

Summary of Actions Alaska Board of Fisheries

SOUTHEAST and YAKUTAT FINFISH

January 22 – February 1, 2006

Ketchikan, Alaska

DESIGNATED REPORTERS: Scott Crass and Sherry Wright

This summary of actions is for information purposes only and is not intended to detail, reflect or fully interpret the reasons for the board's actions.

PROPOSAL NO. 81

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Create subsistence-only zone for Sitka Sound spawn-on-branches

DISCUSSION: The department discussed subsistence uses and potential impacts of commercial fisheries upon those uses. There was consideration of the recent location of fishery stocks. The Department of Law identified the need for caution with restricting subsistence opportunity. Examination of spawn distribution was compared to the areas of traditional harvest. The memorandum of agreement was examined as a procedural approach to keep the interested parties informed and recognized as a voluntary agreement. There was extended discussion on the methodology as well as the ability of the Sitka Tribe to advise on commercial harvest management actions. The board considered the possibility of federal management.

PROPOSAL NO. 82

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Add sac roe seine as alternate gear for Area 3-B

DISCUSSION: The board considered the ability to use gear that would bring the best economic value. The Department of Law noted this proposal requires CFEC action and the board of Fisheries does not have authority to reallocate to another limited entry gear group. The board also considered the potential that a small GHF would be difficult to manage.

PROPOSAL NO. 83

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Add sac roe seine as alternate gear for Area 3-B, equal shares of leftover GHF

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 82.

PROPOSAL NO. 84

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Change allocation to 50-50 between winter bait and spawn-on-kelp fisheries

DISCUSSION: The board referenced the similarities to Proposal 87.

PROPOSAL NO. 85

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Change allocation to 50-50 between winter bait and spawn-on-kelp fisheries

DISCUSSION: The board discussed a fixed allocation for the purpose of allowing herring pounders to know in advance that they will have a fishery and have time to plan accordingly. The department determined that the GHL for this area is fully utilized.

PROPOSAL NO. 86

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Change GHL percentage to 25-75 for Area 3-B winter bait and spawn-on-kelp fisheries

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken of Proposal 111.

PROPOSAL NO. 87

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Change allocation to 45-45-10 among winter bait, spawn-on-kelp and bait pound fisheries

DISCUSSION: The board examined herring pounders desire for a fixed allocation so that they will know in advance that they will have a fishery and have time to plan accordingly. There was discussion of the present operation waiting until the bait fishery is over to know if they will have any quota available. The board determined the GHL for this area is fully utilized. The board discussed the current net depth and its impact on the winter bait fishery as well as the historical execution of this fishery.

PROPOSAL NO. 88

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allocate 10 percent of Sitka Sound GHL to northern Southeast spawn-on-kelp fishery

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the allocative nature of this proposal as well as the economic importance and impact of this fishery.

PROPOSAL NO. 89

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Reduce maximum harvest rates from 20 to 10 percent

DISCUSSION: The board examined information available that suggests marine mammals are having food availability problems; the department stated that herring harvest rates in British Columbia and Washington State are generally established at a fixed 20 percent harvest rate, and the department's sliding scale of 10-20 percent is considered more conservative. The board also examined current stock management data, and concluded the current management plan is working well.

PROPOSAL NO. 90

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Refer to maximum sustainable "resource" when considering closed areas

DISCUSSION: The board took no action due to desire of the author to withdraw.

PROPOSAL NO. 91

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Designate Section 1-E/1-F sac roe fishery a set gillnet only fishery

DISCUSSION: Concerns were raised that this proposal would unfairly eliminate the potential seine fishery in West Behm Canal.

PROPOSAL NO. 92

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Divide the GHL equally, allow consolidation of permits, and require participation of all permit holders in section 1E/1F sac roe fishery

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 101.

PROPOSAL NO. 93

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Clarify which gear group fishes under alternating gear schedule

DISCUSSION: The department stated that this proposal clarifies that gear groups will alternate between fisheries and not calendar years.

