

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

**REVIEWER LETTER**

Dear Reviewer:

August 2011

The Alaska Board of Fisheries will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its **October 2011 through March 2012** meetings. The proposals concern changes to the State's fishing regulations. Members of the public, organizations, advisory committees, and ADF&G staff timely submitted these proposals. The proposals are published essentially as they were received.

The proposals in this book are presented as brief statements summarizing the intended regulatory changes. In cases where confusion might arise or where the regulation is complex, proposed changes are also indicated in legal format. In this format, bolded and underlined words are **additions** to the regulation text, and capitalized words or letters in square brackets [XXXX] are deletions from the regulation text.

You are encouraged to read all proposals presented in this book. Some regulations have statewide application and some regulations may affect other regions or fisheries of the state. Also, some proposals recommend changes to multiple fisheries within an area or region.

In this book the proposals are first grouped by the meeting to which they pertain (see *Proposal Index* for each meeting). Within each meeting the proposals are then organized by region, fishery or species. These proposal lists are not in roadmap order for the meeting. The board will generate a roadmap for deliberations prior to each meeting when committee assignments are made. The roadmap may be changed up to and during the meeting. Agendas for each Board of Fisheries meeting will also be available prior to the meeting.

Before taking action on these proposed changes to the regulations, **the board would like your written comments and/or oral testimony on any effects the proposed changes would have on your activities.**

After reviewing the proposals, please send written comments to:

**ATTN: BOF COMMENTS**  
**Boards Support Section**  
**Alaska Department of Fish and Game**  
**P.O. Box 115526**  
**Juneau, AK 99811-5526**  
**Fax: 907-465-6094**

Public comment, in combination with advisory committee comments and ADF&G staff presentations, provide the Board of Fisheries with useful biological and socioeconomic information. Written comments become public documents. The following are recommendations for providing written comments:

**Timely Submission.** Submit written comments by mail or fax so that they are received no later than two weeks prior to the meeting during which the topic will be considered (see *Tentative Meeting Schedule* on Page v). Written comments received after the two-week deadline will still be accepted but will not be inserted in board member workbooks until the beginning of the meeting or cross-referenced with individual proposals.

**Length.** Prior to the two week deadline, the board will accept written comment of up to 100 single sided pages in length from any one individual or group relating to proposals at any one meeting. After the two week deadline, written comment will be limited to 10 single sided pages in length. During the meeting written comments up to 10 pages in length may be submitted by hand delivery if 25 copies are provided.

**List the Proposal Number.** Written comments should indicate the proposal number to which the comments apply and should clearly indicate whether you “support” or “oppose” the proposal. This will help ensure written comments are correctly noted for the board members. If the comments support a modification in the proposal, please indicate “support as amended” and provide your preferred amendment in writing. You do not need to list the Alaska Administrative Code (AAC) number.

**PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE PROPOSAL.** This helps the board understand the rationale for your recommendation and identify factors that should be taken into account when acting on the proposal. A brief description consisting of a couple of sentences on why you support or oppose the proposal is sufficient.

**Write Clearly.** Comments will be scanned and photocopied so please use 8.5" x 11" paper and leave reasonable margins on all sides allowing for hole punches. Whether typed or handwritten, use dark ink and write legibly. If making comments on more than one proposal, please do not use separate pages for each proposal - simply begin the next set of written comments by listing the next proposal number.

**Advisory Committees.** In addition to the above, please make sure the advisory committee meeting minutes reflect the minority opinion along with the majority opinion. The board benefits greatly from understanding the pros and cons of each issue. Also, minutes should note the number of committee members in attendance as well as other stakeholders or others in attendance during meetings.

**SPECIAL NOTES:** The board applies various statutes and policies when considering fisheries allocations and when addressing salmon proposals: When addressing proposals affecting subsistence uses, the board provides for a reasonable opportunity for subsistence consistent with AS 16.05.258 and 5 AAC 99.010(b). When addressing allocations among commercial, sport, guided sport, and/or personal use fisheries, the board applies its *Allocation Criteria* (AS 16.05.251(e)). When addressing salmon fisheries it applies its *Mixed Stock Salmon Policy* (5 AAC 39.220) and its *Sustainable Salmon Fisheries Policy* (5 AAC 39.222). You may wish to review these statutes and policies as you prepare comments for the board. These are accessible on the board's website (<http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=fisheriesboard.main>). Also, see Page *xii* for information on the board’s procedures for “restructuring proposals”.

Persons with a disability needing special accommodations in order to comment on the proposed regulations should contact the Boards Support Section at (907) 465-4110 no later than two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting to make any necessary arrangements.

Monica Wellard, Executive Director  
Alaska Board of Fisheries  
Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
(907) 465-4110  
<http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us>

**ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES  
2011/2012 PROPOSAL BOOK**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>INTRODUCTION SECTION</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Reviewer Letter.....	i
Table of Contents.....	iii
Tentative Meeting Schedule .....	v
Long-Term Meeting Cycle .....	vi
Board of Fisheries Membership Roster .....	vii
Boards Support Section Staff List.....	viii
Draft Public/Legal Notice.....	ix
Board Procedures on Restructuring Proposals.....	xii
Index of Proposals.....	xvii

<u>PROPOSAL SECTION</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
-------------------------	--------------------

**PACIFIC COD FOR PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND, COOK INLET, KODIAK, CHIGNIK  
AND SOUTH ALASKA PENINSULA**

Gulf of Alaska Pacific Cod .....	1
Kodiak Pacific Cod .....	3
Chignik Pacific Cod.....	7
Chignik and South Alaska Peninsula Pacific Cod .....	13
South Alaska Peninsula Pacific Cod.....	13
Prince William Sound Pacific Cod .....	22
Cook Inlet Pacific Cod.....	27

**PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND, UPPER COPPER RIVER/UPPER SUSITNA RIVER  
FINFISH**

PWS Groundfish and Herring .....	30
PWS and Upper Copper River Subsistence and Personal Use .....	39
PWS Commercial Salmon .....	58
Copper River Commercial Salmon.....	97
PWS and Copper River Sport fishing .....	101

**SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT CRAB, SHRIMP, AND MISCELLANEOUS SHELLFISH**

Shellfish .....	118
King and Tanner Crab.....	127
Dungeness Crab .....	140
Shrimp.....	146
Miscellaneous Shellfish .....	155
Goeducks.....	160
Abalone.....	176
Razor Clams.....	179

## **SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT FINFISH**

Groundfish .....	182
Herring .....	203
Sportfish.....	222
Subsistence and Personal Use .....	242
Commercial Salmon.....	254

## **STATEWIDE DUNGENESS CRAB, SHRIMP AND MISCELLANEOUS SHELLFISH**

Westward Dungeness Crab .....	329
Kodiak Dungeness Crab .....	331
Statewide Scallops .....	333
Prince William Sound Scallops .....	333
Westward Scallops.....	334
Westward Octopus .....	340
Westward Shrimp.....	341
Prince William Sound Shrimp .....	348
Prince William Sound Miscellaneous shellfish (except scallops) .....	356
Cook Inlet Miscellaneous Shellfish .....	358
Statewide Shellfish.....	361

**ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES**  
**2011/2012 Cycle**  
**Tentative Meeting Schedule**

**Southeast, Yakutat, Prince William Sound, and Upper Copper River/Upper Susitna River  
 Finfish; Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, and Shellfish; Statewide Miscellaneous  
 Shellfish; Prince William Sound, Cook Inlet, Kodiak, Chignik, and South Alaska Peninsula  
 Pacific cod; and Supplemental Issues**

PROPOSAL DEADLINE: 5:00 p.m. Friday, April 8, 2011, Supplemental Proposal deadline for Pacific Cod for PWS, Cook Inlet, Kodiak, Chignik and South Alaska Peninsula: 5:00 p.m., Monday, May 16, 2011

<b>Meeting Dates</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Comment Deadline</b>
<b>October 4-5, 2011</b> [ 2 days ]	<b>Work Session</b> ACRs, cycle organization, Stocks of Concern	<b>Anchorage</b> Coast International Inn	Sept. 20, 2011
<b>October 6-10, 2011</b> [ 5 days ]	<b>Pacific Cod for PWS, Cook Inlet, Kodiak, Chignik, and South Alaska Peninsula</b>	<b>Anchorage</b> Coast International Inn	Sept. 20, 2011
<b>December 2-7, 2011</b> [ 6 days ]	<b>Prince William Sound and Upper Copper River/ Upper Susitna River Finfish</b>	<b>Valdez</b> Convention & Civic Center	Nov. 18, 2011
<b>January 15-21, 2012</b> [ 7 days ]	<b>Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, Misc. Shellfish</b> (including Dungeness, King, and Tanner)	<b>Petersburg</b> Sons of Norway	Dec. 30, 2011
<b>Feb. 24-Mar. 4, 2012</b> [ 10 days ]	<b>Southeast and Yakutat Finfish</b> (including salmon, herring, groundfish)	<b>Ketchikan</b> Ted Ferry Civic Center	Feb. 9, 2012
<b>March 20-23, 2012</b> [ 4 days ]	<b>Statewide Dungeness Crab, Shrimp, Misc. Shellfish</b> (except Southeast and Yakutat) and Supplemental Issues	<b>Anchorage</b> Hilton Hotel	Mar. 5, 2012

---

Total Meeting Days: 34

Agenda Change Request Deadline: August 26, 2011 [45 days prior to fall worksession]

*Adopted 06/27/2011*

**ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES  
LONG-TERM MEETING CYCLE**  
(Three-year cycle)

The board meeting cycle generally occurs from October through March. The board considers changes to regulations on a region-based schedule. All fisheries are considered when the regional area, shellfish species, or statewide regulations are before the board. The fisheries include subsistence, sport, guided sport, personal use, and commercial. Special petition and agenda change request procedures are available for the board to consider out-of-cycle requests.

**NOTES:**

1) Statewide shellfish regulations will not be considered every meeting cycle. When setting the future meeting schedule annually, the board will determine whether to consider statewide finfish or shellfish regulations for that meeting cycle.

2) The proposal deadline is April 10 every year. *If April 10 falls on a weekend, the proposal deadline is the Friday preceding that weekend.*

Meeting Cycle:	2010/2011	2013/2014	2016/2017	2019/2020
<u>Area:</u> Cook Inlet Area (All Finfish) Kodiak and Chignik Areas (All Finfish) King and Tanner Crab (Statewide, except Southeast/Yakutat)				

Meeting Cycle:	2011/2012	2014/2015	2017/2018	2020/2021
<u>Area:</u> Prince William Sound Area (All Finfish) Southeast/Yakutat Areas (All Finfish) Southeast/Yakutat Areas (King Crab, Tanner Crab, Dungeness Crab, Shrimp; and Miscellaneous Shellfish) Statewide Miscellaneous Shellfish and Provisions				

Meeting Cycle:	2012/2013	2015/2016	2018/2019	2021/2022
<u>Area:</u> Alaska Peninsula/Aleutian Island Areas (All Finfish) Arctic-Yukon-Kuskokwim Areas (All Finfish) Bristol Bay Area (All Finfish) Statewide Provisions for Finfish				

**THE MEETING CYCLE REPEATS ITSELF EVERY THREE YEARS.** This schedule was adopted November 9, 1990, updated October 13, 2010.

**ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES**  
**Member List**  
**(as of July 1, 2011)**

<u>NAME AND ADDRESS</u>	<u>TERM EXPIRES</u>
<b>Vince Webster (Chair)</b> P.O. Box 121 King Salmon, AK 99613	6/30/2013
<b>Tom Kluberton</b> P.O. Box 200 Talkeetna, AK 99676	6/30/2013
<b>Karl Johnstone (Vice Chair)</b> 18618 Snowy Plover Circle Anchorage, AK 99516	6/30/2012
<b>Mike Smith</b> P.O. Box 70474 Fairbanks, AK 99707	6/30/2012
<b>Sue Jeffrey</b> P.O. Box 3363 Kodiak, AK 99615	6/30/2014
<b>John Jensen</b> P.O. Box 681 Petersburg, AK 99833	6/30/2014
<b>Bill Brown</b> 9150 Skywood Drive Juneau, AK 99801	6/30/2014

\*\*\*\*\*

Alaska Board of Fisheries members may be reached at:

**Boards Support Section**  
Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
P.O. Box 115526  
Juneau, AK 99811-5526  
Phone: (907) 465-4110  
Fax: (907) 465-6094

<http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=process.main>

## BOARDS SUPPORT SECTION STAFF LIST

Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
Mailing address: P.O. Box 115526, Juneau, AK 99811-5526  
Physical location: 1255 West 8th Street  
Phone: (907) 465-4110; Fax: (907) 465-6094  
<http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=process.main>

### ***HEADQUARTERS***

#### Board of Fisheries

**Monica Wellard**, Exec. Director II, 465-6095  
**Shannon Stone**, Pub. Specialist II, 465-6097

#### Board of Game

**Kristy Tibbles**, Exec. Director I, 465-6098  
**Scott Crass**, Pub. Specialist II, 465-4046

**Pamela Wiederspohn**, Administrative Officer I, 465-6096  
**Fathom Whiteley**, Administrative Assistant I, 465-4110  
**Dani Cherian**, College Intern III, 465-6424

### ***REGIONAL OFFICES***

#### Southcentral Region

**Sherry Wright**  
333 Raspberry Road  
Anchorage, AK 99518-1599  
Phone: 267-2354  
Fax: 267-2489

#### Interior Region

**Nissa Pilcher**  
1300 College Road  
Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599  
Phone: 459-7263  
Fax: 459-7258

#### Southwest Region

**Vacant**  
P.O. Box 1030  
Dillingham, AK 99576  
Phone: 842-5142  
Fax: 842-5514

#### Southeast Region (north of Frederick Sound)

**Scott Crass**  
P.O. Box 115526  
Juneau, AK 99811-5526  
Phone: 465-4046  
Fax: 465-6094

#### Arctic Region

**Hazel Smith**  
P.O. Box 689  
Kotzebue, AK 99752  
Phone: 442-1717  
Fax: 442-2847

#### Southeast Region (south of Frederick Sound)

**Shannon Stone**  
P.O. Box 115526  
Juneau, AK 99811-5526  
Phone: 465-6097  
Fax: 465-6094

#### Western Region

**Alissa Joseph**  
P.O. Box 1467  
Bethel, AK 99559  
Phone: 543-2433  
Fax: 543-2021



**DRAFT**

NOTICE OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE  
REGULATIONS OF THE ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES

The Alaska Board of Fisheries proposes to adopt, amend, or repeal regulations contained in Title 5 of the Alaska Administrative Code, dealing with fishery and aquatic plant resources in the areas designated below, including the following:

PACIFIC COD FOR PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND, COOK INLET, KODIAK, CHIGNIK, AND SOUTH ALASKA PENINSULA; PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AND UPPER COPPER RIVER/UPPER SUSITNA RIVER FINFISH; SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT KING AND TANNER CRAB, DUNGENES CRAB, SHRIMP, AND MISCELLANEOUS SHELLFISH; SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT FINFISH; STATEWIDE DUNGENESS CRAB, SHRIMP AND MISCELLANEOUS SHELLFISH FISHERY REGULATIONS:

- A. In the **commercial, sport, and guided sport fisheries**: fishing seasons, periods, opening and closing times; bag, possession, size, sex, and harvest limits, harvest levels, thresholds, or quotas; bycatch provisions; districts, subdistricts, sections, subsections, areas, and other management boundaries; locations open and closed to fishing; methods and means; gear and vessel restrictions, marking, definitions, operational requirements, registration and permit requirements and limitations; registration areas (including exclusive and super exclusive registration areas), permits, harvest record, harvest marking requirements; management plans for conservation, development and allocation among beneficial uses; guiding principles; require, restrict or prohibit the retention, tendering, sale, release, or purchase of fish; methods of release; registration and reporting requirements for fish guides, guided anglers, catchers, processors, buyers and transporters; onboard observer requirements; fish storage and inspection requirements.
- B. In the **subsistence, and personal use fisheries (finfish and shellfish)**: identify subsistence uses and users; fishing seasons, periods, opening and closing times, harvest levels; methods and means; size, age, and sex limitations; districts, subdistricts, sections, subsections, areas, and other management boundaries; locations open and closed to fishing; gear and vessel restrictions and operational requirements; harvest limits, registration and permit requirements, requirements for marking and possession of fish; management plans for conservation, development and allocation among beneficial uses, and users; identify customary and traditional uses of fish stocks, and establish, change or adjust subsistence and personal use fisheries.

For a copy of the proposed regulation changes contact the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Boards Support Section, P.O. Box 115526, Juneau, AK 99811-5526, tel. (907) 465-4110 or go to the internet at: <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=fisheriesboard.main>

You may comment on the regulation changes, including the potential costs to the private persons of complying with the proposed changes, by submitting written comments limited to no more than 100 single sided or 50 double sided pages to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Boards

Support Section, P.O. Box 115526, Juneau, AK 99811-5526, or by fax to (907) 465-6094, so that the comments will be received no later than two weeks prior to the meeting during which the topic will be considered. Unless otherwise specifically specified for a particular meeting in a published notice, written comment over 100 single sided or 50 double sided pages in length from any one individual or group relating to proposals at any one meeting will not be accepted. Written comments limited to 10 single sided or 5 double sided pages in length from any one individual or group will also be accepted after the two-week deadline, but will not be inserted in board member workbooks until the beginning of the meeting. During the meeting written comments limited to 10 single sided or 5 double sided pages in length from any one individual or group may be submitted by hand delivery at any time if 25 copies are provided; but, as a practical matter comments submitted after the board begins deliberations on relevant proposals are likely to receive less consideration than comments submitted earlier. Oral comments may also be presented as explained below.

There will be five separate regulatory meetings. Each meeting will start at 8:00 a.m. on the dates noted below. The public hearing portions for each regulatory meeting will begin immediately after staff reports and continue until everyone who has signed up and is present has been given the opportunity to be heard. Additional public hearings with Board Committees may be held throughout the meeting before consideration and adoption of proposed changes in the regulations for the various areas. An agenda will be posted daily during the meeting.

The board will take oral testimony only from those who register before the cut-off time announced by the board chair at each regulatory meeting. The length of oral statements may be limited to five minutes or less. Anyone interested in, or affected by, the subject matter contained in this legal notice should make written or oral comments if they wish to have their views considered by the board.

### **TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE**

#### **Work Session: agenda change requests, cycle organization, stocks of concern**

October 4-5, 2011

Coast International Inn, 3450 Aviation Ave, Anchorage, AK

#### **Pacific Cod for Prince William Sound, Cook Inlet, Kodiak, Chignik and South AK Peninsula**

October 6-10, 2011

Coast International Inn, 3450 Aviation Ave, Anchorage, AK

#### **Prince William Sound and Upper Copper River/Upper Susitna River Finfish**

December 2-7, 2011

Convention & Civic Center, 212 Chenega Ave., Valdez, AK

#### **Southeast and Yakutat King and Tanner Crab, Dungeness Crab, Shrimp, Miscellaneous Shellfish**

January 15-21, 2012

Sons of Norway, 23 Sing Lee Alley, Petersburg, AK

**Southeast and Yakutat Finfish**  
February 24-March 4, 2012  
Ted Ferry Civic Center, 888 Venetia Way, Ketchikan, AK

**Statewide Dungeness Crab, Shrimp, and Miscellaneous Shellfish**  
(except Southeast and Yakutat and Supplemental Issues)  
March 20-23, 2012  
Hilton Hotel, 500 West Third Avenue, Anchorage, AK

Any changes to meeting locations, dates or times, or rescheduling of topics or subject matter will be announced by news release. Please watch for these announcements in the news media or call (907) 465-4110. Please carefully review the **PROPOSAL INDEX** available for the meeting for specific proposal issues to be addressed by the board. Copies of the proposal indices are in the proposal book or at the relevant meeting.

Anyone interested in or affected by subsistence, personal use, sport, guided sport or commercial fishing regulations, is hereby informed that, by publishing this legal notice, the Board of Fisheries may consider any or all of the subject areas covered by this notice. Pursuant to AS 44.62.200(b), the board may review the full range of activities appropriate to any of the subjects listed in this notice. The board may make changes to the personal use, sport, guided sport or commercial fishing regulations as may be required to ensure the subsistence priority in AS 16.05.258. On its own motion, after public hearing, the board may adopt, amend, reject, supplement, or take no action on these subjects without further notice. In addition, the board may adopt other regulations necessary to implement, administer, or enforce the regulations adopted. **THE BOARD IS NOT LIMITED BY THE SPECIFIC LANGUAGE OR CONFINES OF THE ACTUAL PROPOSALS THAT HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED BY THE PUBLIC OR STAFF.** The language of the final regulations may be different from that of the proposed regulations. **YOU SHOULD COMMENT DURING THE TIME ALLOWED IF YOUR INTERESTS COULD BE AFFECTED.**

If you are a person with a disability who may need a special accommodation in order to participate in the process on the proposed regulations, please contact Monica Wellard at (907) 465-4110 no later than two weeks prior to the beginning of each meeting to ensure that any necessary accommodations can be provided.

Statutory Authority: AS 16.05 - AS 16.20, AS 16.40

Statutes being implemented, interpreted, or made specific: AS 16.05 - AS 16.020, AS 16.40

Fiscal Information: The proposed regulatory actions are not expected to require an increased appropriation.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Monica Wellard, Executive Director  
Alaska Board of Fisheries

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT BOARD PROCEDURES ON SALMON INDUSTRY RESTRUCTURING PROPOSALS</b></p>
--

The following two proposals for the 2011-2012 cycle have been identified by the board's salmon industry restructuring committee as possible restructuring proposals.

**Prince William Sound and Upper Copper River/Upper Susitna River Finfish**

77 Amend the regulation to allow use of two set gillnet permits in Eshamay District.

**Southeast and Yakutat Finfish**

286 Increase length limit for Southeast salmon seine vessel to 75 feet.

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

The board is seeking additional information on these proposals in order that they can be fully evaluated. During the October 4-5, 2011 worksession, the board will:

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

The additional information requested in order to fully evaluate these proposals can be found in the 11 questions contained in the board's Restructuring Proposal Form (*see Page xiv*). The board invites the proposal authors and the public to submit any additional information to help in the evaluation of these proposals.

**Background on Board of Fisheries Restructuring Proposals**

In 2004 the Board of Fisheries established a Commercial Salmon Industry Restructuring Workgroup consisting of various stakeholders and interests from the fishing industry to examine policy and other options for the Board of Fisheries and the Alaska Legislature to properly consider restructuring in Alaska's salmon fisheries. This board workgroup was undertaken after a cooperative agreement between the board and the legislature as a continuation of the work from the Legislature's Salmon Industry Task Force. In 2006, the board received a report from the stakeholder panel and the board forwarded the report to the legislature.

(Report available by writing to the Department of Fish and Game, Boards Support Section, P.O. Box 115526, Juneau, AK 99811-5526 or by calling 907-465-4110.)

Much of the work from the stakeholder workgroup centered around the Board of Fisheries process and how the board should receive and consider proposals which may be considered a "restructuring proposal". The workgroup developed a suggested format for how restructuring proposals should be submitted to the board, along with criteria for how the board should review these proposals. The board decided to

informally follow these recommendations for a “trial period”, during which the board will annually review the process for modification or, ultimately, consider adopting it as a board policy.

Proposals which seek to significantly change how salmon fisheries operate should be reviewed with extra scrutiny and an examination of the possible benefits and impacts to the stakeholders, communities, regions and the state as a whole.

### **Board of Fisheries Criteria for Review of Restructuring Proposals**

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

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

### **Process to Review Restructuring Proposals**

Restructuring proposals may have substantial economic, social, and/or biological impacts and may require significant changes to the management of a fishery. Accordingly, the Board of Fisheries is interested in ensuring ample opportunity for review and comment by potentially affected regions and fishery participants. The board identified the following steps for addressing restructuring proposals:

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

<b><i>Alaska Board of Fisheries - Restructuring Proposal Form</i></b>
---

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

***Please carefully read the instructions on second page before answering the questions.***

- 1) What regulatory area, fishery, and gear type does this restructuring proposal affect?
- 2) Please thoroughly explain your proposal. (See Part II, Question 2 of the instructions on second page for important guidance on how to answer this question).
- 3) What are the objectives of the proposal?
- 4) How will this proposal meet the objectives in Question 3?
- 5) Please identify the potential allocative impacts of your proposal. Is there an allocation or management plan that will be affected by this proposal?
- 6) If the total value of the resource is expected to increase, who will benefit?
- 7) What will happen if your fishery is not restructured as your proposal recommends, and how is this proposal an improvement over current practices?
- 8) Considering the history of the commercial fishery, what are the potential short- and long-term positive and negative impacts on:
  - a) the fishery resource;
  - b) harvesters;
  - c) the sector, species, and regional interdependence relationships;
  - d) safety;
  - e) the market;
  - f) processors; and
  - g) local communities.
- 9) What is your understanding of the level of support for your proposal among the harvesters, processors, and local communities?
- 10) What are the potential short and long-term impacts on conservation and resource habitat?
- 11) What are the potential legal, fishery management, and enforcement implications if this proposal is adopted? What other governmental actions may need to be taken into account?

Submitted By: Name \_\_\_\_\_ (signature required)

Individual or Group \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ ZiPacific code \_\_\_\_\_ Phone \_\_\_\_\_

## Instructions for Restructuring Proposal Form

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

### **Part I: How to determine if your proposal is a “restructuring” proposal**

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

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

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

### **Part II: How to Fill out the Restructuring Proposal Form**

Question #1: For which fishery management areas and gear type will the regulations be changed? For which specific fisheries?

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

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

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

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

Question #5: A restructuring proposal will often have allocative or reallocative impacts. Please identify those potential impacts. Other than already identified in question #1, what management plans and allocation regulations might be affected? Note that this could include fisheries distant from the fishery being regulated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES</b>  <b>October 6-10, 2011</b>  <b>PACIFIC COD FOR PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND, COOK INLET, KODIAK, CHIGNIK</b>  <b>AND SOUTH ALASKA PENINSULA AREAS</b></p>
---

**PROPOSAL INDEX**

*Following is a list of proposals that will be considered at the above meeting sorted by general topic. A board committee roadmap will be developed and distributed prior to the meeting.*

<b>PROP NO. (41)</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
--------------------------	----------------

**Gulf of Alaska Pacific Cod (2)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Review licensing and reporting requirements for parallel Pacific cod fisheries for coordination with federal Pacific cod fisheries. |
| 2 | Require federal LLP license and observer when participating in a parallel Pacific cod fishery.                                      |

**Kodiak Pacific Cod (6)**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 3 | Develop regulations to coordinate state and federal Pacific cod fisheries.                       |
| 4 | Address harvest overage in state-waters Pacific cod pot fishery.                                 |
| 5 | Allow only jig gear onboard a registered state-waters Pacific cod jig vessel.                    |
| 6 | Cap jig vessels 58 feet and larger to 10 percent of the state-waters Pacific cod jig allocation. |
| 7 | Cap jig vessels over 58 feet to 25 percent of the state-waters Pacific cod jig allocation.       |
| 8 | Amend regulatory description of Kodiak groundfish area and districts.                            |

**Chignik Pacific Cod (8)**

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 9  | Develop regulations to coordinate state and federal Pacific cod fisheries.   |
| 10 | Open the state-waters Pacific cod season seven days after federal Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod season closes.  |
| 11 | Open the state-waters Pacific cod season one week after federal Pacific cod season closes.   |
| 12 | Open the state-waters Pacific cod season one week after federal Pacific cod season closes, or March 1, whichever is earlier.                                 |
| 13 | <i>*Note: Proposal 13 was a duplicate of Proposal 96 and has been pulled.</i>  |
| 14 | Establish 14-day stand-down period for vessels using pot gear in a Pacific cod fishery prior to registering for the Chignik state-waters Pacific cod season. |
| 15 | Reduce pot limit in state-waters Pacific cod fishery.  |
| 16 | Establish daily fishing period for Pacific cod fishery.  |
| 17 | Amend regulatory description of Chignik groundfish area and districts.   |

**Chignik and South Alaska Peninsula Pacific Cod (1)**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 18 | Implement 7-day stand-down for vessels that fished Pacific cod in the BS-AI Area before registering for the Chignik or South Alaska Peninsula state-waters Pacific cod fisheries. |
|----|---|

**South Alaska Peninsula Pacific Cod (15)**

- 19 Develop regulations to coordinate state and federal Pacific cod fisheries.
- 20 Open state-waters Pacific cod season seven days after federal Western Gulf of Alaska A season Pacific cod pot sector closes.
- 21 Open state-waters Pacific cod season on March 1, or seven days after federal Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod pot sector closes, whichever is later.
- 22 Open state-waters Pacific cod season on March 15, or seven days after federal Western Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod pot sector closes if that closure is later than March 15.
- 23 Establish regulatory allocation for mechanical jigging machine gear in the state-waters Pacific cod fishery.
- 24 Establish regulatory allocation of 25 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery.
- 25 Establish regulatory allocation of 30 percent for state-waters Pacific cod mechanical jig fishery.
- 26 Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery.
- 27 Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery.
- 28 Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery.
- 29 Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery.
- 30 Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery.
- 31 Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery.
- 32 Repeal one definition of mechanical jigging machine gear.
- 33 Amend regulatory description of South Alaska Peninsula groundfish district and sections.

**Prince William Sound (6)**

- 34 Allocate the state-waters Pacific cod guideline harvest level.
- 35 Establish a specific sector allocation for the jig fishery in PWS.
- 36 Allow only vessels without a federal Pacific cod endorsement to participate in the state-waters Pacific cod fishery.
- 37 Require that Pacific cod from other areas be landed before a vessel participates in the state-waters Pacific cod fishery.
- 38 Amend opening date of the state-waters Pacific cod season.
- 39 Develop regulations governing the state-waters Pacific cod fishery.

**Cook Inlet (3)**

- 40 Reallocate state-waters season guideline harvest level.
- 41 Amend the opening date for state-waters season.
- 42 Develop regulations governing the state-waters Pacific cod fishery.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES</b>  <b>December 2-7, 2011</b>  <b>PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AND UPPER COPPER RIVER/</b>  <b>UPPER SUSITNA RIVER FINFISH</b></p>
---

**PROPOSAL INDEX**

*Following is a list of proposals that will be considered at the above meeting sorted by general topic. A board committee roadmap will be developed and distributed prior to the meeting.*

<b>PROP NO. (96)</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
--------------------------	----------------

**PWS Groundfish and Herring (8)**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 43 | Restrict summer use of commercial bottom gear within three miles of shore.  |
| 44 | Increase the rockfish bycatch allowance to sidestripe shrimp and sablefish from 10 to 30 percent.                       |
| 45 | Repeal one definition of mechanical jigging gear.   |
| 46 | Revise regulations to include Eastern Gulf and PWS.   |
| 47 | Amend dates of skate fishery in Eastern Gulf and PWS.   |
| 48 | Allow for retention of spiny dogfish in Eastern Gulf and PWS.   |
| 49 | Amend the current regulation to accurately reflect management lines and remove the reference to trawl gear for herring. |
| 50 | Clarify thresholds needed to open herring fishery in PWS.   |

**PWS and Copper River Subsistence and Personal Use (26)**

***Subsistence (21)***

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 51 | Review the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery C&T finding.                  |
| 52 | Specify open periods in the Copper River District subsistence fishery.                    |
| 53 | Amend regulation to combine subsistence areas in PWS.                                     |
| 54 | Establish a positive C&T finding for the Chitina dipnet fishery.                          |
| 55 | Reclassify the Chitina dipnet fishery a subsistence fishery.                              |
| 56 | Amend the Copper River King Salmon Management Plan.                                       |
| 57 | Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.                     |
| 58 | Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.                     |
| 59 | Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.                     |
| 60 | Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.                     |
| 61 | Prohibit netting of whitefish and lake trout in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes. |
| 62 | Prohibit netting of whitefish and lake trout in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes. |
| 63 | Prohibit netting of whitefish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.                |
| 64 | Prohibit netting of whitefish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.                |
| 65 | Prohibit netting of whitefish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.                |
| 66 | Prohibit bycatch, require ADF&G notification, and set season in the whitefish fishery.    |
| 67 | Require ADF&G notification, set season, and limit bycatch in the whitefish fishery.       |
| 68 | Establish closed areas and seasons, and prohibit bycatch in the whitefish fishery.        |

- 69 Establish closed area; and set season dates in the whitefish fishery.
- 70 Restrict netting of whitefish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 71 Establish lake trout spawning closures in Tyone lakes complex. (*This proposal is listed under both Subsistence and Sport Fishing for this meeting.*)

***Personal Use (5)***

- 72 Rescind allocation reduction in the Chitina personal use fishery.
- 73 Increase harvest limit of king salmon in the personal use fishery.
- 74 Allow for retention of king salmon in the personal use fishery.
- 75 Increase limit for sockeye salmon in the Chitina personal use fishery.
- 76 Delay opening of Chitina personal use dipnet fishery.

**PWS and Copper River Commercial Salmon (43)**

***Permit Stacking (2)***

- 77 Amend the regulation to allow use of two set gillnet permits in Eshamy District.
- 78 Amend gear restrictions in PWS salmon purse seine fishery.

***Fishing Gear (9)***

- 79 Ban use of deep gillnets in Montague District prior to Coghill, Eshamy, and Unakwik districts opening to deep gear.
- 80 Further define keg or buoy.
- 81 Remove intent language and clarify anchoring and towing of drift gillnet gear.
- 82 Revise purse seine mesh restrictions for commercial seining in PWS.
- 83 Allow a purse seine chafing and border strip for the PWS salmon purse seine fishery.
- 84 Amend gear restrictions for PWS salmon purse seine fishery.
- 85 Reduce gear limits for PWS salmon purse seine fishery.
- 86 Revise lead mesh size for commercial seining in PWS.
- 87 Revise lead mesh size for PWS salmon purse seine fishery.

***Fishing Districts (4)***

- 88 Create a subdistrict in the Coghill District for commercial salmon fishing.
- 89 Amend boundaries for the Northwest, Eshamy, and Coghill districts and Esther Subdistrict.
- 90 Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Eshamy District.
- 91 Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Coghill and Northwestern districts.

***Fishing Seasons (1)***

- 92 Revise season description for the purse seine fishery in the Eastern, Northern, Northwestern, Southwestern, Montague, and Southeastern districts.

***Closed Waters (3)***

- 93 Close designated areas to commercial fishing in PWS.
- 94 Correct geographic description of closed waters in PWS Area districts.
- 95 Expand closed waters in Sheep Bay of the Eastern District.

***Management Plans (5)***

- 96 Close commercial salmon fisheries in Main Bay, PWS, to avoid the 4th of July.
- 97 Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Main Bay alternating gear zone.
- 98 Amend regulation regarding the Wally Noerenberg hatchery plan.
- 99 Change the south end marker in the Armin F. Koernig Hatchery THA.
- 100 Adopt closures for sockeye salmon in Eshamy Lagoon.

***PWS Management and Allocation Plan (12)***

- 101 Revise the gillnet/seine allocation plan.
- 102 Amend the allocation plan for Eshamy District set gillnet group.
- 103 Amend the allocation plan for Eshamy District set gillnet group.
- 104 Designate area in the Coghill District for drift gillnet and purse seine gear.
- 105 Remove the gillnet fleet from the Coghill District on established dates.
- 106 Redefine the Coghill District boundary and open the district on an alternating gear type basis.
- 107 Drift gillnet group will have exclusive access to AFK chum salmon.
- 108 Reallocate chum salmon for the seine fleet in Port Chalmers.
- 109 Discontinue remote release of chum salmon at Port Chalmers and release them at Wally Noerenberg Hatchery.
- 110 Eliminate the mandatory closure prior to July 18 and amend fishing time and area provisions for the Southwestern District.
- 111 Modify the cost-recovery salmon harvest in PWS.
- 112 Increase period of time used in calculation of allocation in PWS allocation plan.

***Use of Aircraft (1)***

- 113 Amend regulation regarding use of aircraft in PWS commercial fishery.

***Reduce Hatchery Production (2)***

- 114 Reduce hatchery production of chum salmon in PWS.
- 115 Reduce hatchery production of chum salmon in PWS.

***Copper River Commercial Salmon (4)***

- 116 Add restrictions on homepack from commercial fishing.
- 117 Establish an optimal escapement goal (OEG) for Copper River king salmon.
- 118 Restrict commercial fishing inside barrier islands prior to June 15.
- 119 Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Copper River District.

***PWS and Copper River Sport (19)******Prince William Sound (6)***

- 120 Increase sockeye salmon bag limit and allow snagging in Eshamy Bay.
- 121 Reduce sockeye salmon bag and possession limit in PWS.
- 122 Establish coho salmon limit for non residents in Hells Hole freshwater fishery.
- 123 Close Ibec Creek to sport fishing above the Copper River Highway.
- 124 Close 18 Mile Creek to sport fishing for coho salmon.
- 125 Amend Prince William Sound trout size regulations.

***Upper Copper River/Upper Susitna River (13)***

- 126 Allow king salmon fishing on Gulkana River five days per week June 10-August 10.
- 127 Restrict guided sport fishery when commercial fishery is restricted.
- 128 Establish a limit for shipping of fish out of state for non-resident sport fishermen.
- 129 Modify lake trout regulations in four area lakes.
- 130 Establish a maximum size limit for lake trout in Lake Louise and Crosswind Lake.
- 71 Establish lake trout spawning closures in Tyone lakes complex. *This proposal is listed under both Subsistence and Sport Fishing for this meeting.)*
- 131 *\*Note: Proposal 131 was a duplicate of Proposal 71 and has been pulled.*
- 132 Close Paxson and Summit lakes to lake trout fishing September 1–October 1.
- 133 Allow use of bait October 1–July 31 in Paxson and Summit lakes.
- 134 Restrict guided sport fishery on Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 135 Restrict guided sport fishery on Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 136 Modify rainbow trout regulations in Summit Lake (Tebay River drainage).
- 137 Align the Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan with area regulations.
- 138 Open Tolsona Lake to sport fishing for burbot.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES</b>  <b>January 15-21, 2012</b>  <b>SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT KING AND TANNER CRAB, DUNGENESS CRAB,</b>  <b>SHRIMP, MISCELLANEOUS SHELLFISH</b></p>
---

**PROPOSAL INDEX**

*Following is a list of proposals that will be considered at the above meeting sorted by general topic. A board committee roadmap will be developed and distributed prior to the meeting.*

<b>PROP</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
<b>NO. (60 total, 4 of which are shared with Southeast/Yakutat Finfish: Proposals 141-144)</b>	

**Shellfish (9)**

***General (3)***

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 139 | Clarify where personal use shellfish regulations apply.  |
| 140 | Establish a catch report card system for subsistence, personal use, and sport shellfish fisheries.   |
| 141 | Prohibit fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Cache Island by all users. <i>(This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Finfish meeting.)</i> |

***Sport Shellfish (6)***

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 142 | Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish in a portion of Behm Canal. <i>(This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Finfish meeting.)</i> |
| 143 | Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Naha Bay. <i>(This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Finfish meeting.)</i>              |
| 144 | Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Cedar Island. <i>(This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Finfish meeting.)</i>          |
| 145 | Reduce the shrimp pot limit for the sport fishery.   |
| 146 | Close sport fishing for Dungeness crab in areas closed to commercial fishing.  |
| 147 | Amend registration requirements for the George Inlet superexclusive guided sport ecotourism Dungeness crab fishery.  |

**King and Tanner Crab (13)**

***Personal Use (4)***

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 148 | Allocate all harvest of king crab in Section 11-A (Juneau area) to the personal use fishery.                |
| 149 | Establish ring net limits for the subsistence, sport, and personal use Dungeness and Tanner crab fisheries. |
| 150 | Establish king and tanner crab size limits in the personal use and subsistence fisheries.                   |
| 151 | Amend live holding regulations for personal use and subsistence king and Tanner crab fisheries.             |

***Commercial Use (9)***

- 152      Revise the Southeast Red King Crab Management Plan to allow equal quota harvest for commercial permit holders when the threshold of available biomass is below 200,000 pounds.
- 153      Revise the Southeast Red King Crab Management Plan to allow equal quota harvest for commercial permit holders when the threshold of available biomass is below 200,000 pounds.
- 154      Prohibit the use of square pots for golden king crab fishing in registration Area A.
- 155      Reduce the pot limit in the golden king crab and Tanner crab fisheries in Registration Area A.
- 156      Clarify when six and one-half inch male golden king crab may be retained.
- 157      Redefine the start date for Tanner and golden king crab fisheries.
- 158      Add additional language that defines how weather delays may impact Tanner and king crab fishing seasons.
- 159      Amend regulation to allow 120 pots for vessels with two Tanner permits aboard.
- 160      Amend regulations to allow additional pots in the king and Tanner fisheries for vessels with two permits aboard.

***Dungeness Crab (7)******Closed Waters (4)***

- 161      Close commercial Dungeness crab fishing in Taku Harbor.
- 162      Close commercial Dungeness crab fishing in Swanson Harbor.
- 163      Close commercial Dungeness crab fishing in Excursion Inlet of District 14.
- 164      Close commercial Dungeness crab fishing in the Ketchikan vicinity.

***Commercial Use (3)***

- 165      Amend regulation regarding buoy markers in the Dungeness crab fishery.
- 166      Revise season dates for commercial Dungeness fishery in Southeast districts 1 and 2.
- 167      Reduce number of Dungeness crab pots allowed on vessels in Yakutat Area.

***Shrimp (10)***

- 168      Revise management plan for the southeast pot shrimp fisheries allowing extra fishing time per subdistrict.
- 169      Establish section sub-divisions in all districts of shrimp fishery.
- 170      Revise the commercial southeast pot shrimp fishery management plan utilizing inseason catch data.
- 171      Establish a spawner index system for the Southeast Alaska spot prawn pot fishery.
- 172      Close the commercial shrimp fishery in the vicinity of Skagway from September 1-March 1 annually.
- 173      Revise the opening dates for the shrimp pot fishery in Registration Area A.
- 174      Establish set times for deploying or retrieving shrimp pots in Registration Area A.
- 175      Revise marking requirements for shrimp pots in Registration Area A.
- 176      Prohibit registration for the commercial beam trawl shrimp and Dungeness crab fishery at the same time.



177 Establish a Beam Trawl Task Force.

### **Miscellaneous Shellfish**

#### ***Sea Cucumbers (5)***

- 178 Establish a variable harvest strategy for sea cucumbers.
- 179 Revise sea cucumber management plans to account for predation by sea otters.
- 180 Amend allowable fishing days during the week of Thanksgiving for the sea cucumber fishery in the Ketchikan area.
- 181 Amend allowable daily dive time for the sea cucumber fishery in areas north of Sumner Strait.
- 182 Prohibit diving of unlicensed CFEC sea cucumber permit holders 48 hours before, during, and 48 hours after commercial sea cucumber fishery openings in Southeast Alaska.

### **Geoducks (12)**

#### ***Harvest Strategy (8)***

- 183 Establish an equal-share harvest program within the Southeast Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.
- 184 Under an equal-share harvest program, require preseason registration for the Southeast Alaska geoduck fishery.
- 185 Open geoduck fishery year round to provide consistent monthly harvest.
- 186 Extend geoduck fishery year round from July 1 to June 30.
- 187 Establish a trip limit program for the Southeast Alaska geoduck fishery.
- 188 Amend number of harvest days and times for the Southeast Alaska geoduck fishery to allow for preseason control of harvest for the fishery.
- 189 Establish a weekly rate of harvest schedule for the Southeast Alaska geoduck fishery.
- 190 Revise harvest rotation areas for the geoduck fishery in Ketchikan and Craig to provide consistent annual harvest in the fishery.

#### ***Gear (3)***

- 191 Limit length of air and water hoses to 300 ft. in the Southeast Alaska geoduck fishery.
- 192 Establish a minimum distance of 200 yards between vessels in the Southeast Alaska geoduck fishery.
- 193 Prohibits divers from using gear in commercial openings following unauthorized use of gear and allow divers to dive on aquatic farm sites.

#### ***Registration (1)***

- 194 Amend the registration requirements for red sea urchins, sea cucumbers, and geoducks in Registration Area A.

### **Abalone (2)**

- 195 Reduce the bag and possession limits for abalone from 50 to 10 in the subsistence and personal use fisheries.
- 196 Restrict the subsistence, personal use, and sport abalone fisheries.

**Razor clams (2)**

- 197 Clarify application of the personal use regulation and close the personal use razor clam fishery in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area.
- 198 Close the subsistence razor clam fishery in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES</b>  <b>February 24- March 4, 2012</b>  <b>SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT FINFISH</b></p>
--

**PROPOSAL INDEX**

*Following is a list of proposals that will be considered at the above meeting sorted by general topic. A board committee roadmap will be developed and distributed prior to the meeting.*

<b>PROP NO. (145)</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
---------------------------	----------------

**Southeast Groundfish (25)**

***General (2)***

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 199 | Amend groundfish area registration to specify registration by vessel. |
| 200 | Clarify use of post-processed and reported commercial fish as bait.   |
| 201 | <i>Proposal 201 does not exist.</i>                                   |

***Closed Waters (4)***

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 141 | Prohibit fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Cache Island by all users. <i>(This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, Miscellaneous Shellfish meeting.)</i>               |
| 142 | Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish in a portion of Behm Canal. <i>(This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, Miscellaneous Shellfish meeting.)</i> |
| 143 | Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Naha Bay. <i>(This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, Miscellaneous Shellfish meeting.)</i>              |
| 144 | Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Cedar Island. <i>(This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, Miscellaneous Shellfish meeting.)</i>          |

*\* Note: Proposals 202-205 do not exist as they are duplicates of proposals 141-144.*

***Dogfish (2)***

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 206 | Create a commercial spiny dogfish pot fishery in the Ketchikan area. |
| 207 | Increase the dogfish daily bag limit.                                |

***Pacific Cod (1)***

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 208 | Establish commercial fishing seasons for Pacific cod for the Eastern Gulf of Alaska area. |
|-----|---|

***Rockfish (5)***

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 209 | Establish commercial fishing seasons for black rockfish for the Eastern Gulf of Alaska area. |
| 210 | Require release of demersal shelf rockfish at depth.   |
| 211 | Require release of rockfish at 40 feet or greater.   |
| 212 | Increase the sport allocation of demersal shelf rockfish to 25 percent.                      |

213 Establish a point system for retention of rockfish.

***Sablefish (3)***

- 214 Standardize sablefish retention and reporting requirements in regulation.  
215 Amend the sablefish fishing season to allow permit holders to participate in stock assessment surveys.  
216 Repeal the nonresident sablefish annual limit.

***Lingcod (8)***

- 217 Amend lingcod allocation between commercial fisheries.  
218 Allow for retention of lingcod in other commercial fisheries.  
219 Increase the allocation for commercially caught lingcod in North Southeast Outside Section.  
220 Reallocate a portion of the Eastern Yakutat Section lingcod GHL.  
221 Increase sport allocation of lingcod in Central Southeast Outside and Southern Southeast Outside sections.  
222 Increase the lingcod GHL in EYKT Section.  
223 Clarify dinglebar gear in the lingcod fishery allows only one line.  
224 Allow lingcod to be used as commercial bait.

***Southeast Herring (21)***

***Spawn on Kelp (2)***

- 225 Allow combining two units of gear in herring spawn-on-kelp fishery.  
226 Amend spawn-on-kelp gear marking and removal requirements.

***Gillnet Sac Roe (3)***

- 227 Amend to clarify that only the purse seine fishery is an equal quota share fishery.  
228 Remove the mesh restriction in the Gillnet Sac Roe Herring Fishery.  
229 Remove the mesh restriction in the Gillnet Sac Roe Herring Fishery.

***Seine Sac Roe (8)***

- 230 Revise the commercial herring fishery management plan for Sitka Sound.  
231 Amend management for the herring sac roe fishery GHL in Sections 13-A and 13-B.  
232 Repeal regulations for establishing the herring fishery GHL for Sections 13-A and 13-B.  
233 Establish an equal-share fishery for herring sac roe in Sitka Sound.  
234 Establish an equal-share fishery for herring sac roe in Sitka Sound.  
235 Restrict fishing vessels from entry into the announced fishing area prior to openings in the Sitka Sound commercial herring fishery.  
236 Change specifications for herring purse seines to reduce depth of nets for the Sitka Sound commercial herring fishery.  
237 Change specifications for herring purse seine to reduce length of nets for the Sitka Sound commercial herring fishery.

***Allocation (8)***

- 238 Establish closed waters for the Sitka Sound commercial herring fishery in order to provide an area only open for subsistence.
- 239 Exclude commercial herring fishing within a defined core spawning area within Sitka Sound to allow for a harvest of herring spawn to meet the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence.
- 240 Re-allocate Sitka Sound herring to provide up to 1,000 tons of herring for commercial bait when the sac roe fishery GHL exceeds 10,000 tons.
- 241 Revise the herring allocation for Hobart Bay to eliminate winter bait and to provide all the available GHL for gillnet sac roe.
- 242 Increase threshold for the West Behm Canal Herring Fishery from 6,000 tons to 15,000 tons.
- 243 Eliminate rotational fishing opportunity for purse seining in West Behm Canal herring sac roe fishery and allow only gillnet sac roe fishing.
- 244 Eliminate rotational fishing opportunity for purse seining in West Behm Canal herring sac roe fishery and allow only gillnet sac roe fishing.
- 245 Allocate of equal shares in the Southeast sac roe fishery in Section 1-E and 1-F by designation of permit holders to harvest herring for others.

***Southeast Sport (22)******Management Plan (2)***

- 246 Clarify that the management measures for the use of two rods is for king salmon only.
- 247 Develop a management plan to protect and enhance the Juneau roadside sport fisheries.

***General Provisions (3)***

- 248 Change the definition of “bag limit” for anglers fishing from a vessel.
- 249 Establish nonresident annual limits for sockeye, coho, chum, and pink salmon in the Southeast Alaska Area.
- 250 Allow retention of king salmon in the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.

***Methods and Means (3)***

- 251 Allow the use of two rods by non-guided anglers in salt water.
- 252 Allow the use of power assisted reels by disabled anglers only.
- 253 Establish system for distinguishing between vessels participating in hand troll and guided charter fishing in Southeast Alaska.

***Special Provisions (14)***

- 254 Allow youth and disabled anglers to use bait in high use and small cutthroat lakes.
- 255 Establish a Taku River king salmon sport fishery.
- 256 Prohibit snagging at the mouth of Auke Creek.
- 257 Prohibit the use of bait in Cowee Creek.
- 258 Reopen Sitkoh Bay Sockeye sport fishery.

- 259 Make fishing within the Sitka Historical Park on the Indian River a fly fishing only, catch and release fishery.
- 260 Liberalize king salmon regulations in the vicinity of Ketchikan.
- 261 Increase king salmon bag limits in the vicinity of Neets Bay.
- 262 Extend the open season and the period bait may be used in City Park Ponds until August 31, and modify the bag and possession limit for cutthroat trout, king, and coho salmon.
- 263 Prohibit the use of bait in the Klawock River.
- 264 Allow the use of bait in the Klawock River.
- 265 Repeal Klawock River regulations applying to adipose fin-clipped steelhead.
- 266 Clarify Klawock Harbor area closed to snagging and retention of sockeye.
- 267 Align Post Office Lake regulations with the Yakutat roadside systems regulations.

### **Southeast Subsistence and Personal Use (14)**

#### ***General (3)***

- 268 Clarify where personal use finfish regulations apply.
- 269 Establish a catch report card system for subsistence, personal use, and sport finfish fisheries.
- 270 Require a permit for subsistence or personal use harvest of sablefish.

#### ***Groundfish (1)***

- 271 Clarify prohibitions to commercial, subsistence, and personal use fishing by commercial sablefish permit holders.

#### ***Herring (2)***

- 272 Clarify subsistence herring and herring spawn customary and traditional use findings for waters of Sections 3-A and 3-B.
- 273 Require a permit for subsistence herring eggs on branches in Sitka Sound or alter the harvest monitoring program to measure landed weights.

#### ***Salmon (8)***

- 274 Modify the personal use fishery for salmon in Southeast Alaska to target king and coho and to include additional gear types.
- 275 Remove the horsepower limit for the Klawock subsistence area.
- 276 Change the subsistence sockeye fishery in the Klawock River from five to seven days per week.
- 277 Allow dip nets in the Taku River for personal use.
- 278 Extend the personal use fishery season on the Taku River from mid-June through August.
- 279 Increase Taku River sockeye salmon daily and annual bag limit per household based on number of persons in the household.
- 280 Clarify that subsistence in District 15 includes Lutak Inlet and opens the day before commercial openings.
- 281 Allow 75 fathom gillnet length in the Yakutat Bay subsistence fishery.

## **Southeast Commercial Salmon (63)**

### ***Management Plan (3)***

- 282 Modify the Situk-Ahrnklin and Lost River King Salmon Management Plan to redefine closed waters, specify nonretention, and clarify action points.
- 283 Revise the *Situk River Management Plan* to delink Situk escapement from a spring troll in Yakutat Bay.
- 284 Establish increased fishing periods for troll when the directed drift gillnet fishery is open in Sections 11-A and 11-B.

### ***Seine (7)***

- 285 Repeal the 58' vessel limit in the Southeast salmon purse seine fishery.
- 286 Increase length limit for Southeast salmon seine vessel to 75 feet.
- 287 Exclude stern ramps and rollers in the 58 foot length limit for the Southeast Alaska area.
- 288 Allow seine vessels to transport two seine nets.
- 289 Close District 10 to seining and open to gillnet fishing.
- 290 Increase seining and reduce gillnet fishing in District 6 in September.
- 291 Allow harvest of pink salmon along the Pt. Adolphus shoreline in District 14 during years of large pink salmon returns.

### ***Gillnet (8)***

- 292 Change gillnet fishery openings from noon Sundays to 8:00 a.m. on Mondays.
- 293 Provide minimum mesh size of six inches in districts 1, 6, 8, 11, or 15 by emergency order when needed to conserve sockeye and access chum.
- 294 Require reporting of commercially-caught salmon and steelhead retained for personal use.
- 295 Modify drift gillnet fishery in Zimovia Strait and Chichagof Pass based on chum:sockeye ratio to provide for increased terminal seine harvest of enhanced chum in the Anita Bay THA.
- 296 Open gillnet fishery in Section 6-D all season to provide pink salmon fishery.
- 297 Open gillnet fishery in Section 6-D during pink season when not open to seining.
- 298 Limit District 5 seine fishery to 2 days per week to increase gillnet pink salmon harvest in District 6.
- 299 Extend commercial closed waters in Taku Inlet to Point Greely–Point Bishop.

### ***Setnet (7)***

- 300 Allow multiple permit holders to fish from the same vessel and to pool and divide harvests on fish tickets in Yakutat Area salmon fishery.
- 301 Relocate boundary for commercial setnet fishing on Tsiu River to provide a separate sport fishing area.
- 302 Prohibit using power boats to drive fish into nets on the Tsiu River.
- 303 Establish criteria to determine the first commercial opening on the Tsiu River.
- 304 Amend Ankau Creek closed waters.
- 305 Amend Akwe River closed waters.
- 306 Change the day when allowable gear increases on the Alsek River from Monday to Sunday.

***Troll (16)***

- 307 Allow downriggers in the commercial hand troll fishery all season.
- 308 Allow six trolling lines on specified inside waters of Southeast Alaska to increase the harvest of enhanced salmon.
- 309 Allow four hand troll gurdies in the summer troll fishery following the initial king salmon retention period.
- 310 Amend the winter king salmon guideline harvest range by adding hatchery-produced kings.
- 311 Change beginning date for coho salmon retention in the spring king salmon fishery from June 15 to June 1.
- 312 Require 10-day mid-August troll closures for conservation and allocation based on the department's midseason assessment.
- 313 Extend season for the troll coho fishery in Southeast to September 30 but closed earlier by emergency order when warranted.
- 314 Through September lengthen the troll season in Districts 1, 6, and 8 each week gillnet fisheries are opened in these districts.
- 315 In Section 1-E redefine the area open for trolling and extend the summer closure date from September 20 to September 30.
- 316 In Section 1-E redefine the area open for trolling.
- 317 Extend the summer closure date in a portion of Section 1-E to September 30.
- 318 Clarify when Section 1-F is open to trolling.
- 319 Increase troll opening in Chichagof Pass to seven days a week to access enhanced Anita Bay chum.
- 320 Increase the area of Section 11-A open to trolling in the directed Taku king salmon fishery.
- 321 Amend closed waters for the Situk River troll fishery.
- 322 Amend closed waters for the Situk River troll fishery.

***Allocation Plans (4)***

- 323 Revise basis for the *Southeast Alaska Area Enhanced Salmon Allocation Management Plan* to include only production by regional associations.
- 324 Create separate enhanced salmon allocation plans for northern and southern Southeast Alaska.
- 325 Redirect spring troll fishery management to target chum salmon to address the enhanced salmon allocation imbalance.
- 326 Provide a targeted chum salmon fishery for troll gear in Section 11-A to address the enhanced salmon allocation imbalance.

***Special Harvest Area (4)***

- 327 Define open fishing periods in regulation for DIPAC, Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association, and Prince of Wales Hatchery Area special harvest areas.
- 328 Allow new gear type for broodstock capture in Districts 12 and 13.
- 329 Adopt a new Special Harvest Area for the Port Saint Nicholas hatchery in District 3.
- 330 Close a portion of Bear Cove in the Silver Bay Special Harvest Area to protect broodstock and provide for safety.



***Terminal Harvest Area (14)***

- 331       Revise the Neets Bay hatchery management plan to allow cost recovery and distribute harvests according to the Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association board of director's annual plan for allocation.
- 332       Change the Neets Bay hatchery management plan to provide common property access based on enhanced salmon allocation status.
- 333       Remove 1:1 gillnet to seine fishing rotation schedule for Neets Bay hatchery common property openings after the 2011 season.
- 334       Continue 1:1 gillnet to seine fishing rotation in Anita Bay THA through 2017.
- 335       Continue 1:1 gillnet to seine fishing rotation in Deep Inlet THA through 2017.
- 336       Allow for a rotational seine and gillnet fishery in the Nakat Inlet THA.
- 337       Establish a new Herring Cove THA management plan to distribute harvest between commercial, sport, and personal use fisheries.
- 338       Expand the Kendrick Bay THA to include McLean Arm for commercial seining.
- 339       Change the opening date for the Anita Bay THA to May 1.
- 340       Modify the open area in the Anita Bay THA to enhance salmon quality.
- 341       Establish a THA in Southeast Cove for seine and troll gear.
- 342       Establish a registration fishery for the Hidden Falls THA to replace cost recovery harvest with tax assessment.
- 343       Open the Hidden Falls THA August 1 through September 20 to allow trolling for enhanced coho and provide for an area during the troll closure.
- 344       Revise the western Deep Inlet THA boundary and season to increase troll fishery access to enhanced king salmon.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES</b> <b>March 20-23, 2012</b> <b>STATEWIDE DUNGENESS CRAB, SHRIMP &amp; MISCELLANEOUS SHELLFISH</b></p>
--

**PROPOSAL INDEX**

*Following is a list of proposals that will be considered at the above meeting sorted by general topic. A board committee roadmap will be developed and distributed prior to the meeting.*

<b>PROP NO. (35)</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
--------------------------	----------------

**Westward Dungeness Crab (2)**

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 345 | Close Dungeness crab season December 31, rather than January 1, and update regulatory coordinates in fishing season regulation. |
| 346 | Amend regulatory description of registration area and districts.  |

**Kodiak Dungeness Crab (3)**

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 347 | Change fishing season to June 15 through December 31.             |
| 348 | Implement 1,000 pot limit per vessel.                             |
| 349 | Designate Kodiak District a superexclusive registration district. |

**Statewide Scallop (1)**

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 350 | Allow scallop harvest from multiple registration areas when an observer is aboard. |
|-----|--|

**Prince William Sound Scallop (1)**

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 351 | Establish new management district subsections for scallop in PWS. |
|-----|---|

**Westward Scallop (3)**

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 352 | Open specified waters currently closed in Registration Area M to scallop fishing.                                   |
| 353 | Open specified waters currently closed in Registration Area M to scallop fishing.                                   |
| 354 | Amend regulatory description for Registration Area J in description of the area, fishing seasons and closed waters. |

**Westward Octopus (1)**

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 355 | Establish octopus management plan for Registration Area J. |
|-----|--|

**Westward Shrimp (2)**

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 356 | Align pot shrimp season with guideline harvest range.                         |
| 357 | Amend regulatory description of Registration Area J, districts, and sections. |

**Prince William Sound Shrimp (10)**

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 358 | Close the commercial shrimp pot fishery in PWS.           |
| 359 | Close the commercial shrimp pot fishery in PWS.           |
| 360 | Close the commercial shrimp pot fishery in PWS.           |
| 361 | Close the commercial shrimp pot fishery in PWS.           |
| 362 | Amend regulatory fishing hours for commercial pot shrimp. |

- 363 Open Nellie Juan Fjord area to commercial shrimping.
- 364 Amend gear marking requirements for commercial shrimp pot gear.
- 365 Restrict operation of sport, personal use, and subsistence shrimp pot gear by persons or vessels participating in the commercial shrimp pot fishery.
- 366 Amend shrimp pot fishery registration from superexclusive to exclusive.
- 367 Include references to the noncommercial shrimp fishery management plan in subsistence and personal use regulations.

**Prince William Sound Miscellaneous shellfish (except scallop) (3)**

- 368 Allow retention of octopus only as bycatch to other directed groundfish and shellfish fisheries.
- 369 Repeal the reference to razor clam guideline harvest levels.
- 370 Require a commissioner's permit for the commercial harvest of clams.

**Cook Inlet Miscellaneous (3)**

- 371 Extend the eastern boundary for the North Gulf Coast personal use shrimp fishery to Cape Fairfield.
- 372 Reduce the bag limit for hardshell clams in Cook Inlet to 80 clams of any species.
- 373 Re-establish Tyonek subsistence clam harvest area.

**Statewide Shellfish (6)**

- 374 Clarify restriction on use of sport, personal, or subsistence-caught shellfish by owner, operator, or employee of a lodge, charter vessel, or other enterprise that furnishes food, lodging, or sport fishing guide services.
- 375 Require that commercial shellfish pots constructed of rigid mesh have a biodegradable escape mechanism identical to that required for subsistence, personal use, and sport shellfish pots.
- 376 Clarify regulations regarding use of hook and line when taking octopus.
- 377 Establish a sustainable Dungeness crab policy.
- 378 Establish a sustainable all-species shrimp policy.
- 379 Establish a sustainable miscellaneous shellfish policy.



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES</b> <b>October 6-10, 2011</b> <b>PACIFIC COD FOR PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND, COOK INLET, KODIAK, CHIGNIK,</b> <b>AND SOUTH ALASKA PENINSULA</b></p>
---

**PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 28.XXX. New Regulation.** Review licensing and reporting requirements for parallel Pacific cod fisheries for coordination with federal Pacific cod fisheries as follows:

Where the harvest and/or processing of State/Federal fisheries may intersect and reporting/licensing requirements applied, the following must first be considered;

- A) Reporting requirements must be reviewed for their full necessity and reasonable effectiveness for managing the fishery.
- B) Prior to requiring information or operating licenses it must be determined if such requirements contain redundancies among those state and federal agencies managing the fisheries, and if they can be streamlined into a common data base for agency and department use.
- C) The methodology of retrieving information should be reviewed and require minimum impact on those entities providing the information. The retrieval should also take into consideration updated data processing technologies that can be incorporated for maximum streamlining and efficient utilization of the information among State/Federal agencies.

**ISSUE:** There will be potential overlap of license and reporting requirement between the Federal and State parallel fisheries for fishers, processors and/or CP's that may be harvesting or buying fish from both areas. To help mitigate this it should be mandated that State and Federal agencies managing the harvest and reporting of the fishery be consistently cognizant of potential redundant and/or unnecessary reporting of information and license requirements.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** It creates a vacuum for inefficient procurement of information by managing agencies, which then becomes overly burdensome for industry.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal is not as applicable to quality as it is to an efficient process of information.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Industry and agencies/departments who manage data collections of our fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Rhonda Hubbard

(HQ-F11-354)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 2** - 5 AAC 28.267. Prince William Sound Pacific Cod Management Plan; 5 AAC 28.367. Cook Inlet Pacific Cod Management Plan; 5 AAC 28.467. Kodiak Area Pacific Cod Management Plan; 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan and; 5 AAC 28.577 South Alaska Peninsula Area Pacific Cod Management Plan. Require a federal LLP license and observer to participate in the parallel Pacific cod fishery as follows:

(b) Each year the commissioner shall open and close, by emergency order, a parallel season in the **Prince William Sound, Cook Inlet, Kodiak, Chignik and** South Alaska Peninsula Areas to coincide with the initial federal season in the federal [WESTERN] **Central** Gulf of Alaska Area. The commissioner shall open and close, by emergency order, the parallel season during which the use of the same gear allowed in the federal [WESTERN] **Central** Gulf of Alaska Area Pacific cod season is permitted, unless use of that gear is prohibited under 5 AAC 28.050 or 5 AAC 28.530. NEW: A vessel participating in a parallel season for Pacific cod **must have a valid federal LLP for the adjacent waters** and may not be more than 58 feet in overall length in the South Alaska Peninsula.

**ISSUE:** The NPFMC is implementing sector allocations for Pacific cod in the GOA in 2012. The NPFMC also just implemented fixed gear agency requirements for LLPs in the GOA. The purpose and need for these actions was well understood and the state supported them. The parallel fishery allows unlimited participation by longliners and pot fishermen without an LLP which is contrary to the goals of these programs to provide stability in the cod fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fishermen without a license (LLP and federal fishery license) and without an observer will exploit a loophole and catch cod in the parallel fishery which reduces the quota available to the sector.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen who would like to operate within an orderly fishery with a known number of participants. Those who want stability in their fishery and don't want to wait for another crisis that's about to happen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those fishermen who would like to exploit a loophole in a program and not have any costs involved with an LLP or an observer. Fishermen who don't want to invest in the federal cod fishery still have very good opportunities in the state water cod fishery and the expanded jig fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The parallel fishery has been talked about for a decade. As the cod resource is fully utilized in the GOA, the seasons become more compressed, and attempts to limit participation are ongoing, it is time to address the parallel issue.

**PROPOSED BY:** Buck Laukitis

(HQ-F11-375)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 28.467. Kodiak Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Develop regulations to coordinate state and federal Pacific cod fisheries as follows:

Regulatory provisions to address may include:

- ◆ State-waters and parallel fishery season opening and closing dates for pot and jig vessels.
- ◆ Area registration.
- ◆ Landing requirements.
- ◆ Gear storage requirements.
- ◆ Guideline harvest level (GHL) rollover and GHL clean-up provisions.

**ISSUE:** This proposal is a placeholder proposal to allow commercial state-waters Pacific cod fishery stakeholders an opportunity to coordinate aspects of the Kodiak Area state-waters Pacific cod fishery with newly restructured federal/parallel Pacific cod fisheries. Draft regulatory language will be developed following release and analysis of federal rulemaking on Pacific cod sector splits occurs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Conflicting regulations regarding state-waters and parallel Pacific cod fisheries.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial state-waters Pacific cod fishery stakeholders.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-363)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 28.467. Kodiak Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Address harvest overage in state-waters Pacific cod Pot Fishery as follows:

There are two approaches to this problem. First, divorce the allocations so that the overages to the pot fleet are not subtracted from the jig allocation (this is our preferred solution). Or second, address the management precision of the pot season.

There are a number of different ways to address the management precision of the pot fleet. Fishing could be slowed by reducing fishing time, reducing pot limits, or implementing trip limits. Another approach could be reserving a portion of the pot quota for the fall when fishing is slower.

**ISSUE:** Overage of the state waters Pacific cod pot fishery is unfairly subtracted from the state waters Pacific cod jig allocation.

In the Kodiak Area Pacific cod management plan, 12.5% of the Central Gulf of Alaska Allowable Biological Catch (ABC), is given to the state (a)(2). Out of this, the management plan states that the jig fleet is allocated 50% and the pot fleet is allocated the other 50%. The pot gear season is often very quick, lasting 2-3 weeks and the department's management prediction is plus or minus 10%. When the pot fleet overharvests their allocation, the overage is subtracted from the jig fleet allocation so that the department can manage the overall allocation. This situation is unfair, and the jig fleet requests that the Board slow this piece of the pot season so that fisheries are managed closer to their allocations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Jig fleet will continue to lose fishing opportunity.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Jig fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Jig Association (HQ-F11-351)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 28.430. Lawful gear for Kodiak Area.** Allow only jig gear onboard a registered state-waters Pacific cod jig vessel as follows:

(g) while participating in the Kodiak Area state waters jig fishery, no ground fishing gear should be allowed onboard the vessel other than jig gear (i.e., no pot, trawl, or longline gear allowed onboard).

**ISSUE:** Vessels using illegal gear during the commercial jig Kodiak Area Pacific cod fishery. Vessels with pot, longline, and trawl gear onboard are currently allowed to participate in the fishery. To avoid potential abuse, only jig gear should be allowed onboard the vessel while they are registered to jig.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Potential illegal fishing with little ability to enforce.

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



**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Jig fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Jig Association

(HQ-F11-352)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 28.467. Kodiak Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Cap jig vessels 58 feet and larger to 10 percent of the state-waters Pacific cod jig allocation as follows:

Cap the large jig vessels (vessels 58 feet and over) to their historical high harvest (10%) in the Kodiak Area.

**ISSUE:** In the Kodiak Area, large jig vessels (58 feet and over) taking a larger percentage of the jig GHJ that has historically been a smaller vessel fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Smaller vessels will continue to lose fishing opportunity. Potential future Kodiak state waters state seasons may close earlier due to larger vessels out competing the smaller fleet. These larger vessels are able to work in more inclement weather and further offshore. This problem will be exacerbated if state-water seasons adopt "reverse parallel" concepts currently being discussed by the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Small jig vessels.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Large vessels participating in the jig fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Jig Association

(HQ-F11-353)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan; 5 AAC 28.577. South Alaska Peninsula Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Cap jig vessels over 58 feet to 25 percent of the state-waters Pacific cod jig allocation as follows:

As in the state Pacific cod pot fishery in Chignik and South Peninsula areas there is a 58 ft limit on the size of vessels that can fish there . Kodiak has a fleet of every size. The solution I prefer would be as in the Kodiak state pot season the vessels over 58 ft would be restricted to 25% of the Jig quota. This would not eliminate anyone from the fishery and allow enough quota for larger vessels.

**ISSUE:** With the short Kodiak federal Pacific cod seasons in January this opens the state waters Pacific cod around the end of January when the weather isn't at its nicest. There is a slow influx of boats over 58 ft in to the Kodiak state Pacific cod jig fishery. If this continues larger vessels who are able to fish in rougher weather taking more of the quota while smaller boats are weathered out. I believe this was intended by the state to be a small vessel entry level fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The small boat fleet will lose quota to the larger boats. A person looking to get into the fishery would think twice about investing in a small vessel to get started fishing knowing the larger vessels could take a large portion of the quota so fast making it not profitable to get in.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This would reduce the danger to smaller boats fishing in rough weather which improves quality of fish landed. It would slow down the fishery because each vessel size will know how much quota is left to each group.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** In the Kodiak state pot cod season the over 58 ft vessel size has not caught over the 25% as far as I know. The small boat fleet will benefit by knowing how much quota they can harvest and that the large vessels are capped at 25% and won't have to compete in bad weather.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I don't know if anyone would suffer, I think giving each group of vessel size a fair percentage of fish to catch would stabilize a growing problem.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There are other proposals written that don't seem fair to all vessel sizes.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ronald G Thompson (HQ-F11-355)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 28.400. Description of Kodiak Area; and 5 AAC 28.404. Description of Kodiak Area Districts.** Amend regulatory description of Kodiak groundfish area and districts as follows:

**5 AAC 28.400. Description of Kodiak Area**

The Kodiak Area consists of all waters of Alaska south of a line extending east from Cape Douglas along 58° 51.10' N. long., west of 149° 00.00' W. long., and east of a line extending south from the Alaska Peninsula (near Kilokak Rocks) along 156° 20.22' W. long. [( 58° 51.10' N. LAT.), WEST OF 149° W. LONG., NORTH OF 55° 30.00' N. LAT., AND EAST OF A LINE EXTENDING SOUTH FROM THE SOUTHERN ENTRANCE OF IMUYA BAY NEAR KILOKAK ROCKS (156° 20.22' W. LONG.)].

**5 AAC 28.404. Description of Kodiak Area Districts.**

(e) Southwest District: all waters of Olga and Alitak Bays and all waters of the Kodiak Area southwest of Kodiak Island, south of 57° N. lat., and west of 154° W. long., **however, not including waters of the Mainland District.**

(f) Westside District: all waters of the Kodiak Area on the west side of Kodiak Island, south of 58° N. lat., north of 57° N. lat., west of 153° W. long., and east of a line extending through Shelikof Strait from a point at 58° 51.10' N. lat., 152° 50.00' W. long., to a point at 56° 37.00' N. lat., 156° 20.22' W. long. [, BUT NOT INCLUDING THE WATERS OF THE MAINLAND DISTRICT.]

**ISSUE:** As commercial groundfish regulations develop over time, demarcation lines within and between management areas sometimes change independent of each other. The intent of this proposal is to standardize demarcation lines across commercial groundfish fisheries, as well as update demarcation coordinates to reflect the best precision afforded by current technology.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued use of ambiguous demarcation lines.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen, fishery managers, and law enforcement.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-360)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Develop regulations to coordinate state and federal Pacific cod Fisheries as follows:

Regulatory provisions to address may include:

- ◆ State-waters and parallel fishery season opening and closing dates for pot and jig vessels.
- ◆ Area registration.
- ◆ Landing requirements.
- ◆ Gear storage requirements.
- ◆ Guideline harvest level (GHL) rollover and GHL clean-up provisions.

**ISSUE:** This proposal is a placeholder proposal to allow commercial state-waters Pacific cod fishery stakeholders an opportunity to coordinate aspects of the Chignik Area state-waters Pacific cod fishery with newly restructured federal/parallel Pacific cod fisheries. Draft regulatory language will be developed following release and analysis of federal rulemaking on Pacific cod sector splits occurs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Conflicting regulations regarding state-waters and parallel Pacific cod fisheries.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial state-waters Pacific cod fishery stakeholders.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-364)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Open the state-waters Pacific cod season seven days after federal Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod season closes as follows:

(c) The commissioner shall open a state waters season in the Chignik Area seven days following the closure of the directed federal season in the federal Western Central Gulf of Alaska Area. The commissioner shall, by emergency order, close the state waters season opened under this subsection as follows:

**ISSUE:** The opening date for the Chignik Pacific cod fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This local cod fleet will be at a disadvantage to the super 58's that come into the fishery when they are done in the Bering Sea (After March 15). Pacific cod will also be harvested at a time when they are not worth as much as they could be. Their weight average and roe content go down dramatically after March 15. The local economies will suffer due to more fish being taken by non-local boats.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, the fishery will be conducted at a time when roe content and average fish weight will be at a high.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Local Chignik fishermen and the local economics.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The large super 58's that fish traditionally fish the Bering Sea before coming the Chignik Area.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Chignik Marketing Association (HQ-F11-010)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Open the state-waters Pacific cod season one week after federal Pacific cod season closes as follows:

That the Chignik Pacific cod season be opened one week after the federal Pacific cod season is over like every other Pacific cod state area (Kodiak, Sandpoint, and King Cove).

**ISSUE:** The March 15<sup>th</sup> opening date for the Chignik Pacific cod fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The late opening date of March 15<sup>th</sup> will lead to larger boats registering for the Chignik area, especially from the Bering Sea and the fish will be much smaller leading to a less profitable fishing season due to size and weight and fish will be more dispersed at this late of time making it harder to harvest the set quota. For the last few years the Chignik area has caught its quota, but in the years past we never did catch the quota and we left some on the table and by moving the opening date to March 15<sup>th</sup> you are taking valuable fishing time from us and setting up the chance that the quota might not be caught in the future.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, Pacific cod will be full of roe and the average weight will be higher and the canneries will pay more money for the higher quality roe.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All local fishermen in the Chignik area and those who have historically fished the Chignik area from March 1st.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who traditionally show up late for the fishery, including the large boats that traditionally fish the federal fishery in the Bering Sea.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The previous proposal of opening the Chignik Pacific cod season on March 15<sup>th</sup>, because by the late starting date fish will start losing the roe and the fish will be significantly smaller in weight and size and canneries don't like this stage.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alfredo Abou Eid (HQ-F11-020)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Open the state-waters Pacific cod season one week after federal Pacific cod season closes, or March 1, whichever is earlier as follows:

(c) the commissioner shall open, by emergency order, a state waters season in the Chignik area seven days following the closure of the directed federal season in the federal Western Central Gulf of Alaska Area, or March 1st, whichever comes first. The commissioner shall, by emergency order, close the state waters season opened under this subsection as follows:

**ISSUE:** The March 15th opening date for the Chignik Pacific cod fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fishermen will not be able to harvest Pacific cod at a time when the cod are most marketable. Local Fishermen, both large and small boats, will become more vulnerable to the large Bering Sea boats that come into the Chignik State Fishery after the federal fishery in the Bering Sea closes.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, Pacific cod will be harvested at a time when the roe and average weight will be high.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Local Fishermen in the Chignik Area and those who have historically fished the Chignik Area from March 1st.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who traditionally show up late for the fishery, including the large boats that traditionally fish the federal fishery in the Bering Sea.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** An opening date of April 15th. The cod become harder to catch. They are also spawned out and not as marketable.

**PROPOSED BY:** Aaron Anderson (HQ-F11-021)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific cod Management Plan.** Establish 14-day stand-down period for vessels using pot gear in a Pacific cod fishery prior to registering for the Chignik state-waters Pacific cod season as follows:

(f) The Chignik Area is a superexclusive registration area for Pacific cod during a state waters season.

**(1)A pot vessel participating in a commercial Pacific cod season immediately prior to participating in a Chignik state-waters Pacific cod season may not register for a Chignik state-waters Pacific cod season for a period of 14 days.**

**ISSUE:** The absence of a local processor in Chignik that will process Pacific cod has put the local, shallow draft fleet out of the federal fisheries. As a result, the Federal Government has taken the unused, local fishermen's' LLPs. This has limited the local fleet to the State Pacific cod season. This, along with competition from the larger, non-local, deep drafted boats coming out of the Federal fisheries, has brought the challenge on the local economy to a critical point.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The local fishermen and economy will continue lose more harvest opportunity to the non-local, deep draft fleet. The cod fishery will progressively become shorter and shorter, eventually becoming a derby style fishery.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The local, shallow draft boat fleet and economy.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The much larger, deep drafted boats that traditionally fish the Federal fisheries until they close, then immediately jump into the Chignik state water season.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Put restrictions on the beam and draft of boats in the Chignik state water fisheries.

It was rejected because the state is not successfully enforcing the 58 foot LOA limit in all state fisheries.

**PROPOSED BY:** Don Bumpus and Aaron Anderson (HQ-F11-349)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Reduce pot limit in state-waters Pacific cod fishery as follows:

Boats may only fish **40 pots** [60 POTS].

**ISSUE:** Larger 58' boats from out of area fishing 24 hours a day.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Local small boat fleet miss out on opportunity to harvest cod in Chignik Area.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Local small boat fleet.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Outside larger boats.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** City of Chignik (HQ-F11-061)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Establish daily fishing period for Pacific cod fishery as follows:

Vessel may only set and pick gear between hours of 6:00 am to 6:00 pm.

**ISSUE:** Boats fishing 24 hours a day. Local fleet shut down because of weather.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Local small boat fleet miss opportunity to catch cod in Chignik Area.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Small boats.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Larger outside boats.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** City of Chignik (HQ-F11-065)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 28.500. Description of Chignik Area; and 5 AAC 28.505. Description of Chignik Area Districts.** Amend regulatory description of Chignik groundfish area and districts as follows:

**5 AAC 28.500. Description of Chignik Area.**

The Chignik Area consists of all waters of Alaska on the south side of the Alaska Peninsula enclosed by a line extending south from the Alaska Peninsula (near Kilokak Rocks) along 156° 20.22' W. long., [(THE LONGITUDE OF THE SOUTHERN ENTRANCE TO IMUYA BAY NEAR KILOKAK ROCKS)] and a line extending 135° southeast from Kupreanof Point (55° 33.98' N. lat., 159° 35.88' W. long.).

**5 AAC 28.505. Description of Chignik Area Districts.**

(a) Sutwik Island District: all waters of the Chignik Area west of [THE LONGITUDE OF KILOKAK ROCKS] 156° 20.22' W. long. and north of 56° 30.00' N. lat.

**ISSUE:** As commercial groundfish regulations develop over time, demarcation lines within and between management areas sometimes change independent of each other. The intent of this proposal is to standardize demarcation lines across commercial groundfish fisheries, as well as update demarcation coordinates to reflect the best precision afforded by current technology.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued use of ambiguous demarcation lines.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen, fishery managers, and law enforcement.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.



**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-361)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 28.577 South Alaska Peninsula Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Develop regulations to coordinate state and federal Pacific cod fisheries as follows:

(G) Any vessel transferring from Area O must stand down 7 days after he or she registers to Area M or Area L, unless Area O has been closed 7 days prior to the opening of Area M or Area L. You will not be able to register for 2 areas at the same time.

**ISSUE:** Boats transferring from a federal cod fishery to a state water cod fishery without standing down 7 days like all other vessels have to in Area M and Area L.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The large influx of vessels into a state water fishery make it hard for the department to manage and is not fair to the vessels that waited 7 days to get started.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone will have the same advantage.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The vessels that sat down for 7 days to start the state water fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kenneth Mack

(SC-F11-024)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 28.577. South Alaska Peninsula Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Develop regulations governing the state-waters Pacific cod fishery to address federal/parallel Gulf of Alaska gear sector allocations.

Regulatory provisions to address may include:

- ◆ State-waters and parallel fishery season opening and closing dates for pot and jig vessels.
- ◆ Area registration.
- ◆ Landing requirements.
- ◆ Gear storage requirements.
- ◆ Guideline harvest level (GHL) rollover and GHL clean-up provisions.

**ISSUE:** This proposal is a placeholder proposal to allow commercial state-waters Pacific cod fishery stakeholders an opportunity to coordinate aspects of the South Alaska Peninsula Area state-waters Pacific cod fishery with newly restructured federal/parallel Pacific cod fisheries. Draft

regulatory language will be developed following release and analysis of federal rulemaking on Pacific cod sector splits occurs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Conflicting regulations regarding state-waters and parallel Pacific cod fisheries.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial state-waters Pacific cod fishery stakeholders.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-365)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 28.577. South Alaska Peninsula Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Open state-waters Pacific cod season seven days after federal Western Gulf of Alaska A season Pacific cod pot sector closes as follows:

The only logical and fair way to open the season being as it is a pot and jig fishery, would be somewhat as it is currently. To open seven days after the "pot" sector of the western gulf federal "A" season closes.

**ISSUE:** Setting a season opening after the implementation of sector splits in the federal season.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Currently there is no way of knowing when the season would open with the sector split system.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, by allowing historical participants to fish as we always have we fish our state waters season into the "spawn". During this period, the fish are at their most valuable, and most accessible point of the year.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All historical participants should see things go smoothly as they always have. Also, I see a major problem on the enforcement side if a pre-determined opening date is set. If the federal pot sector is open in parallel with the state waters, the issue of pot tags and a 60 pot limit would require major rule/law changes and entice morally corrupt people to cheat. That being said, if the trawl sector is still open during the state waters season it is imperative that all vessels that are dual permitted but switching to pots for the state season after trawling in the federal, be required to have no trawl gear aboard while participating in the state season. With the fish being so schooled up this time of year, it would be far too easy for a vessel to set their net, claiming it against the state T.A.C., saving their federal T.A.C. with no risk of being caught.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. Things would basically continue the way they always have.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** If the season was set to open after the entire federal quota was caught, we could potentially miss the spawn. Also, there is the possibility a sector may not be caught resulting in no opening. I have also covered the aspect of a pre-determined opening date above.

**PROPOSED BY:** Blake Painter (HQ-F11-033)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 28.577. South Alaska Peninsula Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Open state-waters Pacific cod season on March 1, or seven days after federal Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod pot sector closes, whichever is later as follows:

The South Alaska Peninsula State Water Pacific cod Fishery will open March 1<sup>st</sup> or 7 days after the closure of the Federal pot sector or whichever date is later.

**ISSUE:** Start date for state water pot cod fishery in the South Alaska Peninsula after closure of Federal pot sector which will be implemented in 2012.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Confusion about start times after Federal pot closure.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, the resource will be harvested earlier at its peak value to fishermen and processors.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen and processors.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Later start date was rejected due to decrease in value of resource to fishermen and processors.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kiley Thompson, Dwain Foster, Sr., Danny Cumberlodge, Arthor Homberg  
(HQ-F11-377)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 28.577. Alaska Peninsula Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Open state-waters Pacific cod season on March 15, or seven days after federal Western Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod pot sector closes if that closure is later than March 15 as follows:

Except as specified in (i) of this section the commissioner shall open, by emergency order, a state waters season in the South Alaska. Peninsula Area on March 15 or 7 days following the closure of the directed Pot Federal Western Gulf season if the closure is after March 15.

**ISSUE:** Sector splits in the Federal Western Gulf Pacific cod season take effect in 2012. The state Pacific cod season opening date for Area M is presently 7 days after the complete closure of the Federal season. The trawl and pot sectors will probably close at different times in 2012.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will be no clear regulation that specifically addresses the opening date for Area M state Pacific cod season in 2012 with the changes that the sector splits will cause in the Federal closure.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The fishermen and processors of Area M state cod fishery will hopefully benefit by having a set date for the opening.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** King Cove Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-366)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 28.577. Alaska Peninsula Area Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Establish regulatory allocation for mechanical jigging machine gear in the state-waters Pacific cod fishery as follows:

I would like for the regulations to specify a quota for mechanical jig boats that would not be dependent on whether or not the pot quota is overfished. We would also like an increase in the historic [less than or equal to] 15%.

**ISSUE:** In the South Alaska Peninsula, there is no guaranteed quota for mechanical jig fisheries. Fishermen would like to see a guaranteed quota as well as an increase in the historical quota. The jig fleet has been rapidly increasing over the years and there are less fish to be divided between more boats.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Small local boats will not have equal access to cod stocks which are more readily available for larger pot fishing boats.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It is arguable as to whether or not the quality of jig fish differs from that of pot-caught fish. However, large deliveries which happen throughout the pot cod fishery often result in fish that are held for longer periods before processing. After the pot cod

quota is caught and only jig boats remain, the catches are small enough that all fish can be processed on the same day.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The jig fleet, which is comprised mostly of small local boats which mostly fish salmon, and are underutilized otherwise.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Larger boats who can fish pot quota but not are not equipped to catch trawl quota. Most larger boats, however, are equipped to catch cod with trawl nets and can utilize the majority of the federal cod quota through all sectors.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Under the federal fishery Amendment 83, jig boats will be allocated 1.5% up to 6% maximum. Many jig boats do not start fishing until later in the fall anyway, and the quota allocated under Amendment 83 is miniscule, comparatively. Smaller boats would rather fish later into the spring instead of starting earlier in January in inclement weather.

**PROPOSED BY:** Patrick Brown (HQ-F11-369)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 28.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish regulatory allocation of 25 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery as follows:

It should say: Jig boats are guaranteed 25% of the quota.

**ISSUE:** Increasing the jig quota.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Jig boats will suffer.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Jig boats.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some pot boats who don't also jig.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We won't get much federal quota, we need to make it up during state season.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kim Gundersen (HQ-F11-379)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 28.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish regulatory allocation of 30% for state-waters Pacific cod mechanical jig fishery as follows:

I would like if the jig fleet was allocated 30% guaranteed of the quota instead of 15% which is not guaranteed.

**ISSUE:** There is not enough quota for jig boats.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Jig boats won't have as much fishing time. Negative economic impact to small boat fleet.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The entire jig fleet.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Pot cod boats which catch a substantial portion of the federal and state cod quota.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Many fishermen were in favor of asking for 50% of the quota but I thought 30% would be a good starting point to build upon.

**PROPOSED BY:** Rob Tripp (HQ-F11-370)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 28.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery as follows:

The new regulation would say that jig boats and pot boats would get an equal allocation of 50% apiece.

**ISSUE:** I would like to see an increase in the jig quota for cod from 15% to 50%.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Jig boats will not have enough fishing time.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The jig fleet.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The pot fleet.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** An increase in the state waters quota will guarantee fishermen have access through the summer and fall.

**PROPOSED BY:** Carl Carlson III (HQ-F11-371)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 28.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery as follows:

It would say that jig boats will get 50% of the quota.

**ISSUE:** I would like to see the jig quota increased.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Small boats will be left out of fishing opportunities.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Jig fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Pot boats.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** George Jackson, Jr. (HQ-F11-372)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 28.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery as follows:

The jig quota will be 50%.

**ISSUE:** The jig quota needs to be increased.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Jig boats will not have equal access to fish.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Jig boats.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Pot boats.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The jig boats deserve equal access.

**PROPOSED BY:** Peter Shuravloff (HQ-F11-373)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 28.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery as follows:

Jig boats and pot boats would equally divide the quota, 50/50.

**ISSUE:** To increase the jig quota to 50%. There are more boats participating.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Jig boats will not have equal access.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Jiggers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Pot fishermen, who already have a large portion of the federal quota.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Albert Spiros (HQ-F11-374)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 28.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery as follows:

I would like to see jig boats sharing the quota equally with pot boats. 50% for jiggers 50% for pot boats.

**ISSUE:** Increasing the jig quota.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Jig boats will continue to get less fishing opportunity.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Jig boats.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Pot boats.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I don't see any other options.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wayne Gundersen (HQ-F11-380)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 28.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish regulatory allocation of 50 percent for state-waters Pacific cod jig fishery as follows:

The cod quota should be shared equally between pot boats and jiggers.



**ISSUE:** Jig boats don't get enough quota.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Equal access is not available to jiggers.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Jiggers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Pot fishermen.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Increase the quota 5% per year when the quota is caught, up to 50%.

**PROPOSED BY:** Nick Gundersen (HQ-F11-381)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 28.570. Lawful Gear for South Alaska Peninsula Area.** Repeal one definition of mechanical jigging machine gear as follows:

(d)(2) **repealed** [A SINGLE CONTINUOUS LINE WITH NO MORE THAN 150 HOOKS].

**ISSUE:** This definition of legal commercial gear for jig and hand troll groundfish fisheries creates confusion among fishermen, is difficult to enforce, and is inconsistent with actual fishing practices. Additionally, this definition of mechanical jigging gear is not recognized by the National Marine Fisheries Service as a legal gear type during federal groundfish fisheries, potentially resulting in conflicting gear regulations when coordinating state- and federally-managed Pacific cod fisheries.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued uncertainty regarding legal gear configurations during commercial jig and hand troll groundfish fisheries.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All fishery stakeholders will benefit from clear and consistent regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-359)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 28.555. Description of South Alaska Peninsula Area Districts and Sections.** Amend regulatory description of South Alaska Peninsula groundfish district and sections as follows:

(1) Eastern District: all waters of the South Alaska Peninsula Area east of the longitude of Scotch Cap Light **(164° 44.72' W. long)** [(164° 44' W. long)], which includes the following sections:

(A) Shumagin Islands Section: all waters of the Eastern District west of a line extending 135° southeast from Kupreanof Point (55° 33.98' N. lat, 159° 35.88' W. long) and east of 161° W. long.;

(B) Pavlof Bay Section: all waters of the Eastern District west of 161° W. long. and east of 162° W. long.;

(C) Sanak Island Section: all waters of the Eastern District west of 162° W. long. and east of the longitude of Scotch Cap Light **(164° 44.72' W. long.)** [(164° 44' W. long.)];

(2) Western District: all waters of the South Alaska Peninsula Area west of the longitude of Scotch Cap Light **(164° 44.72' W. long)** [(164° 44' W. long)].

**ISSUE:** As commercial groundfish regulations develop over time, demarcation lines within and between management areas sometimes change independent of each other. The intent of this proposal is to standardize demarcation lines across commercial groundfish fisheries, as well as update demarcation coordinates to reflect the best precision afforded by current technology.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued use of ambiguous demarcation lines.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen, fishery managers, and law enforcement.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-362)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 28.267. Prince William Sound Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Allocate the state-waters Pacific cod guideline harvest level as follows:

5 AAC 28.267(c), 5 AAC 28.267(c)(2) and 5 AAC 28.267(c)(3) add “with the exception of longline gear”.

5 AAC 28.267(c)(2) – for pots: change 60% to 90%.

5 AAC 28.267(c)(3) – add: for longline gear season will open concurrent with halibut season and close when 75% of GHL is reached, or on....etc.

**ISSUE:** The Board of Fisheries initiated the PWS state waters Pacific cod fishery in March, 2009. Although the GHL was reached in '09 for the first time in over a decade it also resulted in no Pacific cod quota available for jig and pot fishermen in '09. While Pacific cod landings in Cordova were over 50% of the GHL in '09 less than 2% of the GHL was processed in Cordova in 2010.

