

**ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES
DECEMBER 4-12, 2012
BRISTOL BAY FINFISH**

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 01.310. Fishing seasons and periods. Allow for a weekend subsistence schedule in the Nushagak District as follows:

(D) Change 9:00 am Friday to 9:00 am Saturday; to 9:00 am Saturday to 9:00 am Sunday. Instead of closing when the weekend is just starting, it gives those “workers” the opportunity to harvest and process their fish during the weekend when they are off.

ISSUE: Allow subsistence salmon fishing in the Nushagak River on weekends when subsistence restrictions are in place.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Under emergency order and when restricted, subsistence fishing is allowed on a weekly schedule. 9:00 am Monday to 9:00 am Tuesday, 9:00 am Wednesday to 9:00 am Thursday, and 9:00 am Friday to 9:00 am Saturday. Those workers who work a 40 hour work week from Monday to Friday do not have the opportunity to harvest and process subsistence salmon during the week and on the weekend when they are off.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not quality, but opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Workers who work during the week.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (HQ-F12-126)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 67.022(g)(5). Special Provisions, seasons, bag, possession and size limits and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Increase nonretention, no bait waters of the Nushagak River as follows:

The current language is The Nushagak Drainage upstream of its confluence with Harris Creek [TO ITS CONFLUENCE OF CHICHITNOK RIVER] The proposed language would be **The Nushagak Drainage upstream of its confluence with Harris Creek...**

ISSUE: To create consistency in the regulation and to protect rainbow trout. Currently the regulations for rainbow trout on the upper Nushagak River between the confluence Harris Creek and the confluence of Chichitnok River are catch and release and no bait on rainbow trout. My proposal would extend catch and release and no bait to the waters of the Nushagak River above the confluence of the Chichitnok River. This would provide protection to rainbow trout and add consistency to the regulation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? I have seen a decline in the size and abundance of rainbow trout in the waters of the Nushagak River above the confluence of the Nushagak and Chichitnok Rivers. If nothing is done the population of rainbow trout will continue to decline. Also it would provide consistency in the regulation by for sport fisher persons. Rather than having two different bag limits above Harris Creek, they would be the same.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it would reduce the harvest of rainbow trout and eliminate the use of bait. With a catch and release fishery the population of rainbow trout should increase. The goal would be to have the rainbow trout population get back to its historical population, distribution and size of the fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport Fisherman will have a better rainbow trout fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. There are plenty of Dolly Varden and grayling to catch and eat.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. Going to a catch and release sport fishery is the only solution.

PROPOSED BY: Bud Hodson

(HQ-F12-014)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 67.022(x) Special Provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Require barbless hooks in unbaited, single-hook, artificial fly waters as follows:

(x) from June 8 through October 31, only un-baited, barbless, single hook, artificial flies may be used.

ISSUE: Make freshwater fly fishing only nonretention fisheries barbless hooks.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The rainbow trout of the Bristol Bay drainages provide a tremendous economic engine for the sport fishing industry. Anglers from around the world travel to the Bristol Bay region to have the chance at catching a wild rainbow trout. Part of the allure for these customers is that the fish of the Bristol Bay region are larger than any other trout fishery in the world. The rainbow trout fishery plays a significant role in the sport fishery of Bristol Bay that recent studies have shown generates over \$100M a year to the State of Alaska economy. It is prudent that management of these fisheries and the means in which the fish are caught is as protective as possible while still allowing the angler to peruse and catch the fish. A barbless hook will allow for quick release of the fish in addition to minimizing the adverse affect of the hook in the fish's mouth. The barb hook does cause more bleeding which has the potential to mortally wound the fish. The barbless hook will also cut down on the scaring of the fish.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The rainbow trout will be healthier as the trauma of removing the barbed hook will be less and the scaring will also be less. The overall population of the rainbow trout will grow as less fish die after being hooked with a barbed hook. Fish that are not scarred up add to the quality of the anglers experience as well as to the perception in the customer's mind of a pristine untouched fishery. This is a major selling point when trying to get customers to spend money and to book trips to Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All anglers that wish to have a high quality experience when targeting rainbow trout.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody. Less rainbows would die after being caught and thus the population would increase.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I thought of keeping the regulation the same and the continued allowance of barbed hooks in these fisheries. However, we as a state are trying to be on the leading edge of protecting our fisheries in every possible way while still allowing the angler the enjoyment of catching a fish (Felt sole ban starting this year). It makes sense that if we can create a regulation that still allows the angler to catch fish, does not diminish those chances any, and it lessens the potential damage to the targeted fish, then we should implement that regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Kraft

(HQ-F12-030)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 67.030. Methods, means, and general provisions - Finfish. Prohibit putting fish parts in water where use of bait is prohibited as follows:

Notwithstanding 5 AAC 75.995 (36), "bait" means any substance applied to fishing gear or placed in fresh water by a person for the purpose of attracting fish by scent, including fish eggs in any form, natural or preserved animal, fish, fish oil, shellfish, or insect parts, natural or processed vegetable matter and natural or synthetic chemicals.

ISSUE: On many of the freshwaters of the Bristol Bay Area it has become a common practice for individuals, often individuals working as sport fishing guides or sport fishing assistant guides to place substances defined as "bait" in 5 AAC 75.996 (36) into the waters in an effort to attract fish by scent. This practice is commonly referred to as "chumming". Bait applied to fishing gear is currently prohibited in many, if not most, of the waters where this is a common practice. The bait prohibitions found in 5 AAC 67.222 apply to freshwaters distributed throughout the Bristol Bay Area are the result of multiple cycles of Board deliberation. These prohibitions were adopted to address a wide range of both biological and quality of experience issues. The bait prohibitions are appropriate and well supported. This proposal seeks to prohibit the practice of chumming as it is occurring today in those freshwaters of the Bristol Bay Area where bait is now prohibited.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chumming alters the natural feeding routine of the rainbow trout, char and Arctic grayling. Fish concentrate in locations where quantities of bait are frequently placed in the water. Catch rates can increase dramatically as a result of the practice of chumming. Individual fish are caught and handled more often than would occur in a more natural setting. Although most areas are governed by "catch and release" regulations there is still some incidental mortality associated with this practice and that amount increases with increased number of catches. There is also a quality of experience issue that arises when multiple groups of sport fishermen are present in the proximity of each other on the same water and some are adhering to both the wording and the spirit of the bait prohibition and others are engaging in the practice of chumming. Catch rates are normally higher for individuals in the group that is chumming. The antagonism created by situations such as this are not helpful in maintaining the world class quality of the sport fishery in the Bristol Bay Area and if left unaddressed will likely lead to its diminishment.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal seeks to prohibit the practice commonly referred to as chumming specifically in those freshwaters of the Bristol Bay Area where the use of bait is currently prohibited by regulation. A wide range of both biological and quality of experience issues arise from common occurrence of the practice of chumming. The Alaska Board of Fisheries has throughout the years consistently taken the position that fisheries for wild rainbow trout must be managed conservatively and with emphasis on maintaining the quality of the sport fishing experience. "5 AAC 75.222. Policy for the management of wild trout fisheries" lays out an excellent framework. Most of the regulatory development found in 5 AAC 67.022 specifically addresses wild trout fisheries. Prohibiting chumming will enhance the State's

consistent effort to protect both the biological integrity and quality of experience of the wild trout fisheries in the freshwaters of the Bristol Bay Area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Prohibition of the practice of chumming will have a positive effect on the wild rainbow trout resource by maintaining catch rates at levels historically observed in fisheries where bait is prohibited. Conflicts between groups of sport fishermen over the appropriateness of chumming will cease to occur. The probability of achieving the dual goals of wild trout rainbow management, maintenance of historical size, age composition and abundance of the trout population and the maintenance of the quality of the sport fishing experience will be enhanced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Sport fishermen who are now chumming the freshwaters of the Bristol Bay Area where the use of bait is prohibited in an effort to increase their catch rates on wild rainbow trout will find it more challenging to hook these prized fish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Prohibition of chumming through adoption of the recommended regulatory wording is, in my opinion, the only practical way to eliminate this harmful practice.

PROPOSED BY: Pat Vermillion (HQ-F12-056)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 65.020. Bag limits, possession limits, and size limits for Alaska Peninsula and Aleutian Islands Area; 5 AAC 67.022. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Decrease coho salmon bag limit to one in the Ugashik, Dog Salmon, and King Salmon rivers as follows: *(This proposal will be addressed in both the Bristol Bay and AK Pen/Aleutian Island meetings.)*

On page 7 of the Bristol Bay Waters Sport Fishing Regulations an added note would read:

On the Ugashik, Dog Salmon, King Salmon and Cinder River drainages the daily and possession limit for coho salmon is 1.

ISSUE: The recent decline in coho salmon populations on the Ugashik, Dog Salmon, King Salmon and Cinder River drainages. This decline is substantiated by 2011 Bristol Bay wide coho run being 1/3 of historical average and the total lack of commercial harvest on the proposed drainages other than incidental catches from the sockeye run. This problem is also magnified by the increased sport fishing pressure on the spawning grounds of these drainages.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without restrictions on the resource both the sport and commercial users will be exposed to long term declines.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sport, commercial, and subsistence fishermen in the mentioned watersheds.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Short term effects may impact the commercial sport fishing enterprises who do not practice catch and release.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered catch and release but no provision for a damaged fish.

PROPOSED BY: Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee (HQ-F12-114b)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 6 – 5 AAC 67.022. Special provisions for season, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Clarify king salmon bag limit between Constantine and Newenham as follows:

In all fresh waters between Cape Constantine and Cape Newenham, the bag and possession limit for king salmon 20 inches or greater in length is three per day, three in possession, of which only two may be 28 inches or greater in length.

ISSUE: Bristol Bay regulations, which provide for a bag and possession limit for king salmon 20 inches or greater in length of three per day, three in possession, of which only one may be 28 inches or greater in length, are in conflict with prior board action. This proposal would correct the discrepancy between prior board action and regulations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The codified regulations will not reflect prior board action.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This proposal would clarify the regulations for fishery managers, enforcement staff, and anglers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F12-217)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 67.022. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Reduce king salmon bag limit between Constantine and Newenham as follows:

In the waters between Cape Constantine to Cape Newenham the bag limit for Chinook salmon will be two per day one over 28”.

ISSUE: Currently the bag limit for Chinook in waters between Cape Constantine to Cape Newenham is three per day, two over 28". Most of the waters in this area (Bristol Bay) has a reduced bag limit to two Chinook per day and one over 28".

The Togiak river is one of the rivers that still has not been reduced from the three Chinook per day and one over 28". I am very concerned about the Chinook salmon escapement for the past three years. I have a camp on the Togiak river and guide sport fishermen for Chinook salmon. The past three years has been very poor sport fishing but more important the escapement has been dismal.

I also operate a camp up river on the Togiak for Dolly Varden and rainbow trout, followed by silver salmon. My observation in the up river Chinook spawning grounds confirms my concern over a lack of Chinook spawners up river.

This proposal would make the Chinook bag limit throughout the water between Cape Constantine to Cape Newenham (Bristol Bay) consistent throughout the bay.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lack of escapement may cause the Togiak Chinook salmon become a stock of concern.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It may in the future if we get strong Chinook runs back to the Togiak river. The commercial fishery will benefit along with Subsistence and sport fishing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In the future, all users will hopefully benefit by strong Chinook returns.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those anglers who wish to harvest two large Chinook per day.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Bud Hodson

(HQ-F12-023)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 67.022(x). Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Reduce king salmon bag limit in the Togiak and Kulukak rivers as follows:

(x) Daily limits for king salmon 20" or longer in these drainages, including the Kulukak and Togiak river drainages are one per day, three in possession, only one over 28".

ISSUE: Reduce the existing daily limits for king salmon 20" or longer in the Kulukak and Togiak river drainages, from three per day, three in possession, only two over 28". to a lesser amount.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The larger king salmon shall continue to decline and the runs will have to be fully restricted even more than they are now. In light the resource has only so much pressure. Self-regulation in the sports industry in both these drainages is critical.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will make the king salmon that are caught that more valuable to client, guide and recreational user and we will see a bigger return in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Close the fishing all together but that will have to be another proposal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Clients that have reservations of keeping all that they catch, maybe lodges that sell more than three per day guided trips.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the fishery until stocks rebound, because that would not solve the problem we have to work together on building back these stocks back up for everyone to enjoy.

PROPOSED BY: Togiak Traditional Council (HQ-F12-089)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 67.022. Special Provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Limit guided access to rivers as follows:

I recommend the Board consider a time and area allocation scheme which will fairly allow opportunity for all user groups. For commercial operators, client day limits are an obvious solution. This could best be defined in a subcommittee workshop. My personal views will differ from those of the recently established factory lodges who come here without regard for the conservation of the resource or their effects on other users.

ISSUE: Proliferation of guided, transported and boat rental effort has, over the last 15 years, grown to the point that locals have only limited opportunity to enjoy a peaceful day fishing on the Naknek River. These are people that live here year round. Additionally, commercial service providers have been battling for time and space, even if they consider it, to offer quality fishing opportunities. Combat fishing as accepted in other areas of the state is not desirable or acceptable in the Bristol Bay region which is known for quality of experience. The issue of crowding, conflicts in the field among users, and quality of experience are not new, either in hunting or fishing. As regards South West Alaska, people who go to the expense to sport fish here do not do so expecting to have to fight for a place to fish.

Local residents and subsistence users have had enough of large scale sport fish lodge operations owned by people in the lower 48 who know nothing about the Board of Fish process, or the management regimes which allow them to be here at all. They have no consideration for long term conservation of the fisheries resource or any historical knowledge of the Bristol Bay fisheries. They come here purely to take and sell Alaska, and contribute little to the communities involved. A critical question we must ask ourselves is how do we want Alaska to look given our great resource heritage? What is economically sustainable over the long term? What is best for the residents of our state? We are long past the time to allocate access in the sport fishery in Bristol Bay, and particularly the Naknek River.

I have lived here in King Salmon for 40 years and worked as a small scale sport fishing guide during that entire time. I have watched these changes with great consternation. It is now time to take regulatory action to prevent the decline, both biologically and in terms of quality of experience of the sport fishery on the Naknek River. Whatever may happen here could have state wide ramifications. I can tell you this, locals throughout the region, not just on the Naknek River have had enough.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Crowding and conflict amongst users will continue to worsen. The quality of experience for all user groups will definitely diminish.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal does improve quality of the resource and quality of the experience by reducing conflicts among users, reducing impacts of fish species, and provides long term sustainability of a quality sport fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Over the long term, all users will benefit as will the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? In the short term, large scale lodge operators who are primarily owned by lower 48 entities will be required to modify their marketing and business plans to accommodate other users. A vast majority of these people operating on the Naknek River have no idea about the development and establishment of management plans, the role of the Department of Fish and Game and the role of the Board of Fish in establishing management and allocation schemes. They simply come here to take without regard to who it may effect. Now is the time to find an alternative to the status quo.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Joe Klutsch

(HQ-F12-202)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 27.865(b)(7). Bristol Bay Herring Management Plan. Allow unharvested herring stocks in the Togiak District to be reallocated to the Dutch Harbor food and bait fishery as follows:

(b) (7) The maximum exploitation rate for the Bristol Bay herring stock is 20 percent. Before opening the sac roe fishery the department shall set aside approximately 1,500 short tons for the Togiak District herring spawn-on-kelp fishery, and seven percent of the remaining available harvest for the Dutch Harbor food and bait fishery. If the actual harvest level is less than the spawn-on-kelp guideline harvest level, the commissioner may reallocate 50 percent of the remainder to the Togiak District herring sac roe fishery. **If no spawn-on-kelp harvest occurs, after the commissioner has reallocated 750 tons to the Togiak District herring sac roe fishery the commissioner may reallocate the remaining 750 tons to the Dutch Harbor food and bait fishery.**

ISSUE: Increase the quantity (tons) of food and bait herring to be harvested in the Unimak, Akutan and Unalaska Districts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Abundant herring stocks will remain unharvested. There is active demand for these food and bait herring in the local area. These herring bring a higher price per pound than sac roe herring fisheries. There are abundant stocks that can be harvested locally in the Dutch Harbor area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? These herring are post-spawn and are actively feeding and receive a much higher economic value than other harvested herring. There is a 100% utilization of these herring due to their size and quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The State of Alaska for increased value of the herring resource along with the seiners and gillnetters that participate in this food and bait fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This is an un-harvested resource, therefore no one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status-Quo.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Veerhusens

(HQ-F12-129)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 27.865(b)(8). Bristol Bay Herring Management Plan. Remove the necessity for maintaining catch percentages between gear groups inseason by emergency order (EO) as follows:

(b)(8) After the spawn-on-kelp harvest another Dutch Harbor food and bait fishery have been subtracted, the remaining harvestable surplus is allocated to the sac roe fishery. The Department shall manage for a removal of 30% of that surplus by the gillnet fleet and 70% by the purse seine fleet.

ISSUE: Requiring the Commissioner to make adjustments to fishing periods and fishing area by Emergency Order to maintain the 70/30 percent harvest of surplus until each gear has harvested 50% of their allocation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The loss of fishing time when marketable herring are available due to reasons other than processing capacity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It allows herring to be harvested when they are most marketable. It allows the processor to maximize their processing capacity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The herring processors and harvesters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Possible herring gillnetters when weather and or the lack of fish available for harvest in the Kulukak section reduces their harvest.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Heyano (HQ-F12-128)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 27.865. Bristol Bay Herring Management Plan. Split the Togiak District herring sac roe quota allocated to seine and gillnet gear 50/50 as follows:

Split the quota 50/50 between purse seine and gillnet fishermen.

ISSUE: Make the quota for the Togiak Herring sac roe fishery more equitable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The local gillnet fishermen will continue to get short changed on the economic value of the fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, gillnet caught fish in the Togiak sac roe fishery have historically been of higher roe percentage thus better quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The local area residents who still participate in the fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Very few non-Alaska residents who have benefited much from a local fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Togiak Traditional Council (HQ-F12-182)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 27.865. Bristol Bay Herring Management Plan. Close the Togiak herring sac roe fishery through 2016 as follows:

Close the Togiak herring sac roe fishery for one Board of Fisheries cycle. Justification; A) it no longer provides a viable economic benefit to the majority of the local area residents including Togiak; B) The management of the fishery no longer complies with Section 16.251 of the Board of Fisheries regulations which are addressed under (a) (17) 1) to promote fishing and preserving the heritage of fishing in the State; C) the management is out of compliance with the criteria for allocation of fishery resources under (e) of this section which may include such factors as (1) the history of each personal use, sport, guided sport, and commercial fishery; (2) the number of residents and nonresidents who have participated in each fishery in the past and the number of residents and nonresidents who can reasonably be expected to participate in the future; (3) the importance of each fishery for providing residents the opportunity to obtain fish for personal and family consumption; (4) the availability of alternative fishery resources; (5) the importance of each fishery to the economy of the State; (6) the importance of each fishery to the economy of the region and local area in which the fishery is located; and etc.

ISSUE: Lack of participation by the local residents in the Togiak herring sac roe fishery and lost opportunity for subsistence herring roe on kelp due to over harvest of herring before there is adequate spawn in the areas kelp beds.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The local Togiak village residents and others from surrounding villages who used to participate in this fishery will continue to lose opportunity for economic benefit from this State of Alaska resource in their backyard. Secondly, the historical spawn on kelp subsistence fishery and its importance use to the local communities will continue to be significantly jeopardized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The quality of the roe on kelp subsistence fishery will improve.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? More local residents who rely heavily on the roe on kelp for subsistence consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Very few non-Alaska residents who have benefited greatly from a local area resource.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Litigation. Too cumbersome and costly to both the State of Alaska and concerned.