PROPOSAL NO. 94

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Establish commercial closed waters in Section 1-F

DISCUSSION: The board reviewed the idea that closing the area to commercial herring harvest would protect the herring from over harvest until herring movement in the area is addressed. The board noted that calling this area a “sanctuary” has implications not considered by the proponent. The department stated that although herring have been spawning in non-state waters for the past several years, it is expected that in the future herring would return to spawning in state waters and industry would like an opportunity to harvest those herring at that time. The board also discussed the historical makeup of the fishery.

PROPOSAL NO. 95

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Establish commercial closed waters in Section 1-E (West Behm Canal)

DISCUSSION: The board discussed biological data needs regarding herring movement in the Ketchikan area. The board discussed the idea that West Behm Canal historically has never had a stock capable of a commercial fishery as well as concerns about declines in weight at age. The board considered the possibility that fish movement back into the areas may allow for a potential commercial fishery in the future. The board noted the threshold is considered to be at a conservative level.

PROPOSAL NO. 96

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Establish commercial closed waters in sections 1-E and 1-F

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 95.

PROPOSAL NO. 97

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Repeal all references to herring fisheries in sections 1-E and 1-F

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 95.

PROPOSAL NO. 98

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Clarify fish ticket reporting requirements for seine herring openings

DISCUSSION: The board discussed purse seiner statements that this proposal would allow them to unload fish and return immediately to continue participation in the fast paced Sitka Sound herring fishery. The board also discussed legal and enforcement concerns that a fish ticket is a legal document that states who purchased the fish. If a 30 minute interval were allowed between fish transfer and fish ticket completion, it would impose a different level of enforcement difficulties.

PROPOSAL NO. 99

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Allow vessel 75 fathoms with two permit holders onboard

AMENDMENTS: Amendments were made to provide for permit holders to concurrently fish from the same vessel and jointly operate up to 75 fathoms of set gillnet gear under specific requirements. When two permit holders jointly operate gear each permit holder must be onboard the fishing vessel and both are responsible for ensuring that the entire unit of gear is operated in a lawful manner.

DISCUSSION: Department staff stated that this will most likely not change catch rates. The board noted similar action was taken in Bristol Bay where it worked well. The board also discussed potential impacts on crewmen.

PROPOSAL NO. 100

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Equal shares for sac roe seine

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 102.

PROPOSAL NO. 101

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Equal shares for sac roe seine

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the execution of permit stacking as well as economic and biological considerations. The board considered the size of the fishery and the understanding by the department of volunteer cooperation of participants.

PROPOSAL NO. 102

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Equal shares for sac roe seine

DISCUSSION: The department explained that it cannot manage both an equal share and competitive fishery simultaneously. The Department of Law advised that the board has authority to adopt equal shares but not the authority to regulate cooperation, i.e. right to contract. The board considered the possibility that implementing a fishery based on equal shares could improve freshness of fish; slow the pace of the fishery; provide a safer fishery; increase roe percentage of fishery; target less desirable areas; reduce insurance costs; reduce incidents of lawsuits; and reduce capital expenses. The board discussed reduced income for permit holders that consistently harvest above the average. It noted that this is a well managed, lucrative fishery with high permit values. The board cautioned against making changes that would lead to shares being purchased by non-participant investors.

PROPOSAL NO. 103

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Modify kelp allocation table for double-permit closed pounds

DISCUSSION: The board discussed a possible increase in production at higher GHGs and increased incentives to double up on herring pounds, which would likely reduce the amount of herring utilized.

PROPOSAL NO. 104

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Modify spawn-on-kelp pound definition to simply 12,000 cubic feet

AMENDMENTS: A closed pound must be rectangular and may not exceed 800 square feet in area. Specifications were made correlating the maximum depth with the surface square footage.

DISCUSSION: The board examined concerns regarding regulatory language specifying the measurement of pounds. The board examined means reduce loss and improve product quality.

