

**PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 18.360. Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan.** Increase the minimum expected sockeye salmon harvest thresholds from 300,000 to 600,000 prior to July 8 and 600,000 to 1,000,000 fish after July 8, and from 600,000 to 1,000,000 fish in years when runs are as strong as expected, as follows:

The new regulation would read as follows:

5 AAC 18.360. Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan. (a) In years when a harvestable surplus beyond escapement goals for the first (Black Lake) and second (Chignik Lake) runs of Chignik River system sockeye salmon is expected to be less than **1,000,000** (600,000), there will be no commercial salmon fishery allowed in the Cape Igvak Section, as described in 5 AAC 18.200(g)(8), until a harvest of **600,000** (300,000) sockeye salmon in the Chignik Area, as described in 5 AAC 15.100, is achieved. After July 8, after at least **600,000** (300,000) sockeye salmon have been harvested in the Chignik Area, and if escapement goals are being met, the department shall manage the fishery so that the number of sockeye salmon harvested in the Chignik Area will be at least **1,000,000** (600,000) and the harvest in the Cape Igvak Section will approach as near as possible 15 percent of the total Chignik sockeye salmon catch.

(b) In years when a harvestable surplus beyond escapement goals for the first and second runs of Chignik River system sockeye salmon is expected to be more than **1,000,000** (600,000), but the first run fails to develop as predicted and it is determined that a total sockeye salmon harvest in the Chignik Area of **1,000,000** (600,000) or more may not be achieved, the Cape Igvak Section commercial salmon fishery will be curtailed in order to allow at least a minimum harvest in the Chignik Area of **600,000** (300,000) sockeye salmon by July 9 if that number of fish are determined

to be surplus to the escapement goals of the Chignik River system. After July 8, after at least **600,000** (300,000) sockeye salmon have been harvested in the Chignik Area, and if escapement goals are being met, the department shall manage the fishery so that the number of sockeye salmon harvested in the Chignik Area will be at least **1,000,000** (600,000) and the harvest in the Cape Igvak Section will approach as near as possible 15 percent of the total Chignik sockeye salmon catch.

(c) In years when a harvestable surplus beyond escapement goals for the first and second runs of Chignik River system sockeye salmon is expected to be more than **1,000,000** (600,000) and the department determines the runs are as strong as expected, the department will manage the fishery in such a manner whereby the number of sockeye salmon taken in the Cape Igvak Section will approach as near as possible 15 percent of the total Chignik sockeye salmon catch

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The argument made by the BOF in 1978 when they enacted the Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan was that a 600,000 minimum sockeye harvest for Chignik was an adequate amount to “guarantee” Chignik fishermen, and that harvest amount should be assured prior to any opening of the Cape Igvak Section. In fact, the 15% allocation they settled on was justified by the 1978 BOF *because* the 600,000 Chignik sockeye harvest minimum was included in the Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan. While the argument can be made that a 600,000 minimum sockeye harvest assurance for Chignik was inadequate even in 1978, it is indisputable that a minimum Chignik sockeye harvest assurance of 600,000 *today* is woefully inadequate due to the dramatic change in economic conditions since the Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan was adopted *38 years ago*.

**PROPOSED BY:** Axel S. Kopun (EF-F16-052)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 18.355. Reporting requirements.** Require commercial salmon fishermen to register prior to fishing in the Cape Igvak Section and check out upon leaving the section, and require tender operators to report fish ticket harvest data within 12 hours of taking a delivery, as follows:

