ARCTIC-YUKON-KUSKOKWIM FINFISH PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Tanana River Area. Update the Tanana River Management Area stocked waters list as follows:

This proposal updates the Tanana River Management Area stocked waters list.

(c)(29) in stocked waters, the bag, possession, and size limit for rainbow trout, Arctic char/Dolly Varden, landlocked salmon, and Arctic grayling is 10 of all stocked species combined, of which no more than one fish may be 18 inches or greater in length; for the purposes of this paragraph "stocked waters" include Backdown Lake, Ballaine Lake, Bathing Beauty Pond, Bear Lake, [BIG BEAR LAKE], Big "D" Pond, Big Lake, Birch Lake, Bluff Cabin Lake, Bolio Lake, Brodie Lake, Bullwinkle Lake, Chena Lake, Chet Lake, CHSR 25.0 Mile Pit, CHSR 30.0 Mile Pit, CHSR 45.5 Mile Pit, CHSR 47.9 Mile Pit, Coal Mine Road #5, Craig Lake, **Crystal Lake**, Dick's Pond, Doc Lake, Donna Lake, [FIREBREAK LAKE], Forest Lake, Four Mile Lake, Fourteen Mile Lake, Geskakmina Lake, Ghost Lake, Grayling Lake, Hidden Lake (Eielsen Air Force Base), Hidden Lake (Tetlin NWR.), Horseshoe Lake, "J" Lake, Jan Lake, Johnson R. #1 Pit, Kenna Lake, Ken's Pond, Kids Fishing Pond, **Kimberly Lake**, Last Lake, [LES' LAKE], Lisa Lake, [LITTLE BEAR LAKE], Little Donna Lake, Little Lost Lake, Long Pond, Lost Lake, Luke Lake, Lundgren Pond, Manchu Lake, Mark Lake, Meadows Rd. # 1, Meadows Rd. # 2, Meadows Rd. # 3, Meadows Rd. # 4, **Meadows Rd. # 5, Meadows Rd. # 6,** Monterey Lake, Moose Lake, [MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE], Mullins Pit, Nenana City Pond, Nickel Lake, No Mercy Lake, Nordale # 2, North Chena Pond, North Pole Pond, North Twin Lake, Olnes Pond, Otto Lake, Parks 261 Pond, Paul's Pond, Piledriver Slough, Polaris Lake, Quartz Lake, Rangeview Lake, Rapids Lake, Richardson Hwy. 28 M. Pit, Richardson Hwy. 31 M. Pit, Richardson Hwy. 81 Mile Pit, Robertson Lake #2, Rockhound Lake, Round Pond, [SANSING LAKE], Shaw Pond, Sheefish Lake, **Silver Lake (aka Mosquito Creek Lake),** Sirlin Drive Pond, South Johnson Lake, South Twin Lake, Square Lake, Steese Hwy. 29.5 Mile Pit, Steese Hwy. 31.6 Mile Pit, Steese Hwy. 33.5 Mile Pit, Steese Hwy. 34.6 Mile Pit, Steese Hwy. 35.8 Mile Pit, Steese Hwy. 36.6 Mile Pit, [STEESE HWY. 120.0 MILE PIT], Stringer Rd. Pond, Triangle Lake, Tschute Lake, Wainwright #6, Weasel Lake, West Iksgiza Lake, West Pond, Z Pit (Chena Floodway);

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 Tanana River Area stocked waters list.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The list of stocked waters will not be correct.

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

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-09F-142)
****

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 69.155. North Slope Area Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan, 5 AAC 70.055 Northwestern Area Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan, 5 AAC 71.055 Kuskokwim-Goodnews Area Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan, 5 AAC 73.055 Yukon River Area Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan, and 5 AAC 74.055 Tanana River Area Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan. Align Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plans with area regulations as follows:

5 AAC 69.155. North Slope Area Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan.

(d) Regional management approach. Under the regional management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited artificial lures and the bag and possession limit is five fish. The season is open year round, however there are fisheries where catch-and-release fishing is imposed during part or all of the spawning period from April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31**.

(e) Conservative management approach. Under the conservative management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited-single-hook artificial lures. The bag and possession limit is two fish. The fishing season is open year round, and is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the spawning period of April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31**. The use of size limits does apply to certain stocks and fisheries under this approach. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

(g) Special management approach. Under the special management approach, only unbaited single-hook artificial lures and unbaited single-hook artificial flies may be used. Size limits may be imposed for certain fisheries and may include trophy designation, which is a fish 18 inches or greater in length. The bag limit is one fish, except that a fishery may be restricted to catch-and-release fishing, or closed. Single-hook waters may be established. The fishing season is open year round, but fishing is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31** spawning period. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the same water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

5 AAC 70.055. Northwestern Area Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan.

(d) Regional management approach. Under the regional management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited artificial lures and the bag and possession limit is five fish. The season is open year round, however there are fisheries where catch-and-release fishing is imposed during part or all of the spawning period from April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31**.

(e) Conservative management approach. Under the conservative management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited-single-hook artificial lures. The bag and possession limit is two fish. The fishing season is open year round, and is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the spawning period of April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31**. The use of size limits does apply to certain stocks and fisheries under this approach. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

(h) Special management approach. Under the special management approach, only unbaited single-hook artificial lures and unbaited single-hook artificial flies may be used. Size limits may be imposed for certain fisheries and may include trophy designation, which is a fish 18 inches or greater in length. The bag limit is one fish, except that a fishery may be restricted to catch-and-release fishing, or closed. Single-hook waters may be established. The fishing season is open year round, but fishing is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31** spawning period. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the same water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

5 AAC 71.055. Kuskokwim – Goodnews Area Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan.

(d) Regional management approach. Under the regional management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited artificial lures and the bag and possession limit is five fish. The season is open year round, however there are fisheries where catch-and-release fishing is imposed during part or all of the spawning period from April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31**.

(e) Conservative management approach. Under the conservative management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited-single-hook artificial lures. The bag and possession limit is two fish. The fishing season is open year round, and is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the spawning period of April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31**. The use of size limits does apply to certain stocks and fisheries under this approach. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

(g) The department shall manage the Aniak River drainage, **Arolik River drainage,** Holitna River, Kanektok River, and Goodnews River under the conservative management approach.

(h) Special management approach. Under the special management approach, only unbaited single-hook artificial lures and unbaited single-hook artificial flies may be used. Size limits may be imposed for certain fisheries and may include trophy designation, which is a fish 18 inches or greater in length. The bag limit is one fish, except that a fishery may be restricted to catch-and-release fishing, or closed. Single-hook waters may be established. The fishing season is open year round, but fishing is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31** spawning period. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the same water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

5 AAC 73.055. Yukon River Area Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan.

(d) Regional management approach. Under the regional management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited artificial lures and the bag and possession limit is five fish. The season is open year round, however there are fisheries where catch-and-release fishing is imposed during part or all of the spawning period from April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31**.

(e) Conservative management approach. Under the conservative management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited-single-hook artificial lures. The bag and possession limit is two fish. The fishing season is open year round, and is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the spawning period of April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31**. The use of size limits does apply to certain stocks and fisheries under this approach. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

(g) Special management approach. Under the special management approach, only unbaited single-hook artificial lures and unbaited single-hook artificial flies may be used. Size limits may be imposed for certain fisheries and may include trophy designation, which is a fish 18 inches or greater in length. The bag limit is one fish, except that a fishery may be restricted to catch-and-release fishing, or closed. Single-hook waters may be established. The fishing season is open year round, but fishing is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31** spawning period. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the same water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

5 AAC 74.055. Tanana River Area Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan.

(d) Regional management approach. Under the regional management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited artificial lures and the bag and possession limit is five fish. The season is open year round, however there are fisheries where catch-and-release fishing is imposed during part or all of the spawning period from April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31**.

(e) Conservative management approach. Under the conservative management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited-single-hook artificial lures. The bag and possession limit is two fish. The fishing season is open year round, and is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the spawning period of April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31**. The use of size limits does apply to certain stocks and fisheries under this approach. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

(g) The department shall manage the Five-Mile Clearwater [RIVER] **Creek and the Tok River drainage** under the conservative management approach.

(h) Special management approach. Under the special management approach, only unbaited single-hook artificial lures and unbaited single-hook artificial flies may be used. Size limits may be imposed for certain fisheries and may include trophy designation, which is a fish 18 inches or greater in length. The bag limit is one fish, except that a fishery may be restricted to catch-and-release fishing, or closed. Single-hook waters may be established. The fishing season is open year round, but fishing is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the April 1 through [MAY 30] **May 31** spawning period. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the same water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

ISSUE: The Board of Fisheries adopted the Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan (5 AAC 70.055) at the January 2004 meeting. The intent of the plan was to provide protection to spawning Arctic grayling over the two month period during which spawning occurs, April 1 – May 31. Inadvertently, the date of May 30 instead of May 31 was included in the plan. In specific area regulations, April 1 – May 31 is listed as the period for a catch-and-release restriction in four different systems. This proposal would align the management plan dates with those in area

regulations. In addition, this proposal will add two drainages (Arolik River in the Kuskokwim-Goodnews Area and the Tok River in the Tanana River Area) whose regulations fall under the conservative management approach and correct the reference for Five-Mile Clearwater Creek.

The department views this as a housekeeping proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The specific area regulation dates for the catch-and-release spawning restriction will deviate by one day in relation to the dates specified in the management plan.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishery managers, and the public will benefit from clear, concise regulations and management plans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-133)
****

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Tanana River Area. Align Tanana River regulations with the Wild Arctic Grayling Plan as follows:

This proposal brings several rivers in the Tanana River Management Area into compliance with the Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan's regional management approach by removing spawning closures, length, and gear restrictions in these systems.

(c)(2) in the Chatanika River and its tributaries,
[(B) ARCTIC GRAYLING MAY BE TAKEN FROM
(I) JUNE 1 THROUGH MARCH 31, WITH A BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT OF FIVE FISH, 12 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; ALL ARCTIC GRAYLING CAUGHT THAT ARE LESS THAN 12 INCHES IN LENGTH MUST BE RELEASED IMMEDIATELY;
(II) APRIL 1 THROUGH MAY 31, BY CATCH AND RELEASE FISHING ONLY;]

(d)(2) [FROM APRIL 1 THOUGH MAY 31,] in the Chatanika River and its tributaries [UPSTREAM FROM AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED APPROXIMATELY ONE MILE UPSTREAM FROM THE ELLIOTT HIGHWAY BRIDGE,] only unbaited [SINGLE-HOOK], artificial lures may be used, **except that bait may be used only on hooks with a gap size larger than three-quarters of an inch.**

[(c)(19) IN THE RICHARDSON CLEARWATER DRAINAGE, ARCTIC GRAYLING MAY BE TAKEN FROM

(A) APRIL 1 THROUGH MAY 31, BY CATCH AND RELEASE FISHING ONLY;

(B) JUNE 1 THROUGH MARCH 31, WITH A BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT OF FIVE FISH, 12 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; ALL ARCTIC GRAYLING CAUGHT THAT ARE LESS THAN 12 INCHES IN LENGTH MUST BE RELEASED IMMEDIATELY;]

(c)(20) in the Salcha River and its tributaries,

[(B) ARCTIC GRAYLING MAY BE TAKEN FROM

(I) APRIL 1 THROUGH MAY 31, BY CATCH AND RELEASE FISHING ONLY;

(II) JUNE 1 THROUGH MARCH 31, WITH A BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT OF FIVE FISH, 12 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; ALL ARCTIC GRAYLING CAUGHT THAT ARE LESS THAN 12 INCHES IN LENGTH MUST BE RELEASED IMMEDIATELY;]

(c)(21) in the Shaw Creek drainage and its tributaries, Arctic grayling may be taken from

[(A)] April 1 through May 31, by catch and release fishing only;

[(B) JUNE 1 THROUGH MARCH 31, WITH A BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT OF FIVE FISH, 12 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; ALL ARCTIC GRAYLING CAUGHT THAT ARE LESS THAN 12 INCHES IN LENGTH MUST BE RELEASED IMMEDIATELY;]

(c)(23) in the Tanana River and its tributaries within a two-mile radius of its confluence with Shaw Creek, Arctic grayling may be taken from

[(A)] April 1 through May 31, by catch and release fishing only;

[(B) JUNE 1 THROUGH MARCH 31, WITH A BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT OF FIVE FISH, 12 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; ALL ARCTIC GRAYLING CAUGHT THAT ARE LESS THAN 12 INCHES IN LENGTH MUST BE RELEASED IMMEDIATELY;]

ISSUE: The Board of Fisheries adopted the Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan (WAGMP)(5 AAC 70.055) for the AYK region in 2004. The plan has three management approaches: regional, conservative, and special. The Chatanika, Richardson Clearwater, and Salcha Rivers; and Shaw Creek were classified under the regional management approach. Regulations under the WAGMP regional management approach are defined as: "*Under the regional management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited artificial lures and the bag and possession limit is five fish. The season is open year round, however there are fisheries where catch-and-release is imposed during part or all of the spawning period from April 1 through May 30."*

This proposal does three things which will align these areas with the WAGMP regional management approach: 1) it removes the Arctic grayling size restrictions on all four rivers and that portion of the Tanana River near the mouth of Shaw Creek; 2) it removes the Arctic grayling spawning restrictions on the Chatanika, Richardson Clearwater, and Salcha rivers; 3) it retains the Arctic grayling spawning restriction for Shaw Creek and that portion of the Tanana near Shaw

Creek because this is a critical spawning area for Arctic grayling from several systems, and 4) it modifies the gear regulations on the Chatanika River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Regulations for these rivers will continue to be inconsistent with the WAGMP regional regulations. Harvest opportunity will continue to be restricted unnecessarily.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, anglers will have increased opportunity to harvest Arctic grayling from several rivers in the Tanana River Management Area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers who harvest, or would like to harvest, Arctic grayling in the Tanana River Management Area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-141)

****

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Tanana River Area. Clarify regulations for Chena Slough (Badger Slough) as follows:

This proposal clarifies the regulations for Chena Slough (aka Badger Slough) a tributary of the Chena River.

