commercial fishing. This would reduce the economic incentive for commercial fishers, essentially making the commercial fishery just a glorified “sport” fishery.

PROPOSED BY: Gordon Scott

(SC-08F-017)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 31.235. Closed waters in Registration Area E; and 5 AAC 55.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Prince William Sound Area. Limit sport fishing for spot shrimp to designated areas during commercial openings as follows:

The sport fishery should be limited to designated areas when the commercial fishery is open. Commercial fishers would not be allowed to fish in these areas.

ISSUE: The sport shrimp fishery and the commercial fishery for Spot Shrimp open at the same time would create a lot of gear conflicts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There would likely be many gear conflicts between sport and commercial operators.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The resource would be benefited by less gear loss and therefore less dead-loss.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource will be benefited by allowing both fisheries during the non egg bearing periods.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Sport shrimpers will have less area in which to fish for shrimp. Commercial fishers would likewise be affected the same.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Sport and commercial seasons that do not coincide (see other proposals).

PROPOSED BY: Gordon Scott (SC-08F-021)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 02.210 Subsistence shrimp fishery, 55.XXX. New section, and 77.553. Personal use shrimp fishery. Keep subsistence, sport, and personal use pot shrimp fishery open through Dec 31 as follows:

The pot shrimp fishery for sport, subsistence, and personal use is open from April 15 through December 31.

ISSUE: Sport, subsistence, and personal use pot shrimp fishery closes on September 15. I want the season to close on December 31.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport, subsistence, and personal use pot shrimpers will not be able to fish between September 15 and December 31.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, fresh caught shrimp would be available from September 15 through December 31.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Folks hunting deer, bear and sport fishing from September 15 through December 31.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open shrimp pot fishing all year.

PROPOSED BY: Leroy L. Cabana (HQ-08F-046)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 55.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Prince William Sound Area. Allow sport harvest of shrimp from May 15 to September 1 as follows:

Change the regulations so that sport shrimping in PWS is open from May 15 to September 1.

ISSUE: The sport shrimp harvest in PWS is open for a long time. It should be shortened to allow a traditional commercial fishery separated by time. They should not be open at the same time.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The sport fishery and the commercial fishery could be open at the same time, creating gear conflicts and enforcement problems.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The summer boating traffic will benefit from having sport shrimping open during most of the summer season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The sport fishers who want to be the first to drop their pots will have to wait until May 15.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered having both sport and commercial seasons coincide. This would create gear conflicts and enforcement problems.

PROPOSED BY: Whittier Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-08F-011)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 55.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Prince William Sound Area. Shorten sport season for spot shrimp and allow for separate commercial periods as follows:

The sport fishery season needs to be shortened to allow a commercial fishery to happen at a separate time, but both during traditional egg free periods.

ISSUE: The sport spot shrimp fishery has blossomed and grown during a period when there was no commercial harvest. Currently the sport season comprises most of the traditionally egg free period of the spot shrimp. Both sport and commercial seasons need to be allowed to proceed during the traditionally egg free periods.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The health of the fishery’s future should be ensured more by trying not to fish during historical periods when the shrimp are about to release their eggs.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The resource would be more protected as more eggs would hatch, and juvenile recruitment would be greater.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource will be benefited by more eggs hatching. There will be no gear conflicts between sport and commercial operators.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Sport shrimpers will have less time allowed to catch shrimp.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allowing sport and commercial to overlap or run concurrently (see other proposals)

PROPOSED BY: Gordon Scott

(SC-08F-022)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 55.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Prince William Sound Area. Add registration and reporting requirement for sport harvest of shrimp as follows:

Change the regulations so that sport shrimpers in PWS have to register and report harvest data such as was required in the past.

ISSUE: The sport shrimp harvest in PWS is not adequately documented for ADF&G management.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The sport harvest will not be adequately documented for management purposes. Effort, CPUE, and other harvest data will not be collected and will not be able to be used to assess the shrimp stock.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource will benefit as the amount of shrimp and locations caught can be used to assess resource strength and allow ADF&G to regulate the shrimp fisheries. This will benefit all shrimpers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Shrimpers will have to obtain and fill out the permit, costing them a small amount of time.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered that with no reporting, ADF&G will not have adequate information to assess and manage the fishery.

PROPOSED BY: Whittier Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-08F-010)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 02.215. Subsistence Dungeness crab fishery. Open subsistence season year round for all crab species in Prince William Sound and Copper River Delta as follows: .

Subsistence season on all species of crab year-round in Prince William Sound and the Copper River Delta.

ISSUE: No access to crab by local residents..

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No crab for locals.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Find out what's there.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local Alaska residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Bob Henrichs

(SC-08F-040)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 24.200(f). Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections. This proposal would amend the regulation as follows:

(f) Coghill District: waters north and east [WEST] of a line from Point Pigot (60° 48.21' N. lat., 148° 20.90' W. long.) to a point west of Point Culross at 60° 45.45' N. lat., 148° 11.07' W. long. and from Point Culross (60° 45.58' N. lat., 148° 08.74' W. long.) to a point west of Culross Light at...

ISSUE: The Coghill District is inaccurately described as being “west of a line from Point Pigot to a point west of Culross Point”. This needs to be changed to “east of a line from Point Pigot to a point west of Culross Point”.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The description of the Coghill District in regulation will continue to be in error.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishing permit holders that participate in fisheries in the Coghill District.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-323)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 24.200(f)(2). Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections. This proposal would amend the regulation as follows:

(f)(2) Granite Bay Subdistrict: waters in [ON THE EAST SIDE OF] Port Wells, [WITHIN ONE MILE OF SHORE, BETWEEN] east of a line from Esther Rock (60° 48.08' N. lat, 148° 10.67' W. long.) to a point at 60° 51.68' N. lat, 148° 09.844' W. long., and to a point at 60° 55.81' N. lat, 148° 05.89' W. long. including all waters of Esther Passage north of a line at 60° 49.51' N. lat.;

ISSUE: The western boundary of the Granite Bay Subdistrict in the Coghill District is currently described as 1 mile offshore of Esther Island. The western shore of Esther Island is very convoluted resulting in a boundary that is difficult to identify for both commercial fishers operating gear as well as FWP officers monitoring it.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Diligent commercial fishers may inadvertently and unintentionally cross the boundary as currently defined and FWP officers will spend significant amounts of time monitoring this boundary that could easily be straightened and improved.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishing permit holders that fish this area and FWP officers that monitor it.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08F-324)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed waters. Modify boundary of closed waters in Eastern and Southeastern districts as follows:

Change the closed waters line in the eastern and southeastern districts to a line at the latitude of Salmo Point.

ISSUE: Closed waters in Simpson, Nelson, and Orca Bays.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will have to continue writing emergency orders to harvest fish returning to this area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All seine fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Stephen Riedel

(SC-08F-004)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Open east side of Hinchbrook and Montague Island to drift gillnetting as follows:

Open the east side of Hinchbrook and Montague Islands to drift gillnetting. Area would include a line from three miles east of Hinchbrook to a line three miles seaward of Cape Cleare. The west side of the area would be a line from Hinchbrook Light to Schooner Rocks. The opening would be the same as the Copper River openings.

ISSUE: Move the fishing area for the drift fleet on the Copper River / PWS

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The fleet will be in congested area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Fish would be fresher.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Drift gillnet fleet.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? As a dual permit holder, drift and seine, I have no problem letting the drift fleet fish this area.

PROPOSED BY: Warren Chappel

(SC-08F-043)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 24.331(b). Gillnet specifications and operations. Require removal of set gillnet anchor buoys at inactive sites as follows:

During open fishing periods, set gillnet anchor buoys shall be removed from the water at any set gillnet location that is inactive. Anchors that remain in the water at these inactive locations may use a sinking retrieval line running to the shore.

ISSUE: Unused set gillnet anchor buoys and associated lines interfering with the operation of drift gillnets. Many floating running line sets are put in early in the season with the intention of marking or holding a particular beach spot and often times are seldom if ever used during the season. At other times floating running line “sets” are intentionally put in place to block driftnet fishermen from legally fishing close to the beach. The net effect of the many unfished floating sets is that drift gillnet fishermen are unfairly prevented from legally fishing near the beach in many areas throughout Eshamy District.

These unfished floating sets can easily be converted to “sinking sets” by using a sinking running line from the shore and removing the buoy from the anchor lines at the outer end. All setnet fishermen use this very technique to preserve their permanent lease sites at the end of the season. The permanent anchors re kept in place and a sinking line from the anchor bridle to shore makes it easy to retrieve again, clip in the buoy and be ready to fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We would like the Board of Fisheries to establish a regulation stating that at any inactive set net location the buoy floating lines be removed at the beginning of a fishing period. Drift gillnet fishermen are unfairly denied legal access to fish close to the beach. Very often fish travel and school close to the beach, making it some of the most productive fishing area throughout the district. There are over 500 drift gillnet permit holders allowed to fish in the Eshamy District and less than 30 set gillnet permit holders. With large numbers of sockeye salmon again returning to the Main Bay Hatchery (900,000 midpoint prediction for 2002) the Eshamy District will be very crowded. At times only the Main Bay Subdistrict is open to commercial harvest stacking the entire drift and setnet fleets in May Bay. Overcrowding would be eased for the drift gillnet fleet, and the opportunity to legally fish close to the beach would be expanded.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Having to tow to clear obstructions reduces fish quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The entire drift gillnet fleet fishing in the Eshamy District.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No on will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Not applicable.

PROPOSED BY: Steve Aberle

(SC-08F-046)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Require removal of set gillnet buoys and running lines when not being actively used as follows:

Set netters should be allowed to fish anywhere they want as current regs read, but should be required to remove and /or sink those set net buoys, running lines and other entanglements on sites of convenience, when they are not being actively fished. Those sites that are shore fishery leases would of course be exempt.

ISSUE: Set netters in the Eshamy District are increasingly denying drift fishermen access to the shoreline because of increasing numbers of unused or minimally used set net buoys, running lines, and other entanglements. It seems unreasonable that 29 set net permits can effectively deny beach sets, in the Eshamy District, to a drift fleet of 500 and do this while continuing to exceed their PWS allocation by 50%.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Beach access is directly equated to fish access. Gear conflicts between the two user groups are increasing according to Trooper Enforcement. These conflicts will continue to increase as new set nets are continuing, every season, for the purpose of protecting key set net sites and to squeeze drifters from traditional beach fishing areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No increase or decrease in quality would occur.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Gill-netters would benefit. Drifters would be able to access those beaches that are currently being denied to them because of entanglements. Trooper enforcement could be reduced if they were not constantly dealing with gear conflicts between the two user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Set net fishermen would lose an opportunity to deny drifters beach access. Set netters would always have the option of applying for Shore Fishery Leases of fishing anywhere they want, but it would require resetting or reattaching running lines and buoys for those sites that are not leased.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fishing alternate openings in the Eshamy District until estimated set netter allocation limits were met was considered. Doubling the distance between set nets was considered and still could be a viable option.

PROPOSED BY: Scott Seaton

(HQ-08F-090)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 24.335. Minimum distance between units of gear. Increase minimum distance between set gillnet operations in portion of Eshamy District as follows:

No part of a set gillnet may be set or operated within 200 fathoms [100 FATHOMS] of any part of another set gillnet, except in the Main Bay Subdistrict as provided in 5AAC 24.367 (c) (4). In the Crafton Island Subdistrict, no part of a drift gillnet may be operated within 60 fathoms of a set gillnet, except in the zone outside of the offshore end of the set gillnet.

ISSUE: As written, current regulation does not provide equitable access to inshore fishing areas for both the drift and set gillnet fleets in the Crafton Island Subdistrict. The minimum required distance between set gillnets in this portion of the Eshamy District, combined with the minimum distance required between set and drift gillnets, effectively denies the drift gillnet fleet access to productive shoreline areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The set gillnet fleet will continue to control access to the inshore areas of the Crafton Island subdistrict through placement and proximity of gear, resulting in ongoing conflict between the set and drift gillnet fleets, unnecessary and avoidable enforcement issues, and continued imbalance where access is concerned.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not applicable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both the set and drift gillnet fleets will benefit due to fewer conflicts between the gear types. The drift fleet will benefit from a more equitable access situation. Enforcement is also likely to benefit from a reduction in potential enforcement concerns.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The set gillnet fleet will likely suffer as a result of decreased production due to fewer nets in some shoreline locations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Another possibility would have been to reduce the minimum distance required between set and drift gillnet gear. This might have provided some equity where access is concerned; but it would have almost certainly increased, rather than decreased, the current level of conflict between harvesters.

PROPOSED BY: Pete Jenkins (SC-08F-016)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 24.335 Minimum distance between units of gear; and 5 AAC 24.367 (b). Main Bay Salmon Hatchery Harvest Management Plan. Modify gear separation guideline for Main Bay and Crafton Island gillnet fisheries as follows:

5 AAC 24.335 Minimum distance between units of gear

No part of a set gillnet may be set or operated within 100 fathoms of any part of another set gillnet, except in the Main Bay Subdistrict as provided in 5 AAC

(4). In the Crafton Island and Main Bay Subdistricts, with the exception of the Main Bay Terminal Harvest Area as provided in 5 AAC 24.367 (b), no part of a drift gillnet may be operated within 60 fathoms of a set gillnet, except in the zone outside of the offshore end of the set gillnet.