PROPOSED BY: Togiak Traditional Council (HQ-F12-184)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 27.850. Closed waters in Bristol Bay Area. Extend the closed waters area in Togiak Bay as follows:

Add a new section (c) under 5 AAC 27.850. Closed waters in Bristol Bay Area to read **(c) Togiak Bay is closed to taking of herring from the longitude of the Quigmy River to the western point of the Nunavachak Bay. The boundary line will be described from a point west at Quigmy River at 58 degrees 51'20.79"N and 160 degrees 05'44.95"W to a point on the west of Nunavachak Bay at 58 degrees 54'07.61"N and 160 degrees 45'37.51"W.**

ISSUE: Extend the closed area outside of the existing Togiak Section to protect spawn on kelp beds for the health of the subsistence resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The herring will continue to not be able to spawn properly in their historical spawning areas due to over exploitation by the purse seine fleet in the existing open area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The quality of the spawn on kelp in their historical locations will improve due to less pressure from the current fishery in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The local area residents who still rely heavily on the herring spawn on kelp as part of their subsistence food resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Very few, if any, non-Alaskan residents who have benefited much from the local fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Togiak Traditional Council (HQ-F12-181)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Allow set gillnet anchors and running lines at registered sites to remain in the water during closed periods as follows:

The new regulation will state:

Setnet anchor tackle or gear placed at registered sites only can be left in the water during fishing period closures. At any unregistered location all gear will be removed from the water at each fishing period closure.

ISSUE: The problem is setnet fisherpeople are setting anchor tackle at non-registered sites, sometimes more than 0.5 miles from the beach, in an effort to reserve a fishing location. This setting takes place before and during the season. The anchor tackle consists of an end buoy separated by up to 100 fathoms of floating line from another end buoy. This 100 fathoms of floating line is a navigational hazard to all vessels transiting the area where this unattended gear is located. In most cases, this gear is left in the water for the entire season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Vessels traveling along shorelines unfamiliar with the placement of this unattended gear will either run over it (the surface line) or if they observe it will alter course around it. At night due to lack of visibility, chances are the vessel will encounter the floating line. In either case, the interaction of the moving vessel and the surface line has the probability of fouling its propeller thus creating a stranded vessel.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any vessel unfamiliar with the placement of this unattended gear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Only those who currently do this.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Dale Petersen & Duane Kapp (HQ-F12-130)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Allow set gillnet gear to remain in place between fishing periods on consecutive tides as follows:

Setnet gear will be permitted to remain in place between consecutive tides of announced open fishing.

ISSUE: Short closures for setnet fishers between tides at low water. The ADF&G has been announcing consecutive open tides for drift / set fishing, but closing the period for several hours at low water to allow more fish to enter the district at the line. The setnet sites often have little or no water at this time, and are not catching a significant amount of fish (if any). Pulling up and resetting the gear produces unneeded wear and tear on equipment, and consumes excess time needed in between tides.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishers will continue to have to unnecessarily pull and reset gear.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen will benefit by not having to return to their sites to pull the gear (or pull it early before delivering in order to avoid being in the water too late). ADF&G will benefit by not having to patrol / enforce an area that isn't really actively fishing at that time anyway.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: South Naknek Beach Set Net Association (HQ-F12-173)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. In the Nushagak District, prohibit a permit holder from operating a set gillnet seaward of another set gillnet as follows:

5 AAC 06.331(n)

In the Nushagak District, no salmon interim-use or entry permit holder may set or operate a set gillnet seaward of set gillnets operated **by: another salmon interim-use or entry permit holder; or the entry permit holder who is operating either of their dual permits in accordance with 5 AAC 06.331(u).** In the following locations, no part of a set gillnet, anchor, peg, stake, buoy, or other device used to set the net may be seaward of the stated offshore distance:

5 AAC 06.331(o)

No salmon CFEC permit holder may set or operate a set gillnet seaward of set gillnets operated by another salmon CFEC permit holder **or the CFEC permit holder who is operating either of their dual permits in accordance with 5 AAC 06.331 (u)** in the following locations:

ISSUE: Adoption of 5 AAC 06.331(u) resulted in an unanticipated inconsistency with 5 AAC 06.331(n),(o) which has been interpreted to allow a dual setnet permit holder to operate a second 50 fathom net offshore of their own 50 fathom net on the same site in the Nushagak District. The nets must still be separated by the mandated distance but a person could still have 100 fathoms of net on one site at one time.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current interpretation of 5 AAC 06.331(n),(o) will provide a competitive advantage for dual setnet permit holders not originally anticipated when 5 AAC 06.331(u) was adopted. Fishing two 50 fathom set gillnets on one site in the Nushagak District is inconsistent with the original intent of the dual setnet permit proposal – that dual setnet permit holders shall fish the permits in the same manner as if held by two separate permit holders with no greater privileges or encumbrances.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Nushagak setnet fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nushagak setnet fishermen seeking to gain a competitive advantage over their peers via an unanticipated ambiguity in the regulations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Doing nothing. Rejected because this ambiguity is highly allocative and was not subject to notice, comment, deliberation, and knowingly approved by the Board.

PROPOSED BY: Dylan Braund and Tom Rollman Jr.

(HQ-F12-107)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Shorten the distance that a set gillnet can be set from the high-tide mark from 1,000 feet to 600 feet as follows:

Area description from 5 AAC 06.350(d)(1)

Those waters of the Ugashik River upstream of a line from 57°30.19'N lat, 157°39.37 W long to 57°29.83 N lat, 157°32.22 W long except that set gillnetters may be used to take salmon along that portion of the east bank of the Ugashik River from a point at 57°30.74'N lat, 157°24.10 W long to 57°32.27 N lat, 157°24.36 W long.

Change-

5 AAC 06.331 m 8 (this is an addition)

In the area described above, no part of a set gillnet may be more than 600 feet from the 18 foot high tide mark.

ISSUE: If setnet gear is allowed to extend 1000 feet from shore in the Ugashik Village setnet area, the gear will nearly touch shore to shore blocking the entire river. Drift boats home ported in the Ugashik Village area launch and haul out in the setnet area on the only gravel beach (nicknamed Sleepy Hollow). This beach is also used for repair work on setnet skiffs and drift boats. For the season of 2011, this access was restricted to very high tides for the drift boats and setnetters could not navigate to the tender on lower tides.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Safety is also an issue. The tender is anchored on the downriver side of this area and all setnet skiffs need to access the tender at all times. For the 2011 season, the setnet skiffs were running aground and drift boats only had limited access at high tides. In periods of bad weather, setnet skiffs loaded with salmon could roll over attempting to access the tender. Currents are extreme and there is a possibility of drowning or damage to the setnet skiffs.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The river in front Ugashik village is constricted and the 1000 feet currently allowed in the regulations is too much for the confined spaces in the river. The 1000 feet blocks the channel. 600 feet is an acceptable compromise.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnetters, drift boats and the market will benefit from the solution.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, the area further than 600 feet can rarely be fished due to currents which can elevate even 300 pound lead lines.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Hattie Albecker, Lucy Brunetti, Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee,
Ugashik Traditional Village Council (HQ-F12-118)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Restrict drift gillnet gear from fishing within 1,000 feet from the mean high-tide line as follows:

For commercial fishing time when both set and drift gillnet gear types are open for commercial fishing periods: In the Ugashik District between June 1 and July 17th no drift gillnet may be deployed within 1000' of the mean high tide line with respect to the inner beaches (waters toward the Ugashik River inside of Smoky Point 57° 36'39.30" N and 157° 41' 33.19" W and South Spit 57° 33' 53.32" N and 157° 41' 09.58" W). No setnet deployed using anchors can be more than 1,000 feet from the mean high water mark

ISSUE: Many drift gillnet fisherman are creating gear conflicts by fishing in between setnet sites. In many cases the drift fisherman are functionally setnetting by placing their lead line on the muddy bottom and allowing a gently moving tide to rise and fall while their position remains static. Some "rogue" drift fisherman will even go as far as placing the end of their net up on the shore so that as the tide rises and falls, they will fish right next to the beach without changing positions for hours. Despite existing regulations that exclude this type of drift gillnet deployment, fishing this way works well for catching fish on nice weather days with slow moving tides. However, on days with larger tidal exchanges and heavy winds, fishing in between setnet sites has proven to be an extreme hazard as the drift gear begins to move with the tidal current. Many times over the last few years, drifter gear has run over, snagged and wrapped-up stationary setnet gear located at lease held shore fishery sites. Until setnetters and drifters have mutually exclusive fishing areas the risk of catastrophe – loss of life - is sincere.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Gear conflicts will continue to be a safety hazard. A drifter in the Ugashik District does not know when he/she will encounter a deployed setnet. Drifters in the Ugashik District have proven to lack either the spatial awareness or the mechanical means to avoid running over setnet gear with driftnets. Damage to equipment and gear is occurring annually. Future loss of life is a clear possibility if not resolved. Setnet fishermen universally work out of less seaworthy vessels and are at greater risk of casualty when gear conflicts occur.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. It addresses safety and pursuit of a more orderly fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If adopted drift and set gillnet fishermen will mutually benefit from improved safety. Setnet fishermen universally work out of less seaworthy vessels and are presently at greater risk of casualty related to gear conflict. In this sense, improved safety would be of greater benefit to the setnet group than to the drift group.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The drift/setnet allocation will stand unchanged at 90/10. Setnetters will still be guided by ADF&G to catch 10% of the harvest and drifters will be guided to harvest 90% of the commercial harvest.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Most drift fishermen already respect a greater separation of gear types than are laid out by the presently mandated minimums. Most of these

fisherman would be entirely unaffected by the proposed change to the regulations. Gentlemanly resolve has worked for safe fishing practices between gear types for most fishermen. Some fishermen however hold onto conflicting standards of safety and will routinely compromise the safety of another man for personal gain. These fishermen should be guided toward safer fishing practices by regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Ross Marley

(HQ-F12-029)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Allow only historical set gillnet sites on the outside beaches of Ugashik District as follows:

In the Ugashik District between June 1 and July 17th no set gillnet may be deployed on the outer beaches (seaward of Smoky Point 57° 36'39.30" N and 157° 41' 33.19" W & South Spit 57° 33' 53.32" N and 157° 41' 09.58" W) without an established historical setnet site with required ADF&G markings and if necessary BLM lease documentation. No setnet deployed using anchors can be more than 1000 feet from the mean high water mark.

ISSUE: Adopt regulations that require holders of setnet limited entry permits to operate only on their designated and clearly marked Bureau of Land Management (BLM) registered sites. In recent years, holders of setnet limited entry permits deploy 2 each 25 fathoms of gear on their registered sites then travel outside the river mouth and set another 2 each 25 fathoms of gear on the open beach. These "rogue" sites have no markings, are not traditional setnet fishing sites and in many cases are off shore greater than the 1000 feet high tide mark. It has become increasingly hazardous to drift in our traditional drift areas outside the river mouth especially in foggy weather. A drifter does not know when a setnet deployed by anchors will just pop up out of nowhere in-front of your drift set. These "rogue" sets have become very dangerous navigational hazards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Gear conflicts will become increasingly confrontational. A drifter in the Ugashik District does not know when he/she will encounter deployed "rogue" setnets. Setnet allocation plan limits will continue to be exceeded.

This proposal might be an enforcement issue but the Board of Fisheries needs to be aware that these very basic regulations are not being enforced in the Ugashik District.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Ugashik District drift fleet. State of Alaska Fish & Wildlife Enforcement Division.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few Ugashik "rogue" setnetters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Kingsley, JP Ford, Bristol Bay Drifters Association (HQ-F12-121)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 06.334. Identification of gear. Require name of permit holder on stationary gear as follows:

Insert sentence following the number specification sentence as follows: “The name of the fisherman shall be displayed in letters at least six inches in height with lines at least one inch wide and a color contrasting with the background.”

ISSUE: Currently drift boats and set gillnet skiffs are required to have their ADF&G numbers displayed with 12” letters, drift vessels are required to have the vessel name in 6” letters. Normally a vessel can be contacted by VHF by using the vessel name. The specifications require that the name of the fisherman operating a set gillnet or fish wheel display the name of the fisherman operating it but there is no requirement for the size of the display of the fisherman’s name. They legally could be 1” high and marking pen thin. In an emergency, or other concern, the fisherman’s name allows others to contact the fisherman by phone, VHF, or other means, and to so directly, especially when resources to track by CFEC number are closed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Regulations between gear groups will remain inconsistent. For enforcement and safety issues, identification will remain difficult as the name of the fisherman for direct contact and help could be unreadable even at high tide from a skiff or boat. Could continue to be more difficult than necessary to report, or check with permit holder, re possible resource concerns.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Can if someone notices quality issues as better able to report to permit holder, or if absolutely necessary to ADF&G. Can affect quality of someone’s life if able to mobilize help in safety situation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All legitimate set gillnetters and driftnetters will benefit from consistent and practical regulations that enhance identification and communications. This makes set gillnet name requirement consistent and same as boat name requirement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Resource suffer if not helpful readable identification when needed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered 24” letters in locations where distance 1000 feet or more. Considered adding telephone number to marking sign.

PROPOSED BY: Bristol Bay Driftnetters Association (HQ-F12-190)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 06.334. Identification of gear. Change marking requirement from six inches to twelve inches in height as follows:

Insert “twelve inches” where it now says “six inches.”

ISSUE: Currently drift boats and set gillnet skiffs are required to have their ADF&G numbers displayed with 12” letters, but shore side setnet markings are only required to be 6 inches. With 20/20 or greater vision, the maximum readable distance for 6” letters is only 200’.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Regulations between gear groups will remain inconsistent. For enforcement and safety issues identification will remain difficult as the distance from water viewing can be up to 1200’ from the setnet marking sign, whereas boats and skiffs can be easily approached if necessary for identification purposes. Also, better able to report resource concerns to site permit holder if can identify in some fashion.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Can if someone notices quality issues as better able to report to permit holder, or if absolutely necessary to ADF&G.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All legitimate set gillnetters and driftnetters will benefit from consistent and practical regulations that enhance identification and communications.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Resource suffer if not helpful readable identification when needed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered 24” letters in locations where distance 1000 feet or more.

PROPOSED BY: Bristol Bay Driftnetters Association (HQ-F12-191)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 06.334(a)(2). Identification of gear. Remove the drift gillnet marking requirement that a cork must be marked every 10 fathoms and mark only at each end of the drift gillnet with vessel ADF&G number as follows:

At least one cork (at each end) of every drift gillnet that is plainly and legibly marked with the permanent vessel license (ADFG) number of the vessel operating the gear.

ISSUE: Requirement to (2) mark at least one cork every 10 fathoms with the vessel license number. Should read - mark one cork at each end of every drift gillnet.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Time wasted by harvesters and enforcement.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Enforcement: Free up enforcement to do the job they are called out there for - chase down violators. Harvesters: Free up harvesters to do their job - harvest fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The makers of "Magic Marker".

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None, eliminate this goofy law. The markings fade and rub off. It would be much easier to maintain one cork (Plainly and Legibly) at the end of each net. This problem also exists in the herring gillnet fishery. A net that was "abandoned" or lost could still be identified.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Farren (HQ-F12-049)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 06.330. Gear. Allow seine nets in Bristol Bay for permit holders who hold two Bristol Bay drift gillnet permits as follows:

75 fathom Seine net allowed. Two drift permits required to operate a seine net. Separate allocation for drift, setnet, seine. (Seine allocation based on number of participants involved). Separate openings for Drift / Seine.

ISSUE: Gillnetting Salmon in Bristol Bay.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Quality issue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, Very much so. Live fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If a fisherman decides to stay with drifting then he will have to share the overall harvest with the seiners as well as the setnetters - but he will have less boats (competition) on the water when he fishes. The price for Bristol Bay salmon would be higher so all would benefit, directly or indirectly.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Seine fishermen. Major learning curve trying to seine shallow, with current.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fish Traps. Bad idea.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Farren (HQ-F12-050)

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

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 06.3XX. Bristol Bay commercial coho salmon troll fishery. Create a new troll fishery for coho salmon outside commercial fishing districts of Bristol Bay as follows:

Open a new fishery and/or experimental fishery to allow the Bristol Bay residents to troll for coho in the fall.

ISSUE: Troll fishing outside the commercial drift gillnet fishing districts of Bristol Bay for Coho for commercial sales and direct marketing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Quality of coho will continue to be a problem and the specialty markets will be lost if processors leave before the runs quit returning in the fall.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Fresh troll caught coho right from the ocean and handling will make a superior product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All those that have direct marketing and or want to fish later when the processors close.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Sports fisherman, because they get all the fish after the processors leave and / or shut down.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keeping it up to the processors to buy from the existing gillnet fishery.

PROPOSED BY: Wiliam Sanchez (HQ-F12-196)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 06.350(e). Closed waters. Amend closed waters in Togiak District from June 1 to June 30 for king salmon conservation as follows:

The north markers for the Togiak section at the mouth of the river shall be closed from June 1st till June 30th as listed (gps) West marker to be 59 degrees 03'05.57" N; 160 degrees 23'42.19W; East marker to be 59 degrees 03'12.36" N 160 degrees 20'07.55" W.

ISSUE: King salmon returns to the Togiak river system. The Traditional Council of Togiak would like to proposal a district boundary closer of time and area for conservation of Chinook salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chinook salmon will continue to decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Extend the conservation of Chinook to commercial users and help insure better returns.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource will rebound and all users of the resource will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Channel fishermen that use the channel in the beginning of the salmon fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Togiak Traditional Council (HQ-F12-187)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 27 – 5 AAC 06.350. Closed Waters. Change regulatory boundary descriptions for closed waters at the mouth of the Igushik River as follows:

(a) The following locations in the Nushagak District are closed to the taking of salmon:

(5) those waters of the Igushik River upstream of a line from **58° 43.82' N. lat., 158° 52.77' W. long.** [58° 43.60' N. LAT., 158° 52.27' W. LONG.] to 58° 43.60' N. lat., 158° 54.06' W. long.

ISSUE: When the department converted boundary lines from markers and loran coordinates to latitude and longitude coordinates, the boundary at the mouth of Igushik River was inadvertently changed by a small amount. This change has placed a previously existing set gillnet site in closed waters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is done, an existing set gillnet site will remain in closed waters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? No one. This proposal would restore the district boundary line to the historical status quo.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F12-213)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 28 – 5 AAC 06.350. Closed Waters. Change regulatory boundary descriptions for closed waters at the mouth of the Togiak River as follows:

(e) The following locations in the Togiak District are closed to the taking of salmon:

(1) those waters of the Togiak River upstream of a line from 59° 03.33' N. lat., 160° 20.08' W. long. to **59° 03.58' N. lat., 160° 22.60' W. long** [59° 03.66' N. LAT., 160° 22.36' W. LONG].

ISSUE: When the department converted boundary lines from markers and loran coordinates to latitude and longitude coordinates, the boundary at the mouth of Togiak River was inadvertently changed by a small amount. This change has increased the district such that there is room for an additional set gillnet site upstream of the historical boundary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is done, there will be the potential for a new set gillnet site further upstream from the historical boundary line. The addition of a new site has already caused some turmoil and resulted in numerous phone calls to the departments of Fish and Game and Public Safety.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? No one. This proposal would restore the district boundary line to the historical status quo.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who have fished the new site will no longer be able to fish it.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: Leave the line as it currently is.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F12-214)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 06.350(e)(1). Closed Waters. Create a buffer zone closed to commercial drift gillnet fishing at the mouth of the Togiak River as follows:

5 AAC 06.350 (e)(1) Closed Waters. If adopted, this proposal would provide for a buffer zone closed to drift gillnet commercial fishing at the mouth of the Togiak River. The new boundary would close commercial fishing with drift gillnets upstream of a line from markers set at approximately 161° 20.00 west longitude 59° 03.00' north latitude to 161° 30.00' west longitude to 59° 01.00' north latitude.