Under current regulations, PWS longliners targeting Pacific cod must discard halibut and then three weeks later PWS longliners targeting halibut must discard Pacific cod. If the two seasons were to open simultaneously discards of both species would be greatly reduced. This would not result in a loss of opportunity for either Pacific cod or halibut longliners but would maximize benefits for fishermen and processors while minimizing bycatch issues.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** As a result of regulation 5 AAC 28.267(c)(3), nascent pot and jig fisheries have been effectively eliminated. GHL for PWS was reached in about a week in 2009 and about a week in 2010, despite a significant increase in GHL in 2010. Pacific cod landings in Cordova were well over 50% of GHL in 2009 and well under 50% of GHL in 2010. Local longline fleets were unable to access the state waters fishery because the central Gulf fleet harvested entire GHL in one week. Opportunities for PWS longliners have only been marginally improved. Because of the way the regulations are written, the central Gulf longliners only have opportunities to fish Pacific cod during the PWS Pacific cod season.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No. This proposal is quality neutral.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Pacific cod gear groups will benefit from this proposal.

The PWS State waters longline fishery is new and some adjustments need to be made to maximize benefits for local fleets, processors and other gear types. By considering this proposal, the Board of Fisheries can renew opportunity for pot and jig and also address conservation concerns associated with the longline fishery.

Statistics now show that the Pacific cod biomass is plentiful in PWS and some adjustments in regulations could maximize the benefits of Pacific cod fishery to PWS fishermen and processors.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I considered the implications of maintaining the status quo, however this effectively eliminates pots and jigs and increases unnecessary fish wastage. In the interest of conservation and reducing fish waste, this proposal makes economic sense.

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert A. Smith

(HQ-F11-014)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 28.267. Prince William Sound Pacific Cod Management Plan.**  
Establish a specific sector allocation for the jig fishery in PWS as follows:

The current regulation would be rewritten to more closely match the Pacific cod Management Plans found at 5 AAC 28.467 Kodiak and 5AAC28.267 Cook Inlet, which set specific sector allocations to the jig fishery.

**ISSUE:** Currently, the Pacific cod GHL for pot, longline and jig gear does not allocate a specific portion of the GHL for jig harvest. The GHL is typically reached by the longline and pot fleet before the cod are schooled in sufficient densities near shore for a viable jig fishery to occur. Additionally, if a jig allocation were set at say 10% of the GHL, the number of pounds available may not be sufficient to encourage more entry level vessels to participate.

I urge the Board to work with the Council to set a specific GHL for the jig fishery in State waters and also for the proposed Federal waters reverse parallel fishery for vessels under 60' that do not currently hold a federal LLP. I further urge the Board to open this season exclusively to vessels registered to fish with jig gear until October 30th before allowing vessels that participated in the longline or pot fisheries to reregister as jig vessels. This would give entry level participants an opportunity to create a viable fishery and still allow the entire GHL for the jig sector to be harvested.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The jig fishery in the Prince William Sound Management Area will effectively be excluded from participating in the Pacific cod fishery from their home ports and they will have to travel to Kodiak or Cook Inlet to have any meaningful participation in the fishery.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No, this is an allocative issue intended to compliment the efforts currently being pursued at the Council level.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Entry level jig sector fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unless the jig allocation is taken from the pot and longline sectors, no other gear types should suffer. However, if the Council fails to provide a sector allocation above the current GHL, then there would be a reduction in the amount of cod available to pot and longline until the end of October, when they would be permitted to reregister as jig sector participants and finish harvesting the GHL.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The status quo was rejected because the jig sector is currently not economically able to participate in the fishery. Allocating a percentage of the GHL was also considered and rejected as 1) likely to be too low to encourage participation, and 2) it would result in a reduction to the pot and longline sectors which is not the intention of this proposal. The intention of this proposal is to provide jig sector allocation to the entry level vessels under 60' in the PWS area in line with proposed rules at the NPFMC.

**PROPOSED BY:** Gregory Gabriel

(HQ-F11-178)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 28.267. Prince William Sound Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Allow only vessels without a federal Pacific cod endorsement to participate in the state-waters Pacific cod fishery as follows:

(c) The commissioner shall open by emergency order, a state waters season in the PWS Area, for vessels who do not have a Pacific cod endorsement in their federal groundfish license, seven days following....

**ISSUE:** Many fishermen have lost federal Pacific cod endorsements and no longer have access to federal waters. They will now have to compete in state water fisheries against vessels that have access to all waters.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Vessels stuck without FFPS will be unable to continue to fish because they will lose access to federal waters and have to compete in a very short fishery against larger vessels that can then move back to federal waters.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** State waters fishermen who will be able to continue to fish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Federal license holders will not be able to fish PWS.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert A. Smith (HQ-F11-378)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 28.206. Prince William Sound area registration.** Require that Pacific cod from other areas be landed before a vessel participates in the state-waters Pacific cod fishery as follows:

**5 AAC 28.206. Prince William Sound Area Registration.**

...

(d) A vessel validly registered for the Prince William Sound Area state waters Pacific cod season may not operate gear in that fishery while having fish from any other registration area or the exclusive economic zone on board the vessel. These fish must be landed prior to participating in the state waters Pacific cod season. A vessel operator must land fish taken in a state waters season prior to operating gear in any other registration area or the exclusive economic zone.

**ISSUE:** Currently, vessels may simultaneously target Pacific cod in exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and state waters fisheries. Harvest in the EEZ fishery is accounted against the federal total allowable catch (TAC) and in state waters, against a guideline harvest level (GHL). It is important

that harvests be accurately accounted to the respective management programs. Harvest incorrectly accounted against a harvest level or allocation may result in a shorter season.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Inaccurate reporting can confound recordkeeping efforts and result in low quality fishery harvest data when harvests are incorrectly assigned to the respective fishery. In some instances this could result in shorter seasons and forgone harvest.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** There is a small likelihood that vessels ineligible for the federal license limitation program (LLP) may benefit by slightly more fishing time over vessels that are LLP-qualified and wish to exercise that privilege.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Vessels desiring to fish both areas simultaneously may suffer by having to land fish from one area prior to participating in the fishery in another area.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None. It is common to have a landing requirement before participating in a separate fishery.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-293)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 28.267. Prince William Sound Pacific Cod Management Plan.**  
Amend opening date of the state-waters Pacific cod season as follows:

Make a regulation stating that the PWS Pacific cod Fishery will not open until at least 1 week after the <50' sector in the parallel Federal Fishery catches their given allocation for that fishing season.

**ISSUE:** Given the Federal Sector Split for Pacific cod based on length of vessel, the PWS Pacific cod season could be subject to open a week after a certain sector in federal parallel fishery catches their given allocation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This could pose an unfair disadvantage to the smaller vessels (<50') which typically participate in the PWS Pacific cod fishery.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Larger amounts of fish move in later in the year which may accelerate the harvest. Although as fish get closer to spawning time, the flesh quality drops. This could be offset with potential market value of the Roe and Milt as by-products.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** This regulation will allow the smaller boat fleet to have more fishing options, since timing of their allocated harvest is expected to follow the full harvest of the other vessel categories like the 60' + sized vessels.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** If there is no regulation the smaller vessel size (<50') fleet will suffer because they will lose an opportunity to fish the PWS cod fishery to larger vessels.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Consider a specific date but uncertain whether opportunity would be sacrificed by that.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ilia Kuzmin (HQ-F11-350)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 28.267. Prince William Sound Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Develop regulations governing the state-waters Pacific cod fishery as follows:

Regulatory provisions to address may include:

- ◆ State-waters and parallel fishery season opening and closing dates for pot and jig vessels.
- ◆ Area registration.
- ◆ Landing requirements.
- ◆ Gear storage requirements.
- ◆ Guideline harvest level (GHL) rollover and GHL clean-up provisions.

**ISSUE:** This proposal is a placeholder proposal to allow commercial state-waters Pacific cod fishery stakeholders an opportunity to coordinate aspects of the Prince William Sound Area state-waters Pacific cod fishery with newly restructured federal/parallel Pacific cod fisheries. Draft regulatory language will be developed following release and analysis of federal rulemaking on Pacific cod sector splits occurs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Conflicting regulations regarding state-waters and parallel Pacific cod fisheries.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial state-waters Pacific cod fishery stakeholders.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-357)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 28.367. Cook Inlet Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Reallocate state-waters season guideline harvest level as follows:

The jig portion of the quota would start at 10% of the 90% of that amount was caught. It would increase by 5% beginning the next calendar year to a maximum of 25%. .

**ISSUE:** Unharvested state waters cod quota.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Lost opportunity, cod quota left on “table”.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Pot fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Jig fishermen but only if they reach their quota which has yet to happen.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Roll over quota to net year would take cooperation of feds.

**PROPOSED BY:** AlRay Carroll, Glen Carroll, Alvin Swick, Chuck Piper, Matt Stover, Randy Arsenault (HQ-F11-136)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 28.367. Cook Inlet Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Amend the opening date for state-waters season as follows:

The state waters pot season would open 24 hrs. after the closure of the directed federal pot season.

**ISSUE:** Opening date of Cook Inlet Area pot season.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Unknown.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** No one.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** AlRay Carroll, Glen Carroll, Alvin Swick, Chuck Piper, Matt Stover, Randy Arsenault (HQ-F11-137)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 28.367. Cook Inlet Pacific Cod Management Plan.** Develop regulations governing the state-waters Pacific cod fishery as follows:



Regulatory provisions to address may include:

- ◆ State-waters and parallel fishery season opening and closing dates for pot and jig vessels.
- ◆ Area registration.
- ◆ Landing requirements.
- ◆ Gear storage requirements.
- ◆ Guideline harvest level (GHL) rollover and GHL clean-up provisions.

**ISSUE:** This proposal is a placeholder proposal to allow commercial state-waters Pacific cod fishery stakeholders an opportunity to coordinate aspects of the Cook Inlet Area state-waters Pacific cod fishery with newly restructured federal/parallel Pacific cod fisheries. Draft regulatory language will be developed following release and analysis of federal rulemaking on Pacific cod sector splits occurs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Conflicting regulations regarding state-waters and parallel Pacific cod fisheries.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial state-waters Pacific cod fishery stakeholders.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-358)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES**  
**December 2-7, 2011**  
**PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AND UPPER COPPER RIVER**  
**UPPER SUSITNA RIVER FINFISH**

**PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 28.230. Lawful gear for Prince William Sound Area.** Restrict summer use of commercial bottom gear within three miles of shore as follows:

Commercial bottom gear is prohibited within 3 miles of any shoreline between May 15<sup>th</sup> and September 1<sup>st</sup>.

**ISSUE:** The current commercial bottom gear practices throughout the peak sport-fishing season have caused a depletion of fish resources for individual anglers. The current commercial practices, which made fishing safer for commercial fishermen, it now transferring additional risk to individual and subsistence fishermen since near shore depletion of the resource has forced anglers and subsistence fishermen to travel farther and farther to access fish resources. A viable option to prevent near-shore depletion is to limit commercial bottom gear no closer than 3 miles from any shoreline between May 15<sup>th</sup> and September 1<sup>st</sup>.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Anglers will continue to take unnecessary risk to catch fish and expend more resources. Fish stocks near local communities will continue to suffer a decline.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Quality of the public fish resources will rebound near local communities for personal consumption and reduce personal risk to the general public.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Consumptive anglers and subsistence users.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial users will be slightly inconvenienced by this change but will still be able to harvest public resources as they did prior to current management system.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Restrict bottom gear fishing all together between May 15<sup>th</sup> and September 1<sup>st</sup>. Assumed to be too restrictive at this time.

**PROPOSED BY:** Prince William Sound Charter Boat Association (HQ-F11-040)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 28.265. Prince William Sound Rockfish Management Plan.** Increase the rockfish bycatch allowance to sidestripe shrimp and sablefish from 10 to 30 percent as follows:

During sablefish and sidestripe shrimp fisheries, all rockfish in excess of **30** [10] percent, round weight, of all sablefish and sidestripe shrimp on board the vessel, must be weighed and reported

as bycatch overage on an ADF&G fish ticket. Any proceeds from the sale of excess rockfish shall be surrendered to the state.

**ISSUE:** Over the past 15 years, deep water rockfish populations have increased significantly. Fishermen should benefit, rather than having it forfeited or promote increased waste.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fishermen working depths of 200 – 500 fathoms will be plagued with bycatch overages, increasing potential overhead and waste.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Knowing very little of the profits from the catch will be surrendered to the state, can only improve quality.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Deep water long liners and shrimp trawlers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** ADF&G will have reduced added income.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A bycatch averaged over several trips or season. Difficult to implement.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jon Van Hying (SC-F11-007)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 28.230.(h)(2) Lawful Gear for Prince William Sound Area.**  
Repeal one definition of mechanical jigging gear as follows:

(h)(2) **repealed** [A SINGLE CONTINUOUS LINE WITH NO MORE THAN 150 HOOKS].

**ISSUE:** This definition of legal commercial gear for jig and hand troll groundfish fisheries creates confusion among fishermen, is difficult to enforce, and is inconsistent with actual fishing practices. Additionally, this definition of mechanical jigging gear is not recognized by the National Marine Fisheries Service as a legal gear type during federal groundfish fisheries, potentially resulting in conflicting gear regulations when coordinating state- and federally-managed Pacific cod fisheries.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued uncertainty regarding legal gear configurations during commercial jig and hand troll groundfish fisheries.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All fishery stakeholders will benefit from clear and consistent regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-356)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 28.089. Guiding principles for groundfish fishery regulations.**  
Revise regulations to include Eastern Gulf and PWS as follows:

5 AAC 28.089. The provisions of this section do not apply to the ground fisheries in the Eastern Gulf of Alaska and the Prince William Sound Area.

**ISSUE:** Eastern Gulf and PWS are exempt from 5 AAC 28.089.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Justification for reducing bycatch and maximizing benefits to regions and local areas are nonexistent for PWS and EGOA.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Economies of EGOA and PWS as well as fisheries resources.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert A. Smith (HQ-F11-042)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 28.083. Permit requirements for skates and rays.** Amend dates of skate fishery in Eastern Gulf and PWS as follows:

5 AAC 28.083(a)....may be taken only under the conditions of a **miscellaneous finfish permit**  
(2)[SPECIFY SEASON DATES] **open concurrent with halibut;**  
(7)[REQUIRE OTHER CONDITIONS DETERMINED BY THE COMMISSIONER TO BE NECESSARY FOR CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PRUPOSES.]

**ISSUE:** Huge biomass of skate infesting PWS and EGOA. Existing fishery is done in about 12 seconds. Skate compete with all other ground fish for the same food.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Skate will continue to proliferate and continue to depress halibut and crab populations in PWS and EGOA.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen, processors, local economies, any one interested in ecosystem management.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert A. Smith (HQ-F11-043)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 28.084. Fishing season, landing requirements, and utilization for sharks.** Allow for retention of spiny dogfish in Eastern Gulf and PWS as follows:

5 AAC 28.084(b) For the purposes of this section “sharks” are species of the order *Lamniformes*, *Spualiformes*, and *Carcharhiniformes*, **with the exception of spiny dogfish. Vessels longlining in the PWS EGOA Area with a miscellaneous finfish permit may retain spiny dogfish.**

**ISSUE:** Proliferation of spiny dogfish. Currently dogfish is only allowed to be retained as bycatch with other species whose abundance is unrelated to dogfish.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Dogfish resource will continue to be wasted.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Processors, fishermen, local economies and regions, anyone interested in ecosystem management.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Waiting for management. It didn’t happen.

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert A. Smith (HQ-F11-044)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 39.165. Trawl gear unlawful.** Amend the current regulation to accurately reflect management lines and remove the reference to trawl gear for herring as follows:

**5 AAC 39.165. Trawl gear unlawful.**

(1) waters of Prince William Sound enclosed by **a** line[S] from Point Whitshed to Point Bentinck, **a line** from Cape Hinchinbrook **Light** [(60° 13.96' N. LAT., 146° 39.12' W. LONG.)] to seal rocks **light** [(60° 09.96' N. LAT., 146° 50.12' W. LONG.)] to Zaikof Point (60° **19.00'** [18.96] N. lat., 146° **55.00'** [55.12] W. long.), and from a point at 60° **11.00'** [10.96] N.

lat., 147° 20.00 [20.12] ' W. long. on the northwest side of Montague Island, north to a point at 60° 30.00' [29.96] N. lat., 147° 20.00' [20.12] W. long., then east to a point at 60° 30.00' [29.96] N. lat., 147° 00.00' [00.12] W. long., then northeast to Knowles Head (60° ] 41.00' [40.96 N. lat., 146° 37.50' [37.62] W. long.), [except that trawls may be used to take herring during the open commercial herring food and bait season];

**ISSUE:** The trawl closure area description in subsection (1) of 5 AAC 39.165 should be identical to that in regulation 5 AAC 31.235(a)(1). Currently, the two are different, but the correct description is found in 5 AAC 31.235(a)(1). Trawl is not a legal gear for herring.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Enforcement is difficult and confusing when lines are similar, but not identical, are referenced in separate regulations, and affect identical activities (trawling). These regulatory references were identical at one time and need to be realigned to avoid confusion. The trawl reference may cause confusion among users.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen, management, and enforcement personnel will benefit from consistent and accurate reference to closure areas and legal gear types.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-292)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 27.365. Prince William Sound Herring Management Plan; 5 AAC 39.210. Management plan for high impact emerging fisheries.** Clarify thresholds needed to open herring fishery in Prince William Sound as follows:

The following changes are proposed for 5AAC 27.365.

(a) Make explicit the intended meaning of "threshold": replace spawning biomass threshold with spawning biomass productivity threshold

(b) Identify a role for the status "below threshold": At the beginning of a second year with the projected spawning biomass less than the productivity threshold, the Commissioner will announce whether applications will be received from (group?) permit holders for one-time, one year, allocations for the exclusive purpose of development, testing, and demonstration of new and restored higher-value, higher-benefit uses of the resource.

Numerous modifications and additions are needed in 5AAC39.210 to cover the special needs associated with an "emerging, high-impact" initiative that by design is conditional and temporary.

The Commissioner needs the option of delegating to a community board.

Many of the tasks here fit within what is called today Management Procedure. The Commissioner needs the option to use that process, to apply initiation support, to call upon individuals who have expertise in building a Management Procedure approach.

**ISSUE:** a. The Pacific herring fishery in Prince William Sound has been closed and idle since 1994. (There were two spring fisheries (1997, 1998) and three winter fisheries (1997-1999).) All extraction-related activity is at full stop because mature adult herring have biomass "below threshold" as defined in 5AAC27.365:

The minimum spawning biomass threshold is 22,000 tons, and no fishery may be opened if the estimated spawning biomass is below this threshold level.

b. The long closure is a problem, but it is only one part of the problem. The second part consists of the set of known, now idle, problems that will all simultaneously become "live problems" with the first announcement of a herring fishery in Prince William Sound.

The three primary features of this second part are described next. The presentation then returns to the specific area where the Board can, through the adoption of more precise language, turn this present problem into opportunities for locally crafted solutions.

i. Can the herring fishery afford herring management?

- ♦ In every decade since the 1980s, herring management in Alaska has become more sophisticated, more rigorous, and more expensive.
- ♦ That rigor is not an option. Through actions such as 5AAC39.212 and 5AAC27.463, the Board has indicated that it expects the management plan for a commercial fishery that targets an important forage fish to exhibit such rigor in its solutions for sustaining the target species and for sustaining the functions of the ecosystem dependent on the target species.
- ♦ There are difficult, unfinished assessment problems left over from before the crash in 1993, in particular, uncertainty over stock size estimates, traceability of assessment estimates to biologically well-defined observables, calibration.
- ♦ What part of management, what part of the budget will provide scientifically sound, operationally equitable solutions to 128 pound permits, a stock with a history of epizootics, an informed community regarding stress, pounds, and disease, and four-years of research in peer reviewed journals from Seattle-based scientists?
- ♦ If the herring stock at record biomass with record quotas and an unbroken run of 34 years of open fisheries is having trouble affording the herring management that produced that

record, then we all have really big problems. (Southeast Alaska staff, 2004; Southeast Alaska staff, 2005; Hebert, 2006; Hebert and Kelley, 2007; Hebert, 2010)

ii. Getting by with half :soon less.

- ◆ Sometime in the 1970s, possibly earlier, herring roe fishing in British Columbia was vertically integrated. They did it all harvest, roe extraction, and final salting and curing. The industry met whatever standard the buyer required and sold only finished product.
- ◆ Canada passed a federal statute banning the export of unprocessed Canadian fish.
- ◆ Atlantic Canada harvests, extracts roe (Atlantic herring), exports frozen roe ("herring roe").
- ◆ Alaska, the last colony, exports frozen whole herring for roe ("roe herring").
- ◆ Between 1996 and 2008, total herring landings in Alaska and in British Columbia were about equal. Exchange adjusted annual exvessel values for British Columbia fishermen are more than twice that for Alaska fishermen, often three times greater. Annual total export value for British Columbia herring products is twice that for Alaska exports.
- ◆ Herring fishery managers in Alaska and in British Columbia manage stocks with nearly equal landings. Alaska managers must get by with revenues to the State from those landing that are less than half the revenues to British Columbia.
- ◆ Because of the Canadian export ban, the only alternative to roe herring from Alaska has been a higher priced processed product.
- ◆ In February 2011, buyers began to pressure Prince Rupert City Council to support a petition to the Federal government to eliminate the export ban (and to export Prince Rupert jobs to China). This year, the Council voted to support keeping the export ban.

iii. SlowFood, Arc of Taste, Food Security, Marine Stewardship Council, value-added herring. Burke and Phyne (2008) is the best one-stop economic analysis, history, options.

- ◆ The Slow Food Foundation for Biodiversity established its Arc of Taste to identify, preserve and promote significant or at risk heritage items. In 2005, herring spawn on kelp (Native producers in BC) became Canada's fourth entry. A Norway entry is cured and smoked herring.
- ◆ Three UAF schools now have a proposal before the Alaska legislature for a five-year program for Alaska food security. (Does not include fish resources.)
- ◆ The salmon fishermen have done all the hard work on "value-added."
- ◆ The Marine Stewardship Council has certified many herring fisheries in Europe, including the Hastings herring and mackerel fleet, a community fleet of hand-beached



wooden gillnet boats: annual harvest 10MT; certification requested and sponsored by the Hastings Council.

c. A natural opportunity has been hidden by the interpretation of a specialized, technical term according to its vernacular usage.

The "minimum threshold," in 5ACC27.365 (also called "cutoff threshold") is a key concept and a key parameter in the management method called "graded threshold" or "variable rate" in Alaska. During the late 1980s and early 1990s, persons affiliated with or collaborating with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game were among the developers and first implementers of a method to identify the thresholds and harvest rates that optimize average yield and yield stability through repeated, multi-decade simulations of the stock. In a report on their application of the method for Togiak herring, Funk and Rowell (1995) give us the following description of the role and purpose of the "cutoff threshold" in variable rate management and in 5AAC27.365.

Two types of thresholds can be defined::: A conservation threshold, below which a population may experience complete reproductive failure, might be defined...de- signed to prevent extinction. Alternatively, for Pacific herring and many other exploited species, a productivity threshold is defined in terms of quickly rebuilding a population to commercially productive levels.....productivity are always higher than conservation thresholds... (emphasis added)

After nearly twenty years, there is little that looks like "quickly rebuilding :::to a commercially productive level," This suggests that the productivity threshold for Prince William Sound is not 22,000 tons. (Zheng and co-authors (Zheng, 1994; Zheng et al., 1993) reported a productivity cutoff threshold near 22,000 tons from their analysis of a "normal" Prince William Sound. Although they described the effects of assessment error on the optimal threshold and extraction rate, they did not mention any attempt to describe Prince William Sound with greater realism for assessment error and for ecosystem uncertainty due to the oil spill. From our own work, the properties described by Funk and Rowell require a cutoff threshold greater than 50,000 tons (Kiefer et al., 2011).)

What difference does it make whether the herring fishery is closed by a "productivity" threshold or by a "conservation" threshold?

This question was considered by Collie (1991) as he searched for evidence of density dependence in the then new recruitment time series for Prince William Sound and Sitka Sound herring (Collie, 1991),

The value of maintaining a large spawning population to enhance recruitment appears quite limited (Fig. 8). Nor is there clear indication of depensation at low abundance. Thus there is no compelling biological reason for closing the fishery below a threshold biomass. However there may be a biomass threshold below which it is uneconomical to conduct a fishery at all. :::it may be more important for managers to conserve the different geographic components:::

Two others reach the same conclusion. In 2001, Hammarstrom and Otis presented to the Board

revised values for threshold and extraction rate for Kamishak Bay District. In the review of the threshold analysis, they report (Hammarstrom and Otis, 2001), "herring recruitment success in Kamishak Bay appears [to] be related more to environmental factors than spawning stock level."Our work on a dynamics for both Prince William Sound and Sitka Sound herring has reached a similar conclusion, but with two abundance configurations, an upper and a lower, both stable. The stability arises from juvenile production determined by ecosystem constraints and density-dependent interactions between juvenile cohort such that "recruitment" is not a function of spawning biomass. Rather, adult abundance is a function of recruitment and adult mortality. (Kiefer et al., 2011)

Any catch of adults in the "low abundance" configuration (i.e., "below threshold") will, according to the above conjecture, leave recruitment unchanged and decrease adult biomass. Because the outcome of any action relative to expectations is seen four years after the fact, initial actions must be precautionary.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There is no pathway known within existing Department operations that is mandated, equipped and staffed to take a community from a twenty-year closure through restart of a fishery with 5 separate fisheries and over 250 permits.

It can only be pulled off locally. That requires resources and some degree of authorization or acknowledgement. This proposal seeks to set that in motion by starting with a common problem that is apart from the tensions over allocation and access from prior practice.

With no progress on a new perspective on utilization of herring, management will gradually lose competency until fisheries are crashing and the whole idea of commercial fishing herring goes away.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal pursues new uses, heritage uses. The issue of quality is for a later phase.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** One reason for proposing the creation of opportunity for access to the resource where none now exists is that it adds and does not take from any stakeholder.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Abandon commercial fishing on herring. Although it has yet to be done, there remains the belief that a herring fishing can be a plus for all rather than a theft from the commons.

**PROPOSED BY:** Vince Patrick (HQ-F11-227)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 01.616. Customary and traditional subsistence uses of fish stocks and amount necessary for subsistence uses.** Review the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery C&T as follows:

If the BOF reviews the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery and determines that fishery no longer meets the criteria of being a subsistence fishery, the fishery should be re-classified as a personal use fishery with all the same methods and means, season timing, and fish bag limits as currently exists in regulation for the subsistence fishery.

**ISSUE:** The Alaska Board of Fisheries adopted a definition of the phrase, "subsistence way of life," in March, 2010. The definition states that a subsistence way of life means a way of life that is based on consistent long-term reliance upon fish and game resources for the basic necessities of life. At that same meeting, when the Chitna dipnet fishery was reviewed in light of the new definition, the BOF voted unanimously to continue the Chitna fishery as a personal use fishery. The board did not feel that fishery rose to the level of being a subsistence fishery.

I think it is appropriate for the BOF to review the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery in light of the new definition of a subsistence way of life.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Without a review of the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery, in many peoples' minds, an inequality of how subsistence/personal use fisheries are classified in and around the Copper River will continue to exist.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Not directly in most cases. In years of weak returns, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game can more easily restrict or close a PU fishery than a subsistence fishery. In average to strong return years, no difference in the fishery would be noted.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone because better management control over the harvest of returning salmon can be done under a PU fishery designation. A healthy resource benefits all user groups.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** In weak return years, if this fishery were re-classified as a PU fishery, harvest could be limited or eliminated. That could impact some users. Commercial fishermen who would otherwise normally harvest fish for home use in this fishery could supplement any loss of PU fish by utilizing the "home pack" option.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Leaving the situation status quo would only continue hard feelings between Interior residents who felt cheated when the Chitna dipnet fishery was continued as a personal use fishery and the Cordova residents who currently enjoy a subsistence fishery but who are in similar circumstances to the Interior residents utilizing the Chitna fishery. A fair and impartial review of the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery, which was created prior to the development of the definition of a subsistence way of life, should eliminate

any concerns of unequal treatment of fisheries classifications for Alaskan residents dependent on these fisheries for filling their home freezers.

**PROPOSED BY:** Howard Delo

(HQ-F11-017)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 01.610. Fishing seasons.** Specify open periods in the Copper River District subsistence fishery as follows:

Keep the existing regulation but add that subsistence fishing will also be open for a 24 hour period beginning each Saturday at 0700 throughout the season and when regularly scheduled commercial periods are suspended.

**ISSUE:** Current regulations for subsistence fishing in the Copper River District only provide opportunity when the commercial season does not open or during commercial periods when the season is underway on a regular schedule. In previous years, the department has opened subsistence fishing by Emergency Order when the regular commercial schedule has been suspended. The department has eliminated this practice and has stated that reasonable opportunity is being provided for during the commercial periods.

1. Subsistence users who work during the commercial openers have no opportunity to participate in the fishery as it is currently structured.
2. Subsistence opportunity during suspension of the commercial fishery is not available.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Subsistence opportunity in the Copper River District will continue to be the privilege of those with paid vacation, those able to afford time off or those not working.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Subsistence users in the Copper River District will have reasonable and realistic opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Open subsistence fishing 24/7 as in the Glennallen Subdistrict – that much time is not necessary to provide opportunity and potentially fill allowable bag limit given the gillnet harvest method.

**PROPOSED BY:** Copper River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee

(HQ-F11-154)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 01.648. Prince William Sound Subsistence Salmon Fisheries Management Plan; 5 AAC 01.645. Subsistence bag, possession, and size limits.** Amend regulation to combine subsistence areas in PWS as follows:

A new regulation combining the 4 separate subsistence areas into one subsistence area, which would define one subsistence area in Area E with one set of rules regarding legal gear. This could be:

5 AAC 01.648. Prince William Sound Subsistence Salmon Fisheries Management Plan

(c) Salmon may be taken for subsistence purposes in those waters of the Prince William Sound Area as described in 5 AAC 24.000, only as follows:

- (1) salmon may be taken only by gillnets as described in 5 AAC 01.620(3), except that pink salmon may be taken in fresh water by dip nets only;
- (2) no fishing is allowed within the closed waters areas described in 5 AAC 24.350 and 5 AAC 39.290 for commercial salmon fisheries; only pink salmon may be taken in fresh water;

Have one set of bag and possession limits for the above described area. This could be:

5 AAC 01.645. Subsistence bag, possession and size limits.

(b) In the Prince William Sound Area as described in 5 AAC 24.200 the annual subsistence salmon limit is as follows:

- (1) 15 salmon for a household of one person;
- (2) 30 salmon for a household of two persons;
- (3) 10 salmon for each additional person in a household over those specified in (2) of this subsection;
- (4) no more than five king salmon may be taken per permit.
- (5) upon request, a permit for additional salmon will be issued with the following limits:
  - (A) no more than a total of 50 salmon for a permit issued to a household with one person, of which no more than five may be king salmon;
  - (B) no more than a total of 100 salmon for a permit issued to a household within two or more persons, of which no more than five may be king salmon.

**ISSUE:** The current set of regulations in the 4 separate PWS Subsistence Areas (Tatitlek, Chenega, Copper River and PWS) is far more complex than is needed to provide for the subsistence needs of Alaskans in this area. These regulations were crafted in the 1980's when Tatitlek and Chenega residents could have exclusive access to the areas described in the current 01.648. In addition, there is no direct mention of subsistence harvest in the PWS general area in regulation so current subsistence management of areas outside of the Copper River District and the two areas described in 01.648 must be inferred.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The current situation will continue where:

- A Chenega resident who chooses to harvest salmon in the area around his village will be precluded from subsistence fishing in other parts of PWS and the Copper River District,
- Bag limits vary greatly in areas of close proximity,
- Legal gear types vary greatly in areas of close proximity.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No, the quality of the salmon harvested will remain the same.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Subsistence users in PWS will benefit from access to all areas of PWS in a given season rather than being forced to choose only one area and then being locked out of other areas. Tatitlek and Chenega harvests have been minimal in recent years despite unlimited subsistence bag limits this is because the Tatitlek and Chenega subsistence areas do not include areas that have significant numbers of returning sockeye salmon. This solution will allow residents of these villages to harvest the increased bag limit from enhanced returns to the Main Bay hatchery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Leaving the current set of regulations vague and incomplete, but this reduces user access to subsistence resources in PWS.

**PROPOSED BY:** Glen Dune Lankard (HQ-F11-334)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 01.616. Customary and traditional subsistence uses of fish stocks and amount necessary for subsistence uses.** Establish a positive customary and traditional finding for the Chitna dipnet fishery as follows:

Chitna salmon would be designated with a positive C&T finding.

**ISSUE:** Allocate sufficient time at the meeting for the presentation of “new evidence” and reclassify the Chitna Dipnet Fishery as a State of Alaska subsistence fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Salmon at Chitna have customarily and traditionally been used for subsistence every year for over 100 years. In 2002, the federal government recognized customary and traditional use of salmon in Chitna. In 2008, this Board recognized that all other freshwater fish in the area have been customarily and traditionally used for subsistence. The Chitna Dipnet Fishery was used as a specific example of the type of activity that would be protected as subsistence under the original State subsistence law. In 2003, that protection was removed by a 4-3 vote of the Board who relied on misleading statistics from the Subsistence Division that focused on comparing randomly sampled Chitna users with handpicked AHTNA elders from the Glennallen subsistence fishery. The majority of the Board felt that because Chitna users come from urban centers they could not support a positive C&T finding.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Over 10,000 Alaskan families who participate in the Chitna Dipnet Fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. This is not an allocative proposal. The dipnet fishery would not necessarily be allocated additional fish under a subsistence classification. If

all salmon escapements are forecast, or counted to be below the total allocation for all upriver uses, the dipnet fishery would have a higher priority over commercial and sport uses.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None. A customary and traditional used fishstock, for subsistence purposes, should be protected by a positive C&T finding.

**PROPOSED BY:** Fairbanks Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-210)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 01.616. Customary and traditional subsistence uses of fish stocks and amount necessary for subsistence uses.** Reclassify the Chitina Dipnet Fishery a subsistence fishery as follows:

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

**ISSUE:** When the Board of Fisheries changed the classification of the Chitina Dipnet Fishery from subsistence to personal use in 2003, the decision was based on incorrect and incorrectly presented data. The decision was influenced by a flawed analysis of "users" rather than "uses" as required by the Joint Board's subsistence policy and procedure. The Department's position, stated in testimony, was that it "...did not need to follow Legislative intent..." The Department position provided to the Board was in opposition to the Legislative intent of the State's subsistence law.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A recognized and important Alaska subsistence use will not be provided the priority use it deserves. Thousands of families across Alaska, dependent on the Chitina Dipnet Fishery for their wild salmon needs, will not be provided the protections a subsistence priority would provide.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, during times of poor salmon returns, the subsistence priority would provide for the highest priority use – Alaska residents' subsistence needs.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. No additional fish would be harvested from the fishery, but it would have allocation priority to a recognized Alaskan subsistence use.

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

**PROPOSED BY:** Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (HQ-F11-139)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan.** Amend the Copper River King Salmon Management Plan as follows:

**5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan.** (a) The department shall manage the Copper River commercial, personal use, [AND] sport, and subsistence fisheries to achieve a sustainable escapement goal of 24,000 or more for king salmon. For the purposes of managing these fisheries, the department shall consider the best available information regarding harvest, age composition, and escapement, including escapement information obtained from mark-recapture studies, aerial surveys, or by other means.

(b) In the commercial fishery, during the statistical weeks 20 and 21, the commissioner may open no more than one fishing period per statistical week within the inside closure area of the Copper River District described in 5 AAC 24.350(1)(B)(c) In the sport fishery,

(1) in the upper Copper River drainage, the annual limit for king salmon 20 inches or greater in length is four fish;

(2) if the commissioner determines additional conservation measures are necessary to achieve the escapement goals, the commissioner may, by emergency order, use the following management measures in the following priority order:

(A) reduce the annual limit for king salmon;

(B) modify other methods and means not specified in this paragraph;

(C) designate the fishery as a catch and release fishery only;

(D) close specific waters to sport fishing for king salmon

**(d) In the Chitina Subdistrict personal use dipnet fishery,**

**(1) the annual limit for king salmon is one fish;**

**(2) if the commissioner determines additional conservation measures are necessary to achieve the escapement goals, the commissioner may, by emergency order, close the Chitina Subdistrict personal use dipnet salmon fishery to the retention of king salmon.**

**(e) In the Glennallen Subdistrict subsistence fishery, if the commissioner determines additional conservation measures are necessary to achieve the escapement goals, the commissioner may, by emergency order, restrict the retention of king salmon or modify methods and means to reduce king salmon harvest in the Glennallen Subdistrict subsistence fishery.**

**ISSUE:** The Board of Fisheries (board) adopted the Copper River King Salmon Management Plan (CRKSMP) at its December 1996 meeting. This management plan specifically addressed management of the commercial, personal use, and sport fisheries of the Copper River. The CRKSMP was updated and modified during subsequent board meetings in 1999, 2002, and 2005. Modifications included establishing and updating the sustainable escapement goal (SEG) in 2002 and 2005, and removal of the personal use fishery reference when the Chitina Subdistrict was classified subsistence in 1999. Reference to the personal use fishery was inadvertently left out of the CRKSMP when the Chitina Subdistrict was reclassified as personal use in 2003 and has remained absent from the management plan. Due to recent poor Copper River king salmon runs, the Chitina Subdistrict personal use fishery was closed to retention of king salmon during portions of the 2009 and 2010 seasons. The proposed language reflects recent management actions. Secondly, the recent poor king salmon runs to the Copper River have initiated discussion of the need to restrict retention of king salmon in the Glennallen Subdistrict subsistence salmon fishery to ensure the escapement goal is met. Although the authority for such restrictions exists in Alaska Statute (AS 16.05.020, 16.05.050, and 16.05.060), specific guidance within the CRKSMP for



inseason management of the Chitina Subdistrict personal use and Glennallen Subdistrict subsistence salmon fisheries provides additional justification for department staff and the public regarding Copper River king salmon management actions.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Specific management guidelines ensuring achievement of the king salmon escapement goal for the Copper River will continue to address only two of the four fisheries that target king salmon on the Copper River.

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

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-308)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 01.625 Waters closed to subsistence fishing and 5 AAC 77.570 waters closed to personal use fishing.** Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

Stop all netting.

**ISSUE:** Netting of fish.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** All fishing will be deleted.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Ensures that over harvesting doesn't happen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Over 95% of the people.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Less than 5% of the people.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Karl Moe (SC-F11-016)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing.** Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

No netting of fish in these lakes.

**ISSUE:** Netting of fish in Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Tyone Lake.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The loss of lake trout due to being caught in nets.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The netting of white fish produces incidental lake trout netting. This will deplete mature lake trout from these lakes.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All persons.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer but adopt new or old ways to harvest white fish allowing lake trout to be able to survive as well.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Limiting the size of net. This would still produce incidental fish caught in nets.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tom and Ellen Frohlich (SC-F11-017)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing.** Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

Stop the abuse of netting fish.

**ISSUE:** People are netting whitefish and taking trout in mass amounts.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Sport fishing will cease to exist.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The fish can thrive in their natural environment.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The fish, sportsmen, fishermen of all ages.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who were previously abusing the environment.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jake Moe and Brynn Moe (SC-F11-018)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing.** Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

No netting.

**ISSUE:** Netting of whitefish.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Won't be any food for the lake trout.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** More bait fish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sportsmen will have a fish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Danae Williams (SC-F11-015)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing.** Prohibit netting of whitefish and lake trout in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

There will be no netting of white fish or lake trout.

**ISSUE:** The netting of whitefish and incidental lake trout.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The fish will be depleted and will not recover.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The fish would have a chance to replenish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Every one.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Gene Moe (SC-F11-013)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing.** Prohibit netting of whitefish and lake trout in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

There will be no netting of whitefish and incidental lake trout in Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Lake Tyone.

**ISSUE:** The netting of white fish and incidental lake trout in Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Lake Tyone.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The depletion of fish in Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Lake Tyone.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Lake Tyone would be able to have white fish and lake trout reproducing and maturing to retain a healthy population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen and households who wish to catch and eat fish now and in future generations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jane Newby and Susitna Group (SC-F11-010)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing.** Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

No netting of whitefish.

**ISSUE:** Netting of white fish.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** It will threaten the lake trout population and disrupt the ecosystem.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** It protects the balance of the ecosystem.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Future generations and current sport fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who would like to net white fish.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There is only one solution.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jenna Kroll

(SC-F11-014)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing.** Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

Stop all netting of fish in Tyone, Lake Louise, and Lake Susitna.

**ISSUE:** Stop all netting of fish in Tyone, Lake Louise, and Lake Susitna.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** All fish will be depleted. There will be a shortage of fish for sport fishing.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The lake would be able to reproduce and maintain a sustainable number of fish for a long time.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nobody.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Nets would be removed by locals.

**PROPOSED BY:** Dorothy Tideman

(SC-F11-011)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing.** Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

No netting of any fish in Lake Louise, Susitna Lake and Tyone Lake.

**ISSUE:** Stop netting of all fish in Lake Louise, Susitna Lake and Tyone Lake.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Depletion of all fish. Leaving none for sport fishing.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The lake would better be able to reproduce and maintain a sustainable number of fish forever.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everybody.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Vigilantism.

**PROPOSED BY:** Larry Roberts (SC-F11-012)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 01.610. Fishing Seasons; 5 AAC 01.620. Lawful Gear and gear specifications.** Prohibit bycatch, require ADF&G notification, and set season in the whitefish fishery as follows:

Under **5 AAC 01.610. Fishing seasons.** Add the following language:

Any species (except as provided in 5 AAC 01.610(e)) taken incidentally by gillnet may not be retained and must be immediately released

Under **5 AAC 01.620. Lawful Gear and gear specifications.** Add the following language:

Gillnets used for subsistence fishing of freshwater finfish, other than salmon, may be operated only as follows;

- (1) With 24 hour prior notification to ADF&G identifying the specific water body
- (2) May only be fished under the ice
- (3) Must be re-located a minimum distance of 500 feet if greater than 4 lake trout are caught in a set

**ISSUE:** Excess and possibly deliberate bycatch of lake trout in subsistence whitefish nets.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Possible harm to lake trout stocks.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No, but helps eliminate deliberate bycatch of nontarget species.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All that are interested in preserving lake trout stocks.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that benefit from subsistence fishing for whitefish with nets in open water. Those that purposely target lake trout with whitefish subsistence permits.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Considered a set starting date for season, but freeze up is variable in different lakes from year to year and figured open water fishing allowed the most opportunity for abuse of this fishery.

**PROPOSED BY:** Copper Basin Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-200)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 01.610. Fishing seasons (e) Rainbow trout and steelhead; and 5 AAC 01.630. Subsistence fishing permits;** Require ADF&G notification, set season, and limit bycatch in the whitefish fishery as follows:

Require subsistence whitefish permit holders to notify ADF&G, 24 hours prior to deploying gear. Season dates for subsistence whitefish; Nov. 10-March 31<sup>st</sup>. No more than 5% total bycatch will be allowed for the season for each permit holder.

**ISSUE:** Excessive lake trout bycatch by subsistence whitefish users.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Increasing utilization of whitefish by subsistence users will result in unsustainable levels of lake trout bycatch---potentially leading to a closure of the sport fishery on some of the more accessible lakes.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Recreational fishermen, area businesses that serve recreational users. Local residents.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one should “suffer “through the implementation of this regulation. Subsistence users of whitefish should welcome a regulation that encourages sustainability of a fisheries resource.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** limiting issuance of subsistence permits to residences within a 25 mile radius of the lake to be fished. Rejected because of questions concerning legality.

**PROPOSED BY:** Paxson Fish & Game Advisory Committee (SC-F11-001)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing.** Establish closed areas and seasons, and prohibit bycatch in the whitefish fishery as follows:

(A)Closure of the Lake Louise/Susitna Lake and Susitna/Tyone channels totally to subsistence whitefish netting to ensure the natural movement of all finfish.

Coordinates for proposed area closure Lake Louise - Susitna Channel area: Lake Louise 62-21-14-53N by 146-38-8-11W to 62-21-25-56N by 146-37-33-60W and Susitna Lake 62-21-22-84N by 146-38-18-76W to 62-21-43-06N by 146-38-14-43W. Area between these four points proposed for closure.

Coordinates for proposed area closure Susitna Lake - Tyone Lake area: Susitna Lake 62-28-34-98N by 146-40-34-03W to 62-28-21-57N by 146-40-31-36W and Tyone Lake 62-28-51-76N by 146-39-56-85W to 62-28-47-12N by 146-39-39-87W. Area between these four points proposed for closure.

B) Change the opening date of the subsistence whitefish fishery from October 1 to November 15 to ensure the protection of lake trout spawning and to avoid collision of boats/nets due to the still active boating season until the lake area is fully frozen.

C) Release all incidental bycatch dead or alive back into the lake system.

**ISSUE:** Overfishing of lake trout and burbot in the subsistence whitefish gillnet fishery in the Lake Louise, Susitna, and Tyone Lake area. Gillnet fishermen are setting nets across navigable portions of the Lake Louise/Susitna and Susitna/Tyone channel areas creating a safety hazard at the same time allowing no escapement of all species of finfish. These gillnet fishermen are also specifically targeting lake trout spawning area during October.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A) Lake trout, burbot, and other finfish caught as "bycatch" will be depleted and not available for future generations, due to overfishing/overharvesting of the bycatch via whitefish subsistence nets.

B) Possible collision between watercrafts/boats and gillnets in the narrow channel areas. (Cabin owners frequently travel these channels in September and October in the dark.).

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The quality will improve as this measure will lead to conservation and rebuilding of the resource for future years. Despite the lake of date in stock and biomasses the proposed season restrictions will greatly reduce fishing pressure to maintain a healthy balance of all species of finfish which are currently at a historic low level. We need to exercise a precautionary approach to fisheries conservation and management.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those that would benefit are sport and subsistence users that will reclaim a customary and traditional fishery that has been jeopardized by the unethical methods being used at this time.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The individuals that net in open water periods by boat.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No fishing at all but rejected to allow people to still have their customary and traditional use.

**PROPOSED BY:** John & Yvette Delaquito (HQ-F11-177)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing.** Establish closed area and set season dates in the whitefish fishery as follows:

Close the Lake Louise/Lake Susitna Channel to freshwater fish subsistence gillnets. The closed area would extend ¼ mile beyond the channel on both the Lake Louise and the Lake Susitna side of the channel. Also, change the opening date of the "freshwater fish subsistence permit" to December 1<sup>st</sup>.



This would limit some user groups targeting fish in concentrated shallow water areas and prohibit gillnet use during "OPEN" water.

**ISSUE:** The decline of quantity and quality of lake trout and whitefish in the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna, Lake Tyone waterway. As residence of Lake Louise and having fished the waterway since the mid-sixties we and other locals have seen a notable decline of this fishery. The USER base has changed with time and the increase of demand has exceeded a sustainable yield. More and more boats fish the Lake Louise waterway every year, with their "high tech" electronics they are quite efficient at catching lake trout. Another element on the demand side of the equation is the Cormorants – it's just been in recent years that we have seen a large increase in the numbers of Cormorants. And another user group is the "freshwater fish subsistence permit" users, their numbers have increased in recent years. Some user groups abuse the resource by targeting the lake trout during the spawning cycle. The lake trout are extremely vulnerable in the shallow water spawning areas. Regulation changes are merited to protect the lake trout during their spawning period and preserve a sustainable yield for the future.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The demand will continue to grow with all user groups and the fragile slow growth resource will continue to decline. The "catch" will continue to be less fish and smaller fish.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes – absolutely. Protecting the lake trout during their spawning cycle and in shallow concentrated areas will result in greater yield - which will increase the survival rate - which will add to the food supply - which will increase numbers and enhance quality. And in time should restore the number of larger lakera which have suffered a serious decline in recent years.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Present and future generations of fishermen. All USER groups - also, the local, area wide and State economies.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wayne Simmons (HQ-F11-212)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing.** Restrict netting of whitefish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

Limit the amount of white fish netted; no coincidental lake trout in nets; add more regulatory patrolling.

**ISSUE:** No netting of white fish while taking trout.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** No more fish.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, less waste and squander.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All sport fishermen, and residents.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The environmentally unconscious.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Patrolling personally.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jesse Moe and Bridget Moe (SC-F11-009)

\*\*\*\*\*

*\*Note: This proposal is listed under both Subsistence and Sport Fishing for this meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.** Establish lake trout spawning closures in Tyone Lakes complex as follows:

Close lake trout fishing on the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna, Lake Tyone Waterway from September 1<sup>st</sup> to October 15<sup>th</sup>.

**ISSUE:** The decline of quantity and quality of lake trout in the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna, Lake Tyone waterway. Being residents of Lake Louise and having fished the waterway since the mid-sixties - we and other Locals have seen a notable decline over the years. Especially in the last 15 - 20 years. The user base has changed with time, which has increased the demand on a slow growth resource. More and more boats fish the waterway every year - with their "high tech" electronics they are quite efficient at catching lake trout. Cormorants - (another user group) its just been in recent years that we have seen a large increase of Cormorants on this waterway. Another user group that has increased in recent years is the "freshwater fish subsistence permittees". Various user groups target spawning areas during the spawning cycle. The lake trout are extremely vulnerable in the shallow water areas during their spawning period. One of the triggers that's part of the spawning period is water temperature. Water temperature varies from year to year during that time. We have seen lake trout spawn from early September to mid-to late October.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The demand of user groups will continue to grow - which will increase strain on a fragile resource resulting in decline of supply. The fishery will suffer in numbers and quality as it has in recent years.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes - absolutely ! By allowing the spawners to spawn (unmolested by some user groups) the yield will more - which will increase the survival rate -

which will add to the food supply - which will result in an overall increase of lake trout. Also, in time a recovery of larger lakers will improve quality of the resource. The larger lake trout have suffered a serious decline in recent years.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Present and future generation fishermen. The local, area wide and state economies.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wayne Simmons (HQ-F11-199)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan.** Rescind allocation reduction in the Chitina personal use fishery as follows:

Rescind regulation.

**ISSUE:** Chitina personal use fishery being reduced by 50% if commercial fishery is closed more than 13 consecutive days.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Alaskan families forced to other uncustomary means to help feed their families.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan families.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Chitina Dipnetters Association (HQ-F11-108)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan.** Increase harvest limit of king salmon in the personal use fishery as follows:

Restore retention of king salmon to at least 5 per family and 1 for individuals.

**ISSUE:** Chitina personal use fishermen being reduced and for the past three (3) years eliminated from keeping king salmon.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Chitina personal use fishermen being forced to spend more income to feed their family.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan families.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** non-state residents.

**PROPOSED BY:** Chitina Dipnetters Association (HQ-F11-110)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan.** Allow for retention of king salmon in the personal use fishery as follows:

As long as commercial and sport fisheries are allowed to fish or retain any king salmon, personal use fishermen will be allowed to retain kings 2-3 days per week at the fisheries manager's discretion.

**ISSUE:** Chitina sub-district personal use dipnetters being eliminated from keeping king salmon and bearing a bigger part of the conservation of the resource on the Copper River.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Chitina subdistrict personal use dipnetters being eliminated from keeping any king salmon to feed their families while others (commercial and sport fish) only being restricted in the number they can keep or the amount of time they can fish.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Chitina sub-district personal use fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The conservation burden will be more equally shared by all user grounds.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Chitina Dipnetters Association (HQ-F11-107)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC XX.XXX. Regulations Title.** Increase limit for sockeye salmon in the Chitina Personal Use Fishery as follows:

Increase limit as follows for red salmon in the event kings are eliminated due to a conservation concern-

1 person household = 20 reds

2 person household = 35 reds

3 person household = 45 reds

4 person household = 60 reds

5 or more person household = 75 reds.

**ISSUE:** Reduction in king salmon in the Chitina personal use fishery to 1 and elimination of kings the last three (3) years, this equals a reduction of meat to feed families.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Chitina personal use fishers being forced to spend more income to feed their family.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan families.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Chitina Dipnetters Association (HQ-F11-109)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan.** Delay opening of Chitina personal use dipnet fishery as follows:

Open the dipnetters season June 15th of each year.

**ISSUE:** Delay the Personal Use/Dipnetters fishing until June 15<sup>th</sup>.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The amount of "native salmon" going up to spawn at the Upper Copper River, Copper Lake, Tanada Creek, Mentasta Fish Creek, Indian River and Sinona Creek, needs to get through. When you have 9,000 to 10,000 dipnetters/personal use fishermen fishing, they are catching a lot of the Native fish, the State of Alaska" DO NOT check all or very few of the permits and amount of fish caught "it isn't a very accurate count without the Check Point. The State of Alaska needs to reinstall the 24 hour Check Point at the Chitina Five Mile Airport, State of Alaska use to have the Check Point in the 80's. I have a subsistence fish camp/fish wheel located at the Airport, when the first run of Native salmon comes to Chitina, we average approximately 5 to 20 salmons the last few days of May, to the first 15 days of June, after the dipnetter start fishing, the amount of fish we catch is 50% less.

The first run Native stock going to the Upper Copper River are the stronger fish because of the distance they have to travel, they run the middle of May, through the month of June. The later

run of salmon spawns in the Gulkana, Tazlina, Kulitina Rivers, they start going up these river approx. June 15th, and there is generally more of them.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, this proposal would increase the amount of native salmon stock, to reach the Upper Copper River to spawn.

Delaying the Dipnetter personal use season will increase the amount of native salmon to reach the Upper Copper River spawning streams.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All the fishermen will benefit, commercial, subsistence and personal use. This will keep the stock of stronger native salmon in the Copper River.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer, delaying the personal use season 1 week will not affect the amount of salmon they are requiring to catch on their Personal use permit, the salmon season is open for them until the end of October.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Limit the number of people that are listed to use the personal use fish wheels, at Chitina, 50 to 100 name is to large of a list to keep track of who is using the fish wheel and how many fish they have caught.

I knew some of the fish wheel owners that are hauling a lot more fish than their permits allow, every weekend. Also they are processing the fish in their motor homes, freezing and canning on site.

With the State of Alaska Check Point, at the Chitina Airport the State of Alaska would have a accurate count of salmon harvested, and then they will know the amount of salmon that escaped to the spawning streams. This will make it better for everyone, more salmon getting to the spawning stream

**PROPOSED BY:** Elmer V. Marshall (HQ-F11-207)  
\*\*\*\*\*

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

*The board is seeking additional information on this proposal in order that it can be fully evaluated. During the October 11-12, 2011 worksession, the board will:*

- a) Determine if the proposal is complete;*
- b) Determine if there are outstanding questions or information needed;*
- c) Confirm that board has authority to act on the proposal; identify any aspects of the proposal where board may need additional authority to make decisions;*

- d) Identify whether CFEC, Dept. of Commerce, Dept. of Labor or other agencies need to be consulted on issues raised by the proposal and if so, bring staff together to schedule work and process; and
- e) Identify proposal's review process and schedule.

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

**PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations.** Amend the regulation to allow use of two set gillnet permits in Eshamy District as follows:

5 AAC 24.331 would be changed as follows:

1) in the Eshamy District

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

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

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

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Potential safety issues. Since setnetting is family oriented, youth often have permits. Under current law, if a dangerous situation arises, parents legally would have to standby and hope their children can handle it. Of course they wouldn't, which shows another problem with current law. Having fished with a two permit family, I know there are times the current law is ignored. Such as when one boat going through all the gear while the other boat sells and goes to prepare dinner. If two permits decide to operate together, they should not have to break the law to be the most efficient and have the convenience two permits can provide.

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

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

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No other solutions were considered.

**PROPOSED BY:** Michael E. Brown (HQ-F11-035, previously HQ-08F-168)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specifications and operations.** Amend gear restrictions in PWS Salmon Purse Seine Fishery as follows:

Vessel with two valid PWS salmon purse seine permits onboard are allowed to use less than seven inch mesh in the body of their leads. Vessels with one valid PWS purse seine permit on board will still be required to use at least seven inch mesh in the body of their lead.

**ISSUE:** To many vessels purse seining in PWS.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The active purse seine fleet will continue to grow until it reaches close to the 267 permits licensed for the PWS purse seine fleet.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All salmon purse seiners in PWS will realize some benefit. The active purse seine fleet has increased from a low of 101 active permits in 2005 to 174 in 2010. Each year another 10 to 20 vessels are added to the seine fleet. Currently there are 267 purse seine permits licensed for PWS.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I do not think anybody will suffer by allowing permit stacking in the PWS purse seine fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I would like to see purse seines in PWS limited to the 150 fathom of salmon web. Eliminate the 75 fathom lead from being used. I do not think the seiners in PWS would support the removal of using their leads. Fishermen by nature always want more gear and bigger boats.

**PROPOSED BY:** Leroy L Cabana (HQ-F11-073)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations.** Ban use of deep gillnets in Montague District prior to Coghill, Eshamy, and Unakwik districts opening to deep gear as follows:

**5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations.**



(6) before the first Monday in July, unless modified by emergency order, in the Coghill, Unakwik, and Eshamy districts **and the Port Chalmers Subdistrict of the Montague District,** gillnets with a mesh size of less than eight inches may not be more than 60 meshes in depth and gillnets with a mesh size of eight inches or greater may not be more than 40 meshes in depth;

**ISSUE:** The use of illegal deep gillnets (greater than 60 meshes) in the Coghill, Eshamy and Unakwik districts prior to those districts opening to deep gear later in the season as described in 5AAC 24.331.

These illegal gillnets are being brought over from the Port Chalmers Subdistrict where they have been legal in the early season since 2009.

Beginning in 2009, as a result of the PWS Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Management Plan established by the Alaska Board of Fisheries in 2005, drift gillnet permit holders have been permitted to harvest hatchery chum salmon in the Port Chalmers Subdistrict of the Montague District from June 1 - July 30. Deep gillnets were permitted during the first year of this fishery and in all years thereafter. There has been numerous instances observed by permit holders of other drift fishers traveling from the Port Chalmers sub district early in the season with deep gear to other districts where this gillnets greater than 60 mesh are illegal.

This proposal would permit ONLY the use of shallow gillnet gear in the Port Chalmers Subdistrict early in the season until other districts in PWS open to deep gillnet at which point deep gear would be legal in the Port Chalmers Subdistrict as well.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Illegal use of gear will continue, with the result of enforcement expending more man hours. Continued unfair advantage given to fishers that use illegal deep gear fishing next to fishers using legal gear.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal would actually help increase quality of the PWS chum and pink gillnet salmon fisheries. Processors have in the past, complained of low quality harvest, by deep gillnets. Fishers using 60 mesh nets are able to clear their nets quicker and the salmon quality is therefore increased.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen who desire to fish competitively with other participants in the early season Port Chalmers fishery and also fish legally in other districts open in the early season.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Only commercial gillnet fishers that continue to use illegal gear.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) Marking corks differently for deep gear. This would be overly complex for both stakeholders and enforcement. This would also result in an increased cost to participants in this fishery.

2) A complete ban on gillnets deeper than 60 mesh is an option, though gillnet fishers would be at a disadvantage during the pink salmon harvest, fishing alongside seine vessels, with deep nets.

**PROPOSED BY:** James Mykland (HQ-F11-011)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations.** Further define keg or buoy as follows:

**(f) Except for the end of the drift gillnet attached to the vessel operating the gear, each end of a drift gillnet in operation must have a red keg or buoy attached. For purposes of this regulation, the keg or float may not be a CFEC registered vessel or other motorized vessel.**

**ISSUE:** Recently, commercial permit holders in Area E have been using motorized vessels as kegs or buoys when drift gillnet fishing. Other permit holders, as well as law enforcement officers, have reported numerous occasions where drift gillnet gear has been operated in a nontraditional manner. This includes both vessels towing perpendicularly on the deployed drift gillnet and having the powered “keg” tow the far end of the gillnet back to the vessel while the gear is being hauled in shallow water, effectively pursuing the gear.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** These types of violations will continue without further clarification of this regulation.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishing permit holders.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-283)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations.** Remove intent language and clarify anchoring and towing of drift gillnet gear as follows:

(c) For the purpose of this regulation, a gillnet shall be considered to be a drift gillnet unless it has been [INTENTIONALLY] set, staked, anchored or otherwise fixed.

...

**(f) Notwithstanding 5 AAC 39.105(d) (3), 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.**

**(g) A person may not use mechanical power to hold a vessel in substantially the same geographical location while attached to a drift gillnet.**

**ISSUE:** Some drift gillnet permit holders allow their drift gillnets to become anchored or otherwise made fast to the bottom in the waters surrounding Esther Island and in other locations in Prince William Sound (PWS). This is done either by piling leadline on the beach or in shallow water and then setting the net, or by setting across submerged boulders that secure the net. Under current PWS regulations set gillnets may only be used in Eshamy District. Currently, when drift gillnet boats “rock down” or allow their gear to stop drifting, either by grounding or using of mechanical power, they are preventing access to the fishery resource by those fishermen who are using gillnets legally.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** De facto set gillnetting will continue in districts outside of the Eshamy District and drift gillnet permit holders who comply with regulations will be prevented from harvesting the fishery resource in areas obstructed by these improperly used gillnets.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Drift gillnet permit holders who comply with regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-290)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 24.332(a). Seine specifications and operations.** Revise purse seine mesh restrictions for commercial seining in PWS as follows:

Except for the first five fathoms in length of the purse seine, a purse seine may not be less than 200 meshes or more than 330 meshes in depth, or less than 125 fathoms of more than 150 fathoms in length, hung measure. A cork line border strip may be used, not to exceed 5 meshes of more than 4” stretch measure. Body web of seine may not exceed 300 meshes of more than 3 ½” stretch measure and a chafing strip above or below the lead line not to exceed 25 meshes of more than 5” stretch measure. Leads deeper than the seine, exceeding 75 fathoms in length or with mesh size less than 7” may not be used except as specified in 5 AAC 39.260(f).

**ISSUE:** Salmon seine specifications for PWS need to be updated so modern efficient seine construction techniques can be used by net builders.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Seiners in PWS will have trouble taking advantage of efficient new net improvements.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Seiners.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** CDFU-Seine Division (HQ-F11-053)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specifications and operations.** Allow a purse seine chafing and border strip for the PWS salmon purse seine fishery as follows:

The new regulation would read exactly like the regulation prior to 2008, except that a corkline collar of up to 5 and one half meshes will be allowed and not considered for measurement of the 325 mesh depth restriction.

**ISSUE:** Seine specifications for Prince William Sound were changed three years ago to make most of the salmon seine nets utilized in PWS illegal. Specifically, the allowance of a chafing strip 25 meshes above the leadline of mesh size up to 7" was deleted. We need this provision written back into 5AAC24.332. Also, we need a corkline boarder collar of 5 and one half meshes also added into the regulation, with this 5 and one half meshes not counted towards the 325 mesh depth restriction.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** More than 90% of the salmon purse seine nets used in Prince William Sound will continue to be illegal.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** My proposal is nothing more than bringing the seine specification regulation into compliance with the purse seine nets that most PWS purse seine fishermen are using.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The vast majority of the purse seine fishermen will benefit because their purse seine nets will be considered legal again.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** I don't see that my proposed regulation will harm anyone.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The only other solution for this problem is for most of the PWS seine fishermen to remove their 5" or 7" chafing strips and replace them with a 4" or less chafing strip. They would also need to remove their corkline boarder collars that they've been using. This changing of the fishing nets will benefit no one except the net suppliers and net hangers.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alan Kapp

(HQ-10F-016)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specification and operations.** Amend gear restrictions for PWS salmon purse seine fishery as follows:

**The total aggregate length of a seine is 225 fathoms, including any lead.**

- (a) ...no purse seine may be less than 200 meshes or more than 325 meshes in depth, [OR LESS THAN 125 FATHOMS OR MORE THAN 150 FATHOMS IN LENGTH, HUNG MEASURE] or with mesh size greater than 4 inches. **The first 25 meshes above the leadline may be a chafing strip, with a mesh size no larger than seven and ½ inches. A border strip attached to the corkline may also be used.**

**ISSUE:** I would like the Board of Fisheries to repeal the requirement for PWS seiners to use 7" mesh size lead web, in the last 75 fathoms of our 225 fathom seines.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This is an archaic regulation based on a time when most PWS seiners used detachable leads to access shallow water, and because their boats were too small to carry a full 225 fathom seine, they kept a 75 fathom lead in their jitneys (skiffs) with the advent of modern, larger boats, gear and techniques, more and more fishermen use leads permanently attached to the seine. Prince William Sound has become primarily a hatchery fishery and when the department opens the fishery, the goal is to harvest all the fish above and beyond cost recovery, or after escapement is met. Lead web is so large it allows pink salmon to swim through its 7" mesh size. Why should we burn fuel and go through all the effort to catch all excess fish with gear that allows our target species to swim through it? This makes no sense at all. I am also convinced that lead web tows much harder through the water. Therefore, we burn more fuel to tow this kind of seine. This change would not prohibit the use of lead web, if a fisherman still wants to use lead web or a detachable lead (double pinning) for the last 75 fathoms of their net they still can. It simply allows the choice of using lead web or not.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it will reduce the amount of gillnets in large meshed lead web.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen who use and prefer permanently attached leads a single 225 fathom seine.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo is wasteful, archaic and inefficient.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jamie Ross (HQ-F11-347)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specifications and operations.** Reduce gear limits for the PWS salmon purse seine fishery as follows:

Salmon purse seine vessels may fish 150 fathoms of salmon gear, no leads will be allowed.

**ISSUE:** To much purse seine gear in PWS.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Congestion will continue to increase in the PWS salmon purse seine fleet. Management for escapement of wild stocks will be more difficult.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Every salmon purse seine vessel in PWS, 75 fathoms less gear to buy or repair.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Folks who sell or repair salmon seine gear.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Leroy L. Cabana (HQ-F11-117)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specifications and operations.** Revise lead mesh size for commercial seining in PWS as follows:

5 AAC 24.352 sentence #2 – Leads deeper than the seine, exceeding 75 fathoms in length may not be used except as specified in 5 AAC 39.260(f).

5 AAC 39.260(f) where the use of lead is permitted a purse seine vessel may not have or use more than one lead of legal length and depth, without purse rings attached.

**ISSUE:** Pink salmon escaping through the lead web. As pink salmon mature they lose their fear of nets, boats, plungers, etc. As a result they commonly swim through the 7” mesh of the lead.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Excessive buildups of late season pink salmon become more likely. Reducing the possibility of buildups is to everyone’s benefit including both common property fisheries and cost recovery operations.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. More effective harvest out front results in fresher fish, better quality and increased value.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Seiner; wishing to increase efficiency and value.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Unknown.

## OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

**PROPOSED BY:** Rob Nelson

(HQ-F11-062)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 39.260. Seine specifications and operations.** Revise lead mesh size for PWS salmon purse seine fishery as follows:

5AAC39.260 (f) Where the use of leads is permitted, a purse seine vessel may not have or use more than one lead of legal length and depth, without purse rings attached, and with a minimum mesh size of six inches, except that a lead may have a cork line border strip not to exceed five meshes of less than of less than seven-inch stretch measure and a lead line chafing strip not to exceed 25 meshes less than seven-inch stretch measure.

**ISSUE:** Seine specifications for lead web-size needs to be updated to account for shrinkage of used web as nylon shrinks when it gets wet and is used for several years.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Seiners who were in compliance with regulation after the initial purchase of 7-inch lead web will be forced to be bound by a regulation that is unduly costly to them. If regulation is modified it will allow seiners to continue using their leads with no negative consequence to their fishery.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Seiners.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

## OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

**PROPOSED BY:** Timothy J. Moore

(HQ-F11-118)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 24.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts and sections.** Create a subdistrict in the Coghill District for commercial salmon fishing as follows:

Create a subdistrict in the Coghill district to include waters north of Pt Pigot at 60.48.21N 148.20.90W to a point along the Coghill district boundary at 60.47.56N 148.18.46W and waters west of a line from 60.47.56N 148.18.46W to Pt. Packenham at 61.00.429N 148.04.363W to be named the Beetles Bay subdistrict. This subdistrict would be managed for wild stock escapement and opened by emergency order when escapement levels warrant a harvest.

**ISSUE:** Currently wild stock systems on the west side of Port Wells tend to be open to Drift gillnet gear in general district openings targeting Coghill sockeye and WHN chums even though these west side wild stock systems may lack sufficient escapement to have a targeted fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Potential intercept of wild stock pink and chums salmon bound for these systems is detrimental to escapement in years of low abundance to these streams.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** In weak wild stock returns these systems would have added protection to help insure minimum escapements, all users would benefit from this.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** None that I can see.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Tom Nelson (HQ-F11-049)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 24.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections.** Amend boundaries for the Northwest, Eshamy, Coghill districts and Esther Subdistrict as follows:

5 AAC 24.200 would be rewritten to reflect the above changes with an emphasis on protecting wild salmon stocks.

**ISSUE:** Currently, excessive harvest of wild stock pink and chum salmon are occurring during fisheries targeting hatchery sockeye and chum salmon in the Main Bay and Coghill districts. This excessive harvest chronically affects escapement into historic seine districts, leading to closures and restrictions on time and area to the seine fleet during the historic July wild pink and chum seasons. The board should redraw the boundaries for the Northwest, Eshamy, Esther, and Coghill districts to expand the Northwest district to within ½ mile of Esther Island, move the Coghill district north of a line from Point Pakenham to the north shore of Esther Passage, and change the Esther subdistrict to all waters within ½ mile of Esther Island west and south of Esther Island. The board should further restrict the area open to drift gillnetting in the Main Bay and Eshamy districts to more of a terminal harvest area, with input from the department as to what would be most practical and efficient, in order to provide the highest priority to wild salmon stocks.

If wild stock escapements warrant expanded fishing opportunity in the Main Bay and Eshamy district, the department shall also open the Northwest district to the seine fleet.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued interception and overharvest of wild salmon stocks will occur while prosecuting hatchery returns. This will continue to detrimentally impact the areas open to the seine fleet during the July and August returns. Furthermore, the board and the department must manage for wild stock escapement over enhanced harvest.



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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The seine fleet will benefit if escapement goals in traditional seine areas are met and expanded opportunity to harvest wild stocks becomes available.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The gillnet fleet will suffer in the short term while learning to harvest in a terminal fishery as the seine fleet currently does. Also, the gillnet fleet would be giving up some of the wild salmon stocks currently intercepted.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The issue of wild stock interception has been before the board for several cycles and has been the subject of two petitions, with no action taken until the present time. One possible solution may be to further limit mesh size and depth or length on gillnets. However, expanding mesh size might allow small pink salmon to slip through, it is doubtful that it would have any meaningful impact on chum interception. The terminal harvest model has been proven and is used extensively on the seine fleet, and should also be imposed upon the drift gillnet fleet to prevent interception of wild stocks.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-235)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 24.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections.** Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Eshamy District:

(h) Eshamy District: waters [WITHIN ONE NAUTICAL MILE OF THE MAINLAND SHORE FROM THE LONGITUDE OF THE OUTER POINT ON THE NORTH SHORE OF GRANITE BAY TO THE LONGITUDE OF THE LIGHT ON THE SOUTH SHORE OF THE ENTRANCE TO PORT NELLIE JUAN LIGHT]. east of a line from the entrance to Port Nellie Juan at 60° 35.87'N. lat., 148° 06.11'W. long. to a point approximately 1 nautical mile offshore at 60° 36.87'N. lat., 148° 06.11'W. long. and enclosed by a line beginning at 60° 36.87'N. lat., 148°06.11'W. long. to 60°36.144'N. lat., 148°03.72'W. long., to 60° 31.17'N. lat., 147° 56.43'W. long., to 60° 30.038'N. lat., 147° 55.58'W. long., to 60° 26.12'N. lat., 147° 54.12'W. long., to 60° 25.30'N. lat., 147° 55.10'W. long., to 60° 24.45'N. lat., 147° 55.99'W. long., to 60° 24.04'N. lat., 147° 58.90'W. long., to Granite Point at 60° 24.94'N. lat., 147° 57.97'W. long.

**ISSUE:** The current regulation describes the district boundary line one nautical mile off the mainland shore between the Port Nellie Juan light and Granite Point. This line is convoluted and difficult for the drift gillnet fleet to identify using current GPS technology. This proposal will create a line that is approximately one nautical mile offshore defined by 10 sets of latitude and longitude coordinates. The last point is the location of the historical plywood markers. This line has been used by stakeholders and Alaska Wildlife Troopers as the boundary for the Eshamy District.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The existing line one nautical mile from the mainland shore will remain convoluted and difficult to identify using widely available GPS technology.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen, department staff, and enforcement staff will benefit from fishing boundaries that are identified by GPS coordinates.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-285)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 24.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections.** Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Coghill and Northwestern districts:

(f) Coghill District: waters north and east of a line from Point Pigot (60° 48.21' N. lat., 148° 20.90' W. long.) to a point west of Point Culross at 60° 45.45' N. lat., 148° 11.07' W. long. and from Point Culross (60° 45.58' N. lat., 148° 08.74' W. long.) to a point west of Culross Light at 60° 45.16' N. lat., 148° 07.87' W. long. to Point Perry (60° 45.05' N. lat., 147° 57.62' W. long.) to the west island of the Bald Head Chris Islands at 60° 47.97' N. lat., 147° 51.62' W. long. to a point on the mainland at **60° 49.26' N. lat., 147° 51.20' W. long.** [60° 49.33' N. LAT., 147° 51.12' W. LONG.]

(1) Esther Subdistrict: waters of the Coghill District south and east of a line from [AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED ON THE WESTERN SHORE OF ESTHER ISLAND AT 60° 48.06' N. LAT., 148° 08.54' W. LONG.] **a point on the western shore of Esther Island at 60° 48.08' N. lat., 148° 08.54' W. long.** to [ESTHER ROCKS TO POINT CULROSS] **Esther Rock (60° 48.08' N. lat., 148° 10.67' W. long.) to Point Culross (60° 45.58' N. lat., 148° 08.74' W. long.) to a point west of Culross Light at 60° 45.16' N. lat., 148° 07.87' W. long.** and south of a line crossing Esther Passage from 60° 49.51' N. lat., 147° 52.62' W. long. to 60° 49.51' N. lat., 147° 54.82' W. long.;

(2) Granite Bay Subdistrict: waters of Port Wells, east of a line from Esther Rock at 60° 48.08' N. lat., 148° 10.67' W. long. to a point at 60° 51.68' N. lat., 148° 09.84' W. long. and to a point at 60° 55.81' N. lat., 148° 05.89' W. long., including all waters of Esther Passage north of a line at 60° 49.51' N. lat.;

(g) Northwestern District: waters south and west of a line from Point Pigot (60° 48.21' N. lat., 148° 20.90' W. long.) to **a point west of Point Culross at 60° 45.45' N. lat., 148° 11.07' W. long. and from** Point Culross (60° 45.58' N. lat., 148° 08.74' W. long.) to a point west of Culross Light at 60° 45.16' N. lat., 148° 07.87' W. long. and from a point on the southern end of Culross Island at 60° 38.31' N. lat., 148° 08.62' W. long. to a point approximately 1.5 miles west of Port Nellie Juan Light at 60° 34.86' N. lat., 148° 08.62' W. long. to the Eshamy District boundary at the light on the south shore of the entrance to Port Nellie Juan Light, including Culross Passage and waters of Culross Bay.

(1) Whittier Subdistrict: waters west of a line from Point Pigot to a point at 60° **45.85'** [40.71] N. lat., 148° **13.73'** [13.87] W. long., including Passage Canal, Blackstone Bay, and Cochrane Bay;

(2) Culross Island Subdistrict: waters east of a line from Point Pigot to a point at 60° 40.71' N. lat., 148° 13.87' W. long., south of a line from Point Pigot to **a point west of Point Culross at 60° 45.45' N. lat., 148° 11.07' W. long. and from** Point Culross to a point west of Culross Light at 60° 45.16' N. lat., 148° 07.87' W. long., including waters of Culross Bay and Culross Passage and north of a line from a point approximately 1.5 miles west of Port Nellie Juan Light at 60° 34.86' N. lat., 148° 08.62' W. long., to a point on the mainland at 60° 36.46' N. lat., 148° 11.37' W. long.;

**ISSUE:** Inaccurate and unclear regulatory boundary descriptions are present in regulation for the Coghill and Northwestern districts. The northeastern boundary of the Northwestern District is in error based on adjustments made to the common Coghill District boundary at the 2005 Board of Fisheries meeting. The coordinates describing the southern point of the eastern boundary to the Whittier Subdistrict is being adjusted to correct a typographical error. The current latitude and longitude coordinates in regulation that define the eastern boundary of the Coghill District describe a point approximately 160 feet east of Squaw Point and approximately 300 feet into Squaw Bay. This point should be on Squaw Point. This deviation is due to Loran imprecision when this point was put into regulation in the 1960s. In addition, the current northwest boundary of the Esther Subdistrict is a line that is approximately 120 feet south of the Granite Bay Subdistrict boundary. The coordinates for Culross Point and at Culross light are not given in the Esther Subdistrict regulatory description.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** These issues will continue to be corrected annually by the department by emergency order.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen, resource managers, enforcement staff, and the public will benefit by having clarity in these regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-286)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 24.310. Fishing seasons.** Revise season description for the purse seine fishery in the Eastern, Northern, Northwestern, Southwestern, Montague, and Southeastern districts as follows:

(a) The Copper River District is open and closed by emergency order.

- (b) The Bering River District is open and closed by emergency order.
- (c) In the Coghill and Unakwik districts, salmon may be taken only during seasons established by emergency order.
- (d) In the Eshamy District, salmon may be taken only during seasons established by emergency order.
- (e) In the Eastern, Northern, Northwestern, Southwestern, Montague and Southeastern districts, salmon may be taken only during [SEASONS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER] **regularly scheduled bi-weekly 12 hour openings established by the department to begin no earlier than June 1. Openings may be expanded or restricted as necessary to protect wild and enhanced salmon stocks. If run strengths are sufficient to warrant additional fishing time, such fishing time shall be established by E.O. Authority.**

**ISSUE:** Currently, management decisions are based upon aerial surveys for the seine fleet, while gillnet seasons tend to open weekly until there is a need to restrict a fishery. The problem with aerial surveys is that they fail to provide information until salmon reach their natal streams, when they are usually off-limits to harvest opportunity. The board should direct the department to conduct weekly openings for the seine fleet in the same manner as seine fleets are managed in other areas of the state and reduce time and area if warranted by catch rates and other data. By failing to use the fleet as a test fishery, the department's management decisions are based upon stale information. In the case of the 2010 season, salmon returns were much stronger than predicted and opportunity to spread the fleet out and provide product to processors occurred later than necessary.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will continue to rely solely on aerial surveys and their own test boat to determine run strength and composition to the detriment of the seine fleet.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. In times of strong returns, more salmon will be harvested outside the terminal harvest areas, improving flesh quality.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The department will obtain more timely data regarding salmon returns to PWS and the seine fleet will have an opportunity to spread out and provide higher quality product to market.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** This proposal does not seek to remove allocation from another gear type.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There was discussion with the department regarding the efficacy of utilizing a gillnet vessel fishing a transect line, similar to Cook Inlet. However, the seine fleet is uncomfortable with the gillnet gear type fishing areas historically open to seine only. Also, there is an issue regarding stock composition based upon species and whether a

gillnet would provide accurate data because the catch rate would be variable depending on mesh size, depth and color.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-236)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed waters.** Close designated areas to commercial fishing in PWS as follows:

The following areas are closed to commercial salmon fishing, July 1 - August 31

The area east of 148.02, west of 147.52, north of 60.38, south of 60.42

The area east of 148.10, west of 148.05, north of 60.43, south of 60.46

The area east of 148.22, west of 148.18, north of 60.47, south of 60.51

The area east of 147.52, west of 147.48, north of 60.03, south of 60.05

The area east of 147.49, west of 147.43, north of 60.29, south of 60.31

**ISSUE:** The diverse geographic locations of salmon hatcheries in Prince William Sound disperse commercial purse seining throughout much of western Prince William Sound. When pink salmon are being harvested the efficiency of harvest captures the majority of coho salmon in the area also and at times nearly eliminates sport harvest opportunities in much of western Prince William Sound.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued lack of sport fish opportunity for coho salmon in western Prince William Sound, particularly in August.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal will improve coho salmon sport fishing consistency and relieve pressure on the small natural coho runs.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport fishermen and local businesses associated with sport fishing.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial fishermen have been restricted to smaller and smaller areas over the years to better target specific runs. These restrictions will further condense their fishing areas, however, it would have a very small effect on total harvest.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Other options included asking for several more small areas as well as larger areas that would not only provide sport fishermen larger areas to fish but protect natural coho runs as well. These were rejected as the areas are too large and it is felt that these 5 areas along with current restrictions in place will provide sufficient consistent sport fish opportunity to western Prince William Sound sport fishermen.

**PROPOSED BY:** David Pinquoch (HQ-F11-146)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed Waters.** Correct geographic description of closed waters in PWS Area districts as follows:

(3) Eastern District:

(A) Simpson Bay, north of 60° 38.00' N. lat., Orca Inlet and Nelson Bay south and east of a line from Salmon Point to Shepard Point, and all of Orca Inlet southeast of Hawkins Island;

(B) Sheep Bay: north of a line from 60° 42.02' N. lat., 145° 55.12' W. long., [60° 41.97' N. LAT., 145° 55.27' W. LONG.], to 60° 41.66' N. lat., 145° 55.52' W. long., and north of a line from 60° 41.14' N. lat., 145° 56.27' W. long., to 60° 40.84' N. lat., 145° 56.56' W. long.;

(C) Comfort Cove: east of a line from 60° 42.96' N. lat., 146° 05.67' W. long., to 60° 42.70' N. lat., 146° 05.78' W. long. [60° 42.97' N. LAT., 146° 05.62' W. LONG., TO 60° 42.71' N. LAT., 146° 05.72' W. LONG.];

(D) Olsen Bay: north of 60° 44.06' N. lat.;

(E) Beartrap Bay: east of a line from 60° 44.86' N. lat., 145° 59.64' W. long., to 60° 44.55' N. lat. [145° 59.57' W. LONG., TO 60° 44.56' N. LAT], 145° 59.62' W. long.;

(F) St. Matthews Bay: east of a line at 146° 18.09' W. long. [146° 18.12' W. LONG.], and within 500 yards of the northwestern shore, north of 60° 45.36' N. lat.;

(G) Two Moon Bay: south of a line from 60° 44.74' N. lat., 146° 30.15' W. long., to 60° 44.63' N. lat., 146° 30.93' W. long. [60° 44.86' N. LAT., 146° 30.32' W. LONG., TO 60° 44.66' N. LAT., 146° 30.92' W. LONG.];

(H) Irish Cove: south of a line from 60° 46.13' N. lat., 146° 26.84' W. long. [60° 46.16' N. LAT., 146° 26.82' W. LONG.], to 60° 46.06' N. lat., 146° 26.62' W. long.;

(I) Whalen Bay: east of a line from 60° 49.23' N. lat., 146° 15.17' W. long., to 60° 48.59' N. lat., 146° 16.02' W. long. [60° 49.26' N. LAT., 146° 15.22' W. LONG., TO 60° 48.61' N. LAT., 146° 16.02' W. LONG.];

(J) Fish Bay: north of 60° 48.92' N. lat. [60° 48.81' N. LAT.];

(K) Landlocked Bay: within the bay east of a line in the narrows from 60° 51.13' N. lat., 146° 34.05' W. long., to 60° 51.42' N. lat., 146° 34.12' W. long. [AT 146° 34.12' W. LONG.];

(L) Galena Bay: east of a line from 60° 55.64' N. lat., 146° 38.16' W. long. [60° 55.61' N. LAT., 146° 38.22' W. LONG.], to 60° 56.41' N. lat., 146° 36.23' W. long., and within 1,000 yards of the north shore between 60° 57.13' N. lat., 146° 38.83' W. long., and 60° 56.81' N. lat., 146° 36.55' W. long. [60° 57.11' N. LAT., 146° 38.82' W. LONG., AND 60° 56.76' N. LAT., 146° 36.52' W. LONG.];

(M) Jack Bay: south and east of a line from 61° 01.75' N. lat., 146° 34.58' W. long. and 61° 01.01' N. lat., 146° 34.34' W. long. [146° 34.42' W. LONG.], and within 1,000 yards of the terminus of all other salmon streams of the bay;

(N) Mineral Creek Delta, Gold Creek, and Kadis Creek: north of a line from 61° 07.45' N. lat., 146° 23.75' W. long., to 61° 07.45' N. lat., 146° 29.80' W. long. [60° 48.81' N. LAT.];

(O) Head of Port Valdez: waters east of a line from a point west of the Valdez boat harbor at 61° 07.47' N. lat. [61° 07.46' N. LAT.], 146° 22.67' W. long., to a point on the south shore at 61° 05.13' N. lat. [61° 05.16' N. LAT.], 146° 17.82' W. long.;

(P) Allison Creek, Sawmill Creek, and the Alyeska Safety Zone: within 200 yards of the shore from Allison Point at 61° 05.16' N. lat., 146° 20.72' W. long. to a point west of Sawmill Creek at 61° 04.81' N. lat., 146° 27.32' W. long.;

(Q) Sawmill Bay, Valdez Arm: north of a line along 61° 03.14' N. lat. [61° 03.16' N. LAT.] in the northern arm of the bay and west of a line from 61° 03.14' N. lat., 146° 47.41' W. long., to 61° 02.74' N. lat., 146° 47.27' W. long. [ALONG 146° 47.32' W. LONG.] in the western arm of the bay;

(4) Northern District:

(A) Long Bay: north of a line from 60° 59.09' N. lat., 147° 14.52' W. long. [60° 59.06' N. LAT., 147° 14.42' W. LONG.], to 60° 58.97' N. lat., 147° 13.17' W. long. [147° 13.32' W. LONG.], north of a line from 60° 59.24' N. lat., 147° 16.35' W. long., to 60° 59.26' N. lat., 147° 16.59' W. long. [60° 59.26' N. LAT., 147° 16.52' W. LONG., TO 60° 59.31' N. LAT., 147° 16.92' W. LONG.], north of a line from 60° 59.14' N. lat., 147° 16.93' W. long., to 60° 59.03' N. lat., 147° 17.32' W. long. [60° 59.16' N. LAT., 147° 17.12' W. LONG., TO 60° 59.06' N. LAT., 147° 17.52' W. LONG.], and west of a line from 60° 58.46' N. lat., 147° 16.52' W. long., to 60° 57.52' N. lat., 147° 16.56' W. long. [147° 16.62' W. LONG., TO 60° 57.31' N. LAT., 147° 16.52' W. LONG.];

(B) Eaglek Bay: north of 60° 53.46' N. lat.;

(C) Wells Bay: east of a line from 61° 00.59' N. lat., 147° 25.59' W. long. to 61° 00.16' N. lat., 147° 25.48' W. long. [61° 00.56' N. LAT., 147° 25.82' W. LONG. TO 61° 00.21' N. LAT., 147° 25.62' W. LONG.], and north of a line from 61° 00.17' N. lat., 147° 28.88' W. long., to 61° 00.11' N. lat., 147° 29.31' W. long. [61° 00.21' N. lat., 147° 28.92' W. long., to 61° 00.06' N. lat., 147° 29.42' W. long.];

(D) Siwash Bay: west of a line from 60° 57.48' N. lat., 147° 39.73' W. long. [60° 57.46' N. LAT., 147° 39.72' W. LONG. TO 60° 56.97' N. LAT.] to 60° 56.97' N. lat., 147° 39.52' W. long.;

(E) Jonah Bay: west of a line from 60° 00.82' N. lat., 147° 38.63' W. long. to 60° 59.96' N. lat., 147° 38.51' W. long. [147° 38.62' W. LONG.];

(F) Unakwik Inlet: within 1,000 yards of the terminus of all salmon streams north of 60° 51.97' N. lat.;

(6) Coghill District:

(A) Esther Passage: east of a line from 60° 51.49' N. lat., 147° 54.65' W. long. to 60° 52.36' N. lat., 147° 54.85' W. long. [60° 51.26' N. LAT., 147° 54.62' W. LONG. TO 60° 52.16' N. LAT., 147° 54.72' W. LONG.];

(B) College Fiord: within 500 yards of the terminus of Coghill River and within the cove immediately north of the Coghill River mouth;

(7) Northwestern District:

(A) Blackstone Bay: south of a line from 60° 45.95' N. lat., 148° 29.56' W. long. [60° 45.97' N. lat., 148° 29.52' W. long.] to 60° 45.81' N. lat., 148° 26.61' W. long. [148° 26.62' W. LONG.];

(B) Passage Canal (Shotgun Cove): south of a line from 60° 48.11' N. lat., 148° 33.08' W. long. to 60° 47.90' N. lat., 148° 32.09' W. long. [148° 33.02' W. LONG. TO 60° 47.91' N. LAT., 148° 32.12' W. LONG.];

(C) Cochrane Bay: southwest of a line from 60° 39.61' N. lat., 148° 25.41' W. long. [60° 39.56' N. LAT., 148° 25.42' W. LONG.] to 60° 38.11' N. lat., 148° 24.57' W. long., west of a line from 60° 43.76' N. lat., 148° 22.52' W. long., to 60° 41.45' N. lat., 148°

**23.09' W. long.** [60° 41.51' N. LAT., 148° 23.02' W. LONG.], and Surprise Cove west of a line from **60° 45.89' N. lat.** [60° 45.86' N. LAT.], 148° 22.02' W. long. to **60° 45.12' N. lat., 148° 22.31' W. long.** [60° 45.16' N. LAT., 148° 22.32' W. LONG.];

(D) Long Bay (Culross Passage): west of a line from **60° 41.87' N. lat., 148° 15.74' W. long.** [60° 41.86' N. LAT., 148° 15.72' W. LONG.], to 60° 41.61' N. lat., 148° 15.52' W. long.;

(E) Port Nellie Juan (Mink Creek): northwest of a line from 60° 35.66' N. lat., 148° 13.82' W. long., to 60° 34.56' N. lat., **148° 16.47' W. long.** [148° 16.37' W. LONG.];

(F) East Finger Inlet: north of 60° 32.51' N. lat.;

(G) West Finger Inlet: north of a line from 60° 34.16' N. lat., 148° 27.02' W. long., to 60° 34.11' N. lat., **148° 26.21' W. long.** [148° 26.22' W. LONG.];

(9) Southwestern District:

(A) Dangerous Passage: within 1,000 yards of all salmon streams in Dangerous Passage between 148° 08.87' W. long., and 148° 02.62' W. long.;

(B) Ewan Bay: west of **148° 08.35' W. long.** [148° 08.32' W. LONG.];

(C) Paddy Bay: north of a line from 60° 23.97' N. lat., **148° 06.07' W. long.** [148° 06.02' W. LONG.] to 60° 23.91' N. lat., **148° 04.91' W. long.** [148° 04.92' W. LONG.];

(D) Jackpot Bay: north and west of a line from **60° 20.74' N. lat., 148° 13.18' W. long., to 60° 20.52' N. lat., 148° 13.41' W. long.** [60° 20.71' N. LAT., 148° 13.12' W. LONG., TO 60° 20.56' N. LAT., 148° 13.37' W. LONG.];

(E) Whale Bay: south of 60° 14.16' N. lat.;

(F) Port Bainbridge: north of a line from **60° 09.72' N. lat., 148° 19.96' W. long., to 60° 09.68' N. lat., 148° 20.56' W. long.** [60° 09.56' N. LAT., 148° 20.17' W. LONG., TO 60° 09.71' N. LAT., 148° 20.12' W. LONG.];

(10) Montague District:

(A) Zaikof Bay: south of 60° 16.86' N. lat., and within 1,000 yards of the southeastern shore of the bay from a point at **60° 17.94' N. lat., 147° 00.15' W. long.** [60° 17.91' N. LAT., 147° 00.12' W. LONG.], to a line at 60° 16.86' N. lat.;

(B) Rocky Bay: west of a line from a point at **60° 21.30' N. lat., 147° 06.66' W. long.** [60° 21.26' N. LAT., 147° 06.62' W. LONG.], to a point at **60° 20.54' N. lat., 147° 05.61' W. long.** [60° 20.56' N. LAT., 147° 05.62' W. LONG.];

(C) Stockdale Harbor: east of a line from a point at **60° 19.56' N. lat.** [60° 19.51' N. LAT.], 147° 12.02' W. long., to a point at 60° 18.26' N. lat., 147° 11.72' W. long.;

(D) Port Chalmers: within a line from a point at 60° 16.97' N. lat., 147° 12.62' W. long., to a point at **60° 16.06' N. lat., 147° 12.63' W. long.** [60° 16.11' N. LAT., 147° 12.62' W. LONG.], from a point at **60° 15.37' N. lat., 147° 12.31' W. long.** [60° 15.36' N. LAT., 147° 12.32' W. LONG.], to a point at 60° 14.16' N. lat., 147° 14.42' W. long., and from a point at 60° 13.86' N. lat., 147° 14.77' W. long., to a point at **60° 13.56' N. lat.** [60° 12.56' N. LAT.], 147° 16.82' W. long.;

(E) Hanning Bay: east of a line from a point at **59° 58.93' N. lat., 147° 41.46' W. long.** [59° 58.86' N. LAT., 147° 41.52' W. LONG.], to a point at **59° 57.15' N. lat., 147° 42.99' W. long.** [59° 57.21' N. LAT., 147° 42.92' W. LONG.];

(F) MacLeod Harbor: east of a line from a point at 59° 53.26' N. lat., 147° 46.12' W. long., to a point at 59° 52.46' N. lat., 147° 46.52' W. long.;



(G) Montague Strait: within 500 yards of the northwestern shore of Montague Island from **60° 04.61' N. lat., 147° 28.82' W. long., to 60° 03.13' N. lat., 147° 33.17' W. long.** [60° 04.56' N. LAT., 147° 28.72' W. LONG., TO 60° 03.16' N. LAT., 147° 33.22' W. LONG.], and from **60° 02.10' N. lat., 147° 34.28' W. long., to 59° 59.94' N. lat., 147° 40.57' W. long.** [60° 02.06' N. LAT., 147° 34.32' W. LONG., TO 59° 59.97' N. LAT., 147° 40.62' W. LONG.];

(11) Southeastern District:

(A) Port Etches: east of a line from **60° 21.09' N. lat., 146° 33.94' W. long.** [60° 21.06' N. LAT., 146° 33.92' W. LONG.], to 60° 20.06' N. lat., 146° 32.72' W. long., and south of a line from 60° 19.71' N. lat., **146° 34.11' W. long.** [146° 34.12' W. LONG.], to 60° 19.01' N. lat., 146° 35.62' W. long.;

(B) Constantine Harbor: within the harbor from **60° 21.25' N. lat., 146° 36.29' W. long., to 60° 21.04' N. lat., 146° 37.10' W. long.** [60° 21.21' N. LAT., 146° 36.82' W. LONG., TO 60° 21.06' N. LAT., 146° 37.02' W. LONG.];

(C) Shelter Bay, Hinchinbrook Island: east of a line from 60° 26.31' N. lat., 146° 40.12' W. long., to 60° 25.66' N. lat., 146° 40.02' W. long.;

(D) Anderson Bay: south of a line from **60° 28.24' N. lat., 146° 30.78' W. long., to 60° 28.42' N. lat., 146° 31.20' W. long.** [60° 28.26' N. LAT., 146° 30.82' W. LONG., TO 60° 28.41' N. LAT., 146° 31.17' W. LONG.];

(E) Hawkins Cutoff-Orca Inlet Area: south of a line from 60° 27.86' N. lat., 146° 19.72' W. long., to **60° 27.65' N. lat., 146° 21.39' W. long.** [60° 27.66' N. LAT., 146° 21.32' W. LONG.], and Orca Inlet and Nelson Bay south and east of a line from Salmo Point to Shepard Point, and all of Orca Inlet southeast of Hawkins Island;

(F) Canoe Passage: south of a line from **60° 31.18' N. lat., 146° 07.43' W. long., to 60° 31.13' N. lat., 146° 07.07' W. long.** [60° 31.16' N. LAT., 146° 07.32' W. LONG., TO 60° 31.06' N. LAT., 146° 06.92' W. LONG.];

(12) in other streams or rivers: within 500 yards of the terminus of the stream or river or as posted as specified in 5 AAC 39.290.

