

BRISTOL BAY FINFISH

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 01.335. Limits on participation in subsistence finfish fisheries.

Amend this regulation as follows:

While one resides at a sportfishing lodge one may not participate in subsistence fishing activities unless the lodge is also your year-round residence.

ISSUE: Commercial sportfishing lodge personnel operate subsistence nets and potentially feed or give subsistence-caught fish to clients.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lodges that illegally provide subsistence fish to clients will have an advantage over legally operating lodges.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Legal lodge operators.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who live at a lodge part of the year and currently subsistence fish while at the lodge.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No one at a sportfishing lodge may participate in subsistence activities.

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (SW-06F-016)

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 77.2XX. Bristol Bay Personal Use Salmon Fishery. Adopt a new regulation as follows:

Allow a salmon opening for personal use from May 1 through May 15.

ISSUE: Have a commercial salmon opening for personal use, starting May 1 through May 15 so no one needs to travel across the bay for herring.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No development of potential markets. Loss of time and money.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Beginning stages of resource development.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Limited salmon permit holders.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Local subsistence harvesters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Harvesting herring at Togiak. Using leftover salmon parts.

PROPOSED BY: Corrine A. Olsen (HQ-06F-010)

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 27.865. Bristol Bay Herring Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

30 percent gillnetter and 70 percent seiners – neither harvest depends on the other reaching an amount of harvest. At the beginning of the year the split is decided and half way through the department makes in-season adjustments if needed.

ISSUE: The way the 30/70 split between gillnetters and seiners is handled.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Loss of harvesting quality product. Lower price to fishermen.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. We would take fish when they are ready not letting them pass by.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Processors and fishermen – each group would not be shut down when good fish are there waiting on others to catch the product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Remove allocation of 30/70 altogether.

PROPOSED BY: Roseleen Moore (HQ-06F-020)

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 27.865. Bristol Bay Herring Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(b)(8) The department shall manage for a removal of 35 percent of that surplus by the gillnet fleet and 65 percent by the purse seine fleet.

ISSUE: More equitable harvest of surplus of Togiak herring between gillnet and purse seine fishermen.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Local people who comprise most of the gillnet group will continue to loose opportunity to harvest a more equitable share of harvestable surplus of the local herring resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The gillnet caught Togiak herring have historically become more of a better roe quality product. Therefore the increase in the gillnet harvest will enhance the overall quality of the resource harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local Bristol Bay village residents and local businesses that help to improve the living conditions and overall economy on the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few purse seine fishermen that usually fish elsewhere in the state before coming to the Togiak herring fishing grounds.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Increase the gillnet quota to 50 percent. This seems a little too drastic at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Kenneth Wilson (SW-06F-011)

PROPOSAL. 11- 5 AAC 27.810. Fishing Seasons and Periods for Bristol Bay Area.

Amend the regulation as follows:

5 AAC 27.810. Fishing Seasons and Periods for Bristol Bay Area. (a) In the Togiak and Bay Districts, herring may be taken by purse seines and hand purse seines from **April 15** [APRIL 25] through June 1.

(b) In the Togiak and Bay Districts, herring may be taken by gillnets from **April 15** [APRIL 25] through June 1.

(c) In the Togiak and Bay Districts, herring spawn on kelp may be from **April 15** [APRIL 25] through June 1.

ISSUE: Herring run timing has been earlier over the last several years and, if this trend continues, harvestable stocks of herring might be available before April 25. Under current regulations, no fishing would be allowed before April 25. With the current quotas and processing capacity, every day of processing is important in order to harvest and process the entire quota. In recent years compressed run timing and poor weather have resulted in some of the quota left unharvested.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is done, opportunity to harvest herring prior to April 25 will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Adoption of this proposal may allow the herring harvest to be spread out over a longer period of time, reducing the time that fish are held and thus improving product quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users would benefit from harvesting herring as soon as they arrive on the spawning grounds and the roe percentage is suitable for harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06F-165)

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 27.832. Seine specifications and operations for Bristol Bay Area.

Amend this regulation as follows:

(c) Herring may not be retained in a purse seine for more than **18** [36] hours after the closure of a herring fishing period.

ISSUE: The current regulation allows herring to be held in purse seines for 36 hours following a closure, creating the possibility that some participants may try to hold herring in their seines

while tenders take multiple loads from large sets. This may allow for the harvest of more fish than tender and processing capacity would indicate during a fishing period. As the quota is approached, this may hamper the manager's ability to stay within the quota.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If nothing is done, purse seiners will be allowed to hold fish for 36 hours after a closure making it difficult to control harvest as the quota is approached.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Herring held in purse seines for a shorter duration would likely be of higher quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The resource and the resource users would benefit because managers would be better able to manage the fishery and keep the total harvest within the quota.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This has not been an issue since the early 1990s so the department believes that no one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06F-166)

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 27.834. Togiak District Herring Spawn on Kelp Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Select a harvester/fisherman to harvest the roe-on-kelp quota.

ISSUE: Herring fishery/roe-on-kelp.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Roe-on-kelp harvesters will never have a chance to get any benefits of the fishery and still keep paying for permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, roe-on-kelp harvesters want equal share of the quota.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All the roe-on-kelp permit holders.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the herring fishery for recovery, but we figured Board of fisheries wants it like California herring fishery.

PROPOSED BY: Togiak Traditional Council (SW-06F-033)

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations and 5 AAC 06.33X. Holder of Multiple Permits. Amend these regulations as follows:

Add the following regulation (also requiring amendment of 5 AAC 06.331(c) and (e)) to come

onto effect immediately following the enactment of HB 251.

5 AAC 06.33X. Holder of Mutiple Permits.

a) Except within special harvest areas described and defined in 5AAC 06.357, 06.358, 06.360, the holder of two Bristol Bay drift gillnet CFEC permits may fish and operate 200 fathoms of drift gillnet gear from a single vessel.

b) The vessel and multiple permit holder may fish and transfer to other districts upon notification and registration with the department as required in 5AAC 06.370; however, the 48-hour district transfer notification period normally required is waived for multiple permit holders.

c) When a holder of multiple uses a single vessel, the vessel must display its ADF&G permanent license plate number followed by the letter "M" to identify the vessel as a multiple permit vessel. The identification number and letter must be displayed in accordance with 5AAC 06.343.

ISSUE: The need for consolidation in the Bristol Bay fishery; the problem of long-term profitability and high harvesting cost and the future expense of funding a buyback program.

The CFEC in its Bristol Bay salmon drift gillnet fishery optimum number report addressed the issue of economic viability, along with resource conservation and management concerns, and it identified the optimum number of Bristol Bay drift permits was identified as a number in the range of 800 to 1200. The CFEC discussed certain methods to eliminate the 600 or so permits from the Bristol Bay area and noted its support of the boards temporary regulation changes that had allowed for some limited voluntary consolidation maintaining existing permit numbers, i.e., 5 AAC 06.333., in recent years.

In anticipation of House Bill 251 being enacted into law in the near future, the board will be given authority to take further measures and make more permanent regulatory changes to encourage voluntary consolidation of permits in the Bristol Bay fishery. If passed and signed by the governor, HB 251 would allow the Board to assign additional fishing privileges to persons who hold two commercial fishing entry permits in the same salmon fishery. "Those added privileges mat include the use of additional or modified gear; additional fishing time or expanded fishing areas; or other such conditions as the Board considers appropriate for the conservation, development, and/or utilization of the salmon fishery resource."

Accordingly, in anticipation of HB 251 becoming law before the next call for proposals for the Bristol Bay fishery, I would like to propose the following additions to the Bristol Bay fishery regulations which would encourage further voluntary consolidation of permits and achieve the goals outlined by the CFEC's optimum number report.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The problem of low profits and thus, lack of funds to pay crew members, to reinvest into improving quality of fish handling or to maintain equipment on vessels will continue to plague the Bristol Bay fishery until some type of consolidation effort is achieved.

Action should be taken immediately upon enactment of HB 251. But if action is not taken during this cycle of proposals in anticipation of HB 251 being enacted in the immediate future, arguably the Board will not be able to entertain any change in the regulations to take advantage of HB 251 until the 2010 season. The sponsor's statement includes the following, "The Board would only be able to hear this type of request in its normal, three-year cycle; agenda change requests would not be allowed."

Allowing multiple permit holders to take advantage of additional gear and additional fishing time will encourage harvesters to voluntarily consolidate permits and thus avoid high cost of any type of funded buyback program to achieve the optimum number of 800 to 1200 permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? As noted above and in several reports, including the Bristol Bay Salmon Restructuring Study, it is imperative to our long-term market survival that harvesters start improving the quality of product coming out of the Bristol Bay area. Harvesters cannot start investing money into the boats and equipment to start utilizing ice, CSW or RSW equipment until greater profits are realized.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those that can finance or fund the purchase of a second permit will benefit with the ability to hold two permits and fish them on one vessel, with 220 fathoms of gear and without any 48-hour transfer period. Every fisherman in the bay will benefit from this consolidation, especially when compared to the options of funding a buyback program through taxes.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Only those that wish to buy a second permit, but cannot, will arguably find this proposal inequitable. But, even they will acknowledge a benefit with the ultimate reduction in the number of boats and amount of gear in the water which will increase their ability to catch more fish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Erick Sabo (HQ-06F-007)

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow anyone who owns two setnet permits to operate them in accordance with existing regulations and anyone who owns two drift permits to be allowed to fish them in accordance with 5 AAC 06.333.

ISSUE: A person may own two permits but he can only fish one at a time. HB251 gives the board the authority to allow one person to own and operate two permits at the same time. I am asking the board to allow anyone who owns two setnet permits to be allowed to fish them at the same time and anyone who owns two drift permits to be allowed to fish them in accordance with 5 AAC 06.333.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be no benefit to anyone who owns two permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any fisherman who buys two fishing permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one because the permits have been fished in the past.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Vince Webster (SW-06F-021)

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

(R) Notwithstanding 5 AAC 39.105.(d)(3), **in the Bristol Bay area** a person may not operate a drift gillnet when the vessel to which it is attached is grounded, or when any part of the gillnet is grounded above the waterline [IN THE

- (1) UGASHIK RIVER SPECIAL HARVEST AREA DESCRIBED IN 5 AAC 06.357;
- (2) WOOD RIVER SPECIAL HARVEST AREA DESCRIBED IN 5 AAC 06.358;
- (3) EGEK RIVER SPECIAL HARVEST AREA DESCRIBED IN 5 AAC 06.359; AND
- (4) NAKNEK RIVER SPECIAL HARVEST AREA DESCRIBED IN 5 AAC 06.360.]

ISSUE: Adopting into regulation a definition of a drift gillnet in Bristol Bay that is enforceable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The continuation of a regulation defining drift gillnetting in Bristol Bay that is not enforceable.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen and public safety that support enforceable regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who are allowing their vessels or nets to be grounded to harvest more fish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Kenneth Wilson (SW-06F-012)

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

Remove the following regulation. 5 AAC 06.331(q). [DURING THE HOURS BETWEEN SUNSET AND SUNRISE, ASCH GILLNET MUST DISPLAY A LIGHT. FOR DRIFT GILLNETS, THE LIGHT MUST BE LOCATED AT THE END OF THE NET FURTHEST FROM THE FISHING VESSEL. FOR SET GILLNETS, THE LIGHT MUST BE A BLINKING WHITE LIGHT AND MUST BE LOCATED AT THE END OF THE NET FURTHEST FROM THE SHORE].

ISSUE: Net night lights – remove the regulation. Navigation lighting is something we all do to the best equipment will allow.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No tickets for batteries and night lights not working.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The entire fleet.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, the net lights are poorly made. We would still use them but would not be ticketed if they do not work.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Roseleen Moore (HQ-06F-019)

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 06.334(a). Identification of gear. Amend this regulation as follows:

Remove the requirement of marking nets every 10 fathoms on corks, on drift gillnet gear

ISSUE: Marking at the ends, by burning the numbers into the cork, or with paint. This does not help Fish and Game and is a risk to fishermen.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Tickets will be given to those who are trying to comply with the rule as they do not stay marked. Tide water washes the marks off. This does not help Fish and Game and is a risk to fishermen.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. The point system makes it necessary to correct this.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Maybe protection, but I do not think it will help them.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Burning numbers in corks – timely to do. With the painting of corks – paint does not stay on.

PROPOSED BY: Roseleen Moore (HQ-06F-021)

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

All setnet gear, lines, anchors, stakes, buoys, kegs etc. shall be removed from any and all waters during any and all driftnet only openings used by management to enforce any Bristol Bay commercial salmon fishing allocation plan.

ISSUE: Add the requirement to remove all setnet gear during driftnet only gear openings and use to enforce the Bristol Bay commercial fishery allocation plans.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Currently Alaska Statute 16.10.55 states: “Interference with Commercial Fishing Gear” which states “A person who willfully or with reckless disregard for the consequences, interferes with or damages the commercial fishing gear

of another is guilty of a misdemeanor. For the purpose of this section “interference” means the physical disturbance of gear which results in a economic loss or loss of fishing time, and “reckless disregard of the consequences” means a lack of consideration of one’s acts in a manner that is reasonably likely to damage the property of another.”

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both drift and set commercial gear groups in Bristol Bay, to prevent the loss of property, including both set net and drift net gear during drift only openings, clearly defined in AS 16.10.055.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? N/A.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? These allocation plans benefit both user groups, another solution to solve this issue by tossing these allocation plans, does not appeal to either user group.

PROPOSED BY: Todd Granger (HQ-06F-088)

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 06.331. Gillnet Specifications and Operations. Amend this regulation by adding a new subsection as follows:

(t) Permit holders who lose gillnets while fishing must report the lost net to the nearest ADF&G office within 15 hours of the loss.

ISSUE: Inevitably, fishing gear will be lost while prosecuting a fishery. Gear may be lost accidentally or purposely cut loose. There are no records to show how much gear is lost and/or retrieved. Every year, lost nets surface and the circumstances under which the gear was lost are unknown. There are approximately 1,400 permit holders fishing in Bristol Bay, each with 150 fathoms of gill net. If a small percentage of gear is lost annually, “ghost fishing” in Bristol Bay could be problematic. The problem may or may not be pervasive but a reporting requirement would reveal the extent of the gear loss. A regulatory reporting requirement would give the department a means to track the amount of gear lost each year and could facilitate retrieval of the gear.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Permit holders will continue to lose gear that will remain unreported. It will remain unknown how much gear is lost each year and gear retrieval will be less likely. Lost nets may become a navigational hazard and may reduce fishing opportunity for others.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This regulation is not likely to improve the quality of the resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Reporting may provide an incentive to discourage permit holders from losing gear. By reducing the amount of lost gear, the amount of fish trapped in ghost nets would be reduced, resulting in more fish available for harvest. Reported losses of gear would also make retrieval more likely, eliminating a navigation hazard.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06F-167)

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow one person to own and benefit from the permit stacking privileges granted by the board in the Bristol Bay driftnet fishery as allowed by 2006 legislation.