ISSUE: Currently, commercial fishing with drift gillnets is allowed well into the mouth of the Togiak River. Because this is a choke point and because drift gillnets are mobile, commercial fisherman can target Chinook salmon in this narrow shallow area. Set gillnets are not as much of an issue because they don't reach the channel as easily as the more mobile drift gillnets do. The Chinook salmon escapement into the Togiak River has been poor for several years. Chinook salmon are incidentally harvested in the commercial sockeye salmon fishery in Togiak Bay. Historically the price for Chinook salmon has been low and there is little incentive to try and target these fish. Recently a new processor has started operating in Togiak Bay and they pay a much higher price for Chinook salmon. With a higher value there is more incentive to try and harvest Chinook salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? As the value of Chinook salmon increases more people will drift fish in the narrowest part of the bay. This could damage the stock.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the farther away from fresh water the fish harvest the better quality they tend to be.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence, sport and commercial users will benefit if the stock is healthy and does not become a stock of concern.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some fishermen that now drift fish in this area will have to fish in a different area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Josh Berberich (HQ-F12-015)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 06.375. Landing requirements. Allow set gillnet vessels to transport salmon through the Snake River Section provided they have no gear on board the vessel as follows:

5 AAC 06.375

(a) All salmon must be landed in the district in which they were taken. A vessel used to take salmon may not have salmon on board when more than one mile outside the district from which the salmon were taken or when the vessel is more than one-half mile inside the boundary of the Snake River Section of the Nushagak District. Except setnet vessels may transport salmon through the Snake River Section, provided they have no nets onboard.

ISSUE: During the previous Board cycle, passage of a proposal limiting navigation of fishing vessels through the Snake River section of the Nushagak District has unnecessarily compromised navigability and safety for small-boat setnet fishermen. This regulation effectively eliminates a setnet fisherman's ability to safely travel on the Westside of the Nusghagak District with fish onboard.

The original intent of limiting navigation through the Snake River Section is well founded – to eliminate illegal fishing in the Snake River Section. This proposal seeks to uphold the intent and the enforceability of the regulation while providing an exception for setnetters who need to transport fish safely out of the Igushik Subdistrict.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? For safety reasons, skiff fishermen predominantly travel close to shoreline. If an exception is not made for setnet fishermen it will unnecessarily be more dangerous to transport fish out of the Igushik District. Transportation of fish out of the Igushik District is necessary for some fishermen for two reasons: 1) direct marketing requires fish be transported to Dillingham for shipment; and 2) during times of abundance, tenders get “plugged.” Fishers who seek to avoid wanton waste often have to travel to other subdistricts to sell their catch to tenders with available capacity. If an exception is not made that recognizes the unique navigational needs of skiff fishermen, some setnetters who direct market their fish will continue to endure compromised navigability and thereby incur greater safety risks.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, restored navigability makes it easier to transport fish to direct markets.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All setnet fishermen who will no longer be subject to decreased navigability.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This proposal potentially makes it more difficult to enforce illegal fishing in the Snake River Section. Therefore, a proper balance must be achieved between navigability and enforceability. Thus, the proposed setnet regulatory exception places a restriction that setnet vessels have no gear onboard while traveling through the Snake River Section with fish on board.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Removing the Snake River navigation restrictions. Rejected because effective enforcement of illegal fishing in the Snake River Section is clearly warranted.

PROPOSED BY: Dylan Braund & Stephen Olson

(HQ-F12-144)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 06.343. Vessel identification; 5 AAC 39.119. Vessel identification.
Allow vessels with permanent markings to be exempt from dual marking requirements when vessel is used in more than one salmon fishery as follows:

I propose the adoption of a new sub-paragraph to paragraph (b) of this section to read:

(5) Vessels bearing a permanent ADF&G vessel license plate number and license plate are exempt from this provision.

ISSUE: CONFLICTING IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN DUAL-USE VESSELS.

With the exception of setnet skiffs, the vessel identification provisions (5AAC 39.119 p. 51) for Bristol Bay fishing vessels require an ADF&G registration license number and license plate.

Those vessels engaged in setnet operations, however, are instead required to have the operator's S/N number painted on the side.

Current regulatory reading is unclear which of these provisions takes precedence in the case of vessels used for both.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In the past few years, I have encountered troopers who had trouble reconciling this section of the regulations with 39.119. On occasions they've even argued with each other as to which provision should take precedence.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. This proposal is purely for regulatory clarification.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Enforcement personnel, vessel owners and fishermen should all benefit from this proposal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one should suffer from this clarification, with the possible exception of judges in Naknek who love levying hefty fines for vague provisions of statute.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? For those who may not be familiar with the genesis of this regulation and, therefore, the conflict it creates:

During the lean years awhile back, some drift vessels spotted unmarked skiffs fishing in places they had never seen them before. They rightly suspected some setnet fishermen were sneaking out, making a few "stealth" sets and fleeing before anyone was able to discover who they were. This provision was intended to put an end to "anonymous" hit-and-run sets by giving each setnet skiff an easy-to-discover identity. This works fine for smaller skiffs and vessels employed in only one fishery, but some larger ones are often used in multiple endeavors.

To fully comply with current regulations and avoid legal complexity, I'm now forced to figure-out how to arrange the normal State AK numbers, the ADF&G license number and license plate, the vessel name AND find room for an additional eight digits of 12" height. Since skiffs routinely experience wear and tear on the hull unlike that of the drift fleet, this almost means re-writing 31 characters each year on each side of the hull.

PROPOSED BY: Chuck Thompson

(HQ-F12-172)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 06.341. Vessel specifications and operations. Increase vessel length up to 42 feet in length based on vessel processing capabilities as follows:

5 AAC 06.341(c) a vessel registered for salmon net fishing in Area T may be as long as 42 feet in overall length if this vessel a licensed catcher processor by State of Alaska, Division of Environmental Health (ADEH) and can provide weekly documentation of product transfer either to a freezer facility or purchase receipts/invoices from a direct buyer. The amount of catch processed and stored for future sales or sold directly to vendors has to be greater or equal to 80% of total volume documented on fish harvest tickets on a weekly basis. Vessel logs will have to updated on a daily basis and be available for inspection by ADEH and State of Alaska, Fish & Wildlife Enforcement personnel.

ISSUE: Bristol Bay 32 limit on drift vessels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Drift fishermen that want to participate in the processing at sea of their salmon catch. Attempting to accommodate the necessary processing equipment to process salmon at sea on a 32 foot vessel is basically impossible.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, at sea processing will open up salmon fisheries and possibly other fisheries in areas that do not have buyers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A few local Bristol Bay fishermen

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Dan Kingsley & JP Ford (HQ-F12-113)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 06.341(a). Vessel specifications and operations. Increase vessel length to 36 feet if vessel chills catch and 39 feet if the vessel processes and freezes catch as follows:

Abolish the 32 foot limit or at minimum increase the existing limit. If there must be a limit then it should be 36 feet for vessels that chill at the point of harvest and up to 39 feet if the fishing vessel can process and freeze on board including all permits needed to process and freeze on board. Any vessel longer than 32 feet must at minimum chill its fish at the point of harvest.

ISSUE: No vessel registered for salmon net fishing may be more than 32 feet in overall length. An anchor roller may not extend more than eight inches beyond the 32 foot overall length, and any portion that extends beyond the 32 foot overall length may not be more than eight inches in width or height.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bristol Bay salmon will not achieve its highest quality potential.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, currently the 32 foot limit restricts deck space and hull space, which reduce quality.

We are a long way from getting the most value out of the Bristol Bay resource. Although huge strides have been made in the chilling product in Bristol Bay, a huge percentage of the catch is still not chilled at the point of harvest. More chilling capacity will produce more #1, which increase the overall value of the catch. Furthermore, studies by Mark Buckley, have shown that as brailer weights increase quality goes down to that end, if you can spread the fish out in more fish holds, and deliver smaller brailers, your quality goes up.

In the current system any processor will tell you during the peak quality goes down. A lot of that can be attributed to poor handling at the point of harvest. Part of the problem is overloaded brailers and deck loading of the catch coupled with inadequate chilling capabilities of the 32 foot boat.

If, you are allowed to freeze on board, you would be able to produce the highest quality fish possible, and get the most economic value out of our resource. A frozen at sea Bristol Bay sockeye would do wonders for the Bristol Bay Brand. 32 feet is not enough space for equipment and hull capacity to reach economies of scale for a freezer operation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All participants would benefit. Higher quality product gives Bristol Bay a good reputation in the market place. Increasing the vessel length is not about catching more fish, i.e. getting a bigger piece of the pie. It's about making the most of what you catch, i.e. growing the pie (increasing the overall value of our catch) to make it more profitable for everyone.

Keeping the existing 32 foot limit just ensures a limit on the quality that we can achieve on our boats. Imagine if we limited factory longliners or trawlers to 60 feet. The quality would go way down along with the revenues. My guess, is they would not freeze on board at 60 feet. It would be the end to FAS surimi, FAS fillet block, or even the high value frozen at sea pollock roe. What if we limited our existing processors plants to be only 32 wide. Yes, they would figure out a way to deal with it but the quality of the product would suffer and the cost of doing business would go up exponentially. Same for the us in the bay 32 foot limit hurts quality and increases our expenses, i.e. fuel costs go up, equipment costs go up or they are not inefficient because we need them to fit on a 32 foot boat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Dominic Lee

(HQ-F12-096)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 06.341. Vessel specifications and operations. Increase vessel length up to 36 feet as follows:

It would allow for 36' overall vessel length for Bristol Bay Driftnet Salmon Fishery.

ISSUE: Current vessel length restriction at 32' does not allow sufficient deck space for improved quality fish handling methods such as bleeding, salmon slides, delivery chutes, etc. These methods and improvements are essential to maximize overall harvest revenue.

Adding RSW equipment (or slush ice) to existing 32' vessels and flooding fish holds, adds significantly to total vessel weight and reduces overall vessel freeboard and stability during peak operations or in heavy weather. This creates increased hazard of grounding in shallow water or swamping in rough seas. Existing 32' vessels that are modernized to increase revenue (with no increase in displacement) are potentially not as safe as the originally constructed vessel.

The existing 32' vessel length limitation combined with the current need for increased deck space and flotation creates an incentive to construct increasingly wider new vessels at very high cost and reduced efficiency. There is currently no limit on width so there are always larger vessels entering the fishery.

As a result, the vessel length limitation does not prevent larger vessels from entering the fishery. It does create lost revenue and increased risk of loss.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The incentive to add larger, wider and inefficient boats (with massive horsepower) to the fishery will continue.

Existing boats will be improved and made heavier, compromising their original stability and trim.

Overall value will diminish due to the loss of the optimum opportunity, which is to improve and lengthen an existing 32' vessel.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal directly enhances not only the increased value of the fish and overall harvest, but optimizes the utility and value of the existing 32' fleet. A participant looking for a competitive boat could more easily invest in a 32' vessel and improve/lengthen the vessel for a significantly lower overall cost.

The longer deck and increased carrying capacity would be utilized to perform fish handling and chilling operations in order to benefit from the increased value of higher quality products, while maintaining the stability and trim by way of increased length.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those boat owners who choose to lengthen and improve their vessels will benefit and even existing unimproved boats will continue to hold value as they are all potential 36 footers. Those who cannot afford to construct new boats would have a more

viable investment by improving their current vessel. Newly constructed vessels would not have to be built disproportionate any longer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one should suffer if this proposal is adopted.

Anyone could lengthen their current vessel if they wanted more deck space or hull displacement.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered building a wider boat, but the increasing costs of new construction is more than I can afford.

PROPOSED BY: Michael Friccero (HQ-F12-082)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 06.341(a). Vessel specifications and operations. Increase vessel length over 32 feet as follows:

In the current regulation, 32' is used, with exceptions. Instead of dictating a specific length, I would like the BOF to have the latitude to set the length - if any, after testimony & discussion is heard. p.s. at the last BOF meeting for Bristol Bay, 38' was talked about quite a bit.

ISSUE: The inequality of being the only major drift gillnet fishery in the State of Alaska with a vessel length limit, and then trying to produce a best quality product that will compete against fish from other Alaskan fisheries, or fish farms, with an outmoded, obsolete vessel/tool.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Bristol Bay salmon will continue to be considered a lower quality product in the world market. In addition, those fishermen who participate in other Alaskan fisheries will be at a disadvantage when competing against other non-length limited vessels. Not to mention any possible safety advantages.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There is no doubt in my mind that there isn't anything, quality wise, that a 38' vessel can't do better than a 32' vessel. Bigger, more efficiently operated, RSW systems come to mind that dovetails well with a fast-paced volume fishery like Bristol Bay. With more dollars being paid for RSW fish, it could now be very feasible to take a Rawson hull, stretch it 6' and have a pretty viable platform for producing higher quality/higher value, (\$\$\$), fish. To put it simply, larger boats would give Bristol Bay fishermen options that they don't currently have. In the commercial fishing business it is always a good thing to keep your options open.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those fishermen willing to invest and work hard at producing a product that will literally sell itself.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those fishermen who shun technology, or cannot afford it, even though it may be the only way for Alaskan fishermen to compete with very cheap foreign labor/fish farms.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Continue to bury our heads in the sand, and pretend like our fish don't have to compete in the world market! This is not a viable option?

PROPOSED BY: John Webb (HQ-F12-036)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Allow one permit holder who owns two drift gillnet permits 200 fathoms of drift gillnet as follows:

This proposal would allow the owner of two Bristol Bay drift gillnet permits to fish and operate 200 fathoms of drift gillnet gear from a single vessel.

ISSUE: Currently, the full benefit of permit stacking (“D” Permits) is not being realized.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will fall short of the potential improvement in quality and reduction of vessels. (Optimum Number Study)

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bristol Bay drift permit holders and crews will benefit because there will be fewer vessels and less gear per permit giving more opportunity for the remaining vessels and fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kurt Johnson (HQ-F12-139)

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

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Allow one permit holder who owns two drift gillnet permits 200 fathoms of drift gillnet as follows:

This proposal will allow one person to own and operate two Bristol Bay drift gillnet permits issued under the CFEC in accordance with the regulation 5 AAC 06.33 that allows two driftnet permit holders to operate an additional 50 fathoms of gear when used on one vessel.

ISSUE: Bristol Bay driftnet fishers, on average, have experienced a chronic decrease in economic value of their individual businesses, adjusted for inflation, over time. There is overharvesting capacity in Bristol Bay, see CFEC optimum number report 04-3N, October, 2004. During the 2011 season 1,435 vessels operated in Bristol Bay, whereas the report recommends that the optimum number of vessels fishing is between 800 and 1200.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishers operating in Bristol Bay will continue to struggle economically under this burden of overharvest capacity. The local region is impacted the most without alternative economic opportunity to help support the high costs of a fishing business in Bristol Bay. More local people will opt not to invest in the fishing business and more permits will leave the area. Excessive fishing competition will continue to drive costs up further impairing the sustainability of the fleet and rendering the fishery less efficient.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will significantly contribute to improved quality of salmon harvested from the waters of Bristol Bay. By achieving the CFEC optimum number range the intense competition, “race for the fish”, will be effectively diminished. Fisher’s attention and work will be redirected to help themselves improve profits by focusing on increasing the quality of fish harvested that will then be available for higher value markets.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The fishers that comprise the driftnet fleet will benefit in a number of ways.

This proposal, if enacted, will accomplish important economic, fishery and management improvements.

- First, the number of vessels in operation will more likely be reduced to the recommended number cited in the CFEC Optimum Number Study of 800-1200 permits. This important analysis by the CFEC revealed a critical economic balance point for the well-being and sustainability for the commercial drift fleet in Bristol Bay. Generally speaking, the balance sheet for fishing operations appears sustainable when a high price for salmon occurs or an excellent run of fish happens. During many off-years the balance sheet is not sustainable and fishers cannot make their payments or make a livable income. This proposed regulation will provide the help needed to improve the economic model for fishers in Bristol Bay for all seasons including the off-years.

- Second, the improved economic profile and balance sheet for an individual operating a driftnet operation in Bristol Bay will more likely perform in accordance with lending institutions' qualifications. The watershed residents, along with others from the state of Alaska, will more likely have the confidence to invest in the fishery, if the ability to repay loan obligations is improved and fits a reasonable and established economic loan model. The number of permits held by local and Alaska State residents would likely increase with the combination of a favorable loan program and an improved balance sheet for fishing operations. The slice of the pie, so to speak, will be made slightly larger for the operating fleet and provide a turning point for the community and the Bristol Bay fisheries for the future as the boat numbers continue to decrease over time.
- Third, the decrease in total number of vessels fishing will have additional benefits including reduced congestion, less intense competition and improved safety on the water. A more orderly fishery will result management wise, and reduced cost of enforcement is likely to occur.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This proposal, if adopted, will have a slight consolidating affect for the fleet. ADF&G reports that 1,435 vessels participated in the Bristol Bay salmon fishery during the 2011 season. If enacted, the number of boats fishing could further decrease to 1,100 as recommended by the CFEC. The consolidation is self-limiting, however, as the boat number cannot go below the optimum number.

The effects of consolidation ostensibly disadvantage those without the financing to acquire the assets for consolidation. In this case, however, those fishers that choose not to invest in a second permit gain the advantages of reduced gear and competition on the water, but do not bear the costs to achieve it. If there are disadvantages, they are outweighed by the individual economic gains that would be realized by individual fishers to improve and promote their businesses.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? During joint legislative salmon task force meetings and hearings other potential solutions were discussed. They included: quota systems, buy backs and others.

All of which were ultimately rejected for they could not demonstrate that all the intended goals, not the least of which to retain permits in the watershed, could be achieved.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Independent Fishermen's Marketing Association (HQ-F12-088)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Allow an individual to have two drift gillnet permits registered in one name as follows:

A fisherman may have two limited entry drift permits registered in one name.

ISSUE: By not allowing two limited entry drift permits to be held in one name, the original intent of the proposal--to reduce the fleet size in Bristol Bay--is only being half met. It should be remembered the setnetters are allowed to have two permits in one name.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen willing to buy a second permit, but afraid of jeopardizing it by putting it into a crewman's name, will not buy the permit and thereby will not be a positive force in reducing the boat numbers on the water as the original proposal--and the CFEC--had recommended.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes! Less boats on the water (less nets in the water) fishing for the finite amount of fish available will result in less stress on the fish and crews because of more time to handle them in a manner more conducive to quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The world market will receive improved quality fish from Bristol Bay. Those remaining in the fishery will see their incomes improve by catching more fish and selling them (better quality) at a higher price.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None I can think of.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A federal or state buy-back program as has occurred in a number of other fisheries around Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Chris White (HQ-F12-035)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Allow dual drift gillnet permit holders 200 fathoms in other districts when Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) is open as follows:

Rescind the regulation passed at the 2009 Bristol Bay Board of Fish that only allows 150 fathoms of net to be fished in all the districts of Bristol Bay if any one of the special harvest areas reduces the amount of gear you can fish to less than 150 fathoms.

ISSUE: When the fishery is moved into any of the Special Harvest Areas that allow less than 150 fathoms, all the districts of Bristol Bay are not allowed to fish “D” Permits. (more than 150 fathoms).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The value of permits will go down. The incentive to further consolidate permits / boats will be diluted. Further, with advance notice of a potential in-river fishery, secondary permit holders (watershed or otherwise) will not be able to collaborate with vessel owners; preventing them from participation in the fishery.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All permit holders, who have taken the initiative to invest in additional permits or collaborate with existing permit holders to reduce overheads in the fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who own a permit, yet who do not own or can afford a vessel; and must collaborate with an existing vessel owner. Historically, there have been times where fishery managers have stated – pre-season – that there is a strong possibility for an in-river fishery. With this type of advance notice, there is an equally strong likelihood of many permit holders not having access to the fishery given that a dual permit opportunity will not exist.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kurt Johnson (HQ-F12-140)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Allow dual drift gillnet permit holders 200 fathoms in other districts when Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) is open as follows:

Repeal Section (g) of 5AAC06.333.

ISSUE: Under this regulation the use of an extra 50 fathoms would be banned in all Bristol Bay Districts by "D" vessels when fishing is allowed in the Naknek Special Harvest Area. In the last 2-3 years we have had an influx of younger fishermen entering the fishery as permit holders that don't own a vessel. They usually participate in the fishery on a "D" vessel and are compensated more than typical crew members without permits. This regulation was passed with little to no input, or representation from this growing user group. Many permit holders are not even aware that this regulation exists! Since this regulation was adopted, fishing in the Naknek Special Harvest Area has not occurred. When this does happen it could be a real surprise for some, and create some financial hardship/disagreements for others.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There could be some very hard feelings/financial hardships for some crew/permit holders when fishing is conducted in the Naknek Special Harvest Area. Inability to pay back loans, etc.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It does not.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The next generation of Bristol Bay fishermen that can afford to buy a Drift permit (prices up), but can't afford to purchase a very expensive boat at the same time. The, "D", vessel regulation has given start-up fishermen a viable way to get involved in the fishery with a stake greater than being a crew member, when raising the capital to buy a permit and a vessel is not possible.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It was perceived that at the time this regulation passed, the Nushagak River System, had a very high percentage of, "D", vessels, making it harder for single permitted Nushagak vessels to compete. That has not been the case in the last few years. If this proposal is passed it would have little lasting impact on any given group of fishermen in any given river system.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: John Webb

(HQ-F12-033)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Disallow permit stacking in Bristol Bay as follows:

No Bristol Bay drift boat shall be operated with more than one permit on board and one compliment of gear.