(c) **(XX) in Chena Slough (also known as Badger Slough) Arctic grayling may be taken by catch-and-release fishing only;**

(d) **(XX) in Chena Slough (also known as Badger Slough) only one single-hook artificial lure may be used;**

ISSUE: Sport anglers often do not realize that Chena Slough (aka Badger Slough) is part of the Chena River because the slough is occasionally cut off from the river due to low water levels and seasonal dewatering of the slough. Because of this anglers often attempt to harvest Arctic grayling from the slough with multi-hook lures, when in fact the slough is catch-and-release, single-hook artificial lure only, just like the remainder of the lower Chena River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport anglers may continue to be confused.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Arctic grayling will not be inadvertently harvested from a population that is intended to be part of a catch-and-release fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers through reduced confusion in the fishing regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-138)
****

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Tanana River Area. Clarify single-hook regulations in the Tanana River drainage as follows:

This proposal clarifies the gear regulations in the water bodies in which there are either catch-and-release regulations or limited bag and possession regulations for Arctic grayling.

(d)(5) in the Chena River and its tributaries,
[(A) DOWNSTREAM OF THE CHENA RIVER DAM,]
(i) only one unbaited single-hook, artificial lure may be used, except that a treble hook with a gap between hook and shank of one-half inch or greater may be used;
(ii) bait may be used only on a single hook with a gap size larger than three-quarters of an inch;
[(B) UPSTREAM FROM THE CHENA RIVER DAM, ONLY UNBAITED, SINGLE HOOK, ARTIFICIAL LURES MAY BE USED;]
(d)(6) in the Delta Clearwater River drainage, including the Clearwater Lake drainage, from
(A) January 1 through August 31, only **one** unbaited, single-hook, artificial lure[S] may be used;
(d)(8) in Five-Mile Clearwater Creek, from
(A) January 1 through August 31, only **one** unbaited, single-hook, artificial lure[S] may be used;
(d)(13) in Piledriver Slough upstream from its confluence with Moose Creek, only **one** unbaited, single hook, artificial lure[S] may be used;
(d)(16) in Shaw Creek,
(A) [UPSTREAM FROM THE RICHARDSON HIGHWAY BRIDGE,] only **one** unbaited, **single-hook**, artificial lure[S] may be used;
(d) **(XX) in the Tok River drainage, only one unbaited, single-hook, artificial lure may be used;**

ISSUE: The Chena and Tok Rivers, Shaw Creek, and Piledriver Slough Arctic grayling fisheries are managed conservatively to maintain current population characteristics or levels, or rebuild the population to previous population characteristics or levels. The Delta Clearwater River and Five-Mile Clearwater Creek are managed conservatively in order to maintain a high quality Arctic grayling fishing experience (a higher percentage of large fish). Under the conservative management approach of the Tanana River Area Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan (5 AAC 74.055) it is

appropriate to restrict gear to one single-hook, artificial lure rather than allowing two single hooks or artificial flies per line.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport anglers will continue to be allowed to use two single hooks or two flies in systems where there are conservation or other management concerns for Arctic grayling.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This will maintain the Arctic grayling management goals in these systems.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers who may be confused about what "single-hook" means.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Sport anglers who prefer to use two single hooks or two flies.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-143)

****

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 70.011. Seasons and bag, possession, and size limits for the Northwestern Area. Open the Nome River to catch-and-release fishing for Arctic grayling as follows:

(c)(6) In the Nome River drainage, sport fishing for

(B) Arctic grayling is **catch-and-release only for the entire year** [CLOSED].

ISSUE: The Nome River is located near the town of Nome and is the area's most popular fishing destination for several species. However, sport fishing for Arctic grayling in the Nome River has been closed since 1992 due to low abundances resulting from several years of high harvests. In 2004, the Board of Fisheries adopted the Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan (5 AAC 70.055), in which the Nome River was designated to be managed under the special management approach, a designation given to Arctic grayling fisheries exhibiting particular conservation, biological, or restoration issues. The Department's management objective for the Nome River Arctic grayling population stipulates that once the abundance of Arctic grayling has reached 2,000 fish greater than 15 inches, the population can support a catch-and-release fishery. If the stock assessment in 2009 indicates the abundance of Arctic grayling in the Nome River is less than 2,000 fish greater than 15 inches the department will withdraw support for this proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport fishing opportunity for those who like to catch-and-release Arctic grayling close to Nome remains low.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers wanting to catch-and-release Arctic grayling close to Nome.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-134)
****

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 69.105. Description of the North Slope Area, 70.005. Description of the Northwestern Area, and 73.005. Description of the Yukon River Area. Align sport fish boundaries with commercial/subsistence boundaries as follows:

5 AAC 69.105. The North Slope Area consists of all northerly flowing fresh waters, including lakes, draining into, and including, the Arctic Ocean, the Beaufort Sea, and the Chukchi Sea, west of the Canadian border and east of **Point Hope** [CAPE LISBURNE];

5 AAC 70.005. The Northwestern Area consists of all waters draining into and including the Bering Sea, the Chukchi Sea, Kotzebue Sound, and Norton Sound south of **Point Hope** [CAPE LISBURNE] and north of **Point Romanof** [CANAL POINT LIGHT];

5 AAC 73.005. The Yukon River Area consists of all waters of the Yukon River drainage, excluding the Tanana River drainage, and all waters draining into, and including, Norton Sound and the Bering Sea south of **Point Romanof** [CANAL POINT LIGHT] and north of the westernmost point of Naskonat Peninsula;

ISSUE: This proposal will align these Sport Fish management areas boundaries with the common boundaries of the commercial and subsistence regulatory areas. The individual regulatory areas for Sport Fish and Commercial Fisheries divisions generally have the same boundaries for regulatory consistency. However, two exceptions exist in western Alaska. The Norton Sound-Port Clarence commercial and subsistence regulatory area slightly overlaps two Sport Fish regulatory areas (the Northwest and Yukon areas), and the Kotzebue commercial and subsistence area slightly overlaps two Sport Fish regulatory areas (the Northwest and North Slope areas). There is potential for confusion regarding fisheries regulations in areas where two different fishery regulatory areas overlap.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Confusion regarding fisheries and regulations in these overlapping areas may occur.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence, commercial, and sport fishermen in western and northern Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-135)
****

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Tanana River Area. Move sport fishing regulatory boundary in the Chatanika River as follows:

This proposal moves a regulatory boundary in the Chatanika River one mile downstream to a more recognizable location.

5 AAC 74.010(c)(2)(A) sport fishing for salmon is closed upstream **of the upstream edge of the** [FROM AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED APPROXIMATELY ONE MILE UPSTREAM FROM THE] Elliott Highway bridge;

5 AAC 74.010(c)(2)(C) whitefish except least cisco may be taken from

(ii) May 1 through September 30, downstream [FROM AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED APPROXIMATELY ONE MILE UPSTREAM] from **the upstream edge of** the Elliott Highway Bridge, with a bag and possession limit of five fish, with no size limit;

5 AAC 74.010(d)(2) from April 1 through May 31, in the Chatanika River and its tributaries [UPSTREAM FROM AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED APPROXIMATELY ONE MILE] upstream **of the upstream edge of** [FROM] the Elliott Highway Bridge, only unbaited single-hook, artificial lures may be used;

ISSUE The Elliott Highway Bridge provides a more permanent and recognizable boundary marker, rather than an easily removed, destroyed or obscured regulatory sign. The current regulatory boundary on the Chatanika River (an ADF&G marker located one mile upstream from the Elliott Hwy Bridge) was originally put in place for the sport whitefish spear fishery that occurred in the area through 1993. Other regulations used this point as a reference in order to maintain consistency. The sport whitefish spear fishery is closed by regulation and the personal use whitefish spear fishery occurs in a different location.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Anglers may inadvertently fish illegally in an unauthorized location if the ADF&G sign is missing, destroyed, or obscured by vegetation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers by providing a permanent, more visible regulatory boundary.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Any sport anglers who fish for salmon or use multiple hooks in the one mile section between the Elliott Highway Bridge and current location of the regulatory marker.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-136)
****

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Tanana River Area. Amend whitefish sport bag limits in the Chatanika River as follows:

This proposal would repeal the exceptions to the general bag and possession limits and seasonal closures for whitefish in the Chatanika River.

[(c)(2)(C) WHITEFISH EXCEPT LEAST CISCO MAY BE TAKEN FROM
(i) MAY 1 THROUGH AUGUST 31, THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE CHATANIKA RIVER DRAINAGE, WITH A BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT OF 5 FISH, WITH NO SIZE LIMIT;
(ii) MAY 1 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, DOWNSTREAM OF AN FROM AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED APPROXIMATELY ONE MILE UPSTREAM FROM THE ELLIOTT HIGHWAY BRIDGE, WITH A BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT OF 5 FISH, WITH NO SIZE LIMIT;]

ISSUE: The current language is confusing as it allows anglers to fish for whitefish throughout the Chatanika River drainage from May 1 – August 31, in the portion of the river downstream of a regulatory marker from Sept 1 – 30, and then the sport fishery is closed in the entire river from October 1 through April 30. This will simplify sport fishing regulations and liberalize harvest opportunity for whitefish in the Chatanika River.

In 2007, the board authorized a personal use spear fishery for whitefish in that portion of the Chatanika River within the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area. This personal use spear fishery occurs where sport fishing is currently closed from October 1 – April 30. This regulatory change will not affect the personal use spear fishery.

There is not a conservation concern in opening the hook and line sport fishery for whitefish year round, as whitefish are difficult to harvest using hook and line gear compared to personal use gear (spear). From 2003-07, the catch and harvest of whitefish in the Chatanika River by hook and line averaged 194 and 60 fish, respectively. This change will reduce the complexity of the regulations for the Chatanika River as the sport fishing regulations for whitefish will revert back to the area-wide season and bag limits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport anglers who wish to harvest whitefish after September 30 with rod and reel will continue to be restricted.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers who desire to catch whitefish throughout the year using rod and reel gear in the Chatanika River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-137)
****

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Tanana River Management Area. Amend bait restrictions in Fielding Lake as follows:

Modify the regulations concerning Fielding Lake as follows:

(d) special provisions
(B) (7) In Fielding Lake
(A) set lines may not be used;
(B) Only 1 single hook, artificial lure may be used.
(C) **April 1- October 31. bait may not be used.**
(D) November 1-March 31, Bait may be used.