ISSUE: Too many participants in the Bristol Bay fishery as indicated in the Commercial Fish Entry Commission's optimum number study. Present regulations allow vessels to "stack" permits provided that the permits are held by different individuals. Allowing the two permits to be held by one individual will reduce the transactional difficulties in having separately owned permits on one vessel.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The incentive to "stack" permits will not be sufficient to adequately reduce the amount of gear on the grounds contributing to continued economic distress, management difficulty and enforcement of the regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. With fewer vessels, quality problems inherent in line fisheries will be reduced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bristol Bay drift permit holders and crews as fewer vessels and less gear per permit will give more opportunity for the remaining vessels and fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who are satisfied with crowded fishing grounds, low returns on their commercial fishing businesses and substandard fish quality.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Additional privileges for stacking with two separate permit holders on board, however, the transactional difficulties would still not be resolved.

PROPOSED BY: Charles W. Treinen (HQ-06F-044)

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow an individual owning two permits to fish an additional 50 fathoms of driftnet gear or such other additional fishing privileges the board deems appropriate.

ISSUE: Effective June 28, 2006, House Bill 251 authorizes the board to grant additional fishing privileges to individuals owning two permits in a salmon fishery. The current regulation allows a vessel with two separate permit holders onboard to fish an additional 50 fathoms of driftnet gear. The requirement of two separate permit holders onboard the vessel is now inconsistent with legislative intent.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current regulation unfairly denies the owner of two permits the same additional fishing privileges now granted to a permit holder who has an additional permit owner onboard his vessel.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal standing alone does not improve quality. Yet adoption of the proposal fosters and promotes an environment of change necessary to make quality improvements.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Individuals owning two permits will now have the same benefit accorded to a permit holder who has a second permit holder onboard his vessel.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer from adoption of this proposal; however, we anticipate opposition by those same individuals or groups who opposed the current regulation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Bristol Bay Reserve (HQ-06F-046)

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow vessels with two active permits to be able to fish additional gear in the special harvest area.

ISSUE: Too many participants in the Bristol Bay fishery as indicated in the CFEC's optimum numbers study. We need more incentives for current permit holders to buy a second permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue have economic hard times in the Bristol Bay fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. With less boats it will cut down on the line.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, even people with one permit will have the benefit of less boats in the fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Konrad Schaad (HQ-06F-048)

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow one person to have two active permits per House Bill 251 and receive extra benefits which may include more time, area, gear or any other incentives.

ISSUE: Too many participants in the Bristol Bay fishery as indicated in the CFEC’s optimum numbers study.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have economic hard times in the Bristol Bay fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. With less boats it will cut down on the line fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, even people with one permit will benefit with less boats in the fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dominic Lee (HQ-06F-051)

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Amend this regulation as follows:

(a) Except in the special harvest areas specified in (e) of this section, two Bristol Bay drift gillnet CFEC permit holders may concurrently fish from the same vessel and jointly operate up to 200 fathoms of drift gillnet gear under this section. **Additionally a permit holder with two Bristol Bay drift gillnet CFEC permits may operate up to 200 fathoms of drift gillnet gear under this section.**

(b) Before operating drift gillnet gear jointly under this section, both permit holders shall register with the department under 5 AAC 06.370. for the same district. **A permit holder with two Bristol Bay drift permits shall register both permits for the same district with the department under 5 AAC 06.370.** The permit **holder or** holders may not use a vessel for [JOINT] operations of drift gillnet gear unless that vessel is registered with the department under 5 AAC 06.370. for the same district as the permit holders **or holders.**

(c) When two Bristol Bay drift gillnet CFEC permit holders fish from the same vessel and jointly operate a drift gillnet gear under this section **or a permit holder with two Bristol Bay drift gillnet permits,** the vessel must display its ADF&G permanent license plate number followed by the letter “D” to identify the vessel as dual permit vessel. The letter “D” must be removed or covered when the vessel is operating with only one drift gillnet CFEC permit **[HOLDER]** on board the vessel. The identification number and letters must be displayed

- (1) in letters and numerals 12 inches high with lines at least one inch wide;
- (2) in color that contrast with the background;
- (3) on both sides of the hull; and
- (4) in a manner that is plainly visible at all times when the vessel is being operated.

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

(e) The joint operation of drift gillnet gear **or the use of two permits by one permit holder** under this section is not allowed in any other area, or during any time when, a single CFEC permit holder is restricted to operating less than 150 fathoms of drift gillnet gear and in the

(1) Ugashik River Special Harvest Area described in 5 AAC 06.357, and as described in 5 AAC 06.366(f).

(2) Wood River Special Harvest Area described in 5 AAC 06.358.

(3) Egegik River Special Harvest Area described in 5 AAC 06.359.

(4) Naknek River Special Harvest Area described in 5 AAC 06.360.

ISSUE: Use of two permits by one permit holder.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will slow the implementation of the optimum number of units of gear as determined by CFEC.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The fishery will become more viable and support investment required to improve equipment to increase product quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen with two permits, all fishermen will benefit from less gear being fished.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There will be a perceived negative effect by some vessels without the extra 50 fm gear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? To achieve the CFEC optimum number buy back could be implemented with the negative impact of all permit holders having to pay off their debt. The buy back option is rejected because the stacking of permits is preferable as it is flexible to respond to the changing economic realities in the future without government actions.

PROPOSED BY: Peter Thompson (HQ-06F-054)

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Amend this regulation as follows:

Unless all areas are opened to 200 fathoms on a two permitted vessel, no single district shall be allowed to fish 200 fathoms on one vessel.

ISSUE: The use of 200 fathoms on one vessel with two permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Since this regulation was implemented the only district allowed the 200 fathoms per vessel has been the Nushagak. This puts an undo strain on the local fishermen who choose not to own two permits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local fishermen who cannot or will not be able to own two permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Two permitted vessels.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Geoff Wyman (HQ-06F-057)

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Amend this regulation as follows:

A CFEC permit holder may hold two permits.

ISSUE: The lack of ability for a setnet permit holder to have more than one permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued hardship for setnet (mostly Alaska owned) permit holders.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any hard working successful setnet permit holder who wants to make a better living.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Those fishermen who are hard working will continue to be able to make a living.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Roland Briggs (HQ-06F-081)

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 06.333. Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay. Amend this regulation as follows:

Require management to add additional scheduled fishing time for vessels fishing two permits, by emergency order.

ISSUE: Legislative passage of House Bill 251, “An act authorizing the Board of Fisheries to adopt regulations regarding fishing by a person who holds two permits for a salmon fishery”, effective date June 28, 2006.

The current permit stacking regulations in 5 AAC 06.333 is used by few driftnet vessels due to management’s continued use of the “Special Harvest Areas”. Any economic benefit, defined in 5 AAC 06.333 with management’s use of 5 AAC 06.333(e)(1-4), makes such a small economic benefit for permit stacking that this fleet reduction method has been marginally used by this fleet. With the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission (CFEC) report, 04-3N, from October 2004 and 20 AAC 05.1147, using HB 251, giving a larger economic benefit will move the fleet

closer to the final CFEC optimum number defined in 20 AAC 05.1147. This follows in form with the economic, conservation, and fishery management concerns exposed in this report using a voluntary system with a realistic economic benefit. Promoting more fishers into acceptance of this available permit stacking plan and the race will begin to the Optimum Number without the need to implement AS 16.43.100(a)(10) using voluntary acquisitions and mergers used in many industries throughout this nation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With the continued decline of the fisheries economic benefit, by factoring in the lowest inflation adjusted salmon prices paid in history, the lack of fleet consensus dealing with the CFEC report, 04-3N is unacceptable, and detrimental to all fishers' current and future financial stability in this fishery.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishers who wish to reduce the fleet for economic gain, by increasing actual production. Using business principals, of mergers and acquisitions, and seen locally at a processor near you. Any true form of fleet reduction will benefit all who fish at today's low prices, using increased production for economic gains unavailable using other theory.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishers who ignore the economic reality of low product pricing. And this fleet itself, that allowed the state to disregard the Alaskan voter, and their limited entry amendment, as used in all other Alaska salmon fisheries. The harshness of these results is well demonstrated by the facts in this fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A state funded buyback? Using tax-and-spend principals, or another loan to be paid off with another tax, and spent bureaucracy, showing off their social engineering skills is always a negative to any business practice.

PROPOSED BY: Todd Granger (HQ-06F-089)

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 06.370. Registration and reregistration. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Closed season to out-of-area fishermen within Togiak Bay area.

ISSUE: Bristol Bay drift net fishing. Lack of harvest due to out-of-area fishing during week the ending of July.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lack of spawning, lack of harvest, and will decrease salmon escapement.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Will increase harvest production and will also increase spawning grounds.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Togiak Bay Area Permit Holders as well as those who are registered to fish the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Do not know who will likely suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Togiak Bay fishermen meeting.

PROPOSED BY: Diane Abraham

(SW-06F-001)

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 06.370. Registration and reregistration. Amend this regulation as follows:

(k) Notwithstanding (b) of this section, a CFEC permit holder registered before 9:00 a.m. July 17 to fish in the

Ugashik district may not take salmon in the Nushagak, Naknek-Kvichak, Egegik, or Togiak district from 9:00 a.m. June 1 to 9:00 a.m. July 24;

Nushagak, Naknek-Kvichak, Egegik and Togiak district may not take salmon in the Ugashik district from 9:00 a.m. June 1 to 9:00 a.m. July 24; the department may waive the requirements of this paragraph after 9:00 a.m. July 21 if the department projects that the Ugashik River escapement will exceed 850,000 sockeye salmon before 9:00 a.m. July 24.

ISSUE: Establish the Ugashik district as a super-exclusive registration Bristol Bay commercial sockeye fishing district.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The communities of Pilot Point, Port Heiden and Ugashik will continue to experience economic hardship due to excess interception, low ex-vessel price, drastically reduced raw fish tax base and an increase in drift fleet competition later in the season when Ugashik is still lagging in escapement numbers. The Ugashik sockeye traditionally run later than the other Bristol Bay tributaries and with a mobile fleet it becomes impossible to predict effort levels on any given day. With this unpredictable effort level the fishing periods for the Ugashik district have gone from regular 12-hour openings to two to six-hour openings. This reduced fishing time is detrimental to the quality of our product and the production of our local fleet and setnetters.

It should be noted that for the last three years the Ugashik district's harvest has been approximately one million sockeye short of the predicted harvest. This scenario makes it impossible for our communities to financially survive and many families have had to relocate to find jobs. For example, the Pilot Point school may close next year because of a lack of students and most city services have been curtailed due to a lack of raw fish tax funds.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposed regulation change will allow for longer fishing opening allowing fishermen the time to properly ice or chill down their product prior to delivering their catch. Will eliminate the need to use excessive towing on the net to avoid other nets and also eliminate the need to use dead stacking of the catch during an opening. In addition, processors will be better able to judge the amount of capacity needed to process or transport their product to another district for processing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local fisher persons of Lower Bristol Bay. The department because Ugashik River escapement needs will be easier to achieve and maintain.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Several hundred drift fishermen who transfer to Ugashik district after their district of choice has peaked. Predominately non-local vessels.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee (SW-06F-038)

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 06.370. Registration and reregistration. Amend this regulation as follows:

Repeal 5 AAC 06.370. (c) and (d)

ISSUE: After the use of either drift gillnet or set gillnet gear, the use of other types of gear is not permitted until 48 hours have elapsed following notification to the department of the type of gear intended to be used. After July 17, changing to either drift gillnet or set gillnet may be done without notification to the department. The board needs to eliminate the 48-hour notification before July 17 within a fishing district.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There is little or no benefit for a person to own both types of permits at the same time. If you eliminate the 48-hour notification, it may encourage fishermen to buy back some of the permits in Bristol Bay. Under normal fishing conditions only one permit would be fished. However if the department allowed only one gear group to fish to catch up on allocation, this would allow a fishermen to switch gear if he owned both permits. This seems like a small benefit to fishermen but with our depressed fishery, it may mean the difference in being able to survive a bad fishing season.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A person who owns both a set net and a drift net permit. All fishermen when both gear groups are fishing at the same time because gear is removed from the fishery. The gear group sitting on the beach waiting for the other gear group to catch their allocation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one because this will remove gear from the fishery under normal fishing conditions.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reduce the notification period to 12 hours. It would cause more paper work for the department.

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee (SW-06F-010)

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 06.370. Registration and reregistration. Amend this regulation as follows:

Repeal 5 AAC 06.370 (c) and (d).

ISSUE: After the use of either drift gillnet or set gillnet gear, the use of the other type of gear is not permitted until 48 hours have elapsed following notification to the department of the type of gear intended to be used. After July 17, changing to either drift gillnet or set gillnet may be done without notification to the department. I would like the Board to eliminate the 48 hour

notification before July 17 within a fishing district.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There is little or no benefit for a person to own both types of permits at the same time. If you eliminate the 48 hour notification, it may encourage fishermen to buy back some of the permits in Bristol Bay. Under normal fishing conditions only one permit would be fished. However, if the department allowed only one gear group to fish to catch up on allocation, this would allow a fisherman to switch gear if they owned both permits. This seems like a small benefit to fishermen but with our depressed fishery, it may mean the difference in being able to survive a bad fishing season.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A person who owns both a setnet and driftnet permit. All fishermen when both gear groups are fishing at the same time because gear is removed from the fishery. The gear group sitting on the beach waiting for the other gear group to catch their allocation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one because this will remove gear from the fishery under normal fishing conditions.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reduce the notification period to 12 hours. It would cause more paperwork for the department.

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee (HQ-06F-022)

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 06.370. Registration and reregistration. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow a vessel that has registered one permit in one district the ability to drop a second blue card (register) in another district and begin fishing immediately without waiting out 48 hours.

ISSUE: Too many participants in the Bristol Bay fishery as indicated in the CFEC's optimum numbers study. We need more incentives for current permit holders to buy a second permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have economic hard times in the Bristol Bay fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. With less boats it will cut down in the line fishery and give the board more flexibility in the management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, even people with one permit will have the benefit of less boats in the fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Konrad Schaad (HQ-06F-047)

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 06.370. Registration and reregistration. Amend this regulation as follows:

Repeal requirement to wait 48 hours before switching gear types within the same district. Require only notification.

ISSUE: The need to wait 48 hours before switching gear types within the same district.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued economic hardship on fishermen who try to maximize catch volume.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Economically pressed fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one as there is still allocation of catch.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Rolland Briggs (HQ-06F-082)

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 06.370 Registration and Reregistration. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow a vessel with two active permits to be registered in two districts simultaneously.

ISSUE: Too many participants in the Bristol Bay fishery as indicated in the CFEC’s optimum numbers study. We need more incentives for current permit holders to buy a second permit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to have economic hard times in the Bristol Bay fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. With less boats it will cut down on the line fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone, even people with one permit will have the benefit of less boats in the fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Konrad Schaad (HQ-06F-049)

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 06.370. Registration and reregistration. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allowed a one time per season opportunity to file your intent to transfer, wait out 48 hours or more, then designate what district you will be fishing in.