5 AAC 24.367 Main Bay Salmon Hatchery Harvest Management Plan

(b) In the Main Bay Subdistrict west of a line from 60° 32.26' N. lat., 148° 04.85' W. long. to 60° 31.88' N. lat., 148° 04.03' W. long. (Main Bay Terminal Harvest Area),

(1) no portion of a drift gillnet may be operated within 25 fathoms of a set gillnet, except in the zone outside of the offshore end of the set gillnet;

ISSUE: Confusion and inconsistency in gear separation regulations in Main Bay. This proposal attempts to standardize gear separation regulations in the Main Bay / Crafton Island gillnet fisheries. Under our proposal, where setnets must be 100 fm apart, driftnets must be 60 fm from a setnet. Where setnets need only be 50 fm apart, driftnets must be 25 fm from a setnet.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Confusion will continue. At issue here are two gear separation regulations. The first is 5 AAC 24.335 which requires that set nets be at least 100 fm apart except within the Main Bay Terminal Harvest Area (THA). In the THA, under 5 AAC 24.367, the required separation between setnets drops to 50 fm. The THA is about a third of Main Bay. As the name makes clear, it is the terminus of the Bay, which includes the hatchery waters.

5 AAC 24.335 requires that driftnets be at least 60 fathoms from any part (except the offshore end) of a setnet. This regulation applies throughout to the Crafton Island subdistrict, but not in the Main Bay Subdistrict. In the entire Main Bay subdistrict, under the provisions of 5 AAC 24.367 driftnets must only be 25 fathoms from a setnet.

Thus the regulation establishes three zones with differing gear separation regulations. Within the THA setnets need only be 50 fm apart, and driftnets need only be 25 fm from a setnet. Outside of the Main Bay subdistrict, setnets must be 100 fm apart, and driftnets must be 60 fm from a setnet. But in the two thirds of Main Bay not included within the THA, setnets still must be 100 fm apart, but driftnets can be within 25 fm of a setnet.

This regulatory scheme is confusing to fishermen, it creates an impossible enforcement problem, and it is probably inadvertent. Our proposal will fix this error by bringing the outer two thirds of Main Bay into conformity with the rest of the Crafton Island / Main Bay fishery. At its simplest, our proposal would standardize gear separation regulations as follows: Where setnets must be 100 fm apart, driftnets must be 60 fm from a setnet. Where setnets need only be 50 fm apart, driftnets must be 25 fm from a setnet.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishermen, especially the set net fleet.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The drift fleet may lose some beach fishing area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: PWS Setnet Association

(SC-08F-038)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 24.367. Main Bay Salmon Hatchery Harvest Management Plan.
Amend the regulation to modify restriction on drift gillnet use near set gillnets in Main Bay Subdistrict as follows:

5 AAC 24.367. . Main Bay Salmon Hatchery Harvest Management Plan

(b)In the Main Bay Subdistrict

(1) no portion of a drift gillnet may be operated within 25 fathoms of a set gillnet **in that portion of Main Bay west of a line (Main Bay Terminal Harvest Area) from 60A**, in the zone outside of the offshore end of the set gillnet; **no portion of a drift gillnet may be operated within 60 fathoms of a set gillnet in that portion of Main Bay east of line (Main Bay Terminal Harvest Area) from 60°, 32.26'N lat., 148° 04.85'W. long to 60° 31.88'N. lat., 148° 04.03'W. long., And extending to the mouth of Main Bay and boundary line between Main Bay subdistrict and Crafton Island Subdistrict.**

This change is for that portion of Main Bay where set gillnets are required to be a minimum of 100 fathoms apart. In the remainder of the Eshamy District where set gillnets are required to be a minimum of 100 fathoms apart, ADF&G Protection proposed and received approval of setbacks of 60 fathoms between set and drift gillnets due to constant conflict and safety concerns. The concerns are identical and occur on a frequent basis in this portion of Main Bay. Safety concerns will become greater if not resolved. 5 AAC 24.367 (a) provides the necessary framework to address this ongoing conflict. Conflict and safety concerns will be resolved by the requested changes.

ISSUE: 5 AAC 24.367 (a) specifically states intended purpose is to reduce conflicts between users. Unenforceable year setbacks, in that portion of Main Bay east of the THA line and extending to the eastern boundary of the Main Bay Subdistrict, lead to conflict and safety concerns.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Escalating conflict and safety concerns. Past interactions have led to gear damage, vessel damage and personnel injury. If no solution occurs conflict will become unmanageable.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both gear types will benefit by reducing conflict, the fishery will take place in a more orderly manner with a greater degree of safety.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Both gear types will suffer if current setbacks between gear types is not changed as requested – conflicts will escalate.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Retain current gear setbacks – rejected as conflict and safety concerns will become unmanageable.

PROPOSED BY: Paul Owecke

(HQ-08F-171)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____
ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____
DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 24.367(d)(1). Main Bay Salmon Hatchery Harvest Management Plan. This proposal would amend the regulation as follows:

(d)(1) set gillnet gear and drift gillnet gear may be operated only **during alternating periods** [ON ALTERNATING DAYS DURING PERIODS] established by emergency order throughout the season; the department shall alternate the gear type that is allowed to operate at the start of each opening;

ISSUE: The language in this regulation does not accurately reflect current management practices in the Alternating Gear Zone in the Main Bay hatchery subdistrict. The language specifies that set and drift gillnet gear may be operated on alternate days during fishing periods. Currently the gear type does not change during a fishing period at the end of that day as specified in 24.367(d)(1).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulation will not reflect management practices in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishing permit holders that participate in fisheries in the Eshamy District, specifically in the Alternating Gear Zone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08F-325)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

Alternating gear usage to set net and drift gillnet fishing will not normally occur at the same time in the Eshamy District.

ISSUE: Eliminate gear conflicts in Eshamy District between set net operators and the drift gillnet fleet.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The State of Alaska is spending increased amount of money to police this area, draining resources from the Department of Public Safety. There is a loss of small family run set net operations due to stress of increased confrontations and threats during openings.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A decrease in damaged equipment and gear will help to avoid harvest loss because of deliberate damage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? State of Alaska will benefit due to the decreased cost of policing the area. Both groups will have enhanced rapport and less tension improving the quality of life for both groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Set net operators who are unable to fish in any other areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closure to drift boat fishing in Eshamy. Make set net fishing a political suicide.

PROPOSED BY: Colleen James

(HQ-08F-001)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 27.370(e). General restrictions for Prince William Sound Area.
Amend the regulation to open seine areas when there are sufficient stocks to provide harvest opportunity as follows:

All seine areas would open by emergency order when there are sufficient wild stocks or enhanced stocks to provide harvest opportunity. At the very least, weekly openings in some or all seine districts, subject to time and area restrictions as necessary to protect hatchery and wild stocks.

ISSUE: Lack of opportunity for the seine fleet in June if the fleet has exclusive access to Port Chalmers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The entire seine fleet will be limited to the terminal area at AFK during the month of June if the gillnet fleet ever falls below 45% of the enhanced harvest in PWS. This fishery is then subject to manipulation by the PWSAC board through cost recovery schemes. The seine fleet has a major capital investment in vessels, nets, skiffs and refrigeration systems and the additional expense of three crewmembers compared to the gillnet fleet. The seine fleet is just emerging from the dire economic situation created by lack of opportunity and low pink prices, removing June opportunity will likely place the seine fleet at an economic disadvantage once again. At the very least, an alternating cycle of exclusive June fisheries prevents additional investment and planning and subjects the seine fleet to punitive measures by the gillnet dominated PWSAC board.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Harvesting salmon outside terminal areas does provide higher quality product and RSW seine caught fish are arguably higher quality, though this proposal deals with equitable allocation issues and not quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seiners will benefit from not losing their June fishery and eliminating the alternating cycle of good odd years and poor even years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some interception of "gillnet" salmon must be anticipated, however, time and area management can mitigate the effects of interception while providing meaningful harvest opportunity for seiners during the month of June.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Many other solutions were considered and rejected in favor of the committee process whereby all the regulations are on the table, and hopefully, the issue will be resolved.

PROPOSED BY: Gregory R. Gabriel, Jr. (HQ-08F-249)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Modify allocation to purse seine and drift gillnet fleets as follows:

Section (h)(1) **If the drift gillnet harvest value is 45% or less, then in the following year the hatchery operator would be directed to take a greater amount of pink cost recovery and lower Esther chum cost recovery to correct ex-vessel value allocation percentages.**

ISSUE: Based on the allocation plan if the gillnet fleet gains exclusive access to Port Chalmers the seine fleet would have extremely limited opportunity to fish in June, an important part of many of the seine fleets income.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The seine fleet would be restricted to the extremely limited area at AFK, and the chums at Port Chalmers would likely to largely unharvested or be cleaned up as low value dark fish.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Chums as Port Chalmers would be caught as they returned by the seine fleet avoiding unharvested fish or low value fish being cleaned up late in the return.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seine fleet would continue to fish Port Chalmers. The gillnet fleet would be able to correct allocation perimeters by catching more chums at Esther Hatchery, rather than fishing at Port Chalmers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The gillnet fleet targeting Coghill sockeye could see increased competition from the seine fleet targeting the same stocks.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None that I can see.

PROPOSED BY: Thomas Nelson

(HQ-08F-045)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Allow purse seine use in Coghill District and Port Wells prior to July 21 as follows:

Any opening in the Coghill District between June 1 and July 21 north of the latitude of the Granite Bay subdistrict at 60°55.81 and within one nautical mile of the west shore of Port Wells north of Point Pigot would be open to both purse seine and drift gillnet gear.

ISSUE: Allowing the purse seine fleet their historical access to wild Coghill and Port Wells sockeye, pink and chum salmon prior to July 21.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Wild sockeye, pink and chum salmon returning to Coghill and Port Wells prior to July 21 would be harvested exclusively by the gillnet fleet. These fish were historically shared between gear groups.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Wild pink and chum returns to Port Wells are early to mid July – access before July 21 would allow harvest of brighter fish at the peak of return. Coghill sockeye have been overescaped in recent years due to lack of interest by the gillnet fleet. Allowing seine access could fully utilize the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The purse seine fleet would be returned to historical option of targeting wild pink, chum, and sockeye salmon in Port Wells prior to July 21.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The gillnet fleet targeting Coghill Sockeye could see increased competition from the seine fleet targeting the same stocks.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Thomas Nelson

(HQ-08F-044)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Expand harvest of wild salmon in the Coghill District as follows:

Replace (B), (C), of (5) Coghill District with Purse Seine gear may operate in the districts during periods established by emergency order except in the Ester subdistrict between June 1 and July 20 unless allowed under (h)(2) of this subsection.

ISSUE: Underutilization of wild sockeye, pink and chum salmon in the Coghill District. Over escapement to Coghill Lake.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued lost revenue to Fishermen with a historical catch record in this area, local and state economies.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Seine vessels exclusively employ on-board refrigeration to immediately chill caught salmon, providing the highest quality product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The seine gear group, local and state economies.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The gear group that presently underutilizes and allows over-escapement of these wild runs.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Durtschi

(HQ-08F-074)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 24.370 (5) Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Open Coghill District to purse seine harvest of sockeye as follows.

(5) Coghill District

(A) Except as otherwise provided in this section, drift gillnet **and seine** gear may be operated throughout the district during fishing periods established by emergency order.

(B) delete

ISSUE: Allow seiners access to Coghill reds when there is a surplus. These are wild fish and seiners have fished on these stocks pre-hatchery. Provide more area to seiners. Seine caught, raw sea water (R.S.W.) held reds would be a better grade of fish providing a greater quality and price to fishermen.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Seiners would continue to be denied access to pre-hatchery fishing areas.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seiners and processors.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Drift gillnetters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: David Clemens

(SC-08F-002)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 24.370(e)(5)(B). Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Remove start date for seine gear in Coghill District and set boundaries to protect stocks through emergency order authority as follows:

Remove the starting date for seine gear in the Coghill District and set boundaries as necessary to protect hatchery and wild stocks that are needed for escapement or cost recovery goals through the EO authority of the commissioner.

ISSUE: Unharvested surplus of sockeye and pink salmon into Coghill Lake due to lack of effort on the part of the gillnet fleet. These fish are either wasted or lose value due to diminished quality when a terminal clean-up is utilized to harvest these excess salmon. This is possible foregone revenue to the seine fleet which has limited June harvest opportunities.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued lost yield and overescapement.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, removing the starting date in the Coghill district for seine gear will provide higher quality product because seiners will prevent a build-up of unharvested salmon in the terminal area or weir.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seiners who will have additional harvest opportunity in June and processors who receive a higher value product. Ultimately, consumers of the resource and the reputation of our salmon resource in the market will benefit from the harvest of higher quality salmon. Future returns will also benefit if overescapement is prevented.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There may be some gillnetters affected by the additional competition for sockeye salmon, however, they are precluded from participating in the fishery as both gear types would be allowed. To the extent gillnetters are displaced, they have more numerous options for gear deployment in June than seiners do.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Gregory R. Gabriel, Jr.

(HQ-08F-250)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Modify allocation to purse seine and drift gillnet fleets in the Eshamy District as follows:

A meaningful allocation tool would read:

The department (ADF&G) shall manage the Eshamy district to mirror the intent of the 2005 PWS Allocation Plan, that set net harvests are not to exceed 4% of the enhanced PWS salmon stocks, by adjusting fishing time between the set net and drift gillnet fleets.

ISSUE: Set netters are continuing to exceed their allocation of 4% under the PWS 2005 Allocation plan. The most recent data shows the gear group to be at 6%, over the last 5 years, an overage of 50%. The only year when the set netters were under the limit was during the 2005 season, a year when there was a run failure of the largest component of the Main Bay enhanced run.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Set netters will continue to go over their allocation and this impacts the seiner/drift gill-netter allocations as set netter overages take dollars away from drifters and may skew the seiner/drift gill-netter allocation percentages. The tool of allowing set netters no more than 36 hours/week of fishing after July 10 has not affected the set net harvest appreciably. Assuming a normal schedule of two openings a week, in actual practice, the restriction has applied only to the last 12 hours of the second period. Those fish in the district are effectively cleaned up by the time this restriction takes place. The Main Bay run peaks about July 4, so another problem is that the enhanced sockeye run is essentially over when the time restriction take place and the restriction affects mostly the catch of wild Eshamy stocks.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No increase or decrease in quality would occur.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seiners and gill-netters would benefit. Seiners, because those fish taken by set netters above their allocation limit comes directly out of the drift gillnet fleet allocation. Gill-netters, because those fish taken in excess of set netter allocation limits come directly out of drifter income.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Set net fishermen would lose the opportunity to consistently exceed their 4% allocation limit adopted under the 2005 BOF allocation plan.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fishing alternate openings in Main Bay until estimated set netter allocation limits were met was considered. A problem is that this solution might be too big of a hammer, reducing set netter harvests too much. This is a middle ground between alternate fishing periods and the ineffective tool currently in use, of restricting set net fishing to no more that 36hrs/week after July 10.