PROPOSAL NO. 105**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Modify spawn-on-kelp pound definition to simply 12,000 cubic feet**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 104.**PROPOSAL NO. 106****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Allow double pound 2,000 blades if GHl is greater than 700 tons**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed an expected reduction in herring use and increase in product amount and quality.**PROPOSAL NO. 107****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Modify fishing boundary for Area 3-B spawn-on-kelp**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed access to other areas where fish congregate and spawn, providing greater opportunity for a successful commercial fishery; reducing fish transport to pounds and increase product quality in some years. The board also examined the possibility that this would allow protection from weather for placement of herring pounds. The department voiced concerns potential negative affects on a significant subsistence harvest in the area as it may conflict with vessel traffic.**PROPOSAL NO. 108****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Modify kelp allocation to increase kelp blade allocation for Area 3-B**AMENDMENTS:** 600-799 tons: 300 blades. 800-999 tons: 400 blades. 1000 or more tons: 600 blades.**DISCUSSION:** The board examined the possibility of increased product quality. Conservation issues were also examined by the board.**PROPOSAL NO. 109****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Modify fishing boundary for Area 3-B spawn-on-kelp**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 107.**PROPOSAL NO. 110****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Count spawn mileage on pound nets in GHl calculation**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the herring pounders' desire to have the eggs on the herring pound nets accounted for in the forecast. The department's estimate of spawning biomass currently accounts for the fish rather than the eggs that are utilized in the herring pound fishery; to include both in estimates would be double counting; the requirement for leaving the net in place is to optimize egg survival, which has no bearing on estimates of biomass or forecasts but does potentially increase recruitment in future years.**PROPOSAL NO. 111****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Modify multiple pound definitions**DISCUSSION:** The board determined this would participation in both herring pound fisheries in Southern Southeast and Northern Southeast at the same time. The department stated that there may be problems if two units of gear are used with only one permit holder because a permit holder must be present during operation of a pound. Department of Public Safety voiced concerns with crew members operating pound inappropriately.

PROPOSAL NO. 112**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify that kelp allocation is per permit holder**DISCUSSION:** The board considered this a technical correction.**PROPOSAL NO. 113****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify that the permit holder is liable for operation of the pound**DISCUSSION:** The board concluded this proposal would help enforcement by having permit holder at site. The department viewed this as a technical clarification.**PROPOSAL NO. 114****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify spawn-on-kelp pound marking requirements**DISCUSSION:** The department noted that a vertical sign would help with enforcement and in-season management and that it was safer to not approach herring pounds due potential damage to nets and entanglement. The board examined the possibility that a vertical sign was unsafe or that it could get in the way while working on a pound.**PROPOSAL NO. 115****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify spawn-on-kelp fishery pound configurations**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that this proposal standardizes what is currently done under emergency order authority.**PROPOSAL NO. 116****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify spawn-on-kelp reporting requirements**DISCUSSION:** The board considers this a technical correction.**PROPOSAL NO. 117****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify seine specifications to a maximum depth of 2,125 meshes for District 12**DISCUSSION:** The board access to fish which have been below accessible depths using currently allowable gear. The board considered the potential of less GHL remaining for the SOK fishery as well as the potential to exceed quotas in years with small GHs. The board considered the history of the fishery as well as economic considerations.**PROPOSAL NO. 118****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Review amount necessary for subsistence determinations for salmon in Southeast Alaska**AMENDMENTS:** For the Yakutat Area (5,800 to 7,832 salmon). For the Southeastern Alaska Area, Districts 1 through 4 (9,068 to 17,503); Districts 5 through 8, Section 9-B and District 10 (4,120 to 7,345); Section 9-A and District 13 (10,487 to 20,225); Districts 11, 12, 14 and 16 (4,178 to 10,133); and District 15 (7,174 to 10,414).**DISCUSSION:** The board reviewed data on the amount necessary for subsistence from both personal use and subsistence harvest activities. The board acted to revise the amounts needed to meet subsistence needs.