ISSUE: Having to designate what district you are transferring to before waiting out the 48 hour transfer period.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without this change, it is difficult for fishermen to efficiently break in their inexperienced crews, test new refrigeration systems and any new mechanical systems which require several hours or days of testing in order to work properly for the season. Under the current regulation, it can be devastatingly costly for the vessel and the quality of product can suffer if serious problems arise due to lack of earlier testing under actual fishing conditions. One example could be if there were a major mechanical breakdown midseason, the fishing situation can make dramatic changes while the vessel is out of commission, which could adversely effect the rest of their season depending on which district they committed there vessel to, thus locking in their fate.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal will definitely improve the quality of their product by allowing them to more efficiently work out any refrigeration and mechanical problems for this short season. For instance, if refrigeration problem arise, a boat owner may feel it is too costly and risky to play a guessing game of commitment to a certain district and then wait out the time for repairs. It might be more tempting to just continue fishing with a potentially defective reefer system and sell warmer, dry and poorer quality fish than take that huge financial gamble.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All permit holders will benefit. This will allow boats to break in crew and test any refrigeration or mechanical problems near their boatyard support in early June and then designate where they want to fish. Also, say for example if a vessel broke down mid season and took a few days for repair, they could put in their transfer and when the vessel was repaired they could make a better judgment on where to resume fishing as conditions can change rapidly in a few days.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody. Why is it so necessary to have to choose an area before waiting another 48 hours to fish? Fishing conditions can change in this two day window and for the permit holder, that often means playing a guessing game, luck game or even a game of financial Russian Roulette. It is a matter more of the department managing the fish stocks in a district rather than the amount of boats.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Ed Hisaw (HQ-06F-055)

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 06.370. Registration and reregistration. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow all season, the opportunity to file your intent to transfer, wait out 48 hours or more. Then designate what district you will be fishing in.

ISSUE: Having to designate what district you are transferring to before waiting out the 48-hour transfer period.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without this change, it is difficult for fishermen to efficiently break in their inexperienced crews, test new refrigeration systems and any new mechanical systems which require several hours or days of testing in order to work properly for the season. Under the current regulation, it can be devastatingly costly for a vessel and the quality of product can suffer if serious problems arise due to lack of earlier testing under actual fishing conditions. One example could be if there was a major mechanical breakdown midseason, the fishing situation can make dramatic changes while the vessel is out of commission, which could adversely affect the rest of their season depending on which district they committed their vessel to, thus locking in their fate.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal will definitely improve the quality of their product by allowing them to more efficiently work out any refrigeration and mechanical problems for this short season. For instance, if refrigeration problems arise, a boat owner may feel it is too costly and risky to play a guessing game of commitment to a certain district and then wait out the time for repairs. It might be more tempting to just continue fishing with a potentially defective refrigeration system and sell warmer, day and poorer quality fish than take that huge financial gamble.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All permit holders will benefit. This will allow boats to break in crew and test any refrigeration or mechanical problems near their boatyard support in early June and then designate where they want to fish. Also, say for example if a vessel broke down mid-season, and took a few days for repair, they could put in their transfer and when the vessel was repaired they could make a better judgment on where to resume fishing as conditions can change rapidly in a few days.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody. Why is it so necessary to have to choose an area before waiting another 48 hours to fish? Fishing conditions can change in this two day window and for the permit holder that often means playing a guessing game, luck game or even a game of financial Russian roulette. It is a matter more of the department managing the fish stocks in a district rather than the amount of boats.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Ed Hisaw (HQ-06F-056)

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 06.370. Registration and reregistration. Amend this regulation as follows:

(a) Before taking salmon in Bristol Bay, each commercial salmon set gillnet or drift gillnet CFEC permit holder shall register **on June 23 of each year** for a district described in 5 AAC 06.200. Each drift gillnet permit holder also shall register for the same district the drift gillnet vessel that the permit holder will be operating. Initial district registration is accomplished by completing a registration form provided by the department and returning the completed form to the department office in Dillingham or King Salmon. For the purposes of this section, a CFEC permit holder and a drift gillnet vessel may be registered in only one district at a time.

ISSUE: There is no free week; fishermen should be able to go fish wherever they can until June 23 of the current year and then register for a district of their choice.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishers will have to make decisions before having all the data available on the timing of the run size and strength and will not be able to train crews and test machinery before the seasons' run arrives.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No affect on quality of the harvested resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishers in Bristol Bay.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No fishers in Bristol Bay.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Darryl F. Pope (HQ-06F-094)

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 06.341. Vessel specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 06.341. to eliminate the 32-foot limit on vessels used in the driftnet fishery in Bristol Bay.

ISSUE: Vessel safety, quality of salmon caught and the arbitrary 32-foot limit on the length of vessels allowed to fish in Bristol Bay's driftnet fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the board continues to limit the size of the vessels to 32 feet, harvesters will continue to be limited in the equipment and the ability to outfit their vessels to make improvements in fish quality while maintaining safety aboard the boats. At present many 32-foot vessels within the fishery just do not have the capacity or space to properly install an RSW unit or the size and power needed to utilize holds that are filled with a mixture of ice and water. At present, one need only look in a boat yard in Naknek or Dillingham to see that many boats do not even look like boats, evidence of efforts made to put too much into a 32-foot boat. Frankly, some of those boats look like a disaster or serious accident waiting to happen.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal is made to specifically address the need to allow harvesters to design, purchase, adapt current vessels to safely accommodate equipment used to chill or freeze salmon that are caught in Bristol Bay. The quantities of salmon that are caught in a short time in this fishery require a large deck space and large capacity to hold and treat thousands of pounds of product within hours. Some harvesters may see the use of larger and longer vessels as an option to help achieve such goals as processing and freezing their own product on board, in combination with marketing their own product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If larger and longer vessels were allowed, fishermen that would like a bigger and longer vessel to accommodate and operate refrigeration and possibly freezing equipment on board would benefit. Vessel manufacturers and fabricators would benefit from the work that would be generated.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? If a larger vessel has complete advantage over smaller

vessels, the smaller vessels will become obsolete in the fishery. But, I do not think a complete loss of smaller vessels from the fleet would be realized, as smaller vessels can and will always be able to fish shallower waters. They are also generally faster and much more economical to operate.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? As mentioned above, the elimination of the 32-foot limit would not necessarily mean the end of smaller vessels which will always have their own advantages and value over large vessels. It depends on how a fisherman chooses to fish. He or she may choose not to use any type of RSW or CSW system, as gas engine, outboard engines, jet water propulsion, etc. to make ends meet for their individual needs. I thought about proposing a longer limit on the length of vessel, such as 42 feet but the reality is that fishermen will not want a vessel that is too long or too deep and much of the type of vessel depends on a fisherman's favorite way or area to fish. The importance is giving harvesters the option and ability to choose what he or she knows is best for their personal situation.

PROPOSED BY: Erick Sabo (HQ-06F-006)

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 06.341. Vessel specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

The vessel length limit in Bristol Bay would be removed from regulation.

ISSUE: The quality issues and inefficiencies caused by the 32-foot vessel length restriction in the Bristol Bay driftnet fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen will continue to be encumbered by an arbitrary vessel length limit that makes it difficult and problematic to produce the higher quality products demanded by the world market.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, larger vessels would allow for vessels to have equipment and deck space necessary to produce a higher quality product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Bristol Bay fishermen since the overall pack quality could be improved allowing for higher sales prices and better marketing arrangements.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who believe that marketability, product quality and ultimately price, are unimportant in operation of their commercial fishing businesses.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allowing for only incremental vessel length changes, over time. Since it is reasonable to project that vessels excessively larger than 32 feet are unlikely to be immediately adaptable to the Bristol Bay drift fishery and available support services, complete removal of the length restriction will not suddenly change the character of the fishery while allowing for innovation.

PROPOSED BY: Charles W. Treinen (HQ-06F-045)

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 06.341. Vessel specifications and operations. Amend these regulations as follows:

Repeal the 32-foot vessel length limit.

ISSUE: The current and archaic, vessel length limit is restraining the drift gillnet fleet from developing a much more valuable fishery. The simple law of economic returns relative to boat size works fine in all other areas of Alaska. Longer boats that would allow shallower fish holds would greatly increase the quality and value of the catch. We need to remove the limit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Salmon will continue to be destroyed through bruising and disconfiguration. As we all recognize that quality must improve in order to raise the value of the salmon, this is the most obvious stumbling block. It must start here and now.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal is all about improving quality and value. Shallow fish holds, and room for ice or RSW.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who wants salmon to be worth more period.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody, a 32 foot limit does not create equality, ask the guy in the old power rolling Rawson how he feels about the 18 foot wide triple jet.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Christensen (HQ-06F-174)

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 06.341. Vessel specifications and operations. Amend these regulations as follows:

Repeal 5 AAC 06.341. Vessel Specifications and Operations.

ISSUE: The 32-foot vessel Bristol Bay length restrictions in 5 AAC 06.341.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With the board’s “Finding of Fact,” #81-92-FB of April 7, 1981, this regulation does not address the obvious quality issues these findings ignore with another 25 years of fact. With no vessel length limits in any other Alaska salmon driftnet fishery, that deal with the Bay’s large catch volume, the justification can only be attributed to 60 years of sailboat mentality, and ignores a true product quality issue by overloading the 32 foot vessel.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Improvements in product quality are available with the use of larger vessels. Spreading out these large harvest volumes, and needed increasing the quality for a future more marketable product. With the fleet reduction proposed using economic reality, in the CFEC’s Bristol Bay Optimum number report, 04-03N, and 20 AAC 05.1147. This proposal, with a possible future fleet reduction does more to assist this driftnet fleet’s ability to make more quality improvement modifications in these vessels.

As the board’s 1981 “Finding of Fact” imply, “the board considered this action to be consistent with its responsibilities to conserve and develop the salmon resources of Bristol Bay, promote the orderly harvesting and marketing of quality fishery products and to maximize the public

interest.”

Here the sufferer is the industry product, a fleet using Volkswagen Beetles, in need of a school bus, the limit does nothing for the “...orderly harvesting and marketing of quality fishery products...” and actually moves back the marketing of quality fishery products.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any fisher willing to make the long overdue change to promote quality, ending the obvious overloading of their current vessels since 1889, with or without refrigeration.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Any person, with no regard to the product quality issue and supporting these obsolete board findings that have done little since 1981 to improve the product quality issues.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Todd Granger (HQ-06F-178)

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 06.341 Vessel specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

The old 32-foot rule would be removed.

ISSUE: Length of vessel, changed to 45 feet or removed totally.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Quality of salmon in area will not improve as fast as it should in order to compete with other areas and would market. Prices will not come up.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Larger holds, spread the fish over more area, less pressure-in a 32-foot vessel-10,000 pounds is three to four feet deep in a 38 to 40-foot 10,000 pounds is two feet or less, more room to install RSW units. Larger vessels can be tanked.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone; as new or used 38 to 42 foot vessels are built or added to the fishery: The over all quality of Bristol Bay fish will increase and the price for the product will also go up.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The fleet is old. Most of the large aluminum vessels are 16-20 years old. New boats will soon enter the fishery, so timing is important. Now is the time. Very few would be affected as everyone will benefit from the price increase.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fishing more days early to reduce large catches. This was not favored by many small boat owners. Also fishing more area early.

PROPOSED BY: Roseleen Moore (HQ-06F-018)

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 06.341. Vessel specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

(a) No vessel registered for salmon net fishing may be more than 42 [32] feet in overall length. An anchor roller may not extend more than eight inches beyond the 42 [32]-foot overall length, and any portion that extends beyond the 42 [32]-foot overall length may not be more than eight inches in width or height.

ISSUE: Current regulations restricting the overall length of Bristol Bay vessels to 32 feet is detrimental to the fishermen of Bristol Bay because it inhibits our ability of producing a better quality salmon product, makes it extremely dangerous to participate in our 4E halibut fishery and absolutely eliminates us from participating in other developmental fisheries such as cod, clam, capelin, flounder and sole fisheries currently being proposed and studied.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Utilizing larger vessels will enable Bristol Bay fishermen the necessary space to install Refrigerated Salt Water (RSW) systems that can be operated by a separate generator. This advantage would allow the fishermen to operate their respective RSW systems independent of their main engines, saving on fuel. The larger vessels would also allow the participants of the local 4E halibut fishery adequate deck space to fish for halibut, larger fish holes to adequately ice and store the product, fish further off-shore and improve safety of the crew and vessel. This proposed overall length increase will also allow our local fleet the opportunity to participate in other experimental fisheries other than salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Bristol Bay fishermen will reap benefits. Ex-vessel prices of our salmon products will improve with the marketing of a better quality product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. With the inriver fisheries currently dominating departmental management protocol in recent years many fishermen will elect to remain with their smaller 32-foot vessels. Elevated fuel prices will also dictate the decision to upgrade a vessel.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee (SW-06F-039)

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 06.341. Vessel specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

(a) No vessel registered for salmon net fishing may be more than [32] 42 feet in overall length. An anchor roller may not extend more than eight inches beyond the 42-foot overall length and any portion that extends beyond the [32] 42-foot overall length may not be more than eight inches in width or height.

ISSUE: The 32-foot vessel length limit that very effectively retards the advancement of vessel technology. This is the only salmon fishery in Alaska with this small of a vessel length limit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? 1.) Quality of product will continue to suffer. 2.) Innovations or gear requiring more space will not be an option for the fleet. 3.) Our lack of economy of scale combined with stagnant fish prices, increases costs and stiff competition in the marketplace are making 32-foot boats so inefficient as to render them

obsolete and in many cases non-profitable.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Possibly those fishermen with the resources who choose to upgrade to larger vessels would benefit. I might add that it will probably take a lot of hard work in conjunction with a larger vessel in order to realize any potential profit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? To some extent those fishermen who choose not to, or are unable to upgrade to larger vessels. Keep in mind that all vessels, regardless of length, fish the same amount of time and have the potential to fish an equal amount of gear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: John Webb (HQ-06F-003)

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 06.341. Vessel specifications and operations. Amend this regulation to include the following:

No vessel registered for salmon net fishing may be more than 38 feet in overall length.