**ISSUE:** The department has reviewed and identified inconsistencies and errors in the description of geographic coordinates describing closed waters in regulation. The department has plotted regulatory coordinates to closely match existing regulatory coordinates or traditional marker locations while conforming to current geospatial coastline standards. The department relied on marker locations plotted on U.S.G.S. topographical maps utilized during Prince William Sound marker maintenance trips. The department plans to conduct surveys to better define the location of select closed water markers during the 2011 season and prior to the December 2011 Board of Fisheries meeting. Any updates to the proposed language will be made available for public review when department comments are submitted for proposals. This proposal is intended to correct and update the closed waters regulations and maintain the historical intent of the closed water areas currently in use.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will continue to write emergency orders at the beginning of each salmon season to correct inconsistencies and errors in regulation. Alaska Wildlife Troopers will continue to have difficulty enforcing closed water regulations.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen, resource managers, enforcement staff, and the public will benefit by having clarity in the closed waters regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-287)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed Waters.** Expand closed waters in Sheep Bay of the Eastern District as follows:

(3) Eastern District:

...

(B) Sheep Bay: north of a line from 60° 41.99' N. lat., 145° 56.11' W. long., to 60° 41.17' N. lat., 145° 55.87' W. long. [60° 41.97' N. LAT., 145° 55.27' W. LONG., to 60° 41.66' N. LAT., 145° 55.52' W. LONG.];

**ISSUE:** The closed water area within Sheep Bay is in shallow water and is close to the terminus of Sheep and Koppen creeks. During large negative tides, salmon stocks from these two systems, depending on the stage of the run, swim out of the closed water area and then are available to harvest during open fishing periods. The risk of commercial harvest of fish necessary for escapement would be reduced if the closed water area were expanded to include deeper water adjacent to the shallow delta formed by these two creeks. The expanded closed water area will allow for timely harvest near the terminus of Sheep and Koppen creeks when a harvestable surplus of salmon is available. Fish quality may be improved with increased fishing opportunity throughout the salmon run.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If the closed water area is not expanded, the department will continue issuing emergency orders for expanded closed waters within Sheep Bay to protect escapement to Sheep and Koppen creeks.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The timely harvest of salmon stocks near the terminus of Sheep and Koppen creeks may improve the quality of fish harvested in this area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The Prince William Sound commercial salmon purse seine fleet will benefit from timely and more frequent fishing opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-288)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed waters.** Close commercial salmon fisheries in Main Bay, PWS to avoid the 4th of July as follows:

Coordinate commercial opening dates to avoid the 4th of July. The fishery already has periodic closures. It does not seem there would be that much negative effect on the catch, if one the closures was on, and around, the 4th of July.

**ISSUE:** Conflict between commercial salmon fishermen and sport fishermen on the annual 4th of July holiday in Main Bay, Prince William Sound. Main Bay is a very popular destination for sport fishermen on the 4th of July holiday (over 70 boats last year). The last several years, the commercial fishery was open on the holiday, and there were problems of harassment. The commercial guys do not like all the small sport boats in, and around, their nets. They made that clear by their actions, and in running their nets (literally racing between sport boats at anchor, with obvious disregard for folks not there for the commercial fishery). Their radio chatter also confirmed their displeasure with the sport fishermen's presence. The sport guys were unhappy because the only reds available for snagging were the ones small enough to pass through the nets, and the commercial guys were acting like they owned the bay.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Unknown, but a lot of things are possible with animosity between users, in such close proximity to each other.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The sport guys would benefit by increased catch, and less possibility of engaging in conflict with the commercial guys.

The commercial guys would have the opportunity to spend the holiday with their families, without worrying about losing their share of the catch. They would also not have to put up with all the sport guys for those several days. The commercial guys are there because there is an opening they cannot afford to miss, no matter how uncomfortable it makes the situation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** It is possible no one would suffer. The reds will still be there for the nets, after the 4th of July.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** N/A.

**PROPOSED BY:** David Lofland

(HQ-F11-022)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 24.367. Main Bay Salmon Hatchery Harvest Management Plan.** Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Main Bay Alternating Gear Zone:

(d) In the Main Bay Subdistrict south of a line **from 60° 31.34' N. lat., 148° 05.49' W. long., to 60° 31.44' N. lat., 148° 05.71' W. long.** [FROM 60° 31.43' N. LAT., 148° 05.67' W. LONG. TO 60° 31.36' N. LAT., 148° 05.52' W. LONG.] (Main Bay Alternating Gear Zone)

**ISSUE:** The historical latitude and longitude coordinates that define the Main Bay Alternating Gear Zone identify points that are submerged. The proposed coordinates keep the historical line, but extend it to shore on both east and west ends.

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

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The line defining the Main Bay Alternating Gear Zone will remain offshore, adding confusion and unneeded complexity to this fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Set and drift gillnet stakeholders who fish in this area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-289)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 24.368. Wally Noerenberg (Esther Island) Hatchery Management Plan.** Amend regulation regarding the Wally Noerenberg Hatchery Plan as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 24.368. Wally Noerenberg (Esther Island) Hatchery Plan. (a) The department, in consultation with the hatchery operator, shall manage the Esther Subdistrict, **the Granite Bay Subdistrict** and the Perry Island Subdistrict to achieve the corporation's escapement goal for the Wally Noerenberg (Esther Island) salmon hatchery.

**ISSUE:** In 2005, the Alaska Board of Fisheries (BOF) adopted proposal #39 creating the Granite Bay Subdistrict (GBS) as a hatchery subdistrict to more efficiently achieve the Wally Noerenberg Hatchery (WNH) chum salmon cost recovery goal and to provide a tool of access for the seine fleet harvest of the enhanced chum salmon bound for WNH. When placed into regulation, it was only included in 5 AAC 24.370 rather than in both 5 AAC 24.368 and 5 AAC 34.370 and therefore does not capture the intent of the proposal as adopted by the BOF and made clear in the record.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The regulation as published will remain in conflict with its intended purposes and complicate management of the fishery. Lengthy commercial fishing openers within the GBS, ostensibly to target Coghill Lake sockeye salmon have resulted in large harvests of enhanced chum salmon, significantly slowing run entry into the

WNH Special Harvest Area (SHA) and greatly limiting PWSAC's ability to consistently achieve the chum salmon cost recovery goal.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Conservative management by ADF&G in all or part of the Esther Island Subdistrict as a way to compensate for the aggressive harvest schedule in the adjacent GBS has led to prolonged fishing closures, and as a consequence, buildups of unharvested chum salmon sometimes lasting several weeks. ADF&G's ability to manage the GBS for corporate escapement would increase run entry into the Esther Subdistrict and allow for timely and consistent schedule of fishing periods, reducing buildups and improving quality of the fish harvested.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** ADF&G, PWSAC, fishermen and processors.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** None.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Redefine the Esther Island Subdistrict boundaries by including either a portion or all of the GBS. This solution was rejected as it would effectively have the same result and far simpler to record the 2005 board approved proposal into regulation.

**PROPOSED BY:** Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation (HQ-F11-057)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 24.365. Armin F. Koernig Salmon Hatchery Management Plan.**  
Change south end marker in the Armin F. Koernig Hatchery Terminal Harvest Area as follows:

5 AAC 24.365 (b) The Armin F. Koernig Hatchery Terminal Harvest Area consists of the waters of Sawmill Bay (Evans Island) north and west of a line from 60° 03.63' N.lat., 147° 59.45' W. long., to 60° 02.774' N.lat., 148° 01.040' W.long., to 60° 02.63' N.lat., 148° 01.70' W. long., excluding the Armin F. Koernig Hatchery Special Harvest Area.

**ISSUE:** South end marker set in the Armin F. Koernig Hatchery Terminal Harvest Area is problematic and hazardous to boats, nets and crew due to its proximity to a reef and its limited space to set a seine.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The seine fleet, which is spending more and more of its season inside of the Terminal Harvest Area will continue to fish a problematic and dangerous set.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Seine fishermen inside the terminal harvest area will benefit in that more boats will be able to safely fish the south end, relieving congestion on the north end and other sets inside the terminal harvest area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Maintaining the status quo, however this will continue to be an unsafe and difficult set.

**PROPOSED BY:** CDFU, Seine Division (HQ-F11-059)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 100** - 5 AAC 24.350. **Closed waters.** Adopt closures for sockeye salmon in Eshamy Lagoon as follows:

**Anadromous stream closures in Eshamy Lagoon will remain in effect unless it is determined by ADF&G that maximum escapement goals will be exceeded**

Or

**Commercial fishing will not be permitted at any time inside the Eshmay Lagoon ADF&G markers located approximately ½ mile from the ADF&G cabin unless it is determined that maximum escapement goals will be exceeded if the area remains closed**

**ISSUE:** Inequitable division of sockeye salmon between sport and commercial in western Prince William Sound.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued inequitable division of sockeye salmon between sport and commercial fishermen in Western Prince William Sound.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Keeping the area inside the ADF&G markers will improve sport fishing opportunities and reduce conflict with boats anchored inside the ADF&G markers being in the way of commercial drift netters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport fishermen and boaters anchored inside the ADF&G markers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Drift netters who have historically fished inside the lagoon/ADF&G markers will have to fish either outside the lagoon or outside the ADF&G markers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Both solutions were proposed.

**PROPOSED BY:** David Pinquoch (HQ-F11-145)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 101** - 5 AAC 24.370. **Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan.** Revise gillnet and seine allocation plans as follows:

After determining which areas shall be open to the gillnet fleet and which areas will be open to the seine fleet, the current language regarding the economic allocation plan will be deleted and the existing language governing the opening and closing of seasons based upon the strength of wild and enhanced returns will guide the department.

(g) [IF THE DRIFT GILLNET OR PURSE SEINE GEAR GROUP HARVEST VALUE COMPARISON OF ENHANCED SALMON IS 47 PERCENT OR LESS OF THE PREVIOUS FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE EX-VESSEL VALUE COMPARISON OF THE COMMON PROPERTY ENHANCED SALMON STOCKS HARVESTED, AS CALCULATED BY THE DEPARTMENT UNDER (C) OF THIS SECTION, THEN IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING THIS CALCULATION THE DEPARTMENT WILL CONSULT WITH THE HATCHERY OPERATOR TO ADDRESS MAKING PROPORTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS IN COST RECOVERY DURING THE APPLICABLE YEAR TO CORRECT THE EX-VESSEL VALUE ALLOCATION PERCENTAGES TO THE DRIFT GILLNET AND PURSE SEINE GEAR GROUPS].

[(H) IF THE DRIFT GILLNET OR PURSE SEINE GEAR GROUP HARVEST VALUE OF ENHANCED SALMON IS 45 PERCENT OR LESS OF THE PREVIOUS FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE EX-VESSEL VALUE COMPARISON OF THE COMMON PROPERTY ENHANCED SALMON STOCKS HARVESTED, AS CALCULATED BY THE DEPARTMENT UNDER (C) OF THIS SECTION, THEN IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING THIS CALCULATION THE FISHERY SHALL BE MANAGED AS FOLLOWS: ]

[(1) IF THE DRIFT GILLNET GEAR GROUP HARVEST VALUE IS 45 PERCENT OR LESS, THEN IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING THE CURRENT CALCULATIONS, THE DRIFT GILLNET GEAR GROUP SHALL HAVE EXCLUSIVE ACCESS TO THE PORT CHALMERS SUBDISTRICT TO HARVEST ENHANCED SALMON RETURNS FROM JUNE 1 THOUGH JULY 30, DURING FISHING PERIODS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER; AND ]

[(2) IF THE PURSE SEINE GEAR GROUP HARVEST VALUE IS 45 PERCENT OR LESS, THEN IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING THE CURRENT CALCULATIONS, THE PURSE SEINE GEAR GROUP SHALL HAVE EXCLUSIVE ACCESS TO THE ESTHER SUBDISTRICT TO HARVEST ENHANCED SALMON RETURNS FROM JUNE 1 THROUGH JULY 20, DURING FISHING PERIODS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER. ]

[(I) IT IS THE INTENT OF THE BOARD THAT THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SECTION DO NOT RESTRICT THE COMMISSIONER'S AUTHORITY TO TAKE EMERGENCY ORDER ACTION IF NECESSARY FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF WILD STOCKS EVEN IF IT AFFECTS THE ALLOCATION PERCENTAGES ESTABLISHED IN THIS SECTION.

(J) IN THIS SECTION, "ENHANCED SALMON STOCKS" MEANS SALMON PRODUCED BY THE PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AQUACULTURE CORPORATION.]

**ISSUE:** Eliminate the current economic allocation policy and move to management by time and area as is done in the rest of the state. Current policy attempts to allocate the economic income of the Prince William Sound fisheries between seine, set gillnet and drift gillnet gear types based upon a formula that has never worked and is unlikely to work in the future. The problem is

simple: the seine fleet harvests a high volume, low value salmon product relative to the gillnet fleets. The gillnet fleets harvests lower volume, higher value salmon. This creates a situation where apples are compared to oranges, and adjustments are made to apple production in an attempt to create more oranges.

As an example, even though the drift gillnet fleet realized a net increase of \$15 million in ex-vessel value between 2005 and 2007, the seine fleet was removed from the Port Chalmers in 2008, and the fishery was turned into a gillnet fishery because the seine fleets' total percentage of the ex-vessel value increased due to high returns and modest increases in price.

In turn, although the seine fleet had what could be considered a disastrous season in 2009, under the five year rolling average now utilized, the seine fleet would have to face several years of extreme hardship before any relief would be available due to both the triennial board cycle and the effects of recent returns on the five year average.

Each gear type should fish in its respective area and be managed based on the strength of returns, not on what another gear type caught last year.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Every three years either the seine fleet or the gillnet fleet will be before the board seeking to take more apples from the other gear type and turn them into oranges because the current formula attempts to make  $2+2=5$ . This policy has been in place since 1993 and has never achieved the allocation formula as intended.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The short term could produce a slight gain to the seine fleet if the board returns the Port Chalmers subdistrict to the seine fleet. If the board does not change the current time and areas for each respective gear type, then there would be no immediate benefit to either gear type except to provide stability to the fisheries.

The board would benefit because it would not have to deal with proposed mechanisms to achieve an unachievable goal at each board cycle.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** If the board were to take action this year to give Port Chalmers back to the seine fleet, the gillnet fleet would face a short term detriment until the price or volume of pinks falls to such a number that the area would return to the seine fleet.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Over the past 6 board cycles, varying proposals have been generated and some have even been implemented, none have achieved the goal of a 50-50 ex-vessel allocation. The 50-50 split is an economic impossibility for the reasons stated above. To continue in an attempt to achieve the unachievable will do nothing but further divide the seine and gillnet fleets as the gear type falling below the allocation will constantly attempt to gain more from the other gear type, regardless of how much more money they made.



The status quo is rejected for the reasons stated above; a 50-50 split is unachievable when comparing high volume, low value species to low volume, high value species.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-233)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan.** Amend allocation plan for the Eshamay District set gillnet group as follows:

4. (f) If the set gillnet gear group catches five percent of more of the previous five-year average ex-vessel value of the total common property fishery for enhanced salmon as calculated by the department under (c) of this section, the year following this calculation beginning on July 10, the commissioner shall, by emergency order, open set gillnet fishing periods at 50% of the time assigned to the drift gillnet gear group. Opening times for both set and drift gillnet opening shall commence concurrently. [TOTALING NO MORE THAN 36 HOURS PER WEEK].

**ISSUE:** 2. When corrective measures were put in place within the allocation plan to restrict set gillnet harvest the management of the gillnet fishery in the Eshamay District on average allotted 72 hours per week of fishing time within the district. The intention of the correction measures was; beginning July 10 to reduce fishing time to the set gillnet user group by 50%, or 36 hours of eliminated fishing time of the weekly 72 hours the fishery remained open. Loss of 50% of fishing time was and remains a drastic reduction of fishing time to reduce set gillnet harvest, yet can serve as a guideline for equitable resolution. This proposal is based on continuation of the intended 50% reduction in fishing time beginning July 10.

However, since the implementation of the corrective measures to reduce set gillnet harvest there has been great variability in the amount of weekly fishing time that the Eshamay district is open to common property harvest. For the 2010 season all or portions of the Eshamay district have been open during the harvest reduction period up to 144 hours per week. This would have resulted in the set gillnet user group being excluded from harvest up to 108 hours of the 144 hours the common property fishery has been open. This results in harvest time restrictions of 300% over the intended restriction.

Also, since implementation of the corrective measures there has been great variability in the fishing time allocated to different portions of the Eshamay fishing district. One or several areas may be open to 48 hours per week of fishing time and adjoining areas may receive up to 144 hours per week. This is also a major management change since implementation. A more flexible means of restricting fishing time is needed to address this variability.

The problems needing board attention are adopting restrictions that are equitable and flexible enough to reduce set gillnet harvest when their harvest allocation percentage is exceeded without imposing unwarranted restriction.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The set gillnet user group will suffer inequitable, unintended restrictions in fishing time over and above the intention of the harvest restrictions as originally drafted in the allocation plan.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All participants benefit when fishery resources are harvested in a manner that is consistent with Board of Fisheries and all user group intent. This regulation originally proceeded through a committee and the original intent agreed to by all parties, that included both setnet, drift and seine representatives, was to reduce set gillnet harvest by 50% beginning July 10. Set gillnet users will benefit only in regard to having harvest restrictions set at levels as originally intended.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No party will suffer as harvests will be equitably assigned to all user groups as intended.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No other solutions were considered.

**PROPOSED BY:** PWS Setnet Association (HQ-F11-024)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan.** Amend allocation plan for the Eshamay District set gillnet group as follows:

(f) If the set gillnet gear group catches 4 percent or more of the previous five year average ex vessel value of the total common property fishery for enhanced salmon as calculated by the department under(c) of this section, the year following this calculation beginning on July 7, the commissioner shall, by emergency order, open set gillnet fishing periods totaling no more than 36 hours per week.

**ISSUE:** The allocation plan getting changed from its original percentages.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The setnet fleet will continue to increase its presence with more lease site being licensed and more gear being deployed anywhere they see the drift fleet being successful.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The drift gillnet fleet fishing the Main Bay and Eshamay subdistricts by getting back some to the area and freedom the area used to have before the setnet fleet was allowed more than their historic 1% that was in the original allocation plan. Their historic number was less than one percent but was increased to one percent during the original drafting of plan.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one as Setnet fleet can keep catching more than their original allocation and then some.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Make the trigger 3% instead of 4%, rejected in the spirit of harmony.

**PROPOSED BY:** Shawn Gilman (HQ-F11-032)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 24.330. Gear.** Designate area in the Coghill District for drift gillnet and purse seine gear as follows:

Any opening in the Coghill District of waters north of Pt. Packenham at 61.00.429N 148.04.363W to a point on the east side of College Fiord at 61.58.900N 147.59.750W would be open to drift gillnet and purse seine gear.

**ISSUE:** Returning traditional access by the seine fleet to wild stock Coghill sockeye prior to July 21 that was lost due to previous allocation policies that are no longer in use. Current allocation policy only uses PWSAC enhanced fish.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The seine fleet will continue to be denied traditional access to wild stock Coghill sockeye, and in years of abundant pink returns to Coghill river, a large portion of these pinks return before July 21 making them unavailable to the seine fleet.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** In abundant pink returns to Coghill River, the seine fleet could target these fish earlier in the return (prior to July 21) improving the quality of the harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The seine fleet would be returned traditional access to Coghill sockeye before July 21 as well as earlier access to Coghill pinks in abundant years.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Perhaps gillnetters specifically targeting sockeye north of Pt Packenham could see increased competition from seiners potentially fishing this area, however gillnet effort in this area is light and most of the gillnet fleet chooses to fish Esther chums, Main Bay sockeye, Port Chalmers chums, and Copper River sockeye that are returning at the same time.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Tom Nelson (HQ-F11-050)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan.** Remove the gillnet fleet from the Coghill District on established dates as follows:

(5) Coghill District:

(A) except as otherwise provided in this section, drift gillnet gear may be operated throughout the district during periods established by emergency order **from May 1 until July 10 and beginning the day after Labor Day until the close of the season;**

(B) beginning July [21] **10, until Labor Day** [WHEN THE HARVESTABLE SURPLUS IS PREDOMINATELY PINK SALMON], purse seine gear **exclusively** may be operated in the district during periods established by emergency order;

[(C) DURING A YEAR WHEN THE PURSE SEINE FLEET IS ALLOWED TO HARVEST ENHANCED PINK SALMON IN THE ESTHER SUBDISTRICT BEFORE JULY 21 UNDER]

[(H)(2) OF THIS SECTION, FROM JUNE 1 THROUGH JULY 20,]

[(I) THE GRANITE BAY SUBDISTRICT WILL BE CLOSED;]

[(II) IF THE COMMISSIONER DETERMINES THAT AN EMERGENCY OPENING IS NECESSARY IN THE GRANITE BAY SUBDISTRICT TO PREVENT FISH QUALITY DETERIORATION OF ENHANCED SALMON STOCKS RETURNING TO THE WALLY NOERENBERG HATCHERY, PURSE SEINE AND DRIFT GILLNET GEAR GROUPS WILL BE ALLOWED TO HARVEST THE SURPLUS SALMON IN AN AREA WITHIN THE GRANITE BAY SUBDISTRICT AS SPECIFIED BY EMERGENCY ORDER.]

**ISSUE:** Currently, there is a gear conflict in the Esther subdistrict during the August pink salmon returns, since more gillnetters have an economic incentive to pick pinks, nearly the entire gillnet fleet is now elbowing the seine fleet out of this fishery. Due to the volume of pink salmon, it is unfeasible to fish with alternating days for each group without sacrificing quality. The preferred solution would be to remove the gillnet fleet from the Esther subdistrict from July 10 until the day after Labor Day. Currently, the gillnet fleet enjoys exclusive access to the Esther subdistrict from the opening of the salmon season until July 21<sup>st</sup> during the chum season, the seine fleet should also be able to conduct an orderly harvest of the pink salmon fishery without the conflict associated with incompatible gear types vying for the same salmon.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The current situation will continue to escalate, producing frustration among the participating fishermen and preventing an orderly fishery from occurring.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The gillnet fleet is not equipped to handle the large volumes associated with the pink salmon fishery. This has led to quality problems because gillnetters have had to wait for tenders, or have not had markets and either dumped fish or had

poor quality fish delivered to market. This quality issue hurts the salmon industry as a whole, but the statewide seine fisheries in particular since most seine revenue is derived from pink salmon that now go primarily to the fresh and frozen markets.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** This proposal will benefit the seine fleet and the quality of product delivered to market.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The gillnet fleet will suffer in the sense that individual fishermen will not be able to participate in the fishery. However, since PWSAC is shifting cost recovery from chums to pinks, the gillnetters are realizing the economic benefit of the pink salmon without having to pick them. As cost recovery is shifted from pinks to chums, the gillnet fleet enjoys more common property chum opportunities than they would otherwise have.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Alternating days and/or having the gillnet fleet fish at night were considered and rejected primarily for quality reasons due to the high volumes of the pink salmon that enter the Esther subdistrict from July 10 until Labor Day. Also, there is already considerable numbers of gillnetters illegally “rocking down” and fishing part of their nets on the beach contrary to regulation. It is likely that if fishing is permitted at night that there would be enforcement issues with “rocking down” and fishing outside the legal boundaries.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-234)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 24.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections; 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan.** Redefine the Coghill District boundary and open the district on an alternating gear type basis as follows:

Coghill District: (f) Coghill District: waters north [AND WEST] of a line from [POINT PIGOT (60°N, 48.21' N. LAT., 148°W, 20.90' W. LONG.) TO A POINT WEST OF POINT CULROSS AT 60°N, 45.45' N. LAT., 148°W, 11.07' W. LONG. AND FROM POINT CULROSS (60°N, 45.58' N. LAT., 148°W, 08.74' W. LONG.) TO A POINT WEST OF CULROSS LIGHT AT 60°N, 45.16' N. LAT., 148°W, 07.87' W. LONG. TO POINT PERRY (60°N, 45.05' N. LAT., 147°W, 57.62' W. LONG.) TO THE WEST ISLAND OF THE BALD HEAD CHRIS ISLANDS AT 60°N, 47.97' N. LAT., 147°W, 51.62' W. LONG. TO A POINT ON THE MAINLAND AT 60°N, 49.33' N. LAT., 147°W, 51.12' W. LONG.] **From Point Pakenham (Lat, Long) to the promontory on the north side of Esther Passage (lat, long).**

(A) [EXCEPT AS OTHERWISE PROVIDED IN THIS SECTION, DRIFT GILLNET GEAR MAY BE OPERATED THROUGHOUT THE DISTRICT DURING PERIODS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER]; **The Coghill District shall be open on an alternating basis for drift gillnet and seine gear. In odd years, the drift gillnet fleet shall have the first opening, and thereafter alternating openings with the purse seine fleet. In even years, the purse seine fleet shall have the first opening and thereafter alternating openings with the drift gillnet fleet.**

**ISSUE:** This proposal requests that the Board open the Coghill district north of a line from Pt. Pakenham to a point on the north side of Esther Passage on an alternating gear type basis. One of the greatest threats to the economic viability of the seine fleet is the lack of time and area to harvest salmon species other than hatchery pink returns. The Coghill Lake sockeye stocks are chronically under-utilized by the drift gillnet fleet and would provide an additional opportunity to the seine fleet.

Furthermore, as PWSAC continues to take more cost recovery from pink salmon to pay for the production of predominately gillnet allocated sockeye and chum returns, the seine fleet faces even fewer harvest opportunity on pink salmon stocks, increasing the economic risk to the fleet which could be alleviated by some wild sockeye harvest opportunity.

Additionally, wild salmon stocks were removed from the current allocation plan with no regard to how this would affect the seine fleet. Currently, the only early wild stock opportunity for the seine fleet is the regular openings in the Unakwik district which are open to both seine and gillnet gear types. The Unakwik sockeye return is a historically small run with harvests anywhere from hundreds of salmon up to ten thousand salmon. This begs the question: If the small Unakwik sockeye salmon return is able to sustain regularly scheduled openings for both gear types, then why not the more abundant and under-utilized Coghill stocks?.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The seine fleet will continue to be a one dimensional fishery composed solely of enhanced pink salmon opportunity except in those seasons when wild pink stocks are abundant enough to support a common property fishery.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No, this is an allocative issue.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** This proposal would benefit the seine fleet.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** This proposal would have a minor detrimental impact on the gillnet fleet, particularly in years when more cost recovery is taken from Esther chums and the terminal harvest area is not available. Also, some chum salmon may be taken on the south line that may be strays from the Esther enhanced return.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Another possible solution would be to provide regular openings in the Northwest District during June and July to provide opportunity for the seine fleet to harvest wild pink and chum salmon that are now intercepted by the drift gillnet fleet. This idea was rejected because it was unlikely that the department would agree to regular harvest opportunity in the northwest district with the current wild stock interception that occurs and the allocative thicket the incidental harvest of Main Bay sockeye and Esther chums would create should the seine fleet have such a harvest opportunity.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-237)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 24.370. Packers Creek Sockeye Salmon Management Plan.** Drift gillnet group will have exclusive access to AFK chum salmon as follows:

The drift gillnet group will have exclusive access to the chum salmon fishery at the AFK PWSAC hatchery at San Juan in Prince William Sound. The same seasonal start and end dates will be used, as will be used for the exclusive access that the gillnetters will have to the Wally Norenberg PWSAC hatchery at Esther.

**ISSUE:** The drift gillnet gear group (S03E) is far behind the purse seine group (S01E) in the PWS Salmon Allocation Plan. This has been the result of a very large increase in pink salmon prices.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The drift gillnet gear group will not receive their fair share of the allocation.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** PWS drift gillnet group.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** PWS purse seine group that is now far ahead of the gillnet group in the allocation.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The drift gillnet gear group could have more access to the pink salmon fishery but that could lead to poorer fish quality because of harvest methods.

**PROPOSED BY:** John Lorentzen (SC-F11-020)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan.** Reallocate chum for the seine fleet in Port Chalmers as follows:

The regulations would be rewritten to reflect the time and area available to the seine fleet prior to the “piggy bank” allocative model.

**ISSUE:** Return the Port Chalmers remote release chum return to the seine fleet to spread out the economic risk to the seine fleet.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The seine fleet will continue to be a one dimensional fishery composed solely of enhanced pink salmon opportunity except in those seasons when wild pink stocks are abundant enough to support a common property fishery.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No, this is an allocative issue.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** This proposal would benefit the seine fleet.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** This proposal would remove some time and area from the gillnet fleet.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Another solution considered is expanded area and removal of the July start date for the seine fishery in the southwest district, included as another proposal. Returning this area to the seine fleet would spread out the economic risk to the seine fleet and provide for a more orderly fishery than what is currently available in the AFK terminal harvest area.

The status quo was rejected as placing too much risk of economic failure on the seine fleet in the years of low pink salmon abundance, such as occurred in 2009.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-238)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 24.368 Big River Sockeye Salmon Management Plan.**  
Discontinue remote release of chum salmon at Port Chalmers and release them at Wally Noerenberg Hatchery as follows:

The remote release of chum salmon at Port Chalmers should be discontinued and those salmon should be released at the Wally Noerenberg Hatchery at Esther instead. History shows that remote release salmon have a far poorer return rate than salmon released at the hatchery they were raised.

**ISSUE:** The disastrous return rate of remote release chum salmon at the PWSAC remote release site at Port Chalmers in Prince William Sound.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The average individual drift gillnetter will receive thousands of dollars more in income if a similar return rate is realized, as has been in the past, for the chum salmon that have been released at the Esther Hatchery.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Drift gillnet gear group.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Purse seine gear group.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The drift gillnet gear group could have more access to the pink salmon fishery but that could lead to poorer fish quality because of harvest methods.

**PROPOSED BY:** John Lorentzen (SC-F11-023)  
\*\*\*\*\*



**PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan.** Eliminate the mandatory closure prior to July 18 and amend fishing time and area provisions for the Southwestern District as follows:

2) Southwestern District:

(A) [THE DISTRICT IS CLOSED TO SALMON FISHING BEFORE JULY 18;]

(B) [ON OR AFTER JULY 18,] **Bi-weekly 12 hour fishing periods beginning June 1 shall be established by the department,** based on the strength of **chum and** pink salmon stocks, purse seine fishing periods may be [OPENED] **expanded or reduced** by emergency order;

**(C) The San Juan subdistrict shall be opened by emergency order to facilitate an orderly harvest of chum salmon returning to the AFK hatchery.**

The regulations would be rewritten to remove the July start date and provide expanded area for the AFK chum harvest.

**ISSUE:** Remove the mandatory July opening date for the Southwest district to provide more early opportunity for the seine fleet, particularly on the capes, and also to provide additional time and area for the orderly harvest of AFK enhanced chum salmon returns. Currently, the seine fleet is restricted to within the terminal harvest area during June and early July. This is problematic because the current area open only allows for two nets to be in the water at one time, and with the current size of the seine fleet, it is now common to have to wait two to three days just for one turn on the set.

Additionally, a weekly or bi-weekly fishing period district wide would provide the department with data on run entry and composition to be used in making management decisions. Should wild stock data indicate that reduced fishing time is warranted, the department has the authority to restrict time and area to protect wild stocks. Although some undesirable harvest of discreet wild stocks may occur, it is unlikely that a one or two day per week opening would have long term detrimental effects to the sustainability of those stocks.

Also, the department utilizes an aggregate escapement goal model for PWS. However, management decisions appear to be made based upon discreet stock analysis. Weekly or bi-weekly openings are compatible with the aggregate escapement goal model and are used extensively in other areas, such as Kodiak.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The seine fleet will continue to spend most of its time waiting for one turn every two to three days. A fishery in which only two boats can make a set at one time is inefficient and incurs great cost on those vessels participating.

Management decisions will continue to be made on unreliable test boat and aerial survey information at further cost to the State of Alaska and the seine fleet.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, better data and some limited harvests outside the terminal harvest areas will increase flesh quality of the salmon harvested.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** This proposal would benefit the seine fleet.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some interception of gillnet allocated enhanced salmon will undoubtedly occur.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The status quo was considered and rejected because the restrictions placed on the AFK terminal chum harvest are draconian and unworkable. A fishery in which only two vessels can deploy a net at one time is ill-conceived and inefficient.

Another option is to open the San Juan subdistrict during the AFK chum return and allow the department to manage the Southwest district by E.O. authority based upon the strength of wild and enhanced salmon returns. This option was rejected because it is unlikely that the department would actually open any seine area due to political pressure from the gillnet fleet.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-239)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 24.370. Packers Creek Sockeye Salmon Management Plan.**  
Modify the cost-recovery salmon harvest in PWS as follows:

All non-pink salmon PWSAC cost recovery from salmon harvests that would otherwise be harvested by the drift gillnet group will be discontinued as long as the drift gillnet group is more than 5% behind the purse seine group in the 50-50 allocation. The offset will be made up by additional cost recovery taken from pink salmon harvests.

**ISSUE:** The drift gillnet gear group (S03E) is far behind the purse seine group (S01E) in the PWS Salmon Allocation Plan. This has been the result of a very large increase in pink salmon prices.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?**

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Drift gillnet gear group.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Purse seine gear group.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The drift gillnet gear group could have more access to the pink salmon fishery but that could lead to poorer fish quality.

**PROPOSED BY:** John Lorentzen (SC-F11-021)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 24.370. Packers Creek Sockeye Salmon Management Plan.** Increase period of time used in calculation of allocation in PWS allocation plan as follows:

The current five year ex-vessel value time period that is now being used to figure the allocation will be extended to eight years as it is unlikely that the gillnetters will catch up to the seiners in only five years, even if there are additional concessions given by the Board of Fisheries at this meeting - - as the gillnetters are tens of millions of dollars behind the seiners in the allocation.

**ISSUE:** The drift gillnet gear group (S03E) is far behind the purse seine group (S01E) in the PWS Salmon Allocation Plan. This has been the result of a very large increase in pink salmon prices.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Gillnetters will not receive their fair share of the allocation.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Drift gillnet gear group.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Purse seine gear group.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The drift gillnet gear group could have more access to the pink salmon fishery but that could lead to poorer fish quality because of harvest methods.

**PROPOSED BY:** John Lorentzen (SC-F11-022)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 24.378. Use of aircraft unlawful.** Amend regulation regarding use of aircraft in PWS commercial fishery as follows:

If enforcement of 5 AAC 24.378 is not feasible, then eliminate the regulation.

**ISSUE:** It is my observation that aircraft are being used during open commercial fishing periods. I think enforcement is either lax or impossible. I would like to see enforcement of 5 AAC 24.378 or barring that, make flying legal for all participants.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Certain groups will maintain an unfair competitive advantage.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All commercial users will have equal opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

## **OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Ken Jones

(HQ-F11-077)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan.** Reduce hatchery production of chum salmon in PWS as follows:

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

**ISSUE:** Over production of chum salmon by the private, not-for-profit hatcheries. In January, 2001, these hatchery managers promised the Governor and the Board of Fisheries that they would reduce hatchery production of chum salmon by 24% and never increase it again. This promise has not been kept.

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

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Subsistence, commercial, and sport fishers throughout the region will benefit from passage of this proposal because of the importance of wild salmon stocks to present and future generations. The genetic diversity of wild stocks will provide for future needs as Alaskans face climate change. Wildlife populations dependent upon the returning wild stocks will benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. The false “commercial” entity created by the hatchery production will be reduced.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (HQ-F11-140)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 24.XXX. New Regulation.** Reduce hatchery production of chum in PWS as follows:

Reduce hatchery chum production as follows: Reduce hatchery production to 24% of the year 2000 production.

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

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

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

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

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

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Fairbanks Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-213)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 24.XXX. New Regulation.** Add restrictions on homepack from commercial fishing as follows:

Set a limit on homepack salmon to match the sport fishing possession limit, and prohibit any homepack for commercial fishers who engage in the Copper River Delta salmon subsistence fishery

**ISSUE:** Prohibit “homepack” of Copper River salmon, or limit homepack to the sport bag limit for the species caught, in the area caught, and to require a sport fish license for any salmon and a king salmon and harvest stamp card for kings retained as homepack. Allowing commercial fishers and their crew to convert their commercial harvest for personal consumption without a limit gives a preference above all other Alaskans who wish to catch and retain salmon for personal consumption.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Commercial fishers and their crew will continue to harvest and eat unlimited amounts of Copper River salmon while all other Alaskans who wish to harvest and eat these same salmon must purchase a license and adhere to strict daily and yearly possession limits.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Alaskan who believe in equal access to our commonly owned salmon resources. Commercial fishers should not have a preference to harvest salmon for personal consumption simply because of their occupation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Fairbanks Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-206)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan.**  
Establish an optimal escapement goal for Copper River Chinook salmon as follows:

The optimum escapement goal (OEG) for Copper River Chinook should be 30,000. The average escapement from 1999-2008 was 30,221.

**ISSUE:** Too low of BEG for Copper River Chinook. We would like the Board to conduct an escapement goal review and suggest that an appropriate goal should be an O.E.G. of 30,000 Chinook.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued unsustainable exploitation rates of early run Chinook based on artificially low BEG of 24,000.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The escapement goal prior to the current 24,000 BEG was a range of 28,000-55,000. The average escapement from 2004-2008 was 35,535. In 2009

and 2010 commercial harvest was less than 10,000. Upriver fisheries were shut down, or severely restricted, and escapement averaged 23,143. Continued management for a BEG of 24,000 is unsustainable. It allows commercial managers to over exploit the early returning stocks. A 94.9% exploitation rate occurred in May 2005, causing the commercial fishery to be closed from June 18-July 6 during which time the sonar goal was met with hatchery sockeye and the king escapement, for the year, totaled only 21,502.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. An OEG based of the ten year average escapement would promote recovery of depressed Chinook stocks and help prevent future restrictions on upriver fisheries or commercial closers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** N/A.

**PROPOSED BY:** Fairbanks Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-208)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed Waters.** Restrict commercial fishing inside barrier islands prior to June 15 as follows:

The Copper River District commercial fishery shall be conducted entirely outside the barrier islands until June 15.

**ISSUE:** Repeated poor escapement of early kings and wild sockeye. The inside closure mandated by the Board since 2003 during statistical weeks 20 and 21 have not been effective in rebuilding the early run component.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued unsustainable exploitation rates of early run king and wild sockeye.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Chronic overharvest of the early run component have resulted in 1) numerous restrictions on upriver fisheries, 2) failure to meet minimum Chinook escapement goals in 2002, 2005, and 2010 and 3) substantially reduced harvest levels of early season kings and sockeye. A complete commercial closure from June 18-July 6, 2005 because 21,104 Chinook were harvested by May 23, and sonar counts were less than 50% of the objective. The quality of the harvest will improve for all users when the early run rebuilds and provides a sustainable commercial fishery throughout the entire season. With higher escapement of early run (upriver) subsistence users will benefit with reliable returns. Fishery managers will not continue with ultraconservative management in season closures or restrictions, and reliance of late run fish to meet sockeye escapement goals.

Commercial managers will not have to guess as to the strength and timing of early run salmon when setting opening in May and early June. A reliable schedule of outside openings will spread

out the harvest on all stocks and help prevent closures caused by unsustainable harvest during early season commercial fishing in the mouth of the Copper River.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The salmon, ADF&G managers, and ultimately all users.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The commercial fleet in the short term while the early run stocks rebuild.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Setting a minimum escapement past the sonar before inside openings. Rejected due to unreliability of sonar deployments.

**PROPOSED BY:** Fairbanks Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-209)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed waters.** Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Copper River District as follows:

(1) Copper River District:

(A) within a line [FROM GOVERNMENT ROCK TO A POINT 500 YARDS SEAWARD OF THE JUNCTION OF MOUNTAIN SLOUGH, CENTER SLOUGH, AND EYAK RIVER, THEN EAST WITHIN A LINE BOUNDED BY ADF&G REGULATORY MARKERS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY TWO MILES SEAWARD OF THE GRASS BANKS, AND AT ALL TIMES WITHIN SLOUGHS AND IN BOSWELL BAY WITHIN THE BAY] from Whitshed Point south to a point at 60° 26.49' N. lat., 145° 52.86' W. long. to a point at Alaganik Slough North at 60° 24.65' N. lat., 145° 36.70' W. long. to a point at Pete Dahl East at 60° 20.44' N. lat., 145° 29.14' W. long. to a point at West Kokenhenik at 60° 14.88' N. lat., 145° 10.01' W. long. to a point at East "East Side" at 60° 14.83' N. lat., 145° 03.36' W. long. to a point at Coffee Creek East at 60° 14.19' N. lat., 144° 58.01' W. long. to a point at Charlie Mohr North at 60° 15.15' N. lat., 144° 56.43' W. long. to a point at Martin River North at 60° 15.29' N. lat., 144° 52.52' W. long. to a point on Strawberry Reef at 60° 13.93' N. lat., 144° 50.66' W., long. and at all times within sloughs and in Boswell Bay within the bay; ;

(B) except as provided in 5 AAC 24.361(b), the inside closure area defined as all waters north of line from [THE STEAMBOAT ANCHORAGE MARKER TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED AT THE EASTERN BOUNDARY OF COPPER SANDS TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED AT THE WESTERN END OF THE GRASS ISLAND BAR TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED AT THE EAST END OF THE GRASS ISLAND BAR TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED AT THE WESTERN END OF THE KOKENHENIK BAR TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED ON THE EASTERN TIP OF THE KOKENHENIK BAR TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED ON THE WESTERN TIP OF THE SOFTUK BAR TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED AT COFFEE CREEK; BEFORE THE FIRST OPENING OF THE SEASON, THE DEPARTMENT WILL RELOCATE AND REINSTALL THE ADF&G REGULATORY MARKERS LISTED IN THIS SUBPARAGRAPH; IN THE FIRST EMERGENCY ORDER ISSUED FOR THE SEASON, THE COMMISSIONER WILL ANNOUNCE THE EXACT LOCATIONS OF THE REGULATORY MARKERS, BASED



ON THE MARKERS GPS LOCATION, THAT WILL DEFINE THE INSIDE CLOSURE AREA FOR THE SEASON; THE DEFINED INSIDE CLOSURE WILL REMAIN IN EFFECT UNLESS SUPERSEDED BY ANOTHER EMERGENCY ORDER;] a point at Steamboat South at 60° 22.31' N. lat., 145° 33.50' W. long. to the west side of the Pete Dahl entrance at 60° 18.89' N. lat., 145° 30.99' W. long. to the western end of the Grass Island Bar at 60° 18.30' N. lat., 145° 28.42' W. long. to the eastern end of Grass Island Bar at 60° 15.24' N. lat., 145° 17.89' W. long. to the western end of Kokenhenik Bar at 60° 15.00' N. lat., 145° 16.20' W. long. to the eastern tip of Kokenhenik Bar at 60° 13.65' N. lat., 145° 09.46' W. long. to the western tip of Softuk Bar at 60° 13.68' N. lat., 145° 05.78' W. long. to Coffee Creek West at 60° 14.13' N. lat., 144° 58.31' W. long.;

**ISSUE:** Painted plywood signs are no longer placed annually to mark the location of the grass bank line or the king salmon inside closure area referred to in 5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan. Beginning in 2010, these points have been identified using latitude and longitude coordinates. The coordinates specified were put into place by emergency order (EO) in 2010 and 2011.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Obsolete language referring to plywood markers will remain in regulation for area managers to amend by EO annually.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Both commercial and subsistence stakeholders will benefit from clear regulations describing fishing area in the Copper River District.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-284)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 55.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for Prince William Sound Area.** Increase sockeye salmon bag limit and allow snagging in Eshamay Bay as follows:

Daily bag and possession limits for salmon, except king salmon, are 6 per day/12 in possession, of which only 3 per day /6 in possession may be sockeye salmon and only 3 per day/3 in possession may be coho salmon, no size limit. **Daily bag limit for sockeye salmon will be increased to 6 per day/12 in possession by emergency order when sockeye salmon escapement reaches 20,500 at the Eshamy weir.**

Eshamy Lagoon **will be closed to sport fishing for sockeye salmon** [IS CLOSED TO SNAGGING] inside ADF&G markers on the lagoon shore (about ½ mile on either side of the

ADF&G cabin) **if determined by ADF&G that the minimum escapement goal will not be reached.** [UNTIL ADF&G ANNOUNCES THE ESCAPEMENT GOAL WILL BE MET.]

**ISSUE:** Inequitable division of sport/commercial sockeye salmon in western Prince William Sound. Average commercial harvest of sockeye in western Prince William Sound from 2005-2009 was approximately 774,000 fish. Average sport harvest in western Prince William Sound during the same period was about 5300 fish. Snagging is prohibited inside and ADF&G marker at Eshamy Lagoon until escapement has been met yet commercial drift netters are allowed to fish inside the markers before escapement goals are met. Commercial catch based on Eshamy and Coghill District drift and setnet harvests plus southwestern seine harvest. Sport harvest information is from sport fish survey data. I found no recent data specific to Eshamy sport harvest.)

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued inequitable division of sockeye salmon in western Prince William Sound.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal is intended to improve sport fish harvest for sockeye salmon in western Prince William Sound.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport fishermen in western Prince William Sound.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial fishermen harvest of sockeye salmon in western Prince William Sound could be reduced by 1-2% if this proposal is adopted, reducing their percentage to 97-98%..

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** David Pinguoch (HQ-F11-144)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 55.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for Prince William Sound Area.** Reduce sockeye salmon bag and possession limit in PWS as follows:

The bag and possession limit for sockeye salmon in all waters of Prince William Sound is 3 per day and 6 in possession. The bag and possession limit for sockeye salmon in Coghill (all waters of Port Wells north of Pakenham Point) and all the waters of Main Bay and on the Copper River Delta remain at 6 per day and 12 in possession.

**ISSUE:** Over harvest of small sockeye salmon stocks. Sport fishing effort directed toward small sockeye salmon runs has increased greatly since the tunnel to Whittier has been opened to auto traffic. These small sockeye salmon stocks, for example Gun Boot Lakes, and Jackpot, are only a few hundred fish. They are concentrated in small locations and are easily caught. At times I have seen as many as 30 boats, both guided and unguided anglers fishing off the mouths

of these streams. At the current bag/possession limit set at 6/12, these stocks can easily be over harvested, and appear to be so each year.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** These small native runs will cease to exist.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it helps to maintain natural sockeye salmon runs throughout Prince William Sound and into the future.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All users.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Eliminate snagging, but this is not practical as sockeye in these areas do not readily bite. Also considered reducing the bag limit on charter boat fishermen, but this would be a long term solution, and would have many loopholes to enforce.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brian West (SC-F11-008)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 55.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for Prince William Sound Area.** Establish coho salmon limit for non residents in Hells Hole Freshwater fishery as follows:

Limit nonresidents to 1 coho a day from Hells Hole freshwater fishery (maybe salt water as well).

**ISSUE:** Over harvest of sport caught coho salmon from Hells Hole by nonresidents for the past several years a large group of nonresidents have camped at Hells Hole for several weeks during the peak of the coho run. (10+ people are usually with this group) They each keep 3 fish per day and rely on their transporter to pick up their limits each day (via boat) to take back to a lodge for freezing. If seas are too rough the fish spoil. Each person likely leaves the state with at least 50 cohos from Hells Hole. I have been told many of the fish are illegally sold in Europe to finance part of the fishing trip. Reducing nonresidents limit to 1 fish would still allow them to take a reasonable number of fish home. Including salt water in the regulation change would prevent cheating (claiming the fish were take in the salt when they were not).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A repeat of the Shelter Bay coho population decline.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No, simply a move to assure population sustainability.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All users over the long term.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A small number of transporters and or lodge owners who now enable the overharvest.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Season harvest limit for nonresidents likely to hard to enforce.

**PROPOSED BY:** David Grinde (HQ-F11-348)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 55.050. Waters closed to sport fishing.** Close Ibec Creek to sport fishing above the Copper River Highway as follows:

Ibec Creek would be closed to sport fishing 3 miles above the Copper River Highway.

**ISSUE:** Access to spawning habitat in the Ibec River System, to avoid the crowds some anglers are traveling into the spawning areas of the most productive system on the West Copper Delta.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Habitat degradation including serious bank erosion and removal of spawners late in the season.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, blushed spawning coho would finally have a safe haven in this important system.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All user groups who want sustainable coho returns to Ibec Creek.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The few sport fishermen who feel it is necessary to pursue coho to the spawning areas of Ibec Creek.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Closer at 2 mile spawning activity starts above 3 miles in Ibec.

**PROPOSED BY:** Copper River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-152)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 124 - 5 AAC 55.050. Waters closed to sport fishing.** Close 18 Mile Creek to sport fishing for coho as follows:

18 Mile Creek would be closed to sport fishing for coho north of a sign located just below the deep hole by the haystacks (a easily identifiable geologic feature) approximately 1000 yards from the confluence of algalic slough and 18 Mile Creek.

**ISSUE:** Access to spawning habitat in the 18 Mile System and removal of spawning salmon from a small road accessible system.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Habitat degradation including serious bank erosion and removal of spawners from a small creek that is very accessible.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, blushed spawning coho would finally have a safe haven in this small accessible system.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All user groups who want sustainable coho returns to the copper river delta.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Sport fishermen who feel it is necessary to pursue coho in the spawning areas of 18 Mile Creek.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Closing the entire creek too restrictive.

**PROPOSED BY:** Copper River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-153)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 55.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession and size limits, and methods and means for the Prince William Sound Area.** Amend Prince William Sound trout size regulations as follows:

(3) rainbow trout/steelhead/cutthroat trout

...

(C) in all other waters not specified in this paragraph, except the Copper River Delta Special Management Area specified in 5 AAC 55.033: may be taken from June 15 – April 14; bag and possession limit of two fish **with a minimum length of 11 inches and a maximum length of 16 inches**. [OF WHICH ONLY ONE PER DAY AND IN POSSESSION MAY BE 20 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; ANNUAL LIMIT OF TWO FISH 20 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; HARVEST IS TO BE RECORDED ON THE BACK OF THE SPORT FISHING LICENSE; FOR ANGLERS NOT REQUIRED TO HAVE A SPORT FISHING LICENSE, A HARVEST RECORD MAY BE OBTAINED WITHOUT CHARGE FROM DEPARTMENT OFFICES AND FISHING LICENSE VENDORS IN THE PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AREA.]

**PROBLEM:** Prince William Sound (PWS) represents the northern and western edge of the natural distribution of coastal cutthroat trout. While the presence of cutthroat trout has been documented for several stream and lake systems in PWS, the presence or absence of cutthroat is unknown for the majority of freshwater systems. Both resident and anadromous forms of this species have been identified in PWS. Anadromous populations are typically comprised of fewer than 1,500 individuals. The status of the cutthroat trout populations in PWS is unknown. Anadromous cutthroat trout populations in the sound were one of the few fish species determined to be impacted by the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and their recovery has not been determined. Since the tunnel to Whittier opened in 2001 fishing effort in PWS has increased, while the catch and harvest of cutthroat trout has declined.

Department studies conducted on cutthroat trout after the Exxon Valdez oil spill indicate PWS cutthroat trout typically reach sexual maturity at 11 inches and that a small proportion of each population exceeds a length of 16 inches. Using this data to manage PWS trout stocks is more appropriate than the more liberal statewide standards described in 5 AAC 75.220(c) Statewide management standards for wild trout.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The status of PWS cutthroat stocks is unknown and no fisheries-independent monitoring is in place to determine optimum harvest levels. Existing regulations may not be adequate to ensure the sustained use of some cutthroat trout populations (e.g., small anadromous populations).

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public will benefit by better ensuring the sustained use of cutthroat trout stocks.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Anglers who harvest cutthroat trout smaller than 11 inches and larger than 16 inches.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-313)

\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Areas.** Allow king salmon fishing on Gulkana River five days per week June 10 - August 10 as follows:

King salmon fishing on the Gulkana River will be open for five days per week, Tuesday 12:01 am thru Saturday 11:59 pm. June 10—August 10.

**ISSUE:** The king salmon escapement has been below target levels for the past 5 years. This is due to a number of factors, some of which cannot be controlled by regulation and some that can. ADF&G has the power to institute emergency closures on the Gulkana fishery during the season, but this is not always an effective tool. By the time an emergency closure is deemed necessary, it is often too late to produce the desired result. Also---emergency closures have a very negative effect on those who need to plan their vacation well in advance---suddenly they find that they can't fish.

On years when the water levels are low, king salmon are very vulnerable to over fishing on the Gulkana. It cannot be compared to larger rivers that are tougher to fish.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued low king escapements on the Gulkana.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen who desire a sustainable salmon fishery. Fishermen who need to plan vacation time in advance.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Possibly some fish guides.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Earlier season end date. Timed closures; 6:00 pm to midnight. We rejected these because the solution we propose seemed more equitable and carries with it less potential problems.

**PROPOSED BY:** Paxson Fish & Game Advisory Committee (SC-F11-003)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Areas.** Restrict guided sport fishery when commercial fishery is restricted as follows:

If the commercial fishery is closed for conservation measures on the inside waters during the commercial season at least one conservation measure will be instituted on the guided sport fishery. be it A, B, C or D.

**ISSUE:** The disconnect between conservation measures on the downriver and upriver commercial fisheries.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Upriver commercial guides gaining from "conservation" restrictions on the commercial drift fleet.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All users as stability will ensue.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Limited entry for commercial salmon guides on Upper Copper River, Board of Fisheries has failed to address for decades.

**PROPOSED BY:** Shawn Gilman (HQ-F11-031)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 52.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area; 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession and size limits, and methods**

**and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.** Establish a limit for shipping of fish out of state for nonresident sport fishermen as follows:

A valid nonresident sport fishing license entitles the bearer to ship on daily bag limit of each legal species out to the State of Alaska per year. All shipped fish shall be in a form and with enough skin attached so species and quality can be easily determined. All shipping containers will be labeled with a signed ADF&G export tag identifying shipper, license number, quantity and species and granting law enforcement agents the permission to open and inspect the contents. In addition, an ADF&G furnished export report and harvest data survey will be mailed prior to the fish leaving the State of Alaska.

**ISSUE:** Lack of information and a limit on the amounts of nonresident sport caught fish leaving the State of Alaska from the Prince William Sound, Upper Copper River/Upper Susitna River Areas.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued lack of accurate and timely information on the exploitation rates of this potentially ever expanding user group, with possible impacts on Alaskans' fish resources due to delayed or uninformed management decisions.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Good and timely information on harvest rates and trends is vital to good resource management. Identifying potential abuses and/or illegal exploitation benefits the resource and us all.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Future generations – from both the lessening of potential abuses on the resource and the availability of good and timely information on which to base wise management decisions. Identifying potential abuses and/or illegal exploitation benefits the resource and us all.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nonresident fishermen who wish to take undocumented and unlimited quantities of fish out of the State of Alaska for whatever purpose will suffer the inconvenience of filing a report. This inconvenience can be lessened by providing nonresidents with the shipping label and report form on purchasing their license.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Making this regulation statewide, but it is not applicable this cycle.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ralph Lohse (HQ-F11-121)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 52.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area and; 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.** Modify lake trout regulations in four area lakes as follows:



5 AAC 52.022.

...

(2) in all lakes, except Crosswind Lake, Lake Louise, Paxson Lake, Summit Lake, Susitna Lake and Tyone Lake, bait and artificial lures may be used; in Crosswind Lake, Lake Louise, Paxson Lake, Summit Lake, Susitna Lake, and Tyone Lake, a hook and bait may be used only as follows:

(A) from April 16 – October 31, only unbaited, single-hook, artificial lures may be used;

(B) from November 1 – April 15, only single-hooks may be used; bait may be used;

5 AAC 52.023.

...

(5) in Crosswind Lake,

...

(B) the bag and possession limit for lake trout is one fish, with no size limit; [24 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; LAKE TROUT LESS THAN 24 INCHES IN LENGTH MAY NOT BE TAKEN OR POSSESSED AND MUST BE RETURNED TO THE WATER UNHARMED],

(13) in Lake Louise,

...

(D) the bag and possession limit for lake trout is one fish, with no size limit; [24 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; LAKE TROUT LESS THAN 24 INCHES IN LENGTH MAY NOT BE TAKEN OR POSSESSED AND MUST BE RETURNED TO THE WATER UNHARMED],

(21) in Susitna Lake,

...

(B) the bag and possession limit for lake trout is one fish, with no size limit; [24 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; LAKE TROUT LESS THAN 24 INCHES IN LENGTH MAY NOT BE TAKEN OR POSSESSED AND MUST BE RETURNED TO THE WATER UNHARMED],

(26) in Tyone Lake,

...

(D) the bag and possession limit for lake trout is one fish, with no size limit; [24 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; LAKE TROUT LESS THAN 24 INCHES IN LENGTH MAY NOT BE TAKEN OR POSSESSED AND MUST BE RETURNED TO THE WATER UNHARMED],

**ISSUE:** Lake trout fisheries in Lake Louise, Susitna, Tyone, and Crosswind lakes have been restricted to a bag and possession limit of one lake trout over 24 inches since 1994. However, harvest and catch (used to estimate 10% hooking mortality) data from the Statewide Harvest Survey indicate that total fishing mortality of Lake Louise lake trout has exceeded estimated sustained yield in 12 of the past 15 years. The Board of Fisheries adopted the Wild Lake Trout Management Plan

(5 AAC 52.060; WLTMP) at its December 2005 meeting, which provided management guidelines to maintain lake trout harvest in area lakes within sustained yield. To reduce overall harvest within sustained yield levels and to remain consistent with the WLTMP, the current size limit and use of bait during the open water period must be eliminated to reduce overall lake trout biomass removal. These changes are proposed for all four lakes to align regulations in these and other (Paxson and Summit lakes) large lake, lake trout fisheries within the management area and to prevent shifting of angler effort due to the bait restriction.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Lake trout stocks in Lake Louise could decline, requiring restrictive regulations that would affect this and other fisheries in the area.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes; eliminating the size limit to allow a broader range of harvest and restricting bait should maintain harvest within sustained yield estimates.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport anglers who enjoy fishing for lake trout.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Open water anglers who prefer to use bait.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Year-round bait restriction, in addition to the change in size limit; catch-and-release only.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-310)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Areas.** Establish a maximum size limit for lake trout in Lake Louise and Crosswind Lake as follows:

Lake trout 28 inches or greater in length must be immediately returned to the water. Trout under 28 inches in length may be kept, one per day, one in possession.

**ISSUE:** Inappropriate over harvest of mature, breeding trophy lake trout. Fisheries managers should focus on maintaining trophy lake trout for sport fishing, and thus maintain area and regional economic opportunities that benefit from a healthy trophy fish fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The lake trout sport fishery will decline with overharvest of the breeding trophy trout. This will adversely affect the economics in the immediate vicinity and the associated regional supporting enterprises, leading to significant contribution to poor economic conditions in this rural Alaska region.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, the smaller fish are a better quality for eating. There will be more trophy lake trout available to catch (and release) providing more opportunities for the

experience. This will support greater economic influx into the area businesses and communities who provide logistical technical support.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All sport lake trout fishermen, as well as the local and regional businesses that benefit from sport fishing enthusiast activities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The few people who are lucky enough to catch and want to keep the trophy fish for mounting (versus photo re-creation of the fish).

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Voluntary release of (trophy) lake trout 28 inches or greater in length. Not many people actually do release the trophy trout, they bring them home to show off, but never eat them. I've seen several people catch the trophy trout and not return them to the waters.

**PROPOSED BY:** Laurie Thorpe (HQ-F11-071)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*\*Note: This proposal is listed under both Subsistence and Sport Fishing for this meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Areas; 5 AAC 01.610. Fishing Seasons.** Establish lake trout spawning closures in Tyone Lakes complex as follows:

Close lake trout fishing on the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna, Lake Tyone Waterway from September 1<sup>st</sup> to October 15<sup>th</sup>.

**ISSUE:** The decline of quantity and quality of lake trout in the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna, Lake Tyone waterway. Being residents of Lake Louise and having fished the waterway since the mid-sixties - we and other Locals have seen a notable decline over the years. Especially in the last 15 - 20 years. The user base has changed with time, which has increased the demand on a slow growth resource. More and more boats fish the waterway every year - with their "high tech" electronics they are quite efficient at catching lake trout. Cormorants - (another user group) its just been in recent years that we have seen a large increase of Cormorants on this waterway. Another user group that has increased in recent years is the "freshwater fish subsistence permittees". Various user groups target spawning areas during the spawning cycle. The lake trout are extremely vulnerable in the shallow water areas during their spawning period. One of the triggers that's part of the spawning period is water temperature. Water temperature varies from year to year during that time. We have seen lake trout spawn from early September to mid-to late October.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The demand of user groups will continue to grow - which will increase strain on a fragile resource resulting in decline of supply. The fishery will suffer in numbers and quality as it has in recent years.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes - absolutely ! By allowing the spawners to spawn (unmolested by some user groups) the yield will more - which will increase the survival rate - which will add to the food supply - which will result in an overall increase of lake trout. Also, in time a recovery of larger lakers will improve quality of the resource. The larger lake trout have suffered a serious decline in recent years.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Present and future generation fishermen. The local, area wide and state economies.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wayne Simmons (HQ-F11-199)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 52.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.**  
Close Paxson and Summit lakes to lake trout fishing September 1 – October 1 as follows:

Paxson and Summit Lakes are closed to lake trout fishing from Sept. 1- Oct. 1.

**ISSUE:** Excessive lake trout catch during spawning.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Increasing high trout catch rates in late September when these fish are vulnerable in shallow water.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trout fishermen---by keeping Lake trout numbers near where they are presently.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who fish Paxson and Summit lakes during hunting season.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Different closure dates; Sept. 10-Oct. 1<sup>st</sup>. Rejected because there are some early trout spawners, especially in Paxson Lake. However discussion centered around as to whether this would be a balanced solution---protecting some trout while still allowing a trout fishery during hunting seasons.

**PROPOSED BY:** Paxson Fish & Game Advisory Committee (SC-F11-002)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 52.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.** Allow the use of bait October 1 – July 31 in Paxson and Summit lakes as follows:

In Paxson and Summit lakes, Single hook, bait allowed Oct. 1-July 31<sup>st</sup>.

**ISSUE:** Increase fishing opportunity for sport fishermen during selected times of the year. This proposal is part of structured proposals for these two lakes. By reducing spawning impacts and potential bycatch issues, the opportunity for trout fishing during optimum times of the year for most users can be slightly increased.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Nothing.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Not the quality of the fish, but rather the quality and the success rate in the fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The majority of sport fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Lifting the bait restriction for the entire season, Rejected as too liberal. Bait allowed Oct. 1---May 31, rejected as too restrictive. (considerable discussion).

**PROPOSED BY:** Paxson Fish & Game Advisory Committee (SC-F11-004)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 52.037. Freshwater guiding requirements.** Restrict guided sport fishery on Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

Restrict any guides before they get started there.

**ISSUE:** No commercial guiding on Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Overfishing. Depleted resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Less fish harvested, less pressure on this limited resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Families and people who fish as individuals.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one, as the guides have not yet established use of this fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Philip Iverson

(SC-F11-005)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 52.037. Freshwater guiding requirements.** Restrict guided sport fishery on Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

No guide fishing on the Lake Louise - Susitna system.

**ISSUE:** Eliminate guides on the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Lake Tyone system. I have lived in Alaska over sixty years. My favorite place to fish was the Kenai River. When guides became very thick there I left and went to the Deshka River. It was good fishing until guides started there. Then I went to Talkeetna to Clear Creek. I saw an altercation there. A family was stopped in the upper side of a hole fishing salmon. A guide came up and tied up in front of them and started fishing. A gun came out and much yelling and screaming. Then the guide pulled up and left.

I have fished Lake Louise – Lake Susitna for the past forty years. Ethics of true fishing is still there. Fishermen are courteous to other fishermen. The amount of fish in these lakes is limited. No one has abused it.

Lake trout are also found in Lake Tustumina, Lake Silak, and Hidden Lake. In Unit 13, lake trout are in Tangle Lakes, Paxson Lake, Copper Lake to name a few. I would like to think we could have Lake Louise – Susitna without guiding.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The lakes will be over-fished. It will curtail individual sport fishery.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. It would limit the number of fish taken.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** So far there are only one or two guides using these lakes, but if allowed they are likely to increase as has happened to the Kenai.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Probably no one, because as of yet this is not a fully used “guide” area. If guides are not encouraged to begin using it, it will remain for individuals, not commercial.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Gene Moe

(SC-F11-006)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.**  
Modify rainbow trout regulations in Summit Lake as follows:

5 AAC 52.023.

...

(23) in the Tebay River drainage,

(A) in Summit Lake,

(i) **repealed** [SPORT FISHING IS ALLOWED ONLY FROM  
JULY 1 – MAY 31;]

(ii) the bag and possession limit for rainbow/steelhead trout is 10 fish, which must be **14** [12] inches or less in length;

**ISSUE:** Summit Lake (a remote, high alpine lake in Wrangell-St. Elias National Park accessible only by aircraft) was barren of fish until rainbow trout were illegally stocked sometime around statehood. These fish grew exceptionally large in size (e.g., >32 in) and by the mid 1980s, the lake was well known for its trophy-sized fish. By 1999, the population had changed from a population dominated by larger-sized fish (e.g., >24 in) to a stunted population composed of smaller individuals (e.g., <10 in). The Board of Fisheries adopted a 10-fish bag limit, 12-inch maximum length, and spawning closure for rainbow trout in Summit Lake at its December 1999 meeting. In 2003, ADF&G initiated a long-term study to determine if a large-scale removal operation conducted over several years could change this population from its stunted state to a stable population composed of multiple size classes ranging up to 24 inches or greater. This project succeeded in creating a bi-modal size distribution of smaller and larger rainbow trout. Data from the project indicate that maximizing sport harvest of rainbow trout, up to 14 inches in length, is the most feasible regulatory means to attempt to maintain the improved size structure of the rainbow trout population in Summit Lake.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Once large-scale removal of rainbow trout is discontinued, the population will likely revert back to a stunted population.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes; anglers will be allowed to harvest a larger-sized fish and potentially catch trophy-sized rainbow trout.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport anglers who wish to harvest rainbow trout and anglers seeking a fishery for trophy-sized rainbow trout.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No bag limit.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-311)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 137 - 5 AAC 52.055. Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan.** Align the Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan with area regulations as follows:

**5 AAC 52.055. Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan.**

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

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

...

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

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

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

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

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-309)



\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.**  
Open Tolsona Lake to sport fishing for burbot as follows:

(24) in Tolsona Lake,

(A) **the bag and possession limit for burbot is two fish, with no size limit** [MAY NOT BE TAKEN OR POSSESSED AND MUST BE RETURNED TO THE WATER UNHARMED];

**ISSUE:** The Board of Fisheries closed the Tolsona Lake burbot fishery at its January 2003 meeting. The population had declined due to environmental factors and had been closed since 1998 by emergency order. The department has conducted annual stock assessment of the burbot population in Tolsona Lake since 1986 that has tracked the decline in the population and subsequent recovery. The department set a management objective requiring an estimated abundance of 1,500 burbot > 18 inches for two consecutive years to open the lake to sport fishing for burbot and ensure a sustainable fishery. Based on stock assessment, the population objective was achieved in 2008 and 2009.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Anglers will continue to be denied the opportunity to fish for burbot in a road-accessible lake.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes; allowing a burbot fishery will diversify sport fishing opportunity in Tolsona Lake which is currently stocked with rainbow trout and supports a wild Arctic grayling population.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport anglers who enjoy fishing for burbot.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-312)

\*\*\*\*\*.

**ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES**  
**January 15-21, 2012**  
**SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT KING AND TANNER CRAB; DUNGENESS CRAB,**  
**SHRIMP, MISCELLANEOUS SHELLFISH**

**PROPOSAL 139** - 5 AAC 77.60X. Applicability of personal use regulations in the Yakutat Area; and 5 AAC 77.65X. Applicability of personal use regulations in Southeast Alaska. Clarify where personal use shellfish regulations apply as follows:

5 AAC 77.60X. Applicability of personal use regulations in the Yakutat Area. **The personal use regulations in Article 13 only apply to areas not specified in 5 AAC 01.666 and 5 AAC 02.108.**

5 AAC 77.65X. Applicability of personal use regulations in the Southeast Alaska Area. **The personal use regulations in Article 14 only apply to areas not specified in 5 AAC 01.716 and 5 AAC 02.108 or that are identified as non-subsistence areas in the Ketchikan Nonsubsistence Area and the Juneau Nonsubsistence Area as specified in 5 AAC 99.015.**

**ISSUE:** There is confusion amongst the public what about which regulations they can fish under. If adopted, these regulations would clearly state that personal use regulations in Southeast Alaska and Yakutat do not apply to areas with positive customary and traditional use findings. For areas with positive customary and traditional use findings subsistence regulations in Chapters 1 and 2 of the Alaska Administrative Code would apply. Personal use regulations would only apply in non-subsistence areas and areas that do not have positive customary and traditional use findings which is consistent with the intent of the Alaska Board of Fisheries.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued confusion on the part of the public.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** No one. If adopted, this proposal merely clarifies where personal use regulations apply.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-282a)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 140** - 5 AAC 02.1XX. 5 AAC 77.6XX. 47.024. **Harvest record required; annual limit.** Establish a catch reporting system for subsistence, personal use, and sport shellfish fisheries as follows:

Require the use of a catch report card that can be returned by mail or online with the year split into a couple of seasons and a penalty if you fail to return your report on time. (see Washington State regulations regarding their Dungeness catch report card) <http://wdfw.wa.gov/fishing/shellfish/crab/crc.html>.

**ISSUE:** The sustainability of the resource. Without accurate accounting of all removals of the resource we are going to follow other states on both coasts and damage our resource by under-estimating what is harvested in total. This leads to judging the biomass inaccurately and setting commercial catch limits for fully utilized species at unsustainable levels from ignorance and not by intentionally overfishing the resource. Only the commercial data is being considered in the survival rate as it is the only data that is generated along with a little information provided from charter logbooks. We need all recreational harvests besides what is recorded in the charter logbooks, including personal use and subsistence harvests levels for shellfish species accounted for by the use of a catch report card like they use in Washington State for Dungeness crab.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Likely see a decline in most resources over time as we fish beyond sustainable levels.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Our fishery resources will remain sustainable.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** It will likely take a little bit of time on everyone's part.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The use of tags, with identifier numbers, harder to use on some species than others, but with the use of tags you would only be able to have in your possession, the number of tags for the possession limit of the species. Report cards are being used successfully in Washington State for accounting purposes so when with a system that is already established.

**PROPOSED BY:** Clay Bezenek (HQ-F11-176a)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Finfish meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 141 - 5 AAC 28.150. Closed waters in Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area; 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A; 5 AAC 38.XXX. Closed waters.** Prohibit fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Cache Island by all users as follows:

Establish Marine Conservation Zone around Cache Island. For indefinite: create a marine conservation zone around this tiny micro island where bottomfish and shellfish are prohibited from, fishing and harvesting. A no fishing boundary of 1500 feet from lands end will mark the conservation area. In conjunction with several islands being classified as marine conservation lands

in the Clover Pass area where development is prohibited on land; we are taking one step further and creating a conservation area for all bottomfish and shellfish surrounding the island.

**ISSUE:** Depleted bottomfish and shellfish stocks in the area. Crab shrimp and all mollusks.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fish stocks will never have a chance to regenerate from the pressures of overfishing and harvesting. Future generations will not have access to these limited resources.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Something is better than nothing at this point. By providing a small no fish area reduces stress on a limited supply of bottomfish whose populations are already overfished and stressed to the max. There has to be some effort to help conserve and repopulate the stocks that are left. Hope fully it is not too late.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bottomfish and shellfish and mollusks are first; a part of a natural food chain. The immediate benefit will be to those marine animals that feed on bottomfish, shellfish and mollusks. And to animals that feed on animals that feed off of bottomfish. Squid, octopus feed on bottomfish and are favorite foods for halibut. It is all interconnected. The greatest benefit will be the environment to help sustain the ecosystem. Ideally this no fish zone will regenerate and spill over stocks to regenerate surrounding areas.

Second; the next benefit will be to man. Whoever this resource user is; resident or nonresident, subsistence fishermen or guided fishermen, all users of a limited resource will benefit from natural fish, shellfish, mollusks stocks being managed and conserved for regeneration not only for this moment in time but for future generations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Users of a depleted bottomfish and shellfish stocks are already suffering from little if any proper management of these resources. No additional harm will increase what users are already experiencing.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Expand marine conservation zones around Naha Bay to Traitors Cove and all off shores areas in between.

Establish marine conservation zones for 10 year periods. Reopen zones for limited time periods to ensure regeneration of fish stocks.

Establish marine conservation zones for limited users. Allow fishing for only residents.

**PROPOSED BY:** Naha Conservation (HQ-F11-159)

\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Finfish meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 142 - 5 AAC 28.150. Closed waters in Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area; 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A; 5 AAC 38.XXX. Closed waters.** Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish in a portion of Behm Canal as follows:

Establish Marine Conservation Zone for limited users for off shore waters, bays, inlets and coves from Indian Point to Behm Canal area to Bushy Point and all coves and inlets in between. For indefinite: create a marine conservation zone around this point and surrounding islands and land points where bottomfish and shellfish stocks are open for resident fishing and harvest only. Nonresidents are prohibited from fishing and harvesting within this limited conservation zone. In conjunction with several islands being classified as Marine Conservation Islands in the Clover Pass area where development is prohibited on land; we are taking it one step further and creating a limited conservation area for all bottomfish and shellfish surrounding the bay and island.

**ISSUE:** Depleted bottomfish and shellfish stocks in the area. Crab, shrimp and all mollusks.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fish stocks will never have a chance to regenerate from the pressures of overfishing and harvesting. Future generations will not have access to these limited resources.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Something is better than nothing at this point. By providing a small no fish area for nonresidents reduces stress on a limited supply of bottomfish whose populations are already overfished and stressed to the max. There has to be some effort to help conserve and repopulate the stocks that are left.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bottomfish and shellfish and mollusks are first; a part of a natural food chain. The immediate benefit will be to those marine animals that feed on bottomfish, shellfish and mollusks. And to animals that feed on animals that feed off of bottomfish. Squid and octopus feed on bottomfish and are favorite foods for halibut. It is all inter-connected. The greatest benefit will be the environment to help sustain the eco system. Ideally this no fish zone will regenerate and spill over stocks to regenerate surrounding areas.

Second; the next benefit will be to man. Whoever this resource user is; resident or nonresident' subsistence fishermen or guided fishermen; all users of a limited resource will benefit from natural fish, shellfish, mollusks, stocks being managed and conserved for regeneration only for this moment in time but for future generations

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Users of a depleted bottomfish and shellfish stocks are already suffering from little if any proper management of these resources. No additional harm will increase what users are already experiencing.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Establish marine conservation zones open for resident fishing only for a 10 year period. Reopen zones for all fishing on a limited time period to ensure regeneration of fish stocks.

**PROPOSED BY:** Naha Conservation

(HQ-F11-162)

\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Finfish meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 143 - 5 AAC 28.150. Closed waters in Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area; 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A; 5 AAC 38.XXX. Closed waters.** Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Naha Bay as follows:

Establish Marine Conservation Zone for limited users from Naha Bay to Donnelly Point from Donnelly Point to Cache Island from Cache Island to Indian Point all places in between.

For indefinite: create a limited marine conservation zone around this bay and surrounding islands and land points where bottomfish and shellfish stocks are open for resident fishing and harvest only. Non residents are prohibited from fishing and harvesting within this limited conservation zone. In conjunction with several islands being classified as Marine conservation islands in the Clover Pass area where development is prohibited on land; we are taking in one step further and creating a limited conservation area for all bottomfish and shellfish surrounding the bay and islands.

**ISSUE:** Depleted bottomfish and shellfish stocks in the area. Crab, shrimp and all mollusks.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fish stocks will never have a chance to regenerate from the pressures of overfishing and harvesting. Future generations will not have access to these limited resources.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Something is better than nothing at this point. By providing a small no fish area for nonresidents reduces stress on a limited supply of bottomfish whose populations are already overfished and stressed to the max. There has to be some effort to help conserve and repopulate the stocks that are left.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bottomfish and shellfish and mollusks are first; a part of a natural food chain. The immediate benefit will be to those marine animals that feed on bottomfish, shellfish and mollusks. And to animals that feed on animals that feed off of bottomfish. Squid and octopus feed on bottomfish and are favorite foods for halibut. It is all inter-connected. The greatest benefit will be the environment to help sustain the eco system. Ideally this no fish zone will regenerate and spill over stocks to regenerate surrounding areas.

Second; the next benefit will be to man. Whoever this resource user is; resident or nonresident' subsistence fishermen or guided fishermen; all users of a limited resource will benefit from natural fish, shellfish, mollusks, stocks being managed and conserved for regeneration only for this moment in time but for future generations

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Users of a depleted bottomfish and shellfish stocks are already suffering from little if any proper management of these resources. No additional harm will increase what users are already experiencing.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Establish marine conservation zones open for resident fishing only for a 10 year period. Reopen zones for all fishing on a limited time period to ensure regeneration of fish stocks.

**PROPOSED BY:** Naha Conservation (HQ-F11-160)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Finfish meeting.*

**PROPOSAL 144 - 5 AAC 28.150. Closed waters in Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area; 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A; 5 AAC 38.XXX. Closed waters.** Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Cedar Island as follows:

Establish Marine Conservation Zone for limited users around Cedar Island. For indefinite: create a marine conservation zone around this tiny micro island where bottomfish and shellfish stocks are open for resident fishing only. Nonresidents are prohibited from fishing and harvesting within a no fishing boundary of 1500 feet from lands end will mark the conservation area. In conjunction with several islands being classified as Marine Conservation Islands in the Clover Pass area where development is prohibited on land; we are taking it one step further and creating a limited conservation area for all bottomfish and shellfish surrounding the island.

**ISSUE:** Depleted bottomfish and shellfish stocks in the area. Crab, shrimp and all mollusks.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fish stocks will never have a chance to regenerate from the pressures of overfishing and harvesting. Future generations will not have access to these limited resources.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Something is better than nothing at this point. By providing a small no fish area for nonresidents reduces stress on a limited supply of bottomfish whose populations are already overfished and stressed to the max. There has to be some effort to help conserve and repopulate the stocks that are left.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bottomfish and shellfish and mollusks are first; a part of a natural food chain. The immediate benefit will be to those marine animals that feed on bottomfish, shellfish and mollusks. And to animals that feed on animals that feed off of bottomfish. Squid and octopus feed on bottomfish and are favorite foods for halibut. It is all inter-connected. The greatest benefit will be the environment to help sustain the eco system. Ideally this no fish zone will regenerate and spill over stocks to regenerate surrounding areas.

Second; the next benefit will be to man. Whoever this resource user is; resident or nonresident' subsistence fishermen or guided fishermen; all users of a limited resource will benefit from natural fish, shellfish, mollusks, stocks being managed and conserved for regeneration only for this moment in time but for future generations

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Users of a depleted bottomfish and shellfish stocks are already suffering from little if any proper management of these resources. No additional harm will increase what users are already experiencing.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Establish marine conservation zones open for resident fishing only for a 10 year period. Reopen zones for all fishing on a limited time period to ensure regeneration of fish stocks.

**PROPOSED BY:** Naha Conservation (HQ-F11-161)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 145 - 5 AAC 77.010. Methods, means and general restrictions; 5 AAC 47.020. General provisions for seasons and bag, possession, annual, and size limits for the salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Reduce the shrimp pot limit for sport shrimp fishery as follows:

5 pots per person, with a maximum of 10 pots per vessel.

**ISSUE:** The number of sport shrimp pots that nonresidents can fish is too big. The current regulation allows 10 pots per person and 20 per vessel. The bag limit that was allowed with this pot number was 10 pounds or 10 quarts daily. Since the bag limit has been lowered to 3 pounds or 3 quarts daily, the number of pots that nonresidents are allowed to fish should be lowered as well. Way too many shrimp are being caught and some unneeded mortality is occurring from inexperienced shrimp handlers. Many shrimp on deck also provide temptation to go over the bag limit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Shrimp will be killed unnecessarily and nonresidents will continue to exceed the bag limit.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, there will be more available shrimp for both residents and nonresidents. Since more shrimp will survive in certain areas, bigger shrimp will be caught.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All fishers of Alaska because there will be more shrimp and more bigger ones available for harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nonresidents who over harvest Alaska's seafood.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**



**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Advisory Committee

(HQ-F11-149)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 146 - 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A.** Close sport fishing for Dungeness crab in areas closed to commercial fishing as follows:

Areas listed in 5AAC 32.150 Closed waters in Registration Area A will also be closed to sport harvest of Dungeness crab.

**ISSUE:** Currently in areas closed to commercial Dungeness fishing for allocation reasons it remains open to sport fishing.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Areas closed to commercial fishing so local needs can be met will continue to have sport fishing pressure. Generally areas have been closed to commercial fishing so local needs can be met but some of these areas have become high sport use areas and the commercial closure has done what it was designed to do.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Resident personal use fishermen and the resource as it will be harvested only by the people who the closure was implemented to help. All residents will be able to use these areas if this proposal is adopted because they can harvest under personal use regulations and this would only affect sport regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nonresidents as they will lose some areas to sport fish for Dungeness crab.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I considered listing these closed areas separately but they change with each Board of Fish cycle and this way will ensure that the list of closed areas to sportfishing remains current.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brennon Eagle

(HQ-F11-211)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 147 - 5 AAC 47.090. George Inlet superexclusive guided sport ecotourism Dungeness crab fishery.** Amend registration requirements for the George Inlet Superexclusive Guided Sport Ecotourism Dungeness Crab Fishery as follows:

The registration period taking place December 1 - January 2 would require that a business register itself and the number of vessels it intends to use in the exclusive fishery. There would no longer be a window set aside for a guide registration, although any guide registering for the fishery would have to be assigned to one of the companies that had registered itself and vessel(s) during the registration period. The guides would still be required to meet all of the current

requirements (e.g. sub paragraph b, First Aid & CPR, hold a valid State of Alaska fishing license) but would not be forced to register 6 months prior to the ecotourism season.

**ISSUE:** Sub paragraph (c) outlines the registration period for a sport fishing operator, sport fishing guide, or vessel owner to participate in the super exclusive fishery. The registration period begins December 1 and goes through January 2 of the year the fishing will take place. This registration period is months before the tourist season, which leaves open the possibility that a guide that was expected to participate in the fishery ultimately does not or cannot. Potential reasons may include health problems, separation of employment from the company, or the failure to meet other requirements for licensing.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If a company registers itself, its vessel, and also has two captains register based on offers of employment, the company could potentially face serious economic consequences as a result of things outside its control. For instance, if one of the captains were to come down with a serious illness that prevented him from working, the company would have no ability to hire an alternate guide because the registration period would have already been closed. Because of the strict requirements placed on these guides (i.e. they cannot participate in any other guided sport fishery) no guide would register for this fishery without knowing they were going to be offered a job. This leaves no reserve pool to draw from should a guide no longer be available to work for the registered company.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal would ensure that those interested in participating in this ecotour in George Inlet would have the opportunity to do so, even if a replacement guide was needed part way through the season. Under current regulations, if a company were to lose a guide mid-season, many people would lose the opportunity to participate in this tour.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Any company that had registered for the super exclusive fishery and then found themselves in need of a guide after the December 1 to January 2 registration period had ended.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Since only one company, Experience Alaska Tours (EAT), has traditionally registered for this fishery, there does not appear to be any other business or businesses that would be harmed should EAT be allowed to register guides outside the current registration period.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The only other solution would be for EAT to offer employment to reserve guides. This was rejected because either

A) A guided would not waive their rights to another fishery without knowing they were going to get compensated; and

B) Compensating reserve guides would significantly increase costs without generating any additional revenue.

**PROPOSED BY:** Experience Alaska Tours

(HQ-F11-015)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 148 - 5 AAC 34.111. Section 11-A Red and Blue King Crab Management and Allocation Plan.** Allocate all harvest of king crab in Section 11-A (Juneau area) to the personal use fishery as follows:

Amend 5AAC 34.111(a) by deleting the last sentence...[THE BOARD ALSO FINDS THAT THE COMMERCIAL USE OF RED AND BLUE CRAB IN SECTION 11-a IS HISTORIC, ECONOMICALLY IMPORTANT, AND SHOULD BE MAINTAINED]

Amend part (b) to read: The board authorizes the department to conduct the personal use [AND COMMERCIAL FISHERIES] according to the following...

Amend (b)(1) to read: (summer season) **90** [80] percent of the red king crab...

Amend by deleting sections (3) and (4)

**ISSUE:** We request the board reserve all king crab in the Section 11-A for the personal use fishery. The crab resource is not adequate to allow both commercial and personal use fishery for red king crab in this area. Both the commercial and personal use seasons have been closed due to depletion of the king crab stocks.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Personal Use and Commercial uses of king Crab stocks in 11-A will continue to result in boom or bust fisheries for both users. As a result the personal use fishermen that are limited to small vessels will be unable to participate in any king crab fishery.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Personal use crabbers will be able to continue crabbing in Section 11-A once the stock rebuilds and the season is opened. The boom or bust approach to king salmon management in the area will cease which should result in continued and consistent annual openings for the personal use fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial fishermen will have to focus on other areas outside of Section 11-A.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Territorial Sportsmen, Inc.

(HQ-F11-026)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 149 - 5 AAC 02.115. Subsistence Dungeness crab fishery; 5 AAC 02.120. Subsistence king crab fishery; 5 AAC 02.125. Subsistence Tanner crab fishery; 5 AAC 47.035. Methods, means, and general provisions – Shellfish; 5 AAC 77.612. Personal use Dungeness crab fishery; 5 AAC 77.614. Personal use king crab fishery; 5 AAC 77.616. Personal use Tanner crab fishery; 5 AAC 77.662; Personal use Dungeness crab fishery; 5 AAC 77.664;. Personal use king crab fishery; and 5 AAC 77.666. Personal use Tanner crab fishery.** Establish ring net limits for subsistence, sport, and personal use Dungeness and tanner crab fisheries as follows:

**5 AAC 02.115. Subsistence Dungeness crab fishery.**

...

**(7) no more than 10 ring nets per person with a maximum of 20 ring nets per vessel may be used to harvest Dungeness crab.**

**5 AAC 02.120. Subsistence king crab fishery.**

...

**(7) no more than 10 ring nets per person with a maximum of 20 ring nets per vessel may be used to harvest king crab.**

**5 AAC 02.125. Subsistence Tanner crab fishery.**

...

**(4) no more than 10 ring nets per person with a maximum of 20 ring nets per vessel may be used to harvest Tanner crab.**

**5 AAC 47.035 Methods, means, and general provisions – Shellfish.**

...

(c) no more than four pots and 10 ring nets, other than shrimp pots, per person with a maximum of 10 pots **and 20 ring nets**, other than shrimp pots, per vessel may be used in the taking of shellfish [OTHER THAN SHRIMP] at any time, except that no more than four pots **and 10 ring nets** per vessel may be used to take Tanner crab. No more than 10 additional shrimp pots per person with a maximum of 20 additional shrimp pots per vessel may be used in the taking of shrimp at any time.

**5 AAC 77.612. Personal use Dungeness crab fishery.**

...

**(6) no more than 10 ring nets per person with a maximum of 20 ring nets per vessel may be used to harvest Dungeness crab.**

**5 AAC 77.614. Personal use king crab fishery.**

...

**(5) no more than 10 ring nets per person with a maximum of 20 ring nets per vessel may be used to harvest king crab.**

**5 AAC 77.616. Personal use Tanner crab fishery.**

...

**(4) no more than 10 ring nets per person with a maximum of 20 ring nets per vessel may be used to harvest Tanner crab.**

**5 AAC 77.662. Personal use Dungeness crab fishery.**

...

**(6) no more than 10 ring nets per person with a maximum of 20 ring nets per vessel may be used to harvest Dungeness crab, except in waters described in 5 AAC 33.200 as Section 11-A where reduced pot and ring net limits will be consistent with pot and ring net limits imposed for king crab under 5 AAC 77.664.**

**5 AAC 77.664. Personal use king crab fishery.**

...

(c) In the waters described in 5 AAC 33.200 as Section 11-A, in the personal use taking of king crab,

(1) red and blue king crab may only be taken under the authority of a permit issued under 5 AAC 77.015;

(2) the daily bag and possession limit is three male king crab per person;

(3) the commissioner may close and immediately reopen, by emergency order, a personal use red and blue king crab season during which one or more of the following conditions applies:

(A) a reduced bag and possession limit;

(B) a seasonal limit for king crab;

(C) a reduced pot **and ring net** limit.

...

(f) Notwithstanding 5 AAC 77.010(i) no more than four pots **and 10 ring nets** per vessel may be used to take king crab. A pot used to take king crab under this section must have at least two escape rings on opposing vertical or sloping sides of the pot that are not less than six and one-quarter inches inside diameter.

**5 AAC 77.666. Personal use Tanner crab fishery.**

(a) **Except as provided in (b) of this section,** in the personal use taking of Tanner crab,

(1) Tanner crab may be taken only from July 1 through June 15;

(2) the daily bag and possession limit is 30 male Tanner crab;

(3) notwithstanding 5 AAC 77.010(i), no more than four pots **and 10 ring nets** per vessel may be used to take Tanner crab; a pot used to take Tanner crab under this section must have at least two circular escape rings on opposing vertical or sloping sides of the pot that each are not less than four and three-quarter inches inside diameter;

**(b) In the waters described in 5AAC 33.200 as Section 11-A, in the personal use taking of Tanner crab, reduced pot and ring net limits will be consistent with pot and ring net limits imposed in Section 11-A for king crab under 5AAC 77.664.**

**ISSUE:** The number of ring nets that may currently be used by an individual participating in the Southeast Alaska or Yakutat area subsistence or personal use crab fisheries or sport shellfish fisheries is not limited. This proposal establishes consistent limits for the number of ring nets a person is allowed and a maximum number of ring nets allowed per vessel in the subsistence and personal use crab fisheries, and the sport shellfish fisheries.