1. Require Igvak fishermen to register by phone or radio with the local ADF&G management staff prior to harvesting salmon in, and upon leaving, the Cape Igvak Section from June 1 – July 25; and / or
2. Require salmon tenders in the Cape Igvak Section to report commercial fish ticket harvest data to the local ADF&G staff within 12 hours after delivery from individual fishermen.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** An incentive to underreport sockeye salmon harvested in the Cape Igvak Section exists. With RSW now standard equipment in the seine fleet, the overall increase in vessel size of the seine fleet, the knowledge that the Cape Igvak fishery is regulated on the number of fish harvested, and concurrent fisheries taking place not limited by an allocation, there is ample opportunity and a strong economic enticement to misreport. The importance of accurate accounting of sockeye salmon harvested under the Cape Igvak Management Plan is clear. The Cape Igvak fishery is linked to the Chignik and the SEDM

fisheries. All three work under a joint allocation scheme, and therefore it is important that no one area or fishery take the liberty of not completely reporting harvest numbers. There is also importance in determining early run timing and magnitude for Chignik, as the department has stated on record in the past that, “early season management actions (in Chignik) rely heavily on commercial harvest information from the Eastern District and other outlying locations as this is often the best indication of sockeye run timing and magnitude.” Ensuring accurate catch numbers in the Cape Igvak Section would allow the department to better document effort and obtain accurate and timely fishery performance data, which is necessary for effective management of the Black Lake sockeye run during June. Further, tightening catch reporting standards in the Cape Igvak Section is consistent with the Sustainable Salmon Fisheries Policy for the State of Alaska: 5 AAC 39.222, Section 3 salmon management (i) “management should ..... incorporate procedures to assure effective monitoring, compliance, control, and enforcement.”

**PROPOSED BY:** Axel S. Kopun (EF-F16-054)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 18.360. Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan.** Amend the *Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan* so that the harvest allocation applies only prior to July 9, as follows:

5 AAC 18.360. Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan. (a) In years when a harvestable surplus beyond escapement goals for the first (Black Lake) and second (Chignik Lake) runs of Chignik River system sockeye salmon is expected to be less than 600,000, there will be no commercial salmon fishery allowed in the Cape Igvak Section, as described in 5 AAC 18.200(g)(8), until a harvest of 300,000 sockeye salmon in the Chignik Area, as described in 5 AAC 15.100, is achieved. After July 8, after at least 300,000 sockeye salmon have been harvested in the Chignik Area, and if escapement goals are being met, the department shall manage the fishery so that the number of sockeye salmon harvested in the Chignik Area will be at least 600,000 and the harvest in the Cape Igvak Section will approach as near as possible 15 percent of the total **pre-July 9** Chignik sockeye salmon catch.

(b) In years when a harvestable surplus beyond escapement goals for the first and second runs of Chignik River system sockeye salmon is expected to be more than 600,000, but the first run fails to develop as predicted and it is determined that a total sockeye salmon harvest in the Chignik Area of 600,000 or more may not be achieved, the Cape Igvak Section commercial salmon fishery will be curtailed in order to allow at least a minimum harvest in the Chignik Area of 300,000 sockeye salmon by July 9 if that number of fish are determined to be surplus to the escapement goals of the Chignik River system. After July 8, after at least 300,000 sockeye salmon have been harvested in the Chignik Area, and if escapement goals are being met, the department shall manage the fishery so that the number of sockeye salmon harvested in the Chignik Area will be at least 600,000 and the harvest in the Cape Igvak Section will approach as near as possible 15 percent of the total **pre-July 9** Chignik sockeye salmon catch.

(c) In years when a harvestable surplus beyond escapement goals for the first and second runs of Chignik River system sockeye salmon is expected to be more than 600,000 and the department determines the runs are as strong as expected, the department will manage the fishery in such a manner whereby the number of sockeye salmon taken in the Cape Igvak Section will approach as near as possible 15 percent of the total **pre-July 9** Chignik sockeye salmon catch.

(d) The total **pre-July 9** Chignik sockeye salmon catch constitutes those sockeye salmon caught **prior to July 9** within the Chignik Area plus 80 percent of the sockeye salmon caught in the East Stepovak, Southwest Stepovak, Stepovak Flats, Balboa Bay, and Beaver Bay Sections, as described in 5 AAC 09.200(f), plus 90 percent of the sockeye salmon caught in the Cape Igvak Section **prior to July 9**. The harvest in the Cape Igvak Section at any time before July 25 may be permitted to fluctuate above or below 15 percent of the cumulative **pre-July 9** Chignik sockeye salmon catch **in order to approach as near as possible 15 percent of the total pre-July 9 Chignik sockeye salmon catch.**

