

ACR 6

Provide the department emergency order authority to utilize time, area, methods and means or possession limits to restrict Kenai and Kasilof river personal use fisheries and require daily reporting of harvest in these fisheries (5 AAC 77.540, 5 AAC 21.360).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD. 5 AAC 77.540, 77.547, 21.363, 21.360

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM. Department should regulate and give guidance to fisheries managers in season to allow a reasonable opportunity to harvest Personal Use salmon in the Kenai and Kasilof Rivers with a realistic expectation that does not jeopardize the sustainability of the sockeye salmon resource and adheres to the precautionary principles that the department implements in the commercial and sport fisheries. Currently, the only management tools in the Kenai River is to extend the fishery to 24 hours or to close completely. Managers should be able to implement further "step down" measures adopted in 5 AAC 77.540 (c) (1) that will utilize; time, area, methods and means or possession limits to mirror the entry patterns of returning Kenai River sockeye stock and final escapement projections. Managers have very few tools to assess in-river harvests of PU or Sport caught salmon and are restricted to managing for a static number (OEG) that does not allow a reasonable precaution for conservation of the stocks and hinders other user by disproportionate burden sharing for sustainability. Closures in the PU fishery or sport fishery this year in the Kenai River may not have been necessary if other "step down" or "slowdown" measures/tools had been used. In season managers are not able to reasonably assess the success rates of individual PU and sport fishers in lesser sockeye return years and have only static plans in place that do not reflect actual catch or harvest when less concentrations of sockeye are entering or in the Kenai River. Managers should have more in season verifications or surveys to be used to allow a more orderly harvest or conservation measures for all users.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER? Language should reflect guidelines that for sockeye runs of less than 2.3 million to the Kenai River restrictions to; time, area, methods/means or possession limits. Areas could be further condensed, or boat fisheries could be restricted in time and area, bank fisheries could be restricted in time or area, numbers of fish allowed per day may be reduced. Verification of catch/harvest rates by PU or Sport fishers could be more immediate by an electronic system, similar to the commercial fisheries e-tickets or some other online reporting mechanism that would allow more expedient and efficient in season management of returning sockeye salmon stocks.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED ABOVE.

- a) **for a fishery conservation purpose or reason:** This proposal is a place holder for the Board of Fisheries to further their guidance in season for conservation purposes in what is now an inflexible and unequitable management plan.
- b) **to correct an error in regulation:**

- c) **to correct an effect on a fishery that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:**
The PU fishery was originally implemented to allow Alaska residents a "reasonable opportunity" and a "realistic expectation" to harvest salmon when abundant stocks are present. The current language on low productivity years on Kenai River sockeye returns have given this user group a de-facto priority over other users on sockeye runs of less than 2.3 million.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE? Continued reduction of reasonable fishing opportunities for other users and a continued unequitable conservation burden sharing amongst all user groups. Managers will still manage to a static management plan with no consideration for other "step-down" measures or tools to implement sustainability mandates while still offering access to abundance stocks in the present and future.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE. This proposal seeks to allow managers to have less concern about allocative issues and allows them to manage under sustained yield and development mandates.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE FISHERY THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR. We are primarily Alaskan residents who believe opportunity should be afforded the highest regard by following the principles or "high sustained yields".

STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF FISHERIES MEETING. There has been minor changes to the CI PU plan that have not reflected changes in run timing and changing biological conditions.

SUBMITTED BY: Paul Shadura