ISSUE: Permit stacking in the Bristol Bay salmon drift fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Watershed ownership of fishing permits will continue to decline, to the detriment of the local economy. If local people lose fishing rights, their interest in preserving the fishery will decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Longer nets damage fish quality by increasing the time fish stay in the nets, increasing damage by towing, round-hauling and lengthening the time it takes to bleed fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, because fish quality be improved, and also watershed resident who cannot afford to own two permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some wealthy fishermen may object.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Nels Johnson (HQ-F12-162)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Disallow additional gear for vessels with two drift gillnet permits as follows:

This proposal will not allow one person to operate two Bristol Bay drift gillnet permits issued under the CFEC in accordance with the regulation 5 AAC 06.33 that allows two driftnet permit holders to operate an additional 50 fathoms of gear when used on one vessel.

Repeal the regulation that allows dual permit stacking.

ISSUE: Bristol Bay driftnetters are made up of an aging population of boat and permit owners. Bristol Bay is dominated by highly efficient expensive boats and industry rewards and bonuses are paid on quantity verses quality. Bristol Bay has experienced a chronic decrease in investment capital for owning operating two permits. There is no investment capacity in Bristol Bay to capitalize on fishing two permits as it is set up now. During the 2011 season 1,435 vessels operated in Bristol Bay, whereas the majority of vessels using the permit stacking are not from the state and CFEC data of local owned permits that reside in Bristol Bay? It is minimal compared to non-local and non-residents of Alaska. This dual permit stacking has made an average fisherman into highliners and highliners into super fisherman. The study of the average catch of non-resident is double that of locals and one contributing factor is the permit stacking. In other words the dual permit stacking has contributed to /and in this capital investment problem.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishers operating in Bristol Bay will continue to struggle economically under this burden of investment capacity. The local region is impacted the most without alternative economic opportunities to help support the high costs of a fishing business in Bristol Bay. More and more the out migration of Dual permits is and can only hurt the fishery. More local people will opt not to invest in the fishing business and more permits will leave the area. Excessive fishing competition will continue to drive costs up further impairing the sustainability of the region and state. The dual permit fishery will only benefit more non residents that can access investment capital for these super operations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will significantly contribute to improved quality of salmon harvested from the waters of Bristol Bay. By achieving the markets and industry will reward quality and not quantity. Fisher's attention and work will be redirected to help themselves improve profits by focusing on increasing the quality of fish harvested that will then be available for higher value markets. The affects will not disadvantage those without the financing to acquire upgrades and new boats that focus on quality. If there are disadvantages it will be those that are rewarded on quantity not quality. They are outweighed by the individual economic gains that would be realized by individual fishers to improve and promote their businesses.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This proposal will significantly contribute to improved quality of salmon harvested from the waters of Bristol Bay. By achieving the CEFC permit listed

as 150 fathoms of gear to be operated as in statue all created equal. Intense competition, “race for the fish”, will be effectively diminished.as fisherman focus on quality and not quantity Fisher’s attention and work will be redirected to help themselves improve profits by focusing on increasing the quality of fish harvested that will then be available for higher value markets and be rewarded for it. The improved economic profile and balance sheet for an individual operating a driftnet operation in Bristol Bay will more likely be improved because super fisherman numbers will be reduced. The watershed residents, along with others from the State of Alaska, will more likely have the confidence to invest in the fishery, if the ability to repay loan obligations is improved and fits a reasonable and established economic loan model. The number of permits held by local and Alaska State residents would likely increase with the combination of a favorable loan programs and an improved balance sheet for fishing operations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The number of local, non-local and non-residents that invested in the second and sometimes third permit when the permit prices were low. Catching 25% less fish without the dual permit will even the playing field to more favorable quality verses quantity and reverse the catch residents verses nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Sunset the dual permit in 2015 and give the dual permit owners a chance to capitalize their investment and put them up for sale for residents to buy back in it to the fishery. Ultimately rejected this idea for it will not put more permits in the hands of watershed and Alaskan residents and in three years the investment capital of 25% more for this group of super fisherman will only give them that much more capital to invest as they wish.

PROPOSED BY: Frank Woods (HQ-F12-161)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Disallow additional drift gillnet gear for dual permit vessels in the Togiak District as follows:

5 AAC 06.333 (e)(4) Togiak District added to the non use area and time for conservation concerns.

ISSUE: The dual permits being allowed in the Togiak District. Disallowing the dual permits will help the race for fish and allow fishermen to focus on quality vs. quantity. The already small district runs and small fleet doesn't need added pressure from dual permits to affect its already fragile returns of salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The race for fish will continue to be the focus and not be quality.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality is always on the table for processors and fisherman the race for fish will be less of a focus for both.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Locals knowing that the small runs and the protection of these small runs will be continued.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fisherman that have already registered and hit the peak in other districts that own and operate dual permits. One and/or two fisherman that might register to fish the Togiak District all year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status Quo. There is no added protections for this already small run.

PROPOSED BY: Togiak Traditional Council (HQ-F12-185)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Repeal sunset clause for a dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder as follows:

Remove the last sentence of 5 AAC 06.331(u) [THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBSECTION DO NOT APPLY AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2012.]

The remainder of the subsection would remain intact.

(u) A CFEC permit holder who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet permits may not operate more than four set gillnets, and the aggregate length of set gillnets operated by the CFEC permit holder may not exceed 100 fathoms. A single set gillnet may not exceed 50 fathoms in length. The buoys must be marked as specified in 5 AAC 06.334 and 5 AAC 39.280 with both of the CFEC permit holder's five digit permit numbers followed by the letter "D". In addition at least one cork every 10 fathoms along the cork line must be plainly and legibly marked with both CFEC permit numbers. All identifiers must be displayed in a manner that is plainly visible, unobscured, and in a color that contrasts with the background.

ISSUE: 5 AAC 06.331(u) allows dual permit holders to operate up to four nets. This provision has a "sunset clause" of December 31, 2012. Remove the "sunset clause", thus permanently codifying the provision.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The 95 S04T operators that have invested economic and hardware resources to become dual permit holders and consolidate the fishing fleet shall suffer severe economic hardship due to provisions of 16.43.140 forcing sale of permits because this exception expired. The ensuing "Fire Sale" of permits will drive down permit value and disrupt the consolidation of the fishing fleet as envisioned when 16.43.140 (5) was enacted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; by allowing for an improved orderly harvest ensuring a higher quality product delivered to the cannery, thus they produce a higher quality product commanding improved purchase price, which in turns improves bottom line profits for all aspects of the industry and elevates "Wild Salmon" above "Farmed Salmon" as a truly superior product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The 95 Bristol bay Gill Setnet operators that currently own two permits in the S04T fishery; by consolidation of the fishery, operations will become more streamlined increasing profit margins across the spectrum from fisher person to canneries on down the line to retail markets; opportunities will develop by consolidation to existing operations of current operators who seek to exit the fishery and have no viable family takeover.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I envision no suffrage by any segment of the industry based on adoption of the solution.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow “sunset clause” to take effect. Rejected due to invested monies, hardware and resources. Hundreds of thousands of dollars would be lost. Crew members would have to be terminated as income would be reduced by 25-50%.

PROPOSED BY: Jerome D. McArthur, Jr. & Kristina M. Kurtz (HQ-F12-024)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 06.331(u). Gillnet Specifications and Operations. Repeal sunset clause for a dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder as follows:

Remove the last sentence under 5 AAC 06.331 Gillnet Specifications and Operations. (u) [THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBSECTION DO NOT APPLY AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2012].

ISSUE: Remove the sunset clause for a person to own & operate two setnet permits in Bristol Bay (Permit stacking).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A person will be able to own but not operate two setnet permits in 2013.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Someone who owns two Bristol Bay setnet salmon permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Pete Caruso (HQ-F12-022)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 06.331(u). Gillnet specifications and operations. Repeal sunset clause for a dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder as follows:

5 AAC 06.331(u) A CFEC permit holder who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet permits may not operate more than four set gillnets, and the aggregate length of set gillnets operated by the CFEC permit holder may not exceed 100 fathoms. A single set gillnet may not exceed 50 fathoms in length. The buoys must be marked as specified in 5 AAC 06.334 and 5 AAC 39.280 with both of the CFEC permit holder's five digit permit numbers followed by the letter "D". In addition at least one cork every 10 fathoms along the cork line must be plainly and legibly marked with both CFEC permit numbers. All identifiers must be displayed in a manner that is plainly visible, unobscured, and in a color that contrasts with the background. [THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBSECTION DO NOT APPLY AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2012.]

ISSUE: 5 AAC 06.331(u) sunsets after December 31, 2012. If not amended, this would do away with dual setnet permit operation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unlike other fisheries, a setnet site is often a family operation, with several permits held by family members and fished as a whole. Prior to 5 AAC 06.331, a permit holder could only operate a single permit. This system works fine until a young adult enters a different line of work or until a parent reaches an elderly age and cannot fish anymore. Then you have only two choices: break up the operation and sell the permits outright, or transfer the permits into someone else's name with the idea that they will continue to fish with you. A serious gamble as these permits are now legally out of your control and can be sold, lost in a divorce, seized by the IRS, etc.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnetting families who have more than one permit in their operation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Eric M. Beeman

(HQ-F12-031)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 06.331(u). Gillnet specifications and operations. Repeal sunset clause for a dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder as follows:

(u) A CFEC permit holder who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet permits may not operate more than four set gillnets, and the aggregate length of set gillnets operated by the CFEC permit holder may not exceed 100 fathoms. A single set gillnet may not exceed 50 fathoms in length. The buoys must be marked as specified in 5 AAC 06.334 and 5 AAC 39.280 with both of the CFEC permit holder’s five digit permit numbers followed by the letter “D”. In addition, at least one cork every 10 fathoms along the cork line must be plainly and legibly marked with both CFEC permit numbers. All identifiers must be displayed in a manner that is plainly visible, unobscured, and in a color that contrasts with the background.

ISSUE: Remove the Sun Set on Setnet Permit stacking in Bristol Bay.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of family fishing operations in Bristol Bay.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Family fishing operations in Bristol Bay.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Roland Briggs (HQ-F12-053)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 06.331(u). Gillnet specifications and operations. Repeal sunset clause for a dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder as follows:

The Board should drop the sunset clause and allow the regulation to stand as written. I do not propose any changes in the wording of the regulation itself.

ISSUE: This provision has a “sunset” clause. I request that the Board drop the sunset clause so that the regulation continues as written.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulations will be changed by default to eliminate the dual permit holder provision. The many fishers who need this provision to maintain their family fishing businesses will be forced to find alternative permit holders, thereby increasing the amount of fishers sharing in the same catch, hurting everyone.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? All of the reasons that applied when the Board adopted this regulation still apply and the regulation has been the success that was expected. The regulation has been helpful in reducing the number of fishers who share in the resource, making the work more likely profitable and allowing professional fishers to concentrate on quality practices. I am confident that many more setnet fishers will use this regulation as they become aware of it and the result is that the many family fishing businesses can continue to exist and make a reasonable income and can concentrate a higher quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? I will benefit. My family will benefit. My neighbors who have or plan to get dual permits will benefit. The setnet fishers will benefit. Processors benefit. The Bristol Bay fishing industry benefits. State of Alaska benefits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I do not see any downside for anyone, and no downside for the industry or the State.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I don’t think this issue lends itself to alternatives.

PROPOSED BY: Tony Neal (HQ-F12-061)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Repeal sunset clause for a dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder as follows:

5 AAC 06.331(u) A CFEC permit holder who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet permits may not operate more than four set gillnets, and the aggregate length of set gillnets operated by the CFEC permit holder may not exceed 100 fathoms. A single set gillnet may not exceed 50 fathoms in length. The buoys must be marked as specified in 5 AAC 06.334 and 5 AAC 39.280 with both of the CFEC permit holders five-digit permit numbers followed by the letter "D". In addition, at least one cork every 10 fathoms along the cork line must be plainly and legibly marked with both CFEC permit numbers. All identifiers must be displayed in a manner that is plainly visible, unobscured, and in a color that contrasts with the background. [THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBSECTION DO NOT APPLY AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2012.]

ISSUE: 5 AAC 06.331(u) sunsets after December 31st, 2012. If not amended, this would do away with dual setnet permit operation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unlike other fisheries, a setnet site is often a family operation, with several permits held by family members and fished as a whole. Prior to 5 AAC 06.331(u), a permit holder could only operate a single permit. This system works fine until a young adult enters a different line of work, or until a parent reaches an elderly age and cannot fish anymore. Then the family has only two choices: break up the operation and sell the permits outright, or transfer the permits into someone else's name with the idea that they will continue to fish with you—a serious gamble as these permits are now legally out of your control and can be sold, lost in a divorce, seized by the IRS, etc.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnetting families with more than one permit in their operation, especially families with aging parents, or young adults. This is an issue that affects many. Before deciding if we should submit this as a Ugashik Setnet Association proposal, UGSA polled its members as to their views on dual permit ownership. The response was 83% in favor of repealing the sunset clause, and thereby making 5 AAC 06.331(u) a permanent regulation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? 17% of our response was from members who were against the stacking of setnet permits. One felt that stacking could potentially bring more setnet permits to the Ugashik fishery, which could lessen his share of the allocated setnet catch. Another member was opposed, as he felt that both drift and setnet stacking led to more cheating in the fishery. Another was against setnet stacking on general principle.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Ugashik Setnet Association (HQ-F12-095)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Repeal sunset clause for a dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder as follows:

(u) A CFEC permit holder who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet permits may not operate more than four set gillnets, and the aggregate length of set gillnets operated by the CFEC permit holder may not exceed 100 fathoms. A single set gillnet may not exceed 50 fathoms in length. The buoys must be marked as specified in 5 AAC 06.334 and 5AAC 39.280 with both of the CFEC permit holders five digit permit numbers followed by the letter "D". In addition, at least every 10 fathoms along the cork line must be plainly and legibly marked with both CFEC permit numbers. All identifiers must be displayed in a manner that is plainly visible, un-obscured, and in a color that contrasts with the background.

ISSUE: The Egegik Setnet Association would like the board to remove the last sentence of section (u). This would remove the sunset clause from this proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the sunset clause is not removed the Bristol Bay setnet fishers now fishing two setnet permits would not be able to fish 2 permits after December 2012. The dual permit program is working well in the Egegik District of Bristol Bay. We would like to make the use of dual permits in the setnet fishery a permanent regulation by removing the sunset clause of section (u), setnets would continue to be able to fish dual setnet permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Proposal does not address quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All setnet fishers in Bristol Bay would benefit from the ability to fish dual permits in the setnet fishery of Bristol Bay.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No setnet fishers would suffer if this proposal is adopted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions were considered.

PROPOSED BY: Egegik Setnet Association (HQ-F12-098)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Repeal sunset clause for a dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder as follows:

5 AAC 06.331 Gillnet specifications and operations.

Allow one owner to fish two set gillnet permits by amending the regulation as follows:

(f) Except as provided in (u) of this section, a person may not operate more than two set gillnets, and the aggregate length of set gillnets operated by that person may not exceed 50 fathoms in length. Notwithstanding 5 AAC 39.240(a), a person may assist in operation or transportation of additional set gillnet gear when the CFEC interim-use or entry permit card holder of the additional gear is present in compliance with 5 AAC 39.107.

(u) A CFEC permit holder who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet permits may not operate more than four set gillnets, and the aggregate length of set gillnets operated by the CFEC permit holder may not exceed 100 fathoms. A single set gillnet may not exceed 50 fathoms in length. The buoys must be marked as specified in 5 AAC 06.334 and 5 AAC 39.280 with both of the CFEC permit holder's five digit permit numbers followed by the letter "D". In addition, at least one cork every 10 fathoms along the cork line must be plainly and legibly marked with both CFEC permit numbers. All identifiers must be displayed in a manner that is plainly visible, unobscured, and in a color that contrasts with the background. [THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBSECTION DO NOT APPLY AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2012.]

A CFEC permit holder who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet CFEC permits shall be able to fish in exactly the same locations, in the same manner, and by the same means as if the permits were held by two separate permit holders. A CFEC permit holder who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet CFEC permits shall not be able to fish in any location, in any manner, or by any means other than those permitted as if the permits were held by two separate permit holders.

ISSUE: This proposal asks the Board to remove the sunset provision specified in 5 AAC 06.331(u). The proposal asks the Board to exercise its authority under HB251 to continue to allow one person to own and operate two Bristol Bay CFEC set gillnet permits in accordance with existing regulations. This proposal adds additional language to subsection (u) intended to clarify inconsistencies in the regulations and aid in enforcement of the regulation by clarifying the original intent of the proposal – that a dual setnet permit hold shall fish the permits in the same manner as if they were held by two separate permit holders with no greater privileges or encumbrances.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If 5 AAC 06.331(u) expires, hundreds of setnet fishermen who have transferred permits and shore fishery leases into their names will be forced to sell these permits and sites or transfer them to family members or crewmembers, thereby relinquishing all ownership rights. Thus, the hundred or more fishermen who will opt to relinquish ownership rights to family and crew, as opposed to selling their permits and sites, will be forced to operate in a more risky and unstable business environment. All setnetters will be

foreclosed an option to build a more profitable, efficient, and adaptable dual permit setnet operation.

Removal of section 5 AAC 06.331(u) will: make it more difficult to develop direct marketing enterprises; undermine existing direct marketing enterprises; reduce setnet operational efficiencies and profitability; make it more difficult for families to hold on to permits and sites they intend to pass on to their children who have been raised as fishermen but are not yet old enough to hold a permit; compel longtime setnetters, whose kids have grown up and pursued other interests, to transfer permits and sites over to crew to maintain their existing operation, or sell off a portion of their longtime family setnet operation; and create unnecessary administrative work and expenses for setnetters, CFEC, and DNR shore fishery division both: in the short-term due to a significant volume of transfer applications from dual permit holders; and in the long-term because most dual setnet permit holders will opt to transfer permits to family and crew which generally results in more permit and site transfers from year to year as crewmembers frequently move on to other pursuits or buy into the fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, increased profitability derived from fishing multiple set gillnets allows more disposable income to invest in capital improvements that increase product quality. Operational efficiency derived from dual permit setnet operations enables fishing gear to be actively managed continuously resulting more frequent picking, deliveries, and therefore better quality harvest.

A more consistent annual production afforded by multiple nets will provide a solid foundation from which an operation can vertically integrate. Multiple nets enable a fisherman to project a reasonable annual harvest with greater certainty despite changing runs from year to year. This production floor is essential to build long-term direct marketing clientele and ensure that orders are met. Furthermore, expanded harvesting capacity enables a higher average daily catch during scratch fishing, thereby incentivizing fishermen to add “shoulders” to the fishing season, making Bristol Bay direct marketers more competitive with other fishermen around the state who enjoy longer fishing seasons and therefore can guarantee direct marketing clients fresh product for a longer period of time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All current Bristol Bay set gillnet holders will realize an increase in the fair market value of their permits. Existing multi-permit operations will avoid present and future risks associated with relinquishing ownership rights to family members and crewmembers. Single permit holders will be afforded a safe and predictable regulatory mechanism to both expand their operation and increase its profitability.