Additionally, personal use regulations under 5 AAC 77.664 specific to red king crab in the Southeast Alaska Area allow fishery managers to regulate possession limits for red king crab throughout the region during times of low or high stock abundance. These regulations also allow managers to regulate pot and ring net limits for the personal use red king crab fishery in the waters of Section 11-A. This proposal establishes ring limits for the subsistence and personal use king crab fishery in Southeast Alaska and Yakutat to provide consistency in the methods by which red king crab can be harvested. It will allow managers to more effectively manage personal use harvest of red king crab in the waters of Section 11-A in Southeast Alaska. In Section 11-A, managers target an allocated personal use harvest for red king crab during a summer and winter season; establishing consistent gear restrictions across crab species will maintain the required fishing effort needed to meet intentions outlined under 5 AAC 77.664.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Ring net limits will continue to be absent from subsistence, personal use, and sport fisheries. Inconsistencies in the department's ability to manage gear use in the waters of Section 11-A will continue.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public and enforcement will benefit by having clear and consistent subsistence, personal use, and sport fishery regulations that describe the allowable number of ring nets for harvest of shellfish in Southeast Alaska and Yakutat Areas. department staff will be able to more effectively manage red king crab personal use fisheries throughout Southeast Alaska and within the waters of Section 11-A.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Fishermen who have ring nets in excess of the limits allowed by this proposal.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-274)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 150 - 5 AAC 77.614. Personal use king crab fishery; 5 AAC 02.125. Subsistence Tanner crab fishery; and 5 AAC 77.616. Personal use Tanner crab fishery.** Establish king and tanner crab size limits in the personal use and subsistence fisheries as follows:

**5 AAC 77.614. Personal use king crab fishery.** In the personal use taking of king crab  
...

**(6) only male red and golden king crab seven inches or larger, and male blue king crab six and one-half inches or larger, in width of shell may be taken or possessed.**

**5 AAC 02.125. Subsistence Tanner crab fishery.** In the subsistence taking of Tanner crab  
...

**(5) only male Tanner crab 5.5 inches or greater in width of shell may be taken or possessed;**

**(6) male Tanner crab less than the minimum legal size and female Tanner crab that have been taken must be immediately returned unharmed to the sea.**

**5 AAC 77.616. Personal use Tanner crab fishery.** In the personal use taking of Tanner crab  
...

**(5) only male Tanner crab 5.5 inches or greater in width of shell may be taken or possessed;**

**(6) male Tanner crab less than the minimum legal size and female Tanner crab that have been taken must be immediately returned unharmed to the sea.**

**ISSUE:** Currently there are inconsistent and absent subsistence and personal use regulations that define size limits for king crab and Tanner crab in the Yakutat Area. For king crab, size limits exist in subsistence regulations under 5 AAC 02.120(3)(B), but do not exist under personal use regulations. No subsistence or personal use regulations currently define size limits for Tanner crab in the Yakutat area.

Size limits are an important management tool used to allow harvest on the segment of a crab population that has reached sexual maturity and has been allowed time to reproduce and contribute recruitment opportunity to the population. These regulations will provide that opportunity under the subsistence and personal use regulations, and will make size limits consistent for king and Tanner crab within the Yakutat Area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Inconsistencies will continue between subsistence and personal use regulations, and the public may harvest king and Tanner crab that are undersized, thereby negatively impacting recruitment success to local crab stocks.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public, department staff and enforcement officers will benefit by having clearly stated and consistent size limits for king and Tanner crab stated in regulation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-275)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 151** - 5 AAC 77.664. Personal use king crab fishery. 5 AAC 77.666. Personal use Tanner crab fishery; 5 AAC 77.614. Personal use king crab fishery; 5 AAC 77.616. Personal use Tanner crab fishery; 5 AAC 02.120. Subsistence king crab fishery; and 5 AAC 02.125. Subsistence Tanner crab fishery. Amend live holding regulations for personal use and subsistence king and Tanner crab fisheries as follows:

**5 AAC 77.664. Personal use king crab fishery.**

...

(e) [A PERSON MAY NOT UTILIZE A] live holding [FACILITY] facilities utilized to accumulate or pool multiple bag limits by an individual or individuals are prohibited.

**5 AAC 77.666. Personal use Tanner crab fishery.**

...

(6) [A PERSON MAY NOT UTILIZE A] live holding [FACILITY] facilities utilized to accumulate or pool multiple bag limits by an individual or individuals are prohibited.

**5 AAC 77.614. Personal use king crab fishery.**

...

(7) live holding facilities utilized to accumulate or pool multiple bag limits by an individual or individuals are prohibited.

**5 AAC 77.616. Personal use Tanner crab fishery.**

...

(7) live holding facilities utilized to accumulate or pool multiple bag limits by an individual or individuals are prohibited.

**5 AAC 02.120. Subsistence king crab fishery.**

...

(8) live holding facilities utilized to accumulate or pool multiple bag limits by an individual or individuals are prohibited.

**5 AAC 02.125. Subsistence Tanner crab fishery.**

...

(7) live holding facilities utilized to accumulate or pool multiple bag limits by an individual or individuals are prohibited.

**ISSUE:** This proposal would provide consistent language on the use of live holding facilities for the Dungeness crab, Tanner crab, and king crab personal use fisheries in the Southeast Alaska and Yakutat Areas, and for the Dungeness crab, Tanner crab, and king crab subsistence fisheries in Southeastern Alaska-Yakutat Area. These changes would mirror the language already found in 5 AAC 77.662(4), 5 AAC 77.612(4), and 5 AAC 02.115(5). This language is preferable since use of a live holding device by more than one individual is clarified and would prohibit more than one individual from storing more than that individual's bag and possession limit in a live holding device.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The regulatory language regarding use of a live holding device in the Tanner crab and king crab personal use and subsistence fisheries by more than one individual will continue to be vague.

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



**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Tanner crab and king crab personal use and subsistence fishermen who currently limit themselves to the bag and possession limits in regulation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Tanner crab and king crab personal use and subsistence fishermen who might wish to subvert the bag and possession limits in regulation.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-276)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 152 - 5 AAC 34.113. Southeast Alaska Red King Crab Management Plan.** Revise the Southeast Red King Crab Management Plan to allow equal quota harvest for commercial permit holders when the threshold of available biomass is below 200,000 pounds as follows:

If the department estimates there is less than 200,000 lbs of red king crab available to harvest. The department shall equally split that harvest estimated amongst the registered permit holders.

**ISSUE:** The closure of the red king crab fishery due to a minimum threshold that was arbitrarily implemented for marketing concerns.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The commercial fleet will continue to not harvest surplus king crab when available.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The department will be able to closely monitor the fishery and close areas as needed to conserve the resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen and the costal community that depend upon a commercial harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Have a competitive fishery for less than 200,000 lbs. The department cannot control a fishery like this, without potentially exceeding the GHL.

**PROPOSED BY:** Andrew Kittams (HQ-F11-041)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 153 - 5 AAC 34.113. Southeast Alaska Red King Crab Management Plan.** Revise the Southeast Red King Crab Management Plan to allow equal quota harvest for commercial permit holders when the threshold of available biomass is below 200,000 pounds as follows:

If under 200,000 pounds, the fishery will be an equal split among the registered permit holders. This will provide for use of older red king crab before they leave the fishery (die off).

**ISSUE:** The 200,000 pound threshold, required to open the fishery for commercial fishing.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Not harvesting under the 200,000 pound threshold is lost opportunity for the commercial fleet. As this is a harvestable surplus.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** None.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The commercial fishermen and the communities who depend on commercial fisheries revenue.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ladd Norheim (HQ-F11-051)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 154 - 5 AAC 34.125. Lawful gear for Registration Area A.** Prohibit the use of square pots for golden king crab in registration Area A as follows:

The use of square pots is prohibited for the golden king crab harvest in registration Area A.

**ISSUE:** The bycatch of halibut from the use of square pots, primarily in the Southeast Alaska golden king crab fishery. Golden king crab is found in deep waters and consequently the bycatch of the limited halibut stock is high.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The continuing unnecessary waste and localized depletion of already limited halibut stocks.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Over the past several years we have experienced a massive decline in the Area 2C halibut quota. I believe we should do everything possible to eliminate loss of halibut stock to unnecessary bycatch.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All areas of halibut fishing; commercial, subsistence, charter and sport fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The few fishermen still using square pots. Many fishermen have already switched to using cone pots for the ease of transporting them.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The required placement of excluder bars in the square opt tunnels. But that would not prevent smaller halibut from entering pots.

**PROPOSED BY:** Steven M. Thynes

(HQ-F11-029)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 155 - 5 AAC 34.125. Lawful gear for Registration Area A; 5 AAC 35.125. Lawful gear for Registration Area A.** Reduce the pot limit in the golden king and Tanner crab fisheries in Area A as follows:

Changing the pot limit from 100 pots per boat to 50 pots per boat for golden king crab, and changing pot limit from 80 to 50 pots per boat for the tanner crab fishery. Set tier levels for different amount of participants in the fishery. Add appropriate number of days to the tanner crab fishery to account for less effort with the reduction of pots.

**ISSUE:** Slow down the harvest rate of golden king crab and elevate over crowding of gear on fishing grounds.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The quota will continue to be harvested faster than market can utilize the product. Fishermen will receive less than best value for their product. Fishing grounds will continue to be over saturated with fishing gear. This results in higher gear loss from gear conflicts and reduced efficiency of pots fished.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Quality of resource will be increased in the sense that more of product can be sold over time to high paying fresh live markets. In the more recent years demand and availability of these live markets has expanded, this in turn has helped drive price for product to record highs. It has also made available to the consumer a high quality product because the product is sold and held live as opposed to been frozen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All participants will benefit in the sense of higher price for their product. They will also benefit by having less gear conflicts (reduced gear loss) and fishing safety should improve with fishermen having to carry less gear.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who may have other time commitments from a longer season, and boats that are the largest of the fishing fleet who can haul more gear safer than the smaller vessels in fishing fleet.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Stan Savland

(HQ-F11-175)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 156 - 5 AAC 34.120. Size limits for Registration Area A.** Clarify when six and one-half inch male golden king crab may be retained as follows:

**5 AAC 34.120. Size limits for Registration Area A.**

...

(4) male golden king crab six and one-half inches or greater in width of shell may be taken or possessed in the Lower Chatham Strait and Southern Areas only during specified periods opened by emergency order.

**ISSUE:** Currently, there is confusion regarding when male golden king crab of a six and one-half inch may be retained from the Lower Chatham Strait and southern areas. This language is intended to more clearly describe the intent of this regulation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Confusion by department staff, enforcement, and the public will continue.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public, department staff, and enforcement would benefit by having a regulation that is easier to understand.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Permit holders who may have been confused by the regulation and were targeting undersized crab.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-278)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 157 - 5 AAC 34.110. Fishing seasons for Registration Area A; 5AAC 35.110. Fishing Seasons for Registration Area A.** Redefine the start date for Tanner and golden king crab fisheries as follows:

**5 AAC 34.110 Fishing seasons for Registration Area A.**

...

(b) Male golden king crab may be taken only from 12:00 noon **February 15** [ON THE DATE WITH THE SMALLEST JUNEAU TIDAL RANGE BETWEEN FEBRUARY 10 AND FEBRUARY 17, AS ANNOUNCED BY EMERGENCY ORDER,] until the season is closed by emergency order.

**5 AAC 35.110 Fishing Seasons for Registration Area A.** Male Tanner crab may be taken only from 12:00 noon **February 15** [ON THE DATE WITH THE SMALLEST JUNEAU TIDAL RANGE BETWEEN FEBRUARY 10 AND FEBRUARY 17, AS ANNOUNCED] **until the season is closed** by emergency order [, THROUGH MAY 1].

**ISSUE:** Tanner and golden king crab fisheries begin on the same day subject to the smallest Juneau tidal range occurring between February 10 and 17. There is disagreement within the fleet at what point within the tidal range this regulation was intended; as a result, this confusion causes much angst for managers prior to the season. In the past, the department deferred to the King and Tanner Task Force to set the start date, but in recent years this has also been met with numerous and

complex phone calls from fishermen who are unsatisfied with the start date. This proposal would impose a set start date of February 15, regardless of the tide, for both the Tanner and golden king crab fisheries.

This proposal also clarifies the closing date for the Tanner crab fishery, a housekeeping change that was not amended when the new Tanner crab harvest strategy was adopted during a 2009 Board of Fisheries. With adoption of a new Tanner crab harvest strategy in 5 AAC 35.113, the closing dates for core and noncore areas are subject to the total number of pots registered at the start of the fishery; closures are set by emergency order.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Managers will set the start date of the Tanner and golden king crab fisheries based upon the corresponding day between February 10 and 17 that has the smallest tidal range according to the tidal chart for Juneau.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen and department staff will benefit by having start dates for Tanner and golden king crab fisheries that are clearly defined in regulation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some commercial fishermen who feel their catch performance improves when the fishery begins during smaller tides.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Defer start date to the King and Tanner Task Force.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-279)

\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 158** - 5 AAC 34.110. Fishing seasons for Registration Area A; and 5AAC 35.110. Fishing Seasons for Registration Area A. Add additional language that defines how weather delays may impact Tanner and king crab fishing seasons:

**5 AAC 34.110 Fishing seasons for Registration Area A.**

...

**(f) Season openings may be delayed if the National Weather Service forecast for the major fishing areas in the Southeast Region contains gale force wind warnings (35 knots and higher) on the 4:00 a.m. forecast for the day preceding the start date and the following day, in which case the season opening in all sections of Registration Area A eligible for a season opening will be delayed 24 hours and announcement of this delay will be issued 24 hours prior to the start of the fishery; if after the initial delay gale warnings continue regionwide, the season opening in all eligible sections may be delayed an additional 24 hours; season opening delays may continue on a rolling 24-hour basis; for the purposes of this paragraph, the corresponding National Weather Service forecast areas considered within the Southeast Region are as follows:**

**(1) Southern Lynn Canal;**

**(2) Northern Chatham Strait;**

- (3) Stephens Passage;**
- (4) Frederick Sound.**

#### **5 AAC 35.110 Fishing Seasons for Registration Area A.**

**(a)** Male Tanner crab may be taken only from 12:00 noon on the date with the smallest Juneau tidal range between February 10 and February 17, as announced by emergency order, through May 1.

**(b)** **Season openings may be delayed if the National Weather Service forecast for the major fishing areas in the Southeast Region contains gale force wind warnings (35 knots and higher) on the 4:00 a.m. forecast for the day preceding the start date and the following day, in which case the season opening in all sections of Registration Area A eligible for a season opening will be delayed 24 hours and announcement of this delay will be issued 24 hours prior to the start of the fishery; if after the initial delay gale warnings continue regionwide, the season opening in all eligible sections may be delayed an additional 24 hours; season opening delays may continue on a rolling 24-hour basis; for the purposes of this paragraph, the corresponding National Weather Service forecast areas considered within the Southeast Region are as follows:**

- (1) Southern Lynn Canal;**
- (2) Northern Chatham Strait;**
- (3) Stephens Passage;**
- (4) Frederick Sound.**

**ISSUE:** Extreme regionwide weather can create unsafe and unproductive harvest opportunities in Tanner and king crab fisheries and has resulted in delays to the openings of these fisheries. This proposal clarifies how the department will use weather information in delaying season openings. The department is open to working with the public and the Board of Fisheries on the specific parameters of this proposal and offers this draft language for consideration.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Managers will consult with the National Weather Service prior to fishery openings and may delay fisheries without the benefit of criteria found in regulation. Fishermen will continue to be unclear about conditions in which a delay to the start of the Tanner and king crab fisheries may take place.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Harvesting shellfish under extreme weather conditions can negatively impact the quality of the resource harvested; by delaying the fishery to periods of less extreme weather harvest quality will be improved.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen and department staff will benefit by having conditions for weather delays more clearly defined in regulation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-280)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 159 - 5 AAC 35.125. Lawful gear for Registration Area A.** Amend regulation to allow 120 pots for vessels with two Tanner permits onboard as follows:

(1) No more than 80 tanner crab pots may be operated from a vessel registered to fish tanner crab, **except that 120 pots will be allowed for a vessel with two tanner permits on board.**

**ISSUE:** Escalating fixed costs are causing a continuing decline in the fleet's efficiency.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Effort in the fishery will continue to decline as net profits continue to shrink. The resource will be underutilized.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The resource (longer soak times will reduce handling of non legal crab). The fleet (net profits will increase as fixed costs remain the same and there will be less gear in the water allowing better CPUE).

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast King and Tanner Task Force  
(HQ-F11-036, previously HQ-08F-146)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 160 - 5 AAC 35.125. Lawful gear for Registration Area A.** Amend regulation to allow additional pots in the king and Tanner fisheries for vessels with two permits aboard as follows:

- 1) A) No more than 20 king crab pots when the guideline harvest level is at least 200K but not more than 399,000 pounds, **except two permits may be registered to one vessel to allow 40 pots.**
- 2) When the commercial golden king crab season is open in Registration Area A, and the commercial red king crab or tanner crab season is closed, not more than 100 king crab pots may be operated from a vessel, **except when two permits are registered on vessel, 150 pots may be operated.**
- 3) When the commercial golden king and tanner crab seasons are open in registration Area A at the same time, an aggregate of no more than 80 kind and tanner crab pots may be operated from a vessel registered to fish for both kind and tanner crab **except a vessel with two dual permits registered on board may fish an aggregate of 120 pots.**

**ISSUE:** Escalating fixed costs are causing a continuing decline in the fleet's efficiency.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Effort in the fishery will continue to decline as net profits continue to shrink. The resource will be underutilized.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** With less gear in the water the king crab seasons may last longer. More of the quota will be sent out live and the total value of the fishery will increase.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The resource (longer soak times will reduce handling of non legal crab). The fleet (net profits will increase as fixed costs remain the same and there will be less gear in the water allowing better CPUE).

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast King and Tanner Task Force  
(HQ-F11-037, previously HQ-08F-148)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 161 - 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A.** Close commercial Dungeness crab fishing in Taku Harbor as follows:

5 AAC 32.150 Closed waters in Regulation Area A, add “waters within Taku Harbor north and east of a line from Grave Point to Stockade Point”. These points from the entrance to the harbor so this closure would affect only Taku Harbor but not nearby coves and bays.

**ISSUE:** Inadequate stock of Dungeness crab in Taku Harbor for personal use and subsistence needs. Commercial crabber blanket the harbor with posts at the beginning of the opening period and remove all harvestable crab with the first week or two. P/U and subsistence users are left to pick through the remaining crab in hope of finding one large enough to harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Dungeness crab stocks in Taku Harbor will remain depressed. Personal use and subsistence users will continue to be denied a fair share of the resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, as a result of the commercial harvest in Taku Harbor, the crabs are harvested as they recruit into the fishery. This results in small crabs with very little meat in their shells. Eliminating the commercial harvest will allow crabs to grow larger before being harvested by P/U and subsistence users.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All personal use and subsistence Dungeness crab harvesters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A few commercial crabbers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.



**PROPOSED BY:** Juneau Yacht Club & Territorial Sportsmen Inc. (HQ-F11-076)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 162 - 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A.** Close commercial Dungeness crab fishing in Swanson Harbor as follows:

5 AAC 32.150 Closed waters in Regulation Area A, add “waters within Swanson Harbor from the northern tip on the west side of Couverden Island to the southern end of Ansley Island”. These points from the entrance to the main anchorage of the harbor so this closure would affect only one arm of Swanson Harbor, where the public mooring floats are located.

**ISSUE:** Inadequate stock of Dungeness crab in Swanson Harbor for personal use and subsistence needs. Commercial crabbers blanket the harbor with posts at the beginning of the opening period and remove all harvestable crab with the first week or two. Personal use and subsistence users are left to pick through the remaining crab in hope of finding one large enough to harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Dungeness crab stocks in Swanson Harbor will remain depressed. Personal use and subsistence users will continue to be denied a fair share of the resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, as a result of the commercial harvest in Swanson Harbor, the crabs are harvested as they recruit into the fishery. This results in small crabs with very little meat in their shells. Eliminating the commercial harvest will allow crabs to grow larger before being harvested by P/U and subsistence users.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All personal use and subsistence Dungeness crab harvesters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A few commercial crabbers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Juneau Yacht Club & Territorial Sportsman Inc. (HQ-F11-079)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 163 - 5 AAC 32.110. Fishing seasons for Registration Area A. 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A.** Close commercial Dungeness crab fishing in Excursion Inlet of District 14 as follows:

**5 AAC 32.110. Fishing seasons for Registration Area A.** In Registration Area A, male Dungeness crab may be taken or possessed only as follows: (3) in all other waters of Registration Area A, except the waters of Excursion Inlet described in 5 AAC 32.150(17), from 12:00 noon

June 15 through 11:59 p.m. August 15 and from 12:00 noon October 1 through 11:59 p.m. November 30.

**5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A.** In Area A, the following waters are closed to the taking of Dungeness crab: (17) waters of Excursion Inlet between 58° 24.567'N, 135° 26.202'W and 58° 24.170'N, 135° 25.849'W.

**ISSUE:** The need for a personal use/subsistence zone for Dungeness crab fishing within District 14, specifically the area located in Excursion Inlet between 58° 24.567'N, 135° 26.202'W and 58° 24.170'N, 135° 25.849'W.

Residents and property owners of Excursion Inlet within District 14 have reported that since 2002, they have experienced a generally degrading personal use and subsistence Dungeness crab fishery. They attribute this primarily to the actions of commercial crabbers who are increasingly dominating the fishery. Excursion Inlet residents and property owners have cited instances of commercial fishermen setting their gear on top of the personal or subsistence pots already fishing, picking pots, cutting buoy lines, and moving gear. The local enforcement officer has limited time and resources to address the many complaints, and incidents often go unreported for lack of effective enforcement options. This is becoming more serious with confrontations and friction, and it threatens the opportunities for subsistence and personal use fishing within the Excursion Inlet community.

This proposal is directed at the impact on subsistence and personal use by the commercial crabbers. The State of Alaska recognizes that subsistence fishing is economically and culturally important for many Alaskan families and communities. The Excursion Inlet community believes their ability to subsistence fish for Dungeness crab has been seriously impacted by the commercial crabbers.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued, and possibly increased, degradation of personal use and subsistence Dungeness crab fishery. Possible escalation of confrontations and friction between the Excursion Inlet residents/property owners and the commercial crabbers. Opportunities for subsistence and personal use fishing may continue to be threatened. On behalf of the Excursion Inlet community, the Haines Borough proposes a personal use and subsistence zone for Dungeness crab as a solution to the problem.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The problem is the impact on subsistence and personal use by the commercial crabbers. One of the board's specific allocation criteria when allocating between fisheries is: "the importance of each fishery for providing residents the opportunity to obtain fish for personal and family consumption." AS 16.05.251(e)(3). The quality of subsistence and personal use fishing would be improved, and it is presumed that closing the area to commercial fishing would improve the resource by preventing overharvesting on this one area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The residents and property owners of Excursion Inlet who depend on subsistence and personal use fishing. Excursion Inlet is within the Haines Borough's

jurisdiction. The Borough received a petition signed by 36 Excursion Inlet residents and property owners. The Borough Assembly adopted Resolution 10-08-227 on August 24, 2010 in support of submitting this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial crabbers who have been fishing in this area.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Haines Borough (HQ-F11-085)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 164 - 5AAC 32.150. Closed Waters in Registration Area A.** Close commercial Dungeness crab fishing in the Ketchikan vicinity as follows:

In Area A, the following waters are closed to the taking of Dungeness crab: **(17) waters of Helm Bay west of a line from 55° 35' N. lat., 131° 57' W. long., north to Helm Pt. 55°37' N. lat., 131° 53.5' W. long. (18) waters of Traitors Cove east of 131° 42' W. long.**

**ISSUE:** Depletion of Dungeness crabs in District 1, Area A. Dungeness habitat is minimal and limited to small bays in the Ketchikan vicinity. Commercial crabbers fishing in the summer are having a devastating impact on our opportunity to harvest personal use Dungeness. Areas close to Ketchikan that residents have traditionally been able to harvest crab are no longer productive.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There are two bays that have been traditionally used by residents for personal use, which have been affected. Helm Bay has two U.S.F.S. cabins and Traitors Cove has a dock and trails which are used frequently by residents wishing to enjoy the wilderness and harvest some crab, however the crabbing opportunity is very poor now that a summer commercial Dungeness fishery has been prosecuted.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Personal use Dungeness crab will continue to be difficult to harvest around the Ketchikan vicinity. Local residents will not find crab in traditional personal use areas and will have to contend with hundreds of commercial pots that never used to exist in the summer. If some additional areas are not restricted from commercial crabbing residents will not be able to harvest Dungeness crab as in the past.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** This would improve the quality and quantity of the crab available for personal use in Helm Bay and Traitors Cove. These areas are close to Ketchikan; they have cabins, docks, mooring buoys, trails and are heavily utilized by Ketchikan residents for personal use.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial Dungeness fishermen would have to fish areas further away from Ketchikan but this should not be a problem as most of these crabbers are coming from Wrangell and Petersburg anyway.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Considered more area but stuck to the frequently used personal use areas with existing infrastructure supporting recreational use.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ketchikan Guided Sportfish Association (HQ-F11-113)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 165 - 5 AAC XX.XXX. Regulation Title.** Amend regulation regarding buoy markers in the Dungeness crab fishery as follows:

(d) In Area A, all Dungeness crab pots and ring nets operated by a CFEC limited entry or interim permit holder must be [IDENTICALLY] similarly buoyed and marked. At least one buoy on each pot or ring net must be legibly marked with the permanent department vessel license plate number of the single vessel operating the gear. The buoy, or multiple buoys attached to a Dungeness crab pot or ring net, may bare only one vessel license number. The vessel license number must be in symbols at least one and one-half inches high and with lines at least one-quarter inch wide that contrast with the background.

**ISSUE:** The word "identical" in describing Dungeness crab buoys. As written and the standard definition of the word identical is a standard that can't be reached even brand new from the manufacturer. In the manufacture of buoys machine tolerances are approx. + or - 3% between buoys along with slight color variations. In addition based on where the pot is set, they may be sun faded to different degrees. Dept of Public Safety has told SEAFA members that they could issue a ticket if you used a different knot on the buoy, put the tag in a different place on the buoy string or type of rope used is different, if the size of the buoy is different at all. It is unrealistic that a string of up to 300 crab pots can be this identical especially if you have to replace a lost pot or two and use a newer buoy in part of the string.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Warnings and tickets are given even though the crab fishermen attempted to follow the law.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial Dungeness crab fishermen will not have to fully replace the buoys for a whole string of pots in order to replace one missing buoy or worry about enforcement.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Enforcement will be a tad harder as they might have to stop and look and compare buoys.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Fisherman's Alliance (HQ-F11-074)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 166 - 5 AAC 32.110. Fishing seasons for Registration Area A.** Revise season dates for commercial Dungeness fishery in Southeast Districts 1 and 2 as follows:

5 AAC 32.110 FISHING SEASONS FOR REGISTRATION AREA A. In Registration Area A, male Dungeness crab may be taken or possessed only as follows:

(1) in Section 13-B, except the waters of the Sitka Sound Special Use Area described in 5 AAC 32.150(10), [AND BEGINNING FEBRUARY 29, 2012, IN DISTRICTS 1 AND 2,] except the waters of Whale Passage described in (2) of this section, from 12:00 noon October 1 through 11:59 pm February 28;.

**ISSUE:** At the last Board of Fish meeting Districts 1 & 2 season dates for commercial Dungeness crab fishing were changed to coincide with the summer and fall season of the majority of Southeast Alaska for a three year period at which time it would be reevaluted using current data. Following that District 2 was reconsidered at another meeting and returned to a winter fishery only due to concerns that subsistence needs had not been fully considered during the original board cycle. We would like to remove the sunset date on district one and district 2 with a area (to be determined) around Kassan closed for commercial and sport fishing to protect the interests of the Village of Kassan residents. The request for this area to be opened three years ago pointed out that the commercial Dungeness crab fishermen have lost area due to sea otters, personal use area and the closure of Glacier Bay. Having Districts 1 & 2 open during the summer and fall season will help spread out the fleet.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** We will go back to the old status quo of a winter only season for District 1 & 2.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Dungeness crab fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** None.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Closing District 1 & 2 to sport Dungeness crab fishing. If concern over the stock still exists that commercial fishing in the summer is inappropriate then all Dungeness crab fishing should be closed in these 2 districts.

**PROPOSED BY:** Clay Bezenek (HQ-F11-215)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 167 - 5 AAC 32.170. Lawful gear for Registration Area D.** Reduce number of Dungeness crab pots allowed on vessels in Yakutat Area as follows:

We would like to reduce the Dungeness crab pot limit from 400 pots per vessel to 60 pots per vessel in the Yakutat area.

**ISSUE:** The Yakutat area hasn't had a commercial crab season for more than 17 years. We feel that a small scale test fishery will allow for biological information to be collected without putting too much pressure on the resource.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be a lack of accurate data on crab stocks in this area, and the possibility of the fishery to go unutilized.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Crab fishermen, and the ADFG will get valuable data on stocks.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-339)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 168 - 5 AAC 31.145. Southeastern Alaska Area Pot Shrimp Fishery Management Plan.** Revise management plan for the southeast pot shrimp fisheries allowing extra fishing time per subdistrict as follows:

The department shall open each subdistrict for 3 to 7 days after a district closes if that subdistrict had less than 5% of the total district catch. This should be inserted into the shrimp management plan.

**ISSUE:** In many areas in Southeast Alaska the shrimp fleet and catch is being concentrated with the current management plan. In the past the shrimp fleet was able to fish many parts of a district when it was open and was able to access different stocks of shrimp within that district. Currently in some of the districts in Southeast the shrimp are caught in a small portion of the district and this closes the whole district to fishing, this does not allow the fleet to fish on grounds that have seen no effort that year.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The fleet will continue to concentrate on known stocks and will not take advantage of other grounds within each district that don't see any effort and may have fishable populations of shrimp.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Shrimp fishermen will benefit by having more area to fish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Department managers and enforcement will have more areas to manage and enforce.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I considered increasing the guideline harvest range in each district but this would just encourage catching more shrimp in the same area and would not force the fleet to disperse and explore new ground.

**PROPOSED BY:** Brennon Eagle. (HQ-F11-018)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 169 - 5 AAC 31.115. Shrimp pot guideline harvest ranges for Registration Area A.** Establish section subdivisions in all districts of shrimp fishery as follows:

The board should direct the department, working with the Shrimp Task Force, to establish section sub-divisions with appropriate GHGs in all districts of the fishery.

**ISSUE:** The short duration of the fishery forces shrimp fishermen to concentrate on areas with the highest catch rates. The result is that the entire GHG for a District can often be taken from only a very small portion of the District. Nonetheless, the entire District gets closed, even though much or most of it has received little if any fishing effort. The net result is that large areas receive scant fishing effort and harvestable shrimp are left in the water. In response to this the board and department have sub-divided some districts into sections and established separate GHGs for the various sections. (Districts 3, 12 and 13 are sub-divided.) This principle of sub-division is a good one, and should be expanded throughout Area A.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The fleet will continue to suffer economic losses from foregone harvest.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This is not a product quality issue.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The entire fleet should benefit because the proposed action will result in an increased harvest from areas which are now essentially unfished. While additional amounts are not expected to be huge, they will nonetheless be significant, and could off particular importance to fishermen who traditionally continue “scratch fishing” in moderate to low producing areas.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The proposed solution should not cause any negative effects.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I thought about adding a specific GHG for each of the obvious sectors that are not now seeing much fishing effort – say, a standard 5,000 lbs. However, that seems arbitrary and does get to issues like sub-dividing some of the large areas with fairly substantial GHGs. Some of these areas may have several “hot spots” that need to be treated separately. This work is much better left to in-depth discussions at the Task Force level.

**PROPOSED BY:** Greg Fisk (HQ-F11-230)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 170 - 5 AAC 31.145. Southeastern Alaska Area Pot Shrimp Fishery Management Plan.** Revise the Commercial Southeast Pot Shrimp Fishery Management Plan utilizing inseason catch data as follows:

Manage each area within the GHL using the season catch data of effort, daily catch rates, shrimp size and gear saturation to determine closure dates. Not just using the preset quota within the GHL.

**ISSUE:** ADF&G department managers are setting area season catch quotas within the GHL based on preseason models. Once set these quotas are left for 3 years to assess impact. This method of management can lead to over fishing stocks in low abundance years or leaving shrimp unharvested in years of high abundance.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Shrimp stocks can be harvested below threshold levels or shrimp can be left unharvested.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, with active inseason management smaller poor market product will not be over-harvested to reach area quotas now set by ADF&G.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** In years of low abundance the shrimp resource will benefit with timely closures. In years of high abundance fishermen will get more fishing time.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Fishermen believe some areas have been overfished due to the 3 year lagtime for adjusting quotas. Other areas close in hours due to high shrimp stocks, leaving shrimp unharvested.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Otto Florschutz (HQ-F11-056)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 171 - 5 AAC 31.115. Shrimp pot guideline harvest ranges for Registration Area A.** Establish a spawner index system for the Southeast Alaska Spot Prawn Pot Fishery as follows:

A spawner index system such as used in British Columbia is generally recognized to offer the best available in-season management and optimal resource utilization. Spawner index uses a defined ratio of males to females in the catch to determine if the fishery in a given area should remain open or be closed. The board should direct the department to begin moving toward this kind of system in the Southeast Alaska spot prawn pot fishery, with a goal of full implementation by the 2015 board cycle. Interim steps could include testing of the system in selected fishing areas.

**ISSUE:** Lack of an intensive in-season management system in the spot prawn pot fishery results in substantial economic losses to fishermen and to the regional economy because of foregone



harvest. The current system of guideline harvest levels (GHL), season by season target GHLs, limited pre-season surveying, and in-season monitoring of a few “hot” fishing areas, does not provide managers with the best in-season data. The result is that, in strong stock conditions, significant amounts of harvestable prawns are left in the water because managers have to be more cautious than they might otherwise be with better tools. (Note: Most unharvested prawns are not available to harvest the following year because they are final -year females that die before the next season.) Conversely, in bad conditions the existing system can result in overharvest, even with conservative, pre-season target GHLs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The fleet will continue to suffer significant economic losses from foregone harvest.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The entire pot shrimp fleet should benefit through increased harvest, without sacrificing principles of resource conservation. The Southeast regional economy will also benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I have thought about efforts to further refine the existing system, such as more pre-season surveys, more biologists on the grounds in- season, etc. However, since we have an excellent and long-proven alternative model, which is generally acknowledge as the “gold standard” in prawn management, it seems only logical that we move toward adoption of that system. Also, while this will require substantial financial / human resources, the BC experience indicates that such cost will be more than repaid by increased fishery economic output.

**PROPOSED BY:** Greg Fisk (HQ-F11-231)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 172 - 5 AAC 31.145. Southeastern Alaska Area Pot Shrimp Fishery Management Plan.** Close the commercial shrimp fishery in the vicinity of Skagway from September 1 – March 1 annually as follows:

We request that commercial harvest of shrimp be restricted north of a line from Sturgill’s Landing to Burro Creek, from September 1<sup>st</sup> to March 1<sup>st</sup> each year. This small near shore area would serve as a reproductive refuge, which should produce a better harvest for all users, both commercial and non-commercial. The timing is based on local knowledge of peak reproductive times for our shrimp populations. We also request that information used to assess the health of the local shrimp population be obtained locally (many subsistence users would volunteer to provide data), rather than lumping Skagway in with a larger area. Skagway is the terminus of a very long fjord, conditions here are atypical compared to other waters.

**ISSUE:** Subsistence shrimp harvesters in Skagway are negatively impacted by commercial harvest in the immediate vicinity of the nearshore waters of Skagway/Dyea. Immediately after commercial harvests, subsistence harvest typically drops to zero – single digit numbers of shrimp per pot. The numbers very slowly recover over months, only to be decimated again by the next commercial harvest. The damaging commercial harvest occurs during the peak reproductive period of the locally harvested shrimp (when most shrimp are carrying eggs). The local shrimp populations never have a chance to attain their historic abundance.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The shrimp harvesters of an entire community will continue to be negatively impacted year round by commercial harvesters who have access to many areas outside the nearshore waters of the town. The local populations of shrimp will never have the opportunity to return to their historic abundance (based on harvest history of long-time locals who can compare pre-commercial to post-commercial harvest periods).

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, all harvesters, commercial and non-commercial, will benefit from more abundant local shrimp populations. By providing a reproductive refuge from the large-scale commercial harvest during the peak reproductive period, populations should recover.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All harvesters of shrimp in the Skagway/Dyea area will benefit from more robust, abundant shrimp populations. Subsistence harvesters will be able to avoid periods of zero – single digit harvest numbers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial harvesters would still have access to nearshore waters between March 1 and September 1, and would still be able to harvest south of Sturgills-Burro Creek year round.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Restricting commercial harvest north of Kasidaya Creek year-round: the area north of a line from Sturgills-Burro Creek leaves most of Taiya Inlet available to commercial harvest while still providing a nearshore reproductive refuge during the time of peak shrimp reproduction.

**PROPOSED BY:** Taiya Inlet Watershed Council (HQ-F11-070)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 173 - 5 AAC 31.110. Shrimp pot fishing seasons and periods for Registration Area A.** Revise the opening dates for the shrimp pot fishery in Registration Area A as follows:

5 AAC 31.110, in Registration Area A, shrimp may be taken by pots only from **November** [OCTOBER] 1 through **March 31** [FEBRUARY 28], unless closed earlier by emergency order.

**ISSUE:** Making the season start later would improve the quality and higher shrimp prices.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Poor quality and lower shrimp prices.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, both resource harvested and products produced would provide a better quality.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All parties benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** None.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Don G. Munhoven & Donald T. Munhoven Jr. (HQ-F11-219)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 174 - 5 AAC 31.124. Lawful shrimp pot gear for Registration Area A.**  
Establish set times for deploying or retrieving shrimp pots in Registration Area A as follows:

(5) Any shrimp pot can be hauled or retrieved once between 6:00 AM. until 6:00 PM each day; the commissioner may close, by emergency order, the fishing season in a district or a portion of a district and immediately reopen the season during which the time period allowed to deploy and retrieve shrimp pot gear may be increased or decreased to achieve the guideline harvest range”.

**ISSUE:** The Current Regulation reads: “(5) shrimp pot gear may be deployed or retrieved only from 8:00 AM until 4:00 PM each day; the commissioner may close, by emergency order, the fishing season in a district or a portion of a district and immediately reopen the season during which the time period allowed to deploy and retrieve shrimp pot gear may be increased or decreased to achieve the guideline harvest range”. This regulation lacks the flexibility shrimpers need to adjust for and work around the weather.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If nothing is done shrimpers lives will continue to be put at unnecessary risk. Fishers, boats will be torn up or they will continue to waste expensive fuel while watching the weather moderate by 4 pm. Current hauling restrictions force fishers to fish in sometimes severe weather placing crew, vessel and their own lives in unnecessary danger.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. October and November can be and are often stormy months. In inside waters storms can be short lived. An 8-hour a day restriction can often be the window of the worst part of a storm. With current fuel prices, boats and freezers are expensive to operate. Current hauling restrictions force fishers to fish in sometimes severe weather placing crew, vessel and their own lives in unnecessary danger. When choosing not to fish they often watch the wind moderate in the afternoon allowing them to fish but not having time too.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Shrimp fisherpersons and crew.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Leave hours at 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. for hauling.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-147)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 175 - 5 AAC 31.126. Shrimp pot marking requirements for Registration Area A.** Revise marking requirements for shrimp pots in Registration Area A as follows:

(c) Shrimp pots deployed on a longline, consisting of more than ~~ten~~[FIVE] pots, **including 100 fathom or more longline** must have at least one buoy attached to each end of the longline. The buoys must be properly marked as specified in 5 AAC 31.051 [AND THE POTS MUST BE MARKED AS REQUIRED UNDER (A) OF THIS SECTION].

**ISSUE:** Improves safety and saves on pot gear.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Unsafe with two buoy lines. To close together and a lot easier to lose gear at five pots or more.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** None.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Don G. Munhoven & Donald T. Munhoven Jr. (HQ-F11-218)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 176 - 5 AAC 31.128. Operation of other gear in Registration Area A; and 5 AAC 32.128. Operation of other gear in Registration Area A.** Prohibit registration for the commercial beam trawl shrimp and Dungeness crab fishery at the same time as follows:

**5 AAC 31.128. Operation of other gear in Registration Area A.**

...

(c) A vessel owner, or [OPERATOR] **owner's agent**, may not [BE REGISTERED] **register a vessel** for the commercial shrimp pot fishery and the commercial beam trawl shrimp fishery at the same time. However, a vessel owner, or [OPERATOR] **owner's agent**, may cancel **a vessel's** registration for a shrimp fishery and register for a different shrimp fishery by contacting a local representative of the department, in person, and providing all requested information.

**(d) A vessel owner, or owner's agent, may not register a vessel for the commercial beam trawl shrimp fishery and the commercial Dungeness crab fishery at the same time. However, a vessel owner, or owner's agent, may cancel a vessel's registration for the**

**commercial beam trawl shrimp fishery and register a vessel for the commercial Dungeness crab fishery by contacting a local representative of the department, in person, and providing all requested information.**

**5 AAC 32.128. Operation of other [POT] gear in Registration Area A.**

(a) Notwithstanding 5 AAC 32.053, a person or vessel that operates commercial king crab pots in waters deeper than 100 fathoms during the 14 days immediately before the opening of the commercial Dungeness crab fishery in Registration Area A, may participate in the commercial Dungeness crab fishery.

**(b) A vessel owner, or owner's agent, may not register a vessel for the commercial Dungeness crab fishery and the commercial beam trawl shrimp fishery at the same time. However, a vessel owner, or owner's agent, may cancel a vessel's registration for the commercial Dungeness crab fishery and register a vessel for the commercial beam trawl shrimp fishery if**

**(1) the person removes from the water the pots that are used and marked for the commercial Dungeness crab fishery or puts them in storage, as specified in 5 AAC 32.052; and**

**(2) the vessel owner, or owner's agent, contacts a local representative of the department, in person, and requests that the department cancel the vessel's commercial Dungeness crab registration, and the department cancels the vessel's commercial Dungeness crab registration.**

**ISSUE:** Current regulations allow for a permit holder or permit holders to register a vessel for the commercial beam trawl shrimp fishery and the commercial Dungeness crab fishery at the same time. The amended regulatory language above would prohibit a permit holder or permit holders from registering a vessel for the commercial beam trawl shrimp fishery and the commercial Dungeness crab fishery at the same time. Also, current regulations may allow for more than one permit holder to register a vessel for the commercial shrimp pot fishery and the commercial beam trawl shrimp fishery at the same time. The amended regulatory language above clarifies that more than one permit holder registering a vessel for the commercial shrimp pot fishery and the commercial beam trawl shrimp fishery at the same time is prohibited.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If fished in shallow, softer bottoms, beam trawls are effective at catching Dungeness crabs. Current regulations do not prohibit simultaneous registration in both fisheries, do not prohibit both types of gear to be onboard, and do not prohibit a permit holder or permit holders from having beam trawl shrimp and Dungeness crabs onboard a vessel at the same time. Also, the current regulations on simultaneous registration in the pot shrimp and beam trawl shrimp fisheries require clarification.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All user groups that enjoy harvesting and catching Dungeness crabs.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial Dungeness permit holders who might wish to target Dungeness crabs with a beam trawl.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-277)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 177 - 5 AAC 31.111. Shrimp beam trawl fishing seasons and logbook requirements for Registration Area A.** Establish a Beam Trawl Task Force as follows:

The board should establish a Beam Trawl Task Force tasked with:

i) economic revitalization of the Area A shrimp beam trawl fishery, including support for both catcher (for peeling) and catcher processor sectors, and promotion value maximization and full utilization of the resource; and ii) examining all rules currently applicable to the industry for efficacy, and with recommending changes, additions or deletions to such rules to benefit fleet economics, safety and resource conservation. Given the industry's dire economic straits, the board should provide for rule changes and implementation of Task Force recommendations within the 3-year cycle so as not to delay or forestall vitally needed changes.

**ISSUE:** After having been a meaningful contributor to the regional economy for nearly a century, the Southeast Alaska beam trawl shrimp industry is in dire economic condition, even though trawl shrimp stocks are quite healthy. In 2010 only 4 of 27 permits fished and landings were a scant 58,000 lbs – less than 3% of the 15-year average. Many problems contributed to the industry's decline, including very high production from competing coldwater shrimp fisheries in the N. Atlantic. But, the biggest problems were failure to innovate and dependence solely on the lowest value production model. These problems were by no means caused solely by Alaska's management systems. But management systems do set the "playing field" for the industry. If the industry is to get back on its feet again, one part of the equation must be a full assessment of the regulations to ensure that they contribute to a positive operational environment and do not impose unnecessary, unintended impediments to fishermen's economic success.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The beam trawl shrimp fishery is facing economic extinction. Individual fishermen have lost livelihoods and face huge losses on important assets like vessels, permits and gear.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, definitely. The current management system does not support product diversity and value maximization in the industry. Traditionally, the beam trawl shrimp processing sector produced almost entirely cooked and peeled shrimp. This is a vital part of the product mix, but only a part. Other principal coldwater shrimp product forms, which have higher unit value, include whole cooked and whole frozen (sushi-grade) shrimp. These are FAS product forms. The regulatory environment should support production of all the three major product forms to achieve optimum fishery economic success. In the North Atlantic the coldwater shrimp industry achieves ex-vessel values of up to \$1.25 per pound, whereas our traditional

model provided a quarter of that or less. Management rules must also support taking full advantage of our unique and valuable sidestripe shrimp resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The entire beam trawl fleet will benefit if the fishery can be revived economically. Permits and physical assets should regain substantially in value. Efforts to restart traditional shoreside processing will benefit through having a stronger fishing sector and assured supplies of shrimp for peeling. Development of at-sea processing of larger grades will substantially improve overall resource value. Communities and support sectors will benefit from renewed landings and business opportunities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** If the Task Force is successful in its charge and efforts the revive the industry bare fruit, more permits will be fished and the current few active fishermen will face more competition for resources, but that should be offset by overall gains in productivity.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** I considered simply submitting a letter or petition to the board prior to the January, 2012 meetings which would include a problem statement and a request for establishment of a Task Force or formalized working group. However, I felt that taking the formal step of submitting a regulatory proposal to look at the effectiveness of our entire regulatory approach to this fishery would still have merit. In any case, the important thing is to highlight the problems of this proud old fishery and set it on the path to recovery and economic health.

**PROPOSED BY:** Greg Fisk (HQ-F11-232)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 178 - 5 AAC 38.140. Southeastern Alaska Sea Cucumber Management Plan.**  
Establish a variable harvest strategy for sea cucumbers as follows:

**5 AAC 38.140. Southeastern Alaska Sea Cucumber Management Plan. (h)** The department shall establish a guideline harvest level for each area open to the harvest of sea cucumbers. The guideline harvest level shall be based on population estimates from the department's biomass assessment, and shall be calculated as a product: Guideline Harvest Level= $3 \times \text{HR} [\text{CF} \times \text{GF} \times \text{M}] \times \text{P}$ , where:

**HR = annual harvest rate applied to corresponding estimated biomass as follows:**

<b><u>HR</u></b>	<b><u>Biomass estimate as percentage of original estimated biomass</u></b>
<b><u>0%</u></b>	<b><u>Less than 50%</u></b>
<b><u>3.2%</u></b>	<b><u>50% - 59%</u></b>
<b><u>6.4%</u></b>	<b><u>60% - 79%</u></b>
<b><u>9.6%</u></b>	<b><u>80% and greater</u></b>

[CF = 0.4 SCALING FACTOR RELATING MAXIMUM SUSTAINABLE FISHING MORTALITY TO UNEXPLOITED POPULATION SIZE;

GF = 0.5 CORRECTION FACTOR TO ALLOW FOR ERRORS IN ASSUMPTIONS  
UPON WHICH THE SURPLUS PRODUCTION MODEL IS BASED;  
M = 0.32 ESTIMATE INSTANTANEOUS MORTALITY RATE FOR SEA  
CUCUMBERS;]  
P = estimated [VIRGIN] population biomass [SIZE], taken as the lower bound of the  
one-sided 90 percent confidence interval.

The guideline harvest level includes a factor of three to account for a two-year closure under (c) of this section.

**ISSUE:** Guideline harvest levels for the sea cucumber fishery are currently calculated using a fixed annual harvest rate of 6.4%. This rate was regarded as precautionary and included in the management plan prior to development of the commercial fishery in the early 1990s. Since that time, about 20 years of data have been collected during surveys and fisheries; these data have been used to determine the actual response of the population to harvest levels. In some areas, populations have declined below optimal production levels, and they have increased in other areas, indicating that a variable harvest rate, based on stock level, may be more appropriate than a fixed harvest rate regardless of stock level. A variable harvest rate strategy protects stocks from substantial decline below productive levels, and takes advantage of surplus production when stocks are at high levels.

Additionally, under the current management plan there is no biological reference point, or threshold, below which commercial harvest would not be permitted. A threshold of 50% of the estimated initial biomass would prohibit harvest on stocks that are below optimal production levels and may allow stocks to rebound to productive levels more quickly than with constant harvest pressure.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Guideline harvest levels will continue to be based on a fixed 6.4% annual harvest rate and fisheries may be prosecuted when stock levels are low. This may result in continued population decline in less productive areas. In addition, in more productive areas, overall yield may be reduced if not fished at a higher harvest rate.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial harvesters, ultimately, because sea cucumber stocks are expected to reach and sustain levels of optimal productivity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some commercial harvesters who target areas that have fallen below the proposed threshold would suffer. Currently, most areas in this category are inhabited by sea otters, and sea cucumber populations are not expected to recover soon.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Several harvest rate scenarios were considered, including maintaining current management plan, and various combinations of threshold levels and harvest rate categories.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-281)

\*\*\*\*\*.



**PROPOSAL 179 - 5 AAC 38.140. Southeastern Alaska Sea Cucumber Management Plan.**  
Revise sea cucumber management plans to account for predation by sea otters as follows:

The department, on an annual basis, will determine areas that have or are being impacted by sea otters. The department will increase the harvest rate in each of these areas, or allow for experimental fisheries in areas previously closed due to sea otter predation.

**ISSUE:** Sea otters in Southeast Alaska are rapidly impacting sea cucumber populations, particularly on the west coast of Prince of Wales and Sitka. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game manages sea cucumbers by establishing a Guideline Harvest Level in each area open to the harvest of sea cucumbers. ADF&G does not take into account the impact of sea otters in any area. Several areas have been closed due to sea otter predation.

The Southeast Alaska Regional Dive Fisheries Association (SARDFA) wants the department to develop a management plan that takes into account sea otter predation on sea cucumbers. This plan may include a higher harvest rate in areas that sea otters are occupying, or allow for harvests in areas that have previously been closed to see if any sea cucumbers still exist.

Sea otter predation has already reduced the sea cucumber GHF by approximately 300,000 pounds on an annual basis, costing divers millions of dollars.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Sea otters are a major concern for commercial divers. If the State's management plan does not account for sea otters then the predation will continue unchecked. Commercial divers would like the opportunity to realize at least some financial benefit of sea cucumbers before that resource is wiped out by sea otters.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal would allow commercial sea cucumber divers to realize at least some value of the resource before sea otters wipe out the entire sea cucumber population. While increasing the harvest rate will not increase the quality of the resource it will allow for some financial benefit to the fleet.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial divers will benefit from a temporary increase in the harvest of sea cucumbers. It is possible that subsistence and personal use fishermen will benefit if the pace of the expansion of sea otters is slowed by depriving them of a valuable food source.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Other solutions, such as a realistic management plan for sea otters, is beyond the authority of this board or the State. SARDFA is pursuing other options on the Federal level. In the meantime we are pursuing one of the only options that we have.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Regional Dive Fisheries Association (HQ-F11-063)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 180 - 5 AAC 38.140. Southeastern Alaska Sea Cucumber Management Plan.**  
Amend allowable fishing days during the week of Thanksgiving for the sea cucumber fishery in the Ketchikan area as follows:

Change fishing days for sea cucumbers to Sunday and Monday on the week of Thanksgiving.

**ISSUE:** change the fishing days for sea cucumbers on the week of Thanksgiving to: **Sunday and Monday** [MONDAY AND TUESDAY]. Only on Thanksgiving week.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** ADF&G will continue to change fishing days Thanksgiving week by EO authority instead of following codified regulation.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, this gives processors enough time before Thanksgiving to fully process all harvested sea cucumbers before the Holiday.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone because the product produced will be out the highest quality possible.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one, not even the sea cucumbers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None, it is time to change this.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ketchikan Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-141)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 181 - 5 AAC 38.140. Southeastern Alaska Sea Cucumber Management Plan.**  
Amend allowable daily dive time for the sea cucumber fishery in areas north of Sumner Strait as follows:

Starting November 1, in areas north of Sumner Straits, the harvest time frame for Tuesday will be 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Monday's time frame will remain as it currently is.

**ISSUE:** Currently we have 11 hours of dive time over a two day period/week. In Northern Southeast Alaska, as the days get shorter, we lose out on 30-60 minutes, or more, of harvest time each day.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** We'll continue to lose out on time that could be productive.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No. It only allows divers to access the total amount of time legally available to them under current regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Divers in the northern latitudes of Southeast Alaska would benefit from this change.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that don't want any change, regardless of the reasoning, would not support this.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** This topic has been discussed but no proposals have come forth until now.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association (HQ-F11-095)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 182 - 5 AAC 38.140. Southeastern Alaska Sea Cucumber Management Plan.** Prohibit diving of unlicensed CFEC sea cucumber permit holders 48 hours before, during, and 48 hours after commercial sea cucumber fishery openings in Southeast Alaska as follows:

Insert after the last sentence of 38.140(e): For a period of 48 hours before, during, and for 48 hours after a fishing period no non-licensed CFEC sea cucumber permit holder, aboard a vessel registered to harvest sea cucumbers, may enter the ocean waters of Southeast Alaska.

**ISSUE:** Currently tenders or other persons on board dive vessels are entering the water prior to or outside of openings and "prospecting" for the divers. While "prospecting" some individuals are harvesting cucumbers, leaving the bag on the bottom until the "divers" can retrieve them during the dive opening. Enforcement by Fish and Game personnel of this illegal "stockpiling" of sea cucumbers on the ocean floor is next to impossible.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The people presently engaged in this illegal "stockpiling" will continue due to enforcement being extremely difficult. More people will become involved in prospecting and illegally harvesting cucumbers as the "success stories" of people getting away with this activity become more prevalent.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal will help eliminate some of the illegal harvesting currently occurring and result in enforcement being very straight forward and clear for Fish and Game enforcement personnel.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those that currently do not use non-licensed divers to "prospect".

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that currently endorse prospecting with non-licensed divers. Also non-licensed CFEC sea cucumber permit holders who engage in the illegal practice of stockpiling sea cucumbers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Divers that are engaged in this type of activity have been approached by divers not prospecting. The reply has been that this activity is not illegal and the diver in the water is not stockpiling cucumbers. Providing that stockpiling has occurred is

next to impossible by other divers or by Fish and Game personnel. Passing this proposal would eliminate any confusion and provide clear and enforceable guide lines.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association & Mike Reif (HQ-F11-096)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 183 - 5 AAC 38.142. Southeastern Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.** Establish an equal share harvest program within the Southeast Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan as follows:

SARDFA will create an equal share Geoduck fishery plan, similar to the previously submitted “Equal Share” proposal that incorporates the use of core/noncore fishing areas.

SARDFA will define which areas (Geoduck beds) are “Core” areas and which are “Non-core” areas. While the definitions of these areas will need to be addressed by SARDFA the intent is to have more desirable and less desirable areas as the basis for distinction.

The purpose of the two tier distinction is to force divers to harvest their equal share poundage from both types of areas. For example: if one year the composition of the two types of areas is made up of 60% core areas and 40% non-core areas then the diver would harvest 60% of his poundage from core areas and 40% from non-core areas.

**PRESEASON REGISTRATION** All geoduck diving in Southeast Alaska will be conducted using an Equal Share Program for every diver for the entire season. Prior to SARDFA making decisions about when to start the season and what the weekly target poundage will be, the Department of Fish and Game would require all divers, interested in diving during the upcoming season, to register with them two weeks prior to the start of the season. This registration to dive will be the only time that a diver could register to dive that year.

Once the department has divers registered they will know the maximum number of divers that can participate that season. Knowing the maximum number of participants and knowing the total Southeast GHL the department will divide the number of participants into the total GHL to get the equal share poundage figure for that year. For example: if 60 divers sign up and there is a GHL of 900,000 lbs the equal share figure would be 15,000 lbs. for each diver.

Prior to the season SARDFA (Southeast Alaska Regional Dive Fisheries Association) will determine when to start diving. SARDFA will also decide the maximum amount of product to be harvested during each week of the season (weekly poundage target).

**WEEKLY REGISTRATION** Once the season begins and a PSP testing schedule is in place divers must register on a weekly basis with the Department of Fish and Game in order to be able to dive that week. Such registration will be done electronically (email) or over the phone, after the weekly PSP results are known, by a time deadline the Department of F&G determines appropriate. Divers may only register for sub areas which passed that week’s PSP test.

During the “weekly registration” divers would indicate to the Department of F&G which sub-area (only one area) they were signing up for and how much of their equal share they were planning on harvesting that week. If a sub-area has enough of a GHL to accommodate the poundage signed up for no alterations are required. If, however, a sub-area’s GHL can’t accommodate the diver requested poundage the department will pro rate the diver poundage limits on a percentage of the total request basis. For example: if a diver requested to harvest 1000 lbs. of his Equal Share in area “A”, and this poundage represented 10% of the total diver requests in that sub-area, the department would adjust his requested poundage downward to represent 10% of the remaining GHL in that sub-area.

Additionally, if the weekly diver requested poundage exceeds the “weekly target amount” the department would adjust all diver’s requested amounts downward, on a percentage of total requested poundage basis, similar to the above example. For example: The total weekly target amount is 50,000 lbs. Diver “A” signs up to harvest 1500 lbs of his equal share. All the people signing up this week request cumulatively 60,000 lbs. Diver “A”’s request is 2.5% of the total requested amount (60,000 lbs.). In the adjustment he would be allowed to harvest 2.5% of the 50,000 lb. target amount. This new amount is 1250 lbs. instead of the 1500 pounds requested.

The department would make equal share information available to everyone in a manner they deem appropriate and as expeditiously as possible.

An in-season harvesting adjustment will need to be made for poundage not harvested due to: slow individual harvesting rates, non-harvesting by individuals that had registered in the pre-season sign up period, failing PSP tests, etc. SARDFA will specify, prior to the season beginning, how this will be accomplished. This adjustment will occur when a percentage of the total GHL remains or at a specified date. All unharvested poundage will go into this pool to be redistributed to those that sign up for the end of season harvest time frame. During the decision making of the in-season adjustment SARDFA would also set a target ending date, at which time harvesting for the year would cease and any unharvested quota would stay in the ground until the next rotation.

**IN SEASON REREGISTRATION** This adjustment will be managed similar to the pre-season sign up. Only individuals that signed up pre-seasonally may participate in the “remainder of the season” sign-up period. The regular season list of signed up divers, who want to continue diving, will reregister with the department by a specified date. The remaining GHL will be harvested as per the above in-season protocol.

Divers would be able to harvest, whether in the regular season or the latter part of the season, all of the days of the week that the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) would allow (usually 3 days of diving) or a number that SARDFA deems appropriate, not to exceed DEC guidelines. Daily diving would be limited to daylight hours as specified by F&G on a regularly updated basis.

**ISSUE:** Currently geoduck diving is conducted in a Derby Style fishery. The one or two day a week fishery occurs without regard to quality control, marketing situations, shipping conditions or weather. Divers harvest everything they can while they can and hope for the best price.

Alaska provides less than 7% of the world market yet when we place two or three times the daily demand on the market in a single day we degrade the market for ourselves as well as others in the marketplace.

With Derby Diving Alaska is getting a reputation for poor quality product. When divers are harvesting as much and as fast as they can their ability to control the quality of their product is greatly diminished. Once the week's product is boxed the next obstacle is to try to get the product shipped out of Alaska. Many times product has to sit and wait for the next available plane.

Geoducks are sold on the live market and anything that can be done to expedite their arrival at the market in the best condition possible should be of the utmost importance. Currently this is not being done.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** As our annual GHL increases our problems will continue to increase. The market problems and quality control problems we currently have will continue to get worse unless we change the way we harvest.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** YES! Divers would have more time to harvest and care for their product. Spreading out the dispersal of product to the market would be done over a larger timeframe, resulting in better acceptance of the product and meeting the need to provide a "consistent" supply to the markets. Congestion at the airport would be greatly reduced, resulting in product not being held over until the next plane. Divers would also have more flexibility to work around poor weather conditions.

The markets would approve of spreading out shipments and the likelihood of increased ex-vessel pricing improves also.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Anyone interested in giving the market a consistent higher quality supply of product while increasing the ex-vessel prices for geoducks. Those wanting to slow down production while being able to dive around weather and/or improve the quality of product harvested will benefit under this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that like Derby Diving which is a form of harvesting that most fisheries have long since abandoned.

When a fishery is managed in such a way that nearly half of the licensed permit holders don't even participate, or when the major players in the world of geoducks advise us of the negative impact our harvest method is having on the world market, or when our ex-vessel prices aren't much better than processed pricing, it should be taken that it is time to do something to improve our position.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The issue of half the fleet not participating, of diving regardless of weather and market conditions and producing lower quality product than other geoduck regions of North America has been going on for years. It is with the increase of the

annual GHL that these conditions are exasperated. The larger GHL is now causing us to be able to negatively impact other markets.

Some divers have been trying to bring about change through the BOF process for the last three board cycles and have been unsuccessful. The topic has been discussed within SARDFA but a proposal has not been put forth to date. Perhaps with the choices individuals are putting forth SARDFA will be able to support at least one version?

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association (HQ-F11-098)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 184 - 5 AAC 38.142. Southeastern Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.** Under an equal-share harvest program, require preseason registration for the Southeast Alaska geoduck fishery as follows:

**PRESEASON REGISTRATION** All geoduck diving in Southeast Alaska will be conducted using an Equal Share Program for every diver for the entire season. Prior to SARDFA making decisions about when to start the season and what the weekly target poundage will be, the Department of Fish and Game would require all divers, interested in diving during the upcoming season, to register with them two weeks prior to the start of the season. This registration to dive will be the only time that a diver could register to dive that year.

Once the department has divers registered they will know the maximum number of divers that can participate that season. Knowing the maximum number of participants and knowing the total Southeast GHL the department will divide the number of participants into the total GHL to get the equal share poundage figure for that year. For example: if 60 divers sign up and there is a GHL of 900,000 lbs the equal share figure would be 15,000 lbs. for each diver.

Prior to the season SARDFA (Southeast Alaska Regional Dive Fisheries Association) will determine when to start diving. SARDFA will also decide the maximum amount of product to be harvested during each week of the season (weekly poundage target).

**WEEKLY REGISTRATION** Once the season begins and a PSP testing schedule is in place divers must register on a weekly basis with the Department of Fish and Game in order to be able to dive that week. Such registration will be done electronically (email) or over the phone, after the weekly PSP results are known, by a time deadline the Department of F&G determines appropriate. Divers may only register for sub areas which passed that week's PSP test.

During the "weekly registration" divers would indicate to the Department of F&G which sub-area (only one area) they were signing up for and how much of their equal share they were planning on harvesting that week. If a sub-area has enough of a GHL to accommodate the poundage signed up for no alterations are required. If, however, a sub-area's GHL can't accommodate the diver requested poundage the department will pro rate the diver poundage limits on a percentage of the total request basis. For example: if a diver requested to harvest 1000 lbs. of his Equal Share in area "A", and this poundage represented 10% of the total diver requests in that sub-area, the

department would adjust his requested poundage downward to represent 10% of the remaining GHIL in that sub-area.

Additionally, if the weekly diver requested poundage exceeds the “weekly target amount” the department would adjust all diver’s requested amounts downward, on a percentage of total requested poundage basis, similar to the above example. For example: The total weekly target amount is 50,000 lbs. Diver “A” signs up to harvest 1500 lbs of his equal share. All the people signing up this week request cumulatively 60,000 lbs. Diver “A”’s request is 2.5% of the total requested amount (60,000 lbs.). In the adjustment he would be allowed to harvest 2.5% of the 50,000 lb. target amount. This new amount is 1250 lbs. instead of the 1500 pounds requested.

The department would make equal share information available to everyone in a manner they deem appropriate and as expeditiously as possible.

An in-season harvesting adjustment will need to be made for poundage not harvested due to: slow individual harvesting rates, non-harvesting by individuals that had registered in the pre-season sign up period, failing PSP tests, etc. SARDFA will specify, prior to the season beginning, how this will be accomplished. This adjustment will occur when a percentage of the total GHIL remains or at a specified date. All unharvested poundage will go into this pool to be redistributed to those that sign up for the end of season harvest time frame. During the decision making of the in-season adjustment SARDFA would also set a target ending date, at which time harvesting for the year would cease and any unharvested quota would stay in the ground until the next rotation.

**IN SEASON REREGISTRATION** This adjustment will be managed similar to the pre-season sign up. Only individuals that signed up pre-seasonally may participate in the “remainder of the season” sign-up period. The regular season list of signed up divers, who want to continue diving, will reregister with the department by a specified date. The remaining GHIL will be harvested as per the above in-season protocol.

Divers would be able to harvest, whether in the regular season or the latter part of the season, all of the days of the week that the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) would allow (usually 3 days of diving) or a number that SARDFA deems appropriate, not to exceed DEC guidelines. Daily diving would be limited to daylight hours as specified by F&G on a regularly updated basis.

**ISSUE:** Currently geoduck diving is conducted in a Derby Style fishery. The one or two day a week fishery occurs without regard to quality control, marketing situations, shipping conditions or weather. Divers harvest everything they can while they can and hope for the best price. Alaska provides less than 7% of the world market yet when we place two or three times the daily demand on the market in a single day we degrade the market for ourselves as well as others in the marketplace.

With Derby Diving Alaska is getting a reputation for poor quality product. When divers are harvesting as much and as fast as they can their ability to control the quality of their product is greatly diminished. Once the week’s product is boxed the next obstacle is to try to get the



product shipped out of Alaska. Many times product has to sit and wait for the next available plane.

Geoducks are sold on the live market and anything that can be done to expedite their arrival at the market in the best condition possible should be of the utmost importance. Currently this is not being done.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** As our annual GHL increases our problems will continue to increase. The market problems and quality control problems we currently have will continue to get worse unless we change the way we harvest.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** YES! Divers would have more time to harvest and care for their product. Spreading out the dispersal of product to the market would be done over a larger timeframe, resulting in better acceptance of the product and meeting the need to provide a “consistent” supply to the markets. Congestion at the airport would be greatly reduced, resulting in product not being held over until the next plane. Divers would also have more flexibility to work around poor weather conditions.

The markets would approve of spreading out shipments and the likelihood of increased ex-vessel pricing improves also.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Anyone interested in giving the market a consistent higher quality supply of product while increasing the ex-vessel prices for geoducks. Those wanting to slow down production while being able to dive around weather and/or improve the quality of product harvested will benefit under this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that like Derby Diving which is a form of harvesting that most fisheries have long since quit doing.

When a fishery is managed in such a way that nearly half of the licensed permit holders don’t even participate, or when the major players in the world of geoducks advises us of the negative impact our harvest method is having on the world market, or when our ex-vessel prices aren’t much better than processed pricing, it should be taken that it is time to do something to improve our position.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The issue of half the fleet not participating, of diving regardless of weather and market conditions and producing lower quality product than other geoduck regions of North America has been going on for years. It is with the increase of the annual GHL that these conditions are exasperated. The larger GHL is now causing us to be able to negatively impact other markets.

Some divers have been trying to bring about change through the BOF process for the last three board cycles and have been unsuccessful. The topic has been discussed within SARDFA but a proposal has not been put forth to date. Perhaps with the choices individuals are putting forth SARDFA will be able to support at least one version?

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association

(HQ-F11-099)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 185 - 5 AAC 38.142. Southeastern Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.** Open Geoduck fishery year round to provide consistent monthly harvest as follows:

Fish and Game will manage the Geoduck fishery such that there will be consistent monthly poundage available to harvest throughout the entire year.

**ISSUE:** The current season is compressed into approximately four months. The market wants a consistent year around supply of product.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** We'll continue to miss out on maximizing the monetary potential of our product.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Having a year around supply of product that the market can count on will help stabilize our pricing as well as others in the marketplace, i.e. Washington state and British Columbia.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** People that want a fishery that maximizes the price structure and provides opportunities for divers to select different time frames for harvesting product would support this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that don't want the season to lengthen because it is in conflict with other things they do, i.e. jobs, personal plans (vacations), commitments. Fish and game will need additional staff in order to manage the fishery beyond the current timelines. The current diver assessment tax (7% off ex-vessel sales) could be a source of funding for this additional expense.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Prolonging the season has been discussed and proposed but successful implementation has been evasive.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association (HQ-F11-094)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 186 - 5 AAC 38.142. Southeastern Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.** Extend geoduck fishery year round from July 1 to June 30 as follows:

From **July 1** [OCTOBER 1] through **June 30** [SEPTEMBER 30], geoducks may be taken during fishing periods established by emergency order.

**ISSUE:** Currently the dive season may not begin before October 1. As the Southeast Alaska geoduck annual GHIL continues to increase an expansion of the season may become desirable. A very profitable time of year to expand the fishery into are the months of August and September.

The only way to dive those months right now is to carry GHs on the books for the entire year in order to be able to access the months mentioned at the end of the current dive year. Trying to harvest GHs at the end of a season may result in lost harvest opportunities due to the product failing Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning (PSP) tests. If this were to happen the unharvested product would be dealt with as per Fish and Game's overage/underage policy.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Divers will not realistically be able to harvest during one of the highest market demand periods of the year.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** YES. This proposal provides for marketing opportunities currently not being utilized.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Every person interested in expanding marketing opportunities and maximizing ex-vessel pricing.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People not interested in having diving occur outside of the current time frame (October –February).

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Divers have expressed an interest in diving in late summer but aren't interested in risking the lost opportunities associated with sub-areas testing "hot" at the end of a season, resulting in unharvested product.

With Fish and Game's new (2010) overage/underage policy all product would be able to be harvested, thereby rendering mute the above concern.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association (HQ-F11-101)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 187 - 5 AAC 38.142. Southeastern Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.** Establish a trip limit program for the Southeast Alaska Geoduck Fishery as follows:

All geoduck diving in Southeast Alaska will be conducted using a Trip Limit program for every diver for the entire season.

Prior to the season SARDFA (Southeast Alaska Regional Dive Fisheries Association) will determine when to start diving. SARDFA will also decide the maximum amount of product to be harvested during each week of the season (weekly poundage target).

Once the season begins and a PSP testing schedule is in place divers must register on a weekly basis with the Department of Fish and Game in order to be able to dive that week. Such registration will be done electronically (email) or over the phone, after the weekly PSP results are known, by a time deadline the Department of F&G determines appropriate.

During the "weekly registration" divers would indicate to the Department of F&G which sub-area (only one area) they were signing up for. The department, using the "weekly poundage target" and

the total number of registrants for that week, would determine that week's trip limit. For example: if the weekly poundage target was 50,000 lbs. and there were 50 registrants that week's trip limit would be 1,000 lbs for each diver.

If a sub-area's GHl was not large enough to accommodate the number of divers that had signed up for that sub-area the department would recalculate the trip limit for that particular sub-area. Such computation would be accomplished by taking into consideration the number of registrants for the sub-area in question and the poundage available. For example: the sub-area in question has a remaining GHl of 10,000 lbs. and there are 20 divers registered for that area. This would result in a trip limit of 500 lbs per diver that week instead of the 1000 lbs. as in the above example.

The department would make the trip limit information available to everyone in a manner they deem appropriate and as expeditiously as possible.

Divers would be able to dive for their trip limit all of the days of the week that the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) would allow (most of Southeast Alaska, i.e. Craig and Ketchikan, may harvest Geoduck for 5 days from the date the sample is taken. This translates to a potential of three days of diving due to the time required to harvest the sample and get it to the state lab for testing) or a number that SARDFA deems appropriate, not to exceed DEC guidelines. Daily diving timelines would be daylight hours as specified by F&G on a regularly updated basis.

**ISSUE:** Currently geoduck diving is conducted in a Derby Style fishery. The one or two day a week fishery occurs without regard to quality control, marketing situations, shipping conditions or weather. Divers harvest everything they can while they can and hope for the best price.

Alaska provides less than 7% of the world market yet when we place two or three times the daily demand on the market in a single day we degrade the market for ourselves as well as others in the marketplace.

With Derby Diving Alaska is getting a reputation for poor quality product. When divers are harvesting as much and as fast as they can their ability to control the quality of their product is greatly diminished. Once the week's product is boxed the next obstacle is to try to get the product shipped out of Alaska. Many times product has to sit and wait for the next available plane.

Geoducks are sold on the live market and anything that can be done to expedite their arrival at the market in the best condition possible should be of the utmost importance. Currently this is not being done.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** As our annual GHl increases our problems will continue to increase. The market problems and quality control problems we currently have will continue to get worse unless we change the way we harvest.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** YES! Divers would have more time to harvest and care for their product. Spreading out the dispersal of product to the market would be done over a larger

timeframe, resulting in better acceptance of the product and meeting the need to provide a “consistent” supply to the markets. Congestion at the airport would be greatly reduced, resulting in product not being held over until the next plane. Divers would also have more flexibility to work around poor weather conditions.

The markets would approve of spreading out shipments and the likelihood of increased ex-vessel pricing improves also.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Anyone interested in giving the market a consistent higher quality supply of product while increasing the ex-vessel prices for geoducks. Those wanting to slow down production while being able to dive around weather and/or improve the quality of product harvested will benefit under this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that like Derby Diving which is a form of harvesting that most fisheries have long since abandoned.

When a fishery is managed in such a way that nearly half of the licensed permit holders don’t even participate, or when the major players in the world of geoducks advises us of the negative impact our harvest method is having on the world market, or when our ex-vessel prices aren’t much better than processed pricing, it should be taken that it is time to do something to improve our position

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The issue of half the fleet not participating, of diving regardless of weather and market conditions and producing lower quality product than other geoduck regions of North America has been going on for years. It is with the increase of the annual GHF that these conditions are exasperated. The larger GHF is now causing us to be able to negatively impact other markets.

Some divers have been trying to bring about change through the BOF process for the last three board cycles and have been unsuccessful. The topic has been discussed within SARDFa but a proposal has not been put forth to date. Perhaps with the choices individuals are putting forth SARDFa will be able to support at least one version?

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association (HQ-F11-102)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 188 - 5 AAC 38.142. Southeastern Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.** Amend number of harvest days and times for the Southeast Alaska geoduck fishery to allow for preseason control of harvest for the fishery as follows:

Prior to the season SARDFa would determine how many pounds of product could be harvested each week of the season, based on GHF’s available that year, market conditions and diver input. The travel day would be eliminated making one more day available for harvesting purposes. On a weekly basis divers would sign up with Fish and Game indicating which single day, of the days available that week, they wanted to harvest.

**ISSUE:** Under current regulations the Department of Environmental Conservation’s testing for psp in Geoduck determines how many days of harvest time we have. In all of SE Alaska, except Sitka, divers are allowed to harvest for five (5) days from the time the sample is taken.

If we can spread the current weekly rate or some new version of the amount we could harvest out over more days of the week we would lessen the impact on the market, airlines, and divers.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If we continue with the present method of harvest we’ll continue to see Alaskan product receiving the lowest price within the market. Product will continue to get “bumped” at the airport. Diver’s congestion issues will only get worse.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** By spreading out the effort over more days of the week divers would become more efficient. Safety issues would not be as numerous. The market and airlines would respond favorably to our efforts to spread out our rate of harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Divers interested in improving on safety concerns while getting a better price for their product would favor this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that are satisfied with the old way of doing things that they cannot agree on any change to the fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** As time moves on people continue to grumble about market conditions yet fail to propose any real changes. This proposal addresses the concerns of many that to date haven’t been able to put a proposal forward.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association (HQ-F11-097)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 189 - 5 AAC 38.142. Southeastern Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.** Establish a weekly rate of harvest schedule for the Southeast Alaska Geoduck Fishery as follows:

The Department of Fish and Game will manage the rate of geoduck harvest by implementing a weekly rate of harvest schedule.

SARDFA, in consultation with processors and direct marketers, shall decide the amount of quota they wish to see harvested on a weekly basis throughout the season.

**ISSUE:** The current Derby Style Geoduck fishery we have is ruinous to the live market. When our industry harvests more than the market can handle the prices drop and these same prices are very slow to recover.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** With no current way of limiting the amount of product that is harvested during our one and two day openers we’ll continue to see our

efforts rewarded with low prices. Not only do we suffer the low prices for our efforts but other industries (in British Columbia and Washington State) suffer as well. The hole that our current harvest method places us will only deepen the longer we put off changing it.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** By having a weekly harvest allotment the market will respond by giving a consistently higher price for the product harvested.

The regular problems we have with trying to ship large amounts of Geoduck out on a given day will be greatly reduced if not eliminated altogether. Dead loss will diminish and overall quality will go up.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Anyone interested in receiving more money for their product.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that want to keep this fishery in a state of confusion such that it will keep other potential participants from wanting to participate.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Over the years there have been attempts made to slow down the rate of harvest such as: voluntary harvest rates, gentlemen's agreements, buyer's suggestions, proposed trip limits but none of these worked out.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association (HQ-F11-104)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 190 - 5 AAC 38.142. Southeastern Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.** Revise harvest rotation areas for the geoduck fishery in Ketchikan and Craig to provide consistent annual harvest in the fishery as follows:

Fish and Game will adjust the rotation of areas harvested to provide a consistent GHL available in the two major areas, Ketchikan and Craig, in Southeast Alaska. Any regrouping of areas will not result in not harvesting any available product. The goal is to have a consistent amount of product available, in both of the areas mentioned, from one year to the next.

**ISSUE:** The Geoduck Guideline Harvest Levels (GHL) fluctuates dramatically from one year to the next. One year the total GHL may be 400,000 lbs. plus and the following year over 800,000 lbs. Having a known consistent supply of product would assist our efforts to get higher prices for our Geoduck.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Product receipts will continue to be lower than they should be.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Having a known consistent amount of product available would help stabilize pricing and marketability.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All divers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that don't want to support changes that may draw more of the permit holders into being a part of the fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Again, there has been talk of doing something to stabilize the GHs but nothing has ever been written up.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association (HQ-F11-093)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 191 - 5 AAC 38.142. Southeastern Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.** Limit length of air and water hoses to 300 ft. in Southeast Alaska Geoduck Fishery as follows:

**PRESEASON REGISTRATION:** All air and water hoses used, by individual divers, in the harvesting of geoducks shall be limited to 300 feet. Note companion "vessel distance" proposal.

**ISSUE:** Currently some divers use lengths of hoses that are double, or more, the proposed standard length of 300 feet. Divers with longer hoses can anchor far enough away from other boats yet dive in that boat's "zone" without the affected boat being able to reciprocate. The diver with the long hose can come over and "dust out" a neighboring boat without worrying about the same thing happening to him. This creates a safety concern that should be addressed.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Some divers will continue to use much longer lengths of hoses than the proposed length of 300 feet each thereby increasing safety related issues. Longer hoses coupled with close anchoring is a recipe for diving disasters. We need a maximum standard hose length.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal will provide for a safer and more orderly fishery. A diver's ability to harvest more efficiently and safely will improve his opportunities to harvest more responsibly.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All active divers and tenders. Increasing safety and productivity benefits everyone.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that want to hinder fellow diver's ability to harvest safely and efficiently.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Divers have spoken with each other concerning the problem without anything being done about it. Hence the need for a proposal that is long overdue.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association (HQ-F11-100)

\*\*\*\*\*



**PROPOSAL 192 - 5 AAC 38.142. Southeastern Alaska Geoduck Fishery Management Plan.** Establish a minimum distance of 200 yards between vessels in the Southeast Alaska Geoduck Fishery as follows:

During dive openings all vessels shall maintain 200yds. distance between dive vessels. Such distances shall be gauged from the first vessel anchored. Note companion “hose length” proposal.

**ISSUE:** During openings vessels are anchoring so close to other vessels as to create serious safety hazards. During openings anchors are being deployed while divers are in the water with tremendous safety concerns. Vessels are moving around within the arc of an anchored boat’s diver’s hose length. Divers get their hoses tangled with other diver’s hoses or fouled around another boat’s anchor gear. Divers have been drug by moving boats due to weather, current or the desire of one boat to weigh anchor.

It is simply a matter of time before this industry experiences a diver disaster under these current conditions.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The above problems will continue to get worse as divers are forced to dive under the conditions mentioned.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Divers will be able to dive safer without the congestion problems currently experienced. This will result in a more efficient and safer fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All divers currently harvesting will appreciate the ability to keep a minimum distance between themselves and other boats. Productivity will increase along with a wider margin of safety.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those that desire to “jump” or “cork” vessels that have already been anchored within a Geoduck bed with little or no regard for fellow divers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** This issue has been discussed for years on the docks, on the radio, and across bows. There are always certain individuals that will not adhere to any form of a “distance standard”. Hence the need for this regulation.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Geoduck Marketing Association (HQ-F11-103)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 193 - 5 AAC 38.054. Unlawful use of dive fishing gear.** Prohibits divers from using gear in commercial openings following unauthorized use of gear and allow divers to dive on aquatic farm sites as follows:

(b) The prohibition described in (a) of this section does not

...

(2) **repealed.** [PROHIBIT A DIVER FROM LEGALLY PARTICIPATING IN ANY COMMERCIAL MISCELLANEOUS SHELLFISH FISHERY]

**(3) prohibit a diver from diving on a ADF&G permitted aquatic farm site for the purpose of operating the aquatic farm.**

**(c) Any person or vessel who operates dive gear during any timeframe described in (a) of this section may not participate in any commercial, sport, personal use or subsistence dive fishery for 28-days following the use of dive gear.**

**ISSUE:** Currently, under 5 AAC 38.054, a person or vessel that is licensed or registered to commercial fish for any species of miscellaneous shellfish may not operate dive fishing gear 14 days before or after a fishery they took part in unless they are diving in another commercial miscellaneous shellfish fishery or are authorized to dive by the department for a nonharvesting purpose.

In a recent court case, a diver claimed that miscellaneous shellfish were harvested during a legal fishing period that was authorized under 5 AAC 38.054(b)(2), despite a citation for illegal use of dive gear according to 5 AAC 38.054(a). To prevent further confusion, section (b)(2) should be repealed. Divers found to use gear illegally, in contravention of 5 AAC 38.054, would be prohibited from participation in any miscellaneous dive gear fisheries for 28 days following unauthorized use of dive gear.

Current regulation prevents a dive fisherman who is involved in both the commercial shellfish fisheries and the aquatic farm site industry from diving on an approved aquatic farm site without a permit from the department. The department is concerned that as the aquatic farm site industry grows, this process will soon become very burdensome. This proposal would allow a commercial diver who is participating in a miscellaneous shellfish fishery to be able to dive on approved aquatic farm sites without a special permit issued by the department. Such diving would be confined to the specific boundaries of the aquatic farm site.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Divers using dive gear in violation of 5 AAC 38.054 will continue to be difficult to prosecute and will compromise the department's ability to document times and locations of harvests.

Dive fishermen will continue to be required to contact the department and obtain written permission to conduct any aquatic farm site related work that requires diving.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Divers who follow regulations intended to prevent prospecting and stockpiling, and who legally conduct harvest operations will benefit from the use of a sustainably-managed resource.

Dive fishermen and the department will benefit in reduced paperwork needed to conduct day-to-day aquaculture farm site operations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Divers not complying with current regulations.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-258)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 194 - 5 AAC 38.146. Registration requirements for red sea urchins, sea cucumbers, and geoducks in Registration Area A.** Amend registration requirements for red sea urchins, sea cucumbers and geoducks in Registration Area A as follows:

(c) The department may require holders of CFEC permits for red sea urchins or sea cucumbers to register with the department before harvesting those resources. Before harvesting geoducks, a holder of a CFEC permit to harvest geoducks must register with the department. The department may require registration that allows for geoduck fishing in only one registration management area or in one defined harvest area with a specified guideline harvest level. If a CFEC permit holder is allowed by the department to fish for geoducks in a different registration management area, the permit holder shall contact the department at least **two business days prior to the weekly opening**, [24 HOURS] before fishing for geoducks in a different registration management area. **For the purposes of this subsection, business hours are considered 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.**

**ISSUE:** In the geoduck clam fishery there are two separate registration areas, the Southern Management Area, which includes districts 1–8, and the Northern Management Area, which includes districts 9–16. These areas are further subdivided into smaller geoduck fishery rotational areas, each with a separate guideline harvest level (GHL). For each geoduck fishery rotational area, the department establishes opening times for weekly fishing periods based on estimated effort levels and remaining GHLs. In the Northern Management Area, GHLs are relatively small and any changes in effort can result in substantial changes in fishing time allowed in order to remain within established GHLs or to allow maximum harvesting opportunity. Twenty-four hours is not sufficient time for the department to make changes in opening time periods and provide adequate advance notice to fishermen. Requiring fishermen to contact the department two full business days prior to the weekly opening before changing management areas would allow the department to provide sufficient advance notice of opening times to fishermen.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If effort levels increase or decrease significantly, the department could have to announce modifications of a geoduck opening immediately prior to an opening, which would lead to confusion, denied opportunity, and possible overharvest of the resource.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Permit holders and the resource will benefit by more precise management of GHLs.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those fishermen who make decisions about which area they want to fish closer to the time of the fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-250)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 195 - 5 AAC 02.135. Subsistence abalone fishery, and 5 AAC 77.670. Personal use abalone fishery.** Reduce the bag and possession limits for abalone from 50 to 10 in the subsistence and personal use fisheries as follows:

**5 AAC 02.135. Subsistence abalone fishery.** In the subsistence taking of abalone

(1) the **bag and** possession limit is **10** [50] abalone per person;

**5 AAC 77.670. Personal use abalone fishery.** In the personal use taking of abalone

...

(2) the daily bag and possession limit is **10** [50] abalone **per person** [, EXCEPT IN SECTION 13-B NORTH OF THE LATITUDE OF DOROTHY NARROWS THE DAILY BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT IS 20 ABALONE].

**ISSUE:** Abalone were commercially harvested in Southeast Alaska until 1996; the fishery has been closed since. The sport fishery currently has a bag and possession limit of five abalone. Personal use and subsistence limits have been set for many years at 50 abalone per day, except for a small area near the community of Sitka where the limit is currently 20 abalone. This proposal seeks to reduce the regionwide limit for abalone in the subsistence fishery from 50 to 10 abalone per person and in the personal use fishery from 50 to 10. The proposal also seeks to repeal the personal use abalone regulations in Section 13-B north of Dorothy Narrows because they would no longer be needed.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) managers have noticed a steady decline in abalone populations throughout Southeast Alaska. This is attributed in many areas to sea otter predation and predation by other furbearers, such as river otters, that utilize abalone as prey. Very little research has been done to estimate abalone populations, but observations made by ADF&G divers during stock assessment surveys for other species that are commercially harvested clearly indicate a steady decline in abalone populations. These observations have been made over an extensive area of Southeastern Alaska.

Subsistence use surveys conducted in 1987 and again in 1997/1998 also show significant decreases in average household use of abalone in many areas of Southeast Alaska.

The department is concerned that continued harvest of abalone at the present rates under personal use and subsistence regulations will be detrimental to the few remaining abalone concentrations in Southeast Alaska.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The current harvest rates on the few remaining populations of abalone in Southeast Alaska will not allow for a rebounding of population sizes.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The department is confident that current harvest rates are too high on the present stocks of abalone. Increasing populations of sea otters, along with a host of other factors, may limit rebuilding of these declining stocks.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All users of the abalone resource would benefit from robust abalone populations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** People who currently harvest more than 10 abalone in a single trip would suffer in the short term due to the reduced bag limit.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Request the closing of the abalone personal use and sport fisheries.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-261)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 196** - 5 AAC 02.135. Subsistence abalone fishery; 5 AAC 47.020. General provisions for seasons and bag. Possession, annual, and size limits for the salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area; 5 AAC 77.670. Personal use abalone fishery. Restrict the subsistence, personal use and sport abalone fisheries as follows:

Change existing nonresident abalone daily bag and possession limit from 5 daily, 5 in possession to: **3 daily, 3 in possession and establish a 6 abalone annual limit.**

Change existing personal use bag limits from 50 abalone (Southeast) and 20 abalone (in Sitka area 13-B) to: **5 daily, 5 in possession and establish a 25 abalone annual limit in all of Southeast.**

Change existing subsistence bag and possession limits from 50 abalone daily to: **10 abalone daily, 10 in possession and establish a 30 abalone annual limit.**

Change minimum size from 3.5 to **3.75 inches.**

Educate user groups about conservation of existing abalone stocks. For example, to decrease the mortality rate for abalone that are discarded because they are below the minimum size limit or high graded, ADF&G could include information in the regulation book about proper harvest technique. Discarded or small abalone often cannot survive the damage caused by prying from rocks, or releasing individuals in unsuitable habitat.

Below is an example of text taken from California Fish and Game, similar information could be incorporated in to the ADF&G regbook:

There have been reports of numerous empty shells of undersized abalone at popular fishing sites. Although there are many possible causes of death for undersized abalone, a likely cause is carelessness in picking and returning undersized abalone.

Ab irons are designed to reduce the chances of injuring abalone, but the irons can still cause fatal wounds if used improperly. Foot cuts deeper than inch reduce survivability dramatically since abalone have no blood clotting capabilities. Cuts around the head are often fatal. When sliding an iron under an abalone, keep the iron as close to the rock as possible to avoid stabbing the foot. In prying abalone off rocks it is important that the ab iron handle be lifted away from the rock so that the tip of the bar does not dig into the bottom of the foot.

Even uninjured abalone could easily be killed by predators if they are not carefully returned to suitable habitat. Abalone put on sandy areas or seaweed covered rock surfaces will not be able to clamp down sufficiently to protect themselves from predators. Fishing regulations require an undersized abalone be returned to the same surface of the rock from which it was detached. Experienced abalone pickers can distinguish undersized abalone and do not remove them from rocks. Avoiding removal of undersized abalone helps protect abalone populations since any time an abalone is removed from a rock, there is a chance that it could be fatally injured or unable to reattach to a safe location.

**ISSUE:** Regional and localized depletion of *Haliotis kamtschatkana* (Pinto Abalone) populations around the outer coast of Baranof Island and throughout Southeast Alaska. Despite the closure of the commercial dive fishery for abalone in 1996, both anecdotal evidence and historical data indicate a continued depletion of stocks of *H. kamtschatkana*. The successful reintroduction of sea otters by ADF&G and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service between the years 1965 and 1969 has allowed local sea otter populations to increase dramatically, thus increasing predation on abalone populations. This along with high abalone take limits for Nonresident, Personal use and Subsistence user groups and a high likelihood of poaching create a poor outlook for Southeast abalone stock futures. Currently Pinto Abalone are classified as Endangered on the IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) Red List.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If the current nonresident, personal use and subsistence abalone catch limits remain, the already depleted abalone stocks will continue to decline due to a combination of predation by sea otters and humans. The continued decline in abalone numbers will result in decreased fecundity, and eventually, the collapse of the Southeast population of abalone, one of the few remaining abalone populations in the world.

It would be possible that traditional use groups along with subsistence use groups would seek mitigation due to loss of a traditional and or subsistence food sources based on management decisions including sea otter introduction, past commercial abalone fisheries management and past and current abalone harvest limits.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, by actively addressing abalone stock issues now, while abalone are still present, abalone stocks may be allowed to grow in both population and individual size and thus higher fecundity. The desired result will be greater abalone biomass; this will benefit all abalone user groups.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Subsistence, personal use and nonresident abalone harvesters and consumers for years to come. Abalone stocks.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Individuals that harvest and or consume more than the daily and annual limits described in this proposal. These user groups would hopefully only suffer a short-term reduction in abalone access while the abalone stocks return to a level that is capable of sustaining a higher yield.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Initiating a moratorium on abalone harvest for a period of time between 1 and 10 years to allow stocks to recover along with abalone stock enhancement efforts and stock assessment efforts to monitor effectiveness. I rejected these potential solutions for a variety of reasons one being that a moratorium on harvest without dedicated enforcement would likely lead to an increase in illegal harvest or poaching that would be very difficult to track or monitor without costly enforcement (as seen in California and B.C.) Stock enhancement and monitoring efforts would likely be costly to the ADF&G for a fishery that realizes little monetary return for the local, State and or department economy.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ryan Kauffman (HQ-F11-084)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 197 - 5 AAC 77.668. Personal Use Clam Fishery.** Clarify application of the personal use regulation and close the personal use razor clam fishery in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area.