PROPOSED BY: Scott Seaton

(HQ-08F-51)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Establish alternating periods for drift gillnet and purse seine gear in Prince William Sound as follows:

New regulation:

In PWS, drift gillnet and purse seine gear will not fish simultaneously in the same area. Rather, each gear type will have equal access via equal fishing time periods in their shared areas, but they will fish alternating time periods in these shared areas.

ISSUE: Drift gillnet and purse seine gear are not compatible by the basic nature of their fishing methods. Gear conflicts between drift gillnet and purse seine gear exist in PWS when both gear types are fishing at the same time in the same fishing area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Gear conflicts will continue whenever drift gillnet and purse seine gear are sharing the same area and time by the direction of ADF&G.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both gillnet and purse seine gear types will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions considered because I couldn't think of any.

PROPOSED BY: Alan Kapp

(HQ-08F-057)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Establish a firm date when pink salmon management would end in the Coghill District as follows:

(5) Coghill District:

(B) beginning July 21 **and ending August 31**, when the harvestable surplus is predominately pink salmon, purse seine gear may be operated in the district during periods established by emergency order;

ISSUE: The regulation does not adequately and in a timely manner, allow the change over from pink to coho harvest exceeds that of pink salmon. Having a firm date, when coho management would commence, would allow drift fishermen access to enhanced coho, without the gear conflict with the seine fleet. ADF&G would still have the EO authority in the event of over abundance of pink salmon. According to local department statistics, a threshold of less than 10,000 pink salmon in an opening has been the effective end of pink management. Over the last twenty years the average date has been September 1.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Seine fleet will continue to target and harvest more of the “enhanced” coho that are explicitly produced for the drift fleet. The expressed purpose of the coho program was outlined in the 1991-92 Commercial Fishing regulations. Page 50-51. “The board recognizes that enhanced species returning to the gillnet districts during the primary seine fishery in western PWS between 7/18 and 9/1 will be subjected to considerable seine interception and can not be explicitly targeted to the gillnet fleets.” In other words, not having a specific date written into the regulations adversely impacts the allocation ex-vessel percentage numbers under the plan revised by BOF, at the last cycle meeting.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? An assured management date will allow processors to plan for tender coverage for the drift fleet. Tenders, with a source of ice, will help increase the coho quality, which is needed under the Copper River/PWS Marketing Association’s strategic marketing plan.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The drift fleet will have access to the “enhanced” coho run, which was originally created for the benefit of the dgn gear group.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few seine permit holders, who are actively targeting coho in the Coghill district, will not be allowed to harvest cohos, after harvestable surplus of pink salmon are gone. The seine fleet does have an alternative fishery with their exclusive “enhanced” coho run in the Port of Valdez.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Comparing the actual value of the two different species harvested is another option to decide when the department manages for the coho return. This would require the department to monitor and compute fish tickets on a daily basis. This would be a large commitment on the local department’s staff to collect, analyze, and convert the data to then make the management decision.

PROPOSED BY: James L. Mykland

(HQ-08F-102)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 24.370(f). Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Amend the regulation to increase percentage level that triggers subsequent year 36-hour weekly fishing limit as follows:

If the set gillnet gear group catches seven [five] percent or more of the previous five-year average ex-vessel value of the total common property fishery for enhanced salmon as calculated by the department under (c) of this section, the year following this calculation beginning on July 10, the commissioner shall, by emergency order, open set gillnet fishing periods totaling no more than 36 hours per week.

In brief summary the necessity for the change is as follows:

1) The set fishery's 4% allocation under the current management plan falls significantly short of the setnetter's current and historical harvest level. When corrected for enhanced fish only, calculations suggest that the setnet fishery has historically harvested between 6% and 7% of Area E's ex-vessel value. Thus, the 5% trigger actually results in a reduction to the setnet fishery's historical harvest. The 36 hour limitation is therefore essentially a permanent annual restriction on the setnet fishery rather than a remedial measure triggered only in years of anomalous harvest.

2) The 5% trigger for imposition of the 36-hour restriction is only 1% above the setnet fisher's 4% allocation. This is an impossibly narrow window. By contrast, the trigger for imposing remedial measures on the seine and drift fisheries is 5% over and under the target allocation. And even this margin with a total swing of 10% has been criticized as being too narrow.

3) The setnet fishery is so small that its percentage of the Area E harvest is more a factor of fluctuations in the drift and seine harvests, than of the setnet harvest itself. For example a minor change in the pink salmon price to seiners will result in a staggering swing of setnet fishery's relative harvest value percentage. And of course the same is true for the price of Copper River reds. The setnet fishery could harvest the same dollar value from one year to the next, yet still see huge changes in their calculated percentage of the ex-vessel value pie. Conversely, fluctuations in the setnet harvest, either in poundage or value, have only minor effects on the harvest percentages of the other two fleets.

4) The seine and drift fleets have a ceiling and a floor bracketing their allocations. If they harvest above the upper trigger percentage, they are restricted in subsequent years. If they harvest below the lower trigger, they are entitled to extra harvesting opportunities in subsequent years. Conversely, the setnet fishery only has an upper trigger. We are punished for harvesting above our allocation, but we enjoy no remediation for years of low harvest. Thus, we could suffer a catastrophic year, as has happened owing to hatchery failures, with no downstream remediation in our favor. This is an imbalance in the management scheme. In view of this, it seems only fair that we have more than a 1% window before punitive measures kick in.

ISSUE: Setnet harvest restrictions that are not equitable or necessary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Setnet user group is denied access to harvest without justification.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnet user group will be assigned equitable harvest guidelines.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Drift gillnet user group will experience minimal harvest reduction. On a individual basis harvest reduction is minimal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate any setnet harvest restrictions. Remains a viable option with few negative consequences for any user group.

PROPOSED BY: Paul Owecke

(HQ-08F-177)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 24.370 (f). Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Increase trigger for limiting subsequent year weekly fishing hours to 7 percent as follows:

5 AAC 24.370

(f) If the set gillnet gear group catches seven [FIVE] percent or more of the previous five-year average ex-vessel value of the total common property fishery for enhanced salmon as calculated by the department under (c) of this section, the year following this calculation beginning on July 10, the commissioner shall, by emergency order, open set gillnet fishing periods totaling no more than 36 hours per week.

ISSUE: The trigger for imposing restrictions on the setnet fleet is too low. The justification for this change is many-fold and the Association will provide evidence and testimony to support this change.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The setnet fishery's 4% allocation under the current management plan falls significantly short of the setnetter's current and historical harvest level. When corrected for enhanced fish only, calculations suggest that the setnet fishery has historically harvested between 6% and 7% of Area E's ex-vessel value. Thus, the 5% trigger actually results in a reduction to the setnet fishery's historical harvest. The 36 hour limitation is therefore essentially a permanent annual restriction on the setnet fishery rather than a remedial measure triggered only in years of anomalous harvest.

The 5% trigger for imposition of the 36 hour restriction is only 1% above the setnet fishery's 4% allocation. This is an impossibly narrow window. By contrast, the trigger for imposing remedial measures on the seine and drift fisheries is 5% over and under the target allocation. And even this margin with a total swing of 10% has been criticized as being too narrow.

The setnet fishery is so small that its percentage of Area E harvest is more a factor of fluctuations in the drift and seine harvests, than of the setnet harvest itself. For example a minor change in the pink salmon price to seiners will result in a staggering swing of the setnet fishery's relative harvest value percentage. And of course the same is true for the price of Copper River reds. The setnet fishery could harvest the same dollar value from one year to the next, yet still see huge changes in their calculated percentage of the ex-vessel value pie. Conversely, fluctuations in the setnet harvest, either in poundage or value, have only minor effects on the harvest percentages of the other two fleets.

The seine and drift fleets have a ceiling and a floor bracketing their allocations. If they harvest above the upper trigger percentage, they are restricted in subsequent years. If they harvest below the lower trigger, they are entitled to extra harvesting opportunities in subsequent years. Conversely, the setnet fishery only has an upper trigger. We are punished for harvesting above our allocation, but we enjoy no remediation for years of low harvest. Thus, we could suffer a catastrophic year, as has happened owing to hatchery failures, with no downstream remediation in our favor. This is an imbalance in the management scheme. In view of this, it seems only fair that we have more than a 1% window before punitive measures kick in.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The setnet fleet.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. The drift fleet might experience a negligible reduction.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: PWS Setnet Association

(SC-08F-039)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Restrict set netting to 36 hours per week as follows:

A meaningful allocation tool would:

Restrict set netting to 36 hours per week, at the beginning of the season, June 10, and apply to the first hours of any scheduled weekly openings.

ISSUE: Set netters are continuing to exceed their allocation of 4% under the PWS 2005 Allocation Plan. The most recent data shows the gear group to be at 6%, over the last 5 years, an overage of 50%. The only year when the set netters were under the limit was during the 2005 season, a year when there was a run failure of the largest component of the Main Bay enhanced run.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

Set netters will continue to go over their allocation and this impacts the seiner/drift gill-netter allocations as set netter overages take dollars away from drifters and may skew the seiner/drift gill-netter allocation percentages. The tool of allowing set netters no more than 36 hours/week of fishing after July 10 has not affected the set net harvest appreciably. Assuming a normal schedule of two openings a week, in actual practice, the restriction has applied only to the last 12 hours of the second period. Those fish in the district are effectively cleaned up by the time this restriction takes place. The Main Bay run peaks about July 4, so another problem is that the enhanced sockeye run is essentially over when the time restriction take place and the restriction affects mostly the catch of wild Eshamy stocks.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No increase or decrease in quality would occur.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seiners and gill-netters would benefit. Seiners, because those fish taken by set netters above their allocation limit comes directly out of the drift gillnet fleet allocation. Gill-netters, because those fish taken in excess of set netter allocation limits come directly out of drifter income.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Set net fishermen would lose the opportunity to consistently exceed their 4% allocation limit adopted under the 2005 BOF allocation plan.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fishing alternate openings in Main Bay until estimated set netter allocation limits were met was considered. A problem is that this solution might be too big of a hammer, reducing set netter harvests too much. This is a middle ground between alternate fishing periods and the ineffective tool currently in use, of restricting set net fishing to no more that 36hrs/week after July 10.

PROPOSED BY: Scott Seaton

(HQ-08F-052)

SUPPORT

OPPOSE

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____
ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____
DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Reduce hatchery chum production as follows:

Reduce hatchery production to 24% of the year 2000 production.

ISSUE: Over production of chum salmon by the private not for profit hatcheries. In January 2001, the hatchery managers promised the Governor and the BOF that they would reduce hatchery production of chum salmon by 24% and never increase it again - reference Joint Protocol on Salmon Enhancement #2002-FB-215. This promise has not been kept.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this problem is not solved, Alaska’s wild salmon stocks bound for Alaskan rivers, and Alaskan residents will be subject to unfair competition with hatchery fish. The recovery of wild chum salmon stocks will be delayed or reversed. The Alaskan fishermen dependent for their subsistence needs on these wild stocks will continue to have their needs not met; the in-river commercial fisheries, that many rural Alaskan communities are economically dependent upon, will be curtailed or closed. Without healthy and robust Alaskan wild salmon runs, the economy and cultural foundation of a majority of the Alaskan communities will collapse.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal would improve the quality of the Alaskan wild salmon resource because it would reduce the competition between the wild chum and the over abundance of hatchery produced chum. It would also address the concern of ‘overgrazing’ the ocean environment. Protecting Alaska’s wild salmon stocks should be the number one priority. These stocks have played a central role in the history of Alaska. The wild salmon stocks are the cornerstone of the region’s subsistence way of life.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence, commercial, and sport fishermen throughout the region will benefit from passage of this proposal. Wildlife populations dependent upon the returning wild stocks will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The false ‘commercial’ entity created by the hatchery overproduction will go away.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee

(I-08F-010)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

Note, a board committee has identified the following proposal as a “restructuring” proposal. A restructuring proposal is one that is likely to have substantial economic, social, or biological impacts and may require significant changes to the management of a fishery. The proposed regulatory change may strive to improve the value of a fishery by providing new and increased opportunities to: 1) raise the revenue generated from harvested fish (e.g. through improved quality); or 2) lower the cost of fishing operations; or 3) improve conservation.

The board is seeking additional information on this proposal in order that it can be fully evaluated. During the October 8-10, 2008 worksession, the board will:

- a) Determine if the proposal complete;*
- b) Determine if there are outstanding questions or information needed;*
- c) Confirm that board has authority to act on proposal; identify any aspects of proposal where board may need additional authority to make decisions;*
- d) Identify whether CFEC, Dept. of Commerce, Dept. of Labor or other agencies need to be consulted on issues raised by the proposal and if so, bring staff together to schedule work and process; and*
- e) Identify proposal’s review process and schedule.*

The additional information requested in order to fully evaluate this proposal can be found in the 11 questions contained in the board’s Restructuring Proposal Form (see Page xvi). The board invites the author and the public to submit any additional information to help in the evaluation of this proposal.