Dual permit set gillnet operations allow setnet fishermen to be more adaptive and flexible to changing market and fishing conditions. During the last few years, abundant salmon runs and increased grounds prices have increased the average gross earnings for Bristol Bay setnetters. However, several factors have either counteracted these benefits to fishermen, or have the potential to detrimentally affect the profitability of Bristol Bay setnet fishers. Increasing grounds prices have been offset to some extent by dramatically increasing food, fuel, ice, equipment, gear, freight, and other operational costs. History suggests that the historically abundant salmon

runs of recent years are often followed by smaller returns of salmon. Furthermore, ocean acidification may introduce more variability into future salmon returns. Recently, there have been some major processor consolidations occurring in Bristol Bay. Presently, there is potentially less processor competition than at any time in recent memory. Thus, the economic recovery of the fishery faces significant challenges.

In the face of economic uncertainty passage of this proposal will benefit setnet fishermen greatly by providing them with more options to develop a business model that can remain adaptive to changing economic conditions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? New entrants into the fishery will probably pay a higher fair market value for a permit. However, access will probably not be precluded. Bristol Bay set gillnet permits are presently still available for purchase and have remained available for purchase since 5 AAC 06.331(u) was approved by the Board. A similar dual permit holder measure was passed for the Cook Inlet set gillnet fleet with no sunset provision and permits are currently available for purchase in that fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fishing cooperatives, joint ventures, a permit holder appoints a proxy, limiting the amended regulation to family members. Rejected: do not address the issue and/or may not conform to CFEC regulations.

PROPOSED BY: Corey Arnold (HQ-F12-165)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Repeal sunset clause for a dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder as follows:

Remove the last sentence of 5 AAC 06.331 (u): [THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBSECTION DO NOT APPLY AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2012].

The remainder of the subsection would remain intact.

ISSUE: 5 AAC 06.331, (u) allows dual permit holders to operate up to four nets by one setnet permit holder who holds two permits. It is already on the books that one person may hold two setnet permits. This provision allows the permittee to fish two permits simultaneously. This regulation has a sunset clause of December 31, 2012. Please remove the sunset clause and permanently codify this provision.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Individuals who have invested in this privilege will suffer loss of ability to harvest. It will cause loss of income. Setnet leases that some have purchased will be lost because they may not be legally fished. One may not hold a lease unless it can be legally fished by the permit holder. Any consolidation gains which allow a permit holder to do a viable business during diminished harvests will be lost. It is a boon to family operations which will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Allowing simultaneous setnet permit fishing keeps operators in business during hard times. More income rather than reduced income and losses allows investment in equipment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Permit holders will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? If this regulation is kept, the price of permits may rise. This remains to be seen.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I do not see another solution.

PROPOSED BY: Harlan P. Bailey (HQ-F12-175)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Repeal sunset clause for a dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder as follows:

Remove the last sentence of 5 AAC 06.331 (u) [THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SUBSECTION DO NOT APPLY AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2012]. The remainder of the regulation would remain intact.

ISSUE: 5 AAC 06.331 (u) allows dual setnet holders to operate up to four nets. A provision exists allowing an individual to hold two setnet permits. This regulation allows a setnet permit holder to hold and fish two permits simultaneously. This provision has a sunset clause of December 31, 2012. Please remove the sunset clause and allow one permit holder to simultaneously fish two permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Individuals who have invested in and begun operating simultaneous permits will suffer financial loss. Individuals who have obtained sites for the second permit will automatically lose them. Setnet sites cannot be legally held if a permit holder cannot harvest on them. During small harvest seasons, operators will not have the same ability to invest in and remain viable in the fishery that this consolidation has given them.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A viable business can invest in its assets. New and improved assets will produce a better product. This small consolidation will go further in enabling fishers to do a good business during reduced harvests.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This proposal clearly benefits those who currently hold permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The cost of permits may rise if they are more profitable to hold. If permits cost more, it is harder to buy in.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There is no clear solution. I have a child who could hold a permit, but these children also have lives, need, and responsibilities of their own. A lot of flexibility is lost if we must pass these permits around every year. I don't really see another solution as good as my proposal.

PROPOSED BY: Harlan P. Bailey (HQ-F12-195)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Repeal sunset clause for dual set gillnet permits for single permit holder as follows:

5 AAC 06.331 Gillnet specifications and operations.

Allow one owner to fish two set gillnet permits by amending the regulation as follows:

(f) Except as provided in (u) of this section, a person may not operate more than two set gillnets, and the aggregate length of set gillnets operated by that person may not exceed 50 fathoms in length. Notwithstanding 5 AAC 39.240(a), a person may assist in operation or transportation of additional set gillnet gear when the CFEC interim-use or entry permit card holder of the additional gear is present in compliance with 5 AAC 39.107.

(u) A CFEC permit holder who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet permits may not operate more than four set gillnets, and the aggregate length of set gillnets operated by the CFEC permit holder may not exceed 100 fathoms. A single set gillnet may not exceed 50 fathoms in length. The buoys must be marked as specified in 5 AAC 06.334 and 5 AAC 39.280 with both of the CFEC permit holder's five digit permit numbers followed by the letter "D". In addition, at least one cork every 10 fathoms along the cork line must be plainly and legibly marked with both CFEC permit numbers. All identifiers must be displayed in a manner that is plainly visible, unobscured, and in a color that contrasts with the background. [The provisions of this subsection do not apply after December 31, 2012].

A CFEC permit holder who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet CFEC permits shall be able to fish in exactly the same locations, in the same manner, and by the same means in all legal fishing districts and special harvest areas as if the permits were held by two separate permit holders. A CFEC permit holder who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet CFEC permits shall not be able to fish in any location, in any manner, or by any means other than those permitted as if the permits were held by two separate permit holders.

ISSUE: This proposal asks the Board to remove the sunset provision specified in 5 AAC 06.331(u). The proposal asks the Board to exercise its authority under HB251 to continue to allow one person to own and operate two Bristol Bay CFEC set gillnet permits in accordance with existing regulations. This proposal adds additional language to subsection (u) intended to address inconsistencies in the regulations and aid in enforcement of the regulation by clarifying the original intent of the proposal – that a dual setnet permit holder shall fish the permits in the same manner as if they were held by two separate permit holders with no greater privileges or encumbrances.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If 5 AAC 06.331(u) expires, a significant number setnet fishermen who have transferred permits and shore fishery leases into their names will be forced to sell these permits and sites or transfer them to family members or crewmembers, thereby relinquishing all ownership rights. Thus, significant number of fishermen who will opt to relinquish ownership rights to family and crew, as opposed to selling their permits and sites, will be forced to operate in a more risky and unstable business environment.

Other setnetters, who opted not to transfer their sites and permits out of family and crewmember names due to the sunset provision, will also continue to operate in this riskier business environment. All setnetters will be foreclosed an option to build a more profitable, efficient, and adaptable dual permit setnet operation.

Removal of section 5 AAC 06.331(u) will: make it more difficult to develop direct marketing enterprises; undermine existing direct marketing enterprises; reduce setnet operational efficiencies and profitability; make it more difficult for families to hold on to permits and sites they intend to pass on to their children who have been raised as fishermen but are not yet old enough to hold a permit; compel longtime setnetters, whose kids have grown up and pursued other interests, to transfer permits and sites over to crew to maintain their existing operation, or sell off a portion of their longtime family setnet operation; and create unnecessary administrative work and expenses for setnetters, CFEC, and DNR Shore Fishery Division both: in the short-term due to a significant volume of transfer applications from dual permit holders; and in the long-term because most dual setnet permit holders will opt to transfer permits to family and crew which generally results in more permit and site transfers from year to year as crewmembers frequently move on to other pursuits or buy into the fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, increased profitability derived from fishing dual set gillnets allows more disposable income to invest in capital improvements that increase product quality. Operational efficiency derived from dual permit setnet operations enables fishing gear to be actively managed continuously resulting more frequent picking, deliveries, and therefore better quality harvest.

A more consistent annual production afforded by dual nets provides a solid foundation from which an operation can vertically integrate. Dual nets enable a fisherman to project a reasonable annual harvest with greater certainty despite changing runs from year to year. This production floor is essential to: justify direct marketing capital, fixed costs, and variable costs; and build long-term direct marketing clientele and ensure that orders are met. Furthermore, expanded harvesting capacity enables a higher average daily catch during scratch fishing, thereby incentivizing fishermen to add “shoulders” to the fishing season, making Bristol Bay direct marketers more competitive with other fishermen around the state who enjoy longer fishing seasons and therefore can guarantee direct marketing clients fresh product for a longer period of time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All current Bristol Bay set gillnet holders will probably continue realize an increase in the fair market value of their permits. Existing dual permit operations will avoid present and future risks associated with relinquishing ownership rights to family members and crewmembers. Single permit holders will be afforded a safe and predictable regulatory mechanism to both expand their operation and increase its profitability.

Dual permit set gillnet operations allow setnet fishermen to be more adaptive and flexible to changing market and fishing conditions. During the last few years, abundant salmon runs and relatively better grounds prices have increased the average gross earnings for Bristol Bay setnetters. However, several factors have either counteracted these benefits to fishermen, or have

the potential to detrimentally affect the profitability of Bristol Bay setnet fishers. Increasing grounds prices have been offset to some extent by dramatically increasing food, fuel, ice, equipment, gear, freight, and other operational costs. History suggests that the historically abundant salmon runs of recent years are often followed by smaller returns of salmon. Furthermore, ocean acidification may introduce more variability into future salmon returns. Recently, there have been some major processor consolidations occurring in Bristol Bay. Presently, there is potentially less processor competition than at any time in recent memory. Thus, the economic recovery of the fishery faces significant challenges.

In the face of economic uncertainty, passage of this proposal will benefit setnet fishermen greatly by providing them with more options to develop a business model that can remain adaptive to changing economic conditions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? New entrants into the fishery will probably pay a higher fair market value for a permit. However, access will probably not be precluded. Bristol Bay set gillnet permits are presently still available for purchase and have remained available for purchase since 5 AAC 06.331(u) was approved by the Board. A similar dual permit holder measure was passed for the Cook Inlet set gillnet fleet, with no sunset provision, and permits have remained available for purchase in that fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fishing cooperatives, joint ventures, a permit holder appoints a proxy, limiting the amended regulation to family members. Rejected: do not address the issue.

PROPOSED BY: Dylan Braund and Tom Rollman Jr. (HQ-F12-109)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Allow two set gillnet permit holders to fish 100 fathoms on a single site as follows:

Allow two CFEC permit holders to register as a dual and fish one site with up to 100 fathoms gear in the Naknek/Kvichak section.

ISSUE: Drifters are allowed to fish 200 fathoms on one boat as dual permit option. I would like the board to address having a dual permit option for setnet to fish 2 permits on one site with up to 100 fathoms gear.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No possibility to consolidate fishing operations to limit costs. Less options available for setnetters to use at their disposal to better manage their business. Less fishing area/sites available to fish. Possibly higher fuel costs due to long travel time between sites fished. Overall less options available for set gillnet fishermen to use as their circumstances warrant. Drifters will continue to have the option but setnet will not.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal could possibly improve quality with the potential to consolidate operations and less travel time in between sites to pick.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnet fishermen would get the same option as the drifters to help consolidate costs and fishing operations as their circumstances warrant.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Jim W. Reynolds (HQ-F12-101)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 06.370. Registration and reregistration. Prior to June 25, if a drift gillnet permit holder intends to fish in either the Ugashik or Egegik district they must be registered for that district as follows:

Too many boats will be on-ground to warrant any substantial fishing time in the Egegik and Ugashik Districts prior to June 25th because of escapement concerns into the Egegik River. In the last couple of years a good portion of the run occurred considerably earlier than historical run timing and catches were too large to warrant reasonable early fish escapement into the Egegik River.

(4) Beginning June 25, before taking salmon in the Naknek, Kvichak or Egegik Districts, a commercial salmon drift permit holder shall register for one of these districts;

(4a) beginning June 1, before taking salmon in the Ugashik and Egegik District(s), a commercial salmon drift permit holder shall register for the Ugashik or Egegik District(s).

ISSUE: Revert back to original regulation that drift permit holders in the Ugashik District prior to June 25th have to register for the Egegik and Ugashik Districts. Too many drift vessels jumping back and forth between east side districts prior to June 25th. Reduce the number of vessels in the Ugashik and Egegik District prior to June 25th when they jump back to the Naknek/Kvichak or Nushagak Districts.

This proposal is a trade off to the “General District” concept introduced by the industry to promote early fishing effort on the east side of Bristol Bay.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? ADF&G management biologist will have no estimate of exact fleet size until a fishing period is announced. Vessels continue to jump between districts with no restrictions limitations prior to June 25th. Too many vessels currently in Egegik and Ugashik Districts prior to June 25th and the Department have expressed concerns because of the difficulty managing early escapement numbers into the Egegik River.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, increases fishing time and subsequently reduces the need to “dead” stack the fish prior to closing time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A few local Ugashik and Egegik fishermen, the area management biologist, the sustainability of Egegik sockeye run.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few Nushagak and Naknek-Kvichak drift fishermen.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee (HQ-F12-119)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 57 – 5 AAC 06.XXX. Regulatory changes and/or management plans pertaining to chum and sockeye salmon in the Bristol Bay Area. Placeholder for possible regulatory changes based on results from Western Alaska Salmon Stock Identification Project (WASSIP) as follows:

ISSUE: This is a placeholder proposal to allow fishery stakeholders, the board, and the department an opportunity to discuss proposed regulatory changes in the Bristol Bay Area based upon results of the Western Alaska Salmon Stock Identification Project, which will not be available until late summer 2012.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Potentially important information regarding fisheries management will not be utilized until the next Alaska Board of Fisheries cycle for Bristol Bay in 2015/2016.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Unknown.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F12-212)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 06.3XX. General District Salmon Management Plan. Open General District and allow a harvest of up to 25% of projected sockeye salmon run as follows:

Allow General District fishing as generally promulgated during the 2004 season to harvest up to 25% of the projected catch.

ISSUE: Some years in Bristol Bay runs are too compressed and overwhelm processing production capacity. A general district will allow early harvesting of fish with higher commercial value and improve quality. This higher quality fish can be put into a higher value fresh market raising the price paid to Bristol Bay fisherman.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The quality of the fish will suffer because processors are frequently overwhelmed with too many fish. This will alleviate the problem. In the past this has led to over escapement and foregone harvest. Potential revenues are lost from reduced quality and foregone harvest.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, as stated above.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Dominic Lee (HQ-F12-080)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 06.200. Fishing districts and sections. Create two new general districts when all eastside systems have met their escapement goals or on July 17, whichever comes first as follows:

At the end of the season when the escapement goals are met for the Naknek/Kvichak, Egegik, and Ugashik Districts, or the 48-hour transfer is no longer required (July 17th), fishing will be allowed in two new general district sections: The first would connect the Naknek Section-Johnson Hill Line and the North line of Egegik running approximately three miles offshore. The second would connect the South line of Egegik to the North line of Ugashik running approximately three miles off shore. These new sections would remain open until July 27th.

ISSUE: At the end of the season, very few boats get to share the harvest of fish that lead the beach and enter the districts in a small ribbon on the northern and southern district boundaries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, higher quality will be achieved by catching the fish in deep water and not along the beach.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The majority of the fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Aggressive fishermen.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kurt Johnson (HQ-F12-138)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 06.3XX. General District Salmon Management Plan. Create a general district when all eastside river systems have met their escapement goals or on July 17, whichever comes first as follows:

When all eastside rivers reach their biological goals, or the EO goes off on July 17, whichever comes first, there shall be a General District fishery in which--except for the upriver boundary lines--the boundary lines in each eastside district are dissolved. Fishermen may fish anywhere they like within three nautical miles of shore.

ISSUE: Towards the end of the main salmon season, the AK State Troopers, because of budget constraints, greatly reduce their presence in patrolling the boundary lines of the eastside rivers. Because of their absence, hungry fishermen push the lines into illegal territory. Anyone willing to catch the few remaining fish must risk arrest by the infrequent flyovers by the Troopers. It is not conducive to maintaining an 'equal opportunity' fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Otherwise legal fisherman, presented the choice to catch some fish illegally, or far fewer in legal waters, will again face extreme frustration in being corked-off by the pirate minority freely breaking the law. Pirates win again! The unequal opportunity line-fishery remains unchanged.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes! There will be less frantic towing and stern-hauling, as occurs in the line fishery, and the fish will tend to be harvested in a fashion that allows time to put quality first. Better quality equals better price.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen who desire to fish legally (the majority) will have the same opportunity as everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that disregard the law will be forced to fish on a level playing field with everyone else.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Find more money for some sort of line enforcement that extends late in the season, but this seems impractical and far more difficult than just removing the boundary lines. When a river's biological requirements are satisfied, why have boundary lines?

PROPOSED BY: Chris White (HQ-F12-034)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 06.350. Closed waters. After all eastside Bristol Bay rivers have reached escapement goals, remove existing boundaries and allow open access on or after August 1 as follows:

After August 1st (or a date determined by the biologist) and after all eastside rivers of Bristol Bay have reached escapement goals, allow the biologist to remove the boundaries and open the eastside of Bristol Bay for fishing.

ISSUE: After August 1st and after all the eastside rivers have reached escapement goals, we would like the Board to address the issue of the fishing boundaries on the east side of Bristol Bay.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less opportunity to fish; lower quality of fish; less marketing opportunity and possible over escapement.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal would improve the quality of the resource harvested by allowing harvest before contact with fresh water. It would also allow a marketing campaign to be established.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who choose to fish at this time. All of Bristol Bay due to increased buzz and name recognition of marketing as Bristol Bay salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one (in recent history there have been no fishermen this late).

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other solutions would be leaving to fish other areas of the state. However, fishing for salmon elsewhere would only be lowering our standards since Bristol Bay already has the best salmon in Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Wild Salmon Now (HQ-F12-189)

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

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 39.XXX. Restructuring Process. Develop a process for addressing future proposals deemed as Bristol Bay salmon industry restructuring proposals as follows:

Bristol Bay Salmon Industry Restructuring Proposals

Definition: A restructuring proposal is a proposal that is likely to have substantial economic, social or biological impacts and may require significant changes to the management of the Bristol Bay salmon fishery. The proposed regulatory change may strive to improve the value of the fishery by providing new and increased opportunities to: (1) raise the revenue generated from harvested fish (e.g. through improved quality); or (2) lower the cost of fishing operations; or (3) improve conservation. Such proposals may include but are not limited to, consolidation of fishing effort, a shift in who harvests the fish, changes in harvest methods, or allocations.

Board of Fisheries Criteria for Review of Bristol Bay Restructuring Proposals

Keeping in mind that all proposals must promote the sustainability of fishery resources and be consistent with other Board of Fisheries policies, the Board of Fisheries may consider comprehensive regulatory restructuring proposals, and when doing so shall use the following criteria:

- 1) Promote an increased economic benefit to the participants remaining in the Bristol Bay fishery following restructuring;
- 2) Identify possible interactions within the region.
- 3) Identify potential mitigation measures for those dependent on the fishery that may be negatively impacted;
- 4) Promote improvements in the fisheries value, product quality, or an increase in efficiency;
- 5) Adequately address biological impacts to the resource caused by changes in management systems and utilization of the resource.
- 6) Promote a healthy fishing economy in Bristol Bay that provides social and economic benefit to communities dependent upon the fishery and contributes to the overall benefit of the resource and sustainability of Bristol Bay communities and the economy of the State.
- 7) In addition to the criteria above, other factors may be considered as appropriate.

Process to Review Restructuring Proposals

Restructuring proposals may have substantial economic, social and/or biological impacts and may require significant changes to the management of the fishery. Accordingly the Board of Fisheries is interested in ensuring ample opportunity for review and comment by Bristol Bay communities and participants in the fishery.