ISSUE: Maintaining fishing opportunities while addressing harvesting concerns. Fish and Game has implemented a no bait restriction at Fielding Lake. Harvest can be reduced by discontinuing bait during the open water season and allowing bait during a portion of the winter months.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If bait is not allowed during the winter season this would essentially result in a de-facto closure for burbot and lake trout, as the odds of catching a trout or burbot while jigging through the ice without bait are slim to none. Recent regulations at nearby Summit and Paxson lakes allow bait during a portion of the winter. My proposal disallowing bait during summer/fall will reduce harvest because of the methods used, but summer lake trout can still be caught with un-baited lures. Allowing bait between November 1 and March 31 will allow some winter harvest but eliminate the most active month which is April, when there is the most ice fishing pressure due to nice weather. While the Lake Trout Management Plan is an admirable attempt to provide lake trout management, it does not lend itself to innovative solutions, which are needed in this case to still provide a minimum level of fishing opportunities for both burbot and lake trout.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal reduces harvest by limiting harvest to a limited period during winter months while retaining some harvest opportunities for fishermen. The resource

will still continue to grow in numbers and size and meet Lake trout management principles for this area without eliminating fishing opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Dedicated fishermen that are concerned about the quality and value of the resource while retaining fishing opportunities for sport fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A.) Catch and release for lake trout. This would unnecessarily limit harvest opportunities, but would be an acceptable winter alternative. B.) No bait year round. This would unfairly discriminate against fishermen that enjoy ice fishing. No bait basically eliminates the potential to catch burbot or lake trout in winter. It would be inconsistent with adopted regs in nearby lakes such as Summit and Paxson.

PROPOSED BY: Ethan Birkholz (HQ-09F-038)
****

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Tanana River Management Area. Allow for only one closely attended line in Fielding Lake as follows:

(A) **Only one closely tended line may be used.**

ISSUE: Maintaining fishing opportunities while addressing harvesting concerns. Fish and Game has implemented a no bait restriction at Fielding Lake. I would prefer to see harvest reduced by a combination of limiting bait to a portion of the winter months and limiting the number of tended lines. This proposal specifically calls for using only one tended line to further limit harvest potential as another alternative that should be considered to a no bait restriction. Using only one tended line during the winter season would not cut the potential for catching fish in half since the active line sees the most action. But it would reduce harvest and mortality as studies have shown a strong correlation with one tended line using active jigging techniques and significantly reduce mortality as a result.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If bait is not allowed during the winter season this would essentially result in a de-facto closure for burbot and lake trout, as the odds of catching a trout or burbot while jigging through the ice without bait are slim to none. Regulations at nearby Summit and Paxson lakes allow bait during a portion of the winter. Allowing one tended line rather than 2 is an innovative solution supported by scientific studies to reduce harvest. By not implementing this regulation the Department may continue to feel a no bait option is the only solution.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal reduces mortality and harvest by limiting methods and means by only allowing one tended line to limit harvest methods during winter months while retaining fair and reasonable harvest opportunities for fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Dedicated fishermen that are concerned about the quality and value of the resource while retaining fishing opportunities for sport fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A) Catch and release for lake trout. This would unnecessarily limit harvest opportunities, but would be an acceptable winter alternative. B) No bait year round. This would unfairly discriminate against fishermen that enjoy ice fishing. No bait basically eliminates the potential to catch burbot or lake trout in winter. It would be inconsistent with adopted regs in nearby lakes such as Summit and Paxson.

PROPOSED BY: Ethan Birkholz (HQ-09F-039)
****

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Tanana River Management Area. Allow a single hook with trailer hook in Harding Lake as follows:

The new regulation would be worded as follows: "Only single hook with the trailer hook being single hook."

ISSUE: Regulation 5 AAC 70.015 currently states only one single-hook only for Harding Lake. I propose that under this regulation an additional trailer (another single hook) be allowed as a legal presentation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the problem is not solved, nothing detrimental will occur as a result, however angling presentations will be limited due to "one individual single hook" compared to a trailer hook.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it increases the opportunities to catch more fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Many ice fishing anglers will benefit from this change to the regulation for example, anglers who make their own jigs can snell on an additional trailer hook. Lake trout hook mortality will continue to remain low.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, because the current bag and possession limit already minimizes harvest.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Michael J. Lunde (HQ-09F-170)
****

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Tanana River Area. Increase the northern pike bag limit in Volkmar Lake as follows:

(c)(28) in Volkmar Lake, northern pike may be taken only from June 1 through March 31, with a bag and possession limit of [ONE] **three** fish, of which only one fish may be 30 inches or greater in length.

ISSUE: Volkmar Lake is a remote northern pike fishery, approximately 15 miles northeast of Delta Junction, accessed primarily by snowmachine or by float or ski equipped aircraft. The bag and possession limit for northern pike has been one fish, no size limit, since 1997 due to declining abundance. This decline is attributed to excessive harvests in the late 1980's and mid-1990's. Stock assessment in 2000 estimated abundance at 615 northern pike greater than 18 inches in length; in 2005 the abundance was estimated at 1,630 northern pike greater than 18 inches. The management objective for the Volkmar Lake northern pike population is 2,000 northern pike greater than 18 inches. Based on the recent stock assessment trends it is believed that the northern pike population will reach the management objective and a liberalization of the bag limit is warranted. The proposed regulation of 3 fish, only one 30 inches or greater is believed to be sustainable with an abundance greater than 2,000 fish. Spear fishing would be prohibited. If the stock assessment in 2009 indicates the abundance of northern pike in Volkmar Lake is less than 2,000 pike greater than 18 inches the department will withdraw support for this proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport anglers fishing for northern pike in Volkmor Lake would continue to have a reduced harvest opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers who want to harvest more than one fish at Volkmor Lake.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-145)

****

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Tanana River Management Area. Amend open season for northern pike in Volkmar Lake as follows:

Remove Volkmar from the lakes excepted by the baseline April 20 closure. Volkmar would close April 20-June 1.

ISSUE: Early closure of Pike season in Volkmar Lake. Other area lakes have a spawning closure form April 20 – June 1. Volkmar currently closes on March 31. Due to access issues, most years the lake is inaccessible after that date. During late spring years, the lake is prematurely closed and unreasonably denies opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued denial of opportunity to fish Volkmar pike in early April.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The department is proposing to raise the limit from 1 to 3 to create more opportunity for harvest. A lengthened season would accomplish this.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who access Volkmar Lake in early April.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks AC (HQ-09F-050)

****

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 74.044. Minto Flats Northern Pike Management Plan. Align areas in the Minto Flats Northern Pike Management Plans as follows:

This proposal aligns language in the sport fish Minto Flats Northern Pike Management Plan (5 AAC 74.044) with that in the subsistence Minto Flats Northern Pike Management Plan (5 AAC 01.244).

(b)(1) the maximum exploitation rate of northern pike in the **lakes and flowing waters of the Minto Flats** [LOWER CHATANIKA RIVER AND MINTO LAKES/GOLDSTREAM CREEK AREA] by all users may not exceed 20 percent annually;

ISSUE: The description of the area used to estimate the exploitation rate of northern pike in the Minto Flats subsistence and sport fish versions of the Minto Flats Northern Pike Management Plan is not the same, the intent of the plan is to include the same area and fish stocks. Currently, the plans describe two different areas. The proposed language will align the description of the area for which the exploitation rate is calculated.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The two management plans will continue to reference different descriptions of the area for which exploitation rate is calculated.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence and sport fish managers will benefit from a clear description of the area used to determine exploitation rates in the respective management plans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-140)
****

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 01.244 (2)(b). Minto Flats Northern Pike Management Plan. Establish subsistence daily household limit for winter pike fishery as follows:

(B)…except as limited in (f) below. In the area described in (f) the daily household limit shall be 25 and 50 in possession.

ISSUE: To help prevent localized overharvest of congregated overwintering pike in the subsistence fishery near Minto.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued reduction of pike in Minto due to a handful of subsistence fishers who harvest more than they need.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. In 2007 one group of fishers harvested over 500 pike in one trip. This proposal will more equally distribute subsistence opportunity among more users until the seasonal limit of 1,500 pike is reached.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All those who use Minto pike.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who keep harvesting fish regardless of actual need, simply because they can under a no-limit regulation. The average subsistence harvest is much less than 50 pike. If more fish are needed, another trip called be taken.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks AC (HQ-09F-052)
****

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 01.244. Minto Flats Northern Pike Management Plan. 70.044(d). Minto Flats Northern Pike Management Plan. Require single hooks for summer sport and winter subsistence pike fishery as follows:

(D) In the Chatanika River, Minto Lakes and Goldstream Creek only single hooks (may be multiple single hooks) may be used in the summer sport fishery or the winter subsistence fishery.

ISSUE: Unnecessary mortality due to catch and release with barbed treble hooks. In Minto the pike population has declined precipitously since 2006. It is assumed that many fish will be released in the winter subsistence fishery as fishers target specific size fish. Because of expected release, the subsistence fishery is single hook though multiple single hooks may be used.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In the summer fishery the limit has been reduced from 5 to 2. People do not travel to Minto to only catch 2 fish. Many pike are caught with treble hooks, lifted from the water by the eyes or gillplates into the boat where hooks are removed. Single hooks facilitate release into the water and would reduce morality of a rapidly declining population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. More fish will be safely released without impacting the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who believe measures should be taken to reduce incidental mortality to help a stressed population of wild fish. Catch statistics gathered since 1995 show an average of 10 fish released for every 1 retained.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anglers who will have to change the hooks on their pike lures.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Stop fishing after daily limit retained. Rejected because most anglers enjoy hooking many fish during what are typically overnight trips.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks AC (HQ-09F-053)
****

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 07.365. Kuskokwim River Salmon Rebuilding Management Plan. Allow retention of chum salmon in Aniak River sport fishery as follows:

(e) In the sport fishery,

(2) in the Aniak River drainage, the king salmon fishery will be open from May 1 through July 25, with a bag and possession limit of two fish, with an annual limit of two fish; the sockeye, pink, chum, and coho salmon fisheries are open year round, with **a combined daily** [A] bag and possession limit of **all salmon species not to exceed three salmon, of which no more than two fish may be king salmon** [THREE FISH OF EACH SPECIES; CHUM SALMON MAY NOT BE RETAINED OR POSSESSED].

ISSUE: In the Kuskokwim River Salmon Rebuilding Management Plan (KRSRMP), the provisions for retention of chum salmon in the sport fishery are not addressed. At the 2007 AYK Board of Fisheries meeting, a proposal was adopted that allowed the retention of sport caught chum salmon in the Aniak River, but corresponding language in the KRSRMP was not corrected. This will align the sport fishing bag and possession limit for salmon in the KRSRMP with the Aniak River sport regulations in 5 AAC 71.010(c)(3).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulations regarding the retention of chum salmon in the sport fishery will be contrary to the language in the KRSRMP.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport fishermen who want to retain chum salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-139)
****

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 07.331(c). Gillnet specifications and operations. Change maximum mesh size from 8 inch to 6 inch in Kuskokwim River as follows:

Repeal the phrase section of 5 AAC 07.331(c) allowing the use of up to 8 inch gear, so regulation would once again read as it has since 1986 that: "In Districts 1 and 2, salmon may be taken only with gillnets with six-inch or smaller mesh."

ISSUE: The maximum allowable mesh size for commercial gillnets was reduced from eight to six inches or smaller in 1986 in response to a decline of Chinook salmon in the Kuskokwim and the related concerns for maintaining escapement and subsistence needs for those fish targeted with the larger mesh gear. In 2007, the Alaska Board of Fisheries adopted a regulation permitting the use of eight inch or smaller mesh gillnets, citing the desire to "have it in the management toolbox", despite management input that it would not be used in directing harvest towards large Kings. These large fish which comprise most, if not all, of the viable spawning female component are already fully allocated on the Kuskokwim for escapement and subsistence priorities, and should not be subject to additional directed commercial harvest. The harvestable surplus of our Chinook population that may on occasion, be available for directed commercial exploitation, is composed of the smaller "jack kings" that are targeted with the 6 inch or smaller gear should the Chinook return even prove robust enough to alleviate concerns for the associated incidental catch of the larger fish component. This "tool" serves no purpose other than to clutter up the box, present false expectations, and encourage fueling of divisiveness that has little to no productive aftermath potential.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An upset in the balance of management perspective that has evolved through a cooperative management process over the last 20+ years will remain in haunting resurrection, and threaten implementation should future political or other administrative pressures prevail over the stated management priorities as has occurred in other venues of past management action.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Chinook Salmon population of the Kuskokwim drainage and subsistence users who annually rely upon them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those singularly focused on short term interest gains, without

due consideration to long-term consequences for maintaining the integrity of Kuskokwim king salmon populations and related subsistence use needs into the future.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? If the Board chooses to keep this regulation on the books for abstract purposes, it should at least clarify that the use of up to 8" gillnets for commercial fishing would not be allowed during the month of July.

PROPOSED BY: Kuskokwim River Salmon Management Working Group (HQ-09F-169)
****

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 01.120. Lawful gear and gear specifications. Expand hook and line use for subsistence from Wales to Point Hope as follows:

(b) Fish other than salmon may be taken by set gillnet, drift gillnet, beach seine, fish wheel, pot, longline, fyke net, dip net, jigging gear, spear, and lead, or, as specified in (f) of this section, by **rod and reel or by** a hook and a line attached to a rod or a pole.