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Amend the regulation to allow use of two set gillnet permits in Eshamy District as follows:

5 AAC 24.331 would be changed as follows:

1) in the Eshamy District

(a) Notwithstanding 5 AAC 39.240(a), no more than two setnet CFEC interim-use or entry permit card holder may operate together when both are in compliance with 5 AAC 39.107.

No person may [OPERATE, OR] have on board a vessel, more than 150 fathoms of set gillnet in the aggregate;

ISSUE: Setnetting traditionally has tended to be a family endeavor. Current PWS regulations do not allow a family with more than one permit to work in the safest, most convenient and efficient manner. The need to allow permits to operate together is already recognized in the PWS fishery. In the Copper River and Bering River Districts, 5 AAC 24.331 already states “no more than two vessels may operate together...” Also 5 AAC 06.331 (f) governing Bristol Bay setnetters states “...a person may assist in operation or transportation of additional set gillnet gear...” Currently about one-third of the setnet permits in PWS are owned by families with two or more permits. By not allowing PWS setnetters the option of joint operation, they are being unduly hindered.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Potential safety issues. Since setnetting is family oriented, youth often have permits. Under current law, if a dangerous situation arises, parents legally would have to standby and hope their children can handle it. Of course they

wouldn't, which shows another problem with current law. Having fished with a two permit family, I know there are times the current law is ignored. Such as when one boat going through all the gear while the other boat sells and goes to prepare dinner. If two permits decide to operate together, they should not have to break the law to be the most efficient and have the convenience two permits can provide.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It may improve quality of the resource harvested. It may allow the fish to be brought to the tender quicker. It could keep one boat from having to travel large distances between nets, if the other boat could pick the distant net, and reduce the time the fish are in the boat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone in the setnet fishery who decides to join operations. Any families who currently own more than one permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I cannot think of any reason anyone would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions were considered.

PROPOSED BY: Michael E. Brown

(HQ-08F-168)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specifications and operations. Increase allowable purse seine length to 225 fathoms as follows:

a) No purse seine may be less than 200 meshes or more than 325 meshes in depth, or less than 125 fathoms or more than 225 [150] fathoms in length, hung measure, or with mesh size greater than four inches, except that the first 25 meshes immediately above the leadline may be a “chafing strip” with a mesh size no larger than seven and one-half inches. Leads deeper than the seine, exceeding 75 fathoms in length, or with mesh size less than seven inches may not be used.

g) **No combination of seine and lead may exceed 225 fathoms.**

ISSUE: Pink salmon escaping through the lead. Pink Salmon in later stages of their respective run cycles become progressively less fearful of nets, plungers, etc. as they mature.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Pink salmon will continue to swim through the leads, contributing to buildups of lesser value dark fish.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Pink salmon, particularly near hatcheries, escape through the lead, build up against the barrier seines, become increasingly dark, harder to clean up and of lesser value. Seiner, being more effective, will slow these buildups therefore increasing quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seiners targeting pink salmon. Cost recovery vessels trying to harvest cost recovery fish in hatchery terminal harvest areas and special harvest areas.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change all net specifications to seine. Rejected. Economic hardship to convert. Fishing loose lead is extremely effective in some areas.

PROPOSED BY: Rob Nelson

(HQ-08F-042)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specifications and operations. Modify gear specifications for purse seine leads as follows:

Leads may not exceed 75 fathoms in length or 325 meshes in depth. Leads can not be deeper than the purse seine.

ISSUE: Lead mesh size is 7 inches or larger.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Salmon swim through the lead web.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Purse seine fishermen in Prince William Sound.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Leroy L. Cabana

(HQ-08F-047)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specifications and operations. Delete the 200 mesh minimum depth requirement for purse seine gear in Prince William Sound as follows:

Delete the language that requires a minimum of 200 meshes for seine operations in Prince William Sound.

ISSUE: Seines have evolved since the regulations were adopted. The regulations prohibit improvements to handling fish by using wedges.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen will not be allowed to use wedges. Wedges do not increase the effectiveness of catching fish, but reduce strain in bringing fish onboard.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This change would improve both safety and quality of the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All seine fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Specify that this only applies to the last 5 fathoms on the bunt end of a seine.

PROPOSED BY: Stephen Riedel

(SC-08F-003)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

Note, a board committee has identified the following proposal as a “restructuring” proposal. A restructuring proposal is one that is likely to have substantial economic, social, or biological impacts and may require significant changes to the management of a fishery. The proposed regulatory change may strive to improve the value of a fishery by providing new and increased opportunities to: 1) raise the revenue generated from harvested fish (e.g. through improved quality); or 2) lower the cost of fishing operations; or 3) improve conservation.

The board is seeking additional information on this proposal in order that it can be fully evaluated. During the October 8-10, 2008 worksession, the board will:

- a) Determine if the proposal complete;*
- b) Determine if there are outstanding questions or information needed;*
- c) Confirm that board has authority to act on proposal; identify any aspects of proposal where board may need additional authority to make decisions;*
- d) Identify whether CFEC, Dept. of Commerce, Dept. of Labor or other agencies need to be consulted on issues raised by the proposal and if so, bring staff together to schedule work and process; and*
- e) Identify proposal’s review process and schedule.*

The additional information requested in order to fully evaluate this proposal can be found in the 11 questions contained in the board’s Restructuring Proposal Form (see Page xvi). The board invites the author and the public to submit any additional information to help in the evaluation of this proposal.

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 39.117. Vessel Length. Amend this regulation to provide for use of a salmon seine vessel greater than 58 feet in length in Southeast Alaska and Prince William Sound as follows:

Repealed – the 58-foot salmon seine vessel length limit.

ISSUE: The board adoption of excluding the “bulbous bow” from the length measurement of a salmon purse seine vessel is real progress. It should now repeal the 58’ limit on the length of vessel in the salmon purse seine fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaska purse seine salmon vessels will continue to be vessels that are inefficient. The vessels now being built have length to width ratios that, with a bulbous bow, will consume more fuel than needed. The length law does not stop capacity increases because everyone just adds width and depth as a way to make the vessel capacity greater for the fishery. This length restriction produces inefficient vessels.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, a larger length boat would allow those, who so desire, to explore ways to add value to Alaska salmon. Some Alaska salmon purse seiners may want to process their catch at sea and the present 58’ limit makes that almost impossible.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Alaska purse seine fishermen who wish to pioneer ideas of efficiency in vessel operation and those wishing to develop Alaska salmon, value added products.

Others will keep informed of the new ideas and they can copy those that are successful. This helps all.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? “The value of my boat will go down” this statement will be used to argue against the proposal. “Useable space” does not catch more fish, area, gear and time do. These arguments will be discussed in a following document giving more detail of the proposal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Darrell Kapp

(HQ-08F-151)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 55.005. DESCRIPTION OF THE PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AREA; 5 AAC 56.005. DESCRIPTION OF THE KENAI PENINSULA AREA; and 5 AAC 58.005. DESCRIPTION OF THE COOK INLET RESURRECTION BAY SALT WATER AREA. Amend these regulations to provide the following:

Change the sport fish regulatory boundary between Cook Inlet-Resurrection Bay and Prince William Sound from Cape Puget to Cape Fairfield.

5 AAC 58.005. DESCRIPTION OF THE COOK INLET-RESURRECTION BAY SALTWATER AREA. The Cook Inlet-Resurrection Bay Saltwater Area consists of all waters of Alaska, excluding fresh water drainages, enclosed by a line extending south from Cape Fairfield (148 50.25' W. long.) [CAPE PUGET (148 26'30" W. LONG.)], and a line east from Cape Douglas (58 52' N. lat.).

5 AAC 56.105. DESCRIPTION OF THE KENAI PENINSULA AREA. The Kenai Peninsula Area consists of all freshwater drainages of the Kenai Peninsula west of a line from Cape Fairfield (148 50.25' W. long.) [CAPE PUGET (59 56'35" N. LAT., 148 26'30" W. LONG.)] to the west bank of the mouth of Ingram Creek, excluding Ingram Creek.

5 AAC 55.005. DESCRIPTION OF THE PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AREA. The Prince William Sound Area consists of all waters of the Gulf of Alaska and its drainages, west of the longitude of Cape Suckling (143 53' W. long.), and east of the longitude of Cape Fairfield (148 50.25' W. long.) [CAPE PUGET (148 26.50' W. LONG.)], excluding the Copper River between the south bank of the confluence of Haley Creek and the south bank of the confluence of Canyon Creek in Wood's Canyon.

PROBLEM: The regulatory boundary between Cook Inlet- Resurrection Bay and Prince William Sound differs depending on the type of fishery. Cape Fairfield is the boundary for commercial, personal use, and subsistence fisheries. Cape Puget (15 miles to the east) is the boundary for salt and freshwater sport fisheries. The department considers this to be a housekeeping proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The boundary between Cook Inlet-Resurrection Bay and Prince William Sound regulatory areas will continue to create confusing and inconsistent regulations for non-commercial fisheries.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The public, fishery managers, and enforcers of fish and game regulations will benefit from having the same regulatory boundary between management areas for all fisheries.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Remain status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-061)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 55.023 (1). Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods, and means, for the Prince William Sound Area. Add regulation for Johnstone Bay freshwater sport fishery as follows:

Add regulation if the sport fish boundary between Cook Inlet-Resurrection Bay Prince William Sound is moved to Cape Fairfield. No action necessary if this boundary remains at Cape Puget

(e) Johnstone Bay freshwater drainages: bag limit of 3 fish and possession limit of 3 fish, of which 2 per day, 2 in possession may be coho salmon.

PROBLEM: The department is proposing to standardize the regulatory boundary for subsistence, personal use, sport, and commercial fisheries between Cook Inlet- Resurrection Bay and Prince William Sound. Currently Cape Fairfield is the boundary between these two areas for commercial, personal use and subsistence fisheries; but Cape Puget, 15 miles to the east, is the boundary for sport fisheries. Johnstone Lake, located between these two capes, is a popular destination for freshwater salmon fishing in the North Gulf Coast.

In the absence of escapement goals and run assessment tools, salmon abundance in these drainages is managed with conservative bag limits. If the sport fish boundary is moved from Cape Puget to Cape Fairfield, Johnstone Lake drainages would fall under the more liberal freshwater bag limits for “other salmon” in Prince William Sound allowing 6 per day, 12 in possession, of which only 3 may be coho salmon. This proposal would keep the more conservative North Gulf coast limits of 3 per day, 3 in possession, only 2 may be coho salmon in effect for the fresh waters of Johnstone Bay

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sockeye and coho salmon bag limits would increase to match the more liberal freshwater salmon bag limits of Prince William Sound.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Maintaining the current status quo for this drainage will help ensure that these fisheries are sustainable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Salmon anglers who want long term sustainable fisheries at these lakes.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED Remain status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-060)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 75.028. Use of underwater spear. Amend the regulation regarding spear gun use as follows:

In salt water, spears or spear guns may be used to take fish, subject to applicable seasons and bag limits, by persons who are completely submerged.”

ISSUE: Including the use of spear guns, along with spears, as acceptable forms of sport fishing. At present most divers don’t know that spear guns are not a legal form of sport fishing in Alaska, so many of them are using spear guns and breaking the law. Spear guns are much easier to use and safer. Attempting to take larger fish, such as halibut or larger lingcod, with a pole spear may be more dangerous than with a spear gun, as the energy lever of a pole spear is extremely low due to a lower likelihood of making a quick kill. Even with a spear gun, spear fishing is probably the most difficult form of sport fishing, and fewer fish are taken per fisherman than any other form of the sport.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the current regulation is enforced, fewer fish will be taken, divers may be cited for fishing illegally, and spear fishing will continue to be more dangerous.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The small numbers of divers who spearfish in Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make divers aware of the current regulation and then enforce it. This would decrease the very small number of fish taken by divers.

PROPOSED BY: Howard Teas

(SC-08F-005)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC XX.XXX. New section. Allow gaffing of lingcod in the mouth which are intended for release as follows:

Lingcod may be gaffed in the mouth when it is intended to be released. Lingcod gaffed in any other region of the body of head must be retained.

This working would completely take the place of the current regulation which reads:

[LINGCOD WHICH ARE GAFFED MUST BE RETAINED. A GAFF MAY NOT BE USED TO PUNCTURE ANY FISH INTENDED OR REQUIRED TO BE RELEASED].

ISSUE: I would move that the board adopt a new regulation allowing the gaffing of lingcod in the mouth for cod intended to be released.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without the use of a gaff in the mouth, I believe that lingcod survival rates drop because of unnecessary handling, the fish may times brought aboard and put on the floor to extract the hook then handled through the gill plate to return it to the water. This is especially true with bigger lingcod, during closed seasons when they are guarding nest areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, lingcod have very large mouths and are easily gaffed in the mouth. I have gaffed them before with no more damage created then the hook itself. This method is far superior to the alternative by reducing the handling of the fish (most times not even touching the fish), controlling his head while extracting the hook, putting no undue pressure on his belly by placing him on the floor of the vessel, and returning the fish to the water faster than the other methods. The time this would be most crucial would be during closed periods of the season in May and June. This is when anglers are plenty and bycatch of lingcod protecting their nests would be most prevalent.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All anglers by insuring the survival of more lingcod. It too may increase the population by insuring that more lingcod are returned unharmed to guard their nests, which would potentially add hundreds more adults, over time, for every Lingcod returned to guard.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Christopher Williams

(I-08F-003)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 55.xxx. New section. Reduce bag and possession limit for salmon shark as follows:

5 AAC 55.xxx the following special provisions apply to salmon sharks:

- (a) The bag and possession limit for salmon sharks is one fish.
- (b) The vessel possession limit for salmon sharks is two per day on any vessel, or any combination of vessels carried on vessels, vessels towed by vessels, or floating objects (including kayaks and float tubes), with no transfer of possession allowed between vessels unless transferring vessel was carried by receiving vessel.