- 1) Submit the proposal as part of a regular review cycle for Bristol Bay. (Responsibility: Applicant)
- 2) Determine if the proposal is a restructuring proposal. (Responsibility: Board)
- 3) Publish restructuring proposals in a separate section of the board proposal book or otherwise identify proposal as a restructuring proposal. (Responsibility: Board's Support Section)
- 4) Hold a publicly-noticed work session to determine: (Responsibility: Board)
 - a. Is proposal complete?
 - b. Are there outstanding questions or information needed?
 - c. Confirm that the board has authority to act on proposal; identify any aspects or proposal where the board may need additional authority to make decisions.
 - d. Identify whether CFEC, DNR or other agencies need to be consulted on issues raised by the proposal. If so, bring staff together to schedule work and process.
 - e. Identify proposal's review process and schedule.
- 5) Hold information-gathering public hearing(s) within the region. (Responsibility: Board)
- 6) Hold other hearings/work sessions as needed. (Responsibility: Board)
- 7) Board of Fisheries decision. (Responsibility: Board)

Alaska Board of Fisheries – Bristol Bay Salmon Restructuring Proposal Form

Please answer the questions below as completely as possible. Your responses will likely require multiple pages and considerable time and effort. Some questions may not be applicable to your proposal. Some questions might be difficult to answer; incomplete answers will not necessarily disqualify your proposal.

Please carefully read the instructions on the following page before answering these questions.

- 1) What Bristol Bay gear type does this restructuring proposal affect?
- 2) Please thoroughly explain your proposal. (See Part II, Question 2 of the instruction page for important guidance on how to answer this question).
- 3) What are the objectives of the proposal?
- 4) How will this proposal meet the objectives in question #3?
- 5) Please identify the potential allocative impacts of your proposal. Is there an allocation or management plan that will be affected by this proposal?
- 6) If the total value of the resource is expected to increase, who will benefit?
- 7) What will happen if the fishery is not restructured as your proposal recommends, and how is this proposal an improvement over current practices?
- 8) Considering the history of the commercial fishery, what are the potential short- and long-term positive and negative impacts on:
 - a. watershed communities and fishermen
 - b. the fishery resource;
 - c. harvesters;

- d. the sector, species and regional interdependence relationships
- e. safety;
- f. the market; and
- g. processors.

- 9) What is your understanding of the level of support for your proposal among the harvesters, processors, watershed communities and fishermen?
- 10) What are the potential short and long-term impacts on conservation and resource habitat?
- 11) What are the potential legal, fishery management and enforcement implications if this proposal is adopted? What other governmental actions may need to be taken into account?

Submitted By: Name _____ (signature required)
 Individual or Group _____
 Address _____ Zip Code _____ Phone _____

Instructions for Bristol Bay Restructuring Proposal Form

Please answer the question below as completely as possible. Your responses will likely require multiple pages and considerable time and effort. Some questions may not be applicable to your proposal. Some questions might be difficult to answer; incomplete answers will not necessarily disqualify your proposal.

Part I: How to determine if your proposal is a ‘restructuring’ proposal.

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

Please note that if the board does not have the legal authority to implement the proposed regulation then your proposal may be dismissed or tabled. If your proposal is found to be incomplete, the board may direct you to potential resources or specific agencies you may need to work with. If your proposal is determined to be a restructuring proposal, the board may put the proposal on a special timeline for action to allow for appropriate public input. If the proposal is determined to be incomplete or otherwise needs further development prior to action, the board, at its discretion, may table the proposal for future action. The board may, at its discretion, amend any proposal and move it forward.

Restructuring proposals may have broad ramifications with both positive and/or negative impacts to harvesters, processors, coastal communities, associated businesses and the State of Alaska. Therefore, your proposal should consider the potential impacts of the proposed new regulation on all stakeholders.

Part II: How fill out the Bristol Bay Salmon Restructuring Proposal Form

Question #1: For which gear type will the regulations be changed?

Question #2: To completely explain your proposal, address the questions below:

- a. Will this proposal require initial harvester qualification for eligibility? If so, how would it work?
- b. Are there new harvesting allocations? If so, how are they determined?
- c. What means, methods, and permitted fishing gear are proposed?
- d. Is a change in vessel length proposed?
- e. Is the transferability of permits affected? If so, explain.
- f. Is there a defined role for processors? If so, please describe.
- g. Will this proposal be a permanent change to regulation? If not, for how long?
- h. If adopted, will your proposal require a change in monitoring and oversight by ADF&G?
- i. Will vertical integration (e.g. harvesting and/or processing) or consolidation occur? Will limits be imposed?
- j. How do you propose to monitor and evaluate the restructured fishery?
- k. Is there a conservation motivation behind the proposal? If so, please explain.
- l. What practical challenges need to be overcome to implement your proposal, and how do you propose overcoming them?

Question #3: Restructuring proposals may have many goals that may not be apparent from the proposal itself. What specific changes do you want to occur if this proposal is put into place?

Question #4: How and why will your proposed regulation meet the goals and objectives in question #3?

Question #5: A restructuring proposal will often have allocative or re-allocative impacts. Please identify those potential impacts. Other than already identified in question # 1, what management plans and allocation regulations might be affected?

Question #6: Who will benefit? Harvesters? Processors? Communities? State? Subsistence users? Etc.

Question #7: How is your proposal better than status quo?

Question #8: Restructuring proposals will have positive and/or negative impacts to Bristol Bay harvesters, processors, coastal communities, associated businesses and the State of Alaska. Your proposal is more likely to be judged complete if you try to identify both the positive and negative impacts of your proposal on:

- a. The Bristol Bay fishery resource: 1) biological; 2) management system; and 3) economic utilization.

- b. Harvesters: 1) economic efficiency of the harvesting function; 2) species interdependence impacts; 3) distribution of product value; and 4) market access.
- c. Interdependence: How will your proposal impact other gear types and fisheries targeting other species? How will it affect interactions between the communities of the region?
- d. Safety: How does your proposal affect safety, if at all?
- e. The market: 1) market access and product form 2) market timing; 3) competitive opportunities; 4) other, if any.
- f. Processors: 1) economic efficiency of the processing function; 2) species interdependence impacts; 3) processing asset ownership impacts; 4) distribution of product value; and 5) market access.
- g. Local communities: 1) employment enhancement, displacement, and loss; 2) municipal revenue impacts; 3) industry infrastructure impacts; 4) species interdependence impacts; 5) ownership of local permits and processing impacts, and 6) gain or loss of associated businesses.

Question #9: Is this a “one-person idea” or does your proposal have broad support?

Question #10: Conservation and development of fisheries resources and major goals of the board and any impacts on these goals, positive or negative, are of high importance. Please explain the likely impacts of your proposal.

Question #11: Restructuring proposals often have legal, fishery management, and enforcement implications that the board will have the address before it can take action. Please identify the potential issues in these areas.

ISSUE: The lack of formal guidelines for evaluating restructuring proposals in the Bristol Bay salmon fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without formal guidelines the Board risks making decisions on restructuring proposals in an arbitrary manner, to the potential detriment of harvesters, coastal communities and the State of Alaska. That risk is greatest in the Bristol Bay region, should new restructuring efforts accelerate the loss of locally-owned limited entry permits. Without access to the fishing economy, increasing numbers of watershed residents will be forced to pursue other economic development options, with potentially serious negative impacts to Bristol Bay’s salmon resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Maintaining the biological health of the watershed remains an important community value as long as resident participation in the fishery remains viable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Harvesters, coastal communities and the State of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo, rejected for the reasons described above.

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (HQ-F12-124)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 06.355. Bristol Bay Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan; 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Increase set gillnet allocation 20% in Nushagak, Naknek-Kvichak, Egegik, and Ugashik districts as follows:

The allocation would be increased in each district to 20%. The new regulation should read: 5 AAC 06.355. Bristol Bay Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan.

(a) The purpose of this management and allocation plan is to ensure an adequate escapement, as determined by the department, of sockeye salmon into the river systems of the Naknek-Kvichak District to distribute, to the extent practicable, the harvestable surplus of sockeye salmon to the set and drift gillnet fisheries for the allocation percentages specified in (b) of this section. This plan also provides management guidelines to the department in an effort to preclude allocations conflicts between various users of this resource.

(b) It is the intent of the Board of Fisheries (board) that Bristol Bay sockeye salmon be harvested in the traditional harvest locations and that historical sockeye salmon catches be allocated between drift and set gillnet fisheries by district. To achieve this allocation, the department shall manage, to the extent practicable, the commercial sockeye salmon fisheries to achieve the allocation percentages established in the Naknek-Kvichak District.

AND

5 AAC 06.364 (repealed)

ISSUE: Allocation percentages in Bristol Bay/Naknek-Kvichak District to be increased to 20% per district.

It has no basis in either conservation or development of the resource, and only results in lost fishing time. Additionally, it has made management of the resource onerous, as fishery managers must currently take the allocation into effect when determining fishing time. This has produced forgone harvests, as the allocation numbers are based on setnet and driftnet numbers that are not current.

(a) The purpose of this management and allocation plan is to ensure an adequate escapement, as determined by the department, of sockeye salmon into the river systems of the Naknek-Kvichak, and to distribute, to the extent practicable, the harvestable surplus of sockeye salmon to the set and drift gillnet fisheries for the allocation percentages specified in (b) of this section. This plan also provides management guidelines to the department in an effort to preclude allocations conflicts between various users of this resource.

(b) It is the intent of the Board of Fisheries (board) that Bristol Bay sockeye salmon be harvested in the traditional harvest locations and that historical sockeye salmon catches be allocated

between drift and set gillnet fisheries by district. To achieve this allocation, the department shall manage, to the extent practicable, the commercial sockeye salmon fisheries to achieve the allocation percentages established in 5 AAC 06.364 (Naknek-Kvichak District).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will inhibit the Department of Fish and Game to manage and achieve adequate escapement of salmon run into the Naknek-Kvichak Districts.

The allocation will continue to result in forgone harvests, as the drift fishermen have not been able to meet their allocation percentages in time to obtain the maximum return from the salmon run. So, while the setnetters are sitting on the beach "waiting for their turn" the driftnetters have been allowed to fish. If the fish are running close to shore, as they tend to do in certain years due to colder waters, the salmon will continue to over-escape up the rivers, resulting in loss of revenue for the State of Alaska and commercial fishermen.

This will help the Department of Fish and Game to do their job as listed below to manage the fishery:

- (d) The department shall manage, subject to existing management plans, fishery openings, closures, and areas to
- (1) achieve adequate escapement from all segments of the run by spacing openings throughout the run;
 - (2) maintain and improve stock specific management through the use of district, subdistrict, and section openings and closures;
 - (3) distribute fish within individual districts and subdistricts through the spacing and duration of openings;
 - (4) reduce intensive boundary line fishing through the spacing and duration of openings;
 - (5) reduce harvest of stocks bound for other districts, subdistricts, or sections in accordance with specific regulatory management plans.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal will improve the quality of the resource harvested and products produced. Based on a 2011 study of Bristol Bay area gear type and fishing area, the highest quality fish in the entire Bristol Bay was produced by Naknek River beach setnetters. However, by severely circumscribing the Naknek setnet fleet's ability to fish, and limiting openings to only 4 hours (due to the attempt to meet allocation goals by area fishery managers), this has resulted in less of this high quality Naknek setnet fish being harvested and brought to market.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Naknek beach setnetters will benefit, but the entire fleet will benefit overall as an improved quality fish is delivered out of the area, thus helping to buoy prices in the region. The canneries will also benefit from higher quality of fish, and the entire fishery will benefit due to a higher quality of fish being delivered.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The Naknek drift fleet is likely to suffer somewhat. However, they may also benefit in some ways, as they will be allowed to fish for longer periods

if the setnet fleet doesn't have shorter periods. The flexibility afforded managers will allow area managers to schedule fishing times that are more conducive to every fisherman's schedule.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? An alternative solution might be to adjust the allocation to allow for a higher setnet allocation, that is adjusted annually based on the actual numbers of boats registered in the fishing district. This is not a preferred alternative, as it will result in more time devoted to this issue by area managers, and a lot less flexibility as boats transfer out of the region. And from one district to another. Whereas a setnetter has one area to fish the whole season.

PROPOSED BY: Naknek-Kvichak Setnetters (HQ-F12-027)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 06.355. Bristol Bay Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan; 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Increase set gillnet allocation 20% in Nushagak, Naknek-Kvichak, Egegik, and Ugashik districts as follows:

The allocation would be increased in each district to 20%. The new regulation should read: 5 AAC 06.355. Bristol Bay Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan.

(a) The purpose of this management and allocation plan is to ensure an adequate escapement, as determined by the department, of sockeye salmon into the river systems of the Naknek-Kvichak District to distribute, to the extent practicable, the harvestable surplus of sockeye salmon to the set and drift gillnet fisheries for the allocation percentages specified in (b) of this section. This plan also provides management guidelines to the department in an effort to preclude allocations conflicts between various users of this resource.

(b) It is the intent of the Board of Fisheries (board) that Bristol Bay sockeye salmon be harvested in the traditional harvest locations and that historical sockeye salmon catches be allocated between drift and set gillnet fisheries by district. To achieve this allocation, the department shall manage, to the extent practicable, the commercial sockeye salmon fisheries to achieve the allocation percentages established in the Naknek-Kvichak District.

AND

5 AAC 06.364 (repealed)

ISSUE: Allocation percentages in Bristol Bay/Naknek-Kvichak District to be increased to 20% per district.

It has no basis in either conservation or development of the resource, and only results in lost fishing time. Additionally, it has made management of the resource onerous, as fishery managers must currently take the allocation into effect when determining fishing time. This has produced forgone harvests, as the allocation numbers are based on setnet and driftnet numbers that are not current.

(a) The purpose of this management and allocation plan is to ensure an adequate escapement, as determined by the department, of sockeye salmon into the river systems of the Naknek-Kvichak, and to distribute, to the extent practicable, the harvestable surplus of sockeye salmon to the set and drift gillnet fisheries for the allocation percentages specified in (b) of this section. This plan also provides management guidelines to the department in an effort to preclude allocations conflicts between various users of this resource.

(b) It is the intent of the Board of Fisheries (board) that Bristol Bay sockeye salmon be harvested in the traditional harvest locations and that historical sockeye salmon catches be allocated

between drift and set gillnet fisheries by district. To achieve this allocation, the department shall manage, to the extent practicable, the commercial sockeye salmon fisheries to achieve the allocation percentages established in 5 AAC 06.364 (Naknek-Kvichak District).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will inhibit the Department of Fish and Game to manage and achieve adequate escapement of salmon run into the Naknek-Kvichak Districts.

The allocation will continue to result in forgone harvests, as the drift fishermen have not been able to meet their allocation percentages in time to obtain the maximum return from the salmon run. So, while the setnetters are sitting on the beach "waiting for their turn" the drift netters have been allowed to fish. If the fish are running close to shore, as they tend to do in certain years due to colder waters, the salmon will continue to over-escape up the rivers, resulting in loss of revenue for the State of Alaska and commercial fishermen.

This will help the Department of Fish and Game to do their job as listed below to manage the fishery:

- (d) The department shall manage, subject to existing management plans, fishery openings, closures, and areas to
- (1) achieve adequate escapement from all segments of the run by spacing openings throughout the run;
 - (2) maintain and improve stock specific management through the use of district, subdistrict, and section openings and closures;
 - (3) distribute fish within individual districts and subdistricts through the spacing and duration of openings;
 - (4) reduce intensive boundary line fishing through the spacing and duration of openings;
 - (5) reduce harvest of stocks bound for other districts, subdistricts, or sections in accordance with specific regulatory management plans.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal will improve the quality of the resource harvested and products produced. Based on a 2011 study of Bristol Bay area gear type and fishing area, the highest quality fish in the entire Bristol Bay was produced by Naknek River beach setnetters. However, by severely circumscribing the Naknek setnet fleet's ability to fish, and limiting openings to only 4 hours (due to the attempt to meet allocation goals by area fishery managers), this has resulted in less of this high quality Naknek setnet fish being harvested and brought to market.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Naknek beach setnetters will benefit, but the entire fleet will benefit overall as an improved quality fish is delivered out of the area, thus helping to buoy prices in the region. The canneries will also benefit from higher quality of fish, and the entire fishery will benefit due to a higher quality of fish being delivered.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The Naknek drift fleet is likely to suffer somewhat. However, they may also benefit in some ways, as they will be allowed to fish for longer periods

if the setnet fleet doesn't have shorter periods. The flexibility afforded managers will allow area managers to schedule fishing times that are more conducive to every fisherman's schedule.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? An alternative solution might be to adjust the allocation to allow for a higher setnet allocation, that is adjusted annually based on the actual numbers of boats registered in the fishing district. This is not a preferred alternative, as it will result in more time devoted to this issue by area managers, and a lot less flexibility as boats transfer out of the region. And from one district to another. Whereas a setnetter has one area to fish the whole season.

PROPOSED BY: Laverne Pettigen

(HQ-F12-028)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 06.355. Bristol Bay Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries and Management and Allocation Plan; 5 AAC 06.364(b)(2). Naknek - Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Increase set gillnet allocation to 20% in Nushagak, Egegik, and Ugashik districts, and to 22% in the Naknek-Kvichak District as follows:

The allocation would be increased in each district to 20%.

The new regulation should read:

5 AAC 06.355. Bristol Bay Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan

(a) The purpose of this management and allocation plan is to ensure an adequate escapement, as determined by the department, of sockeye salmon into the river systems of the Naknek-Kvichak District to distribute, to the extent practicable, the harvestable surplus of sockeye salmon to the set and drift gillnet fisheries for the allocation percentages specified in (b) of this section. This plan also provides management guidelines to the department in an effort to preclude allocations conflicts between various users of this resource.

(b) It is the intent of the Board of Fisheries (board) that Bristol Bay sockeye salmon be harvested in the traditional harvest locations and that historical sockeye salmon catches be allocated between drift and set gillnet fisheries by district. To achieve this allocation, the department shall manage, to the extent practicable, the commercial sockeye salmon fisheries to achieve the allocation percentages established in the Naknek-Kvichak District.

AND

5 AAC 06.364 (repealed)

ISSUE: Allocation percentages in Bristol Bay/Naknek-Kvichak district to be increased to 22% per district.

It has no basis in either conservation or development of the resource, and only results in lost fishing time. Additionally, it has made management of the resource onerous, as fishery managers must currently take the allocation into effect when determining fishing time. This has produced forgone harvests, as the allocation numbers are based on setnet and driftnet numbers that are not current.

Allocation percentages in Bristol Bay/Naknek-Kvichak District to be increased to 22% per district. It has no basis in either conservation or development of the resource, and only results in lost fishing time. Additionally, it has made management of the resource onerous, as fishery managers must currently take the allocation into effect when determining fishing time. This has produced forgone harvests, as the allocation numbers are based on setnet and driftnet numbers that are not current.

(a) The purpose of this management and allocation plan is to ensure an adequate escapement, as determined by the department, of sockeye salmon into the river systems of the Naknek-Kvichak, and to distribute, to the extent practicable, the harvestable surplus of sockeye salmon to the set and drift gillnet fisheries for the allocation percentages specified in (b) of this section. This plan also provides management guidelines to the department in an effort to preclude allocations conflicts between various users of this resource.

(b) It is the intent of the Board of Fisheries (board) that Bristol Bay sockeye salmon be harvested in the traditional harvest locations and that historical sockeye salmon catches be allocated between drift and set gillnet fisheries by district. To achieve this allocation, the department shall manage, to the extent practicable, the commercial sockeye salmon fisheries to achieve the allocation percentages established in 5 AAC 06.364 (Naknek-Kvichak District).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will inhibit the Department of Fish and Game to manage and achieve adequate escapement of salmon run into the Naknek-Kvichak Districts.

The allocation will continue to result in forgone harvests, as the drift fishermen have not been able to meet their allocation percentages in time to obtain the maximum return from the salmon run. So, while the setnetters are sitting on the beach "waiting for their turn" the driftnetters have been allowed to fish. If the fish are running close to shore, as they tend to do in certain years due to colder waters, the salmon will continue to over-escape up the rivers, resulting in loss of revenue for the State of Alaska and commercial fishermen.

This will help the Department of Fish and Game to do their job as listed below to manage the fishery:

(d) The department shall manage, subject to existing management plans, fishery openings, closures, and areas to

(1) achieve adequate escapement from all segments of the run by spacing openings throughout the run;

(2) maintain and improve stock specific management through the use of district, subdistrict, and section openings and closures;

(3) distribute fish within individual districts and subdistricts through the spacing and duration of openings;

(4) reduce intensive boundary line fishing through the spacing and duration of openings;

(5) reduce harvest of stocks bound for other districts, subdistricts, or sections in accordance with specific regulatory management plans.