(e) This allocation method will be in effect through July 25. The first fishing period of the commercial salmon fishing season in the Cape Igvak Section will not occur before the first **24 hour** fishing period of the commercial salmon fishing season in the Chignik Area.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan is based on the interception of 15 percent of the *total* Chignik sockeye salmon catch when the Cape Igvak fishery is focused almost exclusively on the interception of the pre-July 9 return of sockeye to Chignik. While the plan is based on the total sockeye catch in Chignik over the course of the *entire* season, Igvak fishermen are really only intercepting first (Black Lake) run Chignik sockeye and therefore disproportionately impacting the first (Black Lake) run. Igvak fishermen generally do not have the ability to intercept a significant number of second (Chignik Lake) run Chignik sockeye. Therefore, the Cape Igvak Management Plan should not have an allocation encompassing the entire Chignik sockeye salmon harvest.

**PROPOSED BY:** Jamie Ross

(EF-F16-074)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 18.360. Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan.** Redefine the area used to determine allocation percentages within the *Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan*, as follows:

5 AAC 18.360. Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan. (d) The total Chignik sockeye salmon catch constitutes those sockeye salmon caught **only** within the Chignik Area [PLUS 80 PERCENT OF THE SOCKEYE SALMON CAUGHT IN THE EAST STEPOVAK, SOUTHWEST STEPOVAK, STEPOVAK FLATS, BALBOA BAY, AND BEAVER BAY SECTIONS, AS DESCRIBED IN 5 AAC 09.200(F), PLUS 90 PERCENT OF THE SOCKEYE SALMON CAUGHT IN THE CAPE IGVAK SECTION]. The harvest in the Cape Igvak Section at any time before July 25 may be permitted to fluctuate above or below 15 percent of the Chignik Area sockeye salmon catch.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan provides for a 15 percent allocation of the total Chignik sockeye catch, defined as “those sockeye salmon caught within the Chignik Area plus 80 percent of the sockeye salmon caught in the East Stepovak, Southwest Stepovak, Stepovak Flats, Balboa Bay, and Beaver Bay Sections, as described in 5 AAC 09.200(f), plus 90 percent of the sockeye salmon caught in the Cape Igvak Section.” Management errors in the Igvak and SEDM fisheries in the past have resulted in higher allocations of Chignik bound sockeye salmon than provided for in regulation. The problem is that when an allocation overage occurs in one or both of the two intercept areas, the

amount of overage is used in calculating the in-season allocation for Igvak, which effectively increases the allocation to Igvak fishermen. *Any allocation overages in SEDM or Igvak itself trigger even more overages for Igvak simply because of the way the allocation is defined.* For every Chignik bound sockeye Igvak harvests, they get to harvest 15 percent more; for every sockeye SEDM harvests, Igvak fishermen get to harvest 15 percent more. Plain and simple, if any allocation overage happens, the result is increased harvests for Igvak. Related to but beyond this problem, is the simple fact that *the Cape Igvak Management Plan as written allows for a greater allocation to Igvak for sockeye salmon harvested before they ever even get into the Chignik Area* – the more Chignik bound sockeye that get intercepted (in SEDM & Igvak), the more Igvak fishermen get to intercept! The Board fixed this issue with the SEDM Salmon Management Plan in 2007. It is perfectly reasonable that the Board correct this issue with the Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan as well.

**PROPOSED BY:** Axel S. Kopun (EF-F16-078)  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 18.360. Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan.** Repeal the *Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan* and close commercial salmon fishing in the Cape Igvak Section through July 25, as follows:

The Board is requested to repeal the Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan in its entirety, and close the Cape Igvak Section to commercial salmon fishing through July 25.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan was established in 1978 as an interception fishery targeting Chignik-bound sockeye salmon. At the time Kodiak sockeye stocks were depressed, with Kodiak fishermen harvesting on average fewer than 500 thousand sockeye salmon annually in the 10 years prior to the implementation of the plan. In contrast, the two Chignik sockeye runs were healthy, and the Board decided Chignik fishermen should “share the wealth” with Kodiak. Not surprisingly, things have changed dramatically in Chignik and Kodiak since 1978.