ISSUE: Since 2003 the numbers of salmon sharks observed in Prince William Sound have noticeably decreased. During the same time frame the numbers of sport fishermen killing multiple sharks aboard vessels have increased. At times concentrations of salmon sharks occur in different locations; research has shown that they are a slow growing and late maturing population with a high level of fidelity to certain areas, making them vulnerable to over-harvest. In the past the Alaska Board of Fisheries has recognized the potential for over-exploitation and the low bag and possession limits reflect this concern. I think that the biggest danger does not come from individual fishermen taking excessive numbers of fish but from a large number of fishermen each taking a fish. The problem will still exist even if a large number of fishermen only take one fish in their lifetime. The current regulations do not protect sharks from this revolving door scenario. I have personally observed persons aboard vessels killing numerous sharks and a brief search of the internet will show many photos with numerous sharks taken, some with 6 sharks taken from the same vessel. In 1997 the Alaska Board of Fisheries eliminated the commercial harvest of salmon sharks out of concern for their potential over-exploitation yet the reported take of salmon sharks by guides in each of the last several years is more than the commercial fleet harvested in 1996, the last and only year of directed commercial fishing for salmon sharks. Members of local communities have also expressed concern over the possibility of waste of shark meat when multiple sharks are taken from the same vessel.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The salmon shark population may continue to decline. The public may come to the conclusion that Alaskans are wasteful and unconcerned about the environment.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By reducing the quantity of shark meat taken aboard a vessel at one time, it is easier to take care of the meat with less chance for waste.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Some guides may book more trips if multiple people in the same party wish to harvest more than two fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some guides may lose business if multiple clients are not all allowed to harvest sharks the same day.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Greg Hamm

(SC-08F-007)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 55.022 (8) (A) (B) General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods, and means, for the Prince William Sound Area.
Amend regulation to lower rockfish bag limits as follows:

(8) Rockfish

(A) may be taken from May 1 – September 15; bag limit of [5] **4** fish; possession limit of [10] **8** fish, of which only two per day and in possession may be non-pelagic rockfish; the first two non- pelagic rockfish caught must be retained and become part of the bag limit of the person originally hooking the fish; no size limit

(B) may be taken from September 16 - April 30; bag and possession limit of [10] **8** fish, of which only two per day and in possession may be non-pelagic rockfish; the first two non- pelagic rockfish caught must be retained and become part of the bag limit of the person originally hooking the fish; no size limit

PROBLEM: Rockfish harvest has increased markedly in recent years in Prince William Sound. The average rockfish harvest in Prince William Sound reported in the SWHS from 1991 to 2000 was 13,827. Between 2001 and 2006 the average rockfish harvest has almost doubled to 26,145 fish. Additionally, the Department submitted a proposal to standardize the regulatory boundaries for subsistence, personal use, sport and commercial fish between Cook Inlet-Resurrection Bay and Prince William Sound. Moving the current sport boundary from Cape Puget west 15 miles to Cape Fairfield would change rockfish limits in these waters to the more liberal bag limits for rockfish existing in Prince William Sound. At the lower Cook Inlet meeting in 2007, the Board passed a regulation to reduce the rockfish bag limit in the waters of the North Gulf Coast from 5 rockfish per day to 4 per day. This proposal would help align rockfish regulations in these adjacent waters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Rockfish populations may become overfished if harvest increases continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Lower limits may help locally depleted areas to repopulate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Rockfish anglers who want long term sustainable fisheries.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Rockfish anglers who want to harvest more rockfish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-063)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 01.645 (e) (1) (2) Subsistence bag, possession, and size limits.
Allow retention of rockfish up to the daily bag limit in the subsistence halibut fishery as follows:

(e) The daily bag limit for rockfish is as follows

(1) from May 1 – September 15, the daily bag limit is [5] 4 fish and the possession limit is [10] 8 fish, of which only two per day and in possession may be non-pelagic rockfish; a person may not take or possess rockfish under sport fishing regulations and under this section on the same day;

(2) from September 16 - April 30, the daily bag and possession limit is [10] 8 fish, of which only two per day and in possession may be non-pelagic rockfish; a person may not take or possess rockfish under sport fishing regulations and under this section on the same day.

PROBLEM: The department submitted a proposal to reduce the sport rockfish bag limits to 4 per day, 8 in possession from May 1-September 15, and 8 per day, 8 in possession from September 16- April 30. In the past the board has adopted bag limits for the subsistence rockfish fishery that are the same as the sport fishery. The reason was to prevent Alaska residents from exceeding the sport rockfish bag limits by setting a longline to catch more fish under subsistence regulations. Sport rockfish harvest has increased markedly in recent years in Prince William Sound. The average rockfish harvest in Prince William Sound reported in the SWHS from 1991 to 2000 was 13,827. Between 2001 and 2006 the average rockfish harvest has almost doubled to 26,145 fish. At the lower Cook Inlet meeting in 2007, the Board passed a regulation to reduce the sport and subsistence rockfish bag limit in the waters of the North Gulf from 5 rockfish per day to 4 per day. This proposal would help align rockfish regulations in these adjacent waters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Rockfish populations may become overfished if harvest increases continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Lower limits may help locally depleted areas to repopulate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Rockfish anglers who want long term sustainable fisheries.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Rockfish anglers who want to harvest more rockfish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-064)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 55.xxx. New section. Limit number of lines fished on state licensed charter vessels as follows:

On state licensed charter vessels, limit the number of lines fished to the number of paying customers, up to a maximum of 6 lines, unless the charter vessel is operating with a Federal limited entry halibut permit.

ISSUE: Control the growth in effort, and harvest of charter vessels that don not hold Federal limited entry charter halibut permits. When the Federal limited entry halibut charter program is implemented, it will still be possible for charter vessels of unlimited size to operate in Prince William Sound (PWS) under State regulations, targeting all species except halibut. The potential for uncontrolled growth in effort and harvest, including the mortality of halibut and other species released, is very high in light of increased angler effort in PWS from the ports of Whittier and Seward.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Charter operators who do not hold Federal limited entry charter halibut permits will view PWS as an area of opportunity for large party vessel operations that will further increase the harvest of rockfish and lingcod. This uncontrolled effort will further increase the harvest of rock fish and lingcod that is now more than 2.5 times greater for the recreational sector as a whole than it was in 1996. Unless some measure of control on this effort is implemented now, it will become more difficult to reduce later, and make management more difficult. It will also impact the recreational experience of non-guided anglers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes it preserves the quality of the recreational fishing experience for all guided and unguided recreational fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All non-guided recreational fishermen in PWS, small business owners who operate 6-pack charter vessels but do not have a Federal limited entry charter halibut permit, and charter operators in PWS who hold a Federal limited entry charter halibut permit. ADF&G will benefit from having better control of resource management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those businesses who intend to develop large charter vessel operations, targeting all species except halibut, for the purpose of providing fishing opportunities to more than 6 passengers or clients.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Restricting all charter vessels to the number of paying customers up to a maximum of 6 lines. Rejected because it is inconsistent with provisions of the Federal halibut charter limited entry program.

PROPOSED BY: Cordova District Fishermen United, Groundfish Division (SC-08F-033)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 55.xxx. New section. Define sport fishing gear for finfish in Prince William Sound to prohibit electric downriggers as follows:

Sport fishing gear for finfish in the PWS Management Area will consist of a fishing rod that is a tapering, often jointed, rod equipped with a hand grip and line guides, upon which is mounted a hand powered reel used to deploy and retrieve the fishing line. A downrigger may be used in conjunction with a fishing rod but a downrigger may not be used in conjunction with a troll gurdy. A downrigger is defined as a device designed to be used with a fishing rod to deploy a line to a selected depth and retrieve the downrigger line and weight. A hand powered, electric, hydraulic or power assisted downrigger is not legal sport fishing gear unless it is used in conjunction with a fishing rod and the fishing rod is used to retrieve the fish. Sport fishing gear shall be operated in a manner conforming to its basic design.

ISSUE: Define sport fishing gear for the PWS Management Area to be a fishing pole with a hand operated reel that is attached to the pole. The use of powered electric or hydraulic gear allows the sport fisherman to fish deeper. This allows species such as rougheye, shortrakers and blackcod to be accessed at a higher rate and some of these species are very vulnerable to fishing effort. Species like blackcod in PWS are fully allocated and harvested. A sport harvest to date has not been figured into the setting of catch limits as it was assumed to be a species that would not be targeted by the sport fishery because of the depths at which they live. Sport fishing should be conducted with sport fishing gear and not the quickest most efficient way to take as much as you can.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be an increase in the use of commercial fishing gear with electric or hydraulic help such as electric jigging machines or even power troll gear for the purpose of catching sport fish species. With increasing guided and unguided recreational harvests of groundfish resources in PWS operating out of Wittier and Seward, it is important to apply some measure of control of fishing gear to maintain a quality recreational experience for all users, and minimize conflict with users of fully allocated species.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users will benefit from maintaining a quality recreational fishing experience, rather than allow sport fishing to develop into a competitive meat fishery. Personal use and subsistence regulations will continue to allow residents the opportunity to stock their freezers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Primarily charter operators who are trying to get a full bag limit for every species for their client will not be able to do it as efficiently and as effectively without the use of power operated equipment.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Providing for an exemption for the handicapped. 5 AAC 75.038 already provides the handicapped the necessary exemptions.

PROPOSED BY: Cordova District Fishermen United, Groundfish Division (SC-08F-032)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 55.022. General provisions for seasons and bag, possession, annual, and size limits for the fresh waters of the Prince William Sound Area. Allow the use of sport-caught pink and chum salmon for bait in sport, personal use, and subsistence fisheries as follows:

Notwithstanding 5 AAC 75.026, in the Prince William Sound area, pink and chum salmon taken in a sport fishery may be used as bait in a sport, personal use, or subsistence fishery.

ISSUE: Create a new regulation to allow the use of sport caught pink and chum salmon for bait in sport personal use and subsistence fisheries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The salmon caught will have full utilization.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport fisherman.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, the loss of commercial harvest would be undetectable considering the size of the harvests in Prince William Sound.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Prince William Sound Charter Boat Assoc. and Whittier AC (HQ-08F-092)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 55.022. General provisions for seasons and bag, possession, annual, and size limits for the fresh waters of the Prince William Sound Area. Allow the use of sport caught pink and chum salmon as bait in Prince William Sound as follows:

The use of sport caught pink and chum salmon for bait in Prince William Sound is permitted.

ISSUE: Allow the use of sport caught pink and chum salmon as bait in Prince William Sound.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Products produced. At certain times of the year, predator fish prefer salmon flesh over other types of food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Buy commercial caught salmon. Not sure if it is legal.

PROPOSED BY: James Norris

(HQ-08F-003)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 55.023. Special provisions for seasons and bag, possession, annual, and size limits for the fresh waters of the Prince William Sound Area. Move terminal harvest area closer to Whittier to reduce native salmon interception as follows:

All marine waters west of a line from **Trinity Point to Gradual Point** [BLACKSTONE BAY TO PIGOT POINT PASSAGE CANAL]

ISSUE: Move the Whittier Terminal Harvest Area closer to Whittier to prevent possible native salmon interception and to reduce violation potential for sport fisherman.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The potential exists for 3 small native silver salmon runs to be eliminated and multiple fishing violations will continue partly due to the boundary line passing through a salmon holding area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It may improve the native run fishing areas and reduce unintentional violations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moving the terminal harvest area in reduces the daily bag limit at Pigot Point from 6 to 3. This area is heavily fished and will allow more fishermen to harvest fish. Sport fisherman who don't read the regulations carefully.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Law abiding sport fisherman who fished Pigot Point inside the Terminal Harvest area will no only be able to harvest 3 silvers in that area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Moving the line out farther – rejected because of possible native run interception. Moving the line to Decision Point to Logging Camp Bay – not chosen in favor of proposed line based on ease of enforcement.

PROPOSED BY: Prince William Sound Charter Boat Assoc. and Whittier AC (HQ-08F-093)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 55.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Prince William Sound Area. Reduce area for coho harvest in Passage Canal near Whittier as follows:

Narrow the area to just east of Billings Creek / eastern boarder of Shotgun Cove to the head of Passage Canal.

ISSUE: The area for catching terminal coho runs in Passage Canal (Whittier area) is too large.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Natural coho stocks are intercepted more frequently. Enforcement of the fishery is much tougher.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The new area would much more likely ensure that the terminal fishery is harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? ADF&G, the sport fishers who abide by the rules.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who claim they caught six coho in Passage Canal, when they actually caught them elsewhere.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: David Goldstein

(SC-08F-006)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 55.050. Waters closed to sport fishing. Amend the regulation as follows:

Close Ibec Creek to sport fishing 2 miles above the Copper River Highway

ISSUE: There is increasing encroachment into spawning areas for coho on the Copper River Flats.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport fishing on the Delta is increasing rapidly. It is time for habitat protection for coho on the Copper River Delta.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Coho salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A small number of sport fishermen who want to target coho in spawning areas of the Delta.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing sport fishing above the Copper River Highway, did not address the problem of the 18 Mile system.

PROPOSED BY: Copper River / Prince William Sound Advisory Committee (SC-08F-027)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 55.050. Waters closed to sport fishing. Amend the regulation as follows:
Close 18 Mile Creek 500 yards above the confluence with Alaganik Slough for coho salmon

18 Mile Creek system closed to the taking of coho salmon 500 yards above the confluence with Alaganik Slough.

ISSUE: Sport fishing in coho spawning areas on the Copper River flats.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? 18 Mile system, a ranch of Alaganik Slough will see increasing removal of spawners from the creek system.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Coho salmon in 18 Mile system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A small number of sport fishermen who are targeting coho in the spawning areas of this system.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing sport fishing at the confluence with Alaganik, but was rejected as too restrictive.