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

Yes, this proposal will improve the quality of the resource harvested and products produced. Based on a 2011 study of Bristol Bay area gear type and fishing area, the highest quality fish in the entire Bristol Bay was produced by Naknek river beach setnetters. However, by severely circumscribing the Naknek setnet fleet's ability to fish, and limiting openings to only four hours (due to the attempt to meet allocation goals by area fishery managers), this has resulted in less of this high quality Naknek setnet fish being harvested and brought to market.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

Naknek beach setnetters will benefit, but the entire fleet will benefit overall as an improved quality fish is delivered out of the area, thus helping to buoy prices in the region. The canneries will also benefit from higher quality of fish, and the entire fishery will benefit due to a higher quality of fish being delivered.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

The Naknek drift fleet is likely to suffer somewhat. However, they may also benefit in some ways, as they will be allowed to fish for longer periods if the setnet fleet doesn't have shorter periods. The flexibility afforded managers will allow area managers to schedule fishing times that are more conducive to every fisherman's schedule.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

An alternative solution might be to adjust the allocation to allow for a higher setnet allocation, that is adjusted annually based on the actual numbers of boats registered in the fishing district. This is not a preferred alternative, as it will result in more time devoted to this issue by area managers, and a lot less flexibility as boats transfer out of the region. And from one district to another. Whereas a setnetter has one area to fish the whole season.

PROPOSED BY: Betty J. Bonin (HQ-F12-066)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek – Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Remove set and drift gillnet allocations as follows:

Allocation of drift / setnet fishery is removed.

ISSUE: Allocation of set versus drift gear. Numbers of fishers have changed, and the fish hit at certain segments of the bay / beach, generating total numbers that don't reflect when and where the fish are actually caught. The allocation system also causes unnecessary closures when both gear groups could be benefiting from harvesting the salmon run.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Setnet fishers (particularly those on the non-prime sites) will continue to harvest less amounts when they could be benefitting from a more continuous fishery. Drift fishers will have unnecessary closures when they could be helping to control the over-escapement (which has been happening every year).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It would allow both gear groups to harvest quality fish during the prime portion of the run.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. Increased fishing opportunities are a benefit for all.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who don't want a specific gear group to benefit over the other.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Every other tide openings for drift and set fishing. It's still an option, but during the run, I feel that this would allow too many fish to escape up the river during the set openings (unless the setnet fishery was moved to the NRSHA).

PROPOSED BY: Shannon Ford (HQ-F12-203)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Stagger fishing periods throughout run as follows:

Fishing openings shall occur at staggered intervals throughout the run to allow 1) a more balanced sample of escaped fish to spawn, and 2) make a more predictable and steady amount of salmon available for harvest and processing. One option: every other tide from the beginning, moving to continuous openings at or near the escapement point.

ISSUE: Naknek River Escapement being composed primarily of fish from a small segment of the total run. Often there are either continuous openings at the beginning of the season and then extended closures later, or the opposite. The salmon escapement is therefore all arriving at the same time to compete for resources, and not comprised of a significant sample from the entire run. Likewise, the commercial fishery may not be able to harvest the plentiful mid-run, or largest and most commercially desirable fish at the time when they come through the fishing grounds. When the fishing is open in a continuous flood, canneries go on limit and fish buyers sometimes stop buying fish all together. This causes the waste of fish, and the time and effort expended to catch them. Quality of end product also goes down.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The biological impact may be significant. I would like to see more research into this area of study. Canneries will continue to not have capacity for the run, and quality will go down.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Fishermen and canneries alike could better handle the steadier influx of salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that prefer to fish for only a week or two, and are not concerned with fish quality or biological impact.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? See above in the first section: fishing more heavily in either the beginning or the end may produce an unbalanced harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Shannon Ford (HQ-F12-201)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Open a new set gillnet fishery at Levelock when Kvichak River reaches minimum escapement as follows:

A fishery would be created in front of Levelock for setnetters to provide salmon for the Levelock Fish Plant.

ISSUE: Open a fishery in front of Levelock once the Kvichak river system reaches its minimum escapement goal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Levelock Packing Plant would have to travel all the way to the graveyard and west side for the Levelock Fish Plant.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The salmon will be fresher than having to run all the way to the graveyard and west side for the processing plant in Levelock.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The village of Levelock and the fishers who wish to fish have to go all the way to the Kvichak openings at graveyard and the west side in front of Levelock.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To haul fish all the way from the graveyard and west side is a 12 mile trip and is dependent of the tides and winds.

PROPOSED BY: Levelock Village Council (HQ-F12-006)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 06.3XX. Alagnak River Special Harvest Area Management Plan.
Open Alagnak River Special Harvest Area (ARSHA) to set gillnets when the Kvichak Section is open as follows:

A fishery would be created in the ARSHA Area.

ISSUE: Open the Alagnak River to a setnet fishery when the Kvichak has openings.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Alagnak River System will again be over escapement and salmon will over run the spawn of salmon that went before them.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Salmon that are harvested will not escape up the river systems and over run the salmon that spawned before them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Levelock Packing Company and the Village of Levelock because Levelock is creating a fish plant to benefit the residents and fishers who will want to fish the Alagnak.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We would have to run all the way to the graveyard and west side for salmon.

PROPOSED BY: Levelock Village Council (HQ-F12-005)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 06.373. Alagnak River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Change the allocation plan in the Alagnak River Special Harvest Area (ARSHA) to 84% drift and 16% set as follows:

When the Naknek-Kvichak District is closed and there is a harvestable surplus of sockeye salmon in the Alagnak River Special Harvest Area (ARSHA), the distribution of the harvestable surplus will be as follows: (A) drift gillnet-84 percent; and (B) set gillnet-16 percent. Once the minimum escapement goal for the ARSHA is met, both gear groups may fish at the same time in an effort to achieve the allocation percentages.

ISSUE: Change the allocation plan in the Alagnak River Sockeye Special Harvest Area Management Plan to have the same allocation as in the Naknek-Kvichak District.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Allocation Agreement from the 1997 Bristol Bay Board of Fish meeting that was based on the 20 year set and drift gillnet catch averages and was intended to include all fish harvested commercially by both gear groups. The Alagnak River Sockeye Special Harvest Area which is defined to be within the Naknek-Kvichak District does not have the same allocation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishermen who made the 1997 allocation agreement; the fish that otherwise would be caught in the Naknek-Kvichak District, but for conservation of the Kvichak River sockeye salmon run, are caught in the ARSHA will be allocated as if they were caught in the Naknek-Kvichak District.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kurt Johnson (HQ-F12-141)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Open the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) to set gillnet gear when the Naknek River escapement goal is met as follows:

The area now designated as the Naknek Special Harvest Area will be opened to setnet fishers when the Naknek River achieves its escapement goal for the season as announced by the ADF&G.

ISSUE: Low catch numbers and increased challenges (including loss of income and safety concerns) for setnet fishers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The setnet fishery will continue to dwindle, which will increasingly contribute to loss of traditional business for multi-generational family fisheries. Many of our South Naknek beach permits have been in families since the beginning of the fishery regulation, and almost all are either local / Alaska residents or from long-time Alaska families. Also, there will be continuing hazardous conditions which will likely bring more accidents and unnecessary risk for fisherman. Fish quality will also suffer, and more resources will be consumed in conducting the fishery as it currently stands. High numbers of fish over and above the escapement goal will continue to go up the river (thus exceeding the management plan which should be a biological concern, and denying those fish to fishermen which constitutes a wasted resource during an economic depression).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Harvesting fish closer to the point of delivery / processing results in better fish quality. Setnet fishers do not have reliable access to ice, nor often the resources to convert a small-scale skiff fishing operation into one that is designed for holding fish for any length of time while maintaining quality. Canneries no longer operate on the South Side, and they do not send tenders very far into the Bay (if at all). As a result, setnet fishermen will often transfer fish several times from skiff to shore (or pick a dry net when the tide goes out), then drive the fish up the beach to the river where they reload them into a skiff for running out to the tender. This time and excess handling can result in lowered quality if the fisherman isn't able to take special care. Maintaining quality requires either good weather for safe skiff operation, or an extreme amount of extra work to address the quality of each individual fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit.

- Setnetters will reap a more bountiful harvest.
- Fishing conditions will be safer and consume less resources.
- Seafood companies will receive quicker deliveries of higher quality fish.
- The Naknek River system will not be overburdened with excess salmon above its management goal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody is likely to suffer, except possibly companies selling fuel (less will be consumed).

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Purchasing and using ice machines, transportation equipment, and infrastructure. Cost prohibitive at this time, especially considering the low numbers of fish being harvested (often barely enough to cover fishing expenses).

PROPOSED BY: South Naknek Beach Set Net Association (HQ-F12-170)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Open the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) to set gillnet gear when the Naknek Section is open as follows:

When the Naknek section is open to set gillnet gear also open is all or some (open to negotiation) of the NRSHA to set gillnet gear with 37 1/2 fathoms gear.

ISSUE: I would like the board to address the area open to set gillnet gear during Naknek section set gillnet gear openings.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be a lack of sites to fish, some will not fish due to the lack of a fishable site, unsafe conditions, no beach delivery on the south side, high fuel costs, long delivery times due to travel, weather, etc. Tenders are located in river. Less access to ice for chilling. There is no way for a setnet fishermen to expand or add a permit if you don't have a site to fish. Would open up easier access to local fishermen who might not have all the equipment, bikes, boat etc to fish the outside sites. When escapement is met or beyond this would give setnet fishermen a chance to limit foregone harvest.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the quality is improved with less time holding fish, little to no delivery time, pick and deliver to chilled tenders or company dock. Same tide caught fish delivered to dock. More number 1 fish available to processors. Reasonable and quick access to ice for chilling which would improve quality. Possibly no need for ice with instant pick and deliver option. Enormous fuel savings for fishermen and processors. Much safer conditions for all.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnet fishermen would have more sites to pick from and cost savings and would open up more area to others fishing in the Naknek section.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Keeping the status quo rejected because it doesn't solve the problem.

PROPOSED BY: Jim W. Reynolds (HQ-F12-103)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Limit the amount of gillnet on board a drift vessel to 75 fathoms in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) as follows:

No more than 75 fathoms of drift gillnet gear may be used to take salmon. Gear is considered to be in use if it is aboard the vessel with salmon in it.

ISSUE: The ability of a vessel fishing the Naknek inriver fishery to round haul 75 fathoms, and then throw out another 75 fathoms before picking the first 75 fathoms.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many fishers will continue round hauling the first 75 fathoms, stepping all over them while fishing the next 75. In some cases the first 75 will not get picked in total for many hours, oftentimes being covered with a tarp in the hot sun so as not to interfere with an outgoing net.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It has been solidly shown by digital observers that round hauled fish are of inferior quality. This is also common sense knowledge by anyone who has done so.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Almost all fishers will benefit. The higher the quality of the overall Bristol Bay pack, the higher the perception of Bristol Bay quality and thus our overall price. Further, Bristol Bay will be increasingly subjected to scrutiny by a discriminating press, and a lump of fish and nets does not impress.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It will hurt those who care only of quantity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? In the past I have often fished the Naknek inriver fishery, and personal observations have brought me to feeling that there are no other good solutions. It is not practical to outlaw round-hauling gear as many times it becomes necessary, to avoid obstacles or fishery boundary lines. However, once gear is round-hauled I feel it should be picked before further fishing.

PROPOSED BY: Dave Hansen (HQ-F12-032)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 74 – 5 AAC 06.361. Nushagak-Mulchatna King Salmon Management Plan.

Revise king salmon reference points as follows:

(b) The department shall manage the commercial and sport fisheries in the Nushagak District as follows:

(1) to achieve an inriver goal of XX,XXX [75,000] king salmon present in the Nushagak River upstream from the department sonar counter; the inriver goal provides for

(A) a biological escapement requirement of XX,XXX [65,000] fish;

(C) a king salmon sport fishery guideline harvest level of X,XXX [5,000] fish, 20 inches or greater in length;

(c) If the total inriver king salmon return in the Nushagak River is projected to exceed XX,XXX [75,000] fish, the guideline harvest level described in (b)(1)(C) of this section does not apply.

(d) If the spawning escapement of king salmon in the Nushagak River is projected to be more than XX,XXX [40,000] fish and the projected inriver return is less than XX,XXX [75,000] fish, the commissioner;

(1) shall close, by emergency order, the directed king salmon commercial fishery in the Nushagak District; during a closure under this paragraph, the use of a commercial gillnet with webbing larger than five and one-half inches in another commercial salmon fishery is prohibited;

(2) if the projected inriver return of king salmon in the Nushagak River is at least XX,XXX [55,000], but less than XX,XXX [75,000] fish, and to ensure that sport fishery guideline harvest established in (b)(1)(C) [(b)(2)(C)]of this section is not exceeded, shall establish, by emergency order, a daily bag limit of one fish per day, one in possession for king salmon 20 inches or greater in length;

(3) if the projected inriver return of king salmon in the Nushagak River is less than XX,XXX [55,000] fish, and to ensure that the projected spawning escapement does not fall below XX,XXX [40,000] fish, shall establish, by emergency order, fishing periods to restrict the king salmon sport fishery in the Nushagak River during which any, or a combination of the following restrictions may be applied at the discretion of the commissioner:

(e) If the spawning escapement of king salmon in the Nushagak River is projected to be less than XX,XXX [40,000] fish, the commissioner...

ISSUE: The department operates a sonar counting project on the Nushagak River. Nushagak River is too wide for sonar escapement counts across the entire river because of the effective range of the sonar technology and the bottom profile of the river. The sonar project was designed to count sockeye salmon, which migrate close to shore, and provides an estimate of migrating sockeye salmon. King and chum salmon have also been counted by the sonar in nearshore areas. However, king salmon, and to a lesser extent chum salmon, migrate further offshore. It has also been assumed the sonar counts a consistent proportion of king salmon returning each year.

The department completed the transition from Bendix sonar to DIDSON sonar on the Nushagak River. Due to increased range and resolution, DIDSON sonar is now counting a higher proportion of king salmon migrating up the Nushagak River than was previously possible with Bendix sonar. The king salmon escapement estimates are used to make management decisions

for subsistence, sport, and commercial fisheries. In addition, there are escapement points referenced in the management plan that need to be changed to account for the higher proportion of king salmon being counted. The Bendix sonar-to-DIDSON sonar analysis will not be completed in time to meet the publishing deadline for this proposal. An adjustment factor will be presented by staff and available to the public for review prior to the Bristol Bay Alaska Board of Fisheries meeting. The adjustment factor may result in a change to the king salmon escapement goal and may require adjustments to escapement levels, management trigger points, and terminology in this plan.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will manage for king salmon escapements referenced in the management plan that do not reflect the current sonar technology.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users benefit when the department uses the best available information to make decisions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F12-216)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 06.361. Nushagak-Mulchatna King Salmon Management Plan.

Increase king salmon escapement in the Nushagak River by restricting the drift gillnet fleet as follows:

(e)(1) shall close, by emergency order, the sockeye salmon commercial fishery in the Nushagak District until the projected sockeye salmon escapement into the Wood River exceeds 100,000 fish; **at which time the drift gillnet fleet would be put into the Wood River until the King escapement get 2 days ahead of its escapement forecast.**

(2) shall not open the drift gillnet fishery in the Nushagak Section of the Nushagak District prior to June 28 unless the department can drift gillnets in the Igushik Section of the Nushagak District and may open drift gillnet fishing only in the Wood River Special Harvest Area;

(3) if provision 1 is invoked then sport fishing for Chinook salmon is restricted to a seasonal bag limit of two Chinook salmon. Until such time as the escapement exceeds 55,000 Chinook salmon.

ISSUE: To help the king salmon reach escapement and not to kill off the upper river king run with early netting. This will also help the reds reach their escapement.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We could lose or greatly reduce the King salmon runs on the Nushagak. We could also lose the upper river kings as they are netted in the early season by the gillnet fishermen.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I believe YES, as we allow all salmon (reds and kings) to reach escapement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local people who use the kings for a food source and sport fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I believe no one will suffer from this as there should be more fish in the river system. Both commercial and sport fishermen will suffer if we don't do this.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? ??? Open for ideas.

PROPOSED BY: Save the Nushagak Kings/ Bob Simoni (HQ-F12-010)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 06.320. Fishing periods. Restrict commercial fishing to no more than 3 tides in a 48-hour period and fishing time may not exceed 24 hours in length as follows:

All commercial netting operations cannot exceed 75% of tides in any 48 hour period. Time limits for commercial netting operations cannot exceed 24 hours in any 24 hour period.

ISSUE: Managing the sockeye run to an escapement goal as the only criteria is detrimental to everybody except commercial fisheries. The potential to have several days without sufficient fish in the river is very bad for tourism. It is also not ideal for the ecosystem.

Managing only to a total escapement goal for the sockeye run on the Naknek is not sufficient, and will be harmful to tourism if continued. Managing to just the total escapement goal can result in several days (three-five or more) of commercial netting resulting in very few fish making it into the river during that time. This is severely detrimental to the entire sport fishing industry (lodges, guide services, hotels, restaurants, air taxi services, etc.), and also completely avoidable.

Sport anglers have plenty of choices for fishing trips. Consistency of fish is a high priority for many of these people. Allowing commercial nets to be in the water for extended periods of time over several days kill that consistency. This means that sport anglers run the risk of booking a fishing trip when there are no fish in the river, which defeats the main purpose of the trip. While that variability is part of nature, it should not be imposed by humans.

Think about your own vacation. Would you book a trip to Mexico for sunshine and warm weather if you knew that it would be rainy and cold the ENTIRE time? One or two days out a five to seven day trip would be tolerable, but the ENTIRE time? Even worse, what if that was because somebody in the Mexican government controlled the weather? Suppose that person decided that they had already reached their total amount of sunshine needed for that season, and thus decided to make it rain for one week straight? They could claim that their beaches still average 90 degrees and 300+ days of sunshine per year. They would be correct, but it still resulted in a lousy trip for you. Managing to a total escapement goal for the season with no parameters on a daily or weekly escapement is equivalent.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tourism will decline. Sport lodges, guide services, hotels, and restaurants will suffer.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport lodges, anglers, tourists, hotels, restaurants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody. With no change in the escapement goal, commercial fishing has the same harvest potential.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increasing the escapement goad was rejected due to the negative impact on commercial.

PROPOSED BY: Alan Blinn

(HQ-F12-131)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 06.361. Nushagak - Mulchatna King Salmon Management Plan.

Restrict commercial fishing to no more than 12 hours of commercial fishing in any 24-hour period and no commercial fishing on consecutive high tides if there has been any sport fishing restrictions placed on the Nushagak as follows:

The Nushagak / Mulchatna River Chinook management plan calls for the burden of conservation to be placed solely on the sport fishing user group. There is nothing in this plan that calls for restrictions of any effort by the commercial fishing fleet of Bristol Bay if the Chinook Salmon run is falling short of expectations. In essence, the commercial fleet could have non-stop commercial openers in the Nushagak District while the sport fishers are not even allowed to catch and release Chinook. This simply does not make sense. The plan is an "In-river" conservation effort in such that the river has a set amount of fish and the only way to increase the number of fish to escapement is through limitations on the sport caught fish. In 2010, the entire sport fish user group for the Nushagak River was approximately 4,500 fish. Protection and effort to increase escapement happens in season after the returning numbers fall below expectations and thus the maximum biological gain in increased escapement would only be a small fraction of the entire minimum escapement goal of 75,000 fish as set forth by the management plan. For instance, if the 2014 run were coming in lower numbers than expected, and the management plan called for the sport fishery to go to catch and release only on July 1 (approximate mid point of the run), the net result in additional Kings making it to escapement would be maybe 2,000 fish. In comparison, the commercial fishery, even while implementing smaller mesh size on their nets, still has an intercept impact on the Chinook salmon. With approximately 450 drift gillnet permit holders fishing in the Nushagak District alone (not counting setnets), there is the potential for the commercial fleet to intercept 900 Chinook salmon in a 12 hour period, assuming a 12 hour opener and only two sets per vessel happening in that opener. The commercial fleet has also had openers on every high tide even while the Chinook salmon runs have been falling short of expectations (2010). In addition, the number of Chinook salmon that are sent home in "Home packs" from the commercial fleet is alarming and unregulated.