(f) a person may use a **rod and reel or a** hook and line attached to a rod or a pole when subsistence fishing only

(1) in the state waters of, and all flowing waters that drain into, the Chukchi Sea or Kotzebue Sound from **Point Hope** [CAPE ESPENBERG] to Cape Prince of Wales; or…

ISSUE: Recognize rod and reel as lawful gear for taking salmon and other fish for subsistence and change the geographic area that 5AAC 01.120 pertains to.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People will continue to need a sport fishing license to subsistence fish in the region with a rod and reel and be subject to law enforcement action for not having same when catching fish for food (subsistence) and not sporting purposes.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local people in the Kotzebue Area who customarily harvest fish for food (subsistence) with a rod and reel and do not possess a sport fishing license, because they are not fishing for sport.

The continued use of rod and reel for subsistence fishing has been documented over a ten year period by ADF&G Subsistence Division in the report titled: "Estimated Subsistence Harvests of Fish by Gear (Comprehensive Surveys in Kivalina (1992), Deering (1994), Noatak (1994), and Shungnak (2002)" and accounted for 10.1% of harvest of all fish species found in the region in this survey report.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None, this is the only solution available to remedy the problem.

PROPOSED BY: Kotzebue AC (HQ-09F-035)
****

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 01.170 (b). Lawful Gear and Gear Specifications; and 5 AAC 01.172(a). Limitations on Subsistence Fishing Gear. Expand hook and line use for subsistence in Norton Sound as follows:

5 AAC 01.170 Lawful Gear and Gear Specifications.

(b) A person may use a hook and line attached to a rod or a pole when subsistence fishing only

(3) in the state waters of, and all flowing waters that drain into, the Bering Sea or Norton Sound from Bald Point to Point Romanoff, except the Unalakleet River Drainage.

5 AAC 01.172 Limitations on Subsistence Fishing Gear.

(a) Except when fishing through the ice, for subsistence fishing in state waters of, and all flowing waters that drain into, northern Norton sound form Cape Prince of Wales to **Point Romanoff, except the Unalakleet River Drainage** [BALD POINT (BETWEEN ELIM AND KOYUK)] and with a hook and line attached to a rod or a pole, the following provisions apply.

ISSUE: This proposal is meant to make rod and reel legal subsistence gear for all of Norton Sound Area except the Unalakleet River Drainage. Currently subsistence rod and reel is only legal in that portion of the Norton Sound area west of Bald Point. Subsistence users of Koyuk, Shaktoolik, St. Michael and Stephens have all expressed the desire to be allowed to subsistence fish with the same means that the northern residence of Norton Sound area are able to use. Unalakleet has asked to be excluded for this proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be a disparity for subsistence users within the Norton Sound Area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, subsistence fishers can better target specific fish species. They can also control their harvest better when only wanting to harvest a few fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local people in eastern Norton Sound who customarily harvest fish for food (subsistence) with a rod and reel and do not possess a sport fish license.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Frank Kavairlook Sr. (HQ-09F-068)
****

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 01.172. Limitations on subsistence fishing gear. Allow snagging for non-salmon species in Nome and Port Clarence as follows:

Snagging throughout the year during ice covered and ice free conditions should be allowed in freshwater. 5 AAC 01.010 should be amended to allow snagging of whitefish, suckers, saffron cod, Arctic cod, rainbow smelt and burbot, for Nome and Port Clarence residents in all Nome and Port Clarence streams.

ISSUE: Establishing legal methods and means for harvesting whitefish, suckers, saffron cod, Arctic cod, rainbow smelt, and burbot, which would permit subsistence users to harvest them without fear of citation. Snagging is currently not allowed in the fresh water but is allowed in salt water, under current regulations and should be made legal in fresh water so that subsistence users in Nome and Port Clarence districts can continue long standing traditions. Numerous hook and line methods are use by Nome and Port Clarence residents to harvest all manner of fish, whether fish were caught thru the mouth or snagged.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the problem is not solved subsistence users will continue to face possible citation. Snagging of whitefish, suckers, saffron cod, arctic cod, rainbow smelt and burbot is a long standing tradition that has been prohibited in freshwater but practiced despite the prohibition of snagging in current regulations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal if implemented would improve the quality of the resource harvested. During the late summer and early fall it is popular for people to seine for whitefish. However, if someone does not wish to seine or if a person does not own a seine or have the opportunity to partner with someone who has a seine it is difficult for someone to harvest whitefish, suckers, or burbot otherwise. Snagging must be allowed so that persons can practice the long standing tradition of snagging them and not fear citation. It is popular for persons while hunting caribou, moose, bear, or Muskox to want to harvest whitefish, suckers, or burbot with a hook and line and snag them since they will not readily take a hook. Fishing while hunting is a long standing outdoor tradition that should be made accessible by snagging. Fish like saffron cod, arctic cod, and rainbow smelt are usually snagged without discretion, since it is difficult not to snag them when they are numerous.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence users are likely to benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will be harmed, it is highly unlikely that any other US citizen makes use of Nome or Port Clarence whitefish, suckers, saffron cod, arctic cod, rainbow smelt, or burbot other than Nome, Teller, or Brevig Mission residents, or even has any interest to harvest Nome and Port Clarence population of whitefish, suckers, saffron cod, arctic cod, rainbow smelt, or burbot. There are no trophy or sport aesthetics that are harmed by allowing snagging. Legalizing snagging cannot possibly impact them since they are so numerous.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions considered.

PROPOSED BY: Nome Eskimo Community (HQ-09F-020)

****

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 01.170(e). Lawful gear and gear specifications. Allow seining for salmon in Nome Subdistrict as follows:

Open seining for salmon in Nome subdistrict.

ISSUE: Seining for salmon is closed in Nome Subdistrict.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Loss of subsistence opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Improves quality of harvest gill nets damage fish and one cannot target species preferred.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All subsistence fishermen in Nome subdistrict who wish to fish with seine net.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Thomas S. Sparks (HQ-09F-003)

****

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 01.170. Lawful gear and gear specifications; 5 AAC 04.395. Subdistricts 5 and 6 of the Norton Sound District and the Unalakleet River King Salmon Management Plan. Review Unalakleet king salmon management plan and modify mesh size as follows:

5 AAC 01.170(k) In Subdistricts 5 and 6, the commissioner may, by emergency order, open and close fishing periods during which a gillnet may have a mesh size no greater than

(1) six inches;
(2) four and one-half inches;
(3) seven inches.

ISSUE: Subdistricts 5 and 6 king salmon runs have been below expectations since 2000 and have been designated a stock of yield concern since 2004. In addition, closures to commercial fishing, severe restrictions on subsistence opportunity, and reductions in sport fish bag limits have not had the desired effect of increasing escapements. Tower-based sustainable escapement goals at the North River, an important king salmon spawning tributary of the Unalakleet River have only been reached 50% of time since 1999. A record-low North River king salmon escapement (903 fish) occurred in 2008 despite a restrictive subsistence schedule, inriver mesh-size restrictions in late June, and an early closure to the subsistence and sport fisheries on July 5. As a result of these restrictions, the Unalakleet (Subdistrict 6) subsistence harvest of 1,402 king salmon was also the lowest on record.

This proposal would give managers the ability to restrict gillnet mesh size to seven inches or less by emergency order. This additional management option will provide subsistence fishers with the opportunity to harvest some of the smaller king salmon while allowing female salmon that are generally larger to reach spawning areas, as well as reducing pink and chum salmon catches which are common when fishing with the smaller mesh nets. Restricting gillnet mesh size to seven inches or less may occur earlier in the season than the current option of six inch or less mesh size that has effectively closed king fishing because of high incidental catches of pink salmon in recent years.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In the future, the department may close unrestricted mesh size subsistence fishing periods and establish mesh-size restrictions of six inches or less by emergency order earlier in the run. This will further reduce opportunity to harvest king salmon for subsistence uses.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence fishermen will have an opportunity to harvest smaller king salmon earlier in the run rather than having subsistence fishing closed or being required to use six-inch or less mesh size, which increases pink and chum salmon catch. All users will benefit by having escapements consisting of greater numbers of larger and more fecund females, thereby increasing egg deposition on the spawning grounds.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who would need to purchase a 7-inch net to continue fishing for larger kings if they did not want to use a 6-inch net because of the higher incidental catch of chums and pinks.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-119)

****

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 04.310. Fishing Seasons. Change opening dates for Port Clarence District sockeye fishery as follows:

(4) In the Port Clarence District, during fishing periods established by emergency order from **June 15** [JULY 1] through July 31.

ISSUE: The Port Clarence commercial salmon fishery is only two years old and it has become apparent that the season is set too late to maximize the opportunity of sockeye harvest. The current opener is approaching the mid point of the sockeye migration through the commercial fishing district. A minimum of a week earlier date would be appropriate.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The commercial fishery will continue to have a high incidental harvest of chum salmon and the abundant sockeye stock will be under utilized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the salmon harvested will be brighter and the proportion of sockeye salmon will increase in the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Port Clarence commercial salmon fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? An earlier opening will have some risk associated with it in that an evaluation of the return strength is less exact early in the season. This fishery has had very low participation and currently is unlikely to significantly over harvest the stock.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Norton Sound Economic Corp. (HQ-09F-037)

****

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 04.200(b)(a). Fishing districts and subdistricts. Expand boundaries of Norton Sound Subdistrict 3 as follows:

5 AAC 04.200(b) The Norton Sound District consists of all waters between the latitude of the western most tip of Cape Douglas and the latitude of Point Romanof. The following are regulatory subdistricts of the Norton Sound District:

(3) Subdistrict 3 consists of waters from a Department of Fish and Game regulatory marker located **at Carson Creek** [THREE-FOURTHS OF A MILE EAST OF ELIM VILLAGE ON ELIM POINT**]** to the **tip of Bald Head** [TERMINUS OF KWIK RIVER];

ISSUE: This proposal is intended to move the western boundary of the Norton Sound Subdistrict 3 west to Carson Creek and the eastern boundary to Bald Head. Currently there is limited area to fish near the mouth of the Kwiniuk River. The larger area will allow fishers to have more areas to find locations to target specific salmon species. From subsistence fishing experience many fishers have found areas to the west and east of the current boundary that they can target one species while avoiding another species. In 2007 pink harvest was passed up due to the concern of low chum salmon escapement. This would allow fishers area to search for location to target pinks exclusively. Also salmon are often water marked this close to the river mouth.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Commercial salmon fishers will forgo harvest on an abundant salmon species in order to protect a weak species. It will also have a side benefit of improving fish quality.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Higher numbers of the abundant species will be harvested and fish quality will improve.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subdistrict 3 commercial salmon fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Morris Nakarak (HQ-09F-066)
****

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 04.330. Gear. Expand use of drift gillnets to Port Clarence District as follows:

Set **and drift gillnets** [ONLY] may be operated [, EXCEPT THAT] in the Norton Sound**-Port Clarence District** [DRIFT GILLNETS MAY BE OPERATED] as specified in 5 AAC 04.331.

ISSUE: Extend the drift gillnet operation to the entire Norton Sound-Port Clarence District as it is already authorized in the Norton Sound District.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued unnecessary regulatory prohibition of a fishing method that could reduce conflict with subsistence salmon users and reduce chum salmon bycatch while facilitating targeted sockeye salmon harvesting.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Salmon taken in drift gillnets would be higher quality because they tend to be removed form nets sooner after catching than from set nets.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. Allowing drift gillnets would let fishermen spread out and reduce conflicts over productive setnets sites. It would also allow fishermen targeting sockeye salmon to move to areas where incidental chum salmon bycatch was lower.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Nome Fishermen's Association (HQ-09F-162)
****

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 04.330. Gear. Allow purse seines to harvest pink salmon in Norton Sound as follows:

Set gillnets only may be operated, except that in the Norton Sound District seines may be operated as specified in 5 AAC 04.332 seine specifications and operations when special pink salmon openings are established by emergency order.

5 AAC 04.332. Seine Specifications and Operation. (a) Purse seines and beach seines may not be more than 250 fathoms in length and 325 meshes in depth.
(b) a vessel may have no more than one legal seine net on board.