ISSUE: The problem is the current 32-foot length limit on gillnet boats that can be used in the Bristol Bay salmon fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The primary intent of this proposal is to provide a means useful to fishers that would significantly help to alleviate the historical and ongoing problem of poor quality salmon from the largest component of the Bristol Bay fishery. Ex-vessel prices are significantly lower than in other comparable Alaskan fisheries. They will remain so unless a variety of innovative steps are taken. Allowing the use of larger boats would be a major step toward correcting the problem. If quality is not improved, the potential for higher and more equitable ex-vessel prices will not be realized. All beneficiaries of the fishery, from fishers to service businesses to the tax collectors are currently foregoing potential increased financial returns. Conversely, for the fishers and others, all fixed operational costs are rising rapidly and will likely continue to do into the foreseeable future.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposed change improves the quality of both the resource harvested and the products subsequently made from the harvested resource. Quality production starts with the fishers. Additionally, larger vessels will provide space for on-board value added processing for those fishers attempting to expand additional markets for all or a portion of their catch. The current 32-foot length limit greatly restricts options for improving the quality of salmon produced, as well as options for value-added small scale on-board processing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those fishers who choose to operate a 38-foot vessel. Note, this proposal mainly focuses on improving the quality of salmon caught and retained on the catcher vessel until delivery. There are other benefits such as improved hydrodynamic performance of longer vessels, less stacking of salmon in individual fish holds, opportunity to carry ice in free holds, less likelihood of overloading the stern, etc.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The fishery in general will suffer, due to continued archaic regulation that restricts options for improvement of quality at the fishing end of the industry. From the aspect of competition among fishers, no one will suffer because regulations concerning net length and mesh size will apply equally to all vessels, regardless of size.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions were considered.

PROPOSED BY: John J. Burns (I-06F-002)

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 06.341. Vessel specifications and operations. Amend this regulation as follows:

(a) No vessel registered for salmon net fishing may be more than **38** [32] feet in overall length. An anchor roller may not extend more than eight inches beyond the **38** [32]-foot length, and any portion that extends beyond the **38** [32]-foot overall length may not be more than eight inches in width or height.

ISSUE: Vessel length in the Bristol Bay salmon fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Quality cannot be achieved, dual permits need larger vessel to support larger crew and catch.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality in Bristol Bay with the room to put improved refrigerated sea water, to hold more ice aboard a larger vessel or even an ice machine. Room to put insulated totes to ship fresh fish the possibilities would be endless.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All individuals that want to step up to the plate and bring better quality product to the salmon consumer. Bristol Bay Borough would get bigger tax base with a better base price for fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who do not want to accept change.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Darryl F. Pope (HQ-06F-090)

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 06.355. Bristol Bay commercial Set and Drift Gillnet sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation to include the following in the Bristol Bay East Side (Ugashik, Egegik and Naknek-Kvichak):

(d) The department shall manage existing management plans, fishery openings, closures, and areas to maximize the escapement past each district fish destined for the various rivers in the Naknek-Kvichak District; especially the Kvichak River, which has in recent history had difficulty in achieving it’s escapement goals.

(1) achieve adequate escapement by requiring the fisheries in the various east side districts to remain inside their special harvest area boundaries until the point goal for the Kvichak River red salmon escapement is achieved.

(2) Acknowledge by this regulation that the Kvichak River Sockeye Salmon Escapement is significantly impacted by fishing in the areas seaward of the Special Harvest District Boundaries in the Ugashik and Egegik districts as well as the Naknek-Kvichak district.

This addition would insure that each stock would be harvested at a rate that would approximate the actual arrival of the stocks into the originating system and thus would help target the fisheries on natal stocks while minimizing the incidents of interception of stocks headed for other systems. Specifically this would protect the early Naknek run as well as protect Lake Clark and other Kvichak River spawning area fish from harvest in Egegik and Ugashik. The major benefit would be to the Naknek-Kvichak system as less stress would be put on the potential escapement.

ISSUE: Naknek-Kvichak escapement needs to be shared by the systems that the fish first appear. This will help equalize the burden for the Kvichak escapement among all of the fishermen who benefit from harvesting Kvichak stocks.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Karl R. Hellberg (HQ-06F-028)

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 06.355. Bristol Bay commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Establish a “share” or IFQ type system using CFEC annual catch records to produce the “share”.

ISSUE: Ineffective allocation plan.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lost opportunity by all user groups.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It definitely could improve the quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Improved quality and opportunity should benefit everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Neil C. Armstrong (SW-06F-030)

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 06.320. Fishing periods. Amend this regulation as follows:

In the Egegik, Naknek/Kvichak, Nushagak and Ugashik sections from June 25 through July 17 the following tentative fishing schedule will be in effect:

Monday 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Wednesday 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Friday 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.
For a total of 36 hours per week.

ISSUE: More consistent fishing openings.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Very sporadic openings will continue to occur.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Prior to statehood the federal folks used a similar system (72 hours per week) with apparent success.

PROPOSED BY: Neil C. Armstrong (SW-06F-031)

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 06.356. General District Salmon Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

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

ISSUE: Bristol Bay run is currently too compressed and overwhelms processing production capacity. Early season general district openings will allow a longer harvest window with associated quality improvements, marketability, and higher value.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The quality of the fish will continue to be substandard due to the compressed timeframe of harvest and overwhelming demands on processing capacity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Longer harvest window will allow for more niche marketing, fresh fish shipment, and quicker processing time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The fishery as a whole by increasing overall value and allowing for more marketing opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who do not wish to participate in higher

earnings obtainable by fishing in the general district and localities that perceive losses in fish tax revenue.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Charles W. Treinen (HQ-06F-043)

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 06.356. General District Salmon Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Fishing in General District of Bristol Bay can only take place after all river systems have their maximum escapement goals.

ISSUE: Escapements in the Kvichak River. General district early fishing hurts escapements. Fishing in the waters of the General District should only occur after all rivers have achieved there escapement goals. This is a management plan that should only be used late in the season, if at all.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Kvichak River system will be hurt with low escapements. The Kvichak River has been experiencing poor escapement levels. Because of this the Naknek River Special Harvest Area Management Plan has had to be used to achieve Kvichak escapement. The General District of Bristol Bay is not a traditional fishing area. By regulation the management of Bristol Bay is to try to have fishing in traditional areas. Early fishing in the General District the last time it was used in 2004 hurt Kvichak escapements making it difficult for the Kvichak River to achieve early escapement goals, the Naknek River Special Harvest Area had to be used to help the Kvichak meet escapement goals. This general fishing in the early part of the season before managers had a handle on run size and escapement is a poor management tool. This early fishing on known mixed stocks made managers open the Naknek Special Harvest Area. Keeping the General District closed until all river systems have their escapement goals makes sure we have a future. The Naknek River Special Harvest Area has become one of the only tools used to insure escapement. Why did we manage for catch, then escapement as in 2004, we should be working towards escapement, then catch. Escapement is our future and managing for catch first, as was done in 2004, hurt the fishery later when escapement was needed. Management tools should be in place to help escapement first, then catch.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, everything we can do to prevent the Naknek River Special Harvest Area Management Plan from happening helps with quality and harvest ability.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone in Bristol Bay region benefits from Kvichak escapement. By adopting this closure of the General District until escapements are in, helps the future of Bristol Bay. Early fishing on mixed stocks in the General District only hurts days or weeks later when escapements are a must.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. We all gain by insuring our future with escapements. Management that works towards escapement first, catch later is what is needed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chris Cameron (HQ-06F-130)

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation to provide:

Equal fishing time in the NRSHA to both set gillnet and drift gillnet groups.

ISSUE: The set net gear group is currently being very unfairly treated in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA). The 20 year average catch used for allocation (1977-1996), for the most part, were Naknek/Kvichak district caught fish. When Naknek/Kvichak allocation plan became regulation, it did not include the NRSHA. The original intent of the allocation was for Naknek/Kvichak district fishing, not river fishing. For the last five or six years, most of our fishing has been done in the Alagnak and Naknek rivers. When the setnet gear group fished equal time with the drift fleet, setnetters caught 36 percent of the allocation. This alone should tell everyone that the current allocation percentage in the NRSHA fisheries is wrong. Setnetters are far more efficient at catching salmon in the river fisheries than the drift fleet. The drift fleet is mobile and so, catch more fish in the Naknek/Kvichak district than the setnetters. Because of this the allocation works in the district fisheries, but does not work at all in the NRSHA fisheries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This will again cause an extra hardship on setnetters for no rational reason. Before allocation setnetters fished equal time with the drift fleet.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, because the tenders are so close, setnet fish are delivered more than normal. This will result in higher quality salmon. Setnetters do not tow nets like drift fleet, which results in softer and poor quality fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The setnetters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Possibly the drift fleet, but the board just recently increased the length of their gear from 50 fathoms to 75 fathoms, which would balance it out.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered the NRSHA allocation of 36 percent setnet and 64 percent driftnet. I believe equal fishing time is fair to both gear groups. Again, the setnet gear group is currently being unfairly treated.

PROPOSED BY: Doug McRae Sr. (SC-06F-003)

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Allow harvest of excess stock into the Naknek River with equal fishing time for both gear types.

ISSUE: Not enough fishing time in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area due to the current allocation: 16 percent setnet and 84 percent drift boats. In 2004, there were seven setnet openings and 17 drift openings. When it was hour for hour, the setnetters caught 36 percent of the fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Setnetters will be sitting on the beach

with not enough fishing time which would cause for a bad season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Set gillnet fish have higher quality because deliveries are more often than drift net fish. Setnetters do not tow their nets which results in softer and poorer quality fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnetters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Drift boats.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Revision of the allocation of fish that were caught in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area. We used to fish hour for hour.

PROPOSED BY: Doug G. McRae Jr. (SC-06F-004)

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

5AAC 06.360(c). On or after June 27, when the department projects that the sockeye salmon escapement into the Naknek River will exceed 800,000 fish and the Kvichak River escapement projection is one or more days behind schedule for reaching its escapement goal, the commissioner may open, by emergency order, the NRSHA to the drift gillnet and set gillnet fisheries. The drift gillnet and set gillnet fisheries will open separately [AND THE ALLOCATION SPECIFIED IN 5 AAC 06.364(b)(3)(A) AND (B) WILL APPLY IN THE NRSHA.]

There should be no allocation in the NRSHA. Alternating tides between gear groups works.

ISSUE: Allocation of salmon harvest between gear groups in the NRSHA. The drift fleet is allocated 84 percent and the setnet fleet is allocated 16 percent. Allocation was based on 800 plus boats fishing. When the NRSHA is open most of the drift fleet leaves. Even if only 50 boats remained they would be allocated 84 percent.

Allocation of catch between the driftnet and setnet fleet was based on historical average catches. Those catches occurred in the general Naknek-Kvichak district. During the years used for those historical catches there were an average of at least 800 drift boats registered to fish the district.

When the allocation of 84 percent drift and 16 percent set (eight percent Naknek section and eight percent Kvichak section) was established, it was intended for the Naknek-Kvichak district. The Naknek River Special Harvest Area was established outside of and not part of the overall district. The intent of establishing the NRSHA was to allow harvest groups of surplus stocks entering the Naknek River and to allow a better chance for Kvichak River stocks to pass through to their river of origin.

At the time of creation of the NRSHA there was no allocation applied to it. Openings were concurrent for both gear groups. Eventually, opening times were made on alternate tides with the drift fleet getting the first opening. This made for a more organized fishery, but still there was no allocation applied to either gear group.

During the last cycle of meetings it was decided to add the NRSHA to the Naknek-Kvichak district as far as the allocation is concerned. That action was made without regard to the fact that the number of drift boats that remain to fish the NRSHA is severely diminished from the average numbers that fish the Naknek-Kvichak district. At times there have only been 200-300 drift vessels fishing the NRSHA at the same time, the number of set netters remain relatively constant.

As the regulations stand, even if there were only 50 boats fishing in the NRSHA they would be entitled to 84 percent of the harvest. The setnet fleet would have to sit on the beach and wait for those 50 boats to catch their allocation.

There should be a more equitable solution such as a sliding scale allocation based on fleet size. Example: if 800 boats were to be allocated 84 percent of the harvest, that looks like 10.5% per 100 boats. The remainder would be allocated to the setnet fleet.

A better and easier solution to this problem would be to go back to each gear group fishing alternate tides and taking what comes to them.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The setnet fleet will sit on the beach waiting for the drift fleet to catch its allocation. This is not the intent of the Special Harvest Area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnetters who fish the NRSHA.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, everyone will have an equal chance to catch fish. No one will have to wait for someone else to catch fish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allocation based on number of boats fishing the NRSHA. Example: 10.5 percent per 100 boats equals 84 percent per 800 boats, percentage wise.

PROPOSED BY: George Wilson (HQ-06F-016)

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Special Harvest Area Management Plan.

Amend this regulation as follows:

Remove the following from 5 AAC 06.360(c)

[AND THE ALLOCATION SPECIFIED IN 5 AAC 06.364(b)(3)(A) AND (B) WILL APPLY IN THE NRSHA.]

ISSUE: The application of the Naknek/Kvichak, in-district allocation, to the Naknek River Special Harvest Area has created hardship upon setnet fishermen. Setnet fishermen have lost approximately three-quarters of their fishing periods and half their catch in this emergency fishery. At the inception of the NRSHA set and drift fishers were given equal opportunity by alternating openings. The in-district allocation was based on a fleet of 700-1000 boats. During the peak of 2005 season less than 250 boats were given the 84 percent allocation. Allocation

also subjects setnetters to drift fishing performance methods. Often some drifters fish only a small part of the opening. This extends the amount of time it takes to achieve the allocation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Setnet fishermen will be forced out of business. The emergency fishery in the NRSHA serves two purposes first to control escapement into the Naknek River shed and secondly provides fishermen an opportunity of some income. In the case of local and regional setnetters it may provide their only opportunity. Drift fishers are able to readily fish other districts and stocks.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality of harvest will improve. The setnet fish are better handled and delivered more frequently.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnet fishers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Drift fishers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Place a sliding allocation in the NRSHA based on the number of boats participating. Might be difficult to manage. Later in the season boats transfer to the Naknek/Kvichak on their way to storage. They may fish an opening or two then quit fishing and pull their boats but their remains registered skewing actual numbers participating. The NRSHA was never intended to be catch orientated.
2) Consider a fishing period ratio. Original intent of NRSHA was equal opportunity between gear groups.

PROPOSED BY: Kvichak Setnetters Association (HQ-06F-077)

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Once the department has determined that the minimum escapement goal has been, or will be reached, the allocation system in the NRSHA will no longer be in effect.

ISSUE: Allocation percentage within the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) adversely affects the ability of the department to manage escapement for the Naknek River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Optimum escapement goals for the Naknek River have not been met recently, and likely results include sub-optimum salmon returns in future years.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would help maintain the quantity and quality of future salmon runs by assuring that optimum escapement numbers, as determined by the department, could be met through careful management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Once the minimum escapement numbers are sure to be reached, if gear groups are given alternate fishing periods, then both drift and setnet fishermen benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Curt Nelson

(HQ-06F-104)

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

The Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) consist of

(b) all waters east from a line (described using lat./long.) 100 feet west of the southern most setnet site on the South Naknek beach north to the outer end of the Libbyville Dock, then to the shore and up the Naknek River to the power lines across the river [THE WATERS OF THE NAKNEK RIVER FROM A LINE BETWEEN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKERS LOCATED AT 58° 43.37’ N. LAT., 157° 03.17’ W. LONG. AND AT 58° 42.67’ N. LAT., 157° 03.44’ W. LONG UPSTREAM TO THE POWER LINES ACROSS THE RIVER].