Amend the regulation as follows:

**5 AAC 77.668. Personal use clam fishery.** In the personal use taking of clams

(1) there is no closed season; except that

(2) there are no daily bag and possession limits for clams, except that for

(A) geoducks the daily bag and possession limit is six geoducks per person per day;

(B) [RAZOR CLAMS ON WESTERN KRUFZOF ISLAND BEACHES BETWEEN CAPE EDGECOMBE AND CAPE GEORGIANA, THE BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT IS 50 CLAMS; ALL DAMAGED RAZOR CLAMS ARE PART OF THE BAG LIMIT];

(C) [THE SITKA SOUND SPECIAL USE AREA DESCRIBED IN 5 AAC 77.674(3)(A), THE DAILY POSSESSION LIMIT FOR RAZOR CLAMS IS 10 CLAMS; ANY DAMAGED CLAMS TAKEN MUST BE RETAINED AND BECOME PART OF THE DAILY LIMIT] the Sitka Sound Special Use Area described in 5 AAC 77.674(3) is closed to the harvest of razor clams.;

(3) in addition to the gear specified in 5 AAC 77.010(k)(3), geoducks may be taken with a hydraulic clam digger.

**ISSUE:** The department manages the razor clam population on western Krufzof Island beaches between Cape Edgecombe and Cape Georgiana under subsistence regulations, so the personal use regulations are redundant.

Prior to 1994, Kamenoi Beach, located within the Sitka Sound Special Use Area on Kruzof Island, supported the primary sport, personal use, and subsistence fisheries for razor clams in the Sitka area. From 1977 through 1986, trends in annual harvests of razor clams in the Sitka area, which averaged about 8,700 clams, were stable. After 1986, annual harvests declined until 1993, when 1,000 clams were taken. Numerous reports from the public indicated a substantial decrease in the number of razor clams on Kamenoi Beach. Potential causes of the decline include changes in tidal currents, changes in beach composition and/or topography, increased predation by sea otters, overexploitation, and disease.

The sport fishery for razor clams in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area has been closed by regulation since 1997 (5 AAC 47.021(g)). The subsistence and personal use fisheries have been closed by EO since 1997. Annual surveys were conducted by the department from 1995–2002, with 2002 having the lowest index count during that period. Though there have not been any surveys conducted since 2002 due to budgetary constraints, there is no expectation that there has been appreciable recovery in the stock. The closure of razor clams in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area should be in regulation until it can be determined that the stock has sufficiently recovered to allow harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will have to annually write an EO closing the personal use razor clam fishery in Sitka Sound.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The resource, the public, enforcement officers, and department staff will benefit by reducing confusion regarding harvesting opportunities for clams of all types in the Sitka Sound area. The department will no longer need to manage personal use clam harvests by EO.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-249)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 198 - 5 AAC 02.130. Subsistence Clam Fishery.** Close the subsistence razor clam fishery in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area.

Amend the regulation as follows:

5 AAC 02.130. Subsistence clam fishery

....

**(b) The Sitka Sound Special Use Area described in 5 AAC 77.674(3) is closed to the harvest of razor clams.**



**ISSUE:** 5 AAC 02.108(a)(4) establishes a positive customary and traditional (C&T) use finding for clams, except geoducks, in District 13. In this district, the department manages all clams, except geoducks, under subsistence regulations and manages the geoduck stock under personal use regulations. There is no regulatory limit for subsistence-harvested razor clams.

Prior to 1994, Kamenoi Beach, located within the Sitka Sound Special Use Area on Kruzof Island, supported the primary sport, personal use, and subsistence fisheries for razor clams in the Sitka area. From 1977 through 1986, trends in annual harvests of razor clams in the Sitka area, which averaged about 8,700 clams, were stable. After 1986, annual harvests declined until 1993, when 1,000 clams were taken. Numerous reports from the public indicated a substantial decrease in the number of razor clams on Kamenoi Beach. Potential causes of the decline include changes in tidal currents, changes in beach composition and/or topography, increased predation by sea otters, overexploitation, and disease.

The sport fishery for razor clams in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area has been closed by regulation since 1997 (5 AAC 47.021(g)). The subsistence and personal use fisheries have been closed by EO since 1997. Annual surveys were conducted by the department from 1995–2002, with 2002 having the lowest index count during that period. Though there have not been any surveys conducted since 2002 due to budgetary constraints, there is no expectation that there has been appreciable recovery in the stock. Closure of razor clams in the Sitka Sound Special Use Area should be in regulation until it can be determined that the stock has sufficiently recovered to allow harvest.

The department manages the razor clam population on western Kruzof Island beaches between Cape Edgecombe and Cape Georgiana under subsistence regulations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will have to annually write an EO closing the subsistence razor clam fishery in Sitka Sound.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The resource, the public, enforcement officers, and department staff will benefit by reducing confusion regarding harvesting opportunities for clams of all types in the Sitka Sound area. The department will no longer need to close subsistence clam harvests by EO.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-248)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES**  
**February 24-March 4, 2012**  
**SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT FINFISH**

**PROPOSAL 199 - 5 AAC 28.020. Groundfish area registration.** Amend groundfish area regulation to specify registration by vessel as follows:

Delete [PERMIT HOLDER] and add the word vessel. Currently a vessel with 2 or more permit holders on board can circumvent the intent of the Icy Bay subdistrict superexclusive lingcod fishery. There have been instances of the captain registering in the East Yakutat Fishery, and the crewmember registering in the Icy Bay Subdistrict.

**ISSUE:** Currently the way the code is written superexclusive goes by the permit holder instead of the vessel.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Some boats will be able to continue harvesting more than a fair amount of lingcod as prescribed by the intent of superexclusive registration.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen who pick an area and followed the intent of super exclusion.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those fishermen who do not.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-337)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 200 - 5 AAC 28.190. Harvest of bait by commercial permit holders in Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.** Clarify use of post-processed and reported commercial fish as bait as follows:

(1) except for sablefish, lingcod, and thornyhead, shortraker, rougheye, and yelloweye rockfishes, groundfish may be taken at any time; sablefish, lingcod, and thornyhead, shortraker, rougheye, and yelloweye rockfish, may not be taken for bait or used for bait, except that the head, tail, fins, and viscera of delivered and processed commercial sablefish, lingcod, and thornyhead, shortraker, rougheye, and yelloweye rockfish may be used for bait;

**ISSUE:** The Alaska Board of Fisheries prohibited use of sablefish for bait in 2003, as well as lingcod and thornyhead, shortraker, rougheye, and yelloweye rockfishes in 2006. The primary reasons behind this were that these species were either fully allocated or long-lived and that

groundfish taken for bait use were rarely reported on fish tickets; therefore, the department had little information to gauge the extent of the unreported mortality. An unforeseen result of this regulation was that all parts of these species were prohibited for bait use, including the head, tail, fins, and viscera. The intention of this regulation was not to prohibit the use of post-processed and reported fish parts.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Commercial fishermen will not be able to take advantage of using processing plant waste products from these species. Crab fishermen who use sablefish heads for bait may unknowingly be in violation of this regulation.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen who will have the opportunity to reduce the amount of bait previously purchased.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-270)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, Miscellaneous Shellfish meeting*

**PROPOSAL 141 - 5 AAC 28.150. Closed waters in Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area; 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A; 5 AAC 38.XXX. Closed waters.** Prohibit fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Cache Island by all users as follows:

Establish Marine Conservation Zone around Cache Island. For indefinite: create a marine conservation zone around this tiny micro island where bottom fish and shellfish are prohibited from, fishing and harvesting. A no fishing boundary of 1500 feet from lands end will mark the conservation area. In conjunction with several islands being classified as marine conservation lands in the Clover Pass area where development is prohibited on land; we are taking one step further and creating a conservation area for all bottom fish and shellfish surrounding the island.

**ISSUE:** Depleted bottom fish and shell fish stocks in the area. Crab shrimp and all mollusks.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fish stocks will never have a chance to regenerate from the pressures of overfishing and harvesting. Future generations will not have access to these limited resources.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Something is better than nothing at this point. By providing a small no fish area reduces stress on a limited supply of bottom fish whose populations are

already overfished and stressed to the max. There has to be some effort to help conserve and repopulate the stocks that are left. Hope fully it is not too late.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bottom fish and shellfish and mollusks are first; a part of a natural food chain. The immediate benefit will be to those marine animals that feed on bottom fish, shellfish and mollusks. And to animals that feed on animals that feed off of bottom fish. Squid, octopus feed on bottom fish and are favorite foods for halibut. It is all interconnected. The greatest benefit will be the environment to help sustain the ecosystem. Ideally this no fish zone will regenerate and spill over stocks to regenerate surrounding areas.

Second; the next benefit will be to man. Whoever this resource user is; resident or nonresident, subsistence fishermen or guided fishermen, all users of a limited resource will benefit from natural fish, shellfish, mollusks stocks being managed and conserved for regeneration not only for this moment in time but for future generations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Users of a depleted bottom fish and shellfish stocks are already suffering from little if any proper management of these resources. No additional harm will increase what users are already experiencing.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Expand marine conservation zones around Naha Bay to Traitors Cove and all off shores areas in between.

Establish marine conservation zones for 10 year periods. Reopen zones for limited time periods to ensure regeneration of fish stocks.

Establish marine conservation zones for limited users. Allow fishing for only residents.

**PROPOSED BY:** Naha Conservation (HQ-F11-159)

\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, Miscellaneous Shellfish meeting*

**PROPOSAL 142 - 5 AAC 5 AAC 28.150. Closed waters in Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area; 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A; 5 AAC 38.XXX. Closed waters.** Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish in a portion of Behm Canal as follows:

Establish Marine Conservation Zone for limited users for off shore waters, bays, inlets and coves from Indian Point to Behm Canal area to Bushy Point and all coves and inlets in between. For indefinite: create a marine conservation zone around this point and surrounding islands and land points where bottom fish and shellfish stocks are open for resident fishing and harvest only. Nonresidents are prohibited from fishing and harvesting within this limited conservation zone. In conjunction with several islands being classified as Marine Conservation Islands in the Clover Pass area where development is prohibited on land; we are taking it one step further and creating a limited conservation area for all bottom fish and shellfish surrounding the bay and island.

**ISSUE:** Depleted bottom fish and shell fish stocks in the area. Crab, shrimp and all mollusks.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fish stocks will never have a chance to regenerate from the pressures of overfishing and harvesting. Future generations will not have access to these limited resources.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Something is better than nothing at this point. By providing a small no fish area for nonresidents reduces stress on a limited supply of bottom fish whose populations are already overfished and stressed to the max. There has to be some effort to help conserve and repopulate the stocks that are left.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bottom fish and shellfish and mollusks are first; a part of a natural food chain. The immediate benefit will be to those marine animals that feed on bottom fish, shellfish and mollusks. And to animals that feed on animals that feed off of bottom fish. Squid, octopus feed on bottom fish and is a favorite food for halibut. It is all inter-connected. The greatest benefit will be the environment to help sustain the eco system. Ideally this no fish zone will regenerate and spill over stocks to regenerate surrounding areas.

Second; the next benefit will be to man. Whoever this resource user is; resident or nonresident' subsistence fishermen or guided fishermen; all users of a limited resource will benefit from natural fish, shellfish, mollusks, stocks being managed and conserved for regeneration only for this moment in time but for future generations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Users of a depleted bottom fish and shellfish stocks are already suffering from little if any proper management of these resources. No additional harm will increase what users are already experiencing.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Establish marine conservation zones open for resident fishing only for a 10 year period. Reopen zones for all fishing on a limited time period to ensure regeneration of fish stocks.

**PROPOSED BY:** Naha Conservation (HQ-F11-162)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, Miscellaneous Shellfish meeting*

**PROPOSAL 143 - 5 AAC 28.150. Closed waters in Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area; 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A; 5 AAC 38.XXX. Closed waters.** Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Naha Bay as follows:

Establish Marine Conservation Zone for limited users from Naha Bay to Donnelly Point from Donnelly Point to Cache Island from Cache Island to Indian Point all places in between.

For indefinite: create a limited marine conservation zone around this bay and surrounding islands and land points where bottom fish and shellfish stocks are open for resident fishing and harvest only. Non residents are prohibited from fishing and harvesting within this limited conservation zone. In conjunction with several islands being classified as Marine conservation islands in the Clover Pass area where development is prohibited on land; we are taking in one step further and creating a limited conservation area for all bottom fish and shellfish surrounding the bay and islands.

**ISSUE:** Depleted bottom fish and shell fish stocks in the area. Crab, shrimp and all mollusks.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fish stocks will never have a chance to regenerate from the pressures of overfishing and harvesting. Future generations will not have access to these limited resources.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Something is better than nothing at this point. By providing a small no fish area for nonresidents reduces stress on a limited supply of bottom fish whose populations are already overfished and stressed to the max. There has to be some effort to help conserve and repopulate the stocks that are left.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bottom fish and shellfish and mollusks are first; a part of a natural food chain. The immediate benefit will be to those marine animals that feed on bottom fish, shellfish and mollusks. And to animals that feed on animals that feed off of bottom fish. Squid, octopus feed on bottom fish and are favorite foods for halibut. It is all inter-connected. The greatest benefit will be the environment to help sustain the eco system. Ideally this no fish zone will regenerate and spill over stocks to regenerate surrounding areas.

Second; the next benefit will be to man. Whoever this resource user is; resident or nonresident' subsistence fishermen or guided fishermen; all users of a limited resource will benefit from natural fish, shellfish, mollusks, stocks being managed and conserved for regeneration only for this moment in time but for future generations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Users of a depleted bottom fish and shellfish stocks are already suffering from little if any proper management of these resources. No additional harm will increase what users are already experiencing.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Establish marine conservation zones open for resident fishing only for a 10 year period. Reopen zones for all fishing on a limited time period to ensure regeneration of fish stocks.

**PROPOSED BY:** Naha Conservation (HQ-F11-160)  
\*\*\*\*\*

*Note: This proposal is also scheduled for consideration during the Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, Miscellaneous Shellfish meeting*

**PROPOSAL 144 - 5 AAC 28.150. Closed waters in Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area; 5 AAC 32.150. Closed waters in Registration Area A; 5 AAC 38.XXX. Closed waters.** Prohibit nonresidents from fishing for bottomfish and shellfish near Cedar Island as follows:

Establish Marine Conservation Zone for limited users around Cedar Island. For indefinite: create a marine conservation zone around this tiny micro island where bottom fish and shellfish stocks are open for resident fishing only. Nonresidents are prohibited from fishing and harvesting within a no fishing boundary of 1500 feet from lands end will mark the conservation area. In conjunction with several islands being classified as Marine Conservation Islands in the Clover Pass area where development is prohibited on land; we are taking it one step further and creating a limited conservation area for all bottom fish and shellfish surrounding the island.

**ISSUE:** Depleted bottom fish and shell fish stocks in the area. Crab, shrimp and all mollusks.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fish stocks will never have a chance to regenerate from the pressures of overfishing and harvesting. Future generations will not have access to these limited resources.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Something is better than nothing at this point. By providing a small no fish area for nonresidents reduces stress on a limited supply of bottom fish whose populations are already overfished and stressed to the max. There has to be some effort to help conserve and repopulate the stocks that are left.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Bottom fish and shellfish and mollusks are first; a part of a natural food chain. The immediate benefit will be to those marine animals that feed on bottom fish, shellfish and mollusks. And to animals that feed on animals that feed off of bottom fish. Squid, octopus feed on bottom fish and are favorite foods for halibut. It is all inter-connected. The greatest benefit will be the environment to help sustain the eco system. Ideally this no fish zone will regenerate and spill over stocks to regenerate surrounding areas.

Second; the next benefit will be to man. Whoever this resource user is; resident or nonresident' subsistence fishermen or guided fishermen; all users of a limited resource will benefit from natural fish, shellfish, mollusks, stocks being managed and conserved for regeneration only for this moment in time but for future generations

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Users of a depleted bottom fish and shellfish stocks are already suffering from little if any proper management of these resources. No additional harm will increase what users are already experiencing.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Establish marine conservation zones open for resident fishing only for a 10 year period. Reopen zones for all fishing on a limited time period to ensure regeneration of fish stocks.

**PROPOSED BY:** Naha Conservation (HQ-F11-161)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 206 - 5 AAC 28.084. Fishing seasons. Landing requirements, and utilization for sharks.** Create a spiny dogfish fishery in Ketchikan area as follows:

Directed pot fishery for spiny dog fish. Season duration pot limits, tunnel size, escapement rings and legal size retention (slot size) to be determined by ADF&G.

**ISSUE:** No directed spiny dog fish fishery. Under article VIII of the Alaska Constitution the Predator Control Program is a tool for the state to manage fish and wildlife populations for sustained yields. It is the state's constitutional duty to arrest the unabated growth of spiny dogfish population. By having a fishery for spiny dogfish the state will fulfill its constitutional duty.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A fish resource will continue to be unharvested that resource would multiply unabated competing for food and displacing other fish resources (halibut, black cod, rockfish and salmon).

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishers who want to fish for spiny dog fish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Longline fishery but that would have to deal with bycatch of unwanted species.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ketchikan Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-142)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 207 - 5 AAC 47.020. General Provisions.** Increase the dogfish daily bag limit as follows:

Increase the bag limit of spiny dog fish from 5 to 10 daily with no annual limit.

**ISSUE:** Increase bag limit of spiny dog fish.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Anglers won't get enough access to an abundant resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it allows anglers ample opportunity to retain spiny dog fish while bottom fishing.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Anglers who want to retain spiny dogfish.



**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nobody will suffer, not even the spiny dogfish.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Not limit was considered but not accepted by all who reviewed the information.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ketchikan Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-143)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 208 - 5 AAC 28.XXX. Pacific cod fishing seasons for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.** Establish commercial fishing seasons for Pacific cod for the Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area:

**5AAC 28.XXX. Pacific cod fishing seasons for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area. In the Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area, Pacific cod may be taken from January 1 through December 31, unless otherwise provided in this section or closed by emergency order.**

**ISSUE:** There is currently no regulation that defines a season for Pacific cod in the Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area. The directed Pacific cod season is open on a year-round basis. The guideline harvest range for Pacific cod is defined in 5 AAC 28.160. Adoption of this proposal would define the season in regulation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will be required to open this fishery by emergency order at the start of each fishing season.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public would benefit by having commercial seasons defined in regulation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-264)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 209 - 5 AAC 28.XXX. Black rockfish fishing seasons for Eastern Gulf Of Alaska Area.** Establish commercial fishing seasons for black rockfish for the Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area:

**5AAC 28.XXX. Black rockfish fishing seasons for Eastern Gulf Of Alaska Area. In the Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area, black rockfish may be taken from January 1 through December 31, unless otherwise provided in this section, or closed by emergency order.**

**ISSUE:** There is currently no regulation that defines a season for black rockfish in the Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area. The directed black rockfish season is open on a year-round basis. Guideline

harvest limits for the directed black rockfish fishery are defined in 5 AAC 28.160. Adoption of this proposal would define the season in regulation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will be required to open this fishery by emergency order at the start of each fishing season.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public would benefit by having commercial seasons defined in regulation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-263)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 210 - 5 AAC 47.065. Demersal shelf rockfish delegation of authority and provisions for management.** Require release of demersal shelf rockfish at depth as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 47.065 to add a management tool to require release of demersal shelf rockfish (DSR) in excess of an angler's bag, possession, or annual limit to be released at a depth sufficient to allow recompression.

**ISSUE:** DSR caught in excess of sport limits are sometimes being released dead on the surface.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Mortality of DSR caught above sport limits, which are released on the surface, is at our near 100%. Although more research is needed, recent studies suggest that releasing DSR at depth can result in some of them surviving.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All fishermen would benefit from conservation of the DSR resource.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Guides Organization (HQ-F11-135)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 211 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, Possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area.** Require release of rockfish at 40 feet or greater as follows:

In all water of Southeast Alaska, all non-pelagic rockfish required to be released must be released immediately and without further harm to a depth of at least 40'. No non-pelagic rockfish may be released at the surface.

**ISSUE:** Sport caught rockfish are dying when released because of embolism injury. Recent scientific studies show up to 80% survival in fish that are released at depth as soon as possible after being caught. Short handling time is essential to this survival. Current bag limits and bag limit reductions have not reduced mortality but have increased wastage (which may not be accurately reported).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Because current regulations don't require anglers to stop fishing when they have caught their rockfish bag limit, or non-pelagic rockfish bag limit, most rockfish in excess of the bag limit will die at the surface. These numbers are poorly accounted for and create significant mortality to the fully allocated resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The rockfish that are released at depth will have a reasonable chance at survival rather than floating away.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All users of the rockfish stocks will be less impacted by wastage. Managers will also have a better estimate of rockfish mortality since released fish will have lower mortality rates.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** There is a learning curve to recompression release devices so that will take time for anglers in the beginning to learn the technique. However, devices can be as simple as a weighted inverted milk crate, so it is not unduly time consuming nor difficult to deploy.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None as re-compression devices are the only means to significantly reduce mortality of released sport-caught rockfish. There are many different types of homemade and commercially manufactured devices. Any particular style might work well or poorly in a particular situation so we did not endorse any specific device.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-131)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 212 - 5 AAC 28.160. Harvest guidelines and ranges for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.** Increase the sport allocation of demersal shelf rockfish to 25 percent as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 28.160 to allocate **75%** [84%] of the DSR Total Allowable Catch (TAC) to the commercial fishery, and **25%** [16%] to the sport fishery.

**ISSUE:** Inadequate Demersal Shelf Rockfish (DSR) sport allocation in the Southeast Outside (SEO) subdistrict will likely jeopardize sport fishing for salmon and halibut in future years.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The sport limits for DSR have already been drastically reduced (1 yelloweye per day, 1 per season in 2010), but the sport allocation has still been exceeded in 3 of 5 years since being established in 2006. Because DSR is an unavoidable bycatch while sport fishing for salmon and halibut, and release mortality is very high, sport anglers will likely face time and area closures for all fishing, not just DSR, in the near future.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Preserving an uninterrupted sport season for salmon and halibut fishing enables guided sport operators to continue to market a high quality fishing trip. Time and area closures due to DSR bycatch would greatly diminish the quality and marketability of this product.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport fishermen and guided sport operators on the outer coast of Southeast Alaska. The economy of Southeast Alaska and many small non-charter businesses in local fishing communities will also benefit from the money spent by sport anglers and charter clients.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Potentially commercial longliners, but it's hard to envision any actual harm when the total commercial harvest of DSR averaged less than 60% of TAC from 2006-2010, despite being allocated 84%. By a large margin, the commercial sector has more allocation than is needed to allow for DSR bycatch in the commercial IFQ halibut fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Rejected status quo. Both high value fisheries (commercial halibut IFQ and sport) need enough DSR bycatch allowance (allocation) to engage in their respective fisheries.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Guides Organization (HQ-F11-122)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 213 - 5 AAC 47.024. Harvest record required; annual limit.** Establish a point system for retention of rockfish as follows:

Replace the daily and possession limits of pelagic rockfish & non-pelagic rockfish with a point system in which the angler is allowed a maximum number of points per day and in possession. In the same manner as the current bag limits are set, the Board of Fish in consultation with staff and public, then would set a point value for each species or group of species of rockfish.

For instance, the board could determine that the daily point limit for a nonresident angler is 100 points and the daily bag limit for a resident angler is 130 point; and that yelloweye rockfish were valued at 60 points, other non-pelagic rockfish valued at 15 points, and pelagic rockfish valued at 10 points. An angler would be required to release any rockfish that would cause him to exceed his

limit. At the Board's discretion the current mandatory retention policy for non-pelagic rockfish could be retained or eliminated.

While these point values are provided only as examples, the expectation is that in comparison to the current system, an angler would be allowed to keep more of the species for which management concerns are minimal if they refrain from retaining yelloweye or other species of concern. This would provide an incentive to not target yelloweye that does not exist in the current system.

**ISSUE:** Beginning with the summer of 2011, clients on a significant fraction of the sport charter fleet will be prohibited from fishing for halibut. Some of this fishing effort that historically had been directed at halibut will likely be displaced to rockfish. Harvest levels of the non-pelagic rockfish group is already at the maximum allowed under current allocations throughout most of outer Southeast despite ever increasing restrictions. Sport fish managers and anglers face the prospect of seasonal and/or area closures if effort on these species increases further. Current regulations do not provide individual anglers with any incentive to voluntarily reduce their take of species of concern. This proposal presents an alternative to these more common restrictions by harnessing the "balloon-effect" to direct effort on to species that are better able to tolerate additional harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Further restrictions on sport rockfish harvest including season or area closures on nonresident yelloweye harvest and annual limits on residents will need to be imposed.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Since each angler will be allowed to choose the specie or species that are most valuable to him to harvest, the perceived worth of the total sport harvest under an aggregate limit system will be greater than the perceived worth of the same amount of fish harvested under the current system where all anglers are allocated the same bag limit for all species.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All sport anglers that have specific species that they prefer.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Anglers that are trying to maximize the total number of high-value fish or total pounds, or are trying to see if they can "limit-out" on multiple species in the same day.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Changes to allocation- not a sustainable solution.

Restrictions on the use of metal jigs and rubber tail jigs while halibut fishing- has merit but difficult to determine when an angler is targeting halibut.

Season /area closures- effective, but they create significant hardships.

Further reductions in bag limits- not much more room to reduce; also traditional bag limits don't provide any incentive for anglers to voluntarily avoid targeting particular desirable species.

Encourage the use of re-compression devices- Has much promise- These two changes in conjunction with one another would be superior to either one alone.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Advisory Committee

(HQ-F11-130)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 214 - 5 AAC 28.170. Sablefish possession and landing requirements for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.** Standardize sablefish retention and reporting requirements in regulation as follows:

(g) Except as provided in (j) of this section, in the Southern Southeast Inside Subdistrict, the holder of a CFEC permit or interim use permit for sablefish may not retain more sablefish in the directed fishery than the annual amount of sablefish equal quota share specified by the department. **A permit holder must retain all visibly injured or dead sablefish. Sablefish that are not visibly injured or dead may be released unharmed, but the permit holder must record the live releases in a logbook by gear settings.** The department shall determine the annual amount of sablefish equal quota share by dividing the annual harvest objective by the number of CFEC permits and interim use permits eligible to be fished in the fishery. The department shall use the best available information, including harvest rate and biological data, to set the annual harvest objective.

**ISSUE:** During the 2003 Alaska Board of Fisheries meeting, a regulation was passed clarifying that live release of small sablefish was allowed in the Northern Southeast Inside (NSEI) sablefish fishery. At the time, the proposal was directed only at this area and did not include provisions for the Southern Southeast Inside (SSEI) Subdistrict. There is currently no prohibition on release of small sablefish in SSEI and it is difficult to determine the degree to which small fish are released in this fishery. This proposal would standardize the regulations in these two fisheries, require that all visibly injured or dead sablefish be retained, clarify that the live release of uninjured sablefish is allowed, and also require reporting of any releases that occur in the fishery. This reporting requirement will provide better information on the discard of small fish and could be a useful indicator of incoming recruitment and more accurate catch per unit of effort information in the fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be a discrepancy in the regulations for the NSEI and SSEI sablefish fisheries, as well as a lack of a reporting requirement for sablefish that are released in SSEI.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Small sablefish are less desirable in the marketplace so harvest quality will improve for those permit holders who currently do not release small sablefish and who begin releasing them due to adoption of this proposal. No changes will occur for permit holders who already release small fish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public will benefit by having consistent regulations. SSEI permit holders who do not currently release small sablefish may see additional revenue if they are allowed to release small fish below the market standard. Fishery managers may gain additional information on stock status.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Permit holders who may not wish to retain visibly injured or dead sablefish would be required to retain them.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-266)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 215 - 5 AAC 28.110. Sablefish fishing seasons for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.**

Amend the sablefish fishing season to allow permit holders to participate in stock assessment surveys as follows:

(c) Notwithstanding (a) of this section, sablefish may be taken outside of established seasons in order to provide information on stock condition and other research questions, as provided in this subsection. The commissioner shall request that permit holders who are interested in fishing outside of established seasons for that purpose notify the department. The commissioner will randomly select from those permit holders [, AND]. Selected permit holders shall fish under terms specified by the commissioner.

**ISSUE:** The department is responsible for determining annual harvest objectives and setting annual personal quota shares (PQS) for the Northern Southeast Inside (NSEI) and Southern Southeast Inside (SSEI) sablefish fisheries. The department uses independent survey data to estimate total biomass of sablefish available in each fishing area. The data collected from the surveys represent a historical time series of information and are used by the department to track trends in the population. The surveys impact the total allowable harvest available to the fishery because the estimated survey harvest is deducted from the allowable biological catch (ABC) prior to setting the annual harvest objective (AHO) for each the fisheries.

In an effort to reduce the impact surveys have on the fisheries, the department would like to include eligible sablefish permit holders during surveys and allow them to harvest the catch on their respective PQS. Since surveys occur prior to the start of the fishery, the department must comply with 5 AAC 28.110. Currently, regulation 5 AAC 28.110(c) allows permit holders to take fish out of season, but requires the department to go through a burdensome call for interest process and then randomly select eligible permit holders to fish outside the normal fishing season. In addition, due to state procurement regulations, the effort to include sablefish permit holders is further restricted and may result in unworkable arrangements between permit holders and vessel owners, preventing selected permit holders from being included on the surveys.

This proposal will allow the department to provide a competitive bid process to select and include sablefish permit holders on future department surveys, and for those permit holders to be eligible to sell harvested fish under their respective PQS.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will continue to issue a call for interest to sablefish permit holders to participate in department surveys under guidelines established in 5 AAC 28.110(c). It is possible that due to state procurement regulations, these permit holders may not meet the vessel requirements needed to complete the survey. The department may have to implement to a full competitive bid for vessel contracts only to discover

that bid results do not provide an agreeable arrangement to include permit holders, and result in no permit holders participating in the longline survey and no net savings to the fishery.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sablefish permit holders will benefit through a reduction in decrements to the AHO and the resultant increase in PQS. The department will benefit from a more streamlined method for contracting vessels for the surveys.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Administratively split the revenue from the sale of survey fish among all permit holders within the fishery.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-272)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 216 - 5 AAC 47.020. General provisions for seasons, and bag, possession, annual, and size limits for the alt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Repeal the nonresident sablefish annual limit as follows:

Sablefish (black cod), bag limits is 4 fish, 4 in possession, no size limit and no annual limit. Sablefish harvest will continue to be recorded in charter logbooks.

**ISSUE:** Unnecessary annual limits and reporting requirements for nonresident sportfishers harvesting sablefish. Limits placed on sablefish were based on inflated harvest projections at the 2009 SE finfish meeting. Actual harvest numbers as indicated by charter logbook data are substantially less than the numbers used in order to justify an annual limit. Reasonable daily bag and possession limits along with the difficulty of largeling sablefish will prevent excessive harvest by nonresidents.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Nonresident anglers will continue to be burdened by unnecessary annual limits and required reporting on individual licenses. Those few anglers that wish to target sablefish will continue to be restricted to as little as two days of fishing opportunity.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Nonresident anglers harvesting sablefish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Repeal of the daily bag, possession and annual limits...rejected.



**PROPOSED BY:** Stan Malcom

(HQ-F11-138)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 217 - 5 AAC 28.165. Lingcod allocation guidelines for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.** Amend lingcod allocation between commercial fisheries as follows:

The 66.66% allocation for commercial shall be split among user groups as follows. 10% bycatch to longline fishery, 10% bycatch to troll fishery and 46% to directed fishery (dingle bar). The sport fishery will remain at 33.33%.

**ISSUE:** Increase total GHF for Icy Bay Subdistrict from 100,000 to 120,000 lbs. and provide percentage allocation to all user groups.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The fishery will continue to be closed to other gear groups when the directed fishery (dingle bar) harvest the principal amount allocated to commercial users for area. Usually by the end of May. Thereby limiting other commercial fisheries access to resource and promoting a lot of bycatch mortal releases.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The bycatch fisheries will allow harvest of fish that may otherwise be forced to released. Decreasing the mortality of dead fish bycatch by these user groups.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The fishermen in all gear groups will be allowed to harvest there bycatch.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The small reduction in percentage to the directed fisheries.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Closing the directed fishery. The directed fishery is a important management tool providing Catch Per Unit Effort statistical data as well as harvesting a underutilized resource in a time of year when no other active fisheries are available in this area.

**PROPOSED BY:** Yakutat Advisory Committee

(HQ-F11-340)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 218 - 5 AAC 28.150. Closed waters in Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.** Allow for retention of lingcod in other commercial fisheries as follows:

That 5 AAC 28.150(b) Notwithstanding (a) of this section, lingcod may be retained in the halibut longline **and troll fishery** in the waters described (a) of this section, as limited by the provisions of 5 AAC 28.173(a).

**ISSUE:** Trollers who fish outside closed waters under 5 AAC 28.150(a) cannot legally fish inside closed waters with lingcod bycatch on-board. There are no current conservation concerns for lingcod in these closed waters.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Trollers will not be allowed to keep lingcod in areas that have been rebuilt (Sitka Sound).

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trollers who are fishing for salmon could then retain lingcod as bycatch if these waters were opened.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A small incidental catch that could effect sport fishermen.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There are none.

**PROPOSED BY:** John Murray (HQ-F11-155)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 219 - 5 AAC 28.165. Lingcod allocation guidelines for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.** Increase allocation for commercially caught lingcod in North Southeast Outside Section as follows:

I am asking the Board to consider adding 2,500 pounds of lingcod to North Southeast Outside Section (NSEO) troll lingcod bycatch. This area is between 50-60 miles SE/NW long. It has a relatively small allocation for this large of an area. It is believed that the lingcod population in this area is very healthy.

**ISSUE:** Trollers who fish in two adjoining sections or areas on a salmon troll trip sometimes will not keep lingcod bycatch because one of the areas closed early to troll lingcod bycatch.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Trollers will continue to leave part of the troll lingcod allocation uncaught in some sections or areas. This is especially true in CSEO (CSOS).

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trollers who are fishing in two different adjoining areas (sections) could usually keep lingcod without rising a violation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Take lingcod from CSEO (CSOS) which has a larger total allocation.

**PROPOSED BY:** John Murray (HQ-F11-158)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 220 - 5 AAC 28.165. Lingcod allocation guidelines for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.** Reallocate a portion of the East Yakutat Section lingcod GHIL as follows:

The department shall annually allocate the harvest of lingcod in the East Yakutat Section (EYKT) Sections as follows:

If the annual GHIL is at or below 200,000 pounds – 75% to the directed commercial lingcod fishery; 2% to the sport fishery; 15% to bycatch in the commercial longline fishery; 8% to bycatch in the commercial salmon troll fishery.

If the annual GHIL is over 200,000 pounds – 4,000 pounds to the sport fishery; 30,000 pounds to bycatch in the commercial longline fishery; 16,000 pounds to bycatch in the commercial salmon troll fishery; and the remainder of the GHIL to the directed commercial lingcod fishery.

**ISSUE:** A large portion of the lingcod longline allocation in the (EYKT) is not harvested each year. The EYKT directed fishery harvests their lingcod allocation in a short period of time, two days in 2009 and two and half days in 2010. The purpose of this proposal is to reallocate 32% of the EYKT lingcod GHIL from the commercial longline fisheries to the commercial directed fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be a surplus of unutilized lingcod left over from the longline allocation which would be harvested by the directed lingcod fishery.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** I believe that fish that are caught in a directed fishery are taken better care of than when they are taken as bycatch in another directed fishery. Several participants in this directed lingcod fishery are freezing their catch at sea which makes for a very high quality product.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The directed dinglebar fishery will certainly benefit from our proposed increase.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The longline fishery will lose a percentage of their lingcod allocation however they have only been using a portion of the allocation in recent years.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo, however the directed lingcod fishery will not be able to take advantage of this unutilized allocation.

**PROPOSED BY:** Krist Martinsen (HQ-F11-157)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 221 - 5 AAC 28.165. Lingcod allocation guidelines for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.** Increase sport allocation of lingcod in Central Southeast Outside Section and Southern Southeast Outer Coast as follows:

Change the allocations in 5 AAC 28.165(4)&(5) to: (4) Central Southeast Outside Section: (A) 36 percent to the directed commercial lingcod fishery; (B) 45 [30] percent to the sport fishery; (C) 12 [23] percent to bycatch in the commercial longline fishery; (D) seven percent to bycatch in the commercial salmon troll fishery; (E) zero [FOUR] percent to bycatch in the commercial groundfish fishery using hand troll gear and mechanical jigging machines; (5) Southern Southeast Outer Coast Sector: (A) 20 [30] percent to the directed commercial lingcod fishery; (B) 59 [44] percent to the sport fishery; (C) 17 percent to bycatch in the commercial longline fishery; (D) zero [SEVEN] percent to bycatch in the commercial groundfish fishery using hand troll gear and mechanical jigging machines; (E) four [TWO] percent to bycatch in the commercial salmon troll fishery.

**ISSUE:** Lingcod allocated to bycatch in the longline fishery in the Central Southeast Outside Section (CSEO) and to the directed lingcod fishery in the SSEOC have been consistently underutilized for the past 5 years. Lingcod allocated to bycatch in the commercial jigging fishery has been almost completely unused in the CSEO and SSEOC for the past 8 years. Allocating these unused lingcod to both the sport fishery and to bycatch in the troll fishery would result in more optimal use of the resource. Trollers have been unable to keep lingcod after mid-August in 5 of the past 8 years in the SSEOC. Current guided sport regulations are a 1 lingcod per year limit with a slot limit of 30-35", or 1 over 55" (completely closed mid-season for CSEO and NSEO sections). Guided recreational anglers view this as overly restrictive.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The State and Southeast coastal communities will not be realizing the optimal value of the lingcod resource.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The quality of guided sport fishing trips would be improved by allowing a reasonable opportunity for an angler to harvest a lingcod on his/her trip.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport Anglers fishing on the outer coast of Southeast Alaska. With more restrictive sport halibut regulations, bottom fish of lower commercial value can be of great benefit to the economic viability of guided sport operators. Trollers will benefit by being able to keep and sell their lingcod bycatch through the entire summer season in the SSEOC.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** If current harvest trends continue, no one will suffer. This proposal seeks to move consistently unused lingcod allocation to fisheries where it will be utilized and benefit the economies of coastal communities on the outer coast of Southeast Alaska.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Considered but rejected status quo because existing lingcod allocations do not provide for optimal use of the resource.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Guides Organization (HQ-F11-216)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 222 - 5 AAC 28.160. Harvest guidelines and ranges for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.** Increase the limit of the lingcod GHl in East Yakutat Section as follows:

The Guideline Harvest Level (GHL) for the East Yakutat Section (EYKT) Section is 0 – 425,000 round pounds.

**ISSUE:** Due to the high abundance of lingcod in this area, we would like to increase the upper limit of the lingcod GHl in the EYKT by 200,000 round pounds with the entire increase allocated to the directed lingcod fishery. We think an increase to the GHl is warranted as we have not seen a change in our daily catch rates for the area we are fishing in numerous seasons.

In the event that this proposal and my proposed change to 5 AAC 28.165(a)(2) were approved and the department was to manage the EYKT Section to the upper end of the GHl, the annual directed commercial lingcod fishery allocation would be 375,000 pounds.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** What has already happened in this area is we have gone from 7 to 12 boats participating in this directed fishery to 19 boats in 2009. The increased effort in this fishery has shortened the season to as little as two days. Two days hardly constitutes a fishery and the resource seems like it could sustain a much higher level of harvest. An increase in quota would allow for more fishing time for the fleet.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The directed fishery produces a high quality lingcod product and also there are several vessels that freeze at sea, further increasing the quality of the product. This proposal would increase the amount of this product available to market.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The directed dinglebar fishery will certainly benefit from our proposed increase in allocation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We have considered limited entry for this fishery but there are complications with numbers of people that would qualify, qualifying years, etc.

**PROPOSED BY:** Krist Martinsen (HQ-F11-156)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 223 - 5 AAC 28.130. Lawful gear for Eastern Gulf Of Alaska Area.** Clarify dinglebar gear in the lingcod fishery allowing for only one line as follows:

(h) In the Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area, dinglebar troll gear is gear that consists of a single line that is retrieved and set with a troll gurdy or hand troll gurdy with a terminally attached weight from which one or more leaders with one or more lures or baited hooks are pulled through the water while a vessel is making way. **A vessel operating dinglebar troll gear may have only one line deployed in the water at any time.**

**ISSUE:** Reports in past seasons have indicated that some vessels participating in the directed lingcod fishery with dinglebar gear may be operating multiple lines at the same time. There seems to be some confusion within the fleet over what constitutes operation of a single line, and reports have suggested that some vessels may be deploying a second line once retrieval of the first line has begun. This would put a vessel at quite an advantage over vessels operating legally because it takes time to haul gear to the surface, pull the line in and bring lingcod aboard, and then redeploy the gear back to depth. Lingcod are typically associated with the bottom substrate and some fishermen may be under the impression that once hauling of the gear has commenced, or if the gear is trailing behind the vessel on the surface, that it has effectively stopped fishing. Until all hooks from that line are on board, the line is still considered to be fishing. The amended language serves to clarify the intention of this regulation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There may continue to be confusion over the interpretation of this regulation by some members of the fleet.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public will benefit by having a regulation that more clearly describes the allowable number of lines allowed to be used on a vessel fishing with dinglebar troll gear.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Fishermen who have been confused over the single-line gear restriction and have operated more than one line may be less efficient than in previous fishing seasons.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Continue to outline gear restrictions in the directed lingcod fishery news release.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-268)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 224 - 5 AAC 28.190. Harvest of bait by commercial permit holders in Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.** Allow lingcod to be used as commercial bait as follows:

5 AAC 28.190 (1) except for sablefish, lingcod, thornyhead, shortraker, rougheye and yelloweye rockfish, groundfish may be taken at any time; sablefish, [LINGCOD], thornyhead, shortraker, rougheye, and yelloweye rockfish, may not be taken for bait or used for bait.

**ISSUE:** I want to use lingcod for halibut bait.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Lingcod will continue to proliferate, adversely affecting the health of the lingcod resource, and if this specie continues to grow, it will very likely effect other species 'like halibut' if it hasn't already. Dead and flead lingcod will continue to be wasted.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, halibut will less likely to be mutilated by lingcod. The same for trollers and their salmon.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Longliners who can "make bait" on the grounds. All halibut users who will most likely see an increase in halibut (both numbers and in weight) if halibut don't have to compete with such a large amount of this very aggressive fish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Possibly the directed lingcod fishery. The directed lingcod fishery will probably not see an increase in quota until monies are made available to access the biomass: and therein lies the problem.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Tony Guggenbickler (HQ-F11-060)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 225 - 5 AAC 27.185. Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C and District 7.** Allow combining two units of gear in herring spawn-on-kelp fishery as follows:

You may combine two legal units of gear in the herring roe on kelp fisheries. No additional kelp shall be allocated for combining pens.

**ISSUE:** Allow two legal herring pens to be sewn together and remove the panels between them.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued unnecessary tattering of roe on kelp product and additional handling of herring.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, pens edges have increased tatter and product would improve with combination.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All fishermen and herring.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Combining more than two but need to see further results from connecting two.

**PROPOSED BY:** Michael Bangs (HQ-F11-128)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 226 - 5 AAC 27.185. Management plan for herring spawn on kelp in pounds fisheries in Sections 3-B, 12-A, and 13-C, and District 7.** Amend spawn-on-kelp gear marking and removal requirements as follows:

(g) Herring for placement in a closed herring spawn-on-kelp pound may be captured only with power seines or hand purse seines and may only be transferred to a closed pounds in

(1) Section 3-B after 12:00 noon, March 17 until 12:00 noon, May 10 unless closed by emergency order;

(2) District 7 after 12:00 noon, April 1 until 12:00 noon, May 10 unless closed by emergency order;

(3) Section 12-A after 12:00 noon, April 6 until 12:00 noon, May 15 unless closed by emergency order; and

(4) Section 13-C after 12:00 noon, April 6 until 12:00 noon, May 15 unless closed by emergency order.

...

(k) Marking requirements for roe on kelp pound structure and associated equipment in Registration Area A.

(1) before [KELP OR] a herring [ARE ADDED TO A] pound is placed in the waters of the state a permit holder must plainly and legibly mark the permit holder's first and last name and five-digit CFEC permit number in a conspicuous place on the pound; the sign must be vertical, and the markings must be clearly visible and above the surface of the water at all times; the letters and numbers used to identify a pound must be at least six inches high with lines at least one-half inch wide and must contrast with the background; if a pound is being operated as a multiple-permit pound, the first and last names and five-digit CFEC permit numbers of all permit holders operating the pound must be placed on a single sign; the sign must be left on the pound structure or the webbing support system the entire time any part of the pound or pound system is in the water.

(2) a permit holder must plainly and legibly mark all floats used in support of the fishery with the ADF&G number of the support vessel; the floats must be permanently marked and clearly visible above the surface of the water at all times.

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

...

(w) [A PERMIT HOLDER SHALL COMPLETELY REMOVE] All pounds and associated equipment must be completely removed from the waters in

(1) Section 3-B from [BY] 12:00 noon, May 31 through March 5 of the following year;

(2) District 7 from [BY] 12:00 noon May 31 through March 5 of the following year;

(3) Section 12-A from [BY] 12:00 noon June 10 through March 10 of the following year;

(4) Section 13-C from [BY] 12:00 noon June 10 through March 10 of the following year.

(5) in addition, all pounds and associated equipment must be removed from all waters by June 15.

**ISSUE:** 5 AAC 27.185(g) requires the department to write an emergency order (EO) each season closing this fishery to the capture of herring. Past experience with the fishery has shown that closing the fishery by EO is unnecessary since herring quickly become unavailable to



fishermen after spawning. Herring that have already spawned are not useful for the purpose of producing spawn-on-kelp. The changes proposed to this regulation will close the fishery to the harvest of herring by a specific date, but will still allow the department to close the fishery to the harvest of herring by EO, if necessary, for the conservation of the resource.

Changes to 5 AAC 27.185(k), (l), and (w) address a specific problem: the spawn-on-kelp fisheries take place in areas with relatively high subsistence, recreational, and commercial use areas valued for their fish and wildlife resources, as well as their wilderness character. In some areas, such as Hoonah Sound in Section 13-C, the fishery occurs in an anchorage that is highly used due to the lack of alternative secure anchorages in the area. For many years, some permit holders in this fishery have been leaving a significant amount of gear in the water year-round, which has caused conflicts with other users and uses. During 2010, two specific complaints involved vessels becoming entangled in lines while attempting to anchor during a period of poor weather. One of those incidents resulted in significant damage to the vessel. Over the years, a significant amount of derelict gear has accumulated on area beaches. Residents of the communities near these fisheries have reported that they have become increasingly upset with the poor stewardship practices shown by some permit holders and they have lodged numerous complaints with the department, insisting on better enforcement of regulations. The Alaska Wildlife Troopers (AWT) has suggested that it is difficult to enforce current regulations requiring removal of all gear associated with the commercial spawn-on-kelp fishery. The AWT has stated that requiring permit holders to permanently mark all floating gear and creating a time period in regulation in which pounds and associated equipment must be removed from the waters of Alaska would assist them in enforcing the regulation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** 5 AAC 27.185(g): the department will have to continue to unnecessarily write an EO each season closing this fishery to the capture of herring.

5 AAC 27.185(k), (l), and (w): if nothing is done, the AWT will continue to find it difficult to enforce regulations in the spawn-on-kelp fishery requiring the removal of gear, leading to some permit holders continuing to leave gear in the water and resulting in continued conflict with other users of the area.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone that uses and enjoys these areas for subsistence, recreational, and commercial purposes; AWT; spawn-on-kelp participants who want to improve the aesthetics of the area; those appreciative of habitat quality since lost gear would no longer be as much of an issue; and those to whom improved safety and reduction of social conflicts is important.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Spawn-on-kelp fishermen who prefer not to remove all of their gear from the grounds.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-251)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 227 - 5 AAC 27.197. Sections 1-E and 1-F commercial sac roe herring fishery.** Amend to clarify only the purse seine fishery as an equal quota share fishery as follows:

(a) In managing the commercial sac roe herring fishery in Section 1-E and the waters of Section 1-F north of the latitude of South Vallenar Point, the department shall ...

...

(2) determine the equal share quota by dividing the annual harvest objective by the maximum number of CFEC **purse seine** permits eligible to be fished in the fishery; a CFEC **purse seine** permit holder may not retain more herring than the annual amount of the equal share quota specified by the department.

**ISSUE:** Regulations for the West Behm Canal herring fishery were created to allow fishing in alternate years by either set gillnet or purse seine gear. The set gillnet fishery was intended to be a competitive fishery and the purse seine fishery was intended to be an equal share fishery. 5 AAC 27.197(2) does not specifically say that the equal share rules apply only to the purse seine fishery. The department would like to ensure that regulations include a statement that the equal share fishery is for purse seine gear only in order to reduce the confusion associated with this regulation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Regulations will continue to be unclear about the designation for the sac roe gillnet herring fishery.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Herring fishermen and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game both benefit from a clear definition of the fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-259)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 228 - 5 AAC 27.131. Gillnet specifications and operations for Southeastern Alaska Area.** Remove the mesh restriction in the Gillnet Sac Roe Herring Fishery as follows:

[ (F) IN THE SECTION 1-E AND SECTION 1-F HERRING SAC ROE FISHERIES, A GILLNET WITH A MESH SIZE OF LESS THAN TWO AND ONE-FOURTH INCHES MAY NOT BE USED TO TAKE OR ATTEMPT TO TAKE HERRING ].

**ISSUE:** Delete the mesh restriction of not less than 2 ¼ inches in the section 1-E and section 1-F gillnet sac roe herring fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** When a gillnet fishery occurs in West Behm Canal much of the small herring biomass will not be available for harvest.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Unknown at this time, however; herring harvested would be somewhat smaller than with a larger mesh.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sac roe herring gillnetters could expect to harvest their entire quota of smaller herring. In addition, gear expenses would be less.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one should suffer as only gillnet fishermen would be affected by this gear change.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Change mesh size of West Behm Canal only. We would like a uniform gear size for the region.

**PROPOSED BY:** Arnold Enge (HQ-F11-086)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 229 - 5 AAC 27.131. Gillnet specifications and operations for Southeastern Alaska Area.** Remove the mesh restriction in the Gillnet Sac Roe Herring Fishery as follows:

Repeal 5 AAC 27.131 (f). Making the statewide herring mesh size in 5 AAC 27.050 (c) become the standard for all herring gillnet fisheries in Southeast Alaska.

**ISSUE:** As stated in the petition submitted in 2011, we are submitting this proposal to request a permanent change to the mesh size for gillnet fisheries in District 1 (West Behm Canal or Kahshakes/Cat Island) to be consistent with mesh size required in the rest of Southeast Alaska and Statewide. Then when the fisheries are opened in District 1 net suppliers are not faced with the need to stock a different size net on short notice or fishermen unable to get web for a fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Likely the allowable harvest would not be taken by the set gillnet fishery in the years they are allowed to fish Section 1-E and Section 1-F (West Behm Canal and Kahshakes/Cat Island Fisheries) as a 2-1/4” minimum mesh size is inappropriate for the size of fish in recent years according to ADFG size data and the reasoning for the larger size mesh requirement from the Statewide Standard of 2-1/8” isn’t documented and the statewide standard of 2-1/8” has been sustainable.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The commercial set gillnet fishermen and net suppliers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those individuals who do not want commercial fisheries on herring stocks and are opposed to the fisheries regardless of the regulations.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None, we stated in the petition submitted in 2011 that we would submit this proposal for consideration during the next Southeast BOF cycle.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Fisherman's Alliance (HQ-F11-075)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 230 - 5 AAC 27.190. Herring Management Plan for Southeastern Alaska Area.** Revise the commercial herring fishery management plan for Sitka Sound as follows:

For the management of herring fisheries in the Southeastern Alaska Area, the department

- (1) shall identify stocks of herring on a spawning area basis;
- (2) shall establish minimum spawning biomass thresholds below which fishing will not be allowed;
- (3) shall assess the abundance of mature herring for each stock before allowing fishing to occur;
- (4) except as provided elsewhere, may allow a harvest of herring at an exploitation rate between 10 percent and 20 percent of the estimated spawning biomass when that biomass is above the minimum threshold level;
- (5) may identify and consider sources of mortality in setting harvest guideline;
- (6) by emergency order, may modify fishing periods to minimize incidental mortalities during commercial fisheries.

Adding the following to 1-6 of 5AAC 27.190 **for Sitka Sound only**

**(7) Age class strength and sex composition;**

**(8) The ecosystem function of both target and non-target species;**

**(9) Maintenance of the geographic distribution of the resource.**

**The plan contains nine specific criteria that must be met prior to consideration of a commercial fishery for herring in Section 13A and 13B.**

**ISSUE:** Improving the herring management plan for Southeastern Alaska area, for Sitka Sound only.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The management plan for the Sitka Sound commercial herring sac roe fishery herring will continue to be limited in scope and limited in relevance compared to present scientific data improvements to other Alaska commercial herring sac roe fishery area management plans.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, this proposal goes beyond improving the quality of the resource harvested and addresses improving the management of the resources harvested. Additional criteria in the management plan will allow managers to generate an age composition estimate of the overall biomass observed throughout the entire duration of the spawning migration, and facilitates the evaluation of the relative strength of recruiting year classes. An ecosystem function of both target and non-target species includes a set of conditions and

processes whereby an ecosystem maintains its integrity. Managing a forage fish such as herring on a single species approach is inadequate. It fails to consider predator-prey interactions affected by fishing and other ecosystem functions. This proposal also allows managers to maintain the natural geographic distribution, connectivity, and quality of fish habitat, and allows for managers to maintain stock diversity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Both commercial and subsistence fishers would benefit from an improved management plan for Southeast Alaska herring.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** None.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Considered applying the three additional functions to the management plan for all Southeastern Alaska area, districts 1A-16.

**PROPOSED BY:** Harvey Kitka (HQ-F11-201)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 231 - 5 AAC 27.160. Quotas and guideline harvest levels for Southeastern Alaska Area.** Amend the GHL for the herring sac roe fishery in Section 13-A and 13-B as follows:

**When the total commercial herring sac roe harvest is within 10 percent of reaching the GHL, the fishery closes for the year.**

(g) The guideline harvest level for the herring sac roe fishery in Section 13-A and 13-B shall be established by the department and will be a harvest rate percentage that is not less than 12 percent, not more than 20 percent, and within that range shall be determined by the following formula:

Harvest Rate Percentage =  $2 + 8 (\text{Spawning Biomass (in tons)} / 25,000)$

**Add to 5 AAC 27.160 (g): When the total commercial herring sac roe harvest is within 10 percent of reaching the guideline harvest level, the fishery closes for the year.**

**ISSUE:** The commercial herring sac roe fishery harvest exceeding the Guideline Harvest Level (GHL). Since 1979, the commercial herring sac roe harvest has exceeded the GHL over 60% of the time (1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1984, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, 2005, and 2009).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The commercial herring sac roe fishery will continue to harvest over the GHL without liability and without repercussions. The excess harvest is not even factored into determining the guideline harvest level for a future year.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal improves management by authorizing the department to close the fishery in order to control exceeding the GHL.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Current managers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial herring sac roe permit holders.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Harvey Kitka (HQ-F11-203)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 232 - 5 AAC 27.160. Quotas and guideline harvest levels for Southeastern Alaska Area.** Repeal regulations for establishing the herring fishery GHL for in Sections 13-A and 13-B as follows:

Delete the following from 5 AAC 27.160:

[(g) THE GUIDELINE HARVEST LEVEL FOR THE HERRING SAC ROE FISHERY IN SECTION 13-A AND 13-B SHALL BE ESTABLISHED BY THE DEPARTMENT AND WILL BE A HARVEST RATE PERCENTAGE THAT IS NOT LESS THAN 12 PERCENT, NOT MORE THAN 20 PERCENT, AND WITHIN THAT RANGE SHALL BE DETERMINED BY THE FOLLOWING FORMULA:

Harvest Rate Percentage =  $2 + 8 (\text{Spawning Biomass (in tons)} / 25,000)$

**ISSUE:** The inconsistency with regulation 5 AAC 27.160 and regulation 5 AAC 27.190 in Section 13A and 13B. The Sitka Sound commercial herring sac roe fishery is mandated by the herring management plan for Southeastern Alaska area, 5 AAC 27.190. The harvest rate percentage for Sitka should be re-written to default to the harvest rate percentage equation used for the rest of Southeast Alaska.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Sitka Sound commercial herring sac roe fishery will continue to use a separate harvest rate percentage, compared to the rest of Southeastern Alaska which uses a harvest rate percentage that is not less than 10 percent, not more than 20 percent, and within that range shall be determined by the following formula:

Harvest Rate Percentage =  $8 + 2 (\text{Spawning Biomass (in tons)} / 25,000)$ .

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal improves management by using the same harvest rate formula on herring stocks throughout the Southeastern Alaska area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Current managers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial herring sac roe permit holders.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Harvey Kitka (HQ-F11-205)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 233 - 5 AAC 27.195. Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery.**  
Establish an equal share fishery for herring sac roe in Sitka Sound as follows:

Regulation 5 AAC 27.195 would contain a section or clause that provides for an equally shared GHIL divided among all the GOIA permit holders or some other such regulation providing for an equally shared fishery.

**ISSUE:** The Olympic style of fishing sac roe herring in Sitka is continuing to jeopardize the safety of the participants in the fishery. Collisions and damage to vessels and their gear has been increasing every year. The competitive nature of the fishery has evolved from individual fishermen vying against each other to groups and “combines” of fishermen blocking and pushing vessels away from the opportunity to catch fish. Group members have deliberately set nets in front of other vessels with no intention of catching fish for the purpose of blocking boats away from one of the partner boats attempting to make the catch. In other instances group members will position their vessels in front of others so their partner vessels can have a clean shot at a school of fish. Safety is the first concern.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Over the last decade more groups have formed and the environment during the openings has become increasingly combative and dangerous. Safety, at this point, is of paramount concern. Collisions and gear damage have been on the rise and insurance adjusters are beginning to take notice. It is no longer an issue of if a significant causality will occur it is a matter of when.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** An equally shared fishery will better pace the harvest and processing over less time from when fish are killed to the time they are frozen. This will better enhance quality. Processors could anticipate landing volumes and adjust their operations more efficiently. Roe recovery would also improve because fish could be harvested in the areas with the best tests rather than those areas with lesser tests but the right amount of volume for a competitive opening.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The entire fishery benefits from this proposal. The fishery will be made more predictable and safer. Collisions and run over nets will be a thing of the past. Insurance claims and lawsuits will dramatically decrease. Management will have an easier time overseeing and prosecuting the fishery and enforcement costs will be significantly reduced. Additionally, the overall resource value will be improved, quality will improve, and the fishery will remain viable and sustainable in the long term.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No fishermen will really suffer, some of the most consistent fishermen will lose their high liner status but as they will be equal with the rest of the fleet they will not suffer greatly. Many with above average landings have achieved those landings participating as part of a “combine” group where all the proceeds are divided equally among the participants in the group. Essentially, many of these fishermen are already involved in their own equal split fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** This proposal is a subject that has been long discussed. Everyone in the fishery should realize safety in the fishery has deteriorated to a despicable level and something needs to be done. Those wishing to maintain status quo have brought no other alternative to the table to improve safety and those in favor of equal split see it as a good solution because it provides the most safely benefits as well as other increased benefit.

**PROPOSED BY:** Bill Menish

(HQ-F11-039)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 234 - 5 AAC 27.195. Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery.** Establish an equal-share fishery for herring sac roe in Sitka Sound as follows:

The Board of Fish needs to change the Sitka Sac Roe fishery into an Equal Harvest Share with a new management plan.

**ISSUE:** The Sitka Sac Roe Fishery can be managed better to ensure a safer, better managed fishery that is responsive to potential conservation concerns as well as to a more stable and robust subsistence fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The fishery will continue to be a “derby” fishery where the fleet will potentially impact the resource in a negative fashion in the future.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The quality harvested will increase substantially as the ability to test areas for the best quality will exist in a non-competitive, non-rushed fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All herring fishermen in Sitka will benefit. The subsistence users will also benefit with a fishery that is dispersed and not concentrated so tightly. Also the herring stock will benefit as this management approach will ensure that there will not be a population crash that is accompanied by “overfishing”. Under the Equal Harvest Share (EHS) fishery, there cannot be overfishing.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. There was a myth that some fishermen caught consistently more than others. However, the CFEC numbers show that there isn’t a single fisherman in Sitka who has doubled the fleet average and the majority of fishermen are huddled around the middle zone.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Herring Group

(HQ-F11-179)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 235 - 5 AAC 27.195. Sitka Sound commercial sac roe herring fishery.** Restrict fishing vessels from entry into the announced fishing area prior to openings in the Sitka Sound commercial herring fishery as follows:



**(3) once the ADF&G has announced an opener, defined boundaries, and set the 2 hour notice period, no purse seine vessel, seine skiff, or tender may enter the announced area. Vessels participating in the Sitka Sound sac roe fishery may only enter the defined open area once the 2 hour notice period has ended and the ADF&G has completed the “10, 9, 8...1” (countdown) and announced the fishery “open.”**

The ADF&G will give adequate time for all participating vessels to leave the announced open area prior to the start of the 2 hour notice period. For example it is 12:30, the department announces the boundary, says the opener will be around 3:00 p.m. and tells the fleet they must all be out of the defined area by 1:00 p.m.

**ISSUE:** Over the past several years, the Sitka sac roe fishery has become beyond the point of “competitive”. Even though all the other sac roe fisheries in the Sate (PWS, Cook Inlet, Kodiak and Togiak) had traditionally been conducted in more confined areas, with far more vessels, and with much shorter openings, competition was very stiff – but there were rarely any vessel collisions. If there were, they were accidentally, and fishermen settled these incidents amicably.

Now-a-days in Sitka, however, it is common for vessels to purposely and intentionally smash into other vessels, mainly because they can’t maneuver properly; and they use this as a tactic for stopping other boats from catching the fish.

These actions are totally unnecessary. People can be super competitive (like all the other fisheries) and not purposely bash into you, to try to stop you from catching fish. We are proposing a management style, similar to what is used at times in some of the Canadian purse seine herring fisheries, that would easily and effectively remove most if not all of these ridiculous activities. This is a very simple solution, and would dramatically reduce these kind of altercations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Sitka fishery will become more unpleasant, lawsuits (unnecessary) will occur, property will be damaged, and someone may become insured.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** No, just the quality of the fishery experience.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All seiners, crew, insurance companies, etc. involved in the Sitka fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo. That seems more and more unpleasant.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Herring Seiners Association (HQ-F11-081)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 236 - 5 AAC 27.132. Seine specifications and operations for Southeastern Alaska Area.** Change specifications for herring purse seines to reduce depth of nets for the Sitka Sound commercial herring fishery as follows:

- (a) A herring purse seine may not be more than 200 fathoms in length.
- (b) **For the herring sac roe fishery in Sitka Sound** a herring purse seine may not be more than [1700] **1025** meshes in depth, **1000 meshes of which must be 1 ½” or less.** **“Border” or hanging strips of up to 5 meshes are allowed on corkline, ribline and leadline.**

**ISSUE:** The Sitka sac roe fishery has become more and more contentious. If we were to reduce the catching power of our seines, by reducing the depth of these seines, we believe that the ADF&G could manage the fishery a bit more liberally. This would hopefully take place in the form of larger areas, longer openers, and more openers. If the fish were harder to catch, we would have less success rates, and make more sets in a given opening. We believe this would create an atmosphere of much less urgency, and would therefore reduce the frenzied activity prior to most openings which occurs now. Because of the enormous catching power of our deep seines, the department is forced to be much more cautious with their management style. This means we tend to be compressed into smaller areas with shorter times – which naturally makes everyone act more crazy.

As quotas come down, this problem will only increase. We believe that by reducing the harvest potential now, it will lead to reduced gear conflict and allow the fishery to be prosecuted in a much more pleasant manner.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued altercations, potential for over harvest with larger seines, more compressed fisheries.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Possibly – better % roe herring can sometimes be found in shallower water.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All fishermen will benefit from a more pleasant and less contentious fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** There will be a cost associated with shallowing up your seines.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo – is becoming more and more unpleasant. Also possibly shortening to 150 fathoms.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Herring Seiners Association (HQ-F11-082)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 237 - 5 AAC 27.132. Seine specifications and operations for Southeastern Alaska Area.** Change specifications for herring purse seine to reduce length of nets for the Sitka Sound commercial herring fishery as follows:

- (c) A herring purse seine may not be more than [200] **150** fathoms in length, **for the Sitka Sound Sac Roe Fishery.**

**ISSUE:** Vessel collisions, gear conflict, overzealous fishermen and an overall unpleasant fishery in Sitka Sound. Reducing the catching power of our seines will allow the ADF&G to manage the fishery more liberally. This could take place in the form of larger areas, longer openings, and more openings.

We believe this would create an atmosphere of much less urgency, thus reducing the frenzied activities prior to, and during most of our Sitka sac roe openings.

Shortening the seine length from 200 fathoms to 150 fathoms along with shallowing them to 5 strips, will be very effective towards this goal. As our quotas diminish, these problems will only increase, unless we do something about it now.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued altercations, potential for overharvest with larger seines, more compressed fisheries.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Possibly – spreading out the harvest could possibly increase roe percent.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All fishermen and the fishery and community.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** It will cost all seiners some money to shorten their seines.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo – is becoming more and more unpleasant.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Herring Seiners Association (HQ-F11-083)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 238 - 5 AAC 27.150. Waters closed to herring fishing in Southeastern Alaska Area.** Establish closed waters for the Sitka Sound commercial herring fishery in order to provide an area only open for subsistence as follows:

Establishment of a Subsistence-Only Zone which is closed to commercial sac-roë harvesting activity. The Subsistence Only Zone must be easily accessible, include different areas that are protected from wind and waves from different directions, and be of the size and location necessary to provide a reasonable opportunity to harvest the Amount of high quality herring roe Necessary for Subsistence. Commercial sac-roë fishing shall continue to be allowed in all other areas.

Potentially, the following boundary could be used:

Inside of the perimeter running from Signal Island south to Makhnati Island, then northeast to Aleutski Island, and northeast to the Baranof Island shore at the O'Connell Bridge, then north along the Halibut Point Road shoreline to Harbor Point, then southwest to South Gavanski Island, continuing southwest to the northern end of Crow Island, then to Bieli Rock and from there to Signal Island.

**ISSUE:** Subsistence herring roe harvests in Sitka Sound have been inconsistent despite the recent very high herring population. Commercial fishing activity on this herring stock has increased in proportion to the biomass while subsistence harvest has not. When intensive competitive seining occurs in the area traditionally utilized for subsistence it can cause even the surviving fish to act and spawn in an unpredictable fashion. This results in subsistence roe-on-hemlock harvesters being unable to place their branches for optimal harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** When the commercial pressure in the traditional subsistence areas disturbs the fish, subsistence harvesters will continue to attempt to compensate. Fishermen will set more hemlock trees, competing with one another and will fish in other areas that are often more dangerous to reach in small boats or produce lower quality roe due to the presence of waves contaminating the eggs with sand. In these ways subsistence harvest becomes more difficult and less productive in years of high herring abundance. In years when the commercial harvest is high but the subsistence harvest is down, relations within the community suffer.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The core subsistence area has historically been the source of the highest quality and quantity subsistence roe. This area is close to town and safely accessible to small boats, so that many people can fully participate in harvesting there. Of the areas that the herring spawn regularly, this includes the areas that are most protected from ocean surge, which can degrade roe quality by stirring sediment into the eggs. It includes both areas far enough from town to avoid sediment or pollution associated with development and areas on the road system for those unable to go farther afield.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sitka subsistence gatherers will be able to safely harvest high quality roe-on-hemlock as they have done for thousands of years. Others throughout the state with who eat the roe will be able to enjoy greater quantity and quality herring eggs as well.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** If in any given year the herring stage and spawn nearly exclusively within the sanctuary area, the commercial fleet may not be able to completely harvest their quota. This has more potential to be a problem in times of low biomass, as during the current high biomass regime, there should be plenty of fish outside of the subsistence-only zone to allow the commercial fleet to catch their GHL. If the herring do not stage and spawn in significant numbers within the sanctuary area, then the subsistence harvesters will see no benefit.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** To the extent that even herring that avoid being captured in the sac-rope fishery are subsequently unexploitable for subsistence harvesters, alternatives short of establishing a meaningful sanctuary are ineffective. However, the particular

boundaries of the area could be modified from the above example so long as the designated area was close to town, sufficiently protected from weather, and was large enough and with high enough egg deposition to provide for a reasonable opportunity to harvest the Amount Necessary for Subsistence.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Advisory Committee

(HQ-F11-134)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 239 - 5 AAC 01.716. Customary and traditional subsistence users of fish stocks and amount necessary for subsistence uses.** Exclude commercial herring fishing within a defined core spawning area within Sitka Sound to allow for a harvest of herring spawn to meet the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence as follows:

In managing the commercial sac roe fishery in Area 13-B north of the latitude of Cape Aspid (Sitka Sound), the department shall ... (2) distribute the commercial harvest by fishing time and area if the department determines that it is necessary to ensure that subsistence users have a reasonable opportunity to harvest the amount of herring spawn necessary for subsistence uses specified in 5 AAC 01.716(b) and (3) not allowing the commercial fishery to harvest in the core subsistence fishing area of Sitka Sound including, but not limited to: all marine waters from Signal Island south to Makhnati Island, then east to Aleutski Island, then north to the Baranof Island shore at the O'Connell Bridge, then northwest to Harbor Point along the Halibut Point Road system, then west to the northern end of Big Gavanski Island, then southwest to the northern end of Crow Island, continuing on to Bieli Rocks, and ending at Signal Island.

**ISSUE:** The Sitka commercial herring sac-roe harvest in the core Traditional subsistence herring roe harvesting areas is affecting the quality and quantity of the subsistence harvest for herring roe on branches and kelp. Subsistence harvesters have been unable to harvest the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence in 2001, 2005, 2007, and 2008. As such, we ask that the Board designate a Subsistence Fishery Area to allocate a subsistence resource to local subsistence users as defined in BOF Policy 79-47-FB.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Subsistence herring roe harvesters will continue to experience a depreciated harvest any time the commercial fleet is allowed to harvest a significant portion of its' quota from one area in the most prolific Traditional subsistence herring roe gathering areas. The commercial herring sac-roe fishery will continue to disturb pre-spawning herring in this area, thus affecting the subsistence fishery, which in recent years, occurs after the commercial fishery

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Provides a measure to ensure that the reasonable subsistence opportunity, required by state law, is provided during the Sitka Sound commercial herring sac-roe fishery. A reduction in the amount of herring that the commercial fishery targets in the traditional subsistence area will contribute to insuring the adequacy of the subsistence harvest of the amount reasonably necessary for subsistence (defined in regulation as 136,000-227,000 pounds).

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Traditional subsistence herring roe gatherers from all communities of Southeast Alaska

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The commercial herring sac-roë fleet will not benefit from this proposal in those instances when the major portions of the biomass are staged in this proposed area. However their vessels are larger and more able to fish open waters further away from the protected areas relied on by the Traditional subsistence roë harvesters.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** MOA between Sitka Tribe of Alaska and ADF&G was not able to remedy negative impacts to Traditional subsistence herring roë harvesting.

**PROPOSED BY:** Harvey Kitka (HQ-F11-214)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 240 - 5 AAC 27.195. Sitka Sound commercial sac roë herring fishery.** Re-allocate Sitka Sound herring to provide up to 1,000 tons of herring for commercial bait when the sac roë fishery GHLL exceeds 10,000 tons as follows:

Five percent of the Sitka Sound herring resource will be designated as a winter bait herring fishery in years when the Sitka Sac Roë GHLL exceeds a minimum threshold of 10,000 tons. The winter bait herring fishery will have a cap of 1,000 tons to the fishery in this area. A winter bait herring fishery will not be conducted in years when the minimum threshold of 10,000 tons is not met.

**ISSUE:** There has been a shortage of good quality bait herring available to processors and the long line fleet in central to northern Southeast Alaska. Since herring surveys transitioned from acoustic to spawn deposition methods traditional areas have not been accessed. No new areas have been surveyed. Tenakee Inlet has provided inconsistent supply even when above threshold level. The only consistent quota for bait herring has been in the Meares Pass Noyes Island area. This herring is typically small and of less desirable quality after being tendered to processors in northern Southeast.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be a shortage of high quality southeast bait herring available to the longline fleet and local processors. This will result in lower per hook catch rates which requires additional bait to run more gear. The importing of higher priced bait as an alternative will increase, placing added economic burden on the local fishing industry.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The proposed bait fishery allocation is from a resource which is currently managed by conservative models. No increased impacts or conservation concerns would result from the existing resource being allocated to a bait fishery. The bait allocation is conservative. Fishing would be conducted in close proximity to existing processing capacity. The expected quality would surpass existing bait herring standards. The value of the resource as a bait fishery would exceed levels obtained in the roë fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Regional southeast fishermen will benefit from participating in a winter bait fishery. Local processors and employees will gain additional income during a time of year where processing is low or non-existent. Processors will further benefit from being able to provide the fishing fleet with a high quality bait which will increase vessel landings in the area and improve purchasing opportunity for customers sales. The local economy will experience a contribution to retail sales and services industry.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The roe herring fleet would experience a five percent reduction in their quota during years when the GHL is between 10,000 and 20,000 tons.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Matching processor contributions with ADF&G funding for the purpose of conducting herring surveys could open up additional areas for a winter bait fishery. This is unlikely given the level of ADF&G budgets.

**PROPOSED BY:** Craig Shoemaker, John Baird, and Randy Lantiegne (HQ-F11-090)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 241 - 5 AAC 27.160. Quotas and guideline harvest levels for Southeastern Alaska Area.** Revise the herring allocation for Hobart Bay to eliminate winter bait and to provide all the available GHL for gillnet sac roe as follows:

[(f) THE GUIDELINE HARVEST LEVEL FOR THE DISTRICT 10 SET GILLNET FISHERY DESCRIBED IN 5 AAC 27.160(b)(2)(C) IS THE PORTION OF THE ANNUAL HARVEST AMOUNT ESTABLISHED FOR THE DISTRICT 10 WINTER FOOD AND BAIT FISHERY UNDER 5 AAC 27.190 THAT IS NOT TAKEN BY THAT FISHERY].

**ISSUE:** Delete the allocation language that gives sac roe gillnetters the left over quota after a winter food and bait fishery in Hobart Bay.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Seymour Canal and Hobart Bay may well be one stock of herring. If a bait fishery occurs, herring gillnetters will lose some opportunity to fish a stock of herring that is allocated to their fishery.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, in most cases sac roe herring are of higher value than winter food and bait herring.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sac roe gillnetters would be more confident that they would be able to harvest all of the available quota in the district.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Some bait fishing harvest would be lost.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No other solution would solve this problem.

**PROPOSED BY:** Arnold Enge (HQ-F11-089)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 242 - 5 AAC 27.197. Sections 1-E and 1-F commercial sac roe herring fishery.** Increase threshold for the West Behm Canal Herring Fishery from 6,000 tons to 15,000 tons as follows:

Raise the fishery threshold for the West Behm Canal Herring Fishery from 6,000 ton to 15,000 ton.

**ISSUE:** The West Behm Canal Spawning Biomass has fluctuated greatly over the last decade even with no directed fishery prosecuted. The last time this fishery took place was in 1999 and the following season (1999-00) forecast was for over 10,000 ton however only 3,000 ton showed in the spring. Again in 2003-04 there was a 9,366 ton forecast and only 400 ton showed in the spring. Because these stocks show a history of collapsing by as much as 9,000 ton with no fishery we think it prudent that the fishery threshold be raised.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The west Behm Canal Herring have shown that their spawning biomass can collapse by as much as 9,000 ton in a single year without being fished so prosecuting a fishery at a 6,000 ton threshold could render a collapse in the biomass so significant that the fish are unable to recover for decades.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Currently the herring in West Behm Canal are small. Raising the threshold would allow these fish to grow to a larger size and increase the spawning biomass, which would make them more valuable on the market and could create a sustainable fishery. Under the current Management plan this fishery has proven itself to be unsustainable.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The herring and all the mammals and fish that feed upon them and eventually the fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. This fishery hasn't been prosecuted in 12 years. If we fish them too soon it will take another 12 years to rebuild the stock. Under the current management plan with alternating gear groups, a fishermen may get to fish West Behm Canal two or three times in his lifetime for a miniscule quota. So why even bother having the fishery? It would be better to rebuild the stock sufficient to have a sustainable fishery in the future.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Considered proposing closing the West Behm Canal herring fishery, but if we can sufficiently rebuild the stock then we should fish them.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ketchikan Guided Sportfish Association (HQ-F11-111)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 243 - 5 AAC 27.197. Sections 1-E and 1-F commercial sac roe herring fishery.** Eliminate rotational fishery opportunity for purse seining in West Behm Canal Herring Sac Roe Fishery and allow only gillnet sac roe fishing as follows:



5 AAC 27.197 (a)(1) Delete language that describes purse seine and gillnet harvest sharing. (2) Delete all. (d) Delete purse seine fishery from this language. (f) Delete all of this language.

**ISSUE:** Eliminate the alternating rotational fishery with purse seiners in the West Behm Canal herring sac roe fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Herring gillnetters who have seen significant disruption in traditional fisheries; will have less opportunity to have a economical fishery.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, gillnet herring should be somewhat larger than seine herring from this area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Herring gillnetters should see more opportunity on a more consistent basis.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Purse seiners would lose what opportunity they might see from this fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No other solutions would solve this issue.

**PROPOSED BY:** Arnold Enge (HQ-F11-087)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 244 - 5 AAC 27.110. Fishing seasons for Southeastern Alaska Area.** Eliminate rotational fishing opportunity for purse seining in West Behm Canal herring sac roe Fishery and allow only gillnet sac roe fishing as follows:

[(1) IN THE PURSE SEINE FISHERY, HERRING MAY BE TAKEN ONLY IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS.

(A) SECTION 1-E, SECTION 1-F NORTH OF THE LATITUDE OF SOUTH VALLENAR POINT.]

**ISSUE:** Eliminate the alternating rotational fishery with purse seines in the West Behm Canal herring sac roe fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Herring gillnetters who have seen significant disruption in traditional fisheries will have less opportunity to have a economical fishery.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, gillnet herring should be somewhat larger than seine herring from this area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Herring gillnetters should see more opportunity on a more consistent basis.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Purse seiners would lose what opportunity they might see from this fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No other solutions would solve this issue.

**PROPOSED BY:** Arnold Enge (HQ-F11-088)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 245 - 5 AAC 27.197. Sections 1-E and 1-F commercial sac roe herring fishery.** Allocate of equal shares in the Southeast sac roe fishery in Section 1-E and 1-F by designation of permit holders to harvest herring for others as follows:

(a)(2) determine the equal share quota by dividing the annual harvest objective by the maximum number of CFEC permits eligible to be fished in the fishery: a CFEC permit holder(s) may [NOT RETAIN MORE HERRING THAN THE ANNUAL AMOUNT OF THE] **designate another CFEC permit holder to catch is equal share** quota as specified by the department.

**ISSUE:** The sac roe fisheries in sections 1-E and 1-F have a minimum threshold biomass of 6,000 tons and the 2011 GHF was 1,276 tons for Behm Canal. 5 AAC 27.197 (a)(2) allows for an equal share harvest. It is impractical for 48 seine permit holders to each harvest 26 tons. Therefore, the regulation needs to specify that permit holders may allocate their share to a specific permit holder/harvest boat.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If the regulation is not modified the fishery becomes uneconomical at low population biomasses.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it will improve quality by having fewer boats harvesting the small GHF in an orderly fashion.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The permit holders, processors, and department.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer if the proposal is adopted.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Considering existing regulation which makes the fishery uneconomical.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Herring Conservation Alliance (HQ-F11-106)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 246 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan.** Clarify that the management measures for the use of two rods is for king salmon only as follows:

(c) When the king salmon abundance index is greater than 2.0, the commissioner may, by emergency order, implement the following management measures:

(1) a sport fish angler may use two rods when fishing for king salmon from October through March;

...

(d) When the king salmon abundance index is 1.76 to 2.0, the commissioner may, by emergency order, implement the following management measures:

(1) a sport fish angler may use two rods when fishing for king salmon from October through March;

...

(e) When the king salmon abundance index is 1.51 to 1.75, the commissioner may, by emergency order, implement the following management measures:

(1) a sport fish angler may use two rods when fishing for king salmon from October through March;

**ISSUE:** The management provisions that allow the use of two rods under the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan are not consistent; 5 AAC47.055(c)(1), (d)(1), and (e)(1) specify the use of two rods, whereas 5 AAC 47.055(f)(4), (g)(5), and (h)(4) specify the use of two rods while fishing for king salmon. This inconsistency makes it unclear if two rods may be used to fish for species other than king salmon under the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Confusion over whether to retain or release other species when fishing with two rods as allowed under the Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan will continue.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public, department managers, and enforcement personnel who need clearly defined regulations to guide sport fishing activities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-317)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 247 - 5 AAC 47.XXX. New Regulation.** Develop a management plan to protect and enhance a roadside sport fishery in Juneau as follows:

The ADF&G Sport Fish Division in Juneau will develop and implement a management plan to protect and enhance the Juneau Roadside Sport Fishery within one (1) year of adoption of the proposal.

## Juneau Roadside Fishery Management Plan Outline

Objective: Enhance the Juneau roadside sport fishery as a joint venture between ADF&G, the USFS, DIPAC and other participating organizations and agencies.

### Methods:

1. Participating agencies adopt a cooperative, “can do” attitude that puts words into actions.
2. Develop single points of contact between all participating organizations/agencies.
3. Determine when, where and how a small demonstration project can be initiated.
4. Establish short and long term goals necessary to enhance the sport fishery along the Juneau road system
5. Include enhancement of Juneau roadside sport fishery as a specific line item in participating agencies operating budgets.

### Scope of Work:

Possible options include but are not limited to the following:

- A. Conduct summer creel census on roadside streams and lakes;
- B. Update Mike Bethers July 1, 1985 Recreational Fisheries Maintenance and Enhancement Report;
- C. Designate critical streams or parts thereof as catch and release areas;
- D. Analyze and compare the genetics of wild, Lake Florence cutthroat trout and wild, local cutthroat trout stocks;
- E. Transport wild cutthroat trout and other species and stock suitable lakes;
- F. Use DIPAC facilities to incubate, rear and hold fish used for stocking;
- G. Stock sterile fish in suitable lakes;
- H. Follow the successful Hunter Safety model and institute a sport fishing education curriculum for middle school students;
- I. Identify and secure easements to protect public access to roadside streams, lakes and ponds;
- J. Use the Juneau Empire Outdoor column and other media outlets to keep the public informed.

**ISSUE:** Urban growth and fishing pressure threaten the valuable sport fishery on drainages that cross the Juneau road system. No management plan is in place.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Critical fresh water riparian habitat has been destroyed as pressure on the fresh water fishery increases.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, the quality of sea run cutthroat trout, Dolly Varden char and coho harvests will improve and be sustained by this plan.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Young and adult sport fishers without boats and retailers that sell tackle and gear will benefit as well as visiting anglers and tourists.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Jet ski operators on Auke Lake, off road 4 wheel users on Montana Creek and miners may suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Direct appeals to ADF&G Sport Fish have failed.

**PROPOSED BY:** Greg Capito

(HQ-F11-003)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 248 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area.** Change the definition for “bag limit” for anglers fishing from a vessel as follows:

Change the definition of daily bag limit to allow an angler on board a vessel to voluntarily retain a fish whether or not that person hooks or reels the fish in. In essence, allow a "boat" limit which would be the sum of a daily bag limit for all legal anglers on board the vessel. The captain and crew could be included or excluded if the vessel is a charter boat. In reality, this solution merely legalizes what is currently practiced by most anglers: resident or nonresident, guided or unguided.

5 AAC 75.995(4) Daily bag limit would mean the maximum legal take per person per day in the area in which the person is fishing even if part or all of the fish are immediately preserved. A fish when landed and killed can become the bag limit for any person legally authorized to fish on a vessel whether or not that person actually hooks the fish. While fishing from a vessel a person may land and kill more than the daily bag limit as long as the number of fish for any species on the boat does not exceed the sum of the number of legal anglers on the vessel times the daily bag limit for that species.

**ISSUE:** Ambiguity of wanton waste and conservation of sport caught fish, relative to hooking and catching.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Some sport caught fish of most species will continue to be wasted because of regulation concerning the definitions of hooking and catching. Demersal shelf rockfish, such as the highly desirable yelloweye are very susceptible to barotraumas as well as gill and gut hooking mortality. Other highly desirable species such as halibut and salmon are most susceptible to gill and gut hooking mortality.

Current daily bag limits for some species such as king salmon, halibut and yelloweye rockfish are very restrictive, one or two per person, depending on residency, location and time of year. Catch and release of at least one species is highly likely in the course of a day of fishing, even if one is trying to catch another species to retain. A change in the definition of daily bag limit to allow a person to voluntarily retain a fish whether that person hooks or reels the fish in will minimize this kind of mortality.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. As in most endeavors, some anglers are better than others, and most anglers who sport fish in Alaska fish for food not sport. Current regulations

allow an angler to continue fishing even though the angler may have taken a bag limit of one or more species. In the case of demersal shelf rockfish (DSR,) the angler Must retain all DSR until the bag limit has been reached. Once a person has retained a daily bag limit, all fish subsequently caught of that species must be released. A couple of examples will help to clarify the need for change in this regulation. 1) Recreational fishing methods are not 100 percent selective, i.e. a vessel may anchor and target halibut, but catch rockfish and salmon, or a vessel may troll for salmon and catch rockfish, ling cod and halibut. In this example one angler retains a daily bag of one yelloweye rockfish and a halibut. He/she hooks another yelloweye rockfish and brings it to the surface. Under current regulation, he/she must release the yelloweye, which is nearly 100 percent certain of death due to barotrauma. Hypothetically, this angler could catch numerous yelloweye and is required to release them all, except the first one. A change in the definition would allow another angler(s) on board to retain those yelloweye until the boat limit is reached. Ideally, the boat limit of halibut would be reached before an excess of yelloweye are brought to the surface, and all anglers stop fishing. 2) A family of four goes trolling for king salmon. They want to be sure they take at least a couple kings so the first two that are hooked are reeled in by mom and dad. Soon another king is hooked and dad calls their two kids who are in the cabin to come and get the pole. They are both slow, and dad grabs the pole and reels up the slack and fights the fish for about 15 seconds. Junior comes out and takes the pole and reels in the 35 pound king which is hooked and bleeding profusely from the gill. Under current regulation, dad must release the king, since he is the person who originally hooked the fish and has retained his daily bag of one king salmon. Gill hooked, bleeding salmon probably have no more than a ten percent chance of surviving if released, whether the hook is a treble hook or a single barbless hook. A change in the definition would allow the family to retain this king and come ashore with up to four kings, regardless of who hooked or reeled them in, assuming they were all in agreement of that process.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** We believe that having the flexibility to retain or release fish based on a boat limit and mortal wounds, rather than based solely on an individual limit will benefit the resource. This flexibility will minimize the number of hookups and in effect, minimize catch and release of dead fish until each person catches their bag limit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** This regulation change will benefit all users, by minimizing unwanted mortality. Furthermore, we believe the practice is widely practiced and seldom enforced.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Stop fishing when bag limit is reached. This is rejected because of nonselectivity of methods, i.e. there is no current method which will only target a specific species. To stop fishing for one species would prevent you from fishing for other species.

**PROPOSED BY:** Juneau Douglas Advisory Committee (HQ-FII-342)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 249 - 5 AAC 47.020. General provisions for seasons and bag, possession, annual, and size limits for the salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area; 5 AAC 47.022. General revisions for seasons and bag, possession, annual, and size limits for the salt waters**

**of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Establish nonresident annual limits for sockeye, coho, chum, and pink salmon in the Southeast Alaska Area as follows:

In the Southeast Alaska Region: Nonresident and resident harvest record and annual limits: (a) Nonresident anglers are required to have a non-transferable harvest record in possession when angling for [KING] salmon, steelhead, shark, lingcod, yelloweye rockfish, and sablefish (Black Cod); an annual limit is also established for these species.

5 AAC 47.020. General provisions for seasons and bag, possession, annual, and size limits for the salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area

(2) salmon, other than king salmon: may be taken from January 1 - December 31; no annual limit **for residents. The annual limit for nonresidents is XX silver salmon, XX sockeye salmon, XX pink salmon and XX chum salmon;** no size limit;

5 AAC 47.022. General provisions for seasons and bag, possession, annual, and size limits for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area

(b) (2) salmon, other than king salmon: may be taken from January 1 - December 31; no annual limit **for residents. The annual limit for nonresidents is XX silver salmon, XX sockeye salmon, XX pink salmon and XX chum salmon;** no size limit;

(c) (2) salmon, other than king salmon: may be taken from January 1 - December 31; no annual limit **for residents. The annual limit for nonresidents is XX silver salmon, XX sockeye salmon, XX pink salmon and XX chum salmon;** no size limit;

**ISSUE:** It is the opinion of the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council that abuses to sport fishing bag and possession limits by some nonresident anglers are well known. These behavior patterns by a few nonresidents are contributing to conservation issues that are difficult to address on a case by case basis. One of the first pieces of information required to assess the impacts of nonresident anglers is to document the total harvest of salmon by this group. Personal Use and subsistence fisheries for Chinook, silver and sockeye salmon generally have annual limits that are recorded in the field on a harvest record. Nonresident anglers currently have annual limits for Chinook salmon, steelhead, shark, lingcod, yelloweye rockfish and sablefish. It would not be a significant additional administrative burden for nonresidents to include the harvest of all salmon on their harvest record.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The current mail out survey is not adequate to identify salmon fishery use patterns and total harvest from nonresident fishers. A separate accounting system is necessary to document where, when and how many salmon are taken by nonresidents. It is the opinion of the Council that the lack of this type of information is masking potential conservation issues. The residents of this region place a high value on the salmon resource that is not shared by those that want to pay for their trip to Alaska with boxes of fish. An annual limit will allow some anglers the satisfaction to catch their limit without impacting others rights and opportunities to enjoy this resource.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The residents of Alaska would benefit by providing a meaningful limit on the number of salmon that can be harvested and subsequently removed from the State by nonresident fishermen. The management of all salmon fisheries would benefit because the total harvest by nonresident anglers would be accurately documented.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** There will be some additional recordkeeping by nonresident salmon fishermen. This should not be a substantial burden as catch records are already required for Chinook salmon, steelhead, shark, lingcod, yelloweye rockfish and sablefish.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The Council rejected the idea of suggesting what the annual limits should be but intended the values to be determined by the stakeholders in a public process.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Subsistence RAC (HQ-F11-080)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 250 - 5 AAC 47.022. General provisions for seasons and bag, possessions, annual, and size limits for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Allow for retention of king salmon in freshwater streams in Southeast Alaska Area as follows:

Remove the blanket prohibition against king salmon fishing in freshwater streams of Southeast Alaska to fishing for king salmon. Fish and Game could then close specific streams or sections of streams to sport fishing for king salmon to protect specific stocks or sections important to propagation or rearing of kings.

**ISSUE:** All rivers and streams in Southeast Alaska are closed to sport fishing for king salmon with rod and reel while the rest of Alaska can enjoy this opportunity on the streams and rivers in their areas.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** All other rivers of Alaska except those of Southeast Alaska are open to king salmon fishing with rod and reel. Only Southeast Alaska sport fishermen are discriminated against in this way.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** More fishing opportunity will benefit sportsmen and their suppliers and outfitters. Fishing effort will be more dispersed offering a better fishing experience.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Catch limits and catch allocations will keep negative effects to negligible levels,



**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** To achieve equity in harvest opportunity close all rivers and streams of Alaska to sport king salmon fishing with a blanket prohibition as Southeast.

**PROPOSED BY:** Taku Users Group

(HQ-F11-127)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 251 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area.** Allow the use of two rods by non-guided anglers in salt water as follows:

Current regulations and management plans as provided in special provisions for SE saltwater (5 AAC 47.021) should contain a provision so that: Resident boat anglers fishing from unguided vessels in Southeast Alaska may use year around two rods apiece, up to a maximum of six rods per boat.