ISSUE: Norton Sound pink salmon are the smallest in the state. Gillnet regulations do not provide for an opportunity to harvest an even mix of female and male fish and so the catch is not economic to harvest. Seines would provide a better roe content to the catch and economy of scale that would allow for an increased opportunity to the commercial fishers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The very abundant pink salmon fishery will go largely unutilized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, roe content will improve, and handling damage will be reduced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Norton Sound commercial salmon fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? During years of pink salmon abundance there will be no possibility of conflict. It is anticipated that during years of low abundance seining will not be allowed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Lowering the gill net size minimum size to 3 inch mesh, but this would require a statewide regulation change.

PROPOSED BY: Adem Boechmann (HQ-09F-036)
****

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 04.330. Gear. Allow purse and beach seines in Norton Sound-Port Clarence as follows:

Set gillnets only may be operated, except that in the Norton Sound district drift gillnets may be operated as specified in 5 AAC 04.331.

Purse seines and beach seines may be operated for harvesting salmon.

ISSUE: Authorize purse seines and beach seines for harvesting salmon in the Norton Sound-Port Clarence district.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued unnecessary regulatory prohibition of a fishing method that could facilitate efficient salmon harvesting.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Salmon taken in seines would be higher quality than those taken in gillnets. Gillnets reduce flesh quality particularly with pink salmon which would be the primary species targeted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. Using purse seines and beach seines would allow fishermen to more efficiently harvest the large pink salmon runs we have experienced since 2004 with lower incidental bycatch mortality of other salmon species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Nome Fishermen's Association (HQ-09F-163)
****

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 27.965(m). Management for Herring Pound Norton Sound. Allow closed pounding for herring spawn-on-kelp in Norton Sound as follows:

Delete the line in the regulation that reads: "The structure may not have an enclosure."

ISSUE: This proposal is intended to allow closed pounding as well as opening pounding of spawn on kelp. The health of the Norton Sound herring stock is excellent and barely utilized since the collapse of the herring roe market in western Alaska. This additional opportunity will help to more fully utilize an abundant resource and provide local employment.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Closed pounding will allow permit holders to more actively manage the kelp they have spent significant money to bring in from Southeast Alaska. Open pounding often results in light coverage and then inability to recover costs.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Better coverage of the Macrocystis kelp will result bringing a better price. Closed pounding will also help the pounds to sited further form sources of mud which will result in a higher quality product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Pound fishers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? In years past, Sac roe quota was affected by this harvest, but currently harvests are far below the allowable harvest: so there will be no adverse affect.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limits on area and on the number of pounds. They are not needed at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Eric Osborne (HQ-09F-067)
****

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 27.965(a) & (m). Management Plan for Herring Pound Spawn-On-Kelp Fishery in the Norton Sound District. Allow closed pounding for herring in Norton Sound and Port Clarence as follows:

(a) The purpose of this management plan is to establish criteria for the herring pound spawn-on-kelp fishery in the Norton Sound-**Port Clarence** District.

(m) For the purposes of this section, a "herring pound" is a structure or a means of suspending kelp in the water to provide spawning substrate for herring to be harvested as

spawn on kelp. The structure may not have an enclosure, but may have two leads. A lead may not be more than 300 feet in length measured from shore to a point on the structure. The lead shall consist of a seine weight net with meshes of no more than two inches stretched measure, a cork line, a lead line, and anchors at either end.

ISSUE: Authorize closed pounding for herring spawn on kelp in the Norton sound-Port Clarence District.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued unnecessary regulatory prohibition of a method for utilizing the Norton Sound herring resource which is very large and potentially lucrative.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Herring pound spawn on kelp is a very high quality product compared to wild harvested herring spawn on kelp. Open pounding has not proven practical for producing consistent product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. This proposal would authorize another method for utilizing Norton Sound fishery products and create a new fisheries related industry.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Nome Fishermen's Association (HQ-09F-164)
****

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 70.011(c)(3)(d). Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits for the Northwestern Management Area. Amend sport fishing bag limits for chum salmon in Norton Sound as follows:

The new regulation would replace the closure wording in the sport fishing regulations for the Nome subdistrict with a daily bag limit of one, two or three chum salmon. (i.e. delete the exception)

ISSUE: Nome subdistrict waters were close to sport fishing for chum salmon in 1992 in a coordinated effort to rebuild chum salmon runs because of a history of weak returns. The effort included subsistence restrictions and closures that manifested themselves as Tier II subsistence fishing regulations for the Nome subdistrict. These efforts appear to have met with success. Chum salmon escapement goals have been developed for many rivers and in four out of the most recent five years those goals have been met. Subsistence fishing has returnee to normal regulation for area including the Nome subdistrict.

Currently it is not legal for a sport angler to even cast to a chum salmon with the intent of hooking it.

With healthy chum salmon runs, escapement goals being met and the return to normal subsistence fishing regulation, there is no reason why sport anglers should not be allowed to fish for and harvest chum salmon in the Nome subdistrict.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport anglers will continue to not be allowed to fish for chum salmon in the Nome subdistrict.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers wishing to angle for chum salmon in Nome subdistrict waters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one as both participation and harvest are likely to be low and the fishery could easily be constrained by Emergency Order if returns were projected not to meet escapement goals.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fred DeCicco (HQ-09F-040)
****

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 01.210. Fishing Seasons and Periods. Clarify subsistence fishing schedule in Subdistricts 4-B and 4-C as follows:

Clarify the subsistence fishing schedule in Subdistricts 4-B and 4-C during commercial fishing closures lasting longer than five days.

Repeal current language under (d)(1) and replace with:

(d)(1) In District 4, excluding the Koyukuk drainage, salmon may not be taken:
(A) In Subdistrict 4-A, from 6:00 p.m. Sunday until 6:00 p.m. Tuesday;
(B) In Subdistricts 4-B and 4-C, from 6:00 p.m. Friday until 6:00 p.m. Sunday.

ISSUE: Subsistence fishing time during commercial fishing closures longer than five days was changed at the 2004 board meeting to allow subsistence fishing during the weekend in District 4. However, fishermen in Subdistricts 4-B and 4-C informed ADF&G that they wanted to remain on the traditional schedule in place since 1976. ADF&G has done this by emergency order since 2004. This proposal would change regulations so there would be no need to make this adjustment through an emergency order.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to issue an emergency order to change subsistence fishing times in Subdistricts 4-B and 4-C.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen in Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C who want to maintain the traditional subsistence fishing schedule.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who do not want to change the current regulations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-118)

****

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 01.210. Fishing Seasons and Periods. Modify subsistence fishing schedule in Subdistrict 4-A as follows:

Allow subsistence fishing in Subdistrict 4-A to be open for two 48-hour periods during the commercial fishing season.

(c)(1) District 4, excluding the Koyukuk River drainage: [IN SUBDISTRICTS 4-B AND 4-C] from June 15 through September 30, salmon may be taken for two 48-hour fishing periods per week, established by emergency order;

(e) In Districts 1, 2, and 3 [AND SUBDISTRICT 4-A], excluding the [KOYUKUK AND] Innoko River drainage[S], salmon may not …

(e)(2) Repealed.

(f) Repealed.

ISSUE: Up until the mid-1990s, Subdistrict 4-A had a large scale commercial fishery that targeted summer chum salmon for roe extraction with heavy fishing pressure. The roe market crashed in 1996 and was followed by a period of poor summer chum runs from 1998 through 2002. This resulted in the loss of commercial fisheries infrastructure and fishing gear. Since 2003, Subdistrict 4-A has been struggling to reestablish a viable fishery. In an effort to rebuild this fishery, ADF&G has worked with buyers and fishermen to maximize harvest efficiencies which are critical for operations in this remote section of river. The primary commercial fishing gear is fish wheels, which target chum salmon that are migrating along the river bank. The number of fish wheels is much lower now than during the peak of the commercial fishery in the early 1990s and fishing periods are longer in duration. In recent years fishery managers have allowed subsistence and commercial fishing to take place concurrently through the use of emergency orders. At this time, ADF&G does not have a concern for illegal roe entering the market because of DEC processing requirements. Additionally, most subsistence fishing in Subdistrict 4-A is conducted with drift gillnet gear to target king salmon, not summer chum salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department would likely continue to issue emergency orders to allow concurrent openings of commercial and subsistence fishing periods.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who plan ahead for their fishing activity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who would like to have subsistence and commercial fishing periods separated.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-117)

****

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 01.230. Subsistence Fishing Permits. Require recording subsistence harvest on catch calendars as follows:

All subsistence users must have a catch calendar and shall record all harvested fish on the catch calendar in ink, before concealing the fish from plain view, transported from the fishing site or off loaded from a vessel. Fishing site means the location where the fish is removed from the water. If fish are shared outside the household of the catch calendar holder, the number of fish shared and the name of the person(s) shared with must also be recorded in the catch calendar. The catch calendar must be available for inspection by the department or any law enforcement officer at any fish camp, fishing location, or primary residence of the catch calendar holder.

ISSUE: Commercial use of subsistence caught fish in the Yukon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued commercialization of subsistence caught fish.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. A harvest and transfer record kept in a catch calendar will provide accountability and allow fish to be tracked and accounted for.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All subsistence users who wish to preserve their access to this resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who commercialize their subsistence catch. It is known that certain individuals on the Yukon catch many more kings than their subsistence needs require. They sell or barter these excess fish and end up for sale in Fairbanks or Anchorage, often as smoked strips.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other forms of recording and reporting were considered, because the catch calendar is delivered to all known fishers every season, this method was determined to be the most efficient and easiest to implement and enforce, with little burden on the department or subsistence users.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks AC (HQ-09F-051)
****

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 01.220. Lawful gear and gear specifications. Extend Subdistricts 4-B and 4-C drift gillnet area for king salmon as follows:

To reduce fishing pressure, Middle Yukon AC recommends extending the drift gillnetting area upriver into State waters of Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C to the mouth of Yuki River. This would require amending 5 AAC 01.220. (e)(2) to include drifting for Chinook salmon in portions of Yukon Area Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C to as follows:

(e)(2) In Subdistrict 4-A downstream from the mouth of Stink Creek **and in Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C downstream from the mouth of Yuki River**, king salmon may be taken by drift gillnets from June 10 through July 14.

ISSUE: To reduce fishing pressure off of Chinook salmon subsistence harvest in one popular Yukon River drift gillnet fishing location near Koyukuk village. Currently, this area is highly desirable drifting location by fishers that travel from considerable distances to get there, primarily form Koyukuk and Galena communities; however, fishers from Huslia, Nulato, Ruby and other communities also travel there to harvest fish in this location. Additionally, the drifting area near Koyakuk village is a desirable fishing location that creates congestion among fishers which can render the area as hazardous when fishers compete with one another especially during reduced fishing schedules. Often time fishers wait to be able to drift once then wait again for their turn.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is changed, there will be continued concentrated drift gillnetting fishing pressure targeting same stocks of fish during each subsistence opening. Fishing congestion in this one popular fish location will continue which will increase chances of conflict between subsistence users. During years of subsistence reduced fishing time, conflicts will increase.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by extending drift gillnet fishing into Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C will reduce fishing pressure on Chinook salmon harvested in one constricted and highly desirable fishing area (Koyukuk area) and distribute harvest over a broader area. Yes, by allowing drift gillnetting in Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C, this will spread the Chinook salmon harvest over a larger area and reduce harvest on any one concentrated stock of Chinook salmon. Additionally, quality of harvest by fishers from Galena and Ruby will increase because of the shorter distances needed to travel from fishing grounds to their home communities of fish camps to process fish. With less travel time, fuel cost will also be less.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource will be benefited because drift gillnet fishing pressure will be spread out over a larger area. All subsistence users that currently drift for Chinook salmon in the Koyukuk area will benefit because there will be less competition for the

desirable fishing location resulting in more time available to subsistence fish while costing less for fuel and oil because of shorter travel distances.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Fishers that fail to find or loose drift gillnet hear in attempting to locate a comparable drift gillnetting site in Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C? Possibly the escapement and fishers drainage-wide if this regulation change alters the salmon stocks composition that are harvested in Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C drift fisheries?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon AC (HQ-09F-041)
****

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 01.220. Lawful gear and gear specifications. Extend Subdistricts 4-B and 4-C drift gillnet area for kings and fall chum as follows:

To reduce fishing pressure, Middle Yukon AC recommends extending the drift gillnetting area upriver into State waters of Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C to the mouth of Yuki River. This would requiring amending 5 AAC 01.220. (e)(1) to include drifting for Chinook and fall chum salmon in portions of Yukon Area Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C. to as follows:

(e)(1) In Subdistrict 4-A upstream from the mouth of Stink Creek **and in Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C downstream from the mouth of Yuki River**, king salmon may be taken by drift gillnets from June 10 through July 14, and chum salmon may be taken by drift gillnet after August 2.

