

PROPOSAL 70

5 AAC 06.200. Fishing districts and sections.

Extend the northern boundary in the Ugashik District, as follows:

Ugashik District: all waters south of a line from Cape Greig at 57°43.54' N. Lat., 157° 41.82' W. long to a point **THAT INTERSECTS WITH THE STATE WATERS 3 MILE BOUNDARY AT 57° 43.53' N. LAT., 157° 47.23' W. LONG., THEN EAST OF A LINE FROM 57° 43.53' N. LAT., 157° 47.23' W. LONG.,** to Cape Menshikof at 57° 28.34' N. Lat., 157° 55.84' W. long.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why?

In the Ugashik District of Bristol Bay, extend the northern boundary line at Cape Greig west to the 3 mile State water boundary.

Currently, the Ugashik District northern boundary at Cape Greig extends from the beach to “a point approximately 1 mile offshore at 57° 43.54 N. Lat., 157° 43.80 W. Long., then east of a line from 57°43.54 N. Lat., 157°43.80 W. Long., to Cape Menshikof at 57° 38.34 N. Lat., 157° 55.84 W. Long.

At high water, there is enough physical space for approximately 5-6 boats to deploy their nets on the north boundary line, in an orderly fashion. At low tide approximately 40% of that fishing area becomes inaccessible and chaos seems to develop by virtue of this physical compression. We see no need for this measure of constraint. One only has to look to:

Point #1 – The Outer Port Heiden northern boundary – **to the south of Ugashik** – which extends from the beach, westward to the State waters 3 mile boundary.

Point #2 – And, to the Egegik southern boundary – **to the north of Ugashik** – which also extends from the beach, westward to the State waters 3 mile boundary.

Both of these points serve as precedent and working examples of a more “orderly fishery,” which begs the question of the Board of Fisheries; *why isn't the Ugashik District afforded the same boundary determinations?*

Point #3 – Additionally, according to ADF&G test data, in the 2024 Egegik salmon fishery, it is reported that 1/3 of the total harvest from this district was made up of Ugashik area stocks.

Point #4 – In the Outer Port Heiden District, both WASSIP and University of Washington testing point to the overwhelming harvest of Ugashik area stocks.

Point #5 –These two districts seemingly enjoy harvesting Ugashik stocks but suffer no burden of escapement; that falls upon the registered Ugashik fleet, proper, who have recorded many days of closures and extremely short fishing windows while waiting for escapement. (In 2021, Ugashik did not receive a standard 12 hour opening until July 16th, just one day prior to the emergency order period being waived by regulation. This, in spite of the escapement goal of 1.4 million fish was completely overwhelmed by an actual 2.86 million!)

Point #6 – The prevailing thought at ADF&G is that Egegik interception of Ugashik stocks is just a normalized occurrence; something that is sort of built-in to their management strategy; certainly, no outrage or strategies to counter it. In fact, when Ugashik is struggling for escapement, the one and only tool that ADF&G managers have at their disposal is to pull Egegik in to the “110 Line” – a de facto admission that this is an ongoing event!

See 5AAC 06.359. In an attempt to conserve Ugashik bound stocks, should the Egegik district be redrawn to mirror the current Ugashik boundary?

Point #7 – Critics of this proposal will offer that any expansion of the Ugashik boundary could result in interception of Kvichak stocks. With little data to support such a claim, this becomes mere speculation.

This proposed boundary adjustment would increase the Ugashik fishing district by approximately 40% and allow the existing fleet an opportunity to harvest Ugashik area stocks **IN** the Ugashik District. Please note that this proposal does not seek to extend the southern boundary at Cape Menshikof out to 3 miles too. Rather, a modest expansion, as proposed, to afford the Ugashik fleet a bit more opportunity and elbow room.

Moreover, this proposal would also supplement the local tax base of Pilot Point by elevating the harvest of Ugashik bound fish in an area that is under their taxing authority.

Did you develop your proposal in coordination with others, or with your local Fish and Game Advisory Committee? Explain.

PROPOSED BY: Bristol Bay Reserve Association

(EF-F26-088)