**ISSUE:** Resident sport anglers harvest less than 40% of the total Chinook sport harvest in Southeast Alaska and also experience a Chinook salmon success rate about half that of guided anglers (per Dept report to BOF 2009). This is due in part because salmon boat anglers fishing alone or with only one partner are at a disadvantage fishing only one rod each compared to typical guided vessels that typically carries multiple clients and can deploy multiple rods. Anglers aboard a multi-angler vessel has the benefit of covering multiple lure depths, bait or lure combinations to determine the depth, bait or lure, or action that is effective during a particular fishing trip. One or two anglers fishing together have much less ability to test the range of depths or bait presentations to determine the effective depth/lure combination.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** While the current SE king Salmon Management Plan has allowed the use of two rods per angler during the winter months when effort is quite low, this has done little to decrease the disparity between the success rate and harvest level of resident and nonresident anglers. Resident anglers who fish for personal and resident consumption typically fish alone or with a single companion often in small boat and skiffs. The proposed regulation would lessen the advantage a guided vessel typically has. A guided vessel also has the advantage of being skippered by a professional operator who is on the grounds everyday and is familiar with the most recent fish concentrations and depth and bait preferences. The regulations restricting resident anglers to one rod should be modified to improve the success of local anglers and attain more use of our resource for resident households.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** A small but increased proportion of the harvested resource will go to the benefit of resident households, where more of it will be consumed fresh, or processed into value added product such as smoked and canned.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Resident anglers who typically fish alone or with one companion and resident households who will share in the small but increased proportion of the harvested resource taken by resident anglers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial Sportfishing operations may experience slightly smaller shares of the sport fish harvest.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Resident marine anglers may fish one additional rod per boat up to a maximum 6 rod per boat. I chose the other alternative as being slightly simpler to interpret.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jeff Fujioka

(HQ-F11-052)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 252 - 5 AAC 75.020. Sport fishing gear.** Allow the use of power assisted reels by disabled anglers only as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 75.020 section (d) A power-assisted fishing reel may only be used to sport fish if the:

- (1) power-assisted fishing reel is mounted on a fishing rod by means of a reel seat;
- (2) power-assisted fishing reel assembly, motor, gearbox, fishing line, reel-mounted battery, or other reel-mounted attachments weigh no more than 15 pounds in total when detached from the fishing rod.

**ISSUE:** Amend 5 AAC 75.020 section (d) A power-assisted fishing reel may only be used to sport fish if the:

- (1) power-assisted fishing reel is mounted on a fishing rod by means of a reel seat;
- (2) power-assisted fishing reel assembly, motor, gearbox, fishing line, reel-mounted battery, or other reel-mounted attachments weigh no more than 15 pounds in total when detached from the fishing rod.

**(3) angler is legally handicapped or disabled when fishing in the Southeast Alaska and Yakutat management area.**

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Advisory Committees of this region will lose faith in the Board of Fish process. During the 2010 board of fish cycle, an overwhelming number of the advisory committees in this management region opposed the use of power assisted reels while sport fishing, except for the legally handicapped and disabled anglers. The Board of Fish for this reason should support the Advisory committees of the region and amend 5 AAC 75.020 section (d) specifically for the Southeast Alaska and Yakutat region.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, this proposal preserves the integrity of what the definition of sport fishing truly is and it improves the image of Southeast Alaska's sport fishery and its sport fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The overwhelming majority of this region's residents who feel using a power assisted reel is not sport fishing at all. The handicapped and disabled fishermen who fish in the Yakutat and Southeast Alaska management area and want to use an electric reel. Charter fishermen operating in this area who have handicapped and disabled clients that have difficulty reeling a manual reel.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The people who believe that using a power assisted reel for sport fishing fits the definition of sport fishing. Charter fishermen who wanted to use power assisted reels to attract non handicapped clients who don't want to reel a manual reel while sport fishing.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1. To not allow power assisted reels to be used by anyone who is sport fishing the Yakutat and Southeast Alaska management area. I rejected it first because it would prevent some handicapped and disabled people from the joy of catching fish and second because almost all of the advisory committees of this region agree with that logic.

**PROPOSED BY:** Steve Merritt (HQ-F11-012)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 253 - 5 AAC 29.155. Vessel Identification; 47.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish system for distinguishing vessels participating in hand troll and guided charter fishing in Southeast Alaska as follows:

Willing to consider any enforceable solution such as the Bristol Bay area registration or the regulation that prohibits sport, personal use or subsistence crab fishing 2 weeks prior to a commercial opening. It could be something like require registration if you own both a commercial salmon hand troll permit and a guided sport fish license and register which fishery you are participating in with a stand down period between activation of registration in the other fishery of at least five days so fish can't be held and sold later when the registration for the hand troll permit is in effect; and require the charter license sticker to be covered up when hand trolling and selling fish, until sold and require the Commercial ADFG numbers and HT to be covered up when charter vessel fishing with clients on board until clients and fish are landed.

**ISSUE:** Clarify and make a distinction for when a vessel is commercial hand troll fishing and when the vessel is operating as a licensed guided sport fishing vessel. I see vessels in areas of high king salmon abundance that are closed and other closed areas to commercial fishing and later see them at the processors later that evening selling fish.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Illegal fishing will occur by fishing in closed areas; and/or selling sport caught fish caught in closed waters on the hand troll permit under the disguise of hand troll fishing.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Clarifies which fishery the vessel is participating in and makes regulations more clearly defined for enforcement.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Operators who participate in both fisheries will have an additional requirement to comply with. The operator may depending upon the solution will have to make conscious decision to which fishery he/she will be participating in at which times.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Prohibition against charter fishing and commercially fishing within the same day with the same vessel.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ed Hansen (HQ-F11-204)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 254 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Allow youth and disabled anglers to use bait in high use and small cutthroat lakes as follows:

Allow for the use of bait in high use and small cutthroat lakes to young and disabled persons.

**ISSUE:** Allow use of bait in the freshwater high use and small cutthroat lakes for persons age 10 and under, and persons with a disability.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Young and disabled persons will have limited access to fresh water cutthroat and Dolly Varden fishing. Young children will have a negative fishing experience and not develop a lifelong love for their resource of the sport.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Persons not capable of retrieving artificial lures or flies would benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one would suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-150)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 255 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Establish a Taku River king salmon sport fishery as follows:

Remove the blanket prohibition against king salmon fishing in the Taku.

**ISSUE:** The Taku River is closed to sport fishing for king salmon with rod and reel while the rest of Alaska (except Southeast) can enjoy this opportunity on the streams and rivers in their areas.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Sport fishing for king salmon is being unfairly prohibited on the Taku and fishermen there are being discriminated against when compared to other Alaskans.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** More fishing opportunity will benefit sportsmen and their suppliers and outfitters. Fishing effort will be more dispersed offering a better fishing experience. Sport fishing opportunity equity is also involved. Residents living on the Taku River will not have to travel to saltwater to harvest and enjoy king salmon.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Upriver Canadian commercial fishermen may see a slight reduction in king salmon caught but catch limits and allocations will keep negative effects to negligible levels.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** To achieve equity in harvest opportunity close all rivers and streams of Alaska to sport king salmon fishing with a blanket prohibition as exists on the Taku and other Southeast Alaska rivers.

**PROPOSED BY:** Taku Users Group (HQ-F11-126)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 256 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Prohibit snagging at the mouth of Auke Creek as follows:

(d) In the Juneau vicinity: in the waters that are adjacent to Juneau City and Borough road system to a distance one-quarter mile offshore:

...

(3) in the waters of Auke Bay, east of a line from Waydelich (Wadleigh) Creek to an ADF&G regulatory marker located approximately one-quarter mile south of the mouth of Auke Creek,

(A) sport fishing for sockeye salmon is closed;

(B) Dolly Varden may be taken only from June 1 – March 31;

**(C) snagging or attempting to snag is prohibited within a 200-yard radius seaward of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game markers located approximately 200 feet downstream of the Auke Creek weir, a fish unintentionally hooked elsewhere other than the mouth must be released immediately;**

**ISSUE:** The department has prohibited snagging at the mouth of Auke Creek by emergency order since 2003 to protect sockeye salmon returning to the Auke Lake drainage. This proposal

would establish in regulation a year-round snagging prohibition at the mouth of Auke Creek, which will reduce confusion over where and when snagging is prohibited in this area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will continue to issue emergency orders to prohibit snagging at the mouth of Auke Creek.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Anglers and enforcement staff will benefit if all regulations implemented for the area at the mouth of Auke Creek are established in regulation, rather than issued by emergency order.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-315)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 257 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Prohibit use of bait on Cowee Creek as follows:

Bait is not allowed in Cowee Creek year- round.

**ISSUE:** Often when anglers "hit it right" in Cowee Creek during September, they will catch more fish than they can legally take and hence will release several fish after their limit is caught. Bait fishermen often will hook cutthroats and silvers deeply and so when these fish are released they will frequently die in spite of the best of intentions.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The cutthroat trout and silver salmon populations will remain lower than Cowee could support. It is my belief based on my own experience and anecdotal evidence that the populations of both species, particularly Cutthroat Trout, are lower than when I started fishing in Cowee in 1977. There is more fishing effort in Cowee Creek now and this trend will probably continue.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** A bait ban should increase the numbers of cutthroat trout and silver salmon available for sport fishing and spawning thus increasing both the sport hook-ups and numbers of fish that spawn successfully.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Spin and fly fishermen. They should see increased numbers of cutts and silver salmon in Cowee Creek.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Bait fishermen in Cowee Creek will be hurt. Bait is banned until Sept. 15 now but under this proposal bait will be banned year round. I have bait fished, spin fished and fly fished in Cowee Creek since 1977. It is my firm belief that the techniques used by spin fishermen and bait fishermen are very similar and equally productive. The sole difference is that bait fishermen can not release fish without killing a much higher percentage than all other angling methods.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Circle hooks. A great idea that would be very unpopular with those who feel that they can't hook fish well with them. Lowered catch limits. I don't believe this is called for if more cutts and silver salmon can be safely released.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tony Soltys

(HQ-F11-009)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 258 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag. Possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area.** Reopen Sitkoh Bay Sockeye Sport Fishery as follows:

Rescind the closure of the sockeye sport fishery in Sitkoh Bay.

**ISSUE:** In the early and mid 1990's the Sitkoh sockeye sport and subsistence fisheries were closed due to low escapement counts and concern from the public. Beginning in 1995 the Department began conducting mark-recapture experiments to better estimate the Sitkoh Lake sockeye escapement. These improved estimates of escapement indicated that the Sitkoh Lake sockeye population is healthy and that a harvestable surplus is available. In 2001 the subsistence fishery reopened and in 2006 the sport fishery in freshwater reopened. The sport fishery in the adjacent saltwater has not been reopened.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Anglers will not have the opportunity to harvest sockeye in Sitkoh Bay.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** A sockeye harvested in saltwater will be in better eating condition than the same fish once it reaches freshwater.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Anglers who want to harvest sockeye in Sitkoh Bay.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?**

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We considered leaving the saltwater closed - primarily due to concerns about intentional snagging. This concern can be at least partially addressed by a conservative definition of the freshwater-saltwater boundary provided that the boundary is well marked by the Department.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Advisory Committee

(HQ-F11-132)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 259 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Make fishing within the Sitka Historical Park on the Indian River a fly fishing only, catch and release fishery as follows:

Fishing within the Sitka Historical Park on Indian River be fly fishing only and catch and release.

**ISSUE:** Regulations for support fishing inside the Sitka Historical Park (Indian River) are confusing and causing local confrontations. Make fishing within the park boundary fly fish or catch and release only.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Confusing regulations. Difficult for Sitka Historical Park personnel to manage the resource and identify people targeting salmon. Simplify by marking the fishery fly fishing and catch and release only.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Helps enforcement. Stop the illegal fishing for salmon. People are retaining coho salmon within the park. Help enforcement separate and identify salmon fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sitka Historical Park personnel, enforcement, local sports fishermen who fish for dolly Varden. Enforcement is having trouble separating trout fishermen from people targeting coho.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. No species other than dolly Varden are allowed to be kept. Salmon retention is not allowed! However, some people are fishing for and keeping illegal salmon.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Please change/clarify the regulation for 2011.

**PROPOSED BY:** David R. Rice

(HQ-F11-034)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 260 - 5 AAC 47.055. Southeast Alaska King Salmon Management Plan.** Liberalize king salmon regulations in the vicinity of Ketchikan as follows:

Open an addition to the Ketchikan THA it would start at the south end of the THA in Nichols Passage to Hid Reef. A straight line to the intersection of stat areas 101-29 and 101-25, turning north to South Vallenar Point. Have a two fish daily bag limit that starts the same day as the increased harvest in Ketchikan THA and does not count against annual bag limits.

**ISSUE:** Access to hatchery raised king salmon in the Ketchikan Area.



**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Sport fishermen will continue to lose opportunity to catch hatchery raised king salmon.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Allows access to bright hatchery king salmon before they turn dark.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All sport fishermen that like to catch king salmon.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Donald E. Westlund (HQ-F11-064)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 261 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag. Possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of Southeast Alaska Area.** Increase king salmon bag limits in the vicinity of Neets Bay as follows:

Liberalize king salmon bag limits near Neets Bay terminal saltwater area where there is a greater ratio of hatchery king salmon as follows:

Increase king salmon daily bag limit for residents and non residents by (1) additional fish from June 1 through July 31 in areas 101-85 and 101-90 West Behm Canal (including Survey Pt. and Comano Pt.) when the king salmon abundance index is 1.51 or higher. Maintain the existing annual limit for king salmon by non residents.

**ISSUE:** Neets Bay hatchery king salmon are under utilized by sport fishermen because only a very small and limited terminal area east of Bug Island is opened by E.O. for liberalized bag limits in June. king salmon do not stage in this area and typically pass through quickly with little ability to harvest them.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Neets bay hatchery king salmon will continue to pile up at the net pen with few additional harvesting opportunities by sport fishermen in years of high abundance.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport fishermen targeting Neets Bay hatchery king salmon.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. We believe that providing incentive to fish in an area with a higher ratio of hatchery king salmon will decrease pressure in other areas where there is a higher ratio of treaty fish.

## OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

**PROPOSED BY:** Ketchikan Guided Sportfish Association

(HQ-F11-112)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 262 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special Provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Extend the open season and the period bait may be used in City Park Ponds until August 31, and modify the bag and possession limit for cutthroat trout, king, and coho salmon as follows:

(i) In the Ketchikan vicinity:

...

(3) in the City Park Ponds,

(A) sport fishing is allowed only from the first Saturday in June through **August 31** [THE FIRST SUNDAY IN JULY];

(B) bait may be used from the first Saturday in June through **August 31** [THE FIRST SUNDAY IN JULY];

(C) the bag and possession limit for rainbow [AND CUTTHROAT] trout, **king and coho salmon**, in combination, is five fish; no size limit;

**ISSUE:** The annual “Kids Fishing Day” has been held in the Ketchikan City Park Ponds since the mid 1990s. The Deer Mountain Hatchery has annually stocked the ponds with rainbow trout, king salmon, or coho salmon for this event. In 1997, the Board of Fisheries adopted a proposal opening City Park Ponds for a 30-day period to allow for this event and one month of fishing opportunity. In recent years, the department, Deer Mountain Hatchery staff, and Alaska Wildlife Troopers have fielded calls regarding anglers (usually children) wanting to fish with bait in the ponds during the summer months after the season has closed. Extending the open season and period bait may be used would allow anglers additional sport fishing opportunities to harvest the remaining stocked fish in the ponds. The Deer Mountain Hatchery is currently permitted to stock the ponds with king salmon, coho salmon, or rainbow trout. In order to provide fishing opportunity for these species, regulations need to be modified to reflect the species that are stocked.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Anglers will not have the opportunity to sport fish in the ponds or use bait after the first Sunday in July.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Sport anglers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-318)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 263 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Prohibit use of bait in the Klawock River as follows:

(k) In the Prince of Wales Island Vicinity:

(5) In the Klawock River drainage,

(A) only unbaited, artificial lures may be used;

(B) sport fishing for all species from the Klawock River Bridge is closed;

(C) rainbow and cutthroat trout, in combination, must be no less than 14 inches and no greater than 22 inches in length;

(D) the bag and possession limit for steelhead is two fish if one of the fish has a clipped adipose fin, as evidenced by a healed scar;

(E) upstream from the Klawock River Bridge, sport fishing for sockeye salmon is closed;

(F) **Disallow Use of Bait by Emergency Order.**

**ISSUE:** Stop the use by Emergency Order allowing the use of bait from Sept 15<sup>th</sup> to Oct 15<sup>th</sup> on the Klawock River. The Klawock River is a designated fall run steelhead river and should have the same protection as ten other creeks and drainages listed in the Prince of Wales Island Area region wide regulations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The continued incidental catches of native fall steelhead by fishermen targeting silver salmon. Steelhead incidentally hooked on bait are far more likely die because they are hooked deep in the throat and will probably bleed to death.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Protects Native fall run steelhead. The Klawock Hatchery no longer raises Steelhead.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Native steelhead and sport and subsistence fishermen who fish for them.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Non rural and Nonresident Salmon fishermen wanting to use bait for Silver Salmon. Rural fishermen can continue catching Silver Salmon with bait by getting a federal subsistence permit

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** William Russell

(HQ-F11-058)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 264 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Allow the use of bait in the Klawock River as follows:

The Klawock River on Prince of Wales Island will be open to bait fishing for Coho salmon, for residents and nonresidents.

**ISSUE:** Bait fishing is only allowed on the Klawock River for out of state fishermen by emergency order for Coho salmon. In making plans to fish on this river you never know if it's going to be open to bait until mid September.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** It might cause some fishermen to change their plans and go somewhere else, a loss for the community.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** We won't snag and injure so many fish. When you're using bait you always hook them in the mouth. Much easier to release if you so desire.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT** Nonresidents will have an easier time planning a fishing trip. Fishing will be better for all sportsmen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** There may be a few more fish harvested but I don't think that will be a problem. The community will prosper from the nonresident fishermen.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Robert Tremewan (HQ-F11-048)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 265 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Repeal Klawock River regulations applying to adipose fin clipped steelhead as follows:

(k) In the Prince of Wales Island vicinity:

...

(5) in the Klawock River drainage,

(D) **repealed** [THE BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT FOR STEELHEAD IS TWO FISH IF ONE OF THE FISH HAS A CLIPPED ADIPOSE FIN, AS EVIDENCED BY A HEALED SCAR;]

**ISSUE:** Hatchery-produced steelhead are no longer released into the Klawock River drainage, making this regulation unnecessary.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Anglers will mistakenly believe that hatchery-produced steelhead are present in the Klawock River drainage, and an unnecessary regulation will remain in place.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public, department managers, and enforcement personnel who need clearly defined regulations to guide sport fishing activities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-320)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 266 - 5 AAC 47.021. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the salt waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Clarify Klawock Harbor area closed to snagging and retention of sockeye as follows:

(i) In the Prince of Wales Island vicinity:

(1) **all waters of Klawock Harbor south of a line from the Klawock blinker light to the Klawock oil dock** [THE WATERS OF KLAWOCK HARBOR BETWEEN THE KLAWOCK RIVER BRIDGE AND A LINE FROM THE KLAWOCK BLINKER LIGHT TO THE KLAWOCK OIL DOCK] are closed to:

(A) snagging; a fish hooked elsewhere other than in the mouth must be released immediately;

(B) sport fishing for sockeye salmon;

**ISSUE:** The area description in the current regulation is unclear about whether a small portion of Klawock Harbor is open to sport fishing for sockeye salmon and to snagging.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Anglers may believe that harvesting sockeye salmon and snagging is permitted in a small portion of Klawock Harbor.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public, department managers, and enforcement personnel who need clearly defined regulations to guide sport fishing activities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-321)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 267 - 5 AAC 47.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the fresh waters of the Southeast Alaska Area.** Align Post Office Lake regulations with the Yakutat roadside systems regulations as follows:

(b) In the freshwater drainages in the Yakutat vicinity that are crossed by the Yakutat road system and all streams draining into Yakutat Bay between Ocean Cape and Point Latouche:

...

(5) **repealed** [IN POST OFFICE LAKE

(A) THE BAG AND POSSESSION LIMITS FOR COHO SALMON 16 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH IS A BAG LIMIT OF FOUR FISH AND A POSSESSION LIMIT OF EIGHT FISH;

(B) BAIT MAY BE USED FROM JANUARY 1 – DECEMBER 31;]

**ISSUE:** In 2009, the department successfully eradicated the nonindigenous northern pike population in the Post Office Lake drainage with rotenone treatments. The use of bait, originally allowed to increase harvest of the invasive northern pike, is no longer needed and may hinder reestablishment of coho salmon in this system. In order to rebuild the coho salmon population in the Post Office Lake drainage, the Yakutat road-system bag and possession limit of two coho salmon is more appropriate than the current bag limit of four fish and possession limit of eight fish.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Coho salmon may take longer to recolonize the Post Office Lake drainage.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes; this action will assist in recolonization of coho salmon in the Post Office Lake drainage.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All user groups.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-314)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 268 - 5 AAC 77.60X. Applicability of personal use regulations in the Yakutat Area; and 5 AAC 77.65X. Applicability of personal use regulations in Southeast Alaska.** Amend to clarify where personal use finfish regulations apply as follows:

**5 AAC 77.60X. Applicability of personal use regulations in the Yakutat Area. The personal use regulations in Article 13 only apply to areas not specified in 5 AAC 01.666 and 5 AAC 02.108.**

**5 AAC 77.65X. Applicability of personal use regulations in the Southeast Alaska Area. The personal use regulations in Article 14 only apply to areas not specified in 5 AAC 01.716 and 5 AAC 02.108 or that are identified as non-subsistence areas in the Ketchikan Nonsubsistence Area and the Juneau Nonsubsistence Area as specified in 5 AAC 99.015.**

**ISSUE:** There is confusion amongst the public what about which regulations they can fish under. If adopted, these regulations would clearly state that personal use regulations in Southeast Alaska and Yakutat do not apply to areas with positive customary and traditional use findings. For areas with positive customary and traditional use findings subsistence regulations in Chapters 1 and 2 of the Alaska Administrative Code would apply. Personal use regulations would only apply in nonsubsistence areas and areas that do not have positive customary and traditional use findings which is consistent with the intent of the Alaska Board of Fisheries.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued confusion on the part of the public.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** No one. If adopted, this proposal merely clarifies where personal use regulations apply.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-282b)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 269 - 5 AAC 47.024. Harvest record required; annual limit.** Establish a catch report card system for subsistence, personal use and sport finfish fisheries as follows:

Require the use of a catch report card that can be returned by mail or online with the year split into a couple of seasons and a penalty if you fail to return your report on time. (see Washington State regulations regarding their voluntary salmon reports ) <http://wdfw.wa.gov/fishing/vtr/>; <http://wdfw.wa.gov/fishing/shellfish/crab/crc.html>; <https://fishhunt.dfw.wa.gov/wa/crabreport>

**ISSUE:** The sustainability of the resource. Without accurate accounting of all removals of the resource we are going to follow other states on both coasts and damage our resource by under-estimating what is harvested in total. This leads to judging the biomass inaccurately and setting commercial catch limits for fully utilized species at unsustainable levels from ignorance and not by intentionally overfishing the resource. For example, several of the hatchery Chinook releases are being reevaluated based on the cost versus the perceived survival rate. Only the commercial data is being considered in the survival rate as it is the only data that is generated along with a little information provided from charter logbooks. We need all recreational harvests besides what is recorded in the charter logbooks, including personal use and subsistence harvests levels for

salmon (Chinook), and groundfish species accounted for by the use of a catch report card like they use in Washington State for other species.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Likely see a decline in most resources over time as we fish beyond sustainable levels.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Our fishery resources will remain sustainable.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** It will likely take a little bit of time on everyone's part.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The use of tags, with identifier numbers, harder to use on some species than others, but with the use of tags you would only be able to have in your possession, the number of tags for the possession limit of the species. Report cards are being used successfully in Washington State for accounting purposes so when with a system that is already established

**PROPOSED BY:** Clay Bezenek (HQ-F11-176b)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 270 - 5 AAC 01.730. Subsistence fishing permits; and 5AAC 77.674. Personal use bottomfish fishery.** Require a permit for subsistence or personal use harvest of sablefish as follows:

**5 AAC 01.730. Subsistence fishing permits.**

(a) Eulachon in the Unuk River, and salmon, trout, char, sablefish, and herring spawn on kelp may only be taken under authority of a subsistence fishing permit.

....

**(l) Sablefish subsistence fishing permits are to be issued by the department; only one permit may be issued to a household each year. A permit holder shall record harvest information on forms provided by the department. The department may establish permit possession limits or annual limits prior to the season.**

**5AAC 77.674. Personal use bottomfish fishery.**

...

**(6) Sablefish personal use fishing permits are to be issued by the department; only one permit may be issued to a household each year; a permit holder shall record harvest information on forms provided by the department; the department may establish permit possession limits or annual limits prior to the season.**

**ISSUE:** The department has limited information with which to track subsistence and personal use sablefish harvest in Southeast Alaska. Sablefish subsistence use and harvest information is collected during household surveys for communities within Southeast Alaska; however, the surveys do not occur annually. The department has no means by which to track personal use harvest of



sablefish on a regional level. This proposal provides similar improvements in reporting and tracking of sablefish harvest taken by subsistence and personal use users.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Very limited information will continue to be available about subsistence and personal use harvest of sablefish. As a result, the department is unable to fully account for sablefish mortality.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All harvesters will benefit because the department will be able to manage the resource more effectively.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** A person living in a remote area may have difficulty accessing a department office to register for the permit. NSEI and SSEI sablefish permit holders could experience additional reductions to annual harvest objectives if personal use and subsistence sablefish harvests are higher than the department currently accounts for.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Random phone surveys.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-273)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 271 - 5 AAC 28.180. Prohibitions for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area. and 5AAC 01.715. Limitations on participation in subsistence finfish fisheries.** Clarify prohibitions to commercial, subsistence, and personal use fishing by commercial sablefish permit holders as follows:

**5 AAC 28.180. Prohibitions for Eastern Gulf of Alaska Area.**

(a) A vessel or a person on board a vessel from which commercial, subsistence, or personal use longline fishing gear was used to take fish in the Northern or Southern Southeast Inside Subdistricts during the 72-hour period immediately before the start of the commercial sablefish fishery in that subdistrict, or from which that gear will be used during the 24-hour period immediately after [AN OPEN SABLEFISH FISHING PERIOD] the closure of the commercial sablefish fishery in that subdistrict, may not participate in the taking of sablefish in that [EITHER] subdistrict during that open sablefish fishing period. A vessel or a person onboard a vessel who has harvested and sold their entire equal quota share before the final day of the sablefish season in that subdistrict is exempt from the prohibition on fishing longline gear during the 24-hour period immediately following the closure of the sablefish fishery in that subdistrict.

(b) A vessel or a person on board a vessel commercial fishing for sablefish in the Northern or Southern Southeast Inside Subdistricts may not operate subsistence or personal use longline gear for groundfish from that vessel until commercial sablefish are offloaded from the vessel.

**5AAC 01.715. Limitations on participation in subsistence finfish fisheries.**

**A person on board a vessel from which a longline was used to take groundfish for subsistence uses in the Northern Southeast Inside or the Southern Southeast Inside Subdistricts is subject to the restrictions in 5 AAC 28.180 (b).**

**ISSUE:** The language contained in 5AAC 28.180 has been characterized as vague and confusing for department staff and enforcement in terms of the description of the periods in which the operation of longline gear is prohibited prior to the start and following the closure of a sablefish fishing season. The proposed language clarifies that these periods are the 72 hours prior to the start of a fishery and the 24 hours immediately following the closure of a fishery. The language also clarifies that the prohibition on the operation of longline gear by a vessel during the period before and after a fishery is only within the subdistrict that the vessel will be fishing for sablefish.

Additional language exempts vessels from the prohibition on fishing longline gear in the 24 hours following a closure if they have finished harvesting and sold their equal quota share (EQS) prior to the final day of the sablefish season. The EQS sablefish fisheries occur over a lengthy period of time, and vessels that have finished harvesting their EQS prior to the end of the season would no longer be commercial sablefish fishing; the 24 hour prohibition after the closure of the fishery would be irrelevant to other fishing that they may be involved in.

The ambiguity of the regulation language also brought into question a persons' ability to participate in personal use or subsistence groundfish fisheries if he or she participates in either the Northern Southeast Inside (NSEI) or the Southern Southeast Inside (SSEI) sablefish fisheries. The strictest interpretation of the current regulation prohibits a NSEI or SSEI vessel or person aboard that vessel from harvesting subsistence or personal use sablefish from that vessel during the 72 hours prior to the start of the SSEI fishery until 24 hours after the closure of the NSEI fishery, a period of 5.5 months. The department's position on this regulation has been less restrictive and subsequent guidance to the public has been that a vessel cannot fish for subsistence or personal use sablefish during the 72 hours prior to and 24 hours after an opening for the particular subdistrict or during a commercial sablefish fishing trip. This seems appropriate in an EQS commercial fishery where a vessel is limited to a maximum harvest amount.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be confusion between the department, enforcement, and the public on intention of the regulation.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public, department staff, and enforcement would benefit by having a regulation that is easier to understand.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial longline sablefish fishermen in NSEI and SSEI who may want to fish subsistence or personal use longline gear for groundfish during a commercial sablefish trip would be prohibited from doing so. This proposal will in no way restrict a permit holder from retaining sablefish for personal use from his or her commercial catch as allowed in 5 AAC 39.010.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-271)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 272 - 5 AAC 01.716. Customary and traditional subsistence uses of fish stocks and amount necessary for subsistence uses.** Clarify subsistence herring and herring spawn customary and traditional use findings for waters in sections 3-A and 3-B as follows:

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

...

(11) herring and herring spawn in the waters of District 2 north of the latitude of the northernmost tip of Chasina Point and west of a line from the northernmost tip of Chasina Point to the easternmost tip of Grindall Island to the easternmost tip of the Kasaan Peninsula, [AND IN WATERS OF SECTION 3-B IN SAN ALBERTA BAY NORTH OF THE LATITUDE OF THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CAPE SUSPIRO AND EAST OF 133°20' W. LONG.]; ...

...

(13) herring and herring spawn in the waters of Section 3-B in San Alberto [ALBERTA] Bay north of the latitude of the southernmost tip of Cape Suspiro and east of 133°20' W. long., and in the waters of Section 3-A in Tlevak Strait north of the latitude of High Point and south of the latitude of Eolus Point; ...

...

(16) **repealed** [HERRING AND HERRING SPAWN IN THE WATERS OF SECTION 3-A IN TLEVAK STRAIT NORTH OF THE LATITUDE OF HIGH POINT AND SOUTH OF THE LATITUDE OF EOLUS POINT, AND IN THE WATERS OF SECTION 3-B IN SAN ALBERTA BAY NORTH OF THE LATITUDE OF THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CAPE SUSPIRO AND EAST OF 133°20' W. LONG.];

**ISSUE:** Regulations defining customary and traditional use areas in Sections 3-A and 3-B are confusing and redundant. Regulations describing customary and traditional use findings in Section 3-B are included in three separate locations and are listed at the end of a description of District 2 areas. The department would like to delete two Section 3-B descriptions (5 AAC 01.716 (11) and (16)) and delete one Section 3-A description (5 AAC 01.716(16)).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The regulations will contain redundancies which will continue to confuse the public.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The department and the public will both benefit from a clear description of regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-260)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 273 - 5 AAC 77.672. Personal use herring fishery; 5 AAC 01.730. Subsistence fishing permits.** Require a permit for subsistence herring eggs on branches in Sitka Sound or alter the harvest monitoring program to measure landed weights as follows:

**5 ACC 77.672 Personal Use Herring Fishery.. (8) herring eggs on branches in Sitka Sound require a permit for harvest (or alternatively), Herring eggs on branches harvest shall be surveyed by the department at the six docks in Sitka ten (10) days subsequent to the peak spawn in Sitka Sound.**

**5 AAC 01.730 Subsistence Fishing Permits....(a)....salmon, trout, char, herring eggs on branches,** and... (k) In addition to the reporting requirements under (e) of this section, the department [WILL, TO THE EXTENT PRACTICABLE] shall use a harvest monitoring program with surveys **that shall include measuring and weighing eggs on branches at the dock where landed from the sea,** and interviews to record the harvest of herring spawn on [BRANCHES], kelp, and seaweed taken in the waters of Section 13-A and Section 13-B north of the latitude of Aspid Canpe.

**ISSUE:** Subsistence permits or dock side monitoring is not necessary or required in most subsistence harvest areas. However, the ANS for Sitka herring eggs on branches is being used as a wedge issue to purport that the commercial herring fishery is affecting realization of ANS. there is no scientific or mathematical data that supports this proposition. All parties should desire good data for making decisions that will affect fisheries. Preliminary work in Sitka conducted during the herring egg on hemlock branch harvest in 2009 and 2010 developed a methodology that is simple and reliable.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Unreliable reports of herring egg harvest will be presented to the Board of Fish. Bad data results in faulty and often harmful decisions.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal does not improve product but does vastly improve product documentation and reliability.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone benefits from good data, especially the resource when valid science provides valid data.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one suffers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Household surveys have been used for many years and the data is not scientifically reliable. We need to attempt something different. Good data will provide the Board of Fish with the necessary information to make informed decisions.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Herring Conservation Alliance (HQ-F11-114)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 274 - 5 AAC 77.682. Personal use salmon fishery.** Modify the personal use fishery for salmon in Southeast Alaska to target king and coho to include additional gear types as follows:

5 AAC 77.682(c) Repealed. 5 AAC 77.682(g)(5) Repealed. 5 AAC 77.682(k) The department shall issue permits allowing personal use fishing for salmon with efficient gear types, such as gill nets, power troll gear, and hand troll gear, in all districts open to commercial salmon fishing.

**ISSUE:** Southeast residents are precluded from efficiently harvesting salmon to fulfill their personal use needs. Note: 5 AAC 39.010 is a statewide regulation already allowing resident and nonresident commercial fishermen to efficiently fulfill their personal use needs. And in many other areas of the state residents are already issued permits for this need. For example: the Copper River Delta gillnet fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Southeast residents will seek relief in other venues like the state legislature and/or through federal fisheries management.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** This change is in the broad public interest of the residents of Southeast Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial salmon fishermen will likely see this regulation change as an inconvenience.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Buying a hand troll permit. Not cost effective.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mike Fox (HQ-F11-091)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 275 - 5 AAC 01.750. Vessel specifications and operations.** Remove the horsepower limit in the Klawock subsistence area as follows:

Remove horse power limit. use of seine skiffs/power skiffs would still be prohibited.

**ISSUE:** 35 horse power limit.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Those users that only own outboards greater than 35 horse power cannot fish.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Subsistence users that only own outboards greater than 35 horse power.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one should suffer horse power is not a large factor. This regulation was originally to eliminate power skiffs.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Michael Douville (HQ-F11-174)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 276 - 5 AAC 01.710. Fishing Seasons.** Change the subsistence sockeye fishery in the Klawock River from five to seven days per week as follows:

Klawock subsistence sockeye fishery open July 7th to August 7th.

**ISSUE:** Klawock subsistence fishery July 7th August 7th Monday thru Friday.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Those users that work Monday thru Friday will continue to be deprived of opportunity to fish.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Subsistence users that work week days will be able to fish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one should suffer if week end is open.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Michael Douville (HQ-F11-171)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 277 - 5 AAC 77.682. Personal use salmon fishery.** Allow for use of dip nets in the Taku River for personal use as follows:

Allow taking of personal use salmon on the Taku River with dip nets in addition to set nets.

**ISSUE:** Personal use fishery congestion on the Taku River because there are few suitable sites (3) for set nets on the Taku.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Personal use fisher conflicts will increase, safety at the few sites can be an issue depending on river flow levels.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Dip net selectivity allows for a more controlled harvest and reduced by-catch of nontarget species. Non target species or over limit catch can be released with minimal trauma.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Personal use fishers will because of more opportunity to fish along the Taku. The fishing experience will be enhanced because the expanded sites available to dip net from will eliminate the wait for and pressure on the two available set net spots. The ADF&G fish wheel personnel at Canyon Island will see fewer personal use fishers using the fishing site at their camp below the Canyon Island fish wheel. Dip net selectivity will reduce non target bi-catch mortality, adherence to catch limits and improve catch quality.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Perhaps some of the Canadian commercial fishermen will experience a decrease in the opportunity to harvest because of personal use harvest downriver and may have to increase their effort to catch their quota of the run.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Construct structures in the river to create back eddy's that will allow a set gill net to work. This option is not a permitable nor economic for a personal use fishery.

**PROPOSED BY:** Taku Users Group (HQ-F11-123)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 278 - 5 AAC 77.682. Personal use salmon fishery.** Extend the personal use fishery season on the Taku River from mid-June through August as follows:

Extend the personal use season from mid June through August to coincide with the commercial gill net fishery opening the mouth of the Taku.

**ISSUE:** Personal use fishery congestion on the Taku River because there are few suitable sites (3) for set nets on the Taku and often one must wait for days to get a chance to fish. Some people with limited time are never afforded an opportunity to wet their net.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Personal use fisher conflicts will increase, safety at the few sites can be an issue depending on river flow levels. People expend a great deal of time, effort and money to reach the fishing site at Canyon Island and cannot fish because others are ahead of them waiting for a chance to fish.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** A longer season will spread out the effort reduce conflicts and wait for the two available set net sites on the Taku.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Personal use fishers will because of more opportunity to fish along the Taku. The fishing experience will be enhanced because more fishing days will

spread out the effort over more days and thus the wait for and pressure on the two available set net spots.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Perhaps some of the Canadian commercial fishermen will experience a decrease in the opportunity to harvest because of personal use harvest downriver. However catch limits will keep the total take about the same as now (1200 fish) just spread out the catch over a longer time.

#### **OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Taku Users Group (HQ-F11-124)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 279 - 5 AAC 77.682. Personal use salmon fishery.** Increase Taku River sockeye salmon daily and annual bag limit per household based on number of persons in the household as follows:

Allow households of more than two people to harvest five additional sockeye salmon for each additional person in their household.

**ISSUE:** Personal use sockeye salmon bag limits on the Taku River are set to five (5) fish person or ten (10) per household.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Large families or households of more than two people are limited in the amount of fish they can harvest to ten fish creating and inequitable share of the catch and discrimination against larger households.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Those larger households will be allowed to harvest enough salmon for their personal use. Discrimination against larger households will be eliminated.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Up river Canadian commercial fishermen will see a slight decrease in catch but overall limits will protect escapement.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** No change to harvest limits but that perpetuates and inequitable situation

**PROPOSED BY:** Taku Users Group (HQ-F11-125)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 280 - 5 AAC 01.725. Waters closed to subsistence fishing.** Clarify that subsistence in District 15 includes Lutak Inlet and opens time the day before commercial openings as follows:



(3) in District 15, salt waters of Lynn Canal including Chilkat, Chilkoot and Lutak Inlets, during closed periods of the commercial salmon net fishery in the district, except that salmon may be taken in salt waters of Chilkoot **and Lutak** Inlets north of the latitude of Battery Point, excluding waters of Taiya Inlet north of the latitude of Taiya Point and in Chilkat Inlet north of the latitude of Glacier Point on the Saturday before **and the day before** any period that the commercial salmon net fishery is open in the waters of Section 15-A.

**ISSUE:** The current regulation that opens salmon subsistence fishing in marine waters of District 15 does not include Lutak Inlet, which is part of the District 15 marine subsistence salmon fishing area. Adding Lutak Inlet will align this regulation with 5 AAC 01.716 (2), *Customary and traditional subsistence uses of fish stocks and amount necessary for subsistence uses*, and put in regulation what is currently common practice. During the week of the Juneau Golden North salmon derby, Section 15-A commercial net fisheries are opened on Monday, rather than on Sunday. Current regulations open subsistence salmon fishing opportunities the Saturday before any period that the commercial salmon net fishery is open in the waters of Section 15-A; therefore, there is confusion by the public and Alaska Wildlife Troopers about when marine waters are open to subsistence salmon fishing when the commercial net fishery in Section 15-A opens on a Monday. By specifying “the Saturday before and day before any period that the commercial salmon net fishery is open in the waters of Section 15-A,” the board would clarify the regulations to reflect what is currently occurring in the District 15 subsistence salmon fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued regulatory confusion in area and times open for marine salmon subsistence fishing in District 15.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Stakeholders in this fishery will benefit because regulations pertaining to where and when salmon subsistence fishing takes place in marine waters of District 15 will be clarified.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-252)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 281 - 5 AAC 01.670. Lawful gear and gear specifications.** Allow 75 fathom gillnet length in the Yakutat Bay subsistence fishery as follows:

Increase the subsistence net length to 75 fathoms in Yakutat Bay. There is far less chance of exceeding the permitted number of subsistence salmon, even though it is a longer net, than the chances of catching too many salmon with a 20 fathom net in the Situk river estuary.

**ISSUE:** Currently the legal limit for a subsistence gillnet in Yakutat bay is 50 fathoms. The legal limit for a commercial gillnet is 75 fathoms. A commercial fishermen who wishes to use the commercial gillnet they readily have available is currently unable to. Owning and switching over to a shorter net length creates an undue hardship for the subsistence harvester. This is not consistent with policy in other areas of the district where commercial net length is the status quo for subsistence.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Status quo, will continue to only be able to use a 50 fathom net thus making it harder for the user.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** This action might make it more feasible for a subsistence harvester to utilize the Yakutat Bay, which is a mixed stock fishery, and there by alleviate some of the pressure of over subsistence harvest levels the Situk/Ahrnklin river estuary is currently experiencing.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-335)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 282 - 5AAC 30.365. Situk-Ahrnklin and Lost River King Salmon Management Plan.** Modify the Situk-Ahrnklin and Lost River king salmon management plan to re-define closed waters, specify nonretention, and clarify action points as follows:

Amend paragraphs (c)(1) through (5) as follows:

(a) The purpose of the management plan in this section is to provide for the biological escapement goal requirements of spawning king salmon to the Situk-Ahrnklin River systems. This management plan provides guidelines to the department in an effort to preclude allocation conflicts between the various user groups of the king salmon resource. Action points and associated ranges within the plan are intended to be based on the current king salmon escapement goal ranges for the Situk River system.

(b) The biological escapement goal for the Situk River king salmon is 730 three ocean age and older fish, with a range of 450 - 1,050 fish.

(c) The department shall manage the commercial, sport, and subsistence fisheries as follows:

(1) if the projected **escapement** [IN RIVER RUN OF KING SALMON TO THE SITUK RIVER WEIR] is less than 350 three ocean age and older fish, the commissioner shall close, by emergency order, the king salmon

(A) sport fishery in the Situk River;

- (B) subsistence, personal use, and commercial set gillnet fisheries in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River; and
- (C) commercial troll fishery in the waters of Alaska bounded on the west by the seaward limit of the three-nautical-mile territorial sea and on the north by a line extending seaward from **59°32.49' N. LAT., 139°51.79' W. LONG. (OCEAN CAPE)**, [59°29.70' N. LAT., 139°44.00' W. LONG.] and intersecting the three-nautical-mile limit at **59°39.69' N. LAT., 139°55.49' W. LONG.**, [59°27.77' N. LAT., 139°49.28' W. LONG.,] and on the south by a line extending seaward from **50°21.92' N. LAT., 139°23.15' W. LONG.**, [59°20.30' N. LAT., 139°16.50' W. LONG.] and intersecting the three-nautical-mile limit at **59°19.90' N. LAT., 139°26.39' W. LONG.**, [59°18.25' N. LAT., 139° 21.94' W. LONG.];
- (2) if the projected **escapement** [IN RIVER RUN OF KING SALMON TO THE SITUK RIVER WEIR] is 350 - 450 three ocean age or older fish the commissioner
- (A) shall, by emergency order, close the sport fishery for king salmon in the Situk River; and
- (B) may, by emergency order, implement one or more of the following management measures for conservation purposes:
- (i) establish a **nonretention** ["NON-SALE"] king salmon season in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River set gillnet fisheries;
- (ii) close the commercial salmon troll fishery in the waters of Alaska bounded on the west by the three-nautical-mile limit and on the north by a line extending seaward from **59°32.49' N. lat., 139°51.79' W. long. (Ocean Cape)**, [59°29.70' N. LAT., 139°44.00' W. LONG.] and intersecting the three-nautical-mile limit at **59°39.69' N. lat., 139°55.49' W. long.**, [59°27.77' N. LAT., 139°49.28' W. LONG.,] and on the south by a line extending seaward from **50°21.92' N. lat., 139°23.15' W. long.**, [59°20.30' N. LAT., 139°16.50' W. LONG.] and intersecting the three-nautical-mile limit at **59°19.90' N. lat., 139°26.39' W. long.**, [59°18.25' N. LAT., 139° 21.94' W. LONG.];
- (iii) restrict the weekly fishing periods in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River set gillnet fisheries;
- (3) if the projected **escapement** [IN RIVER RUN OF KING SALMON TO THE SITUK WEIR] is 451 - 730 three ocean age or older fish, the commissioner shall, by emergency order, implement one or more of the following management measures for conservation purposes:
- (A) establish a **nonretention** ["NON-SALE"] king salmon season in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River set gillnet fisheries;
- (B) close the commercial salmon troll fishery in the waters of Alaska bounded on the west by the three-nautical-mile limit and on the north by a line extending seaward from **59°32.49' N. lat., 139°51.79' W. long. (Ocean Cape)**, [59°29.70' N. LAT., 139°44.00' W. LONG.] and intersecting the three-nautical-mile limit at **59°39.69' N. lat., 139°55.49' W. long.**, [59°27.77' N. LAT., 139°49.28' W. LONG.,] and on the south by a line extending seaward from **50°21.92' N. lat., 139°23.15' W. long.**, [59°20.30' N. LAT., 139°16.50' W. LONG.] and intersecting the three-nautical-mile limit at **59°19.90' N. lat., 139°26.39' W. long.**, [59°18.25' N. LAT., 139° 21.94' W. LONG.];

- (C) restrict the weekly fishing periods in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River set gillnet fisheries; and
- (D) restrict the sport harvest of king salmon in the Situk River by implementing one or more of the following management measures:
  - (i) close portions of the Situk River to sport fishing for king salmon;
  - (ii) establish a catch and release sport fishery only for king salmon 28 inches or greater in length;
- (4) if the projected **escapement** [IN RIVER RUN OF KING SALMON TO THE SITUK RIVER WEIR] is greater than 730 three ocean age and older fish but less than 1,050 fish, the department shall,
  - (A) manage the commercial set gillnet fisheries in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River based on the sockeye salmon run strength;
  - (B) manage the commercial salmon troll fishery as specified in 5 AAC 29.100 in the waters of Alaska bounded on the west by the three-nautical-mile limit and on the north by a line extending seaward from **59°32.49' N. lat., 139°51.79' W. long. (Ocean Cape)**, [59°29.70' N. LAT., 139°44.00' W. LONG.] and intersecting the three-nautical-mile limit at **59°39.69' N. lat., 139°55.49' W. long.**, [59°27.77' N. LAT., 139°49.28' W. LONG.,] and on the south by a line extending seaward from **50°21.92' N. lat., 139°23.15' W. long.**, [59°20.30' N. LAT., 139°16.50' W. LONG.] and intersecting the three-nautical-mile limit at **59°19.90' N. lat., 139°26.39' W. long.**, [59°18.25' N. LAT., 139° 21.94' W. LONG.];
- (5) if the projected **escapement** [IN RIVER RUN OF KING SALMON TO THE SITUK RIVER WEIR] is greater than 1,050 three ocean age and older fish, the department shall manage the commercial, sport, and subsistence fisheries as necessary to harvest large king salmon in excess of the biological escapement goal range; to achieve this goal the commissioner may, by emergency order, implement one or more of the following management measures:
  - (A) liberalize seasons, areas, and method and means in the Situk River under 5 AAC 75.003(2);
  - (B) increase the bag and possession limits for king salmon 28 inches or greater in length, to three fish per day and six in possession, with no annual limit;
  - (C) allow for a king salmon troll fishery as specified in 5 AAC 29.090(i);
  - (D) manage the commercial set gillnet fisheries in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River based on the sockeye salmon run strength;
  - (E) in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River set gillnet fisheries, allow the use of one additional gillnet that is no more than 20 fathoms in length and no more than 45 meshes in depth, with a mesh size of no less than seven and one-half inches, for the directed taking of king salmon during periods when sockeye salmon may or may not be retained.

**ISSUE:** Introductory language in the current plan identifies overall management based on king salmon escapement goals established for the Situk River. However, the stipulated target bullets within the plan then suggest management actions based on “in river run” strength. The terms “in river run” and “escapement” are terms that have different defined meanings per the *Policy for Management of Sustainable Salmon Fisheries*. The department is unclear if the board intended

to create inriver run targets for management actions that are different from the escapement goals, and if so, what those targets should be.

A closed area offshore of the Situk River mouth has been included in the plan to reduce the king salmon harvest rate by the commercial troll fishery. The same closed area is applied under 5 AAC 29.100 to reduce troll fishery exploitation on the Situk River coho salmon stock. New coordinates are redetermined that define the closed area in both 5 AAC 30.365 and 5 AAC 29.100(i) because the Situk River mouth has gradually shifted to the north since these plans were originally adopted.

Because of conservation concerns for king salmon on the Situk River, the department recommends “non-sale” be changed to “nonretention”. Low forecasted returns of Situk River king salmon make it imperative that any king salmon possible be released live and not utilized for homepack; “nonretention” communicates that king salmon may not be retained for any reason.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will continue to manage utilizing escapement goal targets per the introductory language in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River King Salmon Management Plan, but it will be unclear if the exact intent of the current plan is being strictly followed.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Situk River king salmon user groups will benefit from clearer goals and management actions.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Total repeal of plan has been considered, but that could hinder clearly-defined management objectives for Situk and Lost River king salmon management and may result in more perceived allocation conflicts among users.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-240)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 283 - 5 AAC 30.365. Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River King Salmon Fisheries Management Plan.** Revise the Situk River Management Plan to delink Situk escapement from a spring troll in Yakutat Bay as follows:

Amend section b(5) (C) [ALLOW FOR A KING SALMON TROLL FISHERY AS SPECIFIED IN 5AAC. 29. 090 (I)].

There is no biological evidence linking a Yakutat Bay troll harvest to the Situk river king salmon run and it should not be considered in the Situk River Management Plan. There is currently a 1000 king salmon spring test troll fishery allocated every year for Yakutat Bay, that has never been implemented because it is currently tied to a 1050 fish projected run of king salmon in the Situk

River. This action will delink the test fishery from the 1050 fish projected run, so the test fishery can take place.

**ISSUE:** Currently the allocated 1000 king salmon test fishery goes unfished in the Yakutat area because the proposed fishery is tied to the Situk River Management Plan by stating that the fishery cannot happen unless there is a forecasted return of 1050 king salmon to the Situk River.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The troll fleet will continue to miss out on the opportunity to harvest a 1000 king salmon, and the biological determining information will go uncollected.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial trollers. The State of Alaska will also gain valuable biological data.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. This is scheduled as a one day a week test fishery, chances of it having an impact on anything are very minimal

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-336)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 284 - 5 AAC 29.097. District 11 King Salmon Management Plan.** Establish increased fishing periods for troll when the directed drift gillnet fishery is open in Sections 11-A and 11-B as follows:

In District 11, the commissioner may open and close, by emergency order, directed Taku River king salmon troll fishing periods, from the first Monday in May through the third Saturday in June, as follows:

- (1) In the waters of Section 11-A that are east and south of a line from Piling Point to Outer Point, then south and west of a line from Marmion Island Light to Circle Point,
  - (A) from 12:01 a.m. Monday through 11:59 p.m. Friday in any week that a directed Taku River king salmon drift gillnet fishery occurs.
- (2) in the waters of Section 11-B that are south of a line from Marmion Island Light to Circle Point,
  - (A) from 12:01 a.m. Monday through 11:59 p.m. Sunday in any week that a directed Taku River king salmon drift gillnet fishery occurs.
- (3) The commissioner will not open a king salmon troll fishing period under this section
  - (A) in the waters of Section 11-A that are east and south of a line from Piling Point to Outer Point, then south and west of a line from Marmion Island Light to Circle Point, from 12:01 a.m. on the Saturday before the Memorial Day weekend to 11:59 p.m. on the Monday after the Memorial Day weekend; and

(B) in the waters of Section 11-B that are south of a line from Marmion Island Light to Circle Point, from 12:01 a.m. on the Saturday before the Memorial Day weekend to 11:59 p.m. on the Monday after the Memorial Day weekend.

**ISSUE:** Trollers have inadequate access to harvest Chinook in the years that the District 11 directed Taku River King Salmon Fishery is open. We propose that the number of trolling days open be de-coupled from the hours the gillnet fishery is open. A different strategy of allocating commercial fishing time in 11-A and 11-B would provide more reasonable access for trollers.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Trollers will continue to lose opportunity to harvest the Taku River salmon stocks that they helped to rebuild. Limited time and area has impacted the fleet's ability to catch a fair share of the harvest. Gillnet catch rates are typically 5 times that of a troller. When this fishery was open in 2006, trollers landed just one tenth of a percent (0.001%) of the total harvest. From 2005-2006, trollers averaged only sixteen (16) fish. These low catches are likely to continue if adjustments are not made.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. If trollers are provided additional fishing time they could add more high quality fish to the district harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trollers who catch Taku River king salmon they helped to rebuild, local processors, retailers, and consumers who wanted to purchase troll product. Trollers who would like to fish closer to home early in the season.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** While some in the other user groups might not want to see trollers in the area, no other fishery is likely to suffer due to these small changes.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1) More area and time in 11-A, but that would increase conflicts unnecessarily. 2) No proposal, but the troll success rate has been so low that only expanded time and area will provide fair and adequate access.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-F11-221)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 285 - 5 AAC 39.117. Vessel length; bulbous bow.** Repeal the 58' vessel limit in the Southeast salmon purse seine fishery as follows:

The preferred solution is for the Board to repeal the length limit on salmon seine vessels in Southeast Alaska in combination with a form of permit reduction to reduce capacity and enhance the value of the fishery to all participants.

**ISSUE:** The Board adoption of excluding the "bulbous bow" from the length measurement of a salmon purse seine vessel was progress. It should now repeal the 58' limit on the length of vessel in the salmon purse seine fishery coupled with an additional permit requirement to address the problem of potential excesses capacity within the SE Salmon Seine Fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Regulations like this hinder innovation and exploration of new ideas in the seine fishery which, as in any industry, stifle opportunities for economic growth.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, a longer boat would allow fishermen to explore ways to add value to Alaska salmon. Some fishermen may want to process some of their catch at sea and the current limit makes that almost impossible. Even something as simple as how the fish are handled on deck could be improved with more space. Existing 58 foot vessels could be lengthened on the stern for better flotation so aft holds could produce fish with better quality.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The Alaska purse seine fishermen who wish to pioneer ideas of efficiency in vessel operation and continue to improve quality production of Alaska salmon. Other fishermen will keep informed of the new ideas and can copy those that are successful. Also, taking permits representing latent, potential excess capacity out to the fishery improves overall fishery conditions for the rest of the fleet. This proposal helps all.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Of course proposals of this nature have some degree of opposition as people feel they will suffer for it. If this proposal had good chance of causing any fishermen to suffer huge financial loss it would not have been submitted. This proposal will not be a drastic change to the fishery. Everyone will be fishing with the same net in the same areas for the same amount of time. Hopefully the prospect of using the idea to get rid of excess potential capacity in the fishery will make the removal of the length limit more palatable to those who do not wholly support the change.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Eliminating the limit entirely was the original solution. Adding the caveat of requiring an additional permit improves this proposal to benefit others in the fishery.

**PROPOSED BY:** Eric Rosvold and Ryan Kapp (HQ-F11-092)

\*\*\*\*\*

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

*The board is seeking additional information on this proposal in order that it can be fully evaluated. During the October 13-17, 2011 worksession, the board will:*

- a) Determine if the proposal complete;*
- b) Determine if there are outstanding questions or information needed;*
- c) Confirm that board has authority to act on proposal; identify any aspects of proposal where board may need additional authority to make decisions;*



- d) Identify whether CFEC, Dept. of Commerce, Dept. of Labor or other agencies need to be consulted on issues raised by the proposal and if so, bring staff together to schedule work and process; and
- e) Identify proposal's review process and schedule.

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

**PROPOSAL 286 - 5 AAC 39.117. Vessel length.** Increase length limit for southeast salmon seine vessels to 75 feet as follows:

No southeast salmon seiner shall be longer than 75 feet hull length.

**ISSUE:** 58-foot limit on southeast salmon seiners.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Opportunity will be lost to increase profit by increasing fuel efficiency and the ability to custom process fish.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, it allows more room for custom processing, fresh packaging or freezing on board.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Any seiner who wishes to custom process.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Larry Demmert (HQ-F11-038, previously HQ-08F-034)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 287 - 5 AAC 39.160. Maximum length of salmon seine vessel.** Exclude stern ramps and rollers in the 58 foot limit for the Southeast Alaska Area as follows:

I would prefer the board adopt a regulation providing an exception for stern ramps and rollers used for drum seining so the length they add to a vessel do not count towards the 58 foot limit in Area A, Southeast Alaska.

An example may be the exception that the Board provided for the 58 foot, Bering Sea hair crab boats which allows bulbous bows to extend past 58 feet, 5 AAC 39.117.

**ISSUE:** The problem I would like the board to address is the existing requirement that stern ramps and rollers used for drum seining outside Alaska must be removed and replaced with an entire new stern section before a drum seiner can block seine for salmon in Alaska.

There is no regulation against stern ramps and rollers per say. They have no value for block seining in Alaska and they afford no advantage in a competitive block seine fishery but they must be removed because they extended the deck, not the hull, of a 58 foot boat past the 58 foot limit.

This requirement is unnecessary, time consuming and expensive.

5 AAC 39.160 (the 58 foot limit regulation) was deleted in 1991 but the 58 foot limit still exists in Alaska Statute, Sec. 16.05.835. This statute also states that the board may provide regulation for longer vessels in a fishery.

5 AAC 39.155. This regulation makes drums illegal.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The 58 foot limit will continue to unnecessarily complicate and add expense to the yearly activities of fishermen who drum seine outside Southeast Alaska.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Seiners who drum seine outside Southeast Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nobody.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Eliminate the drum prohibition for all seiners in Southeast Alaska.

Provide a 58 foot limit exemption for all seiners in Southeast Alaska.

These are good ideas if the board cares to consider them but I expect that my proposed solution is the path of least resistance.

**PROPOSED BY:** Scott McAllister (HQ-F11-027)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 288 - 5 AAC 39.240. General gear specifications and operations.** Allow seine vessels to transport two seine nets as follows:

(a)(1) In Southeast Alaska, purse seine vessels may carry up to two seines on board, provided that both nets are a minimum of 200 fathoms in length and 300 meshes deep, for at least 100 fathoms.

**ISSUE:** Many seiners own two nets currently. Currently only one net may be on board, even though it is impossible to fish more than one net at a time. We waste money and fuel shuffling nets from town to town and lose opportunity whenever a net is damaged.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Purse seiners will continue to be unfairly inconvenienced. Other gear groups may carry extra units of gear on board, even though their gear could easily be combined to exceed the legal gear limit.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Any seiner that chooses to invest in two nets.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one, as only one net may ever be used at a time.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Seiners Association (HQ-F11-180)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 289** - 5 AAC 33.310. **Fishing seasons and periods for net gear.** Close District 10 to seining and open to gillnet fishing as follows:

5AAC 33.310(a) **(5) Subdistricts 105-31 and 105-41 be open no more than 39 hours for Purse Seining in a calendar week.**

**ISSUE:** Restrict Purse Seine time to allow for pink salmon migration into District 6 for opportunity for harvests in the District 6 gillnet fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Gillnet fishermen will continue to have limited time and area to adequately harvest pink salmon harvest.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Gillnet fishermen in District 6.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Purse Seiners would lose some time in some years.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Consideration of closing district 5 for seine fishing was dismissed as too extreme.

**PROPOSED BY:** United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters Association (HQ-F11-195)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 290** - 5 AAC 33.310. **Fishing seasons and periods for net gear.** Increase seining and reduce gillnet fishing in District 6 in September as follows:

In the post-pink salmon summer management scheme, purse seiners will be allowed to harvest salmon in September along the District 6 Etolin Island shoreline, up to 12 boat days per week. The harvest will not be in addition to the driftnet fleet's harvest, but will only be allowed so long as the same amount of harvest occurs that would otherwise have occurred under the current fishing plan for driftnetters. In other words, for every salmon the seine fleet catches, there will be a corresponding trade-off with the driftnet fleet so no additional harvest will occur that isn't already occurring.

**ISSUE:** The purse seine fleet historically has fished in September in District 6 for cohos. Currently, the driftnet fleet has expanded its fishery in District 6 through early October. While most of this district is in driftnet only areas, the Etolin Island, Steamer Pt. corridor is seine area, so seiners should be able to share in the harvest of these salmon. In the overall SE Allocation plan, adopted by the BOF in 1989, the fleets were accorded their historical catch percentages of each species. The purse seine fleet is down by a significant percentage cumulatively on coho harvest, resulting in millions of coho being reallocated to the driftnet fleet.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will be a continued lack of balance on the overall allocation plan. The plan was the culmination of a lawsuit begun by USAG. SEAS does not want to go back to court to enforce this plan.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All seiners benefit. The troll and sport fleets will not change a bit as the coho caught by seiners would be coho that would have been caught by driftnetters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one except the driftnet fleet.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Opening up the region to regular fishing without limitation. Rejected due to the need to delicately manage the wild stocks the driftnet fleet is targeting on in District 6 in September.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Seiners Association (HQ-F11-185)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 291 - 5 AAC 33.XXX. New Regulation.** Allow harvest of pink salmon along the Pt. Adolphus shoreline in District 14 during years of large pink salmon returns as follows:

A Management Plan for very limited fishing along the Pt. Adolphus shoreline west to Mud Bay and south to Eagle Point and Crist Point should be developed. A conservative approach beginning with limited test fisheries in the region would enhance the department's ability to ensure that the fleet can get on top of the exceptionally large returns. In years of average to below average abundance, no fishery would occur (with the exception of the limited test fisheries).

When Icy Strait was closed to purse seining following the 1973 season, there had not been a pink salmon harvest larger than 40 million since 1949. Under this approach, only “special” seasons, such as 1994, 1999 or perhaps the 2001 seasons would be eligible for actual harvest. But the ability to test fish the area would yield an abundance of knowledge for the fleet and the department. Pt. Augusta alone is too limited a test fishery to indicate the health of the entire north end.

**ISSUE:** The lack of opportunity to harvest surplus pink salmon in Northern Southeast in years of exceptionally strong pink salmon returns.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The larger years of abundance often find the seine fleet behind the curve in harvesting pink salmon bound for the systems from Port Frederick North as well as the larger pink salmon producers in District 111 and 115.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The harvest of ocean bright salmon would be a benefit to the quality for the frozen salmon market.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All seiners benefit, as well as the department with the information generated.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Simply allow limited openings each week in the Icy Strait (District 14) corridor. Rejected due to the variability in runs.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Seiners Association (HQ-F11-184)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 292 - 5 AAC 33.310. Fishing seasons and periods for net gear.** Change gillnet fishing opening from noon Sundays to 8:00am on Monday as follows:

Gillnet fishing will begin at 8:00 am Monday.

**ISSUE:** Gillnet fishing openings on Sundays.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fishermen, state employees and other industry support will continue to be forced to forgo Sunday worship and family time for traditional but needless Sunday openings.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** 8:00 am start will have tenders and product back to the plants sooner in the day for better processing scheduling.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Families and communities.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** State fishery monitors who receive overtime pay for weekend openings.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Monday, 12:00 noon openings. 8:00 am seemed better.

**PROPOSED BY:** Otto Florschutz (HQ-F11-007)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 293 - 5 AAC 33.331. Gillnet Specifications and Operation.** Provide minimum mesh size of six inches in Districts 1, 6, 8, 11, or 15 by emergency order when needed to conserve sockeye and access chum as follows:

(d) In District[s 11 and] 15, through the fourth Saturday in June, the maximum gillnet mesh size is six inches.

(e) In Districts 1, 6, 8, 11, [AND] or 15, [DURING PERIODS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER,] the Commissioner may, by emergency order, establish a [THE] minimum gillnet mesh size of [IS] six inches, except that . . .

**ISSUE:** Regulation 5 AAC 33.331(d) was originally established for the conservation and rebuilding of king salmon stocks throughout Southeast Alaska, including the Taku River stock in District 11. The Taku River king salmon stock has not been a conservation concern for the past 15–20 years, but Pacific Salmon Treaty obligations prevented implementation of a directed king salmon fishery until harvest sharing of fish surplus to escapement needs could be agreed upon between the U.S. and Canada. The U.S. and Canada agreed to harvest sharing arrangements in early 2005. The Alaska Board of Fisheries (board) began modifications to District 11 regulations in 2003 anticipating such an agreement. The board made further modifications to the District 11 Taku River directed king salmon fisheries in 2006 by implementing changes proposed by the District 11 Chinook Task Force and also by the Juneau Fish and Game Advisory Committee. One specific change adopted into regulation for District 11, 5AAC 33.331(e)(2), requires seven-inch minimum mesh size through the third Saturday in June. However, 5AAC 33.331(d), which has been in regulation for some time, requires fishermen to switch to a six-inch maximum mesh size through the fourth Saturday in June. This means that in years of District 11 directed king salmon fishing, during a one-week period after the third Saturday in June and before the fourth Saturday in June, fishermen who had been fishing a seven-inch minimum mesh net must switch to a six-inch maximum mesh net. After the fourth Saturday in June, fishermen may switch back to larger mesh gear. Regulation 5 AAC 33.331(d) no longer serves the purpose for which it was intended and is inconsistent with 5 AAC 33.331(e)(2).

Clarification of this regulation by allowing the commissioner the discretion to establish a six-inch minimum mesh size provides fishermen greater opportunity on larger salmon, such as chum salmon, when there is a need to conserve local stocks of smaller sockeye salmon. The department believes this was the original intent of the regulation.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fishermen will continue to be confused by apparently conflicting regulations and will be limited to fishing a six-inch mesh or smaller net during a one-week period in times of high king salmon abundance.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen who will not need to carry and fish a second smaller mesh net during years in which the department has no king salmon conservation concerns. Department managers, law enforcement officers, and fishermen will benefit from clear intent and greater flexibility in the application of this regulation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-254)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 294 - 5 AAC 39.010. Retention of fish taken in a commercial fishery.** Require reporting of commercially caught salmon and steelhead retained for personal use as follows:

5AAC 3910

b) commercial fishers shall report retention of commercially caught salmon or steelhead for personal use to Creel Census personnel at the point of offloading. Or at any docks where creel census is taken. Commercial fishers will no longer need to report these fish on fish tickets.

**ISSUE:** Accurate accounting of salmon taken for personal use in commercial fisheries.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** All salmon taken in commercial fisheries need to be accounted for. Fish that are not recorded on fish tickets are an important part of ADF&G decision making and are an important part of our treaties with Canada. If these fish continue to be harvested but not counted we could face overharvesting in some areas and treaty issues in others.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone. Knowing how many fish are harvested and where is the Hallmark of Alaska's legendary fisheries resource management. This allows all fish be recorded and part of the management process.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Creel census takers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Leaving the system alone. The system is broken virtually no fish are reported on fish tickets as harvested but not sold. I rejected the current system because it is harmful to the fish and the prudent management of the fishery.

**PROPOSED BY:** Peter B. Wright (HQ-F11-025)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 295 - 5 AAC 33.383. District 7: Anita Bay Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan.** Modify drift gillnet fishery in Zimovia Strait and Chichagof Pass based on chum/sockeye ratio to provide for increased terminal seine harvest of enhanced chum in the Anita Bay THA as follows:

Close Zimovia Strait and Chichigof Pass south of Young's rock to driftnet fishing once the chum/sockeye ratio exceeds 4 to 1. In many years the driftnet fleet targets enhanced chum returning to Anita Bay in what is supposed to be a wild sockeye fishery targeting sockeye salmon bound for the Stikine River and surrounding systems. This is in direct violation of the wild salmon management plan adopted by the Board of Fisheries. In some years the ratio of enhanced to wild sockeye has exceeded 50 to 1.

**ISSUE:** Lack of equity in the Anita Bay harvest area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Allocation plan will fail.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The Alaska commercial fishing industry, which relies on protection of wild stocks in wild stock corridors. Also benefitting will be the sockeye salmon, which essentially become a "bycatch" when the illegal hatchery targeting of Anita Bay chums occurs.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Driftnetters who target hatchery chums in a wild stock corridor.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Complete closure in July of Zimovia Strait and Chichigof Pass to driftnetting.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Seiners Association (HQ-F11-183)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 296 - 5 AAC 33.310. Fishing seasons and periods for net gear.** Open gillnet fishery in Section 6-D all season to provide pink salmon fishery as follows:

5AAC 33.310 (c) 2 (A) Sections 6-A, 6-B, 6-C **and 6-D** open on the second Sunday of June;  
(B) Delete all material.



**ISSUE:** Gillnet fishermen wishing to harvest pink salmon in District 6 are precluded from doing so under existing regulations. These conditions are in part due to the closures associated with McDonald Lake conservation measure, which have forced fishermen into already crowded and limited areas. This proposal rectifies the situation by providing access for pink salmon in District 6(D) during years of high pink salmon abundance.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Gillnet fishermen will continue to have limited time and area already. Secondly, the gillnetters are not adequately harvesting their allocation of wild pink salmon in Southeast Alaska.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** New fresh pink markets have allowed for gillnetters to supply a dressed product for a burgeoning fresh-fillet market.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Gillnet fishermen in District 6.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No individual or group unless a seine fishery is conducted later in the year in the same area. Gillnet fishermen would be hard pressed to compete for efficiency in harvests if and when both gear group fisheries were occurring at the same time.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** 1. Open 6D only under Pink Salmon Management. 2. Open other areas of SE Alaska for gillnet harvests during years of high abundance. 3. Open Gillnet areas 7 days a week when seiners are fishing 4 days with only one day off.

**PROPOSED BY:** United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters Association (HQ-F11-192)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 297 - 5 AAC 33.310. Fishing seasons and periods for net gear.** Open gillnet fishery in Section 6-D during pink season when not open to seining as follows:

**5AAC 33.310 (c) (2) (C) Section 6 –D west of a line from Mariposa Rock Buoy to the northernmost tip of Pt. Harrington to a point on Etolin Island at 56.09.60' N. Latitude, 132.42.70 W' Longitude, to the southernmost tip of Pt. Stanhope is open from the first Saturday in August through the first Sunday in September unless open to seining.**

**ISSUE:** Allow for Pink harvest opportunities for gillnetters in District 6 D. Gillnet fishermen wishing to harvest pink salmon in Area 6 are precluded from opportunity by time and area during Pink Salmon Management.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Gillnet fishermen wishing to harvest pinks will continue to have limited opportunities and not meet allocation percentages associated with harvests of wild pink salmon.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, in some cases gillnet fishermen in Area 6 are delivering

dressed pink salmon for salmon fillet markets. Increasing pink salmon harvest opportunities for gillnet fishermen may increase the overall quality of pink salmon available to consumers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Gillnet fishermen harvesting pink salmon in Area 6.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No individual or gear group as the proposal would only open area 6D to gillnetting if Seine fishermen were not present.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Changing the Pink Salmon Management Plan to include greater opportunities for pink harvests for the gillnet fleet as a whole.

**PROPOSED BY:** United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters Association (HQ-F11-191)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 298 - 5 AAC 33.310. Fishing seasons and periods for net gear.** Limit District 5 seine fishery to 2 days per week to increase gillnet pink salmon harvest in District 6 as follows:

5AAC 33.310 (c) (3) **(a) District 110-31 opens on the third Sunday of June for gillnet only.**

**ISSUE:** Gillnet fishermen have limited time and fishing area compared to other fishing groups targeting wild salmon in Southeast Alaska. Currently, the gillnet fishermen have the smallest amount of area in which to target wild salmon and the few number of days available for harvest. Gillnet harvest opportunities are extremely restricted, while the current harvests by the gillnet fishery accounts for only 18% of the entire SE salmon harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Gillnetters will continue to have limited opportunities to harvest wild salmon. Gillnetters will have fewer square miles of water in which to target salmon and gillnetters will continue to bare the brunt of most conservation measures as the gillnet fisheries are based around terminal areas.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All SE Alaska gillnet permit holders.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Purse Seiners may lose some wild harvest opportunity.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Other areas of fishing were also considered; however this is a continuation of an existing gillnet area south of District 11.

**PROPOSED BY:** United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters Association (HQ-F11-194)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 299 - 5 AAC 33.350(6). Closed waters.** Extend commercial closed waters in Taku Inlet to Point Greely-Point Bishop as follows:

The waters closed to commercial fishing in Taku Inlet should be moved to a line from Point Bishop to Point Greely.

**ISSUE:** The present commercial fishing boundary line on the Taku River was established in regulation on January 1962. Since that time the river heavy silt load has filled in the inlet so that one can now be literally fishing in the river. Salmon escapement is falling. Seal predation is increasing with their population.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Natural salmon stock escapement will continue to decline.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Escapement will improve and harvestable stocks will increase.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Salmon escapement, seals, fishermen, sport, commercial, subsistence and personal use.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Alaska commercial fishermen will see a slight reduction in harvest but better escapement will increase their harvest in the future.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Harvest a good share of the large and growing seal population that the season in the first in the first fifteen miles of the Taku above the present closed fishing line. This is not a legal option.

**PROPOSED BY:** Taku Users Group (HQ-F11-028)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 300 - 5 AAC 30.3XX. New Regulation.** Allow multiple permit holders to fish from the same vessel and to pool and divide harvests on fish tickets in Yakutat Area salmon fishery as follows:

Using the guide of Bristol Bay Regulation 5AAC 06.333 Requirements and specifications for use of 200 fathoms of drift gillnet in Bristol Bay, we offer the following:

5AAC. 30.3XX (new section) Requirements and specifications for pooling Yakutat setnet harvests on to a single vessel.

Two to three Yakutat setnet permit holders may register with ADFG to jointly harvest salmon and deliver fish to the processors. Registration will included the vessel number of any vessel that may be used by this co-op partnership. The vessels registered must display it's ADF&G permanent license plate number followed by the letter "D" to identify the vessel as holding multiple permit holders on board. A permit holder who is registered may also fish by themselves if their permit card lists that vessel on it, and the letter "D" is covered up during that trip. When the "D" is displayed the permit holders registered together must be on board the vessel. A permit holder may only be registered in one co-op partnership at a time, but may be involved in more

than one partnership within one year. If fish are harvested in more than one sub-district the fish tickets of each partner in the co-op partnership will show the same estimation of amount of fish caught in each sub-district.

Again, this is trying to create a regulation to allow the historical practice to continue, not anything new.

**ISSUE:** Although the Yakutat setnet fishery has historically operated in partnerships, enforcement is now writing violations for pooling the fish from several sites or units of gear. Yakutat setnet gear is fished out of small open 20 ft. skiffs, and very often under hazardous and rough conditions. For reasons of safety, conservation of fuel, and general overall ease of operations for the fishermen, temporary partnerships will often arise. There may be 2,3 or even more permits all being fished out of one small skiff. Keeping track of which fish came from which net is impossible most of the time under these conditions, and to avoid anyone feeling shorted, historically these fish were considered common property and distributed on a percentage basis among the fishermen at the processors. Typically the split is 50/50, but there are instances where this is not the case, such as when a permit holder with a vessel fishes with a permit holder without a vessel. This has been a common practice prior to limited entry, and we would like to develop a regulation where this practice can continue in the future without fear of prosecution. This is not a permit stacking request.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Increased violations will be issued, or the historical practices of the fishery will have to change increasing the danger of the fishery, and lowering the economic viability of the fishery.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen who currently fish in partnerships.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We considered making it mandatory for there to always be an exactly even split. This would alleviate any potential conflicts with Child Support Enforcement Division, or other court ordered garnishes against one or more of the potential partners, but decided against it, as this is not the intent of fish tickets.

We would prefer to leave it up to the individual fishermen to split the fish based on a percentage that they choose, but if exactly even splits were mandatory, this would be preferable to no splits at all.

**PROPOSED BY:** Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-338)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 301 - 5 AAC 30.350. Closed waters.** Relocate boundary for commercial set net fishing on Tsiu River to provide a separate sport fishing area as follows:

5 AAC 30.350 (12)

Tsiu River; below departmental marker (a) located at 500 yards above mean high tide and above a departmental marker (b) located 1.5 miles above departmental marker [UPSTREAM OF ADF&G REGULATORY MARKERS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY ONE HALF MILE BELOW DUCK CAMP ISLAND]

**ISSUE:** Currently, harvesters are allowed to set nets in almost the entire fishable portion of the river. This proposal is for not moving the existing Fish and Game escapement marker to a different location. It is in the right spot. But to create different boundaries for the users of the river. Boundaries that do not interfere with current commercial harvest levels or opportunity, and addresses an ongoing problem of disappearing sport fishing area as well as the confrontations between the user groups.

In the last 40 years the river has lengthened itself from 1 mile to about 4.5 miles long. It does vary from year to year but it is getting longer over time. This has increased the commercial harvest area over 400%. Conversely, in the last 20 years the “lake” above the marker has completely filled in with sand. An area that sports fishers relied on to get away from the commercial harvest activities. This has decreased the area to sport fish above the marker to almost nothing. Forcing sport fishers to utilize the area below the marker. This could be considered an allocation issue.

When you look at the commercial catch history you will see that no matter what the length of the river, the harvest numbers stayed within a certain range. 2010 is a perfect example of harvesting above the average with a little more than 1 mile of river to set nets. (The marker was moved due to low water conditions) The catch was the second largest in the history of the river and was the ‘cleanest’ catch as well. (Not as many blush fish).

Another problem with the way things are now is after a commercial opener there are no fish left in the 4 mile area that the nets were in. Leaving very few or no fish for other user groups. The small area above the marker is over fished and the fish do not bite very well. And very few new fresh fish making it that far. So you hope more fish come in on the next tide and the river hopefully fills in overnight. But 9 am the next morning the nets go back in and the cycle starts again.

With all that said, it only stands to reason to create these boundaries. I am proposing to allow 1.5 miles of river open to set netting. Starting at a point 500 yards up river from the mean high tide line then continuing for the next 1.5 miles. Unless the river changes to where there is only 2.5 miles of fishable water then the river is divided equally in half regardless of the length. The fish escapement marker should remain in the same spot.

The 500 yard corridor is because the Tsiu River is the #1 Coho sport fishing river in the world - and should be treated as such. The greatest sport fish opportunities are at the mouth on an incoming tide. It is the reason people come to here to fish. Everywhere else on the river is great but that is what makes this the most prized destination on earth for lots of people.

There is absolutely no reason to set nets in the first 500 yards of this river. The fish literally shoot up river to the first holding pools above the tide line before they stop to rest. Very few fresh fish hold in this area. The netters will have the same opportunity starting at the 500 yard mark and not have the problems associated with incoming tides. Like seals eating untold numbers of fish out of the nets and the constant confrontations with sport fishers.

With this proposal both user groups will have equal opportunity at the fish. But by having nets in the first 500 yards one user group will not have equal access or opportunity at the resource. If you force all sport fishing above the netting area the fish will never get to them. The few that do get by are stressed out and won't bite; many have net marks. This may cause an allocation issue.

Let me give you an example: Let's say there are 50 sport fishers (this is above average) at the mouth of the river and there are 3000 fish (that is below average) coming in on a tide. With a limit of 4 per person that would mean 200 fish could be taken. Many sports fishermen practice catch and release so 200 fish taken is above average leaving 2,800 (very conservative) fish to go up the 500 yards to the netting area. This happens in a matter of 3 hours. The netters have 24 hrs to get those fish. This is just during the daytime tide. There is always another when there is no one sport fishing. And on some tides, the fish never stop coming in - sometimes 3 or 4 days in a row at the peak.

If the average harvest is 45,000 with an average of 10 openers per season<sup>i</sup>, this equates to 4,500 fish for every 24 hr period. The harvesters will be able to take just as many fish regardless of where the nets are placed. If they don't, they will have another opener. This is what's nice about a fishery that opens 100% by emergency order.

The Tsiu River Coalition is working to give every group their desired goals.

Are the transferability of permits or harvest privileges affected? No.

Is there a defined role for processors? No.

Will this proposal be a permanent change to regulation? If not, for how long? This is a permanent change in the regulations for the Tsiu River.

If adopted, will your proposal require a change in monitoring and oversight by ADF&G? This will require a slight change in oversight; however it is not expected to be substantial. Each year the F and G will have to determine where the markers are placed. It is my hope that both user groups are part of the discussion on this.

Will vertical integration or consolidation occur? Will limits be imposed? No.

How do you propose to monitor and evaluate the restructured fishery? It will be monitored the same way it is now. It is rare for someone to fish outside the designated area. So not a big issue.

Is there a conservation motivation behind the proposal? If so, please explain. The conservation part of this comes in two parts: a) There will not be as many blush, unmarketable fish being

discarded as wanton waste. b) With the ever increasing length of the river the fish will less likely be harassed over and over again before they make it to the spawning beds.

What practical challenges need to be overcome to implementing your proposal, and how do you propose overcoming them? The only real practical challenge will be determining where the boundaries should be placed each year. But by forming a simple procedure will make this task easy.

What are the objectives of the proposal? Allow all users to harvest salmon without conflict. a.) to reduce the amount of wanton waste and increase the quality and value of the commercial catch. b.) to make the river safer for sport fishermen. c.) to give sport fishermen a better quality fishing experience on such a small river. d.) to increase the tax revenue to the city of Yakutat from new and returning sport fishermen.

How will this proposal meet the objectives in previous question? a.) the longer the river becomes the longer the fish hang out in the river below the current marker. Lots of these fish stay in this area long enough to start to lose their marketable value. This in turn reduces the value of the commercial catch and leads to wanton waste. b.) the high powered boats make an unsafe environment for all users because the river is: Single-channel river, most of it is not braided. The fish migrate up a single path in this river regardless of any braids.

Short – 4 -4.5 miles long.

Small - 60 feet wide.

Shallow - less than 2-foot average.

With the conditions of the river as stated above, the sport fishermen have only one place to wade out to reach the single channel available to catch fish. Boats use the same channel at a high rate of speed. This causes many encounters of less than 10 feet between boats moving at high rates of speed and sport fishermen standing in soft sand in waist-deep water. The boats need to move fast because of the danger of getting stuck on all the shallow sand bars. This is a recipe for disaster. c.) The area is flat with no vegetation except some grass. You can see for miles in all directions. Thus you can see several of the high-powered jet boats constantly circling and hear the nonstop whining of the motors. Powered boats, by necessity, also must get close to sport fishermen, which is a scary experience. It appears often to be harassment to these clients. Between the noise and the fear factor, fishing on the Tsiu during commercial openers is difficult and not enjoyable. d.) More sport fishermen will be willing to spend their money in a place that is safe from being harassed or scared, can see wildlife, and have an overall great Alaskan experience. The direct tax and lease revenue from sport fishing verses commercial harvesting is a staggering 10-1 ratio with potential revenue much higher than this if managed correctly. Whereas the commercial harvest tax and lease revenue is at its maximum. Unless the squatters cabins are put on leases and taxed.

Please identify the potential allocative impacts of your proposal. Is there an allocation or management plan that will be affected by this proposal? This proposed regulation will not affect allocation. This is not a matter of someone has to give up a percentage of their catch so someone else gets more. The netters will still catch just as many fish. This is due to the fact that the nets are 90 feet in length. Easily covering and blocking the entire migratory channel, which is usually 20-30 feet wide (Management report by Sheinberg Associates). The fish have no choice but to

swim into the nets. The only allocation issue is that the sport fishers are not allowed equal access to the resource. This proposal will fix the unintended biased allocation due to current regulations.

What is your understanding of the level of support for your proposal among the harvesters, processors, and local communities? The underlying sentiment for this proposal from the handful of harvesters on the river and the single processor that buys fish in Yakutat is negative. They would like to see nothing changed. The local communities are the typical 50/50.

Sport fishermen: It's interesting that this question didn't include other user groups. The remote sport fishing community overwhelmingly supports this. The Tsiu River Coalition is made up of people that actually use the resource and contribute the lion's share of revenue from this resource. Business owners and professionals from many different fields all agree with this proposal.

What are the potential short and long-term impacts on conservation and resource habitat? Both the short and long term impacts will be nothing but positive. The fish will be less stressed and the resource habitat will be healthier. 1) development of fisheries resource – This fishery is long overdue for some development. Right now it is only managed for commercial harvesting. The management needs to include other user groups when making decisions about the fishery. 2) impacts of proposal – (short term) There will be some slight adjustments made to the commercial harvesting; (long term) fishing conditions will improve and actually get better for everyone.

What are the potential legal, fishery management, and enforcement implications if this proposal is adopted? What other governmental actions may need to be taken into account? Legal: I can't see any with the fishery itself. Conflicts between user groups should drop significantly on the river. Management: No change. Enforcement: This is always a problem with a small remote fishery. But harvesting outside the designated area does not happen too often so shouldn't be an issue.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The fishing on Alaska's Tsiu River is known worldwide. Without changes in the commercial fishing practices on this river, the value of the sport fishery will continue to decline. The amount of revenue to the city of Yakutat will continue to dwindle. Lodges (the largest direct revenue contributor by a 10 to 1 margin) will have to slash their prices creating a discount special fishery, where no one makes any money, out of what was once a high quality, worldwide destination, or go out of business.

This proposed regulation will be an improvement to the entire fishery, the environment and increase the overall experience and safety for everyone. Escapement numbers will be maintained as intended by Alaska fishing regulation and there will be more wildlife to see because they won't be scared away by the obnoxious activities.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The total value of the resource will increase dramatically. The revenue from the commercial harvesters may increase somewhat. Even with just a few nets in the river, they are capable of taking the maximum number of fish allowed by the fishery. The



major increase in value comes from the sport fisher. There were a few years when there was no boating activity on the river and the numbers of sport fishers climbed to its highest point in the history of the fishery. Three years after the boat herding harvesting practice started again the numbers of sport fishers dropped in half. There is a direct correlation as proven by these numbers and the 50+ complaint letters primarily addressing the problem of herding fish with high powered boats.

Everyone will benefit. The state of Alaska and businesses in local communities will benefit from increased tourism. The user groups will have less confrontations and problems. The troopers will have less enforcement issues. The resource itself will be a big winner by minimizing the stress on migrating salmon and steelhead.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** a) the fishery resource; 1) biological - All positive – there will be a smaller area that will be disturbed by the commercial activities. 2) management – Should stay the same. 3) economic utilization – All positive. The river and area are not being used utilized anywhere near its economical potential.

b) harvesters; 1) economic efficiency of the harvesting function - Positive – they will be able to harvest just as many. And increase the value of the catch. 2) species interdependence impacts – None. 3) harvesting asset ownership impacts – There are no harvester assets on the Tsiu. Most harvesters are squatting in small shacks along the river. They do not pay for leases or taxes on improvements like other businesses that use the river. 4) distribution of product value – Will more than likely increase with higher value fish. 5) market access – Will not be affected.

c) the sector, species, and regional interdependence relationships; It is all positive for the species because it is way less stress on the fish's migratory route. The sector and regional interdependence relationships should remain intact and if anything get stronger with the potential increase in revenue.

d) safety; Safety would increase dramatically by minimizing the chance for an accident on such a small river system. The closest hospital is in Cordova, which is an hour away by plane. So that equates to at least 3 hours from the time of the accident to the hospital in perfect conditions. And as much as 3 days in bad weather.

e) the market; 1) market access and product form - Nothing should change here except that the commercial harvest may be more valuable. 2) market timing – I don't believe this is much of an issue because of the relatively low quality of the salmon they are harvested mainly for the eggs. The low quality comment is because of the way the fish are handled. Tossed around multiple times like basketballs, full of sand with little or no ice. Sitting on the dark sand in the hot sun, and at times, for a day or more. When the water is low and the sun is out the river water is 60 degrees or more. That means the fish are that same temperature when they are netted. The fish are 4 feet deep in a tote. It would take a lot of ice to cool them down to 44 degrees while sitting in the sun. 3) competitive opportunities – Should stay the same for harvesters. Will increase for other users.

f) processors: The processors should not be affected except that the quality of the product may be higher.

g) local communities: The local communities will benefit the most. By increasing the tax revenue to the cities and the increase of revenue to the bed & breakfasts, hotels, liquor stores, grocery stores and the local businesses that purchase their goods in those communities. 1) Employment will increase. 2) Industry infrastructure impacts – There will not be any on the harvester side. The other businesses may increase infrastructure thus increasing tax revenue. 3) Ownership of local harvesting and processing impacts – none. 4) Gain or loss of associated businesses – There will not be any on the harvester side. The other businesses associated with sport fishing will gain if this proposal is adopted and there certainly will be loss if not.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tsiu River Coalition

(HQ-F11-067)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 302 - 5 AAC 33.331. Gillnet specifications and operations.** Prohibit use of power boats to drive fish into nets on the Tsiu River as follows:

Add the following language to 5 AAC 30.331:

**(g) in the Tsiu River boats may not be used to purposely drive fish into set nets in any way.**

**ISSUE:** Currently, commercial harvesters use powered boats on the Tsiu River to harass and drive, or herd Coho into set gillnets during each commercial opener (two to five or more 24-hour periods per week during the season). I propose to eliminate the use of powered boats to herd fish into set nets on the Tsiu River. This river is small and shallow and has only one channel in which the fish return. The river averages 20 yards wide and two feet deep (Management Report Sheinberg Associates). The opportunity to harvest fish, in the same quantities, without the use of powered boats for driving fish on such a small river will remain intact.

Is a change in vessel length proposed? No.

Are the transferability of permits or harvest privileges affected? No.

Is there a defined role for processors? No.

Will this proposal be a permanent change to regulation? If not, for how long? This is a permanent change in the regulations for the Tsiu River.

If adopted, will your proposal require a change in monitoring and oversight by ADF&G? Powered boats will still be used to attend to nets, but the herding of Coho will not be allowed. This will require a slight change in monitoring and oversight by the ADF&G. However, it is not expected to be substantial. Currently, ADF&G monitors harvest and escapement.

Will vertical integration (e.g. harvesting and/or processing) or consolidation occur? Will limits be imposed? No.

How do you propose to monitor and evaluate the restructured fishery? It will be monitored and evaluated with the way it is done now. Counting harvest and escapement and calling emergency openers as seen prudent.

Is there a conservation motivation behind the proposal? If so, please explain. There is a conservation motivation in that scaring or herding large numbers of Coho into nets is not appropriate for the run. Regulation 5 AAC 30.331 2(b) says: *“Set gillnets may not obstruct more than two-thirds of any salmon migratory waterway, except in the Tsiu River, where set gillnets may not obstruct more than one-half of the waterway. In the intertidal zone this applies at all stages of the tide.”*

If the nets are set as stated above, then the escapement tends to be the correct amount for sustainability. However, if the fish are herded or circled into the nets, the escapement numbers fall and the run is potentially harmed. As well, the herding process itself further stresses fish.

The use of powered boats to herd fish directly impacts sport fishermen on the Tsiu as well. It is dangerous, spoils the sport fishing experience, and negatively impacts the run.

What practical challenges need to be overcome to implementing your proposal, and how do you propose overcoming them? The practical challenges will be to convince the harvesters that power boats are no longer allowed to scare fish and to ensure that penalties are given out when infractions occur to discourage further scaring of fish. Nothing else will be a challenge.

What are the objectives of the proposal? a.) to make the river safer for sport fishermen. b.) to give the fish that ordinarily would not be gill netted a safe return and not to stir up the river beds. c.) to give sport fishermen a better quality fishing experience on such a small river. d.) to increase the tax revenue to the city of Yakutat from new and returning sport fishermen.

How will this proposal meet the objectives in the previous question? a.) the high powered boats make an unsafe environment for all users because the river is: Single channel river, most of it is not braided. The fish migrate up a single path in this river regardless of any braids. Short – 4 - 4.5 miles long. Small - 60 feet wide. Shallow - less than 2-foot average (Management report Sheinberg Associates). With the conditions of the river as stated above, the sport fishermen have only one place to wade out to reach the single channel available to catch fish. Boats use the same channel at a high rate of speed. This causes many encounters of less than 10 feet between boats moving at high rates of speed and sport fishermen standing in soft sand in waist-deep water. The boats need to move fast because of the danger of getting stuck on all the shallow sand bars. This is a recipe for disaster.

b.) The run is harmed by scaring fish that would ordinarily make it past the nets into those nets. The repeated running down of fish that make it past consecutive nets stresses fish that are not netted. The same fish can be run down as many times as there are nets. 8-12 nets are normal.