ISSUE: To reduce fishing pressure off of Chinook salmon subsistence harvest in one popular Yukon River drift gillnet fishing location near Koyukuk village. Currently, this area is highly desirable drifting location by fishers that travel from considerable distances to get there, primarily form Koyukuk and Galena communities; however, fishers from Huslia, Nulato, Ruby and other communities also travel there to harvest fish in this location. Additionally, fishers congregating in one desirable fishing location during subsistence fishing openings result in safety concerns. Oftentimes fishers wait to be able to drift once then will wait again for their turn to drift.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is changed, there will be continued concentrated drift gillnetting fishing pressure targeting same stocks of fish during each subsistence opening. Fishing congestion in this one popular fish location will continue which will increase chances of conflict between subsistence users. During years of subsistence reduced fishing time, conflicts will increase.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by extending drift gillnet fishing into Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C is biologically sound management practices which will reduce fishing pressure on Chinook salmon harvested in one constricted and highly desirable fishing area (Koyukuk area) and distribute harvest over a broader area. Yes, by allowing drift gillnetting in Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C, this will spread the Chinook salmon harvest over a larger area and reduce harvest on any one

concentrated stock of Chinook or fall chum salmon. Additionally, quality of harvest by fishers from Galena and Ruby will increase because of the shorter distances needed to travel from fishing grounds to their home communities of fish camps to process fish. With less travel time, fuel/oil cost will also be less.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource will be benefited because drift gillnet fishing pressure will be spread out over a larger area. All subsistence users will benefit because there will be less competition for the desirable fishing location resulting in more time available while costing less because of shorter travel distances.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Fishers that fail to find or loose drift gillnet hear in attempting to locate a comparable drift gillnetting site in Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C? Possibly the escapement and fishers drainage-wide if this regulation change alters the salmon stocks composition that are harvested in Subdistrict 4-B and 4-C drift fisheries?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon AC (HQ-09F-042)
****

Note, the Board of Fisheries does not have authority on setting penalties, however it does have authority on setting methods and means.

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 01.220. Lawful gear and gear specifications. Allow set gillnets to be tied up during closures in Subdistrict 5-D as follows:

In District Y-5-D during fisheries closures a set net may be tied up in a manner to render it non-fishing and shall be marked with a black anchor float.

Allow fishermen during fishing closures to tie up their nets instead of pulling them. This would meet the intent of the regulations to allow no fish to be harvested during closures. Changing the anchor float from red, orange, or white to a black float could be required to allow for law enforcement personnel to identify tied up nets during over flights or with river surveys. Failure to comply would result in loss of fishing licenses for one year, or a $1,000.00 fine.

ISSUE: Current regulations place an undue burden and their personal safety at risk by requiring Yukon River fishermen to pull their nets during closed fishing periods. Setting the nets takes time and effort of fishermen and can be a multiple person operation. Pulling the nets and then later resetting them is an undue burden to the fishermen and can place elders and other individual fishermen and fisherwomen at risk of injury due to the fast current and turbulences at eddy lines. Setting the anchor(s) is a high risk activity that would be best to minimize the number of times needed to reset them. There is also an additional fuel cost with complying with the current regulations from pulling and resetting the nets multiple times over the fishing season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen that use set nets will be at risk of injury and possible drowning because the requirement to pull the nets during closures and resetting

them with openings. It will be harder for older fishermen, elders, and women to continue their traditional fishing because of the physical stress and the need of others to assist with their fishing efforts. There would be a higher cost of fishing because of increased fuel used to pull and reset their nets multiple times during the fishing season. With the high costs of fuel, any fuel saving would be appreciated by the fishermen.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen and families across the Yukon River drainage would benefit because of the savings of time and energy and knowing the high risk of setting the nets is minimized.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No fishermen will suffer. Passage of this proposal would change how law enforcement officers would monitor closures.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (HQ-09F-043)
****

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 05.360. Yukon River King Salmon Management Plan. Review triggers, GHR, fishing schedule in king salmon management plan as follows:

(b)(1) Evaluate potential triggers and management tools for managing subsistence, commercial, personal use, and sport fisheries.
(b)(2) Review commercial guideline harvest ranges.

(d) Review subsistence fishing schedule.

ISSUE: Yukon River king salmon are designated as a stock of yield concern and the escapement goal for the Canadian Yukon River mainstem, which was agreed to by Yukon Panel, was not met in 2007 and 2008. As directed by the *Policy for the Management of Sustainable Salmon Fisheries*, ADF&G will develop an Action Plan for the Alaska Board of Fisheries (board) AYK cycle meeting. The Yukon River King Salmon Management Plan will be reviewed as part of the Action Plan. ADF&G will work with the public to evaluate potential management triggers and tools to meet escapement goals, provide for the subsistence priority, and identify a surplus for other uses. The guideline harvest ranges for commercial fisheries were originally established in 1981. During the past decade the available yield has been much lower than previous years. Thus, a review of the guideline harvest ranges is necessary. The subsistence fishing schedule will be re-examined in view of meeting escapement goals and potential triggers for management.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department would continue management without an updated management plan.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users will benefit by being better informed in regard to inseason management actions and from an enhanced management plan based on meeting escapement goals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who would like to see all salmon fishing closed to protect a weak run on a particular salmon species.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-116)
****

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 05.331. Gillnet specifications and operations; and 5 AAC 01.220. Lawful gear and gear specifications. Prohibit drift gillnet gear for subsistence and commercial fishing as follows:

Fishing method restriction. No subsistence or commercial driftnet fishing allowed in the entire Yukon River drainage. All upriver and downriver driftnet areas would be included in this proposal.

ISSUE: Drift gillnetting is recognized as an extremely effective gear at catching the larger, offshore and more non local stocks (Canadian bound) of Chinook salmon in the Yukon River. However, given a run in decline and the need by management to severely restrict, even subsistence users, as fairly as is possible in all the districts of the drainage, then allowing drift netting in selected upriver and downriver areas becomes an impossible problem to deal with. Given a large amount of Chinook and a healthy range of age classes and the need to harvest a large quantity, it is not a problem if everyone has the same right to do it. This is especially true in the Yukon, where, ironically, you have most of the best areas to catch Chinook having been given the right to driftnet and most of the poorest areas to catch them being denied the right. An extreme example of this is the lower districts of the Yukon versus the Koyukuk River drainage or the Yukon Flats district. A decent set net spot in the Koyukuk drainage might produce say six Chinook for the entire season or even less according to Huslia fishermen at a recent YRDFA meeting. Koyukuk River fishermen and the Yukon Flats fishermen (Ft. Yukon Area) are not allowed to drift net. Each year on the YRDFA teleconferences we hear of lower Yukon River driftnet fishermen catching amounts such as 30 fish in one hour or 100 in a short day. Presently management of our allowable fishing gear types has no rhyme or reason to it. When one hour of fishing a season in one of these driftnet districts can produce more and bigger fish than a non driftnet district can get if allowed to fish seven days a week all season then we have a situation that is totally unfair and impossible to insure any degree of equable distribution of fish to meet subsistence needs, especially in years of poor runs.

Large mesh drift gillnetting has had a detrimental effect on the stock composition and quality of escapements for Yukon River Chinook salmon and targets the larger and female Chinook

salmon. There continues to be poor returns of Yukon River salmon since 1998. This has led to conservation concerns on the spawning grounds. These poorer returns do not allow subsistence users a reasonable opportunity to meet their subsistence salmon needs. The use of the larger drift gillnets has changed, and will continue to change the composition of the Chinook stocks harvested. Subsistence fishermen in the middle and upper Yukon Rivers have repeatedly noted that the returning Chinook salmon are getting smaller and conservation measures are needed to protect the larger fish that in turn protects the genetic variability and loss of the older age classes of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks.

Chinook salmon harvest in Y5 and Y6 fish wheels is over 70 percent precocious males under 10 pounds. In the Taku River in Southeast Alaska the directed commercial fishery was closed for 30 years when this happened. The Tozitna River fishery monitoring project (BLM) is one example showing that the composition of Chinook salmon escapement is heavily skewed toward smaller, male fish or jacks. The Rapids Student Data Collection Project at Yukon River mile 730 has randomly sampled over 5000 Chinook (in fish wheels) from 2004 to 2008 with an average weight of a little more than 11 ½ lbs. In 2008 out of 1137 Chinook only 2**.**1% (24 fish) were over 25 lbs, and **.**5% (6 fish) were over 30 lbs.

Even smaller average weights of under 10 lbs were seen at Eagle by the Canadian border in a 2006 sampling effort. In 2008 the Canadian government Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) test fishing showed female Chinook salmon have represented only 23% of the seasons fish wheel catch with females representing only 13% in the early part of the run. The early period is recognized as the hardest hit and most fished in the U.S. portion of the river. The number of female Chinook salmon caught in the DFO net test fishery (used nets with an 8 inch mesh size) represented only 28% of the total catch.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Dealing with the inevitable subsistence restrictions necessary in these years of declining Chinook salmon returns will continue to be impossible to manage fairly. While all districts have different levels of opportunity to harvest salmon due to natural causes as well as allowable gear types, with some gear like driftnets being more effective, the current management strategy will continue to allow an unnecessarily high level of unfairness as the salmon move up river. Not eliminating drift netting would continue the over harvest of the offshore, Canadian bound Chinook salmon. If a combination of management actions are not taken now the genetic shift to smaller fish, genetic variability and loss of the older age classes of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks will continue and a complete closure of even basic household subsistence use could be necessary. This proposal is one of a number of recognized actions needed to address the Yukon River drainage Chinook salmon problem.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal is attempting to improve the quality of the resource harvested by conserving the resource. In 2008 Chinook harvests were limited to subsistence harvest only with severe restrictions on that harvest and Canadian border passage was still not met for second year in a row. By allowing more Chinook salmon to reach their spawning grounds, especially the important larger female salmon, will greatly improve the quality of escapement of Chinook salmon throughout the Yukon River drainage. Passage of this proposal would also address the genetic shift to smaller fish caused by over fishing and targeting the larger female salmon. Local

subsistence users and fishery projects in the Yukon River, including Canada, are reporting harvesting smaller fish. Conservation actions are necessary now to protect the genetic variability, the integrity of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks, and the future sustainability of these stocks for future generations of fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The proposers feel all fishermen in the drainage will benefit in the long run by allowing more Canadian Chinook salmon past the border and reach their spawning grounds. Subsistence and commercial users will benefit by helping to rebuild the genetic variability and integrity of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks for future generations of fishermen across the drainage. Stabilizing the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks and preventing a further decrease in their size is the right step for the fisheries and is good for the Alaskan subsistence lifestyle and the Canadian aboriginal lifestyle in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Clearly, anyone allowed to driftnet now will not like having the same rights as those not allowed to driftnet. However, were most of the areas that are allowed to driftnet now restricted from doing so, they would still have far better opportunities to catch Chinook and other species than most of the areas that would continue to be restricted. It is also a fact that drift netting was rarely a traditional fishing method prior to the limited entry program and the early 1980's. Set net sites and/or fish wheels were the methods used across Yukon River. The proposers are keenly aware passage of this proposal would place restrictions on users but the conservation concern of the genetic impacts of continued over fishing and targeting the larger female salmon needs to be addressed now in order to protect the Yukon River Chinook salmon runs for needs in the future. As of 2008 Yukon fishermen have lost all their allowed Chinook commercial fishing time and have severe restrictions being put on basic Chinook subsistence harvests. Fish camps and the healthy lifestyle that goes along with them have continued disappearing as Chinook fishery economy evaporates due to high fuel costs and low harvest numbers. This has all taken place simply because there are not enough fish anymore. Any seasonal suffering caused by Board of Fish passing of this proposal would be small compared to what has taken place already from inaction.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allowing drift netting in all districts was suggested. While this seemed to solve the fairness issue it was quickly rejected because of the present Chinook salmon run decline and the over harvest dangers of allowing more areas to fish such a highly effective gear.

PROPOSED BY: Co-authored by: Tanana Rampart Manley AC, Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council, Fairbanks AC, Minto-Nenana AC, and Ruby AC (HQ-09F-032)
****

<u>PROPOSAL 89</u> - 5 AAC 05.331. Gillnet specifications and operations; and 5 AAC 01.220. Lawful gear and gear specifications. Restrict depth of subsistence and commercial 6 inch mesh to 35 meshes as follows:

Gill net depth limit. No commercial or subsistence 6" gill nets with a hung depth of more than 15' or 35 meshes shall be allowed in entire Yukon River drainage.