PROPOSED BY: Copper River / Prince William Sound Advisory Committee (SC-08F-029)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 55.023. Special provisions for season, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area. Amend the regulation to close sport fishing for coho salmon along portion of Copper River Highway as follows:

Close sportfishing for coho salmon Mile 7 Copper River Highway to Mile 27 Copper River Highway north of the highway.

ISSUE: Sportfishing for coho salmon Mile 7 Copper River Highway to Mile 27 Copper River Highway north in critical spawning habitat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Spawning ground exploitation, habitat damage, catch and release mortality when coho are vulnerable.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport, subsistence, and commercial long term users of the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some sport anglers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Single hook only, no catch and release in spawning areas.

PROPOSED BY: Stan Makarka

(HQ-08F-284)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 55.023. Special provisions for season, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.
Close spawning beds to sport fishing in Copper River as follows:

Part C sect. **(3) All Known spawning beds are closed to sport fishing.**

ISSUE: In many places, and many other countries with sustained salmon harvest, it is illegal to try to catch salmon while they are trying to spawn reproduce. The spawning beds on the Copper are more accessible, then many other river systems in the state and should be protected.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Future generations of fish will struggle more and more, because even though they made it all the way up the river they will be plucked from their spawning beds. By the time these fish have traveled all that way they are not even appetizing and barely resemble themselves even a short weeks before. This problem will only continue to grow and become larger wit the state unless something is done.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes it gives the mature fish a chance to finish their spawning and die in peace, which I believe is a first step in helping future generations of salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In the future this will help to create more salmon for everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Sport fisherman who like eating mushy, faded, meat that has exhausted all of its oil reserves.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Babic

(HQ-08F-009)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 52.023 – Special provisions for the seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area. Amend these regulations as follows:

This proposal would provide protection to select small stocks of king salmon in the Upper Copper River and Chitina River drainages.

Amend the regulation as follows:

(x) in the Lakina River, including all flowing waters within a one quarter-mile radius of it’s confluence with the Chitina River, sport fishing for king salmon is closed; king salmon may not be taken or possessed;

(x) in Sinona Creek, including all flowing waters within a one quarter-mile radius of it’s confluence with the Copper River, sport fishing for king salmon is closed; king salmon may not be taken or possessed;

(19) in the Slana River drainage, including the flowing waters within a one quarter-mile radius of the confluence of the Slana and Copper rivers,

(A) whitefish may be taken using a spear or bow and arrow from January 1 — December 31;

(B) sport fishing for king salmon is closed; king salmon may not be taken or possessed;

ISSUE: The upper Copper River drainage contains several streams and rivers which support small, distinct stocks of king salmon. Although these stocks currently receive intermittent sport fishing pressure, closure of these streams to sport fishing will add protection to these smaller king salmon stocks that is consistent with the Copper River King Salmon Management Plan 5 AAC 24.361.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Currently, anglers can target these king salmon stocks which may not be able to sustain even low levels of sport harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of the Copper River king salmon stocks.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There is currently limited fishing effort by sport anglers on these streams, so only those few anglers that currently fish these streams will be negatively impacted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-072)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for the seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.

Amend these regulations as follows:

(1) in Ahtell Creek, **including all flowing waters within a one quarter-mile radius of its confluence with the Copper River**, sport fishing for king salmon is closed;...

(7) in all clearwater tributaries of the Gakona River, **including all flowing waters within a one quarter-mile radius of their confluence with the Gakona River**, sport fishing for king salmon is closed;...

(8) in the Gilahina River, **including all flowing waters within a one quarter-mile radius of its confluence with the Chitina River**, sport fishing for king salmon is closed;...

(11) in Indian Creek, **including all flowing waters within a one quarter-mile radius of its confluence with the Copper River**, sport fishing for king salmon is closed;...

(12)(D) in Manker Creek, **including all flowing waters within a one quarter-mile radius of its confluence with the Klutina River**,

ISSUE: The above streams are currently closed to sport fishing for king salmon to protect these small, discrete stocks from over harvest. These streams are clear and create a clear water plume in the glacial water of the adjacent rivers that allows anglers to exploit these stocks in the adjacent waters open to king salmon fishing. The amendments to these regulations extend the closed area to include that portion of the adjacent river within one quarter-mile of the confluence to protect king salmon holding in these waters prior to ascending their spawning streams. Similar closures are already in place for the Gulkana River and tributaries of the Tonsina River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? These small, discrete stocks of king salmon may not be able to sustain even low levels of sport harvest. Currently anglers can target these stocks immediately below the mouths of these streams where the fish may hold for several hours or days depending on water conditions prior to ascending the spawning stream.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The small spawning populations of king salmon in these streams.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those sport anglers that currently target king salmon in these streams.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-065)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.
Close Ahtell Creek to king salmon fishing as follows:

Ahtell Creek – closed to king salmon fishery including 200 yards downstream of its confluence with the Chistochina River.

ISSUE: The targeting of Ahtell Creek king salmon that school at the confluence of the Chistochina and Ahtell creek.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? King salmon that are resting before entering the creek will continue to be targeted.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of the Copper River Salmon resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anglers targeting Ahtell creek king salmon resting at the confluence.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limited entry guiding services. BOF has no authority.

PROPOSED BY: Shawn Gilman

(HQ-08F-119)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area. Extend the king salmon fishing season on the Copper River as follows:

King salmon fishing on the Copper River mainstem below the Klutina River Confluence will close August 10.

(E) in all flowing waters of the Copper River mainstem downstream of the ADF&G regulatory markers located at the confluence of the Klutina River, king salmon may be taken from January 1 – August 10, with a bag and possession limit of one fish 20 inches or greater in length, and a bag and possession limit of 10 fish less than 20 inches in length;

ISSUE: The recent radio telemetry study done by ADF&G has confirmed that many of the fish (as many as half) that come to the Tonsina and Klutina Rivers arrive after the season is closed. The mainstem of the Copper River at the confluence with the Klutina and Tonsina Rivers offers the best walk-in fishing for king salmon left in Alaska. Very few, if any, fish spawn in the Copper River before August 10.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans will continue to have a tough time catching Copper River King Salmon without hiring expensive fishing guides.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Walk in fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open the whole river to August 10, there would be little, if any, fishing pressure above the Klutina, spawning fish would not be harmed.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee and Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee
(SC-08F-025)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.
Modify the Klutina River king salmon season as follows:

Return the Klutina River king salmon season closure to August 10.

(12) in the Klutina River drainage, bait and artificial lures may be used;

(E) in all flowing waters downstream of the ADF&G regulatory markers located at Mile 19.2 on the Klutina Lake Road, king salmon may be taken [ONLY] from January 1 - July 31, with a bag and possession limit of one fish 20 inches or greater in length, and a bag and possession limit of 10 fish less than 20 inches in length;

(i) in all flowing waters downstream of the ADF&G regulatory markers located at Mile 13 on the Klutina Lake Road, king salmon may be taken from January 1 – August 10, with a bag and possession limit of one fish 20 inches or greater in length, and a bag and possession limit of 10 fish less than 20 inches in length;

ISSUE: In 1993 the Board of Fisheries shortened the king salmon season on the Klutina River by ten days based on recommendations from ADF&G in Glennallen. This recommendation was based on two days of late season hook and line “sampling” in which some near-spawning fish were caught.

This decision had a dramatic effect on the residents of the Copper Center/Glennallen area. Many Interior Alaskans depend on the Upper Copper River Tributaries for their winter fish supplies and for a substantial portion of their income. Most businesses in this community are very dependent on traveling fishermen for a large percentage of their annual income. Eliminating ten days from the king salmon season removes a full 20% of the earning potential from many businesses.

Ten days less at the end of the season eliminates 1/3 of the best king salmon fishing. The Klutina River has two distinct runs of kings. The early run (mostly tributary spawners) has been diminishing. Most of the fishing effort takes place during the later run that enters the river from about July 10 to August 10.

Legitimate scientific run timing data was not available for Klutina River king salmon until recently. ADF&G conducted a radio telemetry study from 1999-2005 to determine distribution and run timing in the Copper River System.

The recent radio telemetry study done by ADF&G has confirmed what many Klutina fishermen have known for years: many of the king salmon that come to the Klutina arrive after the season is closed. Data has shown that an average of approximately 30% of the total run enters the river after July 31 (excluding 2004 when data after July 31 was not provided). Some years as much as 67% of the run enters the river after the season close.

King salmon in the Copper River System are referred to as “fully allocated”. 100% of the kings that enter the Klutina after July 31 (30% of the total run) are allocated to Copper River commercial fisheries, personal use (dip-net), and fishwheel fisheries. This allocation should be

changed to include 200-400 fish (estimated harvest August 1-10) for Klutina hook and line fishermen.

Placing an ADF&G regulatory marker at mile 13 of the Klutina Lake Road will protect most of the early spawning fish while allowing enough space to limit crowding.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The people of the Copper River Valley and others wishing to hook-and-line fish the tributaries of the Copper River will continue to be excluded from the allocation of late season king salmon.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any angler wishing to fish the late run king salmon in the Klutina River after July 31 will have the opportunity. Local businesses that depend on king salmon fishing for their annual income will recover from previous lost opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those uses that are currently allocated the fish Klutina fishermen will catch will suffer, if the Copper River system is truly fully allocated.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Many Markers have been considered, but a marker at mile 13 will allow for protection of most spawning fish while limiting over-crowding of lower river fishing holes.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee; Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee; and Fairbanks Advisory Committee (SC-08F-024)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area. Extend the king salmon fishing season on the Tonsina River as follows:

King salmon fishing on the Lower Tonsina River will close August 10.

(25) in the Tonsina River drainage,

(A) in all flowing waters downstream from the outlet of Tonsina Lake, bait and artificial lures may be used;

(B) in Tonsina Lake, sport fishing for king salmon is closed; king salmon may not be retained or possessed;

(C) in all flowing waters entering into Tonsina Lake, sport fishing for king salmon is closed; king salmon may not be retained or possessed;

(D) in all tributaries to Tonsina River, including Little Tonsina River and Bernard Creek, and all flowing waters within a one quarter-mile radius of their confluence with the Tonsina River, sport fishing for king salmon is closed; king salmon may not be retained or possessed;

(E) in all flowing waters downstream of the ADF&G regulatory markers located at the Alyeska Pipeline crossing, king salmon may be taken from January 1 – August 10, with a bag and possession limit of one fish 20 inches or greater in length, and a bag and possession limit of 10 fish less than 20 inches in length;

ISSUE: The recent radio telemetry study done by ADF&G has confirmed that many of the fish (as many as half) that come to the Tonsina arrive after the season is closed. Placing a regulatory marker at the Alyeska pipeline crossing will protect most of the early in-river spawning grounds. The Tonsina has very little fishing pressure and a very strong run of king salmon. This is a late run of fish, similar to the Klutina run, yet it closes July 19.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Much of the late run of king salmon in the Tonsina will not be exploited.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any angler wishing to fish the Late Run King Salmon in the Tonsina River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

Open the whole river to August 10, there is so little fishing pressure spawning fish would not be harmed.

PROPOSED BY: Anchorage Advisory Committee; Matanuska. Valley Advisory Committee; and Fairbanks Advisory Committee (SC-08F-023)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____
ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____
DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 52.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area. Allow retention of sockeye salmon unintentionally hooked in the rivers of the Copper River drainage as follows:

Except for sockeye salmon in the flowing waters of the Copper River drainage, a fish unintentionally hooked other than **in the** mouth must be released immediately.

Change 5 AAC 52.022 (a)(1) to read, **in all flowing waters, only unbaited, single hook, artificial lures may be used; except only single hook, artificial flies with a gap no larger than 3/8", when fishing for sockeye salmon. Additional weight may only be used 18" or more ahead of the fly are allowed.**

ISSUE: Sockeye do not feed in freshwater and therefore do not strike flies, as is the case with other species (i.e. rainbow and steelhead trout) the method of fishing for sockeye salmon with flies is to virtually snag them, whether by drawing the line through their mouth or elsewhere on their body.

It is generally accepted that snagging sockeye in any place other than the mouth increases the possibility of injury and in certain cases such injuries may accelerate mortality.

Therefore the issue is: in an effort to enhance the overall health of the spawning sockeye salmon, allowing the retention of fish caught in the mouth and elsewhere on the body will reduce the number of injured fish being released back into the water and potentially reduce the mortality associated with hooking injury, as the salmon journey to their respective spawning grounds.

By changing this regulation the number of fish caught, injury to the fish, and the unintended mortality will be reduced. Additionally, this change may relieve crowding on the rivers, and reduce potential injuries to anglers.

Finally, with the continued increase in tourism in Alaska, it is to be expected that recreational anglers will be a significant part of that increase. Any provision we make that will enhance the fishery will result in greater economic stability to those businesses attempting to provide goods and services needed for a quality and successful experience in the Copper Valley. If we are to continue seeing adequate production in the spawning streams and rivers to meet the increased demand, we need to do all we can to insure that the resource has every advantage possible for a successful return.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? 1) By allowing the sport anglers to only keep fish snagged in the mouth, the regulation promotes excessive damage to far too many of this species.

2) The current regulation too often results in the same fish being caught and released many times before reaching their spawning grounds which may led to premature death or sterility at the time of spawning.

3) According to the statistics of the ADF&G personnel at a recent meeting of the Copper Valley Fish and Game Advisory Council, approximately 14,000 sockeye were harvested in the 2006 season. If, under the current regulation, each fisherman was forced to release an average of five (5)

or more sockeye salmon (considered by some to be a conservative estimate) for each one retained by “fair catch”, over 70,000 fish were “foul hooked” and released in the 25 mile corridor of the Klutina River to accomplish that estimate. When that number is extended to all the rivers of the Copper River drainage where sportfishing is occurring, it could easily reach levels far exceeding 100,000 sockeye in one season.