You have to remember that there is no clear path for the fish. The nets cover the entire migratory channel. So each fish has to escape each net to make it up river.

c.) The area is flat with no vegetation except for some grass. You can see for miles in all directions. Thus you can see several of the high-powered jet boats constantly circling and hear the nonstop whining of the motors. Powered boats, by necessity, also must get close to sport fishermen, which is a scary experience. It appears often to be harassment to the sport fishermen. Between the noise and the fear factor, fishing on the Tsiu during commercial openers is difficult and not enjoyable.

d.) Most sports fishermen are very proactive pertaining to environmental issues. They are apt to spend money in locations safe from harassment where they can view wildlife within its natural setting. Direct tax and lease revenue from sport fishing verses commercial harvesting (where commercial harvest tax and lease revenue is already at its maximum) is a staggering 10:1 ratio (Management report Sheinberg Associates). Allowing commercial fishermen to use power watercrafts to herd salmon on the Tsiu diminishes this environment, creates potential safety issues and jeopardizes a huge untapped source of revenue for the local and state economies.

Please identify the potential allocative impacts of your proposal. Is there an allocation or management plan that will be affected by this proposal? This proposed regulation will not affect allocation. This is not a matter of someone has to give up something so someone else gets more. The netters will still catch just as many fish. This is due to the fact that the nets are 90 feet in length. Easily covering and blocking the entire migratory channel, which is usually 20-30 feet wide (Management report Sheinberg Associates). The fish have no choice but to swim into the nets.

What is your understanding of the level of support for your proposal among the harvesters, processors, and local communities? The underlying sentiment for this proposal from the handful of harvesters on the river and the single processor that buys fish in Yakutat is negative. They would like to see nothing changed. The local communities are the typical 50/50.

Sport fishermen: I find it interesting that this question didn't include other user groups that don't primarily harvest fish. The remote sport fishing community overwhelmingly supports this. Its members think it is rude, obnoxious, and pitiful that the #1 Coho sport fishing river in the world is treated in such a manner. The Tsiu River Coalition is made up of people that use the resource but actually harvest very few fish and contribute the lion's share of revenue from this resource. Business owners and professionals from many different fields all agree with this proposal.

What are the potential short and long-term impacts on conservation and resource habitat? Both the short and long term impacts will be nothing but positive. The fish will be less stressed and the resource habitat will be healthier because there won't be high powered jet boats stirring up the spawning beds. 1) development of fisheries resource – This fishery is long overdue for some development. Right now it is only managed for commercial harvesting. The management needs to include other user groups when making decisions about the fishery. 2) impacts of proposal – (short term) There will be some slight adjustments made to the commercial harvesting; (long term) fishing conditions will improve and actually get better for everyone.

What are the potential legal, fishery management, and enforcement implications if this proposal is adopted? What other governmental actions may need to be taken into account? Legal: I can't see any with the fishery itself. Conflicts between user groups should drop significantly on the river. Management: should make managing easier with a steady flow of fish being harvested instead of the peaks and valleys associated with the current structure. Enforcement: This is always a problem with a small remote fishery. But since the boats were causing the majority of the issues this should help alleviate a lot of enforcement problems in "a get all you can before the next guy does with total disregard for others and their safety" fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The fishing on Alaska's Tsiu River is known worldwide. Without changes in the commercial fishing practices on this river, the value of the sport fishery will continue to decline. The amount of revenue to the city of Yakutat will continue to dwindle. Lodges (the largest direct revenue contributor by a 10 to 1 margin) will have to slash their prices creating a discount special fishery, where no one makes any money, out of what was once a high quality, worldwide destination, or go out of business.

This proposed regulation will be an improvement to the entire fishery, the environment and increase the overall experience and safety for everyone. Escapement numbers will be maintained as intended by Alaska fishing regulation and there will be more wildlife to see because they won't be scared away by the obnoxious activities.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The total value of the resource will increase dramatically. The revenue from the commercial harvester is about at its maximum. Even with just a few nets in the river, they are capable of taking the maximum number of fish allowed by the fishery. The major increase in value comes from the sport fisher. There were a few years when there was no boating activity on the river and the numbers of sport fishers climbed to its highest point in the history of the fishery. Three years after the boat herding harvesting practice started again the numbers of sport fishers dropped in half. There is a direct correlation as proven by these numbers and the 50+ complaint letters primarily addressing the problem of herding fish with high powered boats.

Everyone will benefit. The state of Alaska and businesses in local communities will benefit from increased tourism. The user groups will have less confrontations and problems. The troopers will have less enforcement issues. The resource itself will be a big winner by minimizing the stress on migrating salmon and steelhead.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** a) the fishery resource; 1) biological -All positive - because the fish that do escape the nets won't be stressed out by being run down multiple times by boats, while allowing all user groups ample opportunity to safely enjoy this valuable resource. 2) management – Should stay the same. 3) economic utilization – All positive. The river and area are not being used utilized anywhere near its economical potential.

b) harvesters; 1) economic efficiency of the harvesting function - Positive – they will be able to harvest just as many. 2) species interdependence impacts – None. 3) harvesting asset ownership

impacts – There are no harvester assets on the Tsiu. Most harvesters are squatting in small shacks along the river. They do not pay for leases or taxes on improvements like other businesses that use the river. 4) distribution of product value – Will more than likely increase with better handling. 5) market access – Will not be affected

c) the sector, species, and regional interdependence relationships; It is all positive for the species because it is way less stress on the fish. The sector and regional interdependence relationships should remain intact and if anything get stronger with the potential increase in revenue.

d) safety; Safety would increase dramatically by eliminating the chance for an accident on such a small river system. The closest hospital is in Cordova, which is an hour away by plane. So that equates to at least 3 hours from the time of the accident to the hospital in perfect conditions. And as much as 3 days in bad weather.

e) the market; 1) market access and product form - Nothing should change here except that the commercial harvest may be more valuable because the fish will be handled better. 2) market timing – I don't believe this is much of an issue because of the relatively low quality of the salmon. [They do have an excellent roe byproduct. (Management report Sheinberg Associates)] The low quality comment is because of the way the fish are handled. Tossed around multiple times like basketballs, full of sand with little or no ice. Sitting on the dark sand in the hot sun, and at times, for a day or more. When the water is low and the sun is out the river water is 60 degrees or more. That means the fish are that same temperature when they are netted. The fish are 4 feet deep in a tote. It would take a lot of ice to cool them down to 44 degrees while sitting in the sun. 3) competitive opportunities – Should stay the same for harvesters. Will increase for other users.

f) processors: The processors should not be affected except that the quality of the product may be higher. The negative for the single processor is that he may have to adjust to having a steady flow of fish instead of the glut then nothing scenario currently in place.

g) local communities: The local communities will benefit the most. By increasing the tax revenue to the cities and the increase of revenue to the Bed and Breakfasts, hotels, liquor stores, grocery stores and the local businesses that purchase their goods in those communities. 1) Employment will increase. 2) Industry infrastructure impacts – There will not be any on the harvester side. The other businesses may increase infrastructure thus increasing tax revenue. 3) Ownership of local harvesting and processing impacts – none. 4) Gain or loss of associated businesses – There will not be any on the harvester side. The other businesses associated with sport fishing will gain if this proposal is adopted and there certainly will be loss if not.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Harvesters – it may take longer to get the same number of fish. But by catching them more slowly means less time in a tote on the beach with little or no ice, which equates to higher quality. During most openers, there are so many fish caught in the first 3-4 hours that they can't get them all hauled out before dark and the fish sit there over night. Some 24 hrs or more. Another negative would be that the harvesters would have to tend the net the entire 24-hour opener to get their fish. Now they clean the river out in 3-4 hours and have to wait for the next tide to see if more fish come in. Plus with so many fish being caught in such a

short time the handling of them becomes rushed and the quality goes down. The point of a 24-hour opener is to have the quality of fish stay fresh.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tsiu River Coalition

(HQ-F11-066)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 303 - 5 AAC 30.310. Fishing Seasons.** Establish criteria to determine the first commercial opening on the Tsiu River as follows:

5 AAC 30.310. Fishing Seasons.

(a) Salmon may be taken by set gillnets only as follows:

(1) in the Yakutaga district the open and closing dates will be made by emergency order, **except that in the Tsiu River the first yearly opening date will only be after 5,000 fish have escaped above the departmental marker below Duck Island as recorded with department aerial surveys.**

Or instead use:

5 AAC 30.310. Fishing Seasons.

(a) Salmon may be taken by set gillnets only as follows:

(1) in the Yakutaga district the open and closing dates will be made by emergency order, **except that in the Tsiu River the first yearly opening date will only be after 10,000 fish have escaped above the departmental marker below Duck Island as recorded with department aerial surveys.**

If the sonar is not an option then at the very least the person doing the aerial surveys should come from Cordova. As well as the plane and pilot. This will help reduce possible misrepresentation of the facts or assumptions. As seen in 2007 and 2010.

**ISSUE:** Current regulations allow the commercial fishery to be opened on any day on the Tsiu River by EO. The first opener is typically done with a predetermined “traditional opening date”. This does not guarantee adequate escapement.

The first opener on the Tsiu River is not done exclusively according to escapement tallied with consistent methodology, it is opened when F&G thinks it is OK based on non-consistent aerial survey methods and a “traditional opening date”. The use of a “traditional date” does not ensure adequate early escapement and often cleans the river out of the low numbers of fish found there early in the season. Additionally using this type of traditional date has caused the commercial fishery to mobilize for that date only to be shut down by lack of fish escapement.

The first opener should happen only when sufficient fish have escaped above the markers as surveyed by a Fish and Game employee. Currently the fish are counted by Fish and Game aerial survey when possible. Usually by a Fish and Game employee from Yakutat on a chartered plane from a Yakutat based air taxi. This method has proven to be faulty. In 2007 and 2010 the river

was opened for the first commercial harvest of the season when there was not enough escapement. Consequently the entire commercial operation set up shop only to be shut down at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour. In 2007 there was no aerial survey conducted before the announcement was made. The fisheries manager was making a decision based on a pilot report. Even though this pilot is very knowledgeable with counting fish from a plane, the pilot also works for an air taxi that stands to make a lot of money from commercial fishing on the Tsiu.

In 2010 the initial aerial survey was done in bad weather. Visibility is extremely low in rainy, windy conditions. The assumption was that with that kind of weather, and with 3,000 fish in the lower river, there were sure to be enough escapement to have the first opener of the season on the traditional opening date. Had the initial opener happened, in both cases, there would have been major devastation to the sport fishing user group because there were hardly any fish above the Fish and Game escapement marker. And with the low water conditions most of the fish would have been taken out of the river below the marker leaving nothing for the sport fisher.

In 2010 the weather was clear and sunny the 3 days between the announcement and the start of the opener. Many planes bringing in the commercial operation flew over the river. But no pilot report was given stating that those 3,000 fish didn't move up river, that the number of fish above the marker wasn't even close to the 5,000 minimum needed. or that a 300 yard sand bar had formed blocking almost all fish from moving up past the marker. It was business as usual getting ready for the traditional first opener, the third Sunday of August.

In 2007 the first commercial opener did not happen for two more weeks after it was shut down. In 2010 it was a one week postponement. In 2010 the initial 5,000 escapement fish needed to have the first opener didn't happen until Sep 7. And the BEG of 10,000 didn't happen until Sep 13. And that is debatable if you look at the facts.

<b><u>DATE</u></b>	<b><u>ABOVE MARKER</u> escapement # (actual #)</b>	<b><u>POTENTIAL ESCAPEMEN T</u> escapement # (actual #)</b>	<b><u>INCREASE ABOVE MARKER</u> escapement # (actual #)</b>	<b><u>ADD</u> escapement #,s)</b>	<b><u>WEEKLY ESCAPEMEN T GOALS</u> escapement # (actual#)</b>
21-Aug	2,500 (5,000)	3,500 (7,000)		6,000	5,000 (10,000)
24-Aug	2,500 (5,000)	5,500 (11,000)	0	8,000	
28-Aug	2,500 (5,000)	6,750 (13,500)	0	9,250	10,000 (20,000)
3-Sep	3,000 (6,000)	5,000 (10,000)	500 (1,000)	8,000	
4-Sep					15,000 (30,000)
7-Sep	5,500 (11,000)	10,000 (20,000)	2,500 (5,000)	15500	
11-Sep					20,000 (40,000)
13-Sep	10,000 (20,000)	7,000 (14,000)	4,500 (9,000)	17,000	
18-Sep					25,000 (50,000)



21-Sep	11,000 (22,000)	7,500 (15,000)	1,000 (2,000)	18,500	
24-Sep					30,000 (60,000)

The rule of thumb for aerial surveys is that whatever you see is approximately 50% of what is actually there. This is due to many factors including grass and overhanging brush. above marker - is the area that has aerial surveys done to count escapement. This is the area that the fish are able to freely move up stream and spawn. This is where the 50% rule applies. (Yakutat Area Fisheries Biologist).

Potential escapement - Refers the area below the escapement marker. These are fish waiting to move up to the spawning beds. In this area there are many factors that could stop the fish from moving freely up stream. Such as low water conditions. This area is free of any obstructions when doing aerial surveys. The fish are in a single channel and swim on a single plane. (they are not stacked up on top of each other) The river is clear and shallow. What is seen from the air here is the actual number of what is there. Whatever the total count is in this area must be divided in half to get an accurate potential escapement.

Then you add the above marker and potential escapement together to get accurate escapement numbers. And it is this information that has to be used to manage the fishery properly.

In 2010 the potential escapement (actual #) was used in determining when to have commercial openers.

The weekly escapement goals is meant to be used as a guideline to ensure enough fish get to the area above marker. There has to be a minimum of 5,000 above marker to have the first commercial opener. The BEG (biological escapement goal) of 10,000 is the bare bones minimum that the Fish and Game wants to have for sustainable future runs on the Tsiu River.

2010 was an extremely dry, low water year. And to compound matters a beaver dam was blocking 100% of the salmon migration to the spawning beds. On or about Sep 1 it appeared that enough of the beaver dam was taken down so fish could get over it. But it was a small opening and only one fish at a time would swim over. It wasn't like opening the flood gates.

Looking at the chart, from Sep 1 to Sep 7 about 6000 fish moved into the above marker area. A little rain the night of Sep 4 probably helped this. Then between Sep 7 and Sep 13, during the lowest water conditions seen yet this season, 9,000 fish moved into the above marker area. So it took all summer for 5,000 fish to move above the marker in more favorable conditions and then in less than two weeks 15,000 moved? That would mean almost all the fish in the entire potential escapement area moved up. Or that a bunch of new fish swam through the potential escapement area to above marker area. Either way there would be fresh fish above the marker or in the potential escapement area. There was not. There were groups of people sport fishing in the area above the marker just about every day during this Sep 1-13 time frame. The fish were just getting darker and darker. Nothing fresh or worth keeping. Sep 7, 8 and 9 not many fish came in the river. (Where and when people were sport fishing, what they were catching, the strength of the run, rain and river conditions are from daily observation recordings.) A lull in the

run? Or the three trollers off shore were catching them? It doesn't matter. The point is that the possibility of 15,000 fish, or more importantly, 9,000 fish moving up between Sep 7-13, is a little hard to believe. Plus there were four openers between Sep 6-13. The total catch for these openers was about 40,000. (All aerial survey and commercial fish counts came from Yakutat area fisheries manager via email)

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be faulty and inaccurate aerial surveys. Potentially harming all user groups with the lack of good information. The commercial harvesters could be netting other rivers until the proper escapement goals are met instead of sitting around pressuring the fisheries manager to open the river. The sport fishers and related businesses would be crushed if the openers were allowed to happen prematurely. You have to remember it is only a six week season to catch the cohos. And to take away one week because of inaccurate information is a huge financial blow to all users.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Only in the fact that there will be a much better handle on how many fish are actually escaping to the spawning beds which leads to better management for all user groups which ultimately leads to higher quality in all segments of the fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All users of the resource. More accurate counting will in turn lead to better management which will only benefit everyone.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tsiu River Coalition (HQ-F11-068)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 304 - 5 AAC 30.350 (a)(3). Closed Waters.** Amend the Ankau Creek closed waters as follows:

(a) Salmon may not be taken in the following waters:

...

(3) Ankau Inlet: inside of a line from **ADF&G regulatory markers located across the terminus of Ankau Inlet at mean low tide** [59° 32.85' N. LAT., 139° 49.70' W. LONG., TO 59° 32.78' N. LAT., 130° 49.70 W. LONG.;]

**ISSUE:** The Alaska Wildlife Troopers (AWT) investigating a possible closed waters violation in Ankau Inlet in 2010 discovered that the lat./long. line in the regulation book was incorrect, and did not cross the terminus of Ankau Inlet. Visible regulatory markers placed across the terminus of the inlet at mean low water would eliminate confusion regarding delineation of closed waters in Ankau Inlet.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Commercial fishermen will continue to be confused about the line that delineates open from closed waters.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen who will be able to see the markers and know they are fishing in legal, open waters.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Correct the lat./long. line given in the regulation book. The terminus of Ankau Inlet changes over time and lat./long. lines may also need to be changed. Visible regulatory markers leave no room for confusion in this location.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-247)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 305 - 5 AAC 30.350 (a)(6). Closed Waters.** Amend the Akwe River closed waters as follows:

(a) Salmon may not be taken in the following waters:

(6) Akwe River: downstream from the ADF&G regulatory markers located **approximately 500 yards above the confluence with the New Italio River** [ONE-HALF MILE FROM THE TERMINUS OF THE AKWE LAGOON AT MEAN LOW WATER] and upstream of ADF&G regulatory markers located approximately two and one-half miles downstream from the westernmost end of the Sand Dunes;

**ISSUE:** This proposal would move the lower regulatory markers in the Akwe River from below the confluence of the Akwe River and the New Italio River to above the confluence to protect New Italio River stocks.

In 1987, the Italio River broke through the beach sand dunes and became a tributary of the Akwe River approximately one mile above the terminus of the Akwe Lagoon. Productivity of both sockeye and coho salmon in the renamed New Italio River has been in decline ever since, and no directed commercial fishery has been opened in the New Italio River since 1987. The lower Akwe River markers, by regulation, are approximately one-half mile downstream from the confluence of the two rivers, and set gillnet permits targeting Akwe River fish can intercept New Italio stocks in this area. Those markers have been moved upstream to 500 yards above the confluence by emergency order (EO) to protect New Italio stocks in the years since 1987. The situation on the ground is now stable and unlikely to change, and this marker change needs to be put into regulation to protect New Italio River fish.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The lower Akwe River markers will have to be moved each year by EO to protect New Italio River salmon stocks.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All user groups if New Italo River stocks increase in abundance.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Yakutat setnet fishermen would lose some sets in the lower Akwe River, but the area of the Akwe River that would remain open under this change is several miles long and will accommodate any relocated permits.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Continue to move the markers by EO. The physical change in the rivers is now permanent, and the marker movement needs to go into regulation so fishermen will know how the area is being managed.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-246)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 306 - 5 AAC 30.331. Gillnet Specifications and Operations.** Change the day when allowable gear increases on the Alsek River from Monday to Sunday as follows:

(1) In the Yakutat District

...

(I) in the Alsek River no set gillnet may be less than 10 fathoms or more than 25 fathoms in length;

(i) before the third **Sunday** [MONDAY] in July, no CFEC salmon permit holder may operate more than three set gillnets, and the aggregate length of set gillnets may not exceed 50 fathoms;

(ii) from the third **Sunday** [MONDAY] in July no CFEC salmon permit holder may operate more than 75 fathoms of set gillnet in the aggregate;

**ISSUE:** In 2006, the weekly opening day for fishing periods in the Yakutat District was changed from Monday to Sunday by regulation. All other fishing regulations were supposed to have been changed to reflect the new opening day. During the third week of July, allowable gear in the Alsek River increases from 50 to 75 fathoms, but the day that increase goes into effect was not changed in regulation from Monday to Sunday.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The department will have to continue to correct the day from Monday to Sunday by emergency order.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** CFEC salmon permit holders fishing the Alsek River will be able to increase aggregate gear during the third week of July on the day of the opening for that fishing period.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-262)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 307 - 5 AAC 29.120. Gear specifications and operations.** Allow downriggers in Southeast Commercial hand troll fishery all season as follows:

Handtrollers have the option of hand- powered downriggers in conjunction with fishing rods and hand powered reels for all seasons.

**ISSUE:** Use of downriggers by hand troll vessels is currently restricted to only the winter season. This proposal would allow the use of downriggers for all season.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Those with injuries such as shoulder and arm injuries would continue to aggravate injury with the use of hand gurdies, resulting in increased loss of income and higher medical costs. Higher operating costs due to the use of heavier commercial type gear. Higher by catch of other species. Downriggers can fish at precise depths therefore reducing the catch of non targeted species.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Salmon hooked on rod and reel type gear are less likely to be foul hooked than salmon hooked on handgurdies resulting in a higher quality product. The mortality rate would be reduced due to the decrease of foul hooked fish.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All hand trollers would benefit from having this option available to them. Those with physical limitations. All power and hand trollers, will benefit by having the ability to produce a higher quality product that will reflect in the overall retail market.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Since this proposal allows the option of using considerably less gear, producing higher quality fish, reducing bycatch and reducing the mortality rate, it does not have a negative impact on anybody in the fisheries that I can think of. There is no data produced by anybody, that would suggest that this proposal would have an unfair or an advantage over other gear groups.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Extending the season that downriggers are allowed, to include the spring season, but not the summer season.

**PROPOSED BY:** Michael W. Whitre (HQ-F11-078)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 308 - 5 AAC 29.120. Gear specifications and operations.** Allow six trolling lines on specified inside waters of Southeast Alaska to increase the harvest of enhanced salmon as follows:

**5 AAC 29.120 Gear specifications and operations.** (a) Salmon may be taken by hand troll gear and power troll gear only in the Southeastern Alaska-Yakutat Area.

(b) The maximum number of trolling lines that may be operated from a salmon troll vessel is as follows:

(1) from a power troll vessel:

(A) no more than six lines may be operated in the exclusive economic zone north of the latitude of the southernmost tip of Cape Spencer **and in the areas described in the spring troll management plan during the spring and summer season**; and

(B) except as provided in (A) of this paragraph, not more than four lines;

**ISSUE:** To help optimize the Troll harvest of enhanced salmon by allowing 6 trolling lines on the inside waters of Southeast Alaska (possibly use the spring hatchery areas to minimize wild stock interactions). The troll fleet is below their allocation range of the Southeast Enhanced Salmon Allocation Plan 5 AAC 33.364. Allowing the use of 6 trolling lines when targeting enhanced salmon should increase the catch rates. There are plenty of areas and opportunity to catch enhanced salmon, but a lot of the troll fleet is still unwilling to pursue enhanced salmon and without more boats participating in the opportunity an alternative is to allow those willing to pursue enhanced salmon additional gear to maximize their harvest.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The troll fleet will remain below their Southeast Enhanced Allocation range. At the Regional Aquaculture Associations a high percentage of the budget (NSRAA is over 50%) is spent raising enhanced fish for the troll fishery but it hasn't solved the problem.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The trollers and all Southeast commercial salmon fishermen in helping to bring balance to the Southeast Alaska Enhanced Salmon Plan.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** None - some trollers might object because they currently use the two extra gurdies to pull their stabilizers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Opening all areas for six lines as west of Cape Spencer is already allowed to use six lines.

**PROPOSED BY:** Ed Hansen

(HQ-F11-072)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 309 - 5 AAC 29.120. Gear specifications and operations.** Allow four hand troll gurdies in the summer troll fishery following the initial king salmon retention period as follows:

**5 AAC 29.120. Gear specifications and operations.** (a) Salmon may be taken by hand troll gear and power troll gear only in the Southeastern Alaska-Yakutat Area.

(C) an aggregate of no more than four fishing rods or an aggregate of no more than two hand troll gurdies may be operated from or on board a hand troll vessel, except that following the closure of the initial summer fishery king salmon retention period and before the opening of the winter troll fishery under 5 AAC 29.070(b),

(i) [AN AGGREGATE OF NO MORE THAN FOUR FISHING RODS] or an aggregate of no more than four hand troll gurdies may be on board a hand troll vessel.

**ISSUE:** Delete the portion pertaining to the maximum number of rods that may be on a hand troll vessel.

The maximum number of rods that may be used has already been established in paragraph (C), and is ignored in the Winter fishery as provide for on page 98, paragraph (j) (5). Extra rods are spare equipment to cover breakage and loss.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The limit on rods that may be on board penalizes law abiding hand trollers that choose to fish with rod and reel gear Those that break the law don't care what is written in the regulations.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Handtrollers that choose to use rod and reel gear will have spare equipment in case of loss or breakage.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Handtrollers that choose to use rod and reel gear.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There are none.

**PROPOSED BY:** Bill Davidson

(HQ-F11-013)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 310 - 5 AAC 29.080. Management of the winter salmon troll fishery.** Amend the winter king salmon guideline harvest range by adding hatchery-produced kings as follows:

(a) the department shall manage the winter salmon troll fishery so that the harvest of king salmon does not exceed a guideline harvest level of 45,000 fish **plus the number of Alaska hatchery Chinook estimated by the department to have been harvested during the winter troll fishery** with a guideline harvest range of 43,000 to 47,000 **plus the Alaska hatchery add-on.**

**ISSUE:** The value of Alaska winter season troll king salmon is significantly higher than the value of Alaska summer season troll king salmon. During the winter troll season, about 10% of the harvest is Alaska hatchery king production that does not count against the treaty cap. Currently that percentage is "added-on" to the summer quota. The department has the tag sampling ability to accurately estimate the number of Alaska hatchery kings caught during the winter season and could "add-on" that number to the winter season when they are most valuable. A rolling historic average of the winter hatchery "add-on" catch could be used instead of a single year if this is more feasible.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** An Alaskan winter troll-caught king salmon is usually worth considerably more per pound than a summer king salmon. Marketing personnel indicate that week to week access of these high-value king salmon through April helps to sell and adds value to fresh halibut, rockfish, and lingcod as wholesalers work with their steady suppliers. Continuing the supply of Alaska troll-caught king salmon on a year-round basis solidifies the Alaska troll salmon market share and adds value to the hatchery access harvest in May and June. Action by the Board to enact this or a similar proposal will result in economic gain and opportunity for Alaska trollers, troll Chinook marketers and trolling communities.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, this proposal will improve the quality of the resource harvested and products produced. Managing the troll harvest of Alaska hatchery king salmon to optimize the value is the purpose of this proposal. The troll fishery has traditionally been managed to suit the internal allocation conveniences of various segments of a highly diversified fleet both in terms of geography and lifestyle interests in when they want to fish. Adding the Alaska hatchery kings caught in the winter to the winter harvest optimizes their value as opposed to adding them to the summer when they are not as valuable.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Consumers, winter trollers, seafood marketers, Southeast rural communities, and the State of Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Trollers who limit their fishing to the summer season only will lose part of a day of summer Chinook fishing.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A great deal of conversation and information at port meetings about how to optimize the value of troll-caught salmon and how the troll fleet needed to look at every issue, from harvest patterns to fish handling to better serve what the market needs has been incorporated into this proposal.

**PROPOSED BY:** Sitka Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-133)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 311 - 5 AAC 29.110. Management of the Coho Salmon Troll Fishery.** Change beginning date for coho salmon retention in the spring king salmon fishery from June 15 to June 1 as follows:

Beginning June 1, allow retention of coho salmon by trollers fishing within the boundaries of the spring Chinook hatchery access areas.

**ISSUE:** Trollers are not allowed to keep coho until June 15. Trollers are particularly interested in accessing early returning hatchery coho, which are often high value, mature fish.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Summer run hatchery coho harvest and early season troll market opportunities for coho will continue to be missed.



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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The troll fleet and processors. Hatchery allocation imbalances could improve with a wider window of troll harvest opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-F11-225)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 312 - 5 AAC 29.110. management of coho salmon troll fishery.** Require 10-day mid-August troll closures for conservation and allocation based on the department's midseason assessment as follows:

5AAC 29.110 ....(b) The commissioner shall [MAY] close by emergency order the coho salmon troll fishery in SE Alaska-Yakutat Area for conservation of coho stocks as follows:

1. For [UP TO] seven days beginning on or after July 25 if the total projected commercial harvest of wild coho salmon is less than 1.1 million; or
2. For [UP TO] 10 days, if the department makes an assessment and determines that....

**ISSUE:** The annual SE Alaska troll closure is ambiguously applied by the Department of Fish and Game leaving some areas of inner SE Alaska without adequate coho stocks for conservation and other user groups. Inside waters fishermen often are the only ones to bear the brunt of conservation measures, which limits fishing time, numbers of fish retained and area for inside waters harvesters.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The movement of wild coho salmon will not adequately reach inside waters for conservation and other user groups. The annual troll closure should occur automatically every year to allow for conservation and the length of the closure should be based upon coho abundance.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** N/A-Not applicable.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The resource of wild coho salmon, sport fishermen, and subsistence users and inside waters commercial fishermen, i.e., inside trollers, gillnetters and seine fishermen will all benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Outside water commercial troll fishermen.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Request ADFG to identify stock specific coho harvests in outside waters and to control harvests on stock specific coho and then limit

overharvest of individual stocks. ADFG unfortunately has funding issues, which would limit an extremely expansive sampling and management program for the outside troll fishery.

**PROPOSED BY:** United Southeast Alaska Gilnetters Association (HQ-F11-189)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 313 - 5 AAC 29.110. Management of coho salmon troll fishery.** Extend season for the troll coho fishery in Southeast to September 30 but closed earlier by emergency order when warranted as follows:

- (a) Coho salmon may be taken from June 15 through September **30** [20]. [HOWEVER, THE COMMISSIONER, IN YEARS OF HIGH COHO SALMON ABUNDANCE, MAY EXTEND, BY EMERGENCY ORDER, THE COHO SALMON FISHERY IN ANY PORTIONS OF DISTRICTS 1-16 FOR UP TO 10 DAYS AFTER SEPTEMBER 20].

**ISSUE:** The troll coho fishery is managed on abundance yet closes on a fix date, unless ADF&G extends the fishery on emergency order. While fishery extensions under this provision are appreciated, they come at the end of the season on short notice, which has led to confusion and logistical difficulties for the fleet and processors. Recent years have seen increasing numbers of both wild and hatchery coho arriving late in the season, so it seems to make more sense to change the coho closure date to September 30, and allow ADF&G to manage according to the actual stock timing and abundance each year. If conservation and/or other regulatory goals dictate a season shorter than September 30, ADF&G already has full authority to close the fishery on emergency order.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Trollers could lose opportunity if the fishery is unexpectedly extended on short notice if they don't get word before they leave productive fishing areas or break down their gear for the season. Processors will experience unnecessary confusion and planning difficulties, such as the hire and release of seasonal processing crew. Late returning hatchery coho are not caught by the troll fleet, with exacerbates the longstanding hatchery allocation imbalance.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. It allows a bit more high quality hook and line salmon to go to market late in the season.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trollers, processors, and consumers who would like to get a few more days of access to wild hook and line salmon. Communities and the support sector who serve the fleet. Hatchery operators who might have late returning coho, which are being produced in part for the troll fleet. Hatchery imbalances could be better addressed.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?**

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-F11-220)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 314 - 5 AAC 29.110. Management of coho salmon troll fishery.** Through September lengthen the troll season in Districts 1, 6, and 8 each week gillnet fisheries are opened in these districts as follows:

From the first Sunday in September thru the 30<sup>th</sup> of September, trolling will be open in the area(s) within Districts 1, 6, and 8 that are open to gillnetting. When there is an opening(s) in a given Stat. Wk. for gillnetting then trolling will be open for the entire stat. wk.

**ISSUE:** Trollers do not have access to SSRAA produced coho after the 20<sup>th</sup> of September. Trollers should have an equal opportunity to catch SSRAA produced cohos in the area(s) that are open to the drift gillnet fleet within Districts 1,6 and 8.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Trollers will continue to be below the targeted allocation of enhanced salmon.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Troll caught coho salmon are more valuable and of higher quality.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Troller – by gaining harvest opportunity.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Gillnetter – they would be sharing this resource with trollers.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A ratio of 4 troll to 1 gillnet. hard to manage, not continuous, winter troll season conflicts.

**PROPOSED BY:** Charles Piercy (HQ-F11-228)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 315 - 5 AAC 29.100. Management of the summer salmon troll fishery.** In Section 1-E redefine the area open for trolling and extend the summer closure date from September 20 to September 30 as follows:

(d)(2)(A)[IN THE WATERS OF SECTION 1-E, BOUNDED BY A LINE FROM ESCAPE POINT TO NOSE POINT WITHIN ONE MILE OF THE SHORELINE] in the waters of Section 1-E, bounded by a line from southernmost tip of Nose Point to a point in West Behm Canal at 55°48.73' N. latitude, 131°44.01' W. longitude (located 1 nautical mile west of Nose Point) then south to a point at 55°43.92' N. latitude, 131°45.44' W. longitude (located 1 nautical mile west of the northernmost tip of Bushy Point), then south to a point at 55°39.09' N. latitude, 131°44.69' W. longitude (located 1 nautical mile west of Escape Point), to the northernmost tip of Escape Point, and in waters of Neets Bay west of the longitude of the southernmost tip of Chin Point and in Traitors Cove west of 131°41.80' W. longitude, from July 1 through September [20] 30;

Note: The proposed definition of the area is an ADF&G proposal, probably labeled “housekeeping”. The only change related to this specific request is the change from 20 September to 30 September.

**ISSUE:** Historically it has been more difficult to provide enhanced Chinook and coho harvest for trolls than to provide enhanced salmon harvest for net gear. In part this has to do with the nature of hook and line fishing as opposed to net gear, particularly in terminal harvest areas. This has led to an imbalance in the SE allocation of enhanced fish; since the inception of that agreement the trollers have never achieved their allocation of enhanced salmon (value). Though all the salmon produced in enhancement projects are common property fish, in essence the effort to produce large numbers of coho is pointed toward enhancing troll harvest while understanding there will be benefits to net fisheries from this same production. The SSRAA Board feels it is important to give trollers every reasonable opportunity to catch coho produced in SSRAA’s programs.

The timing of fall coho runs is quite different across SE Alaska. The Chickamin River stock, used in all of SSRAA’s fall coho projects, is a very late run stock. The release of these fish at Neets Bay is the largest Long-term fall coho producer for traditional fisheries in SE. The peak of the return in the Neets Bay THA is generally from mid September through early October.

The troll fishery on coho is a SE wide fishery that is managed on the overall abundance of coho across SE. It is not uncommon for this fishery to close on 20 September. While a closure on 20 September addresses the overall abundance, and many of the different coho runs are over or nearly over at that date, the abundance, and many of the different coho runs are over or nearly over at that date, the abundance of the SSRAA fish in Clarence Strait (D 106 drift net) and Behm Canal near Neets Bay is still strong. This area (D106) is often open to drift net gear for parts of two weeks after the troll closure. The harvest of these coho in D106 during this period is substantial, often exceeding 20,000 fish. Coded wire tag information suggests almost all the coho caught at this fishery are SSRAA fish. A large number of Neets Bay coho escape this fishery, traversing a portion of Behm Canal and entering the Neets Bay THA.

For reasons none of us understand, coho go “off the bite” once they enter Neets Bay. Troll gear is not effective once these fish move into the bay (THA), while at the same time troll gear can be very effective immediately outside the THA. There is a specific area of Behm Canal just outside of the Neets Bay THA (described below) that is open to trollers early in the summer in order to access Chinook salmon returning to Neets Bay. While this area is open early in the season to access Chinook, it is not open after the September troll closure. We propose giving trollers access to a substantial number of SSRAA coho by leaving this same small area immediately outside the Neets Bay THA open until the end of September.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be large late season harvests of fall coho returning to Neets Bay by net gear in D106 and during rotational fisheries in the Neets Bay THA. Trollers will not be able to effectively access these fish during this period. Secondly, this exacerbates the problems associated with getting fish produced for troll fisheries into troll holds.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Troll harvest just outside the THA will generally produce a slightly brighter fish than a fish caught by net gear near the hatchery. The troll caught fish are also less likely to have “chalky flesh” as compared to a fish caught closer to fresh water in either SSRAA cost recovery or net gear rotational fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The direct benefit will be to the troll fleet. The indirect benefit will be to all SE salmon permit holders as this harvest would help trollers move toward their agreed allocation of enhanced fish (value).

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** While it is not uncommon that 80% of these fish are harvested in traditional common property fisheries before the fish reach the THA, historically SSRAA harvested most of the remaining 20% of the coho after they returned to the Neets Bay THA. The Drift fishery in Clarence Strait occurs before the coho reach the proposed troll fishery. SSRAA would not suffer as coho make up a very small part of the organization’s cost recovery goal.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There is no other way to give the troll fleet effective access to these fish after a 20 September general troll closure.

**PROPOSED BY:** SSRAA (HQ-F11-045)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 316 - 5 AAC 29.100. Management of the summer salmon troll fishery.** In Section 1-E redefine the area open for trolling as follows:

(d)(2)(A) in the waters of Section 1-E, bounded by a line from southernmost tip of Nose Point to a point in West Behm Canal at 55°48.73' N. lat., 131°44.01' W. long. (located approximately 1 nautical mile west of Nose Point) then south to a point at 55°43.92' N. lat., 131°45.44' W. long. (located approximately 1 nautical mile west of the northernmost tip of Bushy Point), then south to a point at 55°39.09' N. lat., 131°44.69' W. long. (located approximately 1 nautical mile west of Escape Point), to the northernmost tip of Escape Point, and in waters of Neets Bay west of the longitude of the southernmost tip of Chin Point and in Traitors Cove west of 131°41.80' W. long. [IN THE WATERS OF SECTION 1-E, BOUNDED BY A LINE FROM ESCAPE POINT TO NOSE POINT WITHIN ONE MILE OF THE SHORELINE] from July 1 through September 20;

**ISSUE:** The waters of Section 1-E in West Behm Canal north of Escape Point and south of Nose Point has traditionally been open to trolling within one nautical mile of the Revillagigedo Island shore from July 1 through September 20. The troll fleet concentrates on waters outside of the Neets Bay Terminal Harvest Area (THA) during the time that chum salmon are returning to the Neets Bay hatchery. However, when this fishery is occurring and the Neets Bay THA is closed to trolling, there is a break in the northern and southern sections of open area near the mouth of Neets Bay. The line is described as within one mile of the shoreline, but because the

mouth of Neets Bay is wider than two miles, there is a small closed section between the northern and southern areas.

This small closed section does not allow a troll vessel to legally fish without removing gear from the water when fishing between the southern section and the northern section. This proposed change in the area description would redefine this Section 1-E fishery, allow trollers to fish historical drags, and allow uninterrupted fishing in the area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Troll fishermen will have impaired access to the waters of Section 1-E in front of the Neets Bay THA, and at times may need to remove their gear from the water while fishing the historical drag.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Troll fishermen, state enforcement agencies, and the department will benefit from a simplified delineation of the open area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-244)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 317 - 5 AAC 29.110. Management of the Coho Salmon Troll Fishery.** Extend the summer closure date in a portion of Section 1-E to September 30<sup>th</sup> as follows:

- (1) A portion of Behm Canal – Indian Point to Nose Point – will remain open to trolling until at least September 30<sup>th</sup>.

**ISSUE:** Trollers would like access to Neets Bay hatchery coho in the late part of the season. The troll season currently closes on September 20 unless it is extended for exceptional wild coho abundance. Both wild and hatchery coho have been returning to the region later in recent years; Neets Bay hatchery coho often don't return to the hatchery until the troll fishery is closed.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Trollers will continue to lose access to hatchery fish they pay for and will fall further behind on their enhanced fish allocation.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The further these fish are caught from the hatchery, the better the quality will be. And, it will be easier to catch them in the requested areas, because the closer the fish get to the hatchery the less likely they are to bite.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The troll fleet and processors. Hatchery operators and fishermen who are struggling to find ways to address the long standing hatchery allocation imbalance.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** SSRAA would lose a small portion of their cost recovery revenue, but it would not be significant and is likely to be mitigated somewhat through enhancement tax paid by commercial fishermen.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-F11-226)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 318 - 5 AAC 5 AAC 29.100. Management of the summer troll fishery.** Clarify when Section 1-F is open to trolling as follows:

(d) In Sections 1-C, 1-E, and 1-F, salmon may be taken only as follows:

(1) Section 1-C: open from August 15 through September 20;

(2) Section 1-E:

(A) in the waters of Section 1-E, bounded by a line from Escape Point to Nose Point within one mile of the shoreline, open from July 1 through September 20;

(B) all other waters of Section 1-E open from July 13 through September 20;

**(3) Section 1-F: open from July 1 through September 20, with the following restrictions:**  
[SECTION 1-F: EAST OF A LINE FROM THE NORTHERNMOST TIP OF KIRK POINT TO MARY ISLAND LIGHT TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CONE ISLAND, FROM JULY 13 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 20;]

(A) from July 1 through July 12, waters of Section 1-F east of a line from the northernmost tip of Kirk Point to Mary Island Light to the southernmost tip of Cone Island, will be closed;

(B) from July 13 through July 31, waters of Section 1-F east of a line from the southernmost tip of Black Island to the westernmost tip of Slate Island to the westernmost tip of White Reef to the easternmost tip of Black Rock to the northernmost tip of Kirk Point, will be closed. [SECTION 1-F: EAST OF A LINE FROM THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF BLACK ISLAND TO THE WESTERNMOST TIP OF SLATE ISLAND TO THE WESTERNMOST TIP OF WHITE] Reef to the easternmost tip of Black Rock to the northernmost tip of Kirk Point, [INCLUDING THE WATERS OF BOCA DE QUADRA NOT CLOSED UNDER 5 AAC 29.150(B)(2), FROM AUGUST 1 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 20.]

**ISSUE:** Most waters of Section 1-F are open to trolling during the summer fishery, with the exception of two relatively small areas within section 1-F. These two areas are closed during all or part of July to protect wild king salmon returning to rivers in Behm canal and Boca de Quadra. The existing regulation, as written, does not specify when waters of Section 1-F are open outside of those two restricted areas.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Trollers who operate gear in Section 1-F during the summer fishery, outside of the two restricted areas, will inadvertently be fishing in

closed waters. Department staff, state enforcement agencies, and troll permit holders will continue to be confused by the existing regulatory language.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Troll permit holders, state enforcement agencies, and the department.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-245)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 319 - 5 AAC 29.100. Management of the summer salmon troll fishery.** Increase troll opening in Chichagof Pass to seven days a week to access enhanced Anita Bay chum as follows:

Exempt 108-10 from regulation 29.100(e).

**ISSUE:** To provide better access, District 108-10 needs to be open to trolling 7 days per week after June 30 allowing harvest of chum salmon returning to the Anita THA.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** This will help trollers increase their allocation harvest.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trollers would benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Net fishers could suffer, if trollers increase their harvest of Anita Bay chum salmon.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Open all of District 8 to the summer troll season

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-151)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 320 - 5 AAC 29.097. District 11 King Salmon Management Plan.** Increase the area of Section 11-A open to trolling in the directed Taku King Salmon Fishery as follows:

ATA requests the following boundary revision in Section 11-A, to provide improved fishing opportunity for trollers.



- (1) In the waters of Section 11-A that are east and south of a line from Piling Point to **Outer Point** [MIDDLE POINT] then south and west of a line from Marmion Island Light to Circle Point.

**ISSUE:** Trollers have inadequate access to harvest Chinook in the years that the District 11 directed Taku River king salmon fishery is open. ATA is seeking a modest increase in the area currently available to trollers in 11-A.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Trollers will continue to lose opportunity to harvest the Taku River salmon stocks that they helped to rebuild. Limited time and area has impacted the fleet's ability to catch a fair share of the harvest. Gillnet catch rates are typically 5 times that of a troller. When this fishery was open in 2006, trollers landed just one tenth of a percent (0.001%) of the total harvest. From 2005-2006, trollers averaged only sixteen (16) fish. These low catches are likely to continue if adjustments are not made.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. If trollers are provided a better fishing area they could add more high quality fish to the district harvest.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The local troll fleet, which helped rebuild Taku River stocks in District 11; local processors; and, consumers of troll caught fish. This proposal would allow early season opportunity close to home for Juneau area trollers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. The area is large enough to accommodate all users. While this small adjustment could help improve harvest in an area shared with anglers, troll effort and harvest rates were very low in the years the fishery was opened. Given the small area, silty glacial water and close proximity to the river where fish don't tend to bite as well, it is unlikely there will ever be a large influx of troll participants.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Status quo – The troll harvest rate has been so low that only expanded time and area will provide fair and adequate access. Open a bigger area or multiple smaller areas – this option would create unnecessary conflict with the other user groups.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Trollers Association (HQ-F11-224)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 321 - 5 AAC 29.100. Management of the summer salmon troll fishery.**  
Amend closed waters for the Situk River troll fishery as follows:

**5 AAC 29.100 (i) (2)** [59' 29.70' N. LAT., 139' 44.00' W LONG. AND INTERSECTING THE THREE MILE LIMIT AT 59' 27.77 N. LAT., 139' 49.28' W. LONG] and add **59' 30.49 N. lat., 139' 46.58 W. long., and intersecting the three mile limit at 59' 28.65 N. lat. 139' 51.17 W. long.** and in **5AAC 30.365 (4) (B)** [59' 29.70' N. LAT., 139' 44.00' W LONG. AND INTERSECTING THE THREE MILE LIMIT AT 59' 27.77 N. LAT., 139' 49.28' W. LONG.]

and add [59' 30. 49 N. LAT., 139' 46. 58 W. LONG., AND INTERSECTING THE THREE MILE LIMIT AT 59' 28.65 N. LAT. 139' 51.17 W. LONG.]

These actions will effectively move the western river boundary west approximately 1.5 miles to accommodate the Situk River's current migration. The first change deals with the fall coho schedule under general trolling regulations, and the second changes the troll boundary for the summer king trolling boundary under the Situk river management plan.

**ISSUE:** The mouth of the Situk River has a 3 mile no trolling corridor around it to protect returning runs of coho and king salmon. Over the last few years the mouth of the Situk River has migrated towards the west approximately 1.5 miles. The corridor needs to be adjusted to fit the parameters of where the river mouth is currently.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There exists the potential for different users groups to feel that the troll fleet will be allowed access to fish stocks to close to the terminus of the Situk River.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** There is no doubt that this action is allocative. It is intended to allow a corridor for more fish to migrate into the Situk River where some of which will be harvested by the gillnet fleet.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** There are some trollers who like to fish right up to the boundary who will be forced to move further away.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Much discussion was held on this subject. It is an area that can at times see a large number of trollers and they do have an impact on the numbers of fish returning into the Situk River. Having a corridor to allow for escapement is a good idea, and keeping it fair so all user groups feel like they are getting equal access to the fish is a good idea. The area to potentially be excluded to trolling is not nearly as productive as it is from the potential new boundary further to the west to Ocean Cape. The main concern from the troll fleet as represented was what if the Situk migrates even further West in the future? Will this set a precedence that may someday push them off of the drag that is their most productive? To be fair it was decided that there would be no further Westward migration boundary moves, and to offset this permanent line, the Eastern boundary would not be moved, thereby increasing the overall troll closure area by 4.5 square miles.

**PROPOSED BY:** Yakutat Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-341)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 322 - 5 AAC 29.100. Management of the summer salmon troll fishery.**  
Amend closed waters for the Situk River Troll Fishery as follows:

- (i) in the Yakataga and Yakutat Districts,...

...

(2) from August 7 through September 20, salmon may not be taken in waters bounded on the west by the three-nautical-mile limit of the territorial sea on the north by a line extending seaward from 59°32.49' N. lat., 139°51.79' W. long. (OCEAN CAPE), [59°29.70' N. LAT., 139°44.00' W. LONG.] and intersecting the three-nautical-mile limit at 59°39.69' N. lat., 139°55.49' W. long., [59°27.77' N. LAT., 139°49.28' W. LONG.,] and on the south by a line extending seaward from 50°21.92' N. lat., 139°23.15' W. long., [59°20.30' N. LAT., 139°16.50' W. LONG.] and intersecting the three-nautical-mile limit at 59°19.90' N. lat., 139°26.39' W. long. [59°18.25' N. LAT., 139° 21.94' W. LONG.]

**ISSUE:** This closed area has been in regulation in order to reduce exploitation of Situk River coho salmon stock by troll gear. The same area has also been established in 5 AAC 30.365 in order to reduce troll exploitation of the Situk River king salmon stock.

The regulation closes a rectangle of ocean waters adjacent to the terminus of the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet a distance of approximately 10 miles north and south of the terminus of the inlet. The terminus of the inlet has been migrating northward along the beach such that the closed water rectangle extends now from approximately 15 miles south of the terminus to approximately five miles to the north of it. This proposal merely adjusts the lat./long. lines to reflect the newer geography.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will continue to be inequity between the amounts of closed waters either side of the terminus of the inlet. The terminus is continuing its westward movement and, at some point, could overlap the northern lat./long. line.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** No one. If adopted, this proposal merely reestablishes the original intent of the regulation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-241)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 323 - 5 AAC 33.364. Southeastern Alaska Area Enhanced Salmon Allocation Management Plan.** Revise basis for the Southeast Alaska Area Enhanced Salmon Allocation Management Plan to include only production by regional associations as follows:

**5 AAC33.364.** (a) The purpose of the management plan contained in this section is to provide a fair and reasonable distribution of the harvest of salmon from enhancement projects among the seine, troll, and drift gillnet commercial fisheries, and to reduce conflicts amongst these users, in the Southeastern Alaska Area. Production of enhanced salmon for allocation purposes shall be

**from the production of fish generated by the regional aquaculture associations only.** The board of fisheries....

**ISSUE:** Currently, the SE Alaska Allocation Area Enhanced Salmon Management Plan requires collection of salmon enhancement taxes from all parts of SE Alaska, which only go to the two regional aquaculture associations, NSRAA and SSRRA. There are multiple Private Non-Profit(PNPs) hatcheries that also produce enhanced fish but do not receive salmon enhancement taxes. Production from these PNPs however, is taxed in each area in which the fish are caught. Money collected is supposed to be spent on gear specific projects in order to meet the allocation percentages set forth in the SE Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. The regional associations are the only recipients of enhancement taxes. Each regional association also is set up to provide for gear specific representation. Private Non-Profits(PNPs) are not required to have gear specific representation and may not be located in areas to benefit all gear groups. Production from the PNPs cannot be evenly distributed to all gear groups without severe and major upheaval in all fishing districts as fishing districts are currently set aside for various gear groups with limited crossover. Each regional association has fishing areas available to all three gear groups. However, the production from the PNPs is utilized in determining allocation of enhanced fish amongst all gear groups, even though the PNPs do not receive the salmon enhancement tax and do not have a fair and just process for divvying up enhanced salmon production as the regional associations are set up to provide.

In past years, there has been limited data (otolith marking) to provide for full accounting for all enhanced fish. This problem will hopefully be rectified by 2012 as ADFG is now requiring that all fish be watermarked. Without complete data, some fish have been counted while other fish have not. Some PNP hatcheries have had intermittent use of otolith markings providing inconsistent and incomplete data for determining enhancement contributions in total. PNP production should not be counted for allocation purposes, as there is no equal application to treat all PNP hatcheries the same in SE Alaska due to otolith marking inconsistencies and location of PNP production geographically. Removing all PNPs from the Southeast Alaska Area Enhanced Salmon Allocation Management Plan would then provide for a simple and just system of producing, taxing and spending to achieve allocation percentages set forth in the allocation plan. The current system allows for abuse and manipulation by one gear group or another based on incomplete data, while taxes are still collected on all gear groups. Prince William Sound also removed PNPs from their allocation plan in accordance with the removal of wild fish, as the contribution from PNPs is difficult to fully ascertain and provide equally for all users. PNPs operate in gear specific areas geographically and do not have equal gear group representation, nor do they receive enhancement taxes to fund future projects.

Removing PNP production from the overall plan, would satisfy the intent of the allocation percentages set forth in the allocation plan without undue manipulation by a PNP's production.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Current private non-profit salmon production will contribute to the overall SE Area Salmon Enhancement Management Plan with no process for divvying production equally to all gear groups. Equal access cannot be ascertained without major upheaval to existing boundaries of all gear groups. Production from the PNPs will be inconsistently accounted, dependent upon varying use of otolith(water) marking

used for identification. Removing the PNPs from the allocation plan is the only fair and just method for full accountability.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All gear groups, as each PNP hatchery is located near one gear group specifically. It is up to the gear groups in the areas with a PNP hatchery to work on providing production beneficial to that fleet. The additional benefit, is that the regional aquaculture associations can work on producing fish to meet the allocations set forth in the Salmon enhancement Plan without undue influence made by PNP production that has little connection to the taxes collected or the allocation requirements set forth in the SE Enhanced Salmon Allocation Plan for each gear group.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one group or one individual as the allocations set forth in the SE Alaska Area Salmon Enhancement Management Plan will continue to be the same. The regional aquaculture associations will be tasked with producing enhanced fish under the plan directly without the influence of any PNP hatchery production. The process for providing allocation of enhanced salmon will be much easier and controllable by the regional associations which collect all of the salmon enhancement dollars and who must by regulation have equal gear group representation.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Re-evaluation of the SE Area Salmon Enhancement Management Plan as the data used was from 1985 where it was extremely difficult and inaccurate to determine the catch of wild vs. enhanced salmon as fish during this time were not thermally marked(otolith) and therefore indistinguishable from one salmon to another. Prince William Sound also found that the data used for formation of the PWS salmon plan was also incomplete and incongruous with regards to accuracy. The department had one number while the aquaculture association had another number for determining allocation percentages. It is highly suspect and possible the SE Alaska Area Salmon Enhancement Plan incorporated faulty data to begin with and thus the percentages set forth for allocation are not achievable under with current enhanced production.

**PROPOSED BY:** United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters Association (HQ-F11-196)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 324 - 5 AAC 33.364. Southeastern Alaska Area Enhanced Salmon Allocation Management Plan.** Create separate enhanced salmon allocation plan for northern and southern Southeast Alaska as follows:

**5 AAC 33.364 (e) Each regional association will individually be responsible for achieving the allocations and percentages set forth in the Southeastern Alaska Area Enhancement Salmon Allocation Management Plan.**

**ISSUE:** Currently, one enhanced allocation plan currently covers all of SE Alaska, while each regional aquaculture association taxes and has gear specific representation to address area-wide

specific salmon enhancement projects. Splitting up the responsibilities into two specific areas will allow the regional boards to appropriate fish in a more fair and just manner. Currently, one area of SE may produce an excess amount of hatchery fish, where as the other aquaculture association may use the other hatcheries production to balance its requirement to produce fish for a specific gear group under the plan. Having a North and South Split, would provide for a fair distribution of resources as each area collects salmon enhancement taxes and thus spends them accordingly. The Regional Planning Team would still be responsible for overseeing enhanced allocation, but would have two distinct areas for each gear group to meet their allocation needs.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fishermen who fish in the northern or southern part of SE Alaska are taxed on all harvested fish and may not be getting any production from their regional association who receives enhancement taxes. In other words, some regional aquaculture associations will receive taxes from a gear group and not spend money on enhancement for the same gear group due in part, from another regional association's production of fish or from the production of a Private Non-Profit hatchery.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All three gear groups at various points in time.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one group or individual will suffer under this proposal. If anything the SE enhancement plan can be more precisely implemented rather than trying to achieve allocation percentages on a grand scale, which includes all of SE Alaska. No individual gear group or individual should be taxed and receive little or no benefit from fish enhancement taxes.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Reevaluate and reconfigure the Southeast Alaska Area Enhancement Salmon Allocation Management Plan; however this is unlikely as the other gear groups have outvoted and will out vote our gear group 4-2 each time.

**PROPOSED BY:** United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters Association (HQ-F11-193)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 325 - 5 AAC 29.090. Management of the spring salmon troll fisheries.** Redirect spring troll fishery management to target chum salmon to address the enhanced salmon allocation imbalance as follows:

5 AAC 29.090 (k) Notwithstanding (a) -(d) of this section the commissioner may, by emergency order, extend the length of, or set, weekly fishing periods during the spring fishery to optimize the troll harvest of hatchery chum salmon in the following areas:

(i) District 14, subdistricts, 114-50, 114-21, 114-23, 114-25

(ii) District 12, South of the latitude of Pt. Howard, and North of the latitude of Hawk Pt.

(iii) District 9, South of latitude 56 degrees 21' and North of latitude 56 degrees 15 .83 minutes.

**ISSUE:** There is a Board of Fisheries plan, 5 AAC 33.364, which allocated SE enhanced salmon. Their troll allocation range is 27-32%. Trollers have harvested 19% since inception. Trollers are short approximately 2.3 million per year.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** In recent years trollers have been paying 35% of the SE salmon enhancement tax while only receiving 19% of the benefit. Without passage of this or similar proposals trollers will continue to be well short of their harvest share.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Troll harvested June chums are usually exceptional "chrome brite" quality and individually handled with great care, live-bled, and immediately chilled.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trollers, processors, tenders, processing workers, local communities, and consumers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** If approved this proposal will move harvest rates toward allocation goals causing a slight reduction in net groups catch.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We developed and brought 22 ideas to improve troll harvest share of SE enhanced salmon to the December 2009 Joint Regional Planning Team. Based on feedback from other groups we honed those ideas down to less than 10 in the winter of 2010. They included ideas such as chum trolling in parts of 15 and all of 12 in June.

We thought about proposing that SE hatchery operators and Joint Regional Planning Team be directed by the BOF to prepare and submit individual and regional plans for bringing trollers within their allocation as soon as possible. We decided against making that proposal based on feedback that chum trollers should prepare a plan for JRPT review.

In March of 2011, after hearing from numerous individuals, groups, ADF&G personnel, and our membership, we decided to submit this proposal for June and another for July. These proposals optimize chum troll hatchery harvest while minimizing conflict with other users.

**PROPOSED BY:** Chum Trollers Association (HQ-F11-054)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 326 - 5 AAC 29.100. Management of the summer salmon troll fishery.** Provide a targeted chum salmon fishery for troll gear in Section 11-A to address the enhanced salmon allocation imbalance as follows:

5 AAC 29.100. MANAGEMENT OF THE SUMMER SALMON TROLL FISHERY.

(f) In District 11: (Add (1)

(1) Salmon may be taken only in Sections 11-C and 11-D.

(Add (2) and new language as follows:

(2) Notwithstanding (1) of this section, the commissioner may, by emergency order, set weekly fishing periods during the summer salmon troll fishery between July 1 and July 20 to optimize the troll harvest of hatchery chum salmon in Section 11A as follows:

Chum and pink salmon may be taken in Section 11A, in an area defined by a line from the Northern most tip of Lincoln Is., North to Little Is. Light, East on the Section 15C Southern Boundary to 134°53.00 W, South to Gull Is. @ 58°30.00 North, West to a point on Lincoln Is. at 58°30.00 North by 134°58.120 West.

**ISSUE:** There is a Board of Fisheries plan, 5AAC. 33.364, which allocates SE enhanced salmon. The troll allocation range is 27-32%. Trollers have harvested 19% since plan inception. Trollers are short approximately 2.3 million per year. The Douglas Island Pink and Chum Hatchery program has succeeded very well in producing chum salmon but only a very small % of the value of their returns go to trollers. In recent years trollers have developed gear and techniques that are highly effective at, and selective for, harvesting hatchery chum salmon. Other hatchery operators and the Alaska Board of Fisheries have adopted proposals in other areas of SE Alaska to enable better troll access to hatchery chums.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** In recent years trollers have been paying 35% of the SE salmon enhancement tax while only receiving 19% of the benefit. Without passage of this or similar proposals trollers will continue to be well short of their harvest share. An opportunity for a high value troll fishery on hatchery chums, mostly bound for cost recovery, will be lost.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Troll harvested chums are individually handled with great care, live-bled, and immediately chilled.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trollers, processors, tenders, processing workers, local communities, and consumers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Gillnet fishermen and DIPAC may harvest a small % less chums due to troll harvest.

Sport fishermen may be concerned about troll/sport conflicts but, unlike coho and Chinook troll fisheries, chum trollers and sport fishermen have little or no conflict as chum trollers are usually fishing deep water and going only 1-1.5 knots. We carefully sited this proposal to avoid popular sport coho and Chinook drags in the Juneau area.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Chum Trollers Association developed and brought 22 ideas to improve troll harvest share of SE enhanced salmon to the December 2009 Joint



Regional Planning Team. Based on feedback from other groups we honed those ideas down to less than 10 in the winter of 2010. They included ideas such as chum trolling in parts of District 15 and all of District 12 in June.

We thought about proposing that SE hatchery operators and Joint Regional Planning Team be directed by the BOF to prepare and submit individual and regional plans for bringing trollers within their allocation as soon as possible. We decided against making that proposal based on feedback that chum trollers should propose a plan for JRPT review.

In March of 2011, after hearing from numerous individuals, groups ADF&G personnel, and our membership, we decided to submit this proposal for July and another for June. These proposals optimize chum troll hatchery harvest while minimizing conflict with other users.

**PROPOSED BY:** Chum Trollers Association (HQ-F11-055)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 327 – 5 AAC 40.032. District 11: Douglas Island Pink and Chum (DIPAC) Special Harvest Area; 5 AAC 40.041. Herring Bay Special Harvest Area–Ketchikan; 5 AAC 40.043. Neets Bay Special Harvest Area–Behm Canal; and 5 AAC 40.051. District 3: Klawock Inlet and River Special Harvest Area.** Define open fishing periods in regulation for DIPAC, Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association, and Prince of Wales Hatchery Area special harvest areas as follows:

**5 AAC 40.032. District 11: Douglas Island Pink and Chum (DIPAC) Special Harvest Area.**

...

(b) A hatchery permit holder harvesting salmon within the special harvest area is exempt from the provisions of 5 AAC 33.310. **The open fishing period within the DIPAC Gastineau Channel, Amalga Harbor, and Speel Arm Special Harvest Areas, for the hatchery permit holder will be from June 1 through October 31. Additional fishing periods may be established by emergency order.** [THE COMMISSIONER SHALL OPEN AND CLOSE, BY EMERGENCY ORDER, FISHING PERIODS DURING WHICH THE HATCHERY PERMIT HOLDER MAY HARVEST SALMON WITHIN THE SPECIAL HARVEST AREA.]

**5 AAC 40.041. Herring Bay Special Harvest Area – Ketchikan.**

...

(b) A hatchery permit holder harvesting salmon within the special harvest area is exempt from the provisions of 5 AAC 33.310. **The open fishing period within the Herring Bay Special Harvest Area for the hatchery permit holder will be from June 1 through October 31. Additional fishing periods may be established by emergency order.** [FISHING PERIODS FOR THE HATCHERY PERMIT HOLDER WILL BE OPENED AND CLOSED BY EMERGENCY ORDER BY GEAR TYPE.]

**5 AAC 40.043. Neets Bay Special Harvest Area – Behm Canal.**

...

(b) A hatchery permit holder harvesting salmon within the special harvest area is exempt from the provisions of 5 AAC 33.310. **The open fishing period within the Neets Bay Special**

**Harvest Area for the hatchery permit holder will be from June 1 through October 31. Additional fishing periods may be established by emergency order.** [FISHING PERIODS FOR THE HATCHERY PERMIT HOLDER WILL BE OPENED AND CLOSED BY EMERGENCY ORDER BY GEAR TYPE.]

**5 AAC 40.051. District 3: Klawock Inlet and River Special Harvest Area.**

...

(b) A hatchery permit holder harvesting salmon within the special harvest area is exempt from the provisions of 5 AAC 33.310. **The open fishing period within the Klawock Inlet and River Special Harvest Area for the hatchery permit holder will be from July 1 through November 30. Additional fishing periods may be established by emergency order.** [FISHING PERIODS FOR THE HATCHERY PERMIT HOLDER WILL BE OPENED AND CLOSED BY EMERGENCY ORDER BY GEAR TYPE.]

**ISSUE:** Adoption of this proposal would open and close hatchery special harvest areas (SHA) by regulation rather than by emergency order (EO). These changes would alleviate the need for area managers to issue EOs for specific areas that are regularly opened each season for hatchery cost recovery operations, and would simplify and streamline existing activities.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** These areas will continue to be opened and closed by EO.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Department area managers and hatchery cost recovery operators. This proposal will result in reduced workload for area managers, and defined opening and closing dates for hatchery cost recovery operators.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer with the proposed change.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-256)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 328 - 5 AAC 40.042. Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association Special Harvest Areas.** Allow new gear type for broodstock capture in Districts 12 and 13 as follows:

Sec. (9) (c) (5) Hidden Falls: beach seine, purse seine, hand purse seine, drift gillnet, troll gear, and net pen broodstock capture system

Sec. (9) (c) (7) Deep Inlet: beach seine, purse seine, hand purse seine, drift gillnet, troll gear, and net pen broodstock capture system.

**ISSUE:** NSRAA would like to use a brood stock capture system that is currently not in regulation for NSRAA's SHAs at Hidden Falls and Deep Inlet. In 2011 NSRAA experimented with such a net pen system through emergency order authority.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Capture and control of broodstock will be less efficient and interruptions to fisheries are more likely to occur and with greater frequency. NSRAA is developing a broodstock capture system that will allow chum salmon to volitionally enter pens throughout the fishery period from late June to mid-July. Currently the fishery needs to be shut down numerous times in order to collect sufficient broodstock.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Quality of fish improves every time NSRAA does not close down the fishery for broodstock purposes. Closing the fishery entails waiting a day or days for fish to accumulate for broodstock capture. The broodstock capture system may not end closures but the new methodology should reduce closures.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen, processors, and NSRAA.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** When ADF&G operated Hidden Falls Hatchery from 1979 to 1988 the fishery was held off until most of the fish were in the terminal area. Fish quality was poor and broodstock relatively easy to collect during this late period of the run. In the 23 years NSRAA has operated the program the fishery has expanded in area and intensity. Fish quality has improved immensely. During this 23 year period, NSRAA has managed to attain the broodstock goal in most years but it requires shutting down the fishery almost every year for one to three openings.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (HQ-F11-172)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 329 - 5 AAC 40.XXX. District 3: Port Saint Nicholas Special Harvest Area.**  
Adopt a new Special Harvest Area for the Port Saint Nicholas hatchery in District 3as follows:

**5 AAC 40.XXX. District 3: Port Saint Nicholas Special Harvest Area.**

**(a) There is established the Port Saint Nicholas Special Harvest Area, consisting of all waters of Port Saint Nicholas east of 133°02.92' W. long. and west of 132°59.50' W. long., located at the mouth of the Port Saint Nicholas head stream.**

**(b) A hatchery permit holder harvesting salmon within the special harvest area is exempt from the provisions of 5 AAC 33.310. Fishing periods for the hatchery permit holder will be open from May 1–August 15 unless closed by emergency order.**

**(c) Notwithstanding 5 AAC 33.330, legal gear types for the hatchery permit holder in the special harvest area are purse seine, beach seine, and dip net.**

**ISSUE:** Prince of Wales Hatchery Association (POWHA), established in 1996, is a nonprofit organization with the mission of enhancing the production of salmon in the Craig and Klawock

area. In 2004, POWHA was permitted to operate an incubation and rearing facility at Port St. Nicholas for king salmon. In 2010, king salmon adults began to return in sufficient numbers that would have allowed cost recovery if a plan had been in effect. Instead, the department allowed a personal use fishery to occur. For 2011, POWHA would like to initiate cost recovery in the head of Port St. Nicholas. The department would like to clearly describe those waters where cost recovery activities may occur.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will be no clear definition in regulation for Port Saint Nicholas Special Harvest Area cost recovery activities.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the hatchery operator will benefit from a new regulation defining where cost recovery operations may occur.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-257)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 330 - 5 AAC 33.375. District 13: Silver Bay (Medvejie Creek Hatchery) Salmon Management Plan.** Close a portion of Bear Cove in the Silver Bay Special Harvest Area to protect broodstock and provide for safety as follows:

The following was supported by the NSRAA board of directors in 2010 & 2011, implemented via EO authority, and now as a regulatory change.

The Silver Bay Special Harvest Area (SHA) will open to commercial trolling effective at...and will remain open through... (5 AAC 33.375). The Silver Bay SHA includes waters east of a line from Entry Point Light to Silver Point with the following restriction:

Bear Cove: the waters of Bear Cove will remain closed east of a line defined by a point on south shore at 57°0.767 N. latitude, 135°9.085 W. longitude; to a point of north shore- 57°0.940 N. latitude, 135°9.232 W. longitude.

**ISSUE:** Foul hooking Chinook by commercial trollers (primarily hand troll) in terminal area of Bear Cove.

Close a small portion of Bear Cove near Medvejie Hatchery to trolling east of a line from a point on south shore at 57°0.767 N. latitude, 135°9.085 W. longitude; to north shore- 57°0.940 N. latitude, 135°9.232 W. longitude. This was accomplished by E.O. authority in 2010 and 2011. This area is approximately 500' from freshwater and still allows hand trolling in the majority of the bay.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Snagging by a small number of hand trollers leaves scarred Chinook and numerous treble hooks in NSRAA nets and Chinook that create a safety hazard. Treble hooks were being used inside the proposed line prior to 2010 and dozens of treble hooks were entangled in NSRAA's beach seine operation. Crew safety is at risk. At the end of three weeks of beach seining we had a gallon bucket of treble hooks we had pulled out of the net.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, NSRAA beach seines the terminal Chinook and eliminating snagging will improve the quality of the fish harvested. Sport fishing will be unaffected in the area in terms of opportunity; however the aesthetics will improve for users if the rodeo atmosphere is eliminated by implementation of this proposal.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** NSRAA Chinook harvest will benefit and the sport fishing experience will benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Since the emergency order snagging has nearly been eliminated and this has affected commercial troll (stationary hand troll only) catch negatively in Bear Cove.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** In 2008 and 2009 we attempted self policing subsequent to discussions with troll fishermen using the area. Several hand troll permit holders caught Chinook in the area in question without snagging using a high degree of skill and effort. These individuals attempted to convince the 'snaggers' to change their ways but ultimately this was unsuccessful.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (HQ-F11-169)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 331 - 5 AAC 33.370. District 1: Neets Bay Hatchery Salmon Management Plan.** Revise the Neets Bay hatchery management plan to allow cost recovery and distribute harvests according to the SSRAA board of director's annual plan for allocation as follows:

- (a) The intent of the Board of Fisheries in adopting this management plan is to distribute the harvest of hatchery-produced salmon in Neets Bay between the purse seine, troll and drift gillnet fleets. In addition to that goal, the board and the public would like to have a fishery in Neets Bay that produces a quality product that will allow the Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (SSRAA) to meet its corporation escapement goal with the least number of fish and provide the highest possible price to the fishermen.
- (b) The department, in consultation with SSRAA, shall manage Neets Bay east of the longitude of the easternmost tip of Bug Island to the closed waters area at the head of the bay to distribute the harvest of Neets Bay hatchery produced salmon between the purse seine, troll, and drift gillnet fleets by setting the fishing times and areas for those fleets by emergency order in accordance with the SSRAA Board of Director's yearly Neets Bay

plan for meeting broodstock and cost recovery goals and establishing commercial fisheries which are consistent with the Southeast Enhanced Salmon Allocation Plan.[AS FOLLOWS;]

(1)[SALMON MAY BE TAKEN BY TROLL GEAR ONLY DURING PERIODS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER;

(2)[SALMON MAY BE TAKEN BY PURSE SEINES AND DRIFT GILLNETS ONLY DURING PERIODS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER AS FOLLOWS:

(A)OPENINGS FOR SEINES AND GILLNETS MUST BE ROTATED BETWEEN NET HEAR GROUPS WITH A CLOSURE OF AT LEAST 24 HOURS BETWEEN OPENINGS; THE FIRST OPENING MUST BE FOR GILLNETS;

(B)A GILLNET OPENING MUST BE NO LESS THAN 24 HOURS IN DURATION AND A SEINE OPENING MUST BE NO LESS THAN 12 HOURS IN DURATION, EXCEPT THAT AFTER JUNE 20 THE TIME RATIO FOR GILLNET OPENINGS TO SEINE OPENINGS IS ONE TO ONE;]

(3)repealed 6/25/89;

(4)repealed 6/25/89;

(5)From the second Sunday in June through August 1, the area described in (b) of this section shall be expanded to Neets Bay east of the longitude of Chin Point to the closed waters area at the head of the bay.

(c)A drift gillnet operated in the harvest area may not exceed 200 fathoms in length.

(d)Personal use and sport fishing will be allowed in the harvest area whenever SSRAA is not harvesting salmon for its corporation escapement goal and so long as the personal use and sport fishery do not jeopardize the attainment of that goal.

(e)Gear for the personal use fishery is drift gillnets with a maximum length of 50 fathoms. The annual bag and possession limited is 25 salmon.

(f)Waters of Neets Bay within and including the barrier net located at [EAST OF A LINE BETWEEN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKERS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY ONE MILE FROM] the head of the bay are closed to commercial, sport, and personal use salmon fishing from June 15 through November 15.

**ISSUE:** (1)The current Neets Bay Hatchery Salmon Management Plan was in large part adopted in 1985. The current species mix and release numbers have changed dramatically since 1985. The existing regulation identifies fall chum and coho harvest although summer chum now comprise the primary harvest which also includes Chinook. The troll fleet did not harvest large numbers of summer chum until the past several years. Because of these changes current harvest management in the Neets Bay SHA does not follow the existing regulation.

(2)Because almost all of SSRAA's cost recovery harvest comes from salmon harvested in the Neets Bay SHA and all of the chum broodstock for SSRAA programs is collected in Neets Bay, allowing commercial common property harvest in Neets Bay SHA is complicated. The existing regulation does not provide adequate flexibility to allow for broodstock collection, the required cost recovery harvest, and the conduct of commercial harvest in response to the SE Enhanced Salmon Allocation Plan. The SSRAA Board believes it could best annually respond to the Allocation Plan with greater flexibility in the Neets Bay Salmon Management Plan.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The SSRAA Board may have to ask the Board of Fisheries to change the Neets Bay regulation at every SE Board of Fisheries Meeting. Of greater concern, the SSRAA Board will have to continue to ask ADF&G to manage the fishery outside the language of the Neets Bay Plan in order to annually address gear group imbalance related to the SE Allocation of Enhanced Fish.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The proposed changes would likely not change the quality of salmon harvested or produced.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Under the current regulation the fishing ratio between gillnetters and seiners is set. This proposal would allow the SSRAA Board to annually modify the ratio based on the Southeast Alaska Area Enhanced Salmon Allocation Management Plan. Addressing the current (2011) allocation imbalance, changes would likely benefit troll and seine gear.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Over the short term (2011) the proposal is likely to reduce fishing opportunity for drift gillnet gear in Neets Bay. Over the long term, this would depend on the distribution of value (of enhanced harvest) between seine, drift gillnet, and troll fleets as related to the Southeast Alaska Area Enhanced Salmon Allocation Management Plan.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The SSRAA Board didn't consider any other Neets Bay regulatory changes that would address the problem.

**PROPOSED BY:** SSRAA

(HQ-F11-046)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 332 - 5 AAC 33.370. District 1: Neets Bay Hatchery Salmon Management Plan.** Change the Neets Bay hatchery management plan to provide common property access based on enhanced salmon allocation status as follows:

(b)(2)(A) If a single net group is below their range 3 years in a row on a 5 year rolling average, as described by 33.364, then that group fishes all openings exclusive of the other net group. (B) In every other instance, the time ratio for a gillnet opening to seine opening is 1:1; the first opening must be for the gear group that is lower in their range.

**ISSUE:** The continuing imbalance of harvest sharing of enhanced salmon as set out in 33.364. In particular, 33.370 Neets Bay Hatchery Management Plan is not flexible enough to address allocation problems.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fishing in Neets Bay under the system put forth in regulation will compound the allocation imbalance.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The net gear type that is below range. Seiners are currently below range.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Gillnetters are above range and would forfeit some opportunity.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Changing Neets Noy to Seine/Troll only. Rejected for being too rigid.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Seiners Association (HQ-F11-181)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 333 - 5 AAC 33.370. District 1: Neets Bay Hatchery Salmon Management Plan.** Remove 1:1 gillnet to seine fishing rotation schedule for Neets Bay hatchery common property openings after the 2011 season as follows:

Remove the rotation schedule for various gear groups occurring after June 20<sup>th</sup> of each year.

5 AAC 33.370 (b)...B a gillnet opening must be no less than 24 hours and a seine opening must be no less than 12 hours in duration, . [EXCEPT THAT AFTER JUNE 20<sup>TH</sup> TIME RATIO FOR GILLNET OPENINGS TO SEINE OPENINGS IS ONE TO ONE].

**ISSUE:** In 2009, the BOF adopted language as part of an industry consensus agreement. Part of that agreement created an amendment to 5 AAC 33.370 (b) B, which placed gillnetters and seiners on a one to one ratio after June 20<sup>th</sup> in Neets Bay. All aspects of the agreement will sunset in 2012. This change was inadvertently adopted as part of that consensus with no sunset provision. Reversing action will allow gillnetters to regain time that was taken away in 2009.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Gillnetters will continue to miss out on fishing opportunities during years of high abundance.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Gillnet fishermen, who already have limited fishing areas and limited fishing time compared to other fishing groups, and those gillnetters who lost time due to the change in 2009.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Seine fishermen will lose some time.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Re-evaluate the SE Alaska Salmon Enhancement Plan.

**PROPOSED BY:** United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters Association (HQ-F11-190)  
\*\*\*\*\*



**PROPOSAL 334 - 5 AAC 33.383. District 7: Anita Bay Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan.** Continue 1:1 gillnet to seine fishing rotation in Anita Bay THA through 2017 as follows:

The Southeast Joint Regional Planning Team proposes that the time ratio for gillnet to seine openings in Anita Bay would remain one to one through 2017. The reason for extending the 1 to 1 rotation at Anita Bay through 2017: Work has started involving two summer chum production increases that may change the relative value of enhanced fish to seine and gillnet fleets. The first step in this process will take place with egg collection in 2011. The first significant returns from this new production will not occur until the return of four-year-old fish in 2015. The relative value to the fleets, related to that change, will not be finalized in the calculations made by ADF&G until the spring of 2017.

The proposed language of the pertinent section of the regulation would read: beginning with the first emergency order of 2012 season through the last emergency order of the 2017 season the time ratio for gillnet openings to seine openings is one to one.

**ISSUE:** The values of enhanced salmon harvested by both gillnet and seine fleets are outside of the allocation percentages (percent of the total value of enhanced fish) set in regulation 33.364. (The ADF&G determines allocation percentages each year by calculating a five year rolling average from data provided by the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission.) These two fleets have been outside their respective percentages for five consecutive years (2005 to 2009). The gillnet fleet has been above its allocation through this period while the seine fleet has been below. Several Special Harvest Area (SHA) management changes were proposed to and adopted by the BOF at the 2009 meeting in order to help bring the two net fleets back into their allocation ranges. A change to a one-to-one time ratio at Anita Bay was adopted by the board. This change had a sunset clause so that the regulation could be revisited at the next Board of Fish Meeting in 2012. Despite the changes in SHA management the imbalance still exists. While there is a current slight trend toward the agreed allocation, allowing the changes to sunset would likely exacerbate the imbalance.

It is important to note that the troll fleet is also well below its allocation range.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Unless unusual and unpredictable changes in survivals and/or market conditions occur, returning the ratio to 2 gillnet to 1 seine will send the allocation imbalances in the wrong direction.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Compared to a two to one ratio the seine fleet should benefit. All users will benefit if all three major user groups are within their range as described in the Southeastern Enhanced Salmon Allocation Management Plan. Opportunities for improved production are more restricted when one or more gear groups are consistently out of their range.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Over the long term, compared to a two to one ratio, the gillnet fleet will likely harvest a reduced percentage of the fish available in the Anita Bay SHA.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The Board of Fisheries adopted the Southeast Enhanced Allocation Plan in 1994. The findings adopted with this plan give the joint RPT responsibility to review the distribution of enhanced fish over time and to consider the effects on allocation in its recommendations. In addition to its recommendations the joint RPT has submitted and commented on Board of Fisheries proposals regarding harvest.

More drastic SHA changes (e.g. seine/troll only) have not seriously been considered at Anita Bay because of the need to give some opportunity to the local gillnet fleet, especially in years when a substantial portion of the fish get past the common property fishery.

The JRPT frequently considers long term solutions to enhanced salmon allocation imbalances but the enhanced system has a lot of inertia; fishermen have adapted their fishing strategies around the availability of hatchery fish and resist change increasing production is expensive and not always cost effective, and opportunities are limited. Nevertheless, there are long term solutions in the works that may help solve the problem.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Joint Regional Planning Team (HQ-F11-198)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 335 - 5 AAC 33.376. District 13: Deep Inlet Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan.** Continue 1:1 gillnet to seine fishing rotation in Deep Inlet THA through 2017 as follows:

The Southeast Joint Regional Planning Team (JRP) proposes that the time formula for gillnet to seine openings in Deep Inlet would remain one to one through 2017. The reason for extending the 1 to 1 rotation at Deep Inlet through 2017: Work has started involving two summer chum production increases that may change the relative value of enhanced fish to seine and gillnet fleets. The first step in this process will take place with egg collection in 2011. The first significant returns from this new production will not occur until the return of four-year-old fish in 2015. The relative value to the fleets, related to that change, will not be finalized in the calculations made by ADF&G until the spring of 2017.

The proposed language of the pertinent section of the regulation would read: except that beginning with the first emergency order of the [2009] **2012** season through the last emergency order of the [2011] **2017** season the time ratio for gillnet openings to seine openings is one to one.

**ISSUE:** The values of enhanced salmon harvested by both gillnet and seine fleets are outside of the allocation percentages (percent of the total value of enhanced fish) set in regulation 33.364. (The ADF&G determines allocation percentages each year by calculating a five year rolling average from data provided by the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission.) These two fleets have been outside their respective percentages for five consecutive years (2005 to 2009) The gillnet fleet has been above its allocation through this period while the seine fleet has been

below. Several Special Harvest Area (SHA) management changes were proposed to and adopted by the BOF at the 2009 meeting in order to help bring the two net fleets back into their allocation ranges. A change to a one-to-one time ratio at Deep Inlet was accepted by the board. This change had a sunset clause so that the regulation could be revisited at the next Board of Fish Meeting in 2012. Despite the changes in SHA management the imbalance still exists. While there is a current slight trend toward the agreed allocation, allowing the changes to sunset would likely exacerbate the imbalance.

It is important to note that the troll fleet is also well below its allocation range.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Unless unusual and unpredictable changes in survivals and/or market conditions occur, returning the ratio at Deep Inlet to 2 gillnet to 1 seine will send the enhanced allocation imbalances in the wrong direction.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Compared to a two to one ratio the seine fleet should benefit by increasing its percentage of the Deep Inlet returns over years when the ratio was 2 to 1.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Compared to a two to one ratio the gillnet fleet will very likely have a reduced percentage of the Deep Inlet returns.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** The joint RPT reviews the distribution of the value of enhanced salmon annually. Recommendations regarding productions are made with an awareness of the allocation situation. The JRPT frequently considers long term solutions to enhance salmon allocation imbalances but the enhanced system has a lot of inertia; fishermen have adapted their fishing strategies around the availability of hatchery fish and resist change increasing production is expensive and not always cost effective, and opportunities are limited. Nevertheless, there are long term solutions in the works that may help solve the problem.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Joint Regional Planning Team (HQ-F11-197)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 336 - 5 AAC 33.372. District 1: Nakat Inlet Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan.** Allow for a rotational seine and gillnet fishery in the Nakat Inlet THA as follows:

The Nakat Inlet SHA will be open to the seine and gillnet fleets on a rotational schedule with a 1-1 time ratio.

**ISSUE:** Imbalance within the southeast Alaska enhanced salmon allocation plan.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The seiners will remain below the adopted allocation range.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** The quality of chum salmon should improve in a normal season. More frequent “cleaning up” of Nakat Inlet by the seine fleet should lead to better quality of all fish harvested in the terminal area.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Seiners and all other fishermen that depend on the allocation plan to deliver a fair return on enhancement taxes paid.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Nakat gillnetters may catch fewer chums.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Seine-only SHA. Rejected due to the Tree Point driftnet fleet’s historical reliance on the Nakat SHA.

**PROPOSED BY:** Southeast Alaska Seiners Association (HQ-F11-182)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 337 – 5 AAC 33.3XX. New Section.** Establish a new Herring Cove THA management plan to distribute harvest between commercial, sport and personal use fisheries as follows:

**5 AAC 33.XXX. District 1: Herring Cove Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan. The management plan in this section allows for a harvest of hatchery-produced king salmon in the Herring Bay Terminal Harvest Area and distributes the harvest between the commercial troll, sport, and personal use fisheries.**

**ISSUE:** The Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (SSRAA) operates the Whitman Lake Hatchery, which is located at the head of Herring Bay approximately nine miles south of Ketchikan. SSRAA is permitted to release king salmon from this site, which return annually. These returning king salmon are harvested throughout Southeast Alaska by the troll fishery. Sport fishermen harvest these king salmon in the Mountain Point area and in front the Whitman Lake Hatchery. Shore-based sport fishermen can also catch these king salmon while fishing in the intertidal area in Herring Bay.

In the late 2000s, a surplus of king salmon returned to the Whitman Lake Hatchery and not all were harvested by existing fisheries. This surplus was sold as cost recovery by SSRAA. In 2008, a surplus of 10,000 king salmon were not harvested and returned to the Whitman Lake Hatchery. SSRAA initially brought this concern to the department and asked if it would allow additional time for commercial trollers to harvest these king salmon in an area in front of the hatchery where they tend to school up.

Since 1999, the king salmon sport fishery has been liberalized in the area adjacent to the Whitman Lake Hatchery by emergency order (EO) and personal use fisheries have been opened in Herring Cove to allow harvest by drift gillnet. In 2009 and 2010, the department opened a Herring Cove THA troll fishery by EO, which began immediately after the first troll king salmon retention period closed in July. This opportunity allowed trollers to target Whitman Lake king salmon at a time

when the general king salmon season was closed and coho salmon catches had not yet reached their peak.

The department would like to create a Herring Cove THA in regulation that would be open to fisheries at times when excess king salmon are expected to return to the Whitman Lake Hatchery. king salmon harvests in Herring Cove are almost entirely hatchery fish; this proposal is not expected to cause issues with the Pacific Salmon Treaty.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Alaska Department of Fish and Game will continue to open this area for trolling, personal use, and sport fisheries by emergency order during years when an excess of hatchery-produced fish return to Herring Cove.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All fishermen.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Continuing to open this terminal troll, sport and personal use fisheries by EO each season.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-243)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 338 - 5 AAC 33.377. District 2: Kendrick Bay Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan.** Expand the Kendrick Bay Terminal Harvest Area to include McLean Arm for commercial seining as follows:

The addition of McLean Arm to the Kendrick THA was approved by the RPT including ADF&G representatives. Our attempt at modification of the regulation is below:

5 AAC 33.377. District 2: Kendrick Bay/**McLean Arm** Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan.

(a)The management plan in this section allows for a harvest of hatchery produced chum salmon in Kendrick Bay **and McLean Arm** by the purse seine fleet.

(b)The department, in consultation with the Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association, shall manage Kendrick Bay west of 131°59' W. long, **and west of a line across McLean Arm at 54°47' N.; 131°57' W.; to 54°47' N.; 131°57' W.** and set the fishing time for the seine fishery as follows: salmon may be taken by seines only during periods established by emergency order.

**ISSUE:** The current Kendrick Bay Terminal Harvest Area is neither large enough to effectively accommodate a fishery confined to the THA, nor is it a good net pen site in inclement weather. The site is exposed to wind and wave action during most low pressure events. Inclement weather can make normal fish culture activities both difficult and dangerous.

Secondarily, SSRAA may move its release annually between the two areas, McLean Arm and Kendrick Bay, in order to further spread the fishery when fishing is confined to the THA. The annual movement of net pens between the two sites could confuse juvenile salmon predators that might tend more to key on a single release site.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The current Kendrick Bay THA is a relative “postage stamp” that allows for only two effective seine sets. When the seine fishery is confined to the THA there are sometimes as many as 25 or 30 seiners waiting to make one of those two sets.

Salmon culture at the current site will be difficult and to some degree dangerous during normal patterns of inclement weather.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Uncertain, but it is possible a THA more conducive to seiner participation would attract more effort and subsequently the fish could be cleaned up more quickly and in better condition. The return is generally quickly harvested now, so this would not represent a significant change.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The seine fleet and SSRAA fish culturists.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one would suffer from this solution.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** This is the only obvious solution possible without changing management of the current fishery. During the early season, prior to “pink salmon management” a portion of District 102 is open when the Kendrick THA is open. McLean Arm is very close to Kendrick Bay and lies within that part of D102 that is generally opened when Kendrick is opened. In addition, there are no significant wild chum stocks in McLean Arm. Harvest of summer chum in McLean Arm would not be confused by the presence of wild fish.

**PROPOSED BY:** SSRAA

(HQ-F11-047)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 339 - 5 AAC 33.383. District 7: Anita Bay Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan.** Change the opening date for the Anita Bay THA to May 1 as follows:

(d) The department shall manage the Anita Bay Terminal Harvest Area from **May 1** [JUNE 1] through November 10 to distribute the harvest of excess hatchery-produced king, coho, and chum salmon as follows:

**ISSUE:** This change in regulation will align regulations with current management. Since 2006, the Anita Bay Terminal Harvest Area (THA) has opened by emergency order (EO) to all gear groups on May 1 in order to provide access to hatchery king salmon. A May 1 start is expected to continue to be the date when the THA opens to all gear groups.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The Anita Bay THA will continue to be opened and closed under the department's EO authority.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The department, AWT and public will benefit from this change because it places into regulation an EO that has been issued annually.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-253)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 340 - 5 AAC 33.383. District 7: Anita Bay Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan.** Modify the open area in the Anita Bay THA to enhance salmon quality as follows:

(B)(4) The Anita Bay THA shall be open from 6/15 to 7/11 each year in an area west of a line from 56° 12.314 North, 132° 26.22 West, to 56° 12.064 North, 132° 26.22 West; and East of a line from 56° 11.955 North, 132° 29.575 West; to 56° 11.730 North, 132° 29.360 West; within .25 nautical miles (NM) from the north shore of Anita Bay. **Other closure lines and regulations remain in effect other than the exception noted in section (b)(4).**

**ISSUE:** The problem for the Board to address is the loss of enhanced salmon value due to over restrictive area closures in the Anita Bay Terminal Harvest Area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If the problem is not solved, commercial salmon fisheries will continue to lose a substantial value of enhanced salmon in Anita Bay.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Enhanced salmon are being allowed to concentrate in front of the release site for up to 25 days, 6/15 to 7/11 before they can be harvested. The longer these fish remain in the terminal area, the less marketable they become due to blackening skin color and other biological changes to flesh quality; thus resulting in loss of value.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Salmon fishers would benefit.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one would suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A larger area opening was considered. This solution was rejected because it would not take into consideration the needs of the crab fisheries.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wrangell Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-148)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 341 - 5 AAC 33.3XX. New Section.** Establish a THA in Southeast Cove for seine and troll gear as follows:

As per agreement reached with JRPT at the April 6, 2011 meeting KNFC/GCH would like to propose a THA mirroring our SEC SHA along with the accompanying Salmon management plan. Wording for proposed regulation would read as follows.

District 9: Southeast Cove Terminal harvest Area Salmon management Plan. (a) The intent of this management plan is to distribute the harvest of hatchery-produced salmon in the area described in (b) of this section between the purse seine, and troll fleets.

(b) The department, in consultation with Kake Non Profit Fisheries Corporation (KNFC), Shall open and close, by emergency order, fishing seasons and periods to manage waters of Southeast Cove and adjacent waters which consist of the waters of Keku Strait enclosed by a line from a rocky point on the northern end of Kuiu island located on the east side of Southeast Cove at 56° 52.95' N. lat., 134° 01.33' W. long. to the northwest, corner of Hound Island at 56° 53.12' N. lat., 133° 56.77' W. long. Then northwest, connecting points along the northern shore of Keku Islands at 56° 53.98' N. lat., 133° 57.58' W. long. to 56° 54.90' N. lat., 133° 59.53' W. long. to 56° 55.93' N. lat., 134° 00.97' W. long. to 56° 55.95' N. lat., 134° 02.15' W. long. to 56° 55.22' N. lat., 134° 02.53' W. long. to 56° 56.37' N. lat., 134° 06.62' W. long. then to the northwest corner of Payne island 56° 57.45' N. lat., 134° 08.75' W. long. then south to a point on Kuiu Island at 56° 55.08' N. lat., 134° 09.25' W. long., as follows:

(1) Salmon May be taken by seines and troll gear only during periods established by emergency order as follows: Openings for seines will be on Sundays following four consecutive days (Mon - Thus) of cost recovery harvest and two build up days (Fri and Sat) until set cost recover goals are met.

(A)The department, in consultation with KNFC. shall close fishing between openings; openings will be abundance based

(2) salmon may be taken by troll gear when the waters described in this sub section are closed to commercial net gear;

(3) the commissioner shall close the seasons in the waters described in this subsection to trolling during hatchery cost recovery periods.

(4) As per agreement with seine fleet at April 6, 2011 Joint Regional Panning Team meeting (JRPT) all fish caught within the waters described in this subsection will be charged a cost recovery assessment tax. (Similar to Hidden Falls).