ISSUE: Deeper nets are having a detrimental affect on the stock composition and quality of escapements for Yukon River Chinook salmon and tend to target the larger and female Chinook salmon which most fishermen claim swim deeper. This knowledge is commonly accepted along the river. Limiting the depth of nets would clearly allow more fish to pass through a fishery unmolested. There have been continued poor returns of Yukon River salmon in the majority of the years since 1998. This has led to conservation concerns on the quality of escapement on the spawning grounds. These poorer returns are also not allowing subsistence users to have a reasonable opportunity to meet their subsistence salmon needs. The use of the larger gillnets has changed, and will continue to change the composition of the Chinook stocks harvested. Subsistence fishermen in the middle and upper Yukon Rivers have repeatedly noted that the returning Chinook salmon are getting smaller and conservation measures are needed to protect the larger fish that in turns protects the genetic variability and loss of the older age classes of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks.

Chinook salmon harvest in Y5 and Y6 with fish wheels is over 70 percent precocious males under 10 pounds. In the Taku River in Southeast Alaska the directed commercial fishery was closed for 30 years when this happened. The Tozitna River fishery monitoring project (BLM) is one example showing that the composition of Chinook salmon escapement is heavily skewed toward smaller, male fish or jacks. The Rapids Student Data Collection Project at Yukon River mile 730 has randomly sampled over 5000 Chinook (in fish wheels) from 2004 to 2008 with an average weight of a little more than 11 ½ lbs. In 2008 out of 1137 Chinook only 2.1% (24 fish) were over 25 lbs, and .5% (6 fish) were over 30lbs. Even smaller average weights of under 10 lbs were seen at Eagle by the Canadian border in a 2006 sampling effort.

In 2008 the Canadian government Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) test fishing showed female Chinook salmon have represented only 23% of the seasons fish wheel catch with females representing only 13% in the early part of the run. The early period is recognized as the hardest hit and most fished in the U.S. portion of the river. The number of female Chinook salmon caught in the DFO net test fishery (used nets with an 8 inch mesh size) represented only 28% of the total catch.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If management actions are not taken now the genetic shift to smaller fish, the reduction in genetic variability and the loss of the older age classes of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks will continue and a complete closure of even basic household subsistence use could be necessary. This proposal is one of a number of recognized actions, able to help the problem, that need to be taken.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal is attempting to improve the quality of the resource harvested by conserving the resource. In 2008 Chinook harvests were limited to subsistence only with severe restrictions even on that and Canadian border passage was still not met for second year in a row. All returning Chinook salmon and the especially important larger female salmon will be provided additional opportunity to reach their spawning grounds which would help improve the quality of escapement of Chinook salmon throughout the Yukon River drainage. Passage of this proposal would address the genetic shift to smaller fish caused by over fishing and targeting the larger fish that has gone on for many years. Local subsistence users and fishery projects in the

upper Yukon River area, including Canada, are reporting harvesting smaller fish. Conservation actions are necessary now to protect the genetic variability, the integrity of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The proposers feel all fishers in the drainage will benefit except those whose priority is the immediate harvest of fish at hand. Subsistence and commercial users will benefit by helping to rebuild the genetic variability and integrity of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks for future generations of fishers across the drainage. Stabilizing the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks and preventing a decrease in their size is the right step for the fisheries and is good for the subsistence lifestyle in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those fishermen whose priority is the immediate harvest of fish at hand. The proposers are keenly aware passage of this proposal would place restrictions on users but the conservation concern of the genetic impacts of continued over fishing and targeting the larger female fish needs to be addressed now in order to protect the Yukon River Chinook salmon runs for needs in the future. Had some smaller steps been taken many board cycles ago when similar proposals and concerns started appearing we may not be in the severe situation we find ourselves faced with today where fishermen are being asked to give up so much of their fishing livelihood.

As of 2008 Yukon fishermen have lost all their allowed Chinook commercial fishing time and have severe restrictions being put on basic Chinook subsistence harvests. Fish camps and the healthy lifestyle that goes along with them have continued disappearing as the Chinook fishery economics evaporate due to high fuel costs and low harvest numbers.. This has all taken place, not by virtue of proposals proposed and passed by the Board of Fish, but simply because there are not enough fish anymore. Any seasonal suffering caused by the Board of Fish passing of this proposal would be small compared to what has taken place already from inaction.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None others considered in this area.

PROPOSED BY: Co-authored by: Tanana Rampart Manley AC, Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council, Fairbanks AC, Minto-Nenana AC, and Ruby AC (HQ-09F-030)
****

<u>PROPOSAL 90</u> - 5 AAC 05.331. Gillnet specifications and operations; and 5 AAC 01.220. Lawful gear and gear specifications. Prohibit subsistence and commercial gillnets over 6 inch mesh size as follows:

No commercial or subsistence gill nets with a stretched mesh larger than 6” shall be allowed in entire Yukon River drainage.

ISSUE: Larger mesh size nets have had a detrimental effect on the stock composition and quality of escapements for Yukon River Chinook salmon and target the larger female Chinook salmon. There have been continued poor returns of Yukon River Chinook salmon in the majority of years since 1998. This has led to conservation concerns on the spawning grounds on the quality of the escapement. These poorer returns are also not allowing subsistence users to have a

reasonable opportunity to meet their subsistence salmon needs. The use of the larger gillnets has changed, and will continue to change, the composition of the Chinook stocks harvested. Subsistence fishermen in the middle and upper Yukon Rivers have repeatedly noted that the returning Chinook salmon are getting smaller and conservation measures are needed to protect the larger fish that in turns protects the genetic variability and loss of the older age classes of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks. Chinook salmon harvest in Y5 and Y6 with fish wheels is over 70 percent precocious males under 10 pounds. In the Taku River in Southeast Alaska the directed commercial fishery was closed for 30 years when this happened. The Tozitna River fishery monitoring project (BLM) is one example showing that the composition of Chinook salmon escapement is heavily skewed toward smaller, male fish or jacks. The Rapids Student Data Collection Project at Yukon River mile 730 has randomly sampled over 5000 Chinook (from fish wheels) from 2004 to 2008 with an average weight of a little more than 11 ½ lbs. In 2008 out of 1137 Chinook sampled only 2.1% (24 fish) were over 25 lbs, and .5% (6 fish) were over 30lbs. Even smaller average weights of under 10 lbs were seen at Eagle near the Canadian border with a 2006 sampling effort. In 2008 Canadian government Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) test fishing showed female Chinook salmon represented only 23% of the seasons fish wheel catch with females representing only 13% in the early part of the run. The early period is recognized as the hardest hit and most fished in the U.S. portion of the river. The number of female Chinook salmon caught in the DFO net test fishery (used nets with an 8 inch mesh size) represented only 28% of the total catch.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If management actions are not taken now the genetic shift to smaller fish, the reduction in genetic variability and the loss of the older age classes of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks will continue and a complete closure of even basic household subsistence use could be necessary. This proposal is one of a number of recognized actions needed to address the Yukon River drainage Chinook salmon problem.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal is attempting to improve the quality of the resource harvested by conserving the resource. In 2008 Chinook harvests were limited to subsistence only with severe restrictions even on that and Canadian border passage was still not met for second year in a row. All returning Chinook salmon and the especially important larger female salmon will be provided additional opportunity to reach their spawning grounds which would help improve the quality of escapement of Chinook salmon throughout the Yukon River drainage. Passage of this proposal would address the genetic shift to smaller fish caused by targeting the larger fish that has gone on for many years. Local subsistence users and fishery projects on the Yukon River, including Canada, are reporting harvesting smaller fish. Conservation actions are necessary now to protect the genetic variability, the integrity of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks, and the future sustainability of these stocks for future generations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishermen, subsistence and commercial, will benefit by helping to rebuild the genetic variability and integrity of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks for future generations of fishermen across the drainage. Stabilizing the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks and preventing a decrease in their size is the right step for the fisheries and is good for the Alaskan subsistence lifestyle and the Canadian aboriginal lifestyle in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those fishermen whose priority is the immediate harvest of the largest fish at hand. The proposers are keenly aware passage of this proposal would place restrictions on users but the conservation concern of the genetic impacts of continued over fishing and targeting the larger female fish needs to be addressed now in order to protect the Yukon River Chinook salmon runs for needs in the future. As of 2008 Yukon fishermen have lost all their allowed Chinook commercial fishing time and have had severe restrictions put on basic Chinook subsistence harvests. Fish camps and the healthy lifestyle that goes along with them have continued disappearing as the Chinook fishery economics evaporate due to high fuel costs and low harvest numbers. This has all taken place simply because there are not enough fish anymore. Any seasonal suffering caused by the Board of Fish passing this proposal would be small compared to what has taken place already from inaction.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Nets in the 7" range were considered in past Board cycles however a number of reasons were discovered why they were not suitable. 1) A USFWS study (An Investigation of the Potential Effects of Selective Exploitation on the Demography and Productivity of Yukon River Chinook Salmon, Bromaghin, Nielson, and Hard) showed 7.5" mesh to be ineffective at reversing declining size trends and can actually contribute to the problem. 2) Current ongoing mesh size studies by ADF&G and anecdotal info from fishermen river wide show nets of the 7" range actually catching more fish and more lbs of Chinook than the more normally used 8- 9" nets and the smaller 6" range nets. Fishermen in the upper river commonly are reporting most Chinook going through the larger nets. This is clearly because of the lack of the larger fish at present. Targeting the next available largest Chinook age class with 7" range nets will only further damage the run. Proposers feel it would be best at this point to leave the mesh size at unlimited (commonly 8-9") if the 6" is not approved by Board.

PROPOSED BY: Co-authored by: Tanana Rampart Manley AC, Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council, Fairbanks AC, Minto-Nenana AC, and Ruby AC (HQ-09F-029)
****

<u>PROPOSAL 91</u> - 5 AAC 05.362. Yukon River Summer Chum Salmon Management Plan. Limit commercial king harvest during chum directed fisheries as follows:

The bycatch harvest of Chinook salmon during commercial chum directed fisheries shall be set at 3000 fish (1999-2008 average incidental harvest of Chinook salmon was 2,300 fish; 2004-2008: 4,600 Chinook salmon) until such time that border escapements into Canada are achieved for one full life salmon cycle (six years). Upon reaching the quota number all commercial chum salmon directed fisheries shall be closed for the remainder of the summer chum season.

ISSUE: During the directed commercial fishery for Yukon River chum salmon there is a bycatch of Chinook salmon that needs the attention of the Alaska Board of Fisheries. In 2008 approximately 4600 Chinook salmon were harvested as bycatch during the summer chum commercial fisheries and sold. With the low price for chum and the high price for Chinook salmon, the buyers and fishermen were targeting Chinook salmon for commercial sale. This commercial harvest of Chinook salmon needs to be managed especially during times like these when every returning Chinook salmon is important to meet escapement, U.S./Canada Agreement requirements, and for subsistence needs. Without management guidelines, Yukon River Chinook

salmon will continue to have an unregulated commercial fishery and create an incentive to harvest critical Canadian bound Chinook salmon during the chum directed fisheries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Declining Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks will continue to decline because of the increase harvest above subsistence needs for the lower river fishing districts. A commercial harvest of Yukon River Chinook as bycatch with directed commercial chum fisheries will continue to threaten efforts to rebuild the Yukon River Chinook stocks so that in the future the needs of escapement and subsistence are met throughout Alaskan portion of the river and State of Alaska meets its requirements with Canada.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of the resource harvested would be improved because with sound management guidelines the fisheries managers will be able to protect the Yukon River Chinook salmon during times of conservation concern and rebuilding while allowed commercial harvest of abundant chum salmon. The Yukon River Chinook escapement quality should improve because the bycatch numbers should be factored into the Yukon River Chinook management regime. The quality of future subsistence harvests may improve because of the improved quality of escapement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All would benefit from the sound management of the Yukon River Chinook in-river bycatch.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those whose interests are on the immediate unregulated financial gain from the sale of Yukon River Chinook salmon harvested as bycatch.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (HQ-09F-045)
****

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 05.362. Yukon River Summer Chum Salmon Management Plan. Prohibit sale of kings during non-king directed fisheries as follows:

No commercial sales of Chinook salmon caught in non Chinook directed commercial fisheries in entire Yukon River drainage. Chinook salmon caught as bycatch shall go into the subsistence fishery only.