ISSUE: A twenty-year restrictive boundary with little benefit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Naknek/Kvichak fishermen will continue to bear the brunt of the burden of Kvichak escapement while southern eastside districts are allowed to fish in outside waters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes it expands the boundary for a more orderly fishery which will improve the quality of the catch.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Naknek/Kvichak fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee

(SW-06F-006)

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 06.360(b). Naknek River sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Redefine Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) as all waters east from a line (described using lat./long.) 100 feet west of the southern most setnet site on the South Naknek beach north to the outer end of the Libbyville dock, then to the shore and up the Naknek River to the power lines across the river.

ISSUE: A twenty year restrictive boundary with little benefit.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Naknek/Kvichak fishermen will continue to bear the brunt of the burden for Kvichak escapement while southern eastside districts are allowed to fish in outside waters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Expands boundary to allow for a more orderly fishery which will improve the quality of the catch.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Naknek/Kvichak fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek Kvichak Advisory Committee (HQ-06F-023)

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(c) On or after **July 5**, [JUNE 27], when the department projects that the sockeye salmon escapement into the Naknek River will exceed 800,000 fish and the Kvichak River escapement projection is **three** [ONE] or more days behind schedule for reaching its escapement goal, the commissioner may open, by emergency order, the NRSHA to the drift gillnet and set gillnet fisheries. The drift gillnet and set gillnet fisheries will open separately, and the allocation specified in 5 AAC 06.364(b)(3)(A) and (B) will apply in the NRSHA.

ISSUE: On or after June 27, when the Kvichak River escapement goal projection is one or more days behind schedule for reaching its escapement goal we move into the NRSHA. This time frame is not realistic to determine the strength of the Kvichak run. It imposes undo hardships on fishermen for little benefit in saving Kvichak fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen will continue to be pushed into the NRSHA when there are no Kvichak fish in the district to save. 5 AAC 06.360.(c), puts a 30 percent safety cushion on the department’s forecast to save Kvichak fish.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Fish caught in Naknek/Kvichak district is fresher than fish caught in the NRSHA.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishermen in Bristol Bay.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who want to fish the Naknek River.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Vince Webster (SW-06F-025)

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Do not close the Naknek district to conserve Kvichak fish. Open the NRSHA to set net only, when the Kvichak District is closed to both gear groups.

ISSUE: When the fishing fleet is pushed into the Naknek River to conserve Kvichak fish, the entire bay is disrupted with little savings to show for the Kvichak escapement. The NRSHA was established because most people thought all the Kvichak fish were being intercepted. Mother nature may have shows us that we were wrong. The Alagnak River grew to historic runs over the past 15 years while the Kvichak River continued to decline. How can all the Kvichak fish be intercepted while the Alagnak fish continue to swim by? The department was able to bring the Kvichak River back to historic levels in the past from smaller escapement numbers then we have now just by closing the Kvichak section. The board needs to reassess the benefit of the NRSHA compared to the harm it imposes on other river systems.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen will continue to be pushed into the NRSHA with little benefit to the Kvichak River.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Fish caught in the bay are fresher than fish caught in the river.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishermen in Bristol Bay.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who want to fish in the Naknek River.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Vince Webster (SW-06F-026)

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(d) When a set gillnet opening is occurring,

....

(3) Nothing in this plan will prohibit the Naknek River Sockeye Special Harvest Area from being opened concurrently with openings in either the Kvichak subdistrict or Naknek subdistrict or both.

ISSUE: Allow a few fishermen to choose to fish in the “Special District” while the largest portion of the fleet would probably choose to fish the regular district. It would encourage the surplus fish to be harvested without the rancor and dangerous crowding that now occurs. Further this would be similar to what the Nushagak district has done the last couple of years with the Wood River Special Harvest Area. This provisions should not cause any negative impacts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Karl R. Hellberg

(HQ-06F-031)

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allow both drift and setnet to fish at same time. Start openings earlier in tide allowing more time to stop over escapement. Over escapement should have no bearing or reflection on any allocation plan.

ISSUE: Over escapement of Naknek River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Possible damage to spawning grounds resulting in poor runs in the future.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who think they have exclusive rights to these fish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Donald Mack

(HQ-06F-067)

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

No more than 75 fathoms of gear in the aggregate shall be used in the NRSHA, though vessels may have 150 fathoms onboard.

ISSUE: Poor quality of drift harvest from NRSHA.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A high percentage of the catch will get round-hauled rather than reel-picked leading to very poor quality.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Absolutely, it will encourage reel-picking.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishers concerned with the overall quality of Bristol Bay salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those fishers who continue to be concerned only with poundage.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dave Hansen

(HQ-06F-095)

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

Setnetters are allowed to keep their gear fixed throughout the commercial salmon season once a site has been claimed in the NRSHA.

ISSUE: Setnet fishermen should be allowed to leave all of their fixed gear (anchors, buoys, running lines, chains, or other anchoring and site marking devices) on their claimed fishing sites in the Naknek Special Harvest Area between and during fishing periods.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Setnet fishermen have a difficult time anchoring their nets due to the swift tidal currents. As such, screw anchors need to be used, and it is impractical if not impossible, to put these anchors in and take them out each fishing period. If permanent anchors cannot be used for the season, more nets will flat and/or otherwise drag off the site line causing them to drift too close together and violate the 150 foot separation requirement that is to be maintained between sites.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Minimizing drifting nets will minimize the number of drop-out fish falling from the nets and prevent fish from getting squished as the nets are towed back into position.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnet fishermen and processors.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Drift fishermen will suffer by having their nets snagged on setnet gear which has been a danger of drifting since the gear group began fishing.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Eike Smith

(SW-06F-042)

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

5 AAC 06.360

(d) When a set gillnet opening is occurring,

...

(2) [BEYOND 500 FEET FROM THE SHORE,] all gear associated with set gillnet fishing shall be removed when it is not being used to fish in the NRSHA.

ISSUE: Fishing area being denied the drift fishers by gear being left in the fishing area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The drifter will still be denied this area.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Drift fisher would gain a little more area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one—all fishers will still have same level of access to salmon as they do now.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mitch Kink (HQ-06F-078)

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend these regulations as follows:

When a drift gillnet opening is occurring, all set net buoys and anchors and running lines will be removed.

ISSUE: Hazards to navigation when the driftnetters are fishing in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, better fish quality will result from a driftnet fishery with less obstacles that require towing to miss them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Driftnetters will save thousands of dollars in damaged nets.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Kurt Johnson (HQ-06F-108)

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 06.359(b). Egegik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(b) The Egegik Special Harvest Area consists of the waters east of a line (described using lat./long.) from Goose Point north to a ADF&G marker at Bishop Creek.

(c) The commissioner may close, by emergency order, that portion of the Egegik District not described in (b) for the existing regulations reasons 1-3. (To be described using Lat./ Long.)

ISSUE: The harvest of salmon bound for other districts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued harvest of salmon bound for other districts.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Adjacent fishing districts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Egegik fishermen.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee (SW-06F-007)

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 06.359. Egegik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(b) The Egegik Special Harvest Area consists of waters east of a line from Goose Point north to a ADF&G marker at Bishop Creek.

(c) The commissioner may close, by emergency order, that portion of the Egegik District not described in (b) for the existing regulations reason 1-3.

ISSUE: The harvest of salmon bound for other districts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued harvest of salmon bound for other districts.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Adjacent fishing districts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Egegik fishermen.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee (HQ-06F-024)

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 06.359. Egegik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(b) The Egegik Special Harvest Area consists of a western boundary from Goose Point to Bishop Creek unless otherwise specified in this section, the applicable provisions in 5 AAC 06.001 through 5 AAC 06.380 apply to the Egegik Special Harvest Area.

ISSUE: The department has to add more protection to the Kvichak River system. Depending on timing, tide and weather patterns, Kvichak River stocks are still vulnerable to intercept in outlying fishing districts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Kvichak River escapement will not be achieved with the timing pattern of the run.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No effect on quality of the harvested resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups will benefit. Kvichak escapement is good. The faster we get escapement the faster we get to return to our normal fishing districts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one suffers, the faster we get the Kvichak on a normal timing pattern the sooner we get to fish in our regular salmon district.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Current inriver special harvest sockeye salmon run does not provide for an exploitation rate of greater than 40 percent with the timing patterns of the run for Kvichak sockeye salmon.

PROPOSED BY: Darryl F. Pope (HQ-06F-091)

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 06.359. Egegik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Eliminate the Egegik Special Harvest Area to conserve Kvichak fish and move Egegik district's western boundary to the 130 line permanently.

ISSUE: When the Egegik western boundary is moved back to the 110 line from the 135 line, it disrupts the entire fishery. The western line is pushed back to conserve Kvichak or Ugashik fish. When the western boundary was set at the 140 line, the department asked the board to move the line shoreward to the 130 line to prevent interception of Kvichak fish. The board decided to move the line shoreward to the 135 line.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen will continue to be disrupted every time the boundary line is moved shoreward to the 110 line. If you move the Egegik western boundary to the 130 line and leave it there, the entire bay will be more balanced with fishermen.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishermen in Bristol Bay because the fleet will be spread out more evenly.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who like to fish within the 110 line.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Vince Webster (SW-06F-023)

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 06.359. Egegik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(d) [IF A DISTRICT CLOSED UNDER (c)(1) OF THIS SECTION IS REOPENED TO FISHING, THE COMMISSIONER SHALL REOPEN THAT PORTION OF THE EGEGIK DISTRICT THAT WAS CLOSED UNDER (c) OF THIS SECTION.]

Removed this section to comply with the proposed change in Section 5 AAC 06.355(d).

ISSUE: The above change will insure that the Egegik district, which impacts the Naknek and Kvichak fish before they are available in the Naknek-Kvichak district, cannot harvest fish that are going to be needed to insure Naknek and/or Kvichak escapement nor significantly impact the harvest in these districts.

There is no logical reason to include the Naknek-Kvichak closure as a prerequisite in this statement. The burden of conserving low sockeye returns of the Kvichak needs to be shared by all systems.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? There should be no losers caused by this change as everyone involved will know what to expect.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Karl R. Hellberg (HQ-06F-029)

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 06.359. Egegik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(e) The department shall attempt to issue an emergency order under this section at least **12** [48] hours before the effective time of the opening or closing.

ISSUE: Align the usual 12 hours or less notice that the Egegik managers have been customarily providing the Egegik District in the last several years. There is not a good reason for this anomaly in good management procedures. Additionally the provision for a 48 hour notice to bring Egegik in line to help with the conservation of the Naknek or Kvichak stocks has been perceived by the fisherman as a blatant maneuver to exclude Egegik from a fair share of the responsibility for conserving Naknek and Kvichak stocks they significantly harvest. There should be no damage caused by this change.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Karl R. Hellberg (HQ-06F-030)

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 06.359(c). Egegik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

The line stays out at the 135 line until July 2.

ISSUE: There is no reason to use the Egegik Special Harvest Area during the early season.
WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue producing a low quality product at the 110 line. Continue to experience surges of fish that overwhelm processing capacity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, less towing, less round hauling and catching fish in deeper water will improve the quality of the fish substantially.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Peter Thompson (HQ-06F-053)

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 06.359. Egegik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation to include the following:

(g) No more than 50 fathoms of drift gillnet may be used to take salmon

(h) A vessel may not have more than 150 fathoms of gillnet net on board

ISSUE: All the special harvest areas restrict fishers to a reduced area and reduced net length except ERSHA management.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishers fishing in a special harvest area would all have the same restrictions. The Kvichak escapement would also benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Mitch Kink (HQ-06F-079)

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 06.359. Egegik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

At a minimum, set gillnet running lines must be removed when setnetters are not fishing.

ISSUE: Lack of access to the beach by drift gillnetters when setnetters are not fishing because their buoys, running lines, etc. obstruct drifters who are trying to fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of fishing area by drift fishers.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Drift fishers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Remove buoys, lines and anchors, but may be too hard to take all gear out each time.

PROPOSED BY: Myra J. Olsen (SW-06F-018)

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 06.357. Ugashik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulations by adding the following:

Prior to June 23 and when the Naknek River Special Harvest Area Plan is in effect, the Ugashik District boundaries will consist of all waters east of a line from South Spit to North Smokey Point (described using lat./long.).

ISSUE: Early harvest of non-Ugashik River salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Salmon bound for other rivers will continue to be harvested.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Possibly all districts other than Ugashik.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who fish Ugashik District.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee (SW-06F-009)

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 06.357. Ugashik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation by adding the following:

Prior to June 23, the Ugashik District boundaries will consist of all waters east of a line from South Spit north to Smokey Point (described using lat./long.)

ISSUE: Early harvest of non-Ugashik River salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Salmon bound for other rivers will continue to be harvested.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Possibly all districts other than Ugashik.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who fish Ugashik district early (generally less than 50).

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee (SW-06F-008)

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 06.357. Ugashik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation by adding the following:

Prior to June 23, and when the Naknek River Special Harvest Plan is in effect, the Ugashik District boundaries will consist of all waters east of a line from South Spit north to Smokey Point to be described using latitude and longitude.

ISSUE: Early harvest of non-Ugashik River salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Salmon bound for other rivers will continue to be harvested.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Possibly all districts other than Ugashik.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who fish Ugashik district.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee (HQ-06F-026)

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 06.357. Ugashik River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation by adding the following:

Prior to June 23, the Ugashik District boundaries will consist of all waters east of a line from South Spit north to Smokey Point to be described using latitude and longitude.

ISSUE: Early harvest of non-Ugashik River salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Salmon bound for other rivers will

continue to be harvested.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Possibly all districts other than Ugashik.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Fishermen who fish Ugashik district early (generally less than 50).

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee (HQ-06F-025)

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 06.373. Alagnak River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

No action would be taken that would restrict the harvest of Naknek or Kvichak fish to obtain the OEG on the Alagnak. Set the OEG on the Alagnak at 100,000.

ISSUE: The department is developing a SEG for the Alagnak River system between 400,000 and 500,000. The department has never managed the Alagnak River system. If the Kvichak recovers fishers may be prevented from harvesting Kvichak fish to obtain the SEG on the Alagnak. The board needs to adopt a management plan, with an OEG, for the Alagnak River to prevent this from happening.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All fishermen in Bristol Bay could continue to have restrictions placed on them after the Kvichak recovers.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishermen in Bristol Bay when the Kvichak recovers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, because the Alagnak was never managed in the past.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Stop the department from developing a SEG.

PROPOSED BY: Vince Webster (SW-06F-022)

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 06.373. Alagnak River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

The Alagnak should follow the regulations already established at 84 percent drift gillnet and 16 percent set gillnet.