**ISSUE:** As per agreement reached with Southeast Joint Regional Planning Team (JRPT) at the April 6, 2011 meeting Kake Non Profit Fisheries Corporation / Gunnuk Creek Hatchery (KNFC/GCH) would like to propose the formation of a Southeast Cove (SEC) Terminal Harvest



Area (THA) mirroring our current Special Harvest Area, along with an accompanying SEC THA salmon management plan.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Trollers and seiners (primarily seiners) would continue to have a difficult time catching the 60% Gunnuk Creek Hatchery enhanced chum salmon. As per the performance goals set by the Southeast Alaska Allocation task force.

Gunnuk Creek Hatchery with its 65 million permitted capacity of enhanced chum salmon playing a major role in bringing back seiners and trollers back within their allocations may be lost.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Seiners and trollers who will be able to get closer to their respective allocations. KNFC would be meeting the performance goals set by the SATF. The Community of Kake which may see a positive economic impact from having the fleets stop into the town

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Only those in Kake who would see a public resource as their very own.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There were no solutions that could address the need of meeting the 60% common property contribution and cost recovery needs without negatively affecting the other negatively other than this one.

**PROPOSED BY:** Kake Non-Profit Fisheries Corporation (HQ-F11-119)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 342 - 5 AAC 33.374. District 12: Hidden Falls Hatchery Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan.** Establish a registration fishery for the Hidden Falls THA to replace cost recovery harvest with tax assessment as follows:

(b) ii seine openings may be managed using a registration fishery through emergency order. In years of registration fishery the first opening in June would initiate registration and be effective until 31 July. Boats fishing in the Hidden Falls THA without registration would be fishing in closed waters.

**ISSUE:** Provide option of registration fishery for Hidden Falls THA seine fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The legislature passed a law in 2006 providing for an assessment in a hatchery THA in lieu of conducting a specific cost recovery harvest for revenue. A registration type fishery is seen as the best alternative for a well regulated and enforceable fishery. If status quo prevails the new law will be more difficult if not impossible to implement.

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

Yes, the reason for an assessment registration fishery in the Hidden Falls THA is to increase value and quality to the southeast Alaska seine fisheries. The assessment registration fishery will result in more consistent openings at Hidden Falls but also in other areas in southeast Alaska. Hidden Falls attracts the majority of seine boats during late June and early July openings and therefore ADF&G frequently opens other areas simultaneously. Without Hidden Falls open the department often will not open elsewhere in southeast.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The southeast Alaska seine fleet, but also the department because they are able to see catch data at other areas that otherwise would not open.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. This Assessment Registration proposal is supported by the seine fleet as represented by Southeast Seiner Associations (SEAS).

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Hidden Falls has been conducting cost recovery operations using the same methodology for 23 years. Numerous closures have been necessary which is disruptive to the fishery. It took three years to pass the new law allowing for an assessment to be collected by Department of Revenue. The status quo can work but the parties that have fished the area and managed the fishery believe this is a highly desirable solution.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (HQ-F11-173)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 343 - 5 AAC 33.374. District 12: Hidden Falls Hatchery Terminal Harvest Area salmon management plan.** Open the Hidden Falls THA August 1 through September 20 to allow trolling for enhanced coho and provide for an area during the troll closure follows:

**(e) The Hidden Falls Terminal Harvest Area will be open to coho salmon retention by troll gear from August 1 through September 20 unless closed by emergency order. During seasons when the general summer troll season is extended in District 12 the Hidden Falls Terminal Harvest Area will also be extended. During the mid-August troll closure, the Hidden Falls Terminal Harvest Area will be open, and the open area will be restricted to an area within one nautical mile from shore south of 57°15.00' N. lat., north of 57°10.00' N. lat. and west of a line from 57°15.00' N. lat., 134°48.60' W. long. to 57°10.00' N. lat., 134°46.40' W. long.** [THE HIDDEN FALLS TERMINAL HARVEST AREA TROLL GEAR COHO SALMON FISHERY WILL BE MANAGED BY EMERGENCY ORDER TO HARVEST COHO SALMON SURPLUS AFTER BROODSTOCK AND COST RECOVERY NEEDS ARE MET.]

**ISSUE:** Currently, the Hidden Falls Terminal Harvest Area (THA) is closed to trolling for coho salmon unless opened by emergency order (EO). The department, in consultation with the Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (NSRAA), may open the THA to coho retention by troll gear once NSRAA's broodstock and cost recovery needs are met. NSRAA has not experienced difficulties meeting those needs in the past, nor does it anticipate having difficulties in the future. Existing regulations allow troll retention of king and chum salmon, with certain limitations, so allowing coho retention by default would be more consistent with current regulations

for other species. During a mid August troll closure, the eastern boundary of the THA would be reduced to approximately one mile off the Baranof Island shoreline to reduce interception of nonhatchery coho stocks. During the rest of the summer troll season, the eastern boundary would be two nautical miles from the Baranof Island shoreline.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** An EO will continue to be required in order to allow trolling for coho in the Hidden Falls THA. The time spent preparing that EO is usually unnecessary, since meeting broodstock and cost recovery needs have not been a problem there.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Trollers would benefit by having the opportunity to harvest hatchery-produced coho salmon during an August troll closure when options to fish are limited. The department will benefit by having one less EO to write.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-242)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 344 - 5 AAC 33.376. District 13: Deep Inlet Terminal Harvest Area Salmon Management Plan.** Revise the western Deep Inlet THA boundary and season to increase troll fishery access to enhanced Chinook as follows:

Amend the existing code 5 ACC 33.376 to read:

(d) The waters described in (b) of this section, west of **135 20.75'** [135° 21.52'] W. long., will be closed to purse seine and drift gillnet gear **beginning with the first emergency order of the season through the third Saturday in June** [FROM MAY 1 THROUGH MAY 21].

**ISSUE:** Revise the western Deep Inlet THA boundary line in June to allow increased troll access to hatchery Chinook returns. Hatchery Chinook pass through the THA and are currently harvested primarily in purse seine and drift gillnet fisheries. This proposal may result in a modest change in the allocation balance. It is endorsed by the NSRAA Board of Directors, with unanimous consent.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Harvest splits will remain "status quo", with the bulk of Chinook harvested by net gear.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Chinook harvested by trollers will have a higher quality and value than if harvested by net gear.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The troll fleet.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Perhaps the drift gillnet and purse seine fleet; although all gear representatives on NSRAA's board are in support of the proposal as it addresses allocation concerns.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (HQ-F11-170)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES**  
**March 20-23, 2012**  
**STATEWIDE DUNGENESS CRAB, SHRIMP AND MISCELLANEOUS SHELLFISH**

**PROPOSAL 345 - 5 AAC 32.410. Fishing Seasons for Registration Area J.** Close Dungeness crab season December 31, rather than January 1, and update regulatory coordinates in fishing season regulation as follows:

(a) In the Kodiak, Chignik, Alaska Peninsula, and Aleutian Districts, male Dungeness crab may be taken or possessed from 12:00 noon May 1 until **11:59 pm December 31** [12:00 NOON JANUARY 1], except in **waters of the Kodiak District south of the latitude of Boot Point (56° 49.98' N. lat.) and east of longitude of Boot Point at 153° 46.10 W. long. and waters south of the latitude of Cape Ikolik at 57° 17.40' N. lat. and west of the longitude of Boot Point at 153° 46.10 W. long.** [SOUTH OF THE LATITUDE OF THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF BOOT POINT AND SOUTH OF THE LATITUDE OF SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CAPE IKOLIK], male Dungeness crab may be taken or possessed only from 12:00 noon June 15 until **11:59 pm December 31.** [12:00 NOON JANUARY 1].

**ISSUE:** The season closure date for Dungeness crab is not in agreement with calendar year Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission landing permits and Alaska Department of Fish and Game catch reporting practices. Additionally, as commercial shellfish regulations develop over time, demarcation lines within and between management areas sometimes change independent of each other. The intent of this proposal is to standardize demarcation lines across commercial fisheries as well as update specific demarcation coordinates to reflect the best precision afforded by current technology.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued confusion regarding commercial Dungeness crab catch reporting and landing requirements as well as ambiguous demarcation lines.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen, fishery managers, and law enforcement.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Commercial fishermen that harvest Dungeness crab between 12:01 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. (noon) on January 1.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-303)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 346 - 5 AAC 32.400. Description of Registration Area J; and 5 AAC 32.405. Description of Registration Area J Districts.** Amend regulatory description of registration area and districts as follows:

**5 AAC 32.400. Description of Registration Area J.** Registration Area J consists of the Pacific Ocean waters that are south of the latitude of Cape Douglas (58° 51.10' N. lat.) and west of **149° W. long.** [THE LONGITUDE OF CAPE FAIRFIELD (148° 50.25' W. LONG.),] and the Bering Sea and Pacific Ocean waters that are east of the Maritime Boundary Agreement Line as that line is described in the text of and depicted in the annex to the Maritime Boundary Agreement between the United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed in Washington, June 1, 1990, and as that Maritime Boundary Agreement Line is depicted on *NOAA Chart #513* (6th Edition, February 23, 1991) and *NOAA Chart #514* (6th Edition, February 16, 1991). These charts are adopted by reference.

**5 AAC 32.405. Description of Registration Area J Districts.**(a) Kodiak District: waters of Registration Area J that are south of the latitude of Cape Douglas (**58° 51.10' N. lat.**) [(58° 51.85' N. LAT.)], **west of 149° W. long.** [THE LONGITUDE OF CAPE FAIRFIELD (148° 50.25' W. LONG.),] and east of **a line extending south from the Alaska Peninsula (near Kilokak Rocks) along 156° 20.22' W. long.** [THE LONGITUDE OF KILOKAK ROCKS (156° 19' W. LONG.)];

**(b) [(e)] Chignik District:** waters of Registration Area J that are west of **a line extending south from the Alaska Peninsula (near Kilokak Rocks) along 156° 20.22' W. long.** [THE LONGITUDE OF KILOKAK ROCKS (156° 19' W. LONG.)], and east of a line extending 135° southeast from Kupreanof Point (55° 33.98' N. lat, 159° 35.88' W. long.).

**(c) [(b)] Alaska Peninsula District:** waters of Registration Area J that are west of a line extending 135° southeast from Kupreanof Point (55° 33.98' N. lat, 159° 35.88' W. long.), and east of the longitude of Scotch Cap Light (**164° 44.72' W. long.**) [(164° 44' W. LONG.)] and south of **54° 51.30' N. lat.** [54° 51.50' N. LAT.,] in Isanotski Strait.

**(d) [(c)] North Peninsula District:** Bering Sea waters of Registration Area J that are north of the latitude of Cape Sarichef **Light (54° 35.89' N. lat.)** [(54° 36' N. LAT.)] and north of **54° 51.30' N. lat.** [54° 51.50' N. LAT.,] in Isanotski Strait.

**(e) [(d)] Aleutian District:** waters of Registration Area J that are west of the longitude of Scotch Cap Light (**164° 44.72' W. long.**) [(164° 44' W. LONG.)] and south of the latitude of Cape Sarichef **Light (54° 35.89' N. lat.)** [(54° 36' N' LAT.)].

**ISSUE:** As commercial shellfish regulations develop over time, demarcation lines within and between management areas sometimes change independently of each other. The intent of this proposal is to standardize demarcation lines across commercial fisheries as well as update specific demarcation coordinates to reflect the best precision afforded by current technology.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued use of ambiguous demarcation lines.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen, fishery managers, and law enforcement.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-302)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 347 - 5 AAC 32.410. Fishing seasons for Registrations Area J.** Change fishing season to June 15 through December 31 as follows:

Change Dungeness crab season opening date to June 15 through December 31 for the entire Kodiak District.

**ISSUE:** Too many soft Dungeness crab harvested during the Kodiak District Commercial Dungeness Crab Fishery. During some years, crab have not fully hardened before the Kodiak Dungeness fishery opens in May and early June. Given the recent increases in the number of boats participating in the fishery, more boats are fishing earlier in the season resulting in larger harvests of soft crab.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued catch, handling, and mortality of soft crab.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Soft crab are less marketable and worth less money. A later season opening date will reduce the amount of soft crab delivered to processors resulting in better prices for all Kodiak Dungeness fishermen. Also, the dead loss and handling mortality of soft crab is also much higher compared to hard crab resulting in less crab for fishermen to catch in the future.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Boats that fish early in the season.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mike Clark (HQ-F11-004)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 348 - 5 AAC 32.425. Lawful gear for Registration Area J.** Implement 1,000 pot limit per vessel as follows:

Limit the maximum amount of gear a vessel may use to 1000 pots.

**ISSUE:** Overcapitalization of the Kodiak District Dungeness Crab Fishery. Kodiak is an open access fishery for Dungeness crab. Without gear limits, more and more large transient boats are entering the fishery which has significantly increased the amount of gear used in the fishery. The fishery is becoming less and less viable for the long-term participants.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued overcapitalization and competition for Dungeness crab.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, with no pot limits there is a higher probability of lost gear resulting in ghost fishing.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Everyone.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Vessels that use more than 1,000 pots.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mike Clark (HQ-10F-005)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 349 - 5 AAC 32.406. Area J Registration.** Designate Kodiak District a superexclusive registration district as follows:

Make Kodiak a superexclusive registration district for Dungeness crab.

**ISSUE:** Overcapitalization of the Kodiak Dungeness crab fishery. Kodiak District is a nonexclusive registration district for Dungeness crab. Large transient boats can come to Kodiak fish a large amount of gear for short period of time then move to another district and do the same thing. The fishery is becoming less and less viable for the long-time participants.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued overcapitalization and competition for Dungeness crab.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. Long-time participants are invested in the fishery and interested in protecting the resource and increasing the quality and value of the fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Long-time participants in the Kodiak Dungeness crab fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Vessels that try and fish in several districts in the same year.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mike Clark (HQ-F11-006)



\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 350 - 5 AAC 38.076. Alaska Scallop Fishery Management Plan.** Allow scallop harvest from multiple registration areas when an observer is aboard as follows:

5 AAC 38.076. (d)

A vessel may be registered to take scallops in only one scallop registration area at a time, **unless a vessel carries an onboard observer. A vessel with an onboard observer may take scallops from more than one scallop registration area at a time.**

**ISSUE:** Current regulations read "A vessel may be registered to take scallops in only one scallop registration area at a time." This can force vessels to run great distances to reregister costing lost fishing time and unnecessary fuel costs. Current regulations require scallop vessels to carry onboard observers that can report catch and location information daily to the department. With this type of required onboard observer reporting capability, this is an unnecessary regulation at great cost to the fishermen.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Vessels will continue to run great distances out of their way for needless registrations, costing industry lost fishing time and extra fuel expense.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This will reduce the carbon footprint of the scallop fishery, enhancing it's appeal in the market.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen will benefit with reduced fuel expenses and less lost fishing time.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Fishermen will suffer with larger fuel expenses and lost fishing time.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** A faxed copy of the registration onboard could be accepted by enforcement.

This would not normally work as the scallop vessels normally fish in very remote locations and do not have onboard fax machines. Current at sea technology only allows us communication via Satellite phone and "text only" emails, no faxing capabilities, at least not at a cost scallop vessels can afford.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Scallop Association (HQ-F11-019)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 351 - 5 AAC 38.205. Description of Registration Area E Districts and sections.** Establish new management district subsections for scallops in PWS as follows:

(1) Eastern Section: all waters of the Outside District east of 147° W.long.;

**(A) East Kayak subsection: waters between 144→ 00→ W long. and the longitude of the Cape Saint Elias lighthouse 144→ 35.09→ W long., and south of Kayak Island.**

**(B) West Kayak subsection: waters between 146→ 00→ W long. and the longitude of the Cape Saint Elias lighthouse 144→ 35.09→ W long., and north of Kayak Island.**

**ISSUE:** The scallop fishery in Registration Area E occurs in the Eastern Section of the Outside District and is managed for separate guideline harvest levels east and west of the longitude of Cape Saint Elias (144→ 35.9→ W long.) on Kayak Island. Fishery management has referenced these geographic areas since the mid-1990s. This proposal will establish scallop management subsections to facilitate reference to these areas.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Written reference to these areas will continue to be more complex than necessary.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Both fishery managers and participants will benefit from a simple regulatory reference.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-291)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 352 - 5 AAC 38.425. Closed waters for scallops in Registration Area J.** Open specified waters currently closed in Registration Area M to scallop fishing as follows:

5AAC 38.425. (6) the Pacific Ocean waters of the Alaska Peninsula Area between the longitude of Scotch Cap and the longitude of Cape Pankof, [AND WATERS OF KING CRAB REGISTRATION AREA M EXTENDING SHOREWARD AND THREE MILES SEAWARD OF A LINE (THE BASE LINE) BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CAPE KUMLIK TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF UNAVIKSHAK ISLAND TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF ATKULIK ISLAND TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF KAK ISLAND TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF CASTLE CAP (TULIUMNIT POINT) TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF CHANKLIUT ISLAND AND FROM THERE ALONG THE SEAWARD COAST TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CHANKLIUT ISLAND TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF SEAL CAPE TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF MITROFANIA ISLAND TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF SPITZ ISLAND TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CHIACHI ISLAND, AND TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF KUPREANOF POINT, AND ALL WATERS WEST OF THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF KUPREANOF POINT WHICH ARE DEPICTED AS TERRITORIAL SEA ON NOAA CHART #16540, (11 EDITION,

MARCH 4, 1989) TITLED, “SHUMAGIN ISLAND TO SANAK ISLAND,”] and all waters east of the longitude of Scotch Cap Light and south of Unimak Island and the Alaska Peninsula which are depicted as Territorial Sea on NOAA Chart #16520, (21 Edition, April 15, 1989) titled, “Unimak and Akutan passes and approaches”;

**ISSUE:** The waters around Mitrofanina Island have been closed to scallop fishing since the mid 80’s, to protect Tanner crabs. Since 1993 scallop vessels are required to carry onboard observers. Onboard observers give ADFG the ability to instantly stop scallop fishing if crab bycatch is determined to be too high. The proposer would like to only open the Federal waters (outside 3 miles) south of Mitrofanina Island and leave the waters within 3 miles closed to scallop fishing.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A known harvestable surplus of scallop in this area will continue to not be prosecuted, without utilizing the high expense and proven statewide success of the Scallop onboard observer program.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Alaska weathervane scallops from this region are of high quality and are heavily sought after by high end seafood markets.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Scallop fishermen will benefit as well as the Alaska Weathervane Scallop purchasing public. Scallop fishermen will see a reward for their years of good stewardship statewide and the high cost of carrying required onboard observers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer. Crab fishermen’s interests can be protected by bycatch limits and onboard observers working in cooperation with scallop captains and ADFG managers, as the scallop fishermen have done successfully in other regions of the state. Other non-observer fisheries with un-quantified by-catch are allowed to fish this area, why not responsible scallop fishermen with responsible onboard observers?

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We considered asking that the scallop beds within 3 miles be reopened, but did not believe this would be an acceptable solution by other interests. We considered asking only for the scallop beds outside 3 miles to be a much less contentious request. We could not find any other solutions that would allow for a safe, sustainable and low impact scallop fishery in this area.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Scallop Association (HQ-F11-115)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 353 - 5 AAC 38.425. Closed waters for scallops in Registration Area J.** Open specified waters currently closed in Registration Area M to scallop fishing as follows:

5AAC 38.425. (6) [THE PACIFIC OCEAN WATERS OF THE ALASKA PENINSULA AREA BETWEEN THE LONGITUDE OF SCOTCH CAP AND THE LONGITUDE OF CAPE PANKOF, AND WATERS OF KING CRAB REGISTRATION AREA M EXTENDING SHOREWARD AND THREE MILES SEAWARD OF A LINE (THE BASE LINE)] beginning at the southernmost tip of cape Kumlik to the easternmost tip of Unavikshak Island to the

southernmost tip of Atkulik Island to the easternmost tip of Kak Island to the easternmost tip of castle cap (Tuliumnit Point) to the easternmost tip of Chankliut Island and from there along the seaward coast to the southernmost tip of Chankliut Island to the southernmost tip of seal cape to the easternmost tip of Mitrofanina Island to the southernmost tip of Spitz Island to the southernmost tip of Chiachi Island, and to the southernmost tip of Kupreanof point, and all waters west of the southernmost tip of Kupreanof point which are depicted as territorial sea on NOAA chart #16540, (11 edition, march 4, 1989) titled, "Shumagin Island to Sanak Island," [AND ALL WATERS EAST OF THE LONGITUDE OF SCOTCH CAP LIGHT AND SOUTH OF UNIMAK ISLAND AND THE ALASKA PENINSULA WHICH ARE DEPICTED AS TERRITORIAL SEA ON NOAA CHART #16520, (21 EDITION, APRIL 15, 1989) TITLED, "UNIMAK AND AKUTAN PASSES AND APPROACHES"];

**ISSUE:** The waters south of Unimak Bight have been closed to scallop fishing since the early 70's, to protect king crab and to eliminate gear conflicts with crab pots. Since 1993 scallop vessels are required to carry onboard observers. Onboard observers give ADFG the ability to instantly stop scallop fishing if crab bycatch is determined to be too high. The proposer would like to only open the Federal waters (outside 3 miles) south of Unimak Bight and leave the waters within 3 miles closed to scallop fishing.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A known harvestable surplus of scallop in this area will continue to not be prosecuted, without utilizing the high expense and proven statewide success of the Scallop onboard observer program.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Alaska Weathervane Scallops from this region are of high quality and are heavily sought after by high end seafood markets.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Scallop fishermen will benefit as well as the Alaska Weathervane Scallop purchasing public. Scallop fishermen will see a reward for their years of good stewardship statewide and the high cost of carrying required onboard observers.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer. Crab fishermen's interests can be protected using bycatch limits and onboard observers working in cooperation with scallop captains and ADFG managers, as the scallop fishermen have done successfully in other regions of the state. Other non-observer fisheries with un-quantified by-catch are allowed to fish this area, why not responsible scallop fishermen with responsible onboard observers?

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** We could not find any other solutions that would allow for a safe, sustainable and low impact scallop fishery in this area.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Scallop Association (HQ-F11-116)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 354 - 5 AAC 38.400. Description of Registration Area J; and 5 AAC 38.420. Fishing Seasons for Scallops in Registration Area J; and 5 AAC 38.425. Closed Waters for**

**Scallops in Registration Area J.** Amend regulatory description for Registration Area J in description of the area, fishing seasons and closed waters as follows:

**5 AAC 38.400. Description of Registration Area J.** Registration Area J consists of all Pacific Ocean waters that are south of the latitude of Cape Douglas (58° 51.10' N. lat.) and west of **149° W. long.** [THE LONGITUDE OF CAPE FAIRFIELD (148° 50.25' W. LONG.)], and the Bering Sea and Pacific Ocean waters that are east of the Maritime Boundary Agreement Line as that line is described in the text of and depicted in the annex to the Maritime Boundary Agreement between the United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed in Washington, June 1, 1990, and as that Maritime Boundary Agreement Line is depicted on *NOAA Chart #513* (6th Edition, February 23, 1991), and *NOAA Chart #514* (6th Edition, February 16, 1991), adopted by reference.

**5 AAC 38.420. Fishing Seasons for Scallops in Registration Area J.**

...

(b) In Scallop Registration Area (K), in those waters of the Southwest District described in 5 AAC 34.405(c) that are south of a line from [THE WESTERNMOST TIP OF] Cape Ikolik **at 57° 17.40' N. lat., 154° 47.40' W. long.** to the **Alaska Peninsula (near Kilokak Rocks) at 57° 10.34' N. lat., 156° 20.22' W. long.** [SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CAPE KILOKAK], and west of 155° **00.00'** W. long., and north of 56° 07.**00'** N. lat. and east of 156° 20.22' W. long., a person may take weathervane scallops only under the authority of a permit issued by the commissioner under 5 AAC 38.076(e).

**5 AAC 38.425. Closed Waters for Scallops in Registration Area J.** Scallops may not be taken in

(1) **all waters of Registration Area J south of 57° 17.40' N. lat (the latitude of Cape Ikolik), east of a line extending south from the Alaska Peninsula (near Kilokak Rocks) along 156° 20.22' W. long., west of a line across Sitkalidak Strait at 153° 16.00' W. long, and west of a line extending south from Cape Barnabas along 152° 52.20' W. long.** [WATERS SOUTH OF THE LATITUDE OF CAPE IKOLIK (57° 17.33' N. LAT.), WEST OF THE LONGITUDE OF CAPE BARNABAS (152° 52' W. LONG.), EAST OF THE LONGITUDE OF KILOKAK ROCKS (156° 19' W. LONG.), AND IN OLD HARBOR NARROWS WEST OF 153° 16' W. LONG.], except that weathervane scallops may be taken in the waters specified in 5 AAC 38.420(b);]

(2) **all waters of Alaska on the southeast side of Kodiak Island that are east of a line across Sitkalidak Narrows along 153° 16.00' W. long., east of a line extending south from Cape Barnabas along 152° 52.20 W. long., west of a line from Narrow Cape at 57° 25.95' N. lat., 152° 19.13' W. long. to the northernmost tip of Ugak Island at 57° 23.63' N. lat., 152° 17.47' W. long., and west of a line extending south from the southernmost tip of Ugak Island along 152° 18.76' W. long.** [ALL WATERS OF SITKALIDAK STRAIT, KILIUDA BAY, AND UGAK BAY EAST OF 153° 16' W. LONG. IN SITKALIDAK PASSAGE AND ENCLOSED BY A LINE FROM BLACK POINT AT 56° 59.50' N. LAT., 153° 18' W. LONG. TO 56° 57.50' N. LAT., 153 13' W. LONG., THEN A LINE ALONG THE THREE MILE CONTOUR TO 57° 20' N. LAT., 152° 23' W. LONG., THEN A STRAIGHT LINE TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF UGAK ISLAND AT 57° 22' N. LAT., 152° 18.50' W. LONG., AND WEST OF A LINE FROM THE NORTHERNMOST TIP OF UGAK

ISLAND AT 57° 23.50' N. LAT., 152° 17' W. LONG. TO NARROW CAPE AT 57° 26' N. LAT., 152° 19' W. LONG.];

(3) all waters enclosed by a line from Cape Chiniak at 57° 37.20' N. lat., 152° 09.37' W. long. to Marmot Cape at 58° 10.00' N. lat., 151° 52.00' W. long., to Pillar Cape at 58° 08.90' N. lat., 152° 06.77' W. long., and by a line from Inner Point to Afognak Point along 152° 47.75' W. long. [(57° 38' N. LAT., 152° 09' W. LONG.), TO 57° 38' N. LAT., 151° 47' W. LONG., THEN TO CAPE ST. HERMOGENES (58° 15' N. LAT., 151° 47' W. LONG.) AND FROM MARMOT CAPE (58° 10' N. LAT., 151° 52' W. LONG.) ON MARMOT ISLAND TO PILLAR CAPE ON AFOGNAK ISLAND AT 58° 09' N. LAT., 152° 07' W. LONG.];

(4) all waters of Uyak Bay, Uganik Bay, Viekoda Bay, Kupreanof Strait, Raspberry Strait, Malina Bay, Paramanof Bay, Foul Bay, and Shuyak Strait enclosed by [EAST OF] a line from Cape Uyak at 57° 38.33' N. lat., 154° 20.83' W. long., to Cape Ugat at 57° 52.33' N. lat., 153° 50.67' W. long., to Raspberry Cape at 58° 03.58' N. lat., 153° 25.25' W. long., to Black Cape at 58° 24.50' N. lat., 152° 53.30' W. long., to Eagle Cape at 58° 32.57' N. lat., 152° 40.07' W. long., by a line across Cape Current Narrows along 152° 30.00' W. long., and by a line between Inner Point and Afognak Point along 152° 47.75' W. long. [(57° 38.33' N. LAT., 154° 20.83' W. LONG.), TO CAPE UGAT (57° 52.33' N. LAT., 153° 50.67' W. LONG.) TO RASPBERRY CAPE (58° 03.58' N. LAT., 153° 25' W. LONG.) TO BLACK CAPE (58° 24.50' N. LAT., 152° 53' W. LONG.) TO PARTY CAPE ON SHUYAK ISLAND (58° 37.17' N. LAT., 152° 34' W. LONG.) WEST OF 152° 30' W. LONG. IN SHUYAK STRAIT AND WEST OF 152° 50' IN WHALE PASS AND AFOGNAK STRAIT];

(5) all waters of Alaska on the south side of the Alaska Peninsula west of a line extending south from the Alaska Peninsula (near Kilokak Rocks) along 156° 20.22' W. long., and east of a line extending south from Scotch Cap Light along 164° 44.72' W. long. [KILOKAK ROCKS AT 156° 19' W. LONG., AND EAST OF CAPE KUMLIK AT 157° 27' W. LONG.];

(6) all waters on the south side of the Alaska Peninsula that are west of a line extending south from Seal Cape along 158° 26.00' W. long., east of a line extending south from Three Star Point along 159° 10.48' W. long., and north of 55° 33.98' N. lat., and all waters of Alaska on the south side of the Alaska Peninsula that are west of a line extending south from Cape Pankof along 163° 03.70' W. long. and east of a line extending south from Scotch Cap Light along 164° 44.72' W. long. [THE PACIFIC OCEAN WATERS OF THE ALASKA PENINSULA AREA BETWEEN THE LONGITUDE OF SCOTCH CAP AND THE LONGITUDE TO CAPE PANKOF, AND WATERS OF KING CRAB REGISTRATION AREA M EXTENDING SHOREWARD AND THREE MILES SEAWARD OF A BASELINE BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CAPE KUMLIK TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF UNAVIKSHAK ISLAND TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF ATKULIK ISLAND TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF KAK ISLAND TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF CASTLE CAPE (TULIUMNIT POINT) TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF CHANKLIUT ISLAND AND FROM THERE ALONG THE SEAWARD COAST TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CHANKLIUT ISLAND TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF SEAL CAPE, AND ALL WATERS ENCLOSED BY A LINE EXTENDING SOUTH FROM SEAL CAPE (158° 25' W. LONG.) TO THE LATITUDE OF KUPREANOF POINT (55° 34.50' N. LAT.), WESTWARD TO THE LONGITUDE OF THREE STAR POINT (159° 10' W. LONG.) AND NORTHWARD TO THREE STAR POINT AND WATERS EXTENDING

SHOREWARD AND THREE MILES SEAWARD OF A THE LINE FROM THREE STAR POINT AT XY TO KUPREANOF POINT AT 55° 33.98' N. LAT., 159° 35.88' W. LONG., AND ALL PACIFIC OCEAN WATERS WEST OF 159° 35.88' W. LONG. THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF KUPREANOF POINT] WHICH ARE DEPICTED AS TERRITORIAL SEA ON NOAA CHART #16540, (11<sup>TH</sup> EDITION, MARCH 4, 1989), TITLED, "SHUMAGIN ISLAND TO SANAK LIGHT, AND EAST OF THE LONGITUDE OF SCOTCH CAP LIGHT AND SOUTH OF UNIMAK ISLAND AND THE ALASKA PENINSULA WHICH ARE DEPICTED AS TERRITORIAL SEA ON NOAA CHART #16520, (21<sup>ST</sup> EDITION, APRIL 15, 1989) TITLED, "UNIMAK AND AKUTAN PASSES AND APPROACHES"];

(7) all waters of Akun Bay enclosed by a line from Billings Head at 54° 17.50' N. lat., 165° 28.50' W. long., to the opposite shore at 54° 12.70' N. lat., 165° 24.60' W. long. [(54° 17.50' N. lat., 165° 28.50' W. long.), to 54° 13' N. lat., 165° 24.50' W. long. on the opposite shore];

(8) all waters of Akutan Bay enclosed by a line from North Head at 54° 13.54' N. lat., 165° 56.20' W. long., to Akun Head at 54° 17.64' N. lat., 165° 38.24' W. long., and by a line from Akun Island at 54° 08.40' N. lat., 165° 38.29' W. long., to Akutan Island at 54° 07.69' N. lat., 165° 39.74' W. long. [SOUTH OF A LINE FROM AKUN HEAD (54° 18' N. LAT., 165° 38' W. LONG.) TO NORTH HEAD (54° 14' N. LAT., 165° 56' W. LONG.)];

(9) all waters of Beaver Inlet enclosed by a line from Brundage Head at 53° 55.90' N. lat., 166° 12.36' W. long., to Cape Sedanka at 53° 50.50' N. lat., 166° 05.33' W. long., and by a line across Udagak Strait along 53° 42.50' N. lat. [SOUTH OF A LINE FROM BRUNDAGE HEAD (53° 56' N. LAT., 166° 12.50' W. LONG.) TO CAPE SEDANKA (53° 50.50' N. LAT., 166° 05.33' W. LONG.) AND NORTH OF 53° 42' N. LAT.];

(10) all waters of Kaletka Bay enclosed by a line from [THE TIP OF] Erskine Point at 53° 58.97' N. lat., 166° 16.50' W. long. to [THE TIP OF] Cape Kaletka on Unalaska Island at 54° 00.50' N. lat., 166° 22.37' W. long.;

(11) all waters of Unalaska Bay enclosed by a line from Cape Cheerful at 54° 01.00' N. lat., 166° 40.25' W. long., to Cape Kaletka at 54° 00.50' N. lat., 166° 22.37' W. long. [(54° 01' N. LAT., 166° 09.50' W. LONG.) TO CAPE KALETKA (54° 00.50' N. LAT.)];

(12) all waters [OF MAKUSHIN BAY] enclosed by a line from Cape Kovrizha at 53° 51.00' N. lat., 167° 09.50' W. long to Cape Idak at 53° 31.35 N. lat., 167° 47.66' W. long., and by a line from Otter Point at 53° 23.13' N. lat., 167° 50.50' W. long. to Konets Head at 53° 18.95 N. lat., 167° 51.06' W. long. [(53° 51' N. LAT., 167° 09.50' W. LONG.) TO CAPE IDAK (53° 31.33' N. LAT., 167° 47' W. LONG.) TO KONETS HEAD (53° 19.50' N. LAT., 167° 50.75' W. LONG.)];

(13) all waters of Inanudak Bay enclosed by a line from Cape Kigunak at 53° 20.00 N. lat., 168° 26.08' W. long., to Cape Ilmalianuk at 53° 16.42' N. lat., 168° 36.78' W. long. [ON UMNAK ISLAND];

**ISSUE:** As commercial shellfish regulations develop over time, demarcation lines within and between management areas sometimes change independent of each other. The intent of this proposal is to standardize demarcation lines across commercial fisheries as well as update specific demarcation coordinates to reflect the best precision afforded by current technology.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued use of ambiguous demarcation lines.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen, fishery managers, and law enforcement will benefit from clear and consistent regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-307)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 355 - 5 AAC 38.41X. Registration Area J Octopus Management Plan.** Establish octopus management plan for Registration Area J as follows:

**5 AAC 38.41X. Registration Area J Octopus Management Plan.** Octopus may be taken in Registration Area J during a directed fishery or as bycatch to a directed groundfish or shellfish fishery as follows:

(1) when octopus are taken during a directed fishery a commissioner's permit is required under provisions of 5 AAC 38.062;

(2) when octopus are taken as bycatch a commissioner's permit is not required; octopus taken as bycatch shall be recorded on the directed fishery CFEC permit card; octopus taken as bycatch may not exceed 20% by weight of the directed species onboard a vessel, unless modified by emergency order;

(3) octopus taken under a commissioner's permit shall be recorded on a valid CFEC permit card for octopus.

**ISSUE:** Few regulations presently guide commercial harvest of octopus in Registration Area J. This proposal seeks to enact commercial octopus regulations consistent with current management practices.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Potential confusion regarding commercial management of octopus.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen, fishery managers, and law enforcement will benefit from clear and consistent regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.



**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-304)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 356 - 5 AAC 31.590. Westward Area Shrimp Fisheries Management Plan.**  
Align pot shrimp season with guideline harvest range as follows:

**5 AAC 31.590. Westward Area Shrimp Fisheries Management Plan.**

(a) The management plan in this section applies to shrimp fishing with pots in the North Afognak, West Afognak, and Mainland Sections of the Kodiak District.

(b) Shrimp may be taken only from May 1 through February 28, unless closed earlier by emergency order.

(c) The guideline harvest range is 0 to 40,000 pounds, whole weight. No more than 15,000 pounds, whole weight, may be harvested from an individual section **from May 1 through February 28** [DURING A CALENDAR YEAR].

**ISSUE:** This regulation limits shrimp harvest to 15,000 pounds per calendar year; however the commercial shrimp season and the corresponding guideline harvest ranges are established for the dates of May 1 through February 28. Harvest caps used to prevent overharvest of localized shrimp populations are not consistent with actual commercial season dates for shrimp taken with pot gear.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued use of inconsistent regulations.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen, fishery managers, and law enforcement will benefit from clear and consistent regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-305)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 357 - 5 AAC 31.500. Description of Registration Area J; and 5 AAC 31.505. Description of Registration Area J District and Sections.** Amend regulatory description of Registration Area J, districts, and sections as follows:

**5 AAC 31.500. Description of Registration Area J.** Registration Area J consists of the Pacific Ocean waters that are south of the latitude of Cape Douglas (58° 51.10' N. lat.), and west of **149° W. long.** [THE LONGITUDE OF CAPE FAIRFIELD (148° 50.25' W. LONG.)], and the Bering Sea and Pacific Ocean waters that are east of the Maritime Boundary Agreement Line as that line is described in the text of and depicted in the annex to the Maritime Boundary

Agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed in Washington, June 1, 1990, and as that Maritime Boundary Agreement Line is depicted on *NOAA Chart #513* (6th Edition, February 23, 1991) and *NOAA Chart #514* (6th Edition, February 16, 1991). These charts are adopted by reference.

**5 AAC 31.505. Description of Registration Area J District and Sections.** (a) Kodiak District: waters of Registration Area J that are east of a line extending south from the Alaska Peninsula (near Kilokak Rocks) along 156° 20.22' W. long. [RUNNING SOUTH FROM KILOKAK ROCKS].

(1) Inner Marmot Bay Section: all waters of Marmot Bay and adjacent bays enclosed by a line between Inner Point and Afognak Point along 152° 47.75' W. long., and by a line from Cape Izhut at 58° 06.03' N. lat., 152° 20.40' W. long. to Miller Point at 57° 50.25' N. lat., 152° 21.12' W. long. [EAST OF A LINE FROM THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF INNER POINT TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF AFOGNAK POINT AND WEST OF A LINE FROM THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CAPE IZHUT TO THE NORTHERNMOST TIP OF MILLER POINT];

(2) Ugak Bay Section: all waters enclosed by a line from Narrow Cape at 57° 25.95' N. lat., 152° 19.13' W. long., to the northernmost point of Ugak Island at 57° 23.63' N. lat., 152° 17.47' W. long., by a line from the westernmost point of Ugak Island at 57° 21.88' N. lat., 152° 18.76' W. long., to a location offshore at 57° 10.09' N. lat., 152° 18.76' N. long., to a location offshore at 57° 02.84' N. lat., 152° 37.69' W. long., and by a line extending south from Kodiak Island along 152° 37.69' W. long. [WEST OF A LINE FROM NARROW CAPE TO THE NORTHERNMOST POINT OF UGAK ISLAND, TO 57° 10' N. LAT., 152° 19' W. LONG., TO 57° 03' N. LAT., 152° 37.92' W. LONG., AND EAST OF 152° 37.92' W. LONG., INCLUDING ALL OF UGAK BAY];

(3) Kiliuda Bay Section: all waters enclosed by a line across Sitkalidak Strait along 153° 16.00' W. long., by a line extending south from Kodiak Island along 152° 37.69' W. long., and by a line extending east from Sitkalidak Island along 57° 02.84' N. lat. [ALL WATERS OF SITKALIDAK STRAIT WEST OF 152° 37.92' W. LONG., AND NORTH OF 57° 03' N. LAT., INCLUDING THE WATERS OF SITKALIDAK STRAIT EAST OF A LINE FROM BUSH POINT TO A POINT ON SITKALIDAK ISLAND AT 57° 12.92' N. LAT., 153° 13.08' W. LONG.];

(4) Two Headed Island Section: all waters enclosed by a line across Sitkalidak Strait along 153° 16.00' W. long., by a line extending east from Sitkalidak Island along 57° 02.84' N. lat., by a line from a location offshore at 57° 02.84' N. lat., 152° 37.69' W. long. to Sitkinak Island at 56° 33.88' N. lat., 153° 52.66' W. long., and by a line from Whirlpool Point Light at 56° 36.99' N. lat., 154° 05.60' W. long. to Aliulik Peninsula at 56° 46.01' N. lat., 153° 54.21' W. long. [WEST OF A LINE FROM THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF BUSH POINT TO A POINT ON SITKALIDAK ISLAND AT 57° 12.92' N. LAT., 153 13.08' W. LONG., AND SOUTH OF A LINE FROM 57° 03' N. LAT., 153° 11' W. LONG., TO 57° 03' N. LAT., 152 37.08' W. LONG., TO THE NORTHERNMOST TIP OF CAPE SITKINAK AND EAST OF A LINE FROM A POINT ON THE ALIULIK PENINSULA AT 56° 4.17' N. LAT., 153° 54' W. LONG., TO THE NORTHERNMOST TIP OF WHIRLPOOL POINT];

(5) Alitak Bay Section: all waters of Alitak Bay and adjacent bays enclosed by a line from Aliulik Peninsula at 56° 46.01' N. lat., 153° 54.21' W. long. to Whirlpool Point Light at 56° 36.99' N. lat., 154° 05.60' W. long., by a line from Dolina Point at 56°

**36.86' N. lat., 154° 13.40' W. long.) to Cape Alitak Light at 56° 50.59' N. lat., 154° 18.42' W. long., excluding the waters of the Olga Bay Section** [ALL WATERS WEST OF A LINE FROM A POINT OF THE ALIULIK PENINSULA AT 56° 46.17' N. LAT., 153° 54' W. LONG, TO THE NORTHERNMOST TIP OF WHIRLPOOL POINT AND EAST OF A LINE FROM THE NORTHERNMOST TIP OF DOLINA POINT TO CAPE ALITAK LIGHT AND SOUTH OF OLGA NARROWS AT 57° 03' N. LAT.];

(6) Olga Bay Section: all waters of Olga Bay **enclosed by a line across Olga Narrows along 57° 03.00' N. lat.** [NORTH OF OLGA NARROWS AT 57° 03' N. LAT., AND INCLUDING ALL OF OLGA BAY];

(7) Uyak Bay Section: all waters of Uyak Bay **and adjacent bays enclosed by a line from Cape Uyak at 57° 38.33' N. lat., 154° 20.83' W. long. to Cape Kuliuk at 57° 48.25' N. lat., 153° 55.98' W. long.** [EAST OF A LINE FROM CAPE UYAK TO CAPE KULIUK, INCLUDING ALL OF UYAK BAY];

(8) Uganik Bay Section: all waters of Uganik Bay **enclosed by a line from Miners Point at 57° 54.00' N. lat., 153° 43.58' W. long. to Cape Uganik at 57° 58.00' N. lat., 153° 30.28' W. long., and by a line across Uganik Passage along 153° 12.33' W. long.** [EAST OF A LINE FROM THE NORTHERNMOST TIP OF MINERS POINT TO THE WESTERNMOST TIP OF CAPE UGANIK AND WEST OF 153° 12.33' W. LONG. IN UGANIK PASSAGE];

(9) West Afognak Section: all waters **enclosed by a line from Cape Uganik at 57° 58.00' N. lat., 153° 30.28' W. long., to Raspberry Cape at 58° 03.58' N. lat., 153° 25.25' W. long., to Black Cape at 58° 24.50' N. lat., 152° 53.30' W. long., to Eagle Cape at 58° 32.57' N. lat., 152° 40.07' W. long., by a line across Cape Current Narrows along 152° 30.00' W. long., by a line between Inner Point and Afognak Point along 152° 47.75' W. long., and by a line across Uganik Passage along 153° 12.33' W. long.** [EAST OF A LINE FROM THE WESTERNMOST TIP OF CAPE UGANIK THROUGH THE WESTERNMOST TIPS OF RASPBERRY, BLACK AND EAGLE CAPES, SOUTH OF THE LATITUDE OF THE WESTERNMOST TIP OF EAGLE CAPE AND WEST OF THE LONGITUDE OF THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF CAPE CURRENT NARROWS AND WEST OF A LINE FROM THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF INNER POINT TO THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF AFOGNAK POINT AND EAST OF A 153 12.33' W. LONG. IN UGANIK PASSAGE];

(10) North Afognak Section: **all waters enclosed by a line from Shuyak Island at 58° 37.77' N. lat., 152° 19.65' W. long, to a location offshore at 58° 26.00' N. lat., 151° 59.20' W. long., to Tonki Cape at 58° 21.13' N. lat., 151° 59.20' W. long., and by a line across Cape Current Narrows along 152° 30.00' W. long.** [ALL WATERS SHOREWARD OF A LINE FROM TONKI CAPE TO 58° 26' N. LAT., 151° 59' W. LONG., TO POINT BANKS AND EAST OF CAPE CURRENT NARROWS INCLUDING THE WATERS OF TONKI BAY];

(11) Mainland Section: **all state waters of Alaska adjacent to the Alaska Peninsula that are south of 58° 51.10' N. lat. (the latitude of Cape Douglas), and east of 156° 20.22' W. long.** [ALL WATERS SOUTH OF THE LATITUDE OF CAPE DOUGLAS (58° 52' N. LAT.), WEST OF A LINE FROM 58° 52' N. LAT., 153° W. LONG., TO 57° N. LAT., 156° 19' W. LONG., AND NORTHEAST OF THE LONGITUDE OF CAPE KILOKAK (156° 19' W. LONG.)];

(12) Marmot Island Section: **all waters of the Kodiak District enclosed by a line extending east from Tonki Cape along 58° 21.13' N. lat., by a line from Cape Izhut at**

**58° 06.03' N. lat., 152° 20.40' N. long. to Miller Point at 57° 50.25' N. lat., 152° 21.12' W. long., and by a line extending east from Kodiak Island along 57° 47.90' N. lat.** [ALL WATERS SOUTH OF THE LATITUDE OF TONKI CAPE (58° 21' N. LAT.), EXCLUDING THE WATERS OF TONKI BAY, AND ALL WATERS NORTH OF THE NORTHERNMOST POINT OF LONG ISLAND AT 57° 47.50' N. LAT., AND EAST OF A LINE FROM CAPE IZHUT TO MILLER POINT];

(13) Chiniak Bay Section: all waters of Chiniak Bay **enclosed by a line extending east from Kodiak Island along 57° 47.90' N. lat., and by a line from Cape Chiniak at 57° 37.20' N. lat., 152° 09.37' W. long., to 57° 47.90' N. lat., 152° 3.73' W. long.** [SOUTH OF 57 47.50' N. LAT., AND WEST OF A LINE FROM CAPE CHINIAK TO 57° 47.50' N. LAT., 152° 04.50' W. LONG.];

(14) Repealed 7/25/82;

(15) Repealed 7/25/82;

(16) Alitak Flats Section: all waters **enclosed by a line from Cape Alitak Light at 56° 50.59' N. lat., 154° 18.42' W. long. to Dolina Point at 56° 36.86' N. lat., 154° 13.40' W. long., by a line extending west from Dolina Point along 56 36.86' N. lat., by 154° 47.40' W. long. (the longitude of Cape Ikolik), and by a line extending west from Low Cape along 57° 00.00' N. lat.** [WEST OF A LINE FROM THE NORTHERNMOST TIP OF DOLINA POINT TO CAPE ALITAK LIGHT, NORTH OF THE LATITUDE OF DOLINA POINT (56° 37' N. LAT.), EAST OF THE LONGITUDE OF CAPE IKOLIK (154° 47' W. LONG.) AND SOUTH OF THE LATITUDE OF LOW CAPE (56° 59.50' N. LAT.)];

(17) General Section: all remaining waters of the district.

(b) Chignik District: **all waters of Registration Area J on the south side of the Alaska Peninsula west of a line extending south from the Alaska Peninsula (near Kilokak Rocks) along 156° 20.22' W. long., east of a line from Kupreanof Point at 55° 33.98' N. lat., 159 35.88' W. long. to Castle Rock at 55° 16.80' N. lat., 159° 29.11' W. long. and extending 135° southeast from Castle Rock** [ALL WATERS WEST OF A LINE EXTENDING SOUTH FROM KILOKAK ROCKS AND EAST OF A LINE FROM KUPREANOF POINT TO THE EASTERNMOST POINT OF CASTLE ROCK, AND EAST OF A LINE EXTENDING 135° SOUTHEAST FROM THE EASTERNMOST POINT OF CASTLE ROCK].

(1) Kujulik Bay Section: **all waters enclosed by a line from Cape Kumlik at 56° 38.45' N. lat., 157° 27.00' W. long., to the westernmost point of Sutwik Island at 56° 32.40' N. lat., 157° 19.90' W. long., by a line from Foggy Cape at 56° 32.21' N. lat., 156° 58.40' W. long., to the southernmost point of Nakchamik Island at 56° 18.57' N. lat., 157° 49.57' W. long., and by a line from the northernmost point of Nakchamik Island at 56° 22.15' N. lat., 157° 49.85' W. long. to Cape Kumliun at 56° 28.58' N. lat., 157° 51.55' W. long.** [ALL WATERS WEST OF A LINE FROM CAPE KUMLIK TO THE WESTERNMOST POINT OF SUTWIK ISLAND, NORTH OF A LINE FROM FOGGY CAPE TO THE SOUTHERNMOST POINT OF NAKCHAMIK ISLAND, AND EAST OF A LINE FROM THE NORTHERNMOST POINT OF NAKCHAMIK ISLAND TO CAPE KUMLIUN];

(2) Chignik Bay Section: **all waters enclosed by a line from Cape Kumliun at 56° 28.58' N. lat., 157° 51.55' W. long. to the northernmost point of Nakchamik Island at 56° 22.15' N. lat., 157° 49.85' W. long., and by a line from the southernmost point of Nakchamik Island at 56° 18.57' N. lat., 157° 49.57' W. long. to Castle Cape at 56° 14.44' N. lat., 158° 06.94' W. long.** [ALL WATERS WEST OF A LINE FROM CAPE KUMLIUN TO THE NORTHERNMOST POINT OF NAKCHAMIK ISLAND, AND NORTH OF A LINE

FROM THE SOUTHERNMOST POINT OF NAKCHAMIK ISLAND TO CASTLE CAPE];

(3) Kuiukta Bay Section: all waters of Kuiukta Bay enclosed by a line from Cape Ikta at 55° 58.78' N. lat., 158° 30.55' W. long. to the southern entrance of Herring Lagoon at 55° 57.50' N. lat., 158° 39.20' W. long. [NORTH OF A LINE FROM CAPE IKTI TO THE SOUTHERN ENTRANCE OF HERRING LAGOON AT 55° 57.50' N. LAT., 158° 38.75' W. LONG.];

(4) Mitrofanina Island Section: all waters enclosed by a line extending south from Seal Cape along 158° 26.00' W. long., by 55° 33.98' N. lat. (the latitude of Kupreanof Point), by a line from Three Star Point at 55° 53.35' N. lat., 159° 10.48' W. long. to the northernmost point of Chiachi Island at 55 52.66' N. lat., 159° 08.85' W. long., and by a line extending south from the southernmost point of Chiachi Island along 159° 07.00' W. long. [WEST OF THE LONGITUDE OF SEAL CAPE (158° 26' W. LONG.), AND NORTH OF THE LATITUDE OF KUPREANOF POINT (55° 33.98' N. LAT.), EAST OF THE LONGITUDE OF THE SOUTHERNMOST POINT OF CHIACHI ISLAND (159° 07' W. LONG.) AND EAST OF A LINE FROM STAR POINT TO THE NORTHERNMOST POINT OF CHIACHI ISLAND], excluding the waters of the Kuiukta Bay Section;

(5) Ivanof Bay Section: all waters enclosed by a line from Three Star Point at 55° 53.35' N. lat., 159° 10.48' W. long. to the northernmost point of Chiachi Island at 55° 52.66' N. lat., 159° 08.85' W. long., by a line extending south from the southernmost point of Chiachi Island along 159° 07.00' W. long., and by a line extending east from Kupreanof Point along 55° 33.98' N. lat. [WEST OF A LINE FROM STAR POINT TO THE NORTHERNMOST POINT OF CHIACHI ISLAND, WEST OF THE LONGITUDE OF THE SOUTHERNMOST POINT OF CHIACHI ISLAND (159° 07' W. LONG.), AND NORTH OF THE LATITUDE OF KUPREANOF POINT (55° 33.98' N. LAT.)];

(6) Chiginagak Bay Section: all waters enclosed by a line from Cape Providence at 56° 58.67' N. lat., 153° 33.47' W. long. to Aiugnak Columns at 56° 53.08' N. lat., 156° 34.12' W. long., to the easternmost point of Ugaiushak Island at 56° 47.10' N. lat., 156° 50.45' W. long., to Cape Kuyuyukak at 56° 53.85' N. lat., 156° 49.72' W. long. [THE SOUTHERNMOST TIP OF CAPE PROVIDENCE TO AIUGNAK COLUMNS (56° 53.08' N. LAT., 156° 34.12' W. LONG.) TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF UGAIUSHAK ISLAND TO CAPE KUYUYUKAK (56° 54.37' N. LAT., 156° 48.75' W. LONG.)];

(7) Seal Cape Section: all waters enclosed by a line from Castle Cape at 56° 14.44' N. lat., 158° 06.94' W. long. to the northernmost point of Chankliut Island at 56° 09.39' N. lat., 158° 05.55' W. long. and by a line from the southernmost point of Chankliut Island at 56° 07.98' N. lat., 158° 06.87' W. long., to Seal Cape at 55° 59.57' N. lat., 158° 26.00' W. long. [WEST OF A LINE FROM CASTLE CAPE TO THE NORTHERNMOST POINT OF CHANKLIUT ISLAND, AND FROM THE SOUTHERNMOST POINT OF CHANKLIUT ISLAND TO SEAL CAPE];

(8) Nakalilok Bay Section: all waters enclosed by a line from Cape Kuyuyukak at 56° 53.85' N. lat., 156° 49.72' W. long., to the easternmost point of Ugaiushak Island at 56° 47.10' N. lat., 156° 50.45' N. long., to Foggy Cape at 56° 32.21' N. lat., 156° 58.40' W. long., to Cape Kunmik at 56° 46.63' N. lat., 157° 10' W. long. [(56° 54.37' N. LAT., 156° 48.75' W. LONG.), TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF UGAIUGHAK ISLAND TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF FOGGY CAPE TO CAPE KUNMIK (56° 46.63' N. LAT., 157° 10' W. LONG.)];

(9) Aniakchak Bay Section: all waters enclosed by a line from Cape Kunmik at 56° 46.63' N. lat., 157° 10' W. long. to Foggy Cape at 56° 32.21' N. lat., 156° 58.40' W. long., and by a line from the westernmost point of Sutwik Island at 56° 32.40' N. lat., 157° 19.90' W. long., to Cape Kumlik at 56° 38.45' N. lat., 157° 27.00' W. long. [LINES FROM CAPE KUNMIK (56° 46.63' N. LAT., 157° 10' W. LONG.) TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF FOGGY CAPE AND FROM THE WESTERNMOST TIP OF SUTWIK ISLAND TO THE EASTERNMOST TIP OF CAPE KUMLIK].

(c) South Peninsula District: all waters of Registration Area J on the south side of the Alaska Peninsula that are west of a line from Kupreanof Point at 55° 33.98' N. lat., 159° 35.88' W. long. to Castle Rock at 55° 16.80' N. lat., 159° 29.11' W. long. and extending 135° southeast from Castle Rock, and that are east of a line extending south from Scotch Cap Light along 164° 44.72' W. long. [ALL WATERS WEST OF A LINE FROM KUPREANOF POINT TO THE EASTERNMOST POINT OF CASTLE ROCK, AND WEST OF A LINE EXTENDING 135° SOUTHEAST FROM THE EASTERNMOST POINT OF CASTLE ROCK AND PACIFIC OCEAN WATERS EAST OF THE LONGITUDE OF CAPE SARICHEF].

(1) Stepovak Bay Section: all waters enclosed by a line from Kupreanof Point at 55° 33.98' N. lat., 159° 35.88' W. long., to Castle Rock at 55° 16.80' N. lat., 159° 29.11' W. long., to Cape Thompson at 55° 15.21' N. lat., 159° 31.23' W. long., by a line from Big Koniuji Island at 55° 13.13' N. lat., 159° 34.45' W. long. to Nagai Island at 55° 10.75' N. lat., 159° 48.75' W. long., by a line from Nagai Island at 55° 15.07' N. lat., 159° 56.50' W. long. to Cape Devine at 55° 22.65' N. lat., 160° 08.95' W. long., to Karpa Island at 55° 30.06' N. lat., 160° 03.85' W. long., to the Alaska Peninsula (near San Diego Bay Lagoon) at 55° 33.93' N. lat., 160° 26.80' W. long. [BOUNDED BY A LINE FROM KUPREANOF POINT TO THE EASTERNMOST POINT OF CASTLE ROCK TO CAPE THOMPSON ON BIG KONIUJI ISLAND, THEN FROM A POINT ON BIG KONIUJI ISLAND AT 55° 13.25' N. LAT., 159° 34.50' W. LONG., TO A POINT ON NAGAI ISLAND AT 55° 10.83' N. LAT., 159° 48.67' W. LONG., AND FROM A POINT ON NAGAI ISLAND AT 55° 15.25' N. LAT., 159° 56.50' W. LONG., TO CAPE DEVINE ON KOROVIN ISLAND, TO THE SOUTHERNMOST POINT OF KARPA ISLAND, AND FROM THE WESTERNMOST POINT OF KARPA ISLAND TO THE ENTRANCE OF SAN DIEGO BAY LAGOON];

(2) Unga Straits Section: all waters enclosed by a line from the Alaska Peninsula (near San Diego Bay Lagoon) at 55° 33.93' N. lat., 160° 26.80' W. long. to Karpa Island at 55° 30.06' N. lat., 160° 03.85' W. long., to Cape Devine at 55° 22.65' N. lat., 160° 08.95' W. long., by a line from Korovin Island at 55° 23.75' N. lat., 160° 19.25' W. long. to Popof Island at 55° 21.42' N. lat., 160° 20.00' W. long., by a line from East Head at 55° 21.47' N. lat., 160° 29.55' W. long. to West Head at 55° 22.72' N. lat., 160° 31.17' W. long., and by a line from Unga Spit to the Alaska Peninsula along 160° 43.50' W. long. [BOUNDED BY A LINE FROM THE ENTRANCE OF SAN DIEGO BAY LAGOON TO THE WESTERNMOST POINT OF KARPA ISLAND, THEN FROM THE SOUTHERNMOST POINT OF KARPA ISLAND TO CAPE DEVINE ON KOROVIN ISLAND, THEN FROM A POINT ON KOROVIN ISLAND AT 55° 23.75' N. LAT., 160° 19.25' W. LONG, TO A POINT ON POPOF ISLAND AT 55° 21.42' N. LAT., 160° 20' W. LONG., THEN FROM EAST HEAD ON POPOF ISLAND TO WEST HEAD ON UNGA ISLAND, THEN FROM UNGA SPIT (160° 43.50' W. LONG.) NORTH TO THE MAINLAND];

(3) West Nagai Section: all waters enclosed by a line from West Head at 55° 22.72' N. lat., 160° 31.17' W. long. to East Head at 55° 21.47' N. lat., 160° 29.55' W. long.,

**by a line from Popof Island at 55° 21.42' N. lat., 160° 20.00' W. long. to Korovin Island at 55° 23.75' N. lat., 160° 19.25' W. long., by a line from Cape Devine at 55° 22.65' N. lat., 160° 08.95' W. long. to Nagai Island at 55° 15.07' N. lat., 159° 56.50' W. long., by a line extending south from Mountain Point along 160° 13.38' W. long., by 54° 41.35' N. lat., and by a line extending south from Acheredin Point along 160° 49.25' W. long.** [BOUNDED BY A LINE FROM MOUNTAIN POINT ON NAGAI ISLAND SOUTH TO A POINT AT 54° 43.33' N. LAT., 160° 13.25' W. LONG., THEN WEST TO A POINT AT 54° 43.42' N. LAT., 160° 49.25' W. LONG., THEN NORTH TO ACHEREDIN POINT ON UNGA ISLAND, THEN FROM WEST HEAD ON UNGA ISLAND TO EAST HEAD ON POPOF ISLAND THEN FROM A POINT ON POPOF ISLAND AT 55° 21.75' N. LAT., 160° 20' W. LONG., TO A POINT ON KOROVIN ISLAND AT 55° 23.75' N. LAT., 160° 19.25' W. LONG., AND FROM CAPE DEVINE ON KOROVIN ISLAND TO A POINT ON NAGAI ISLAND AT 55° 15.25' N. LAT., 159° 56.50' W. LONG.];

(4) Beaver Bay Section: all waters **enclosed by a line from Unga Spit to the Alaska Peninsula along 160° 43.50' W. long., and by a line from Pinnacle Point at 55° 16.44' N. lat., 160° 51.60' W. long. to Seal Cape at 55° 21.59' N. lat., 161° 19.71' W. long.** [BOUNDED BY A LINE FROM PINNACLE POINT ON UNGA ISLAND TO SEAL CAPE AT 55° 21.75' N. LAT., 161° 19.50' W. LONG., AND FROM UNGA SPIT (160° 43.50' W. LONG.), NORTH TO THE MAINLAND];

(5) Kenoy's Island Section: all waters **enclosed by a line extending south from Acheredin Point along 160° 49.25' W. long., by 54° 41.35' N. lat., by a line from Goose Island at 54° 41.35' N. lat., 162° 13.24' W. long. to the easternmost point of Poperechnoi Island at 55° 04.00' N. lat., 161° 32.65' W. long., to the southernmost point on Wosnesenski Island at 55° 09.55' N. lat., 161° 20.36' W. long., and by a line from the northeasternmost point of Wosnesenski Island at 55° 13.14' N. lat., 161° 19.71' W. long. to Seal Cape at 55° 21.59' N. lat., 161° 19.71' W. long., to Pinnacle Point at 55° 16.44' N. lat., 160° 51.60' W. long.** [BOUNDED BY A LINE FROM SEAL CAPE AT 55° 21.75' N. LAT., 161° 19.50' W. LONG., TO PINNACLE POINT ON UNGA ISLAND, THEN FROM ACHEREDIN POINT ON UNGA ISLAND TO A POINT AT 54° 43.42' N. LAT., 160° 49.25' W. LONG., THEN WEST TO THE NORTHERNMOST POINT ON GOOSE ISLAND, THEN TO THE EASTERNMOST POINT ON POPERECHNOI ISLAND, THEN TO THE SOUTHERNMOST POINT ON WOSNESENSKI ISLAND, AND THEN FROM THE NORTHEASTERNMOST POINT ON WOSNESENSKI ISLAND TO SEAL CAPE AT 55° 21.75' N. LAT., 161° 19.50' W. LONG.];

(6) Pavlof Bay Section: all waters **enclosed by a line from Seal Cape at 55° 21.59' N. lat., 161° 19.71' W. long. to the northeasternmost point of Wosnesenski Island at 55° 13.14' N. lat., 161° 19.71' W. long., and from the southernmost point of Wosnesenski Island at 55° 09.55' N. lat., 161° 20.36' W. long. to the easternmost point of Poperechnoi Island at 55° 04.00' N. lat., 161° 32.65' W. long., to a location offshore at 54° 55.28' N. lat., 161° 48.33' W. long., to a line from the Alaska Peninsula at 55° 05.90' N. lat., 161° 59.00' W. long.** [BOUNDED BY A LINE FROM SEAL CAPE AT 55° 21.75' N. LAT., 161° 19.50' W. LONG., TO THE NORTHERNMOST POINT OF WOSNESENSKI ISLAND AND FROM THE SOUTHERNMOST POINT OF WOSNESENSKI ISLAND TO THE EASTERNMOST POINT OF POPERECHNOI ISLAND TO BELKOFSKI POINT];

(7) Belkofski Bay Section: all waters **enclosed by a line from the Alaska Peninsula at 55° 05.90' N. lat., 161° 59.00' W. long., to a location offshore at 54° 55.28' N.**

lat., 161° 48.33' W. long., to Goose Island at 55° 41.35' N. lat., 162° 13.24' W. long., to Fawn Point at 54° 49.66' N. lat., 162° 19.05' W. long., and by a line from West Cape at 54 55.66' N. lat., 162 26.19' W. long. to Thin Point at 54° 57.32' N. lat., 162° 33.50' W. long. [BOUNDED BY A LINE FROM BELKOFSKI POINT TO THE SOUTHERNMOST POINT OF POPERECHNOI ISLAND TO THE NORTHERNMOST POINT ON GOOSE ISLAND TO FAWN POINT ON DEER ISLAND TO THIN POINT ON THE ALASKA PENINSULA];

(8) Morzhovoi Bay Section: all waters enclosed by a line from Thin Point at 54° 57.32' N. lat., 162° 33.50' W. long. to Cape Pankof at 54° 39.60' N. lat., 160° 03.70' W. long., and by a line across Isanotski Strait along 54° 51.30' N. lat. [BOUNDED BY A LINE FROM THIN POINT ON THE ALASKA PENINSULA TO CAPE PANKOF OF UNIMAK ISLAND AND FROM THE FALSE PASS CANNERY DOCK TO NICHOLS POINT].

(d) North Peninsula District: all Bering Sea waters east of the longitude of Cape Sarichef.

(e) Aleutian District: all waters west of 164° 44.72' W. long. (the longitude of Scotch Cap Light ), excluding the waters of the North Peninsula District [THE LONGITUDE OF CAPE SARICHEF].

**ISSUE:** As commercial shellfish regulations develop over time, demarcation lines within and between management areas sometimes change independent of each other. The intent of this proposal is to standardize demarcation lines across commercial fisheries as well as update specific demarcation coordinates to reflect the best precision afforded by current technology.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Continued use of ambiguous demarcation lines.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial fishermen, fishery managers, and law enforcement will benefit from clear and consistent regulations.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-306)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 358 - 5 AAC 31.210. Shrimp pot fishing seasons for Registration Area E.**  
Close the commercial shrimp pot fishery in PWS as follows:

Close the commercial shrimp season and remove new shrimp “plan” from regulation in Prince William Sound implemented in last Board of Fish cycle. Repeal article 7 area E.



**ISSUE:** New commercial shrimp season in Prince William Sound in addition to current subsistence personal use and sport harvest will result in overharvest of current shrimp stocks and is violation of the Sustainable Salmon Fisheries Policy.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Stocks will be overharvested. Conflict will continue to occur. Exvessel value of catches, if accurate, clearly shows this fishery is results in a negative cash flow for all parties involved.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, shrimp stocks will remain healthy and Alaskans will be able to harvest a few shrimp without conflict. The economic benefit for the state is far greater in a sport fishery with thousands of users buying fuel food rope pots etc.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All subsistence personal use and sport shrimpers in Alaska. Shrimp stocks. The State of Alaska, the Department of Fish and Game and shrimpers who are obviously losing money in this fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. If current catches are accurate fishermen are actually losing money by participating.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Restrict commercial fishery to areas fished in 2010 and 2012 to avoid conflict with 70% of non commercial users. This would still result in a losing fishery and enforcement would cost taxpayers even more money to assure fishery operated in legal areas.

**PROPOSED BY:** Joseph J. Hanes (HQ-F11-030)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 359 - 5 AAC 31.210. Shrimp pot fishing seasons for Registration Area E.**  
Close the commercial shrimp pot fishery in PWS as follows:

Close the commercial pot fishery in Prince William Sound. This is being ruined for thousands of Alaskans so a few can lose money in the \$200,000 fishery. What is the cost to the taxpayers to manage this fishery? There is no way they made any money with the cost of fuel with the reported catch. This is destroying the wonderful family event it had become.

**ISSUE:** The new commercial shrimp pot fishery.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** There will be no shrimp left in the Sound. It will become the desert that it was for 16 years.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes there will not be any shrimp left if this is not fixed, if its not to late.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskans who like to eat shrimp and enjoy family time in the sound.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Everyone is suffering now if reported harvest is accurate.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** There are no other options.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jeff Benkert (HQ-F11-164)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 360 - 5 AAC 31.210. Shrimp pot fishing seasons for Registration Area E.**  
Close the commercial shrimp pot fishery in PWS as follows:

Closure of the commercial pot fishery in Prince William Sound.

**ISSUE:** The unsustainable commercial pot fishery for shrimp in Prince William Sound.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The fishery will crash like it has in the previous commercial fishery.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes. The fishery is being overexploited.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskan who enjoy the great outdoors in the Sound. This was a fully allocated fishery before the board of fish opened the commercial fishery.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. This is not a commercially viable fishery.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Just close area 2 close to Wittier. Does not protect the now dwindling stocks in the whole sound.

**PROPOSED BY:** Wynn Gilbertson (HQ-F11-165)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 361 - 5 AAC 31.210. Shrimp pot fishing seasons for Registration Area E.**  
Close the commercial shrimp pot fishery in PWS as follows:

Repeal the management plan that allows the commercial fishing for spot shrimp in Prince William Sound.

**ISSUE:** The over exploitation of the spot shrimp pot fishery. I am concerned about the sustainability of this fishery. We are repeating the past by allowing this to continue. The resource will be degraded to the point where we were years ago, and the future of the sport fishery is in danger of going away for decades. This was a fully allocated fishery before the current management plan was put in place.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Prince William Sound has been a great place for friends and families to go do some shrimping and that is going to go away. This great recreational opportunity will be a thing of the past. The commercial fishery is not worth destroying the sport and subsistence use of the resource. The value of the resource is much higher for the noncommercial use than the \$200,000 that the commercial fishery is worth.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, there will not be any shrimp left.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** All Alaskans that enjoy Prince William Sound.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** The 80 something commercial shrimpers that are trying to figure out how to make money in this.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Close are 2 to commercial shrimping and save for the sport fishery. If this was done the commercial shrimpers will lose more money than they are now.

**PROPOSED BY:** Mike Crawford (HQ-F11-166)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 362 - 5 AAC 31.223. Lawful shrimp pot gear for Registration Area E.**  
Amend regulatory fishing hours for commercial pot shrimp as follows:

The hours of fishing restriction should be removed. This will allow fishermen to fish when they think is good with their operation.

**ISSUE:** The restriction of hours when gear is allowed to be operated is unnecessary. It does not allow for weather factors, driving factors in and out of ports, unforeseen complications of hauling gear, etc. It forces operators to make transits to and from ports at certain times, sometimes in darkness, sometimes in heavy weather, only to be able to operate fishing gear in the narrow window of time allowed. It forces operators to make hasty decisions when under a time crunch. These decisions could easily compromise safety, and also could easily create more lost gear that could have been avoided with more time, or more able to retrieve legally before it becomes lost.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Fishermen will continually be encouraged to increase risk in weather transits, just in order to be able to fish, and not “lose” a day of fishing. From the distant areas, they will often not be able to get the shrimp to market on the same day of fishing.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Fishermen will benefit by being able to make safer transits in rough weather by waiting until it is good to travel instead of traveling at a certain time in order to be able to fish at legal times.

Consumers will benefit by availability of fresher product.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen will benefit by being able to make safer transits in rough weather by waiting until it is good to travel instead of traveling at a certain time in order to be able to fish at legal times.

Consumers will benefit by availability of fresher product.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Extending the hours was considered. It only changes the times when fishermen are exposed to compromising their safety. We found no good reasons for the fishery to be restricted by the clock.

**PROPOSED BY:** Whittier Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-120)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 363 - 5 AAC 31.235. Closed waters in Registration Area E.** Open Nellie Juan Fjord Area to commercial shrimping as follows:

Section 5 AAC 31.235 (b)(1) would be replaced in order to read as follows (with the appropriate Latitude and Longitude references to be included): “waters enclosed by a line from the north entrance to Pigot Bay to Point Culross, a line from the southernmost point of Culross Island to the northwest corner of Applegate Island, and north of a line from the southernmost point of Applegate Island running westward about a mile to the mainland. (approximately 60 degrees 37 minutes N latitude).

**ISSUE:** We would like the entire Nellie Juan Fjord area be accessible to Commercial shrimpers. The intent of having the commercial closed areas of subsection (b) was to leave the areas near ports and residential centers available for shrimp fishing only to the sport/recreational fishermen. These areas are where a high percentage of the recreational fishery takes place, and would reserve these areas exclusively for the sport/recreational fishery. The Nellie Juan closure is far from any port or community. It is beyond the normal usage area of many of the smaller boats.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Commercial fishermen will be denied access to an area that is not saturated with recreational fishermen, and this area will probably be underutilized.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Commercial shrimpers would have access to the resource in this area. Also they would not have a closed area separating open areas.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one. Recreational/sport fishermen would still have access to this area whenever the fishery is open.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Whittier Advisory Committee

(HQ-F11-167)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 364 - 5 AAC 31.226. Shrimp pot marking requirements for Registration Area E.** Amend gear marking requirements for commercial shrimp pot gear as follows:

We would like it to read so that if you have more than ten pots on a longline, then you are required to have a buoy at each end.

**ISSUE:** The restriction of the number of pots allowed for one buoy is too restrictive. And it also increases the chance for line in the wheel, often close to shore, creating a potential safety hazard.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Often shrimp pots are deployed close to shore. Safety could be compromised by risking getting line in the wheel from the buoyline at the end of the longline while close to shore. One does not always have the desired maneuverability to get away from the line when close to shore, especially with offshore winds. This rule is perhaps in regulations for 2 reasons. One is the ability to show others where you are fishing, with the intent (no guarantees) of fewer gear conflicts. Ten or fewer pot longlines are generally fairly short (no guarantees), and are adequately marked with just one buoy. Another factor is that when properly set with adequate buoy line, the buoy is not directly over the pots, so the buoys only generally mark where the pots are set. Another reason for 2 buoys is a second chance to eliminate lost gear. From experience and hearsay, most of the shrimp pot gear that is “lost” in Prince William Sound would not be saved by having a second buoy. We do not feel that changing this regulation will change the amount of lost gear with any significance

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen will benefit by increased safety margins when operating near shore where maneuverability is restricted.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one will suffer. Fishermen will still retain the choice to add a second buoy to a longline of any length.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Another solution we looked at was to have no requirement for a second buoy. We feel that once a string of gear gets significantly long, the advantage of being able to pull from the other end when something breaks, possibly but not necessarily outweighs the disadvantages (there are other means – dragging or fishing across - of retrieving lost longlines that actually work better for retrieving longer sets). We looked at setting the number of allowed pots with one buoy as high as 15, but ended up agreeing that 10 would be an acceptable number.

**PROPOSED BY:** Whittier Advisory Committee

(HQ-F11-168)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 365 - 5 AAC 31.2XX. Operation of Other Pot Gear.** Restrict operation of sport, personal use, and subsistence shrimp pot gear by persons or vessels participating in the commercial shrimp pot fishery as follows:

**5 AAC 31.2XX. Operation of other pot gear. A person participating in, or a vessel validly registered for, the Area E shrimp pot fishery may not participate in, or be used to participate in, subsistence, personal use, or sport fisheries for shrimp with pot gear unless the vessel is unregistered as described in 5 AAC 31.053(d)(2) and other requirements of 5 AAC 31.053 have been met.**

**ISSUE:** Prince William Sound (PWS) shrimp regulations currently allow simultaneous participation in commercial and sport, personal use, and subsistence shrimp fisheries. There are areas of high shrimp abundance that are closed to commercial shrimp harvest immediately adjacent to areas that are open to commercial shrimp harvest. This creates a situation where misreporting of sport, personal use, or subsistence shrimp harvest may potentially occur. Clear separation of commercial and sport, personal use, and subsistence fisheries will benefit those individuals reporting harvests accurately. Commercially-harvested shrimp may be retained for personal use so an opportunity exists for a commercial harvester to obtain shrimp for personal consumption.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Confusion regarding legal participation in sport, personal use, and subsistence fisheries will persist and the potential for noncommercial product to become part of the sale of commercial product.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishery management will benefit from accurate reporting of shrimp harvests. All harvesters will benefit from better management and accurate data from the shrimp fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-294)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 366 - 5 AAC 31.020. Shrimp area registration and 5 AAC 31.206. Area E registration.** Amend shrimp pot fishery registration from superexclusive to exclusive as follows:

**5 AAC 31.206. Area E registration.**

...

(b) Registration Area E is an **exclusive** [SUPEREXCLUSIVE] registration area for vessels fishing for shrimp with pot gear. A vessel participating in the Registration Area E shrimp pot fishery must be registered with the department by 5:00 p.m. April 1.

**ISSUE:** Prince William Sound (PWS), Area E, is designated a superexclusive registration area for vessels fishing for shrimp with pot gear. However, the term “superexclusive” is not defined in shrimp regulations. Statewide regulations describe restrictions on vessels registered for exclusive registration areas (5 AAC 31.020(e)(1)). This definition of exclusive registration area captures the board’s intent when it adopted the superexclusive registration requirement for PWS.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If nothing is done, confusion will persist regarding the meaning of superexclusive.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Users will benefit from having definitions for terms used in regulation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Define superexclusive registration area, but the meaning was already applied to the term exclusive area registration.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-295)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 367 - 5 AAC 02.210. Subsistence shrimp fishery; and 5 AAC 77.553. Personal use shrimp fishery.** Include references to the noncommercial shrimp fishery management plan into subsistence and personal use regulations as follows:

**5 AAC 02.210. Subsistence shrimp fishery. Subsistence shrimp fisheries in Prince William Sound will be managed as specified in 5 AAC 55.055.** In the subsistence taking of shrimp...

**5 AAC 77.553(a). Personal use shrimp fishery. Personal use shrimp fisheries in Prince William Sound will be managed as specified in 5 AAC 55.055.** In the personal use taking of shrimp...

**ISSUE:** Management of Prince William Sound (PWS) subsistence and personal use fisheries is guided by the language in 5 AAC 55.055, Prince William Sound Noncommercial Shrimp Fishery Management Plan. However, there is no reference to this regulation in the PWS subsistence or personal use fisheries regulations.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Participants in PWS subsistence and personal use shrimp fisheries will lack information and understanding of the basis of PWS shrimp management.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Users will benefit by being able to access regulations governing the different fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-296)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 368 - 5 AAC 38.2XX. Area E Octopus Management Plan.** Allow retention of octopus only as bycatch to other directed groundfish and shellfish fisheries as follows:

**5 AAC 38.2XX. Area E Octopus Management Plan. Octopus may only be taken as incidental bycatch in Registration Area E in pot and longline gear fisheries.**

**(1) the guideline harvest range for octopus in Registration Area E is XXX pounds;**

**(2) octopus may be retained as bycatch only in an amount not to exceed 20 percent, by weight, of the directed harvest aboard the vessel except that in a directed pot fishery for shrimp, octopus may be retained in an amount not to exceed 35 percent, by weight, of the shrimp aboard the vessel;**

**(3) when the guideline harvest level has been reached, the commissioner shall close, by emergency order, Area E to the retention of octopus;**

**(4) octopus retained for sale or for personal use shall be reported on a fish ticket as described in 5 AAC 39.130;**

**ISSUE:** Octopus is typically taken as bycatch to longline and pot fisheries for groundfish and shellfish. There is increasing interest in retaining octopus for both personal use and for sale as bait and food. Regulation 5 AAC 38.062 currently provides only for directed harvest of octopus under the terms of a commissioner's permit. However, most interest is in retention of octopus as incidental bycatch.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Octopus will remain closed to retention and there will be no reporting of octopus retained for bait or for personal use.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Users with a valid commercial fishing CFEC permit will benefit by being able to retain octopus bycatch for personal use or for sale.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.



**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-297)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 369 - 5 AAC 38.215. Guideline harvest levels for clams in Registration Area E.**  
Repeal the reference to razor clam guideline harvest levels as follows:

**5 AAC 38.215. Guideline harvest levels for clams in Registration Area E. Repealed** [THE GUIDELINE HARVEST LEVEL FOR THE COMMERCIAL AND SUBSISTENCE TAKING OF RAZOR CLAMS FROM KANAK ISLAND IS 100,000 – 150,000 POUNDS.]

**ISSUE:** The GHLS referenced in regulation are outdated and unrealistic. There has been no commercial razor clam harvest in the Prince William Sound (PWS) Area since 1993. The department does not assess razor clams in the area. Any clams that are sold for human consumption may only be harvested from beaches certified by Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC). There are no beaches currently certified by DEC for commercial razor clam harvest in PWS. In addition to the decline in commercial interest, the number of subsistence razor clam permits issued for the Copper River Delta Area has declined, along with reported harvest. A companion proposal seeks to adopt a commissioner's permit requirement for future clam fishery management.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Potential harvesters may be misled by the regulatory reference to GHL.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Both public and agency personnel will benefit by removing the misleading reference.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-298)  
\*\*\*\*\*.

**PROPOSAL 370 - 5 AAC 38.206. Area E Registration.** Require a commissioner's permit for commercial harvest of clams in the Prince William Sound Area as follows:

**5 AAC 38.206. Area E registration.**

(a) Notwithstanding 5 AAC 38.020(a)(1) Registration Area E is a separate registration area for all miscellaneous shellfish.

**(b) Notwithstanding 5AAC 38.062(a), a clam registration in Area E will be issued only under a commissioner's permit as specified in 5 AAC 38.062(b).**

**ISSUE:** There has been no commercial hardshell clam harvest in the PWS area since the 1970s and no commercial razor clam harvest since 1993. Current regulation has the season for clams and mussels open year-round. The department does not assess clam abundance in PWS. If interest in commercial clam harvests were to develop, the department would likely close the season until a suitable management plan could be developed. A commissioner's permit requirement would give the department additional tools beyond season and area to manage these undeveloped fisheries. The permit would allow collection of information and perhaps development of a management approach that could ultimately come before the Board of Fisheries for approval.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** The fisheries could be closed given the lack of management tools.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Users and the resource will benefit from a slower and information-driven approach to management development.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-299)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 371 - 5 AAC 77.553. Personal use shrimp fishery.** Extend the eastern boundary for the North Gulf Coast Personal Use Shrimp Fishery to Cape Fairfield as follows:

The eastern boundary for the North Gulf Coast will be Cape Fairfield.

**ISSUE:** Extend the eastern boundary for the North Gulf Coast Personal Use Shrimp Fishery to Cape Fairfield. (map on page 56 of 2010 South Central sport fish regulations).

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** North Gulf shrimp will be underutilized and harvest reporting will not be available as a tool for management. Personal use shrimp fishing east of Cape Fairfield has been in place for years.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** A harvest report filed by the personal use shrimp fishermen would provide information on stocks in the North Gulf Coast.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Residents of Alaska.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Seward Fish and Game AC

(HQ-F11-002)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 372 - 5 AAC 02.310. Subsistence miscellaneous shellfish fishery; 5 AAC 58.022. Waters; seasons; bag, possession, and size limits; and special provisions for Cook Inlet – Resurrection Bay Saltwater Area; and 5 AAC 77.518. Personal use clam fishery.** Reduce the bag limit for hardshell clams in Cook Inlet Area to 80 clams of any species as follows:

**5 AAC 02.310. Subsistence miscellaneous shellfish fishery.**

...

(b) In the subsistence taking of clams,

(2) there are no bag, possession, or size limits for clams, except that for **littleneck and butter clams the bag and possession limit is 80 of any species in combination and**

(A) littleneck clams the

(i) [BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT IS 1,000 CLAMS; AND]

minimum legal size is one and one-half inches across the widest width of the shell;

(B) butter clams the

(i) [BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT IS 700 CLAMS; AND]

minimum legal size is two and one-half inches across the widest width of the shell.

**5 AAC 58.022. Waters; seasons; bag, possession, and size limits; and special provisions for Cook Inlet - Resurrection Bay Saltwater Area.**

...

(12) littleneck clams **and butter clams**: may be taken from January 1 - December 31; **with a combined** bag and possession limit of **80** [1,000] clams; minimum size **for littleneck clams** is one and one-half inches in length across the widest part of the shell; **minimum size for butter clams is two and one-half inches in length across the widest part of the shell;**

(13) **repealed** [BUTTER CLAMS: MAY BE TAKEN FROM JANUARY 1 - DECEMBER 31; BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT OF 700 CLAMS; MINIMUM SIZE IS TWO AND ONE-HALF INCHES IN LENGTH ACROSS THE WIDEST PART OF THE SHELL;]

**5 AAC 77.518. Personal use clam fishery.**

...

(2)(B) the **combined** bag and possession limit for littleneck clams **and butter clams** is **80** [1,000] and the minimum size **for littleneck clams** is 1.5 inches in length **across the widest part of the shell; minimum size for butter clams is two and one-half inches in length across the widest part of the shell;** and

(2)(C) **repealed** [THE BAG AND POSSESSION LIMIT FOR BUTTER CLAMS IS 700 AND THE MINIMUM SIZE IS 2.5 INCHES IN LENGTH.]

**ISSUE:** Department surveys indicate a decline in hardshell clam abundance in Kachemak Bay. Specifically, survey data for Jakolof Bay show littleneck clam density has declined from 21 clams per square meter in 2001 to three clams per square meter in 2010. Similarly, butter clam density declined from three clams per square meter to one clam per square meter over the same time period. Hardshell clam densities have also shown a decline in other monitored areas of Kachemak Bay. It is necessary to reduce the current bag limits of 1,000 littleneck and 700 butter clams to reflect current levels of abundance; current limits were established when abundance was high and were set only to allow enforcement to discern commercial from noncommercial harvesters. A bag limit of 80 clams of both species combined still provides for the regulatory amount reasonably necessary for subsistence uses of 6,800 to 10,200 pounds of hardshell clams.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Sustainability of the stock will be at risk.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The public will benefit by adoption of a clam limit that provides opportunity while protecting the reproductive potential of the resource to allow for abundance to increase.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** In the short term, users who harvest only several times a year may suffer.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Differing bag limits of between 60 and 100 per day.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-301)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 373 - 5 AAC 02.310. Subsistence miscellaneous shellfish fishery.** Re-establish Tyonek Subsistence area as follows:

Re-establish the Tyonek Subsistence Area 2 miles adjacent to the North side of Polly Creek.

**ISSUE:** Depletion of clams in this area.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** For the past few years, the area was depleted of the natural stock. Our people using the area have been returning with little or no clams and the ones they got were very immature and small.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This will help prevent the area from being depleted again so subsistence needs can be met.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Users

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Clams.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** Permanent prohibition of dredging.

**PROPOSED BY:** Tyonek Fish & Game Advisory Committee

(HQ-F11-069, previously SC-10F-003)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 374 - 5 AAC 75.XXX. Closed Waters and Prohibited Acts; 5 AAC 77.XXX. Methods, Means, and General Restrictions and; 5 AAC 02.XXX. Methods, Means, and General Restrictions.** Clarify restriction on use of sport, personal, or subsistence-caught shellfish by owner, operator, or employee of a lodge, charter vessel, or other enterprise that furnishes food, lodging, or sport fishing guide services as follows:

The owner, operator, or employee of a lodge, charter vessel, or other enterprise that furnishes food, lodging, or sport fishing guide services may not furnish to a client or guest of that enterprise, shellfish, unless the

- (1) shellfish has been taken with gear deployed and retrieved by the client or guest;
- (2) gear has been marked with the client's or guest's name and address, as specified in 5 AAC **75.035(1)**, 5 AAC 77.010(d), and 5 AAC 02.010 (e)(1) by the client.
- (3) shellfish is to be consumed by the client or guest or is consumed in the presence of the client or guest.

The captain and crew members of a charter vessel may not deploy, set, or retrieve their own gear in a sport, personal use, or subsistence shellfish fishery when that vessel is being chartered.

**ISSUE:** Charter boat operators and crew who pull their own sport, personal use, or subsistence shellfish pots and provide shellfish to paying clients are engaging in unlawful commercial fishing. Regulations in southeast Alaska clearly prohibit this practice. Regulations for areas outside of southeast Alaska, are not clearly stated that prohibit charter boats and lodges from setting and retrieving their own shellfish pots and supplying their customers with fresh shellfish. Therefore the illegal commercial use of sport, personal or subsistence caught shellfish is occurring and clarity in regulation is needed. This prohibition is needed on a statewide basis.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Difficulties will continue with enforcement of illegal commercial sale of sport, personal use and subsistence caught shellfish. Fishery management restrictions could result sooner because commercial activities increase harvests.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The shellfish resources of Alaska and users.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Lodge owners, operators, and employees, charter vessel owners and operators may not operate their own shellfish gear when paying clients are present.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Public Safety (HQ-F11-323)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 375 - 5 AAC 39.145(4). Escape mechanism for shellfish and bottomfish pots.** Require that commercial shellfish pots constructed with rigid mesh have a biodegradable escape mechanism identical to that required for subsistence, personal use, and sport shellfish pots as follows:

**5 AAC 39.145. Escape mechanism for shellfish and bottomfish pots.**

(4) [BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2007,] all **commercial**, subsistence, personal use, and sport shellfish pots constructed with rigid mesh must have at least one rectangular opening in a sidewall of the pot.

**ISSUE:** Currently, there is no biodegradable escape mechanism defined for commercial shellfish pots constructed of rigid mesh. Although the regulation applying to subsistence, personal use, and sport shellfish pots constructed of rigid mesh provides guidance on how the mechanism should be constructed, there is no requirement that commercial shellfish pot gear adhere to this description.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** If nothing is done, commercial fishermen using shellfish pots constructed of rigid mesh will lack guidance on how to comply with the biodegradable escape mechanism requirement. It is possible that some pots will lack any escape mechanism which could result in lost and derelict gear continuing to trap marine species.

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

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** The resource and resource users will benefit from rigid mesh pots that are properly rigged with a biodegradable escape mechanism and from a clear understanding of the requirement in regulation.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-300)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 376 - 5 AAC 75.XXX. New Regulation.** Clarify regulations regarding use of hook and line when taking octopus as follows:

Clarify the use of hook and line gear as a legal means of taking octopus to allow harvest of the current incidental catch by anglers targeting other species.

**ISSUE:** Statewide sport fishing gear regulations do not clarify whether hook and line gear may be used to take octopus.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** A relatively small potential harvest of octopus will be foregone by anglers who occasionally catch octopus on hook and line gear while attempting to take other species.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** This proposal will help prevent wastage of any mortally hooked octopus that would otherwise have to be released.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Anglers who prefer to harvest octopus when incidentally caught on hook and line gear.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** No one.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** John T. Parker Sr. (HQ-F11-105)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 377 - 5 AAC 32.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish a sustainable Dungeness crab policy as follows:

A Sustainable Dungeness Crab Policy similar to the king crab, tanner crab management plan or the Sustainable Salmon Policy is needed for Dungeness Crab to have guiding principles to minimize repeating past management strategies that inadvertently lead to closed fisheries and depleted stocks that are not sustainable.

**ISSUE:** Please create a Sustainable Dungeness Crab Policy that establishes a comprehensive framework or checklist to provide guiding safeguards for sustainability of Dungeness fisheries into the future.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Closed fisheries and depleted stocks that are not sustainable.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, if this policy also includes quality issues pertaining to these fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen into the future who promote sustainable fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who promote non sustainable fisheries without looking at a larger picture.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc. (HQ-F11-343)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 378 - 5 AAC 31.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish a sustainable all species shrimp policy as follows:

A Sustainable All Species Shrimp Policy similar to the king crab, tanner crab management plan or the Sustainable Salmon Policy is needed for all species of shrimp to have guiding principles to minimize repeating past management strategies that inadvertently lead to closed fisheries and depleted stocks that are not sustainable.

**ISSUE:** Please create a Sustainable All Species Shrimp Policy that establishes a comprehensive framework or checklist to provide guiding safeguards for sustainability of Shrimp fisheries into the future.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Closed fisheries and depleted stocks that are not sustainable.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, if this policy also includes quality issues pertaining to these fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen into the future who promote sustainable fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who promote non sustainable fisheries without looking at a larger picture.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc. (HQ-F11-344)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 379 - 5 AAC 38.XXX. New Regulation.** Establish a sustainable miscellaneous shellfish policy as follows:

A Sustainable miscellaneous shellfish Policy similar to the king crab, tanner crab management plan or the Sustainable Salmon Policy is needed for miscellaneous shellfish to have guiding principles to minimize repeating past management strategies that inadvertently lead to closed fisheries and depleted stocks that are not sustainable.



**ISSUE:** Please create a Sustainable Miscellaneous Shellfish Policy that establishes a comprehensive framework or checklist to provide guiding safeguards for sustainability of miscellaneous shellfish fisheries into the future.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?** Closed fisheries and depleted stocks that are not sustainable.

**WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?** Yes, if this policy also includes quality issues pertaining to these fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?** Fishermen into the future who promote sustainable fisheries.

**WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?** Those who promote non sustainable fisheries without looking at a larger picture.

**OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?** None.

**PROPOSED BY:** Pioneer Alaskan Fisheries Inc. (HQ-F11-345)  
\*\*\*\*\*