Chignik has gone from supporting several shore-based processors to none, and we are almost solely dependent on our sockeye salmon fishery. There just aren’t any jobs available outside of fishing, our villages are losing residents and we are on the verge of losing our schools as well. Every sockeye lost to interception at Cape Igvak heavily impacts the well-being of the five Chignik villages.

Kodiak on the other hand, has several shore based processors, multiple fisheries in which fishermen can engage in, and a myriad of jobs available outside of fishing. Kodiak’s sockeye harvests have rebounded dramatically as well, with an average harvest of 2.2 million sockeye per year in the past 10 years, despite an average harvest of “only” 158, 607 sockeye at Igvak in the same time period. In fact, in 2015, according to the preliminary figures provided by ADF&G in a

report titled “2015 Alaska Commercial Salmon Harvests and Ex-vessel Values,” the Kodiak sockeye harvest was worth more than double that of Chignik (\$13.4 million vs. \$6.6 million), despite the fact the Igvak fishery only accounted for a sockeye harvest of under 7,000 sockeye total. According to the same report, the Kodiak pink salmon harvest provided an additional \$20+ million to Kodiak fishermen in 2015. It is clear that the Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan is not necessary to the success of the Kodiak salmon fishery.

**PROPOSED BY:** Michael Macaluso, spokesperson for Chignik Seiners Association  
(EF-F16-079)

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 18.360. Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan.** Reduce the Cape Igvak Section allocation from 15 percent to 7.5 percent of the total Chignik Area sockeye salmon catch, as follows:

5 AAC 18.360 (b) (c) Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan is amended to read:

The Department shall manage the fishery so that the number of sockeye salmon in the Cape Igvak Section by Area K fishermen shall approach as near as possible 7.5% [15%] the total Chignik sockeye salmon catch through July 25.

**What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?** The Cape Igvak Section fishery was established in 1978 as an allocation fishery on Chignik-bound sockeye salmon. At the time Kodiak sockeye stocks were depressed from over-fishing. The two Chignik runs were healthy, and it was deemed reasonable to ‘share the wealth’ with Kodiak, a measure of income redistribution which some now believe is quite fashionable or progressive. Things have changed dramatically at Chignik and Kodiak from the 1970’s. While Chignik’s two sockeye runs are still healthy, the Area L salmon fishery is not. Chignik has gone from supporting several shore-based processors to none now owing to economic conditions within the Chignik fishery. Unlike Kodiak, Chignik’s single industry, for all practical purposes, is salmon fishing. There are simply no jobs available, and our villages are losing residents.

When the Board assigned an allocation of Chignik sockeye salmon to the Igvak fishery in 1978 Kodiak had been harvesting less than 500 thousand sockeye salmon annually (avg. 1958-67: 437,000; avg. 1968-77: 494,000(ADF&G, Jackson et al. 2015)). Now according to ADF&G, Kodiak is averaging about 4.5 times that amount for the last 10-years (avg. 2006-15: 2.2 million sockeye harvest ( J. Jackson, 11/16/15)).

The Board is requested to roll-back the Cape Igvak allocation by 50%, from an allocation of 15% to 7.5%, a measure that would improve the Chignik salmon fishery and overall Chignik conditions. Chignik salmon fisherman have no hatcheries to draw upon, and our local pink and chum runs are not managed to provide economic sustainability as was well addressed at last year’s Board of Fisheries. Chignik salmon fishermen contribute 2% of their catch in a tax to support local management and safeguard fisheries habitat. This includes funding for an annual smolt study (to ADF&G), Black Lake and Chignik habitat monitoring (to FRI), and in-season stock separation genetics (to ADF&G). Chignik is battling for economic survival, and it has no options available

for supplemental salmon production similar to those as achieved in Kodiak. We believe that relief from the Cape Igvak Section fishery on Chignik bound sockeye salmon is quite reasonable to the degree proposed.

**PROPOSED BY:** George Anderson

(HQ-F16-042)

\*\*\*\*\*