ISSUE: No allocation for the Alagnak Special Harvest Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Setnetters are getting more fish than is allotted for the Naknek-Kvichak management plan.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, typically product off a drift vessel is better than set net product, especially if the drift vessel has RSW.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The driftnet fleet.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Setnetters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Dominic Lee (HQ-06F-052)

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 06.373. Alagnak River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation 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
- (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: The allocation agreement from the 1997 Bristol Bay board 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 is not being applied correctly.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All 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-06F-133)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 06.373. Alagnak River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

Due to the fact that the Alagnak River king salmon run occurs at exactly the same time as the Alagnak River sockeye salmon run and the average Alagnak king salmon escapement is only 5,000 fish, commercial fishing will not be permitted in the Alagnak River.

ISSUE: I do not believe that there should be any commercial fishing allowed in the Alagnak River because a relatively small run of king salmon occurs at exactly the same time as the sockeye salmon run in the Alagnak.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The king salmon escapement in the Alagnak River averages only 5,000 fish each year and unlike other rivers in Bristol Bay the Alagnak king run occurs at exactly the same time as the sockeye run. Due to the very shallow nature of the lower Alagnak, king salmon only enter the river on the tides. Even if the kings get through gill nets by busting a mesh, they lose their slime and will not live long enough to spawn. Therefore, I believe commercial fishing in the Alagnak could very easily wipe out the Alagnak king salmon run.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Over 1,000 sport fisherman each year, the Alaska tourism industry, several sport fishing lodges and many Bristol Bay area businesses will benefit if my solution is adopted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A small number (20-50) of commercial fishermen may suffer if my solution is adopted, however there are other options (other areas in Bristol Bay) for these commercial fisherman.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

If Alagnak River sockeye could be harvested without adversely affecting the Alagnak king salmon run, I would not oppose it. Due to the shallow nature of the Alagnak and the fact that in the Alagnak, the king and sockeye salmon run at precisely the same time, I do not see how this can be done.

PROPOSED BY: Karl Storath (HQ-06F-063)

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 06.373. Alagnak River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(d) Salmon may be taken in the ARSHA only with set gillnet gear.

ISSUE: Drift in the Alagnak River Special Harvest Area jeopardizes the chinook salmon run. The area is not conducive to orderly drift fishing because of size, depth, gear length and efficiency. The setnetter and sport fishing interest have established a co-existence that does not endanger chinook stocks.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chinook stocks will be put at risk. Conflict between drift and sport fishers will intensify.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality of the harvest will improve. The setnet fish are better handled and delivered more frequently.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnet fishers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Drift fishers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminating all commercial fishing in the Alagnak. It is not fair to punish setnetters. They have demonstrated they are able to co-exist with sport fishers.

PROPOSED BY: Kvichak Setnetters Association (HQ-06F-076)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 06.373 Alagnak River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

A small setnet fishery is okay. But there should be no driftnet fishery in the Alagnak because of the bycatch.

ISSUE: I would like to see driftnet fishery on the Alagnak River stopped.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The king run in the Alagnak River is 5,000 fish, and they run with the sockeye run. So the bycatch of kings is going to be too great to sustain the king run for very long.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would stabilize the king run for sport fishing and still give the commercial fishery some fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The king run in the Alagnak, the sport fishery, and the commercial setnet fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The driftnetters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Michael Struznik (HQ-06F-112)

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Remove the allocation regulation completely.

ISSUE: The allocation between drift and setnet in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area and Naknek-Kvichak district.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Setnetters will continue to suffer economic hardship and lost fishing time even while meeting escapement and overescapement of

the river systems.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will increase the quality of the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All concerned parties.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None at this time.

PROPOSED BY: South Naknek Village Setnetters (SW-06F-019)

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Repeal the allocation regulation.

ISSUE: The allocation between drift and setnet in the Naknek River special harvest area and Naknek/Kvichak district.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Setnetters will continue to suffer economic hardship and lost fishing time even while meeting escapement and over escapement of the river systems.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will increase the quality of the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All concerned parties.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None at this time

PROPOSED BY: South Naknek Village Setnetters (HQ-06F-064)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

- 1) The Naknek-Kvichak district allocation plan will not apply in the NRSHA. The setnet fleet will fish one tide after the drift fleet fishes two consecutive tides or
- 2) No gear group may fish more than two consecutive tides for the purpose of trying to catch up on allocation.

ISSUE: The Naknek-Kvichak allocation plan was based on the historical harvest in the district not the NRSHA. The amount of gear fished in the district is in no way a reflection of

the gear fished in the river. When the district allocation plan is used in the NRSHA, the setnet fleet has been unable to fish for two to three days at a time because the drift fleet did not have enough effort to harvest their allocation. Last year the drift fleet fished for three days straight and the canneries went on limit by the time the setnetters got to fish. The board needs to bring back an allocation in the NRSHA based on tides fished or say no gear group may fish more than two consecutive tides for the purpose of trying to catch up on allocation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Setnetters could continue to sit on the beach because there is not enough drift fleet effort to catch their allocation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnetters in the NRSHA.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Drift fishermen who choose not to transfer out of the NRSHA.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Vince Webster (SW-06F-024)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Delete from 5 AAC 06.364 under section (b):

- (1) drift gillnet - 84 percent and
- (2) set gillnet - 16 percent as follows:
 - (A) Kvichak Section set gillnet fishery - eight percent; and
 - (B) Naknek Section set gillnet - eight percent;
- (3) notwithstanding (2)(A) and (B) of this subsection, when the Naknek-Kvichak district is closed and there is a harvestable surplus of sockeye salmon in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area, the distribution of harvestable surplus will be as follows:
 - (A) drift gillnet - 84 percent; and
 - (B) set gillnet - 16 percent.

Replace with:

Drift gillnet 67 percent, Naknek Section setnet 16.5 percent, Kvichak setnet 16.5 percent. NRSHA drift gillnet 67 percent, and set gillnet 33 percent.

Apply to both the outside area and inside the SHA.

ISSUE: The allocation of 84 percent drift gillnet and 16 percent and the unforeseen problem brought about by a reduced effort of drift fleet. The Naknek/Kvichak has experienced many problems from the beginning of the allocation plan. Most of these problems are related to fleet size.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Incorrect allocation of salmon stocks.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnetters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Drifters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1.) Re-evaluation of allocation plan. 2.) Return to alternating tides. (Both submitted as proposals.)

PROPOSED BY: Donald Mack (HQ-06F-068)

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Delete from 5 AAC 06.364 under section (b):

- (1) drift gillnet - 84 percent and
- (2) set gillnet - 16 percent as follows:
 - (A) Kvichak Section set gillnet fishery - eight percent; and
 - (B) Naknek Section set gillnet - eight percent;
- (3) notwithstanding (2)(A) and (B) of this subsection, when the Naknek-Kvichak district is closed and there is a harvestable surplus of sockeye salmon in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area, the distribution of harvestable surplus will be as follows:
 - (A) drift gillnet - 84 percent; and
 - (B) set gillnet - 16 percent.

Replace with:

New calculations starting at time of allocation plan to present time. Install safeguards to allow adjustment of allocation due to fluctuation of user groups.

Apply to both the outside area and inside the SHA.

ISSUE: Allocation problems from current regulations allowing drift gillnet fleet 84 percent and set gillnet 16 percent. New averages will show a greatly reduced drift gillnet fleet that enjoys an allocation designed for a fleet almost twice the size that participates nom.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Set gillnetters will sit on the beach while the drift gillnet fleet tries to close an allocation gap that is almost impossible to do with the size of the current fleet.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A fair system benefits everybody.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1.) Drift gillnet 67 percent and set gillnet 33 percent. 2.) Return to alternating tides. (Both submitted as proposals.)

PROPOSED BY: Donald Mack

(HQ-06F-069)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Delete from 5 AAC 06.364 under section (b):

- (1) drift gillnet - 84 percent and
- (2) set gillnet - 16 percent as follows:
 - (A) Kvichak Section set gillnet fishery - eight percent; and
 - (B) Naknek Section set gillnet - eight percent;
- (3) notwithstanding (2)(A) and (B) of this subsection, when the Naknek-Kvichak district is closed and there is a harvestable surplus of sockeye salmon in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area, the distribution of harvestable surplus will be as follows:
 - (A) drift gillnet - 84 percent; and
 - (B) set gillnet - 16 percent.

Replace with:

Alternating tides for user groups as adopted during the 2000 Board of Fisheries cycle.

Apply to both the outside area and inside the SHA.

ISSUE: Problems closing allocation gap of 84 percent drift gillnet and 16 percent set gillnet, due to reduced fishing effort by drift gillnet fleet.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Set gillnetters will continue to miss fishing time due to a reduced drift fleet fishing on an allocation designed for a much larger fleet.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who is affected by an incorrect allocation system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who is receiving an allocation percentage that is greater than it should be.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1.) Drift gillnet 67 percent and set gillnet 33 percent.

2.) Recalculate Naknek-Kvichak allocation system. (Both submitted as proposals.)

PROPOSED BY: Donald Mack

(HQ-06F-070)

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

5 AAC 06.364(d)(1)

(A) When a harvest of Kvichak stocks is projected the commissioner shall allow Kvichak section set gillnets to fish concurrently with all Naknek section drift gillnet or set gillnet

openings, with openings consistent with other provisions of this section.

(1) shall allow additional Kvichak setnet only openings to attain the eight percent allocation

(2) If the projected Kvichak harvest is less than one million fish, the commissioner may limit Kvichak set gillnet gear to 25 fathoms.

ISSUE: The board has established that Kvichak setnet fishers are allocated eight percent of the Naknek/Kvichak harvest. Due to timing differences between returns to the Naknek River versus the Kvichak River, area biologists manage the district harvest to target first the Naknek River stocks and then the Kvichak River stocks. Primarily this is done through Naknek only openings early in the season, either drift, set, or both gear types. The result is the Kvichak setnet fishers are being excluded from participation in the early portion of the harvest comprised of predominately Naknek stocks though any stocks in the Kvichak district are likely Naknek stocks due to run timing. Kvichak setnet fishers are unable to participate on an equal basis. In most years this results in a high likelihood that the Kvichak setnet allocation of eight percent will not be achieved. During years when the projected harvestable stock from the Kvichak River system is low, full harvest of the Kvichak stocks are achieved through predominantly Naknek Section-only openings.

Catches are as high as 70 percent Kvichak fish. 1985 is an excellent example when drift catches of Kvichak stocks during a three-day period of Naknek-only openings equaled the entire seasons' Kvichak setnet catch of 500,000 fish. This information is in the departments scale sampling study. In the study, Naknek catches were comprised of 40 percent Kvichak stocks on the average.

The solution suggest here provides an additional tool to meet the allocation objective, while providing gear reduction necessary to meet the escapement goal in low-return years.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Kvichak setnet fishers will continue to be excluded from participation in the early portion of the harvest and the harvest of the allocated eight percent will continue to not be achieved.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quality of the harvest will not be impacted positively or negatively.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Kvichak setnet fishers and Naknek section fishers, both setnet and drift, who currently harvest in excess of their allocated percentages. This proposal would help balance the allocation and validate their catches.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow Kvichak setnet fishers to fish in the NRSHA while drift and Naknek setnet fishers are fishing in the Naknek section. This idea was rejected as being deemed unnecessary since when the department opens the Naknek section they are accepting a level of interception harvest of Kvichak stocks and Kvichak fishers could participate equaling by fishing their traditional sites.

PROPOSED BY: Kvichak Setnetters Association

(HQ-06F-075)

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Allocation percentage between gear groups in the NRSHA will be set daily by the department based on the number of permits registered in the district. For instance, if 800 drift boats and 100 set nets were registered to fish the NRSHA, drift boats would receive a higher allocation percentage. When the initial allocation numbers were set, (84 percent drift/16 percent set), there were many more drift permits registered in the Naknek district than there have been since the fishery was moved to the NRSHA to protect Kvichak stocks. There were also more set permits registered, but the ratio between the two gear groups has changed. The allocation percentage needs to be changed to reflect this shift.

ISSUE: Allocation percentage within the Naknek River Special Harvest Area (NRSHA) adversely affects the ability of the department to manage escapement for the Naknek River salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Optimum escapement goals for the Naknek River have not been met recently, and likely results include sub-optimum salmon returns in future years.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would help maintain the quantity and quality of future salmon runs by assuring that optimum escapement numbers, as determined by the department, could be met through careful management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The fishermen, either set or drift, who are in the Naknek district.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Wanda Nelson (HQ-06F-103)

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Limit the number of successive tides that a gear group would fish to three before the alternate gear group would be allowed an opportunity to fish at least one tide.

ISSUE: Generally, when fewer drift boats are fishing, it takes them longer to catch their allocated percentage of the harvest. Additionally, many drift boats choose not to fish the whole period which makes it even more difficult for them to catch their allocated percentage. While waiting for them to catch up, the setnet fleet, which remains relatively constant in numbers, has to sit on the beach and wait. During the 2004 fishing season, setnet fishermen waited over nine tides for the drift fishermen to try and catch their allotted percentage. This did not give the setnet fishermen an opportunity to participate equally in the fishery, especially considering this was during the peak time of the run (on and around July 4).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Willing and able setnet fishermen see the profitability of their seasons suffer while drift fishermen fish only the “best” part of the tide before heading back to the dock to wait for their next opening. The drift fishermen justify this behavior (reasonably) because it costs more to operate a drift boat, so more fish must be harvested to make each set profitable. As a result of the situation, over escapement occurred while setnet fishermen would have been willing to fish the entire tide to maximize the use of the resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This type of regulation would allow opportunity for setnet fishermen to have access to fishing time when there are few drift fishermen in the district. Processors have shown a preference for the quality of fish harvested by setnetters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnet fishermen and processors.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Drift fishermen who do not take advantage of their full fishing time.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Let setnet fishermen and drift fishermen fish simultaneously. Simultaneous gear group fishing has been unfavorable in the NRSHA due to the small size of the district.

PROPOSED BY: Eike Smith (SW-06F-041)

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 06.364(b). Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend the regulation as follows:

Close Kvichak River a minimum of five years to any commercial fishing.

Contain drift gillnet fleet to Naknek section only, contain set gillnetters to NRSHA and make NRSHA a permanent commercial fishing district for setnet only.

Continue to develop Alagnak River fishery.

From 5 AAC 06.364. section (b) the following parts (1), (2)(A)(B), and (3)(A)(B). Replace with any of the following to be used by the department: staggered tides, alternating tides, or simultaneous fishing by both user groups.

ISSUE: Declining salmon stocks in the Kvichak River. The following is a list of benefits that can be achieved by a temporary closure of the Kvichak River to commercial fishing.