4) It is generally recognized that the best way to insure successful spawning by the highest number of the sockeye salmon is to simply leave them alone. This of course does not address the needs of those requiring the resource for consumption and others that are interested in sport fishing. The more often a sockeye salmon is caught and released the greater the threat is that the fish will be less likely to successfully spawn. This is critical to the rivers that receive low returns such as Gun Creek and the Gulkana River in certain years.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, damage to the fish (tearing and scarring) would be greatly reduced. Mortality rates from tearing, scarring and fatigue and trauma from multiple catch and releases will decline. Therefore, successful spawning by higher number of fish may result in increased returns in the following years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? There are several benefits to consider:

- 1) The sockeye salmon will not be exposed to multiple catches on their journey to the spawning grounds, resulting in healthier spawners. Less trauma means healthier resource.
- 2) Currently, time on the river necessary to catch a limit of three fish often takes from 1 to five hours. Adoption of this rule change will greatly reduce the time spent on the river by most anglers and therefore overcrowding would be greatly reduced as the limits would be reached quicker so each angler could leave the river sooner, thus reducing the catch and release.
- 3) Except for anglers who wish to catch and release only, upon catching their limit, anglers can vacate the river for the day reducing pressure on the resource.
- 4) Physical injuries to anglers caused by crowding in confined areas (combat fishing) would be reduced if less time is required to catch the limit of sockeye salmon, resulting in many anglers spending less time on the river.
- 5) Fewer fishers will crowd the banks of the rivers, allowing for a more enjoyable experience for all those wishing to sport fish for this resource.
- 6) And finally, the enforcement of the current catch and release of “foul caught” fish will virtually be eliminated, releasing our Fish and Game enforcement officers to other more pressing and important issues.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Any snagging fish that incurs injuries considered serious enough that it would jeopardize their ability to continue to spawning grounds (i.e. gut tears, bleeding at the gills, damage from removal of swallowed hooks, etc.) must be kept and considered a part of the daily limit. 2) If a fish is removed from the water for any reason, it must be kept and considered as part of the daily limit. 3) Once the daily limit is reached (three fish per day) the angler must cease fishing for sockeye salmon.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Lanegan, Ken Hughes, and Alan LeMaster

(HQ-08F-041)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area. Prohibit removal from water any salmon which are intended for release as follows:

Require all salmon removed from the water to be kept.

(4) salmon, other than king salmon: may be taken from January 1-December 31, as follows;

(a) greater than 16 inches in length; bag and possession limit of three fish;

(b) 16 inches or less in length; bag and possession limit of 10 fish;

(c) A person may not remove from the water any salmon that the person intends to release;

ISSUE: The practice of “Kick and Release” has become more prevalent as sockeye salmon fishing effort has increased in the Copper River Valley. Many fishermen, Guided and Un-Guided alike have developed a system of landing small salmon (Reds and Silvers). They drag the fish onto the gravel, many of which are snagged, let them flop around until they quit moving, unhook the fish, then kick it back in the water. This “Kick and Release” practice undoubtedly causes needless injury and raises catch and release mortality. The abuse of valuable Copper River Salmon will continue unless this practice is addressed.

All salmon species will quickly calm down and allow hook removal if properly netted or tailed.

This regulation has been in place for king salmon for years to reduce catch and release mortality.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Thousands of fish per year will be injured or killed needlessly.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sockeye Salmon, Silver Salmon and anyone who cares about the resource will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anglers who would rather not make an effort to handle fish properly will be required to release fish with respect.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Prohibit the release of any fish species removed from the water-rejected-not practical for all species. Status Quo-rejected-this situation should be addressed.

PROPOSED BY: Klutina River Association

(I-08F-002)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.
Count any landed or deliberately released salmon against the daily bag limit as follows:

On all tributaries of the Copper River, any salmon landed or deliberately released is counted in the daily bag limit for species of salmon. Once the daily bag limit for salmon is reached no sport fishing for salmon is allowed until after 12:01 AM the following day.

ISSUE: The Copper River is a very swift and difficult river for salmon to ascend. Catch and release of Chinook and sockeye salmon expends stored energy necessary for reaching the spawning grounds. Documented mortality from the catch and release of salmon is estimated between 4% and 20%. See Bendock 1992, Stuby 2002, with spawning escapement and run conservation concerns on the Copper River, wasting fish through incidental mortality of catch and release is unacceptable.

Sport fishing pressure on the Copper River increases every year. The stocks cannot sustain this kind of pressure. Mortality and failure to spawn of migrating and spawning salmon by the practice of catch and release is a loss to all user groups and a threat to the resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups: sport personal use, subsistence and commercial. To help avoid an over harvest of salmon through mortality and lack of ability to spawn of released fish. This will insure a healthy and safe spawning environment for the runs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It may slightly limit sport fisherman from being able to recreate a full day, but people can still fish and keep their bag limit of salmon.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing all tributaries to fishing. This is pretty radical but it would insure a safe spawning habitat. Limiting catch and release is a much more reasonable approach. 2. Make it more difficult to fish by implementing additional bag limits and gear restrictions. Restrictions in bag limits and gear restrictions are limited and do not address the wasting of the resource

PROPOSED BY: Native Village of Eyak

(SC-08F-044)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.
Close Klutina and Gulkana rivers to power boat use two days per week as follows:

Restrict methods and means for sport fishing in the Klutina and Gulkana Rivers to not allow fishing from or transporting fishermen in a power boat two days a week.

ISSUE: Back trolling is a very efficient method and could lead to over harvest. Bank and habitat degradation is occurring from the use of motorized transport and fishing from motorized boats in the spawning tributaries of the Copper River. This is a proactive preventative measure based off experience on highly trafficked rivers in other parts of the state.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Salmon could be over harvested and bank and habitat degradation will continue to get worse. Spawning habitat will be impaired and reduce the productivity and sustained yield of the salmon runs.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Salmon will have a better chance to spawn and will not suffer from power boats, exhaust pollution or habitat degradation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing the river to power boats on weekends or other restrictions on access. This will cause enforcement problems and confusion to the public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups: sport personal use, subsistence and commercial. To help avoid an over harvest of salmon loss of spawning habitat. This will insure a healthy and safe spawning environment for the runs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides who transport clients in motorized boats or fishermen who back-troll using power boats. This can be compensated for by using non motorized rafts.

PROPOSED BY: Native Village of Eyak

(SC-08F-045)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC XX. XXX. New section. Apply restrictions to hatchery and stocking programs as follows:

- 1) The use of hormones, including testosterone, or their precursors in any state sport fish hatchery is prohibited.
- 2) The production and stocking of genetically altered fish by any state sport fish hatchery is prohibited. An exception may be granted when item 3 is fulfilled.
- 3) ADF&G may be allowed to produce and stock sterile fish in a water body only after the local populace that uses the water body has been notified and the local Fish and Game Advisory Committee, after a public review, has given approval.
- 4) When wild species are present in a major drainage the sport fish hatcheries will use local populations of wild fish for brood donors.
- 5) A species may be stocked in a major drainage when there are no wild populations of that species present or when the likelihood of developing a feral population is low.

ISSUE: The Alaska Department of Fish and Game is genetically altering and using the hormone testosterone to make sterile rainbow trout. The sterilization program is being expanded to include other stocked species. Alaskans don't want to catch genetically altered fish and they don't want "Frankenfish" on the dinner table. Alaskans want natural fish and clean water. Alaskans should expect not to pay over \$100 million for two state sport fish hatcheries that produce genetically altered fish and put hormones in the water.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Some Alaskan will stop fishing and others will switch to wild stocks. The result will be less money for local economies and more pressure on wild stocks. The use of the hormone testosterone in the state sport fish hatcheries and its subsequent discharge into Alaska streams and estuaries may negatively impact fish, wildlife, and human health.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal assures anglers and other Alaskans that no hormones or genetic alteration was used to produce hatchery fish. Anglers will know that the fish on the dinner table is not genetically altered and is healthy for their families. Alaska water quality and fish, wildlife, and human health will be protected.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers will benefit by knowing that they are not catching and putting genetically altered fish on the dinner table. Fish, wildlife, and human health will benefit from clean water. Local economies will benefit from more anglers spending more money to catch and harvest normal hatchery fish. Wild fish populations will benefit from less pressure. Local citizens will benefit by having more control over how hatchery fish are produced and what is stocked in local waters. Everyone will benefit knowing that their money is not going towards the production of genetically altered fish and the release of hormones in the water.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who like catching genetically altered "Frankenfish" and who don't mind hormones in Alaska waters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allowing ADF&G Sport Fish Division to continue managing the state sport fish hatcheries without additional public oversight was rejected because the

policy making process within the division is neither open nor transparent. The division's leaders have disregarded public involvement.

PROPOSED BY: Bill Larry and Ralph Seekins

(HQ-08F-027)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.
Amend this regulation as follows:

(28) in stocked **waters** [LAKES], the bag and possession limit for rainbow/steelhead trout, Arctic char/Dolly Varden, landlocked salmon, and Arctic grayling is 10, fish in combination, of which only one may be greater than 18 inches in length; for the purposes of this paragraph “stocked **waters** [LAKES]” include Arizona Lake, Buffalo Lake, Connor Lake, Crater Lake, Dick Lake, DJ Lake, Gergie Lake, John Lake, Junction Lake, **Kathleen Lake**, Little Crater Lake, Little Junction Lake, North Jans Lake, Old Road Lake, Peanut Lake, Pippin Lake, Round Lake, Ryan Lake, Sculpin Lake, Silver Lake, Strelna Lake, South Jans Lake, Squirrel Creek Pit Lake, Tex Smith Lake, Three Mile Lake, Tolsona Mountain Lake, [TOWN LAKE], Two Mile Lake, and Van Lake.

ISSUE: This is a housekeeping proposal. In conjunction with the Board of Fisheries cycle, the Department reviews the stocked waters list for the various management areas. Stocked waters are removed from the stocked waters list due to a loss of public access, poor fish growth or survival, or insufficient fishing effort. As new waters are identified and included in the stocking plan they are added to the list. The proposed language will update the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Management Area (UCUSMA) stocked waters list. In addition, this proposal requests the language be modified to include all stocked waters, not only stocked “lakes”, which adds clarity to the regulation and is consistent with the language in the UCUSMA Stocked Waters Plan (5 AAC 52.065).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Water bodies that are no longer stocked will remain in regulation and new stocked waters will not be added to regulation. The regulation will not reference stocked waters that are not lakes (currently none occur in the UCUSMA, but do elsewhere in the region).

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The public, by having up-to-date regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

(HQ-08F-073)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 52.023 (24)(B) - Special provisions for the seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.
Amend this regulation as follows:

(24) in Tolsona Lake,

[(B) THE BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT FOR RAINBOW/STEELHEAD TROUT IS 10 FISH, OF WHICH ONLY ONE MAY BE 20 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH;]

ISSUE: This is a housekeeping proposal. Tolsona Lake had been stocked with various species, most recently in 1999 with rainbow trout, but was dropped from the stocking program after 1999 due to access issues. In 2004, the Board adopted 5 AAC 52.065 Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area Stocked Waters Management Plan which provides management approaches for the stocked waters in the area. The current stocked waters in the UCUSMA and associated bag limits are listed in 5 AAC 52.023 (28). Based on a life expectancy of 7 years for the hatchery rainbow trout stock and that the most recent stocking consisted of sterile trout, it is unlikely any rainbow trout remain in Tolsona Lake. If this proposal is adopted and until stocking resumes in Tolsona Lake, the bag and possession limit for rainbow trout in Tolsona Lake will revert to the area background regulation of 2 fish, of which only one may be 20 inches or greater in length.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Anglers may believe that there is a rainbow trout population in Tolsona Lake of sufficient size to sustain a sport fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport fish anglers who fish Tolsona Lake.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

(HQ-08F-071)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 52.045. Lake Burbot Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

This proposal would repeal the Lake Burbot Management Plan.

[5 AAC 52.045. LAKE BURBOT MANAGEMENT PLAN.

THE DEPARTMENT SHALL MANAGE LAKE FISHERIES ON BURBOT POPULATIONS IN THE UPPER COPPER RIVER AND UPPER SUSITNA RIVER AREA TO ENSURE MAXIMUM SUSTAINABLE HARVEST. IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE MAXIMUM SUSTAINABLE HARVEST OF LAKE BURBOT POPULATIONS, THE DEPARTMENT SHALL, BY EMERGENCY ORDER, ESTABLISH PERIODS DURING WHICH

- (1) TIME AND AREA ARE REDUCED;
- (2) THE USE OF SET LINES IS PROHIBITED;
- (3) OR BOTH. (EFF. 4/9/89, REGISTER110)]

ISSUE: This is a housekeeping proposal. The stipulations and guidelines in this regulation are now covered under 5 AAC 52.022 (14) (prohibits set lines), AS 16.05.060, and 5 AAC 75.003 (EO Authority). Therefore, 5 AAC 52.045 is redundant.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The management plan will remain in regulation with redundant wording.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The angling public and enforcement staff will benefit from clear, concise regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game. (HQ-08F-066)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 24.xxx. New section. Amend the regulation to restrict commercial activity by participants of subsistence fisheries as follows:

Permit holders or vessels that participate in subsistence fisheries will not allowed to fish in commercial openers for 1 month. Pattern regulation after 5 AAC 34.128 and 5 AAC 01.360. This is the rule in other parts of Alaska for crab and salmon. It should be here too. Any commercial fisher, both resident and non-Alaskan can still keep an unlimited number of salmon for personal use from there commercial loads.

ISSUE: Commercial fishermen fishing during early season subsistence only openers for fish that they ship to market or store in snow banks until they're commercial openings when they dig them out and sell them.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Salmon that are supposed to be for subsistence users will be sold and not show up on any fish tickets.