ISSUE: Chinook bycatch commercial sales. Currently there is economic incentive to take Chinook salmon bycatch in chum salmon only directed commercial openings. There is no incentive to avoid them, as all Chinook bycatch is allowed to be sold. This has the effect of increasing Chinook take at the very time when severe conservation measures may be in effect for Chinook. In 2008 during the chum salmon directed openings this was the case. Presently managers are working with processors and fishers to voluntarily not sell or buy Chinook but this needs to be put in regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? During chum only directed commercial openings some fishers will continue to view Chinook as a valuable money fish and deliberately target them as their value exceeds the chum salmon. This can go contrary to the same season efforts of fishermen and managers to conserve declining Chinook stocks. It is a known that chum and Chinook have different travel habits and frequent different areas. Pulse peaks of the different species are often in different areas of the river and fishers can often avoid or target a species with all this knowledge. Depending on the gear used for harvest (driftnets), some fishers can take advantage of this situation all too easily.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal is attempting to improve the quality and the amount of the resource harvested by conserving the resource. In 2008 Chinook harvests were limited to subsistence only with severe restrictions even on that and Canadian border passage was still not met for second year in a row. Passage of this proposal would eliminate the commercial incentive to target Chinook salmon thereby allowing the returning Chinook salmon and the especially important larger female salmon additional opportunity to reach their spawning grounds which would help improve the quality of escapement of chinook salmon throughout the Yukon River drainage. Passage of this proposal would also address the genetic shift to smaller fish caused by over fishing and the years of targeting the larger fish. Local subsistence users and fishery monitoring projects in the upper Yukon River area, including Canada, are reporting harvesting smaller fish. Immediate conservation actions are necessary now to protect the genetic variability, the integrity of the Yukon River chinook salmon stocks, and the future sustainability of the resource to provide for future generations of fishermen, both subsistence and commercial.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The proposers feel all fishers in the drainage will benefit except those whose priority is the immediate harvest and commercial sale of fish at hand. Subsistence and commercial users will benefit by helping to rebuild the genetic variability and integrity of the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks for future generations of fishers across the drainage. Stabilizing the Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks and preventing a decrease in their size is the right step for the fisheries and is good for the subsistence lifestyle in Alaska and the Canadian aboriginal lifestyle the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those fishers whose priority is the immediate harvest of fish at hand for commercial sale. The proposers are keenly aware passage of this proposal would place restrictions on users but the conservation concern of the genetic impacts of continued over fishing needs to be addressed now in order to protect the Yukon River Chinook salmon runs for needs in the future. As of 2008 Yukon fishers have lost all their allowed Chinook commercial fishing time and have had severe restrictions placed on basic Chinook subsistence needs. Fish camps and the healthy lifestyle that goes along with them have continued to disappear as the Chinook subsistence fishery economy evaporates due to high fuel prices and poor harvest rates. This has all taken place simply because there are not enough fish anymore. Any seasonal suffering caused by Board of Fish passing of this proposal would be small compared to what has taken place already from inaction.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None others considered in this area.

PROPOSED BY: Co-authored by: Tanana Rampart Manley AC, Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council, Fairbanks AC, Minto-Nenana AC, and Ruby AC (HQ-09F-031)
****

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 05.360. Yukon River King Salmon Management Plan. Prohibit retention of kings during chum directed main stem fisheries as follows:

In commercial openings on the main stem of the Yukon River in District 1 through 5 for an other-directed species, chum salmon (*Oncorhypcus kota*) i.e. a fisherman or fisherwoman participating in those directed fisheries may neither retain nor sell any king salmon he or she bycatches in those directed fishery openings.

(I personally do not object to this proposed regulation for District 6 (Tanana River) as well, but Alaska State management biologist advise us that the Tanana River king salmon run statistics are satisfactory.)

ISSUE: The problem is some years inadequate numbers of Yukon River, "main stem" king salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) make it to any of the Canadian spawning areas to satisfactorily replenish the Yukon River main stem run – Yukon River main stem king salmon runs in 2007 and 2008 for instance. And of those depleted numbers that make it to the Canadian spawning grounds the age class configurations and sex ratios differ from those of "healthy" runs.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The subject run abundance, age class configuration and sex ratio vectors will, already have and will continue to display deteriorating trends.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If this proposed regulation is adopted and it successfully acts as an incentive to lower king salmon commercial bycatch in Yukon River directed fisheries, then all those who rely on the Yukon River king salmon resource will likely benefit including eventually even the fisherman or fisherwoman who is deprived of his or her bycatch king salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The fisherman or fisherwoman who is denied the opportunity to retain or sell his or her bycatch king salmon and the family, if any of those fishermen or fisherwomen, will, in the short term at least, likely suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? My proposed solution is but one of a number of solutions that will be required to return the Yukon River main stem, Canadian-bound king salmon run to its former numbers, age class configuration and habitat fecundity-replenishing role.

PROPOSED BY: Jude Henzler (HQ-09F-019)
****

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 05.360. Yukon River King Salmon Management Plan. Require windows schedule during lower river commercial fishery as follows:

Repeal 5 AAC 05.360(e) (managers must stick to the window schedule)

ISSUE: When the BOF established 5 AAC 05.360(d) it did not intend for it to be circumvented. The department had this put in regulation in January 2004. As soon as there is a commercial opening the department throws the windows out the window.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have 7 day a week fishing in the Lower Yukon.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The salmon will have closures so they can travel up the river unmolested. The board determined in January 2001 that reasonable opportunity was.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks AC (HQ-09F-057)

****

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 05.360. Yukon River King Salmon Management Plan. Reallocate commercial king salmon harvest as follows:

5 AAC 05.360(b)(2): the department shall manage the Yukon River commercial king salmon fishery for a guideline harvest range of **0 - 60,000** [67,350 – 129,150] king salmon distributed as follows:

(A) District 1 and 2: **0 - 26,700** [60,000 – 120,000] king salmon;
(B) District 3: **0-8,000 set net only** [1,800 – 2,200] king salmon;
(C) District 4: **0-8,000** [2,250 – 2,850] king salmon;
(D) District 5
(i) Subdistrict 5-B and 5-C: **0-8,000** [2,400 – 2,800] king salmon;
(ii) Subdistrict 5-D: **0-1,300** [300 – 500] king salmon; and
(E) District 6: **0-8,000** [600 – 800] king salmon;

(3) when the king salmon harvest range for Districts 1-6 combined is below the low end harvest level from zero to **60,000** [67,350] fish, the department shall allocate the commercial harvest available by percentage for each district as follows:

(A) District 1 and 2: **44.5** [89.1] percent;
(B) District 3: **13.33** [2.7] percent **set net only**;
(C) District 4: **13.33** [3.3] percent;
(D) Subdistrict 5-B and 5-C: **13.33** [3.6] percent;
(E) Subdistrict 5-D: **2.16** [0.4] percent; and

(F) District 6: **13.33** [0.9] percent.

ISSUE: The Yukon River lower river fishing districts, Y1 and Y2, are allocated 89 percent of the commercial harvest. In order to prosecute the commercial fishery in accordance with the allocation scheme, the manager is required to start the fishery prior to having a valid assessment of the strength of the run. This does not align with sound fisheries management and common sense. It has contributed to the collapse of the Chinook salmon run and the United states not meeting the Canadian border passage goals of the treaty with Canada.

Very few Chinook salmon originate in districts Y1 and Y2, the Andreafsky River being the only river and it is closed to commercial fishing. This violates a well known international agreement that the country of the salmon's origin has primary interest in ownership of the salmon. The same should apply for the area of origin for Yukon River salmon and it does not. For example, between 30-40 percent of the Chinook salmon that enter the Yukon River originate from the Tanana River, however the commercial allocation for the Tanana River originate from the Tanana River, however the commercial allocation for the Tanana River is .9 of the percent while districts Y1 and Y2 is allocated 89 percent of the commercial harvest. In 2006 and 2007, districts Y1 and Y2 commercially fished while the Tanana River was closed in order to make escapement goals.

In 2008 there were no eight year olds, 0.5 percent seven year olds, and 7.6 percent six year age classes in the escapement at the Tozitna River Wier. The once great run of Chinook salmon in the Yukon River will have no yield thereby violating the State constitutional requirement that they be managed for sustained yield. Upriver subsistence fishermen both in Alaska and in Canada have had a hard time meeting their subsistence needs. In Canada alone, in 2007 & 2008, less than half of the subsistence requirements were met.

The current situation forces the fisheries managers to prosecute the commercial fisheries prior to full assessment of the run. Passage of this proposal would assist the managers to comply with Policy for the Management of Sustainable Salmon Fisheries (5 AAC 39.222).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The manager will continue to receive demands and threats form the Y1 and Y2 commercial fishermen to open the commercial fishery. The manager will not be able to manage the fishery in a manner consistent with the Policy for the Management of Sustainable Salmon Fisheries (5 AAC 39.222). The viability of the Chinook run in the Yukon River will continue to decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Spreading the harvest out river wide lessens the impacts to single components of the run and allows greater flexibility for the manager to prosecute fisheries on healthy isolated stocks.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen and villages in fishing District 3-6 would benefit with a fairer distribution of the commercial harvest of Yukon River Chinook salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen of fishing Districts 1 and 2 might suffer because they would be reduced by 40 percent of their current allocation. In the long run it might benefit them due to the increased incentive to increase the amount of returning salmon to allow then to increase the umber of fish they harvest and sell.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (HQ-09F-044)
****

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 05.362. Yukon River Summer Chum Salmon Management Plan. Reallocate commercial summer chum salmon harvest as follows:

(f)(1) 180,000-540,000
(2) 24,000-72,000
(3) 120,000-360,000
(4) 36,000-108,000
(5) 4,000-12,000
(6) 36,000-108,000
(g)(A) 45%
(B) 6%
(C) 30%
(D) 9%
(E) 1%
(F) 9%

ISSUE: The Yukon River summer chum salmon allocation is too high in Districts 1 & 2. This causes the manager to start the fishery prior to having a valid assessment of the strength of the run.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The manager will not be able to manage the fishery in a manner consistent with the Policy for the Management of Sustainable Salmon Fisheries 5 AAC 39.222.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen in Districts 3 and 6.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen in Districts 1 and 2.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks AC (HQ-09F-056)
****

PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 05.365. Yukon River fall chum salmon guideline harvest ranges. Reallocate commercial fall chum salmon harvest as follows:

(1) District 1, 2, 3: 21,825-96,000
(2) District 4: 14,550-64,000
(3) Sub District 5 B, C, & D: 14,550-64,000
(4) Sub District 5D: Delete
(5) District 6: 21,825-96,000

ISSUE: Unfair allocation of fall chums, no fall chum originate in the Lower Yukon. This causes the managers to start the fishery prior to having a valid assessment of the run strength.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The manager will not be able to manage the fishery in a manner consistent with the Policy for the Management of Sustainable Salmon Fisheries 5 AAC 39.222.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone due to management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks AC (HQ-09F-054)
****

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 05.200. Fishing districts and subdistricts. Open commercial fishing between Black River and Chris Point as follows:

Fishing would be permitted for both drift and setnet between Chris Point and Black River (between statistical areas 334-11 & 334-12).

ISSUE: Lack of fishing area on the Lower Yukon Delta.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Crowded fishing. Lack of fishing opportunity fleet stuck in crowded areas.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, would improve quality as fish would be ocean costal as opposed to river run.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users because it will define management objectives.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Y-1 Fishermen.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No one.

PROPOSED BY: KwikPak Fisheries (HQ-09F-157)
****

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 05.350(4). Closed Waters. Open Andreafsky River to commercial fishing as follows:

Part (4) of 5 AAC 05.350 would be deleted.

ISSUE: The Andreafsky River is closed to commercial fishing. It should be managed as a terminal river. It is the only river in the lower Yukon that produces king and summer chum and coho.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Andreafsky River will continue to not have a commercial fishery.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen who would like to fish in the Andreafsky River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks AC (HQ-09F-055)
****

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 74.010. Seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Tanana River Management Area. Close the Tok River drainage to sport fishing for salmon as follows:

Close the Tok River drainage to sport fishing for salmon.

(c)(26) in the Tok River drainage
(C) sport fishing for salmon is closed;

ISSUE: In 2008, approximately 50 coho salmon were observed in a tributary of the Tok River. Prior to this adult coho salmon had not been documented in the Tok River drainage. This is believed to be a relatively small, discrete stock of coho salmon and may not be able to sustain any level of harvest. This proposal is consistent with regulations in other Tanana River tributaries (Delta River drainage, upper Chatanika, Goodpaster, and Salcha rivers) to protect small salmon stocks or spawning salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There is potential for harvests to exceed sustainable levels due to the small number of coho salmon in the Tok River drainage.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The small population of coho salmon in this drainage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those sport anglers that may target coho salmon in this drainage.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-09F-144)
****