- 1.) The Kvichak River - May help declining salmon stocks. Some say the decline is a historical cycle and will rebound naturally. What isn't historical is the efficiency and aggressive nature of the drift fleet fishing on the Kvichak stocks during a declining cycle.
- 2.) The quality of salmon - Less towing to avoid collisions, less tangled gear due to fishing in restricted areas, quicker delivery times to tenders and processing plants.
- 3.) Drift gillnetters - Safer less dangerous fishery, less gear and boat damage, more room to fish, more opportunity to fish on larger schools of salmon, less chance of over escapement, no

- interference from setnet gear, know where you will be fishing for the next five years.
- 4.) Set gillnetters - Safer and less dangerous fishery due to less boat traffic, less night openings, less gear lost, know where you will be fishing for the next five years, no allocation, no missed fishing time, choice of NRSHA of Alagnak fishing areas and easier quicker deliveries.
 - 5.) ADF&G - Easier management of stocks, can maximize returning Kvichak salmon stocks for rebuilding purposes. No Naknek/Kvichak allocation problems to deal with.
 - 6.) Enforcement - Safer less dangerous application on duties. Less disputes among user groups, less collisions/property damage among drifters, easier to monitor setnet group.
 - 7.) Board of Fisheries - a. Help stabilize Naknek/Kvichak shrinking drift gillnet fleet and allocation problems associated.
 - b. Help stabilize Nushagak growing drift fleet and allocation problems associated.
 - c. Eliminate long standing allocation disputes in Naknek/Kvichak area that the board has been dealing with since the beginning of the allocation plan.
 - d. Not faced with the morale decision to lower the Kvichak River minimum escapement goals further endangering this river system.
 - 8.) Canneries - Will know where their fleet will be for better processing, planning and tender placement.

This proposal has the potential for solving a wide range of problems and possibly creating some, but I believe it is worth consideration.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued decline of Kvichak salmon stocks. Continued uncertainty of Naknek/Kvichak fishermen and other river districts affected by Kvichak not needing minimum escapement as to where they will be fishing (special harvest area or commercial district).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, less towing on gillnets to avoid collision and less tangled gear due to fishing in small area. More tenders spaced throughout district for quicker receiving and delivery of salmon to processing plants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Kvichak River, drift gillnetters, setnet gillnetters, the department, enforcement and board of fisheries.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some set and drift gillnetters who wish to fish the Kvichak and some Ugashik and Egigek fishermen depending on their special harvest area status.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We have tried many other solutions. Maybe doing nothing for a period of time is the solution.

PROPOSED BY: Donald Mack (HQ-06F-004)

PROPOSAL 97 - 5AAC 06.360. Naknek River Sockeye Salmon Special Harvest Area Management Plan; and 5 AAC 06.364. Naknek-Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend these regulations as follows:

Set an optimum escapement goal (OEG) of 2,000,000 fish on the small years and 6,000,000 fish on the large year with an additional escapement of 50 percent of the run over the 6,000,000 escapement on the large year.

ISSUE: The department is talking about setting a SEG for the Kvichak River at 17,000,000 fish on large years. I feel increasing the escapement goal would destroy our fishery again like it did the last time the BEG was increased for the Kvichak. I am asking the board to develop an OEG for the Kvichak River to prevent a total destruction of our fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen will continue to be pushed into the NRSHA after the Kvichak recovers.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishermen in Bristol Bay.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Ask the department not to raise the escapement on the Kvichak River. The department will not openly admit they caused the Kvichak to crash by increasing the BEG in 1984.

PROPOSED BY: Vince Webster (SW-06F-027)

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 06.364 Naknek – Kvichak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Establish an optimal escapement goal (OEG) for the Kvichak River for off-peak years between 1 million and 1.5 million fish. Allow full district fishing in the east side fisheries until July 2 regardless of the Kvichak escapement.

ISSUE: The effect that the Kvichak River has on the management of other districts. Quality issues with the inriver fisheries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to produce low quality product and not harvest significant quantities of fish due to management constraints.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, when fishing in the outer districts, the quality is better.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Konrad Schaad (HQ-06F-050)

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 06.367. Nushagak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(c) Have allocation period end July 12.

ISSUE: By July 12 a significant portion of both user groups have ceased operation. But harvest percentages are still being managed for until July 17.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Missed opportunity to harvest more fish.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (SW-06F-014)

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 06.367. Nushagak District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(d) During directed chinook openings set and drift openings may be nonconcurrent but equal length.

ISSUE: Currently both gear types should be opened concurrently unless making adjustments to sockeye harvest percentages. This results in more bucking tide for the drift fleet during directed chinook openings.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? During directed chinook openings the drift fleet has to buck tide resulting in more expensive operating cost or the setnet fleet gets more fishing time than the drift fleet.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, by allowing closures to be timed such that bucking time is minimized and access to the dock is available.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (SW-06F-015)

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 06.XXX. Create a new regulation to provide for the following:

A special Nushagak harvest area shall be in effect after July 10 between Kanakanak Bluff and

Snag Point when Nushagak district registered permit holders may use up to 25 fathoms of drift gillnet gear for the “dude fishing” charter trips. Trip limits of 500 pounds may be reduced by the department if conservation considerations warrant.

ISSUE: Limited economic opportunities for rural Alaska communities.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? An easily realized economic opportunity will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Enhanced visitor business opportunities will add value to the resource by significantly increasing the ex-vessel value of the catch.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who participate benefit by virtue of the alternative economic opportunity made available, and those who do not participate benefit by decreased competition in the regular Nushagak commercial district, since for every permit fished in the special harvest area, 125 fathoms of drift gillnet gear are removed from the regular commercial district.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Costs involved in taking “dude licensed” tourists into the regular Nushagak District are prohibitive.

PROPOSED BY: Fritz Johnson (SW-06F-034)

PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 06.367. Nushagak District commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

When the preseason forecast for the Kvichak River sockeye salmon run does not provide for an exploitation rate of greater than 40 percent, it is the intent of the Board of Fisheries that on July 5 that it will move the Nushagak District from Nushagak Bay north of a line from a ADF&G regulatory marker located at approximately 58° 39.37’N. lat., 158° 46.57’W. long. (Nichols Hills) to a ADF&G regulatory marker located at approximately 58° 39.37’ N. lat., 158° 19.31’W. long. (Etolin Point) to Snake River ADF&G marker 58° 52.90’ N. lat., 158° 43.30’ W. long.

ISSUE: The department has to add more protection to the Kvichak River system. Depending on timing, tide and weather patterns, Kvichak River stocks are still vulnerable to intercept in outlying fishing districts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Kvichak River escapement will not be achieved with the timing pattern of the run.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No effect on quality of the harvested resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups will benefit. Kvichak escapement is good. The faster we get escapement the faster we get to return to our normal fishing districts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one suffers, the faster we get the Kvichak on normal timing pattern the sooner we get to fish in our regular salmon districts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Current inriver special harvest sockeye salmon run does not provide for an exploitation rate of greater than 40 percent with the timing patterns of the run for Kvichak sockeye salmon.

PROPOSED BY: Darryl F. Pope (HQ-06F-092)

PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 06.365. Egegik District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries and Management Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation to provide the following:

In Egegik District from June 1 until escapement goal is met; if drift fleet falls behind by two percent of their 86 percent allocation allow fleet to fish 200 fathoms of gear until allocation is met. If boat numbers are below 200, set nets fish concurrently and allocation plan ends if fleet cannot bring up allocation. After three tides, allocation plan ends.

ISSUE: The drift fleet is unable to harvest the 86 percent allocation because there are too few boats in the district. Late in the Emergency Order period boats leave the Egegik District for other areas, leaving low effort in Egegik. Surplus fish are wasted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Boats will continue to be unable to bring up allocation numbers because of low boat numbers. Setnets are safer by sitting on the beach.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both gear types.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fleet below 200 boats, end allocation plan. (Did not reject idea.)

PROPOSED BY: Cody and Kim Rice (HQ-06F-105)

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 06.365. Egegik District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

(c) For the purpose of calculating the set and drift gillnet allocation percentages specified in (b) of this section, the accounting period is from June 1 until the escapement goal is met [THROUGH 9:00 A.M. JULY 17].

ISSUE: Accounting period change; change accounting period to reflect when escapement is met, not a calendar day.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If escapement is met, allocation plan

should end. Boat numbers too low in late season to bring up percentages.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both gear types.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Fleet below 200 boats end allocation plan. (Did not reject idea.)

PROPOSED BY: Kim Rice (HQ-06F-106)

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 06.365. Egegik District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

The outer boundary of Egegik fishing district is the 110 line. When Naknek special harvest area goes into effect, Egegik goes to inriver fishing. No outside fishing. Move the line up inside to the mouth of the river. No outside beaches.

ISSUE: Kvichak River escapements. Low Kvichak River escapements hurt all of Bristol Bay. Interception of Kvichak fish is known and documented in the Egegik district. When the Naknek River Special Harvest Area goes into effect, and Egegik goes to the 110 line, catches in Egegik go down and two days later Naknek catches go up. When fishing at the beginning of the season starts in the Naknek River and Egegik starts at the 110 line projected catches change almost to the number: Egegik less fish, Naknek more fish. Egegik’s outer boundary should be the 110 line and when the Naknek River Special Harvest Area is in effect, they should have to move in more towards the Egegik River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We are hurting all fishers and people of Bristol Bay by allowing interception of Kvichak fish in Egegik. You cannot take fish in one district that are going to another. This management plan has been hurting all of Bristol Bay.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the proposal tries to prevent Kvichak from having low escapements causing Naknek Special Harvest Area. Egegik will have more time to fish on their own fish because interception of Kvichak stocks will be less.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone. Egegik always seems to have plenty of inriver fish on paper so let them catch this inriver estimated fish. They will get more fishing time inriver not having to worry about Kvichak stocks. Kvichak stocks of salmon will be protected from interception at the 135 line. Take interception out of the picture and management will be easier to control escapements.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Interception in Bristol Bay has been a problem for many years. It is time to stop it. The Kvichak is the main river system. The west side is a fishery that can handle more boats and it is the traditional fishing grounds of Bristol Bay.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chris Cameron (HQ-06F-132)

PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 06.365. Egegik District Commercial Set and Drift Gillnet Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management and Allocation Plan. Amend these regulations as follows:

(g) In the set gillnet fishery, all set gillnet fishing gear, including anchors and buoys, shall be removed during set gillnet closures, consistent with Alaska Statute 16.10.055.

ISSUE: Setnet gear still in the navigable fishing waters of the Egegik district during closed fishing periods.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current situation allows dangerous hindrances to navigation, jeopardizing both lives and equipment. Commercial fishing vessels and gear will continue to be willfully and recklessly damaged by disregard to the consequences.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this regulation will also greatly improve quality by alleviating power-rolling situations by the driftnet fleet as they are blown or flooded onto all the cables, lines, and buoys.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All navigators will benefit. Set and drift gillnetters will both benefit from a more responsive manageable fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some set gillnetters will need to reconfigure their operations in order to operate in this manner of consequential responsibility. Hydraulic power packs for pulling anchors are readily available and affordable.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Larry Christensen (HQ-06F-173)

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 06.200(a). Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections. Amend this regulation as follows:

Move the lower Nushagak boundary at Etolin Pt. 2 to 3 miles to the north of Etolin Point.

ISSUE: The Nushagak interception of Kvichak fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Kvichak river sockeye stock will continue to experience difficulty in recovering. Commercial, sport and subsistence fishermen of the Kvichak will continue to have difficulty harvesting Kvichak sockeye.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All commercial fishermen as Kvichak stock will recover

more quickly allowing greater fishing opportunity for Kvichak sport and subsistence fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Having Nugashak fish inriver. Too restrictive.

PROPOSED BY: Igiugig Village Council (HQ-06F-126)

PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 06.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections. Amend this regulation as follows:

Reduce the district fishing boundary at the Etolin Pt.

ISSUE: Elimination of Kvichak bound sockeye in the lower Nushagak district, particularly at the southeast corner at Etolin Pt. Here, Kvichak fish cycle through and are intercepted before getting to their river of origin.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This interception of Kvichak bound fish stocks will continue and the Kvichak will continue to have problems meeting its escapement goals. The sport fish, subsistence and commercial Kvichak fishermen will be negatively impacted with reduced fishing times and harvest levels.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Quantity of Kvichak stock will increase and repopulate.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Kvichak sport and subsistence fishermen who have consistently had to reduce harvest levels and needs. Also commercial setnet and driftnet fishermen will have a healthier Kvichak stock to harvest in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, Nushagak fishermen can go to other districts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Igiugig Village Council (HQ-06F-127)

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 06.200(a). Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections. Amend this regulation as follows:

Move the lower boundary line two miles to the north, away from Etolin Point.

ISSUE: Interception of Kvichak stocks in the Nushagak district.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Kvichak sockeye run will continue to have difficulty achieving escapement goals.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Randolph Alvarez (HQ-06F-129)

PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 06.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections. Amend this regulation as follows:

Ugashik fishing district is all waters inside a line from Smoky Point to South Spit. Ugashik becomes an inriver fishery. No outside fishing.

ISSUE: Kvichak River escapements, low Kvichak escapements cause managers to use Naknek River Special Harvest Area hurting Naknek River stocks of king salmon and causing over-escapement of the Branch River and the Naknek River. Fishing in the Ugashik district has a 17-mile line on outside waters. If all the fish going into Ugashik were only caught in an inriver fishery which is already open, less interception of other district fish would occur. Ugashik fish are known to come later than other runs. It is a known intercept fishery of Kvichak stocks. If Ugashik was an inriver fishery, managers could give Ugashik fishers more time to work on only Ugashik fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We are going down the road of endangering Kvichak, Branch River, and Naknek runs. Interception of fish in any area of Bristol Bay when other rivers cannot meet escapement hurts everyone. If Ugashik fish are going into the Ugashik River then why can they not catch them all within Ugashik inside waters where interception most likely will not occur.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it helps prevent under-escapement of Kvichak stock which causes Naknek River Special Harvest Area. If Ugashik was an inriver fishery, managers could give Ugashik fishers more time to work on only Ugashik fish. Ugashik fish will be better; Ugashik fish are known to move in and out of the river on the tide. More time inriver to prevent water marking of these fish. Ugashik always seems to have big numbers of inriver fish before escapement so let Ugashik catch these fish and not intercept fish going to other areas on the 17-mile outside line.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Ugashik fishermen for they can now fish more time on Ugashik fish inriver and not be concerned about other stocks getting intercepted. All fishermen in Bristol Bay benefit from Kvichak fish getting to the Kvichak River without getting intercepted in other districts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Interception of Kvichak stocks in any river system hurts all people in Bristol Bay.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chris Cameron (HQ-06F-131)

PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 06.220. Fishing Districts, Subdistricts, and Sections. Amend this

regulation as follows:

The Ugashik District boundary will consist of all waters south of a line between South Spit and Smokey Point, upstream of a line from 57° 29.62' N. lat., 157° 37.63' W. long. to 57° 29.83' N. lat., 157° 35.22' W. long.