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

WHO TO BENEFIT? Honest commercial users and subsistence users through proper use of subsistence openings.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Illegal commercial fishers who sell fish caught during subsistence openings will be hurt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Steve Johnson

(HQ-08F-286)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC XX.XXX. New section. Amend the regulation to prohibit home pack of king salmon in Copper River commercial fishery as follows:

Commercial permit holder may not homepack Chinook salmon in the Copper River Fishery.

ISSUE: Eliminate “home pack” of Chinook salmon in the Copper River commercial fishery. In 2004, 500 permit holders reported 1,106 Chinook taken as home pack. This equals two fish per permit holder.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This is an unfair allocation of Chinook when compared to restrictive upriver allocation included one Chinook per household in the dipnet fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will allow the board to reallocate 1,100 Chinook to other user groups while realistically they will go to the commercial allocation at least those fish will be accurately allocated and the public can see the total percentage of available Chinook that is allocated to commercial fishers as “home pack”, subsistence or “commercial” harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Kramer

(HQ-08F-242)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 24.356. Reporting requirements. This proposal would repeal the regulation that requires the reporting of king salmon harvested but not sold in the Copper River and Bering River districts.

ISSUE: During the March, 2007 meeting, the Board adopted a statewide regulation requiring that all fish retained but not sold from a commercial delivery be documented on a fish ticket, (5AAC 39.130(10)). This action made 5 AAC 24.356 redundant and unnecessary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unnecessary language will remain in the regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Area E drift gillnet permit holders will benefit from the increased clarity of the regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-327)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Prohibit use of dipnets and gaffs in commercial fishery as follows:

The use of dipnet, landing nets and gaffs are prohibited for the taking of king salmon not already incidentally caught in gill nets.

ISSUE: During the sockeye commercial fishery, nets are made slack enough and “roll” along the bottom, and kings are caught. This method actually targets kings. Nets are pulled up and when kings are seen, the fishermen reach down and catch unnetted fish with dip nets or gaffs.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fewer king salmon will travel upriver to the spawning grounds.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Incidental taking of kings is a lucrative by catch of the sockeye fishermen. The present system offers no restrictions to keep the sockeye fishermen from targeting kings. This proposal would allow the escapement of more kings.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In the long run, all users of the king salmon fishery because there would be greater escapement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The sockeye fishermen who are taking these kings incidentally, and selling them.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make it illegal to retain any king salmon caught by sockeye permit holders. This would waste the resource, and no one would benefit.

PROPOSED BY: Chitina Dipnetters Assn., Byron Haley, President (I-08F-011)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 24.334. Identification of gear. This proposal would amend the regulation as follows:

5 AAC 24.334. Identification of gear. (a) Each drift gillnet in operation must have a **red** keg or buoy at each end **except an end attached to the vessel operating the gear,** plainly and legibly marked with the permanent vessel license plate (ADF&G) number of the vessel operating the gear **in permanent symbols at least four inches high with lines at least one-half inch wide in a color that contrasts with the background.**

ISSUE: The current commercial fishing regulations allow for inadequate marking of commercial drift gillnet gear. Currently kegs (buoys) are sometimes marked with ballpoint pens or “Sharpie” pens in small letters that are not readily legible.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Derelict gear, abandoned gear and illegally set gear will continue to be difficult to identify quickly and accurately by FWP officers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Area E commercial fishing permit holders will benefit through improved regulatory enforcement as FWP officers better invest their time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-326)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 24.350(1)(B). Closed waters. This proposal would amend the regulation as follows:

(1)(B) except as provided in 5 AAC 24.361(b) , the inside closure area defined as all waters north of a line from the Steamboat anchorage marker at (1)(B) except as provided in 5 AAC 24.361(b) , the inside closure area defined as all waters north of a line from the Steamboat anchorage marker at **60° 22.30' N. lat., 145° 33.50' W. long.** [60° 22.39' N. LAT., 145° 33.09' W. LONG.] to the eastern boundary of Copper Sands at 60° 18.80' N. lat., 145° 30.30' W. long. to the western end of the Grass Island bar at **60° 18.35' N. lat., 145° 28.66' W. long.** [60° 17.65' N. LAT., 145° 27.15' W. LONG.] to the eastern end of the Grass Island bar at **60° 15.07' N. lat., 145° 17.95' W. long.** [60° 15.00' N. LAT., 145° 16.30' W. LONG.] to the western end of the Kokenhenik bar at **60° 14.96' N. lat., 145° 16.08' W. long.** [60° 14.43' N. LAT., 145° 13.94' W. LONG.] to the eastern tip of the Kokenhenik bar at 60° 13.58' N. lat., 145° 08.29' W. long. to the western tip of the Softuk bar at **60° 13.65' N. lat., 145° 05.72' W. long.** [60° 13.60' N. LAT., 145° 05.18' W. LONG.] to the ADF&G regulatory marker at Coffee Creek at **60° 14.13' N. lat., 144° 58.31' W. long.** [60° 14.09' N. LAT., 144° 57.69' W. LONG.];

ISSUE: Inaccurate latitude and longitude coordinates that define the “Inside Closure” do not match specified geographic locations. The reason for these changes is that shifting sand bars are used as reference points. The original points used to define this area in 2005 were estimated using electronic charts and geo-referenced satellite images that may not have accurately reflected the exact current locations of the actual sand bars.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to issue locations at the start of each season for these geographic locations that vary from the points listed in regulation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial and subsistence permit holders that participate in fisheries on the Copper River delta will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-08F-328)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 124 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Open the east side of Kayak Island to drift gillnetting as follows

Open the area on the east side of Kayak Island to drift gillnetting. On a line from three miles seaward from Cape St. Elias to a line three miles seaward from Cape Suckling. This area would be open from the 1st of June the same fishing periods that are open on the Copper River.

ISSUE: The gillnet fleet won't be able to fish some of their traditional areas and not be able to spread the fleet out.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The fleet won't be able to spread out.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The salmon are in better shape and fresher when caught in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Gillnet fleet.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? This fishery was closed because it was called an intercept fishery. The vast majority of salmon caught were headed for the Copper River or PWS. The Bering Sea trawlers caught over 130,000 kings last year as by catch. Area M is an intercept fishery. Kodiak intercepts Chignik and Cook Inlet salmon. Every troll caught salmon is an intercept fishery. If we are not allowed to fish in a traditional area then all of the other intercept fisheries should be shut down.

PROPOSED BY: Warren Chappel

(SC-08F-042)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed Waters. Amend the regulation to expand fishing area in Bering River District as follows:

5 AAC 24.350. Closed Waters

Sect 2 part (b) waters east of the longitude of Cape Suckling (143° 53.60), and to the west of Pinnacle Rock (144° 36.30) within this area fishing is only allowed within 1 mile from shore at mean low water.

ISSUE: Currently about 1/3 of the Bering River district is closed from its original and traditional fishing area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The fishing fleet will continue to be confined to a much smaller area, which concentrates fishing.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen who will be able to spread out more.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To open the entire district to its original size, but it was closed because of intercepted fish, so limiting the area to 1 mile offshore would keep people from fishing out offshore where the interception rates are much higher.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Babic

(HQ-08F-246)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 24.360. Copper River District Salmon Management Plan. Modify inriver escapement goals for Copper River regulation as follows:

Revise in-river goals based on new species-specific escapement goals, new research data on basin stock structure of sockeye and Chinook, and current in-river fishery data.

ISSUE: In-river goals identified in the Copper River District Salmon Management Plan based on outdated information that is no longer accurate. The old management plan goals not reflect current escapement needs, recent sonar validation studies that show historic estimates were biased, and changes in harvest patterns of in-river fisheries upstream from the sonar counter.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The management plan will continue to provide faulty direction resulting in management actions contrary to the true needs of the fish and the fisheries or contrary to the specific regulatory direction contained in the plan.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups will benefit from management for accurate escapement goals and clear management plan guidance for meeting those goals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Repeal of the management plan was considered but was rejected because of a continuing need for explicit in-river sonar objectives to provide for spawning escapement and in-river fishery needs.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Kramer

(I-08F-012)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 24.360(c). Copper River District Salmon Management Plan. This proposal would repeal subsection (c).

(c) **Repealed.** [THE DEPARTMENT SHALL ESTABLISH THE SUBSISTENCE COMPONENT OF THE INRIVER GOAL WITHIN THE RANGE OF 160,000 – 225,000 SALMON TO ENSURE SUBSISTENCE HARVEST NEEDS WILL BE MET.]

ISSUE: 5 AAC 24.360(c) incorrectly states the subsistence portion of the Miles Lake inriver sonar goal. From 2000-2002 the Chitina Subdistrict fishery was classified a subsistence fishery. During this time, the range specified in 5 AAC 24.360(c) was 160- 225 thousand to include the combined sum of the Glennallen Subdistrict subsistence range (60- 75 thousand) and the Chitina Subdistrict subsistence range (100- 150 thousand) specified in section (b). At the 2003 BOF meeting, the Chitina Subdistrict dipnet fishery was reclassified a personal use fishery and the wording in 5AAC 24.360(b) was changed from "Chitina Subdistrict subsistence harvest" to "Chitina Subdistrict personal use fishery", however section (c) remained at 160- 225 thousand salmon. This reflects the sum of the personal use range and the sum of the subsistence harvest now specified in section (b).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? 5 AAC 24.360(c) will continue to be in error and may be misleading.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Participants in Copper River fisheries will benefit from regulatory clarity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-08F-329)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 24.360. Copper River District Salmon Management Plan. Delay commercial fishing until after 5,000 fish are counted at Miles Lake sonar as follows:

First Copper River commercial opener may not commence prior to 5,000 fish being counted at the Miles Lake Sonar.

ISSUE: Extending the king season on the Klutina River from the mouth to mile 14 from Aug 1 to Aug 10 for wounded warriors

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? King escapements in the Gulkana will continue to plummet and not attain 1996 averages (see 1996 weir statistics vs. current Gulkana tower count trends.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It compels the Board to recognize the fact that the early-run Gulkana component is indeed a distinct stock (address ADF&G genetics study) and its timing through the commercial fishery subjects it to potential over-harvest. (Stock-specific run timing through Copper River commercial fishery.)

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The fishery will benefit by not being depleted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The Copper River drift gill net fishery will still open, it will just open when fish are assured to be in the river. Guess work will be eliminated.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The current program is not working. Commercial openers are set to begin based on a stat week and not on run strength. Currently, they can begin prior to any fish passing the sonar. This puts early, milling stocks at risk (especially upper tributary spawning Chinook). 5,000 fish trigger will give the fish a safety margin and assure their long term survival.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee

(I-08F-008)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan. Amend the regulation to increase sustainable escapement goal (SEG) for Copper River king salmon as follows:

The SEG in the management plan is reset to a minimum of 28,000. This can be reset by the Board as an Optimal Escapement Goal (OEG) without new evidence.

ISSUE: Amend the Copper River Chinook Salmon Fishery Management Plan to reinstate a spawning escapement range of 28,000 – 55,000 Chinook as recommended by ADF&G in 2003.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued artificially low SEG goal of 24,000.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, a more realistic escapement goal benefits the long term viability of the resource and all users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mike Kramer

(HQ-08F-240)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan. Amend the regulation to allow only one fishing period per statistical week during weeks 20 and 21 for the Copper River District as follows:

(b) in the commercial fishery, during statistical weeks 20 and 21, the commissioner may open no more than 3 fishing periods within the inside closure area of the Copper River District described in 5 AAC 24.350 (1)(b).

ISSUE: During statistical weeks 20 and 21 there may be only 1 fishing period per statistical week with the inside closure are of the Copper River District.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to overescapce the early runs of fish.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will help managers to stay on track with escapement goals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who uses the resource would benefit because if needed the manager may still impose an additional closure if needed. So it would basically let the managers decide who to let, and now many fish through.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To make the total number of periods allowed to be open within the inside closure Area 4. This would not be much of a compromise with other users on the river, and in some times could cause additional closures to commercial fishing if inriver goals are not met.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Babic

(HQ-08F-245)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan. Add statistical weeks 22 and 23 to limits on commercial fishing within inside closure area of Copper River as follows:

The Department will extend the existing management strategy for protecting the waters inside the barrier islands by adding statistical weeks 22 and 23. The extra time will allow King salmon to enter the river in the early part of the season.

ISSUE: The timing of the early king salmon returns into the Copper River drainage system. For the recent history, twenty years or so, the kings have been later and later arriving at the mouth of the spawning streams, like the Klutina and Gulkana. In the last three seasons, the kings did not show at the mouth of the Gulkana until the second week of June. The commercial fishery has, in the past, and may be continuing to harvest too many of these early fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The genetic studies and reports are due in time to provide input for the Prince William Sound meeting. However, absent the genetic relationship, or lack of a relationship between the timing of the king salmon entering the Copper River and the spawning stream destination, this proposal is to provide additional protection for the early king salmon to enter the Copper River system. If the problem is not solved, the early fish run, commercial and other harvests and escapement may be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. If too many kings are harvested there will be a loss of the early part of the fishery for all users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users can benefit from understanding the impact to the king population from the early run harvests.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are alternatives to “how to get the early fish in the river and through to escapement and spawning” but the genetic impact report on the harvest is needed to evaluate the alternatives. The best solution is having the ability to use the genetic information to plan and manage the return and planning commercial openings to accommodate the escapement goals for the various rivers in the system.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee

(I-08F-006)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan. Repeal mandatory commercial closure during statistical weeks 20 and 21 for inside closure area of Copper River as follows:

5 AAC 24.361
(B) Repealed December, 2008.

ISSUE: Inside closures during the statistical weeks 20 and 21

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Management flexibility will be compromised. In times of early break up, unnecessary closures restrict ADF&G's ability to adjust inseason management.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishermen could see increased opportunity in times of abundance.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. ADF&G would still have the closure tool in the box, if needed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Copper River / Prince William Sound Fish and Game Advisory Committee
(SC-08F-028)

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE# _____