The solution would be to not allow more than 12 hours of commercial fishing in a 24 hour period, nor could there be commercial openers on consecutive high tides, if there have been any restrictions put on the sport fishing user group due to the shortage of returning Chinook Salmon per the Nushagak / Mulchatna Management plan.

ISSUE: The decline in Chinook Salmon making it back to the Nushagak River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Chinook salmon run on the Nushagak River provides a tremendous economic opportunity for those in the sport fishing business. The ability for the sport fishing industry to market to the world the opportunity and then the realization to catch a Chinook Salmon brings a willingness for the potential visitor to pay for that opportunity. As the population of returning fish dwindles, and threats of potential closures to the sport fishing industry loom, the potential visitor is more likely to choose not to pay to visit the area. Visitor dollars that are new to the region are re-spent six times before leaving the region. This is a tremendous economic engine for the sport fish, visitor industry, and communities of the region. If we do not protect the Chinook Salmon run through various means

of conservation of the fish prior to entering the Nushagak River, we will ultimately lose the marketing battle for those outside dollars to other fishing and travel destinations throughout the world.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By implementing conservation measures that would allow more Chinook Salmon to enter the Nushagak River, we will encourage more and more sport fishing opportunities which will encourage the industry to grow and continue to provide millions of dollars to the Bristol Bay economy. A recent economic study shows that the Bristol Bay sport fishing industry brings almost \$100M a season in revenue to the state of Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The health of the Chinook salmon resource would be the biggest benefactor of adopting this proposal. All user groups would ultimately benefit since a stronger and stronger Chinook run on the Nushagak will mean that future restrictions in future years will be less likely and thus the impact on the commercial fishery will be minimized. However, if we wait until the Chinook run is at a crisis level and continue to rely solely on the sport fish users for conservation measures we will ultimately need to place more restrictive and potentially drastic measures on all user groups--including severe limitations on commercial openers. We are better served now to address the issue, make sacrifices with all user groups participating in order to ensure the longevity and survival and ultimate increase in the Chinook population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? At first, the commercial fishing fleet will potentially see some restrictions on opener lengths or times. However, as I stated above, the short term sacrifices will result in a long term sustainable gain as we allow the Chinook population to return to sustainable levels. Remember, these restrictions would only go into effect IF there are also restrictions on the sport fish user group. Thus both industries would be making a sacrifice in order to protect the resource.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Not allowing a commercial opener on consecutive high tides until 75% of the expected Chinook escapement has made it into the Nushagak River.

This was rejected because it is too restricting on the commercial user group. It also would be in place regardless if the sport fish user group were making any effort through restrictions. The intent is to have both groups that impact the resource do something in the way of sacrificing to protect the run. Thus this idea was rejected.

2) Move the commercial fleet into the Wood River if the Nushagak Chinook run was falling short of escapement goals.

This idea has merit but it could be too restricting on the commercial fleet. For example, the sockeye run was coming in very strong yet the Chinook run was weak. The proposal I have set forth still allows for the fleet to have commercial openers within the district without going to an in-river fishery. Thus the economic opportunities for the comfishers will still be there. By moving the fleet into the Wood River special management area, the fleet would lose economic opportunity. Thus this idea for the purposes of this proposal was rejected.

PROPOSED BY: Brian Kraft

(HQ-F12-177)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 78 – 5 AAC 06.358. Wood River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Revise sockeye salmon escapement reference points as follows:

(c) The commissioner may open, by emergency order, the Wood River Special Harvest Area when

(1) the department projects that the sockeye salmon escapement into the Wood River will exceed 700,000 fish and as follows;

(A) if the preseason forecast for the Nushagak River sockeye salmon run is at least 1,000,000 fish, the department shall manage the Nushagak District to exceed a minimum **sustainable** [BIOLOGICAL] escapement goal of XXX,XXX [340,000] sockeye salmon to the Nushagak River, and the commissioner may open the Wood River Special Harvest Area only when department projections indicate the Nushagak River sockeye salmon escapement will not exceed XXX,XXX [340,000] fish;

(B) if the preseason forecast for the Nushagak River sockeye salmon run is less than 1,000,000 fish and the ratio of Wood River to Nushagak River sockeye salmon is projected to be greater than three to one, the department shall manage the Nushagak District for an optimal escapement goal of at least XXX,XXX [235,000] sockeye salmon to the Nushagak River, and the commissioner may open the Wood River Special Harvest Area only when department projections indicate the Nushagak River sockeye salmon escapement will be less than XXX,XXX [235,000] fish;

(C) if the inseason forecast prepared by the department during the first week of July for the Nushagak River sockeye salmon run is at least 1,000,000 fish, the department shall manage the Nushagak District to exceed a minimum biological escapement goal of XXX,XXX [340,000] sockeye salmon to the Nushagak River, and the commissioner may open the Wood River Special Harvest Area only when department projections indicate the Nushagak River sockeye salmon escapement will be less than XXX,XXX [340,000] fish;

(D) if the inseason forecast prepared by the department during the first week of July for the Nushagak River sockeye salmon run is less than 1,000,000 fish, the department may open the Wood River Special Harvest Area only when department projections indicate the Nushagak River sockeye salmon escapement will be less than XXX,XXX [235,000] fish;

ISSUE: The department operates a salmon sonar counting project on the Nushagak River. Nushagak River is considered too wide for sonar escapement counts across the entire river because of the effective range of sonar technology and the bottom profile of the river. The sonar project was originally designed to count sockeye salmon, which migrate close to shore, and is believed to provide fairly good estimates of migrating sockeye salmon. It has also been assumed that the sonar project has counted a consistent proportion of sockeye salmon returning each year.

The department has completed the transition from Bendix sonar to DIDSON sonar on the Nushagak River. Due to increased range and resolution, DIDSON sonar is now counting a higher proportion of sockeye salmon migrating up the Nushagak River than was previously possible with Bendix sonar. Sockeye salmon escapement estimates are used to make management decisions for subsistence, sport, and commercial fisheries. In addition, there are escapement reference points in the management plan that may need to be changed to account for

the higher proportion of sockeye salmon being counted. An adjustment factor may be presented to the board when the Bendix sonar-to-DIDSON sonar analysis is complete.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will manage for sockeye salmon action points that do not reflect the current sonar technology.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users benefit when the department uses the best available information to make decisions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F12-215)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 06.358. Wood River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Allow separate drift and set gillnet fishing periods in the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA) and require all running lines, anchors, and buoys shall be removed from the water during drift periods as follows:

(4) (f) The drift gillnet and set gillnet fisheries will open separately.

1) The following provisions apply to set gillnet openings in the WRSSSHA.

a) set gillnet running lines, buoys, and anchoring devices may not be in the water during a drift gillnet fishing period.

b) when a set gillnet fishery is occurring, the provisions of (a) of this subsection does not apply.

ISSUE: Congestion in the Wood River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area. When the Wood River Special Harvest Area is open to fishing, both gear types are allowed to fish concurrently. With both set and drift operators fishing, congestion and gear conflict occurs between gear types especially in the lower harvest area. The allocation ratio's in the harvest area between gear types is consistent with the outer Nushagak District. Consequently the set gear type fishes continually 24.7 while the drift operators cease fishing to balance the allocation ratio specific to 5 AAC 06.358.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If status quo, then continued congestion in the Wood River Special Harvest Area by both gear types. Most setnet operators prefer the lower district because their harvest diminishes further upstream. Consequently, a small percentage of the Nushagak Set Gear operators fish in Wood River because of limited productive sites.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both drift and set gillnet operators with less gear conflict and congestion.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Set gillnet operators. Each time the WRSSSHA has been open, the drift gillnet fishermen have to stop fishing to keep the allocation ratio's balanced. If there were alternating openings between gear types, setnetters would give up their non-stop fishing.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make everyone a drifter but have separate openings. Not allowed in State Statute.

If this proposal were adopted, allow setnet fishermen to anchor their nets anywhere in the WRSSSHA regardless of distance offshore. Not allowed in State Statute.

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee

(HQ-F12-123)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 06.358(d). Wood River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Allow separate drift and set gillnet fishing periods in the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA) as follows:

Allow separate and alternating openings between drift and setnet fishermen during the Wood River Special Harvest fishery.

ISSUE: The Wood River Special Harvest Area. Modify the management plan to allow separate openings between drift fishermen and setnet fishermen. This would reduce gear conflict between gear types.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have frenzied and hectic openings, gear conflicts and turmoil.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will prevent congestion in a small area in the Wood River Special Harvest Fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both gear types.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make everyone a drifter but still have separate and alternating openings between permit types.

PROPOSED BY: Kenny Wilson (HQ-F12-043)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 06.358(d)(4). Wood River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Allow up to 150 fathoms on board a drift gillnet vessel when fishing in the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA) as follows:

Same wording as NRSWA 5 AAC 06.360.

ISSUE: WRSHA – NRSWA. Both harvest areas allow 75 fathoms for drift gillnet. NRSWA allows for 75 fathoms which can be on the vessel, with fish in it – while another 75 fathoms is in the water fishing.

WRSHA allows for 75 fathoms which can be on the vessel, with fish in it – while the other 75 fathoms has to be bagged. AAC 06.358 (4)

Change WRSHA. Make it the same as NRSWA.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Age old problem of trying to prevent over escapement to the Wood River.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Drift Fishermen. ADF&G will have “stronger” tools in trying to control fish movement into the Wood River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? My crew.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other Solutions might be - Forget about the WRSHA. Prior to the WRSHA fishermen fished in the outer Nushagak District since around 1882. The Nushagak sockeye run never collapsed or went extinct.

PROPOSED BY: Daniel Farren (HQ-F12-046)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 06.358. Wood River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area.

Allow dual drift gillnet vessels to have up to 200 fathoms on board in the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA) as follows:

Change the 150 fathoms to 200 fathoms. Nothing else changes.

ISSUE: Dual permit operators who fish the Wood River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area have to unload 50 fathoms of gear from their vessels to legally participate in the fishery. Current regulation is specific to 150 fathoms allowed. **“(D) a person may not have more than 150 fathoms of drift gillnet on board a vessel;”**

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Dual permit operators could inadvertently fish the Wood River Special Harvest Area with 200 fathoms of gear on board. Potential for citation is at risk.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Dual permit operators who will not have to unload 50 fathoms of gear off their fishing vessels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (HQ-F12-127)

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

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 06.358. Wood River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area

Management Plan. When the Nushagak District is closed and the Wood River Special Harvest Area (WRSHA) is open, allow set gillnet permit holders to remain in the Nushagak District with 25 fathoms of gear as follows:

Whenever the Wood River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area is open and the Nushagak District is closed to Commercial Fishing, setnet fishermen are allowed to fish one half of their legal compliment of gear (25 ftms) in the Nushagak District.

ISSUE: Limited participation by setnet fishermen in the Wood River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area because they are not “mobile”. When the WRSSSHA is open and when the Nushagak District is closed to commercial fishing, setnet fishermen who do not have the resources or skiffs to fish the Special Harvest Area do not have the opportunity to fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued inability for setnet fishermen in the Nushagak District to harvest fish.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnet fishermen who do not fish the WRSSSHA.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (HQ-F12-125)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 06.358. Wood River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area

Management Plan. Allow dual set gillnet permit holders to have up to 50 fathoms of gear on board and fish two sites with up to 25 fathoms at each site as follows:

(d) When the Wood River Special Harvest Area is open under this section, the following apply within the open waters:

(1) set gillnets may be operated only as follows:

(A) a set gillnet may not exceed 25 fathoms in length;

(B) a set gillnet may not be set or operated within 150 feet of another set gillnet;

(C) a person may not place any part of a set gillnet, anchor, peg stake, buoy, or other device to set the gillnet, more than 250 feet from the terrestrial vegetation line of a bank of the Wood River, during the operation of the set gillnet; for purposes of this section “a bank of the Wood River” does not include the banks of any island of the Wood River;

(D) a set gillnet must be operated in a substantially straight line perpendicular to the nearest bank of the Wood River;

(E) a person may not have more than 50 fathoms of set gillnet, per CFEC set gillnet permit, on board a vessel.

(3) a CFEC setnet permit holder may not use more than one site to take salmon at any one time. Except in accordance with 5 AAC 06.331(u), a person who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet permits may not use more than two sites to take salmon at any one time.

ISSUE: Adoption of 5 AAC 06.331(u) resulted in an unanticipated inconsistency with 5 AAC 06.358 which has been interpreted to only allow a dual setnet permit holder to operate one of their entry permits within the Wood River Special Harvest Area and made it illegal for them to store the gear for both permits on board their skiff while inside the special harvest area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current interpretation of 5 AAC 06.358 places an encumbrance on a dual permits holder’s second permit by restricting their ability to utilize that permit in the Wood River Special Harvest Area. Additionally, a person who holds two Bristol Bay set gillnet permits cannot travel from the fishing grounds with their full complement of gear and legally enter the special harvest area. Restricting dual permit holders to one site within the Wood River Special Harvest Area is inconsistent with the original intent of the dual setnet permit proposal – that dual setnet permit holders shall fish the permits in the same manner as if held by two separate permit holders with no greater privileges or encumbrances.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Nushagak setnet fishers who will no longer be subject to fishing restrictions not originally intended when 5 AAC 06.331(u) was adopted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Persons who hold two Bristol Bay set gillnet permits who will not be able to fish their permits as originally intended when 5 AAC 06.331(u) was adopted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dylan Braund and Tom Rollman Jr (HQ-F12-146)

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

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 06.3XX. Togiak River King Salmon Management Plan. Create a Togiak River King Salmon Management Plan similar to the Nushagak River Plan.

Develop a Togiak River King Salmon Management Plan similar to the existing Nushagak-Mulchatna King Salmon Management Plan.

ISSUE: Enhance the management for the Togiak River King Salmon for all user groups in the Togiak River Section and to ensure the local subsistence uses of kings are not negatively affected as in other areas of the state.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be less kings salmon for all user groups to harvest in the future.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. All the different user groups will have a better tool for planning of having a real quality experience in participating in their own area of the king fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All the historical users of the king salmon, especially the local subsistence users of this important resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None known as of this writing.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Togiak Traditional Village Council (HQ-F12-179)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 06.3XX. Togiak River Coho Salmon Management Plan. Create a Togiak River coho salmon management plan similar to Nushagak River plan as follows:

Develop a Togiak River Coho Salmon Management Plan similar to the existing Nushagak River Coho Salmon Management Plan.

ISSUE: Enhance the management for the Togiak River Coho Salmon for all user groups in the Togiak River Section and to ensure the local subsistence uses of Coho are not negatively affected as in other areas of the state. Furthermore, there has been very little active management of this important resource primarily for the commercial fishery in the Togiak River section in the last decade. Therefore, it has become harder for market planning to harvest the surplus for commercial fishery thus resulting in loss of economic opportunity for those who would like to participate in what could continue to be a viable opportunity to help provide the need for extra cash to pay for high cost of energy and fuel in surrounding communities.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be less coho salmon for all user groups to harvest in the future.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. All the different user groups will have a better tool for planning of having a real quality experience in participating in their own area of the existing coho fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All the historical users of the coho salmon, especially the local commercial and subsistence users of this important resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None known as of this writing.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Togiak Traditional Village Council (HQ-F12-180)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 06.369. Togiak District Salmon Management Plan. Change the waiving period to July 24 if escapement goal is projected to exceed 175,000 before July 27 as follows:

The department may waive the requirements of this paragraph after 9:00 a.m. (NEW) **July 24** if the department projects that the Togiak River escapement will exceed 175,000 sockeye salmon before 9:00 a.m. July 27. This would align the added three days of protection at the last BOF cycle.

ISSUE: The department may waive the requirements of this paragraph after 9:00 a.m. July 21 if the department projects that the Togiak River escapement will exceed 175,000 sockeye salmon before 9:00 a.m. July 27. The last BOF added three days of protection this would be aligning that effort.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In early strong returns and run timing and years of early escapement the Department might feel pressure to open the fishery earlier than July 27.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality is always on the BB fisherman’s mind and industry is finally rewarding that peace of the puzzle.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Locals knowing an early run might not open the fishery any earlier than July 24th to preserve this already small run.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fisherman that have already registered and hit the peak in other districts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leave it the same but aligning the dates makes sense.

PROPOSED BY: Togiak Traditional Council (HQ-F12-186)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

Proposal 238 was submitted prior to the proposal deadline for the 2012-2013 Board of Fisheries' cycle, but was inadvertently omitted from the proposal book. This proposal will be considered by the board at its BRISTOL BAY FINFISH meeting scheduled for December 4-12, 2012.

PROPOSAL 238 – 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet gear in Bristol Bay. Allow one permit holder who owns two drift gillnet permits to use 200 fathoms drift gillnet gear, and operate the gear from a single vessel.

In the Bristol Bay Salmon Drift Net Fishery one individual may hold two Limited Entry permits for that fishery in his or her name and fish those permits on one vessel. The vessel fishing in the dual permit configuration may fish no more than a total of 200 fathoms of gear. (This is one hundred fathoms or 33% less than would be fished by those two permits if the permits were operated separately).

ISSUE: Presently only setnet fisherman are allowed to have two permits in the name of the same person for the purpose of “permit stacking”. Drift fisherman should be afforded the same ability in regard to holding permits in one name. The present regulation is cumbersome and does not allow the same advantage of being able to responsibly invest in their business by owning and fishing two permits. The second problem that exists that is addressed by this proposal is the issue of too many permits in the Bristol Bay Drift Salmon Fishery. The optimum number range established in 2005 by CFEC is 900-1400 permits. Presently there are over 1800 permits in the Bristol Bay Salmon Drift Net Fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Bristol Bay Salmon Drift Net Fishery will continue to be plagued by too many boats and the economic sustainability of the fishery will be challenged at best. Creating regulation that allows two permits to be held and fished by the same individual will reduce the number of boats fishing, reduce the amount of gear in the water by 10,000 fathoms for every 100 permits that fish in the dual configuration and make the fishery more manageable, orderly and profitable for all participants.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the ability to fish two permits reduces the number of boats fishing. The fishery will become economically sustainable to the extent that individuals can responsibly invest revenue into technology that will improve overall quality; refrigeration, salmon slides, vessel improvement specific to raising product quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fisherman will benefit. Every permit that fishes in the dual configuration will be one less permit operating a separate 150 fathom unit of gear. The CPUE for each boat in the fishery, dual permit or single will increase. There will be less crowding as a result of fewer boats. The fishery should become more manageable from an enforcement perspective given the reduction in the number of boats.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I truly believe that this proposal represents a win-win situation for all participants for all of the reasons previously mentioned.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Matthew Luck.

(HQ-F12-251)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

Proposal 239 is a board-generated proposal created by the board at its October 2012 meeting. This proposal will be considered by the board at its BRISTOL BAY FINFISH meeting scheduled for December 4-12, 2012.

PROPOSAL 239 – 5 AAC 67.022(g)(6). Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Limit sport and guided sport fishing for king salmon in the Nushagak River drainage, excluding the Wood River drainage, to unbaited, single-hook, artificial lures from May 1 through July 31, as follows:

(g) In the Nushagak River drainage, excluding the Wood River drainage, and unless otherwise specified in 5 AAC 06.361 or 5 AAC 06.368, the following special provisions apply:

(6) only unbaited, single-hook, artificial lures may be used May 1 through July 31.

ISSUE: Anglers on the Nushagak River anecdotally catch and release many king salmon per angler per day during periods of high king salmon abundance. Regulations allow the use of multiple hook lures and bait raising concerns of catch and release related mortality in the fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Anglers will continue to use bait, which is demonstrated to result in higher catch rates relative to when bait is not used, and may contribute to release related mortality, and multiple hook lures in the sport king salmon fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, though if fewer king salmon are caught and released, the harvested fish may be less likely to suffer hook related injury.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who wants to reduce catch rates of king salmon by sport anglers on the Nushagak River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anglers who use bait and/or treble hooks to catch king salmon in the Nushagak River sport fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Board of Fisheries. (HQ-F12-XXX)

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

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____