ISSUE: The department has to add more protection to the Kvichak River system. Depending on timing, tide and weather patterns, Kvichak River stocks are still vulnerable to intercept in outlying fishing districts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Kvichak River escapement will not be achieved with the timing pattern of the run.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No affect on quality of the harvested resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups will benefit. Kvichak escapement is good. The faster we get escapement the faster we get to return to our normal fishing districts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one suffers, the faster we get the Kvichak on normal timing pattern the sooner we get to fish in our regular salmon districts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Current inriver special harvest sockeye salmon run does not provide for an exploitation rate of greater than 40 percent with the timing patterns of the run for Kvichak sockeye salmon.

PROPOSED BY: Darryl F. Pope (HQ-06F-093)

PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 06.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections. Amend this regulation as follows:

Change Ugashik boundaries to start at Cape Greig to a buoy one mile offshore and then continue out to Cape Menshikof.

ISSUE: Ugashik fishing boundaries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued hardship on fisherman.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All drift fishermen

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Roland Briggs (HQ-06F-080)

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 06.200(a)(1). Fishing districts, subdistricts and sections.

Amend this regulation as follows:

(a)(1) Igushik Section: all waters of Nushagak Bay bounded by a line from ... **to a point at 58° 36.28' N. lat., 158° 34.40' W. long.** [TO A POINT AT 58° 36.29' N. LAT., 158° 34.41' W. LONG.] ...

ISSUE: As written, the point to be changed is approximately 50 feet short of the Nushagak district south line as described in 5 AAC 06.200 (a). The new point is much closer to the south line (approximately 15 feet over), effectively closing the wedge that would otherwise be open in the Igushik Section when the Igushik Section is closed and the Nushagak Section is open.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A small area of the Igushik Section will be open when the Nushagak Section is open and the Igushik Section is closed.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Participants in the fishery will benefit from more clarity in the regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-06F-168)

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 06.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections. Amend this regulation as follows:

The outer boundary line will remain on the 32110 line whether the fleet is in the Naknek River Special Harvest Area or not.

ISSUE: Interception of the Naknek and Kvichak stocks at the Egegik district.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? These stocks will continue to have difficulty achieving escapements, especially the Kvichak.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Naknek/Kvichak fishermen, and Egegik inriver fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The line fishermen.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Lake Iliamna Advisory Committee (SW-06F-029)

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 06.320. Fishing periods. Amend this regulation as follows:

Add 12 hours to the Kulukak section.

ISSUE: Short opening for salmon fishing in Kulukak section.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It has not been fair for the traditional Kulukak fishermen especially for the setnet fishermen who do not have any other site besides Kulukak.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, it will be the same.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Setnet and drift fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Same openings as Togiak section.

PROPOSED BY: Togiak Traditional Council (SW-06F-032)

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 67.022. Special provisions for seasons, bag limits, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Amend this regulation as follows:

In Lake Kulik and the Chulitna River drainage including the waters of Lake Clark within one mile of the outside of the Chulitna River the bag, possession, and size limit of northern pike is 5 fish per day, 5 in possession, **none of which may be over 30 inches** [ONE IN POSSESSION MAY BE OVER 30 INCHES IN LENGTH].

ISSUE: Large trophy northern pike are only found in a number of drainages in Bristol Bay. Harvest of large northern pike at Lake Kulik of the Wood River Drainage and the Chulitna River drainage could eliminate a unique resource in the Bristol Bay area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Large northern pike may be over harvested resulting in stunted populations of northern pike and the loss of a unique angling opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will help ensure that the large northern pike at these locations will not be overharvested providing a unique opportunity for individuals interested in angling for trophy northern pike, while still allowing for the harvest of fish under 30 inches for food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anglers interested in angling for, and maintaining populations of northern pike.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anglers interested in harvesting large northern pike over 30 inches, however if a trophy is desired for taxidermy a replica can be created of a trophy fish released.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Apply the regulation Bristol Bay wide, but this would eliminate all harvest opportunity for large northern pike.

PROPOSED BY: Nushagak Advisory Committee (SW-06F-013)

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 67.022. Special Provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Amend this regulation as follows:

Brooks Lake would be closed within one fourth mile of all inlet and outlet streams between April 10 and June 7 and there is no retention of Rainbow trout in Brooks Lake within one fourth mile of Brooks River from June 8 through October 31.

ISSUE: There is no fishing allowed in Brooks Lake between April 10 and June 7 and no retention of Rainbow trout from June 8 through October 31. I would like the board to remove the above restrictions from Brooks Lake. The closure and restrictions should only apply to Brooks River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishing on Brooks Lake will continue to be restricted without any biological concern.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who wishes to fish in Brooks Lake.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. There is no biological concern of any species in Brooks Lake.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Vince Webster (SW-06F-020)

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 67.025. Kvichak River Drainage Sockeye Salmon Management Plan. Amend this regulation as follows:

Remove from regulation any regulation that calls for the reduction of sport caught limits on sockeye salmon in the Iliamna drainage prior to biological data obtained during the current salmon season. The department has as a management tool, the ability to close any waters should biological data received show a need.

ISSUE: Unnecessary reduction in sport caught/kept sockeye in the Iliamna drainage when the department forecasts escapements below minimum returns of sockeye. Past records show that sport fish harvest of sockeye salmon averaged 0.0023. In 1989 the highest sport-harvested sockeye salmon was 23,614. When we take that number and use it on the 2002 escapement with the smallest sockeye salmon return of 703,884, it shows that sport fish harvest consists of only 0.0335 percent of all Iliamna drainage. The department still maintains the control to shut down all harvest should biological data show the need.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The loss of revenue in the Iliamna

drainage communities has been tremendous due to the reduction in harvestable sport caught sockeye salmon. If this regulation is left in place there will be continued loss of revenue and potential revenue for small sport fish Iliamna drainage businesses and Bed and Breakfasts in the area. In addition, the Iliamna drainage will have a continued poor reputation as a viable destination for sport fishing of all species.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it improves the potential for governments and individuals to enhance revenues, decrease dependence of outside agency's support as well as overall view of the welfare of the Iliamna drainage area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users and potential users as well as state governing agencies overlooking management of Iliamna drainage area resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is expected to suffer because there is no biological evidence that the current regulation was needed or that any adverse impact has been recorded from the legal harvest of sockeye salmon to support the current regulation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: George Riddle and Nanci Morris Lyon (SW-06F-035)

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 67.022. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Amend this regulation as follows:

(g) In the Naknek River Drainage from its confluence with Harris Creek, upstream to its confluence with the Chichitnok River, only one rainbow trout over 24 inches per year may be retained. All other rainbow trout must be immediately released.

ISSUE: Lack of opportunity for anglers to retain one rainbow trout per year between Harris Creek and the Chichitnok River. Anglers travel far and pay plenty and should have the choice as to whether they want to keep one rainbow trout for trophy mounting. No biological reasons exist to justify zero harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The guides operating in this area are at a disadvantage concerning client recruitment when compared to other areas that allow some rainbow trout retention. This disadvantage will continue when no biological reason can support keeping the current regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Under current regulations, no rainbow trout may be harvested. Under this proposal only a high quality rainbow would be retained on an extremely limited basis. The quality of the angling experience would increase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those likely to benefit include anglers who wish to retain one rainbow trout per year for mounting or eating and guides trying to recruit clients who wish to keep one rainbow. Guides who pay the state land use fees in this area will be able to fish closer to camp when angling to keep one trophy rainbow trout.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The total take and the impact, even if every angler

retained a fish, would be insignificant.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Raise the minimum size for retention to 25 inches or 26 inches. Did not reject this idea. One rainbow trout may be kept on the main Nushagak River only. Rainbow trout may not be retained on any tributary between and including Harris Creek and the Chichitnok River. Did not reject. This would prevent any threat of overharvest on the smaller tributaries.

PROPOSED BY: Don Duncan (HQ-06F-015)

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 67.022. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Amend this regulation as follows:

On the Nushagak River upstream from Harris Creek, to the confluence of the Chichitnok River, and excluding all tributaries, only one king salmon may be retained except that “jack kings” below “X” inches may be retained with no limit. All tributaries of the Nushagak River, above Harris Creek and the Nushagak River above Chichinok River are closed to king salmon fishing.

ISSUE: Lack of opportunity for anglers to fish and or retain one king salmon per year above Harris Creek on the Nushagak River. This regulation came to be for all the wrong reasons, politics. No biological reason supports the current regulation as evidence by the fact that no such restrictions are put on the Mulchatna River, the Nuyukuk River, the Iowithla River, the Kokwok River and Muklung River or the Wood River all the way to the head waters including all spawning grounds. Anglers travel far and pay plenty and should have the opportunity to fish for and keep one king salmon for trophy mounting. A king salmon is just as dead regardless if it was above or below Harris Creek. The upstream anglers in this area should have the right to some opportunity. With the current regulations in this area only allowing single hook, no bait,; the take would be in significant. Keeping the total closure is ridiculous.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The guides and their permitted base camps on state land in this area (above Harris Creek) are at a disadvantage concerning client recruitment when compared to other areas that allow king salmon fishing and limited retention. This disadvantage will continue when no biological reason can support keeping the current regulation. Anglers will loose opportunity needlessly. King salmon anglers will continue to be crowded into areas like Portage.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Under current regulations, no fishing for king salmon is allowed. This proposal would allow for a higher quality fishing experience and an extremely limited take.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those likely to benefit include anglers who fish for and retain one king salmon/year for mounting of eating. Those anglers who do not wish to combat fish in Alaska. The guides (who lease land from the state for camp in this area) trying to recruit clients who wish to fish for and keep one king salmon.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The total take and the impact, even if every angler retained a fish, would be insignificant.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open all of the Nushagak River above Harris Creek

including all tributaries to king salmon fishing with or without ant retention allowed. Did not reject.

Open all Nushagak River above Harris Creek to the Chichitnok River, not including the tributaries, to king salmon fishing but no kings may be retained. Did not reject because something is better than nothing is what we currently have even though no biological reason can support the current closure.

PROPOSED BY: Don Duncan (HQ-06F-015B)

PROPOSAL 121 - This proposal asks the Board of Fisheries to recommend to the legislature, as per AS 16.05.251(a)(1), that a refuge area be designated as follows:

The state-owned waters in the Lower Talarik Creek, Upper Talarik Creek and the Kuktuli River are established as a State Fish Refuge to

- (1) ensure the protection and enhancement of fish habitat;
- (2) ensure the conservation of salmon and other fish;
- (3) allow the continuation of commercial, subsistence, and sport fishing of fish that spawn and rear in these waters;
- (4) policy for managing the fish refuge will be made by the board with advice from a refuge citizens advisory committee;
- (5) the board shall establish a citizens advisory committee for the refuge consisting of 12 members representing commercial, subsistence, and sport fisherman, who will assist in establishing a management plan for the refuge and provide the Board of Fisheries with an annual assessment of issues that affect the refuge in accordance with the State’s Policy for the Management of Sustainable Fisheries, and other relevant Board of Fisheries issues;
- (6) the department will manage the refuge, in accordance with board policy management of the refuge, based on board policy, taking into consideration advice from the citizens advisory committee.

ISSUE: The Board of Fisheries Policy for the Management of Sustainable Salmon Fisheries states that “in the aggregate, Alaska’s salmon fisheries are healthy and sustainable largely because of abundant pristine habitat and the application of sound, precautionary, conservation management practices” (5 AAC 39.222(a)(1)). This notable achievement particularly applies to the Bristol Bay region where salmon are a world class renewable resource that sustains the livelihood and enjoyment of many commercial, subsistence, and sport fishermen and related businesses. But some salmon habitat in the Lake Iliamna and Kuktuli River watersheds of the Bristol Bay region may be faced with major and permanent transformation. One (and possibly more) open pit gold mines are being proposed for the area. If developed, they would be some of the largest open pit mines in the world.

Although the permitting process for these mines will address impacts on salmon habitat and one proposed mine (Pebble) states that there will be "no net loss to the regions fisheries as a result of our project" (Anchorage Daily News, May 5, 2005), there is considerable uncertainty about whether state policy "to effectively assure sustained yield and habitat protection for wild salmon stocks" 5 AAC 39.222(a) and "salmon habitats should not be perturbed beyond natural boundaries of variation" 5 AAC 39.222(c) can be meet at this scale of development right in the heart of an area so vital to salmon spawning and rearing. Also, there is some concern that a permit-driven approach to habitat protection does not necessarily provide the comprehensive or precautionary approach that is needed to adequately protect the pristine habitat that Bristol Bay salmon have thrived on. What is needed is conservation-oriented management approach that

oversees all factors that relate to Bristol Bay salmon habitat protection, irrespective of a permit. The management approach that is being proposed here is that the board use its powers under AS 16.05.251 for "setting apart fish reserve areas, refuges, and sanctuaries in the waters of the state" to establish a state fish refuge in the waters of Lower Talarik Creek and Upper Talarik Creek (which drain into Lake Iliamna) as well as the Kuktuli River (which drains into the Mulchatna River). Most of the land adjacent to these waters is owned by the State of Alaska. It is recognized that a fish refuge will be "subject to the approval of the legislature."

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If a comprehensive, conservation-oriented approach is not taken to protecting the water quality and quantity used by salmon that spawn and in the Talarik Creeks and the Kuktuli River, there is an unacceptable risk that some or all of these stocks may essentially be "taken" by habitat loss. Furthermore, any pollution that reduces salmon productivity in these watersheds could have a downstream effect and impact salmon habitat in the Lake Iliamna and the Mulchatna River watersheds. Establishing a fish refuge in the waters that flow through the mining operations should help contain any water quality or quantity problems to its source.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? All those who harvest fish from the Lake Iliamna and Mulchatna River watersheds, as well as those who provide services to these harvesters, will have greater assurance that these fish stocks will be available in future years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All those who harvest fish from the Lake Iliamna and Mulchatna River watersheds, as well as those who provide services to these harvesters, will have greater assurance that these fish stocks will be available in future years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No users of fish from the Lake Iliamna and Mulchatna River watersheds should suffer or be faced with any displacement of their usual practices. Who might suffer are developers of other resources (i.g., gold mines) that destroy fish habitat and, ultimately fish populations. However, if nonrenewable resource developers are able to internalize their costs and achieve "no net loss" of the regions fisheries, not only would they be unaffected by this proposal, but they should support the proposal to demonstrate their level of confidence in achieving "no net loss."

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A fish sanctuary was considered, for which there are other models to consider, but rejected since fish sanctuaries usually do not allow consumptive use of fish. Although there may be few if any fish refuges to compare to, Alaska does have many state and federal game refuges that allow public access and consumptive use of wildlife. This is the type of management being proposed.

PROPOSED BY: George Matz (HQ-06F-032)

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 67.022 Special provisions for seasons, bag, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Amend this regulation as follows:

Make the Alagnak River a total barbless fishery.

ISSUE: With a 10 percent mortality rate for catch-and-release, and 150 fishermen a day, releasing five fish each, combined with the commercial bycatch could wipe out the king run.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The mortality of kings released with barbed hoops and the commercial fishery in the Alagnak River is damaging the king run.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The king salmon run on the Alagnak River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The sport fishermen, but ever so little.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Michael Struznik

(HQ-06F-113)