PROPOSAL NO. 119**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Create state-managed subsistence fishery on Stikine River**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action due to concerns with the Pacific Salmon Treaty.**PROPOSAL NO. 120****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Add archery as legal gear type**DISCUSSION:** The board noted the lack of a customary and traditional pattern of use of archery gear. The board also noted the lack of public support for making this change.**PROPOSAL NO. 121****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Open sport fishing in Chilkat Inlet north of Letnikof Cove boat ramp when the projected in-river run to the Chilkat River is high**DISCUSSION:** The department noted that predictive models for Chilkat king salmon returns are not very accurate and that commercial and subsistence gear groups that historically utilized these stocks should not be excluded from the management plan.**PROPOSAL NO. 122****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Increase bag, possession, and annual limits for king salmon in Chilkat Inlet north of Seduction Point during years of high projected returns**DISCUSSION:** The department already has this authority based on the newly adopted management plan.**PROPOSAL NO. 123****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Develop king salmon management plan for District 11**AMENDMENTS:** Defined the time and area for the troll fishery, added new area for the gillnet fishery, moved the western line back to the traditional line from Point Arden to Point Bishop and defined the sport fishery harvest levels. Weekly fishing periods were specified and bag and possession limits were specified.**DISCUSSION:** This allows directed fisheries to harvest king salmon in excess of the escapement needs. The board found this provided the best opportunity for a comprehensive management plan and a reasonable harvest opportunity. Changes were warranted from the emergency regulations used last year. The board sought to make regulations that would provide consistency with board action in District 8.**PROPOSAL NO. 124****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Develop king salmon management plan for District 11**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 123.**PROPOSAL NO. 125****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow spring troll fishery in Section 11-A, B, and C during directed fisheries**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 123.**PROPOSAL NO. 126****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Develop king salmon management plan for District 8**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 127.

PROPOSAL NO. 127**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Establish abundance-based management plan for fisheries targeting Stikine River king salmon in District 8**AMENDMENTS:** This management plan contained numerous specific elements.**DISCUSSION:** This proposal creates directed fisheries to harvest king salmon in excess of escapement needs. The board considered 24 consensus items from the Stikine King Salmon Workgroup. The board noted that any necessary adjustments can be made next cycle. The board attempted to strike a balance between the user groups, taking into account gear efficiency. Sport fishermen were concerned with the interception of Crystal Lake hatchery king salmon by trollers in District 8A. The board was concerned with harvest of hatchery king salmon and problems with the harvest sharing arrangement in the Crystal Lake Management Plan if this area is open to spring trolling. The department can close by executive order, if needed. An estimated 45 percent of the Petersburg sport fishing effort in 2005 was in the Woodpecker Cove area. The board heard from sport fishing charter operators that they need an annual limit of 6 king salmon because they usually sell 3-day packages and need an annual limit divisible by two. Variable annual limits were seen as unenforceable.**PROPOSAL NO. 128****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Establish harvest limits in District 8 during years of high abundance of Stikine River Chinook**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 127.**PROPOSAL NO. 129****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Manage spring troll and driftnet fisheries for concurrent openings**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 127.**PROPOSAL NO. 130****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Relax drift gillnet mesh restriction regulation for District 8**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 127.**PROPOSAL NO. 131****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Change opening date for District 8 drift gillnet fishery to first Monday in May**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 127.**PROPOSAL NO. 132****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Adopt mesh restrictions in drift gillnet fisheries to protect steelhead**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 127.**PROPOSAL NO. 133****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Manage spring troll fisheries in District 8 for Alaska hatchery fish**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 127.**PROPOSAL NO. 134****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow spring troll fishery in all of District 8 during directed fisheries**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 127.

PROPOSAL NO. 135**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Modify allocation between commercial and sport users in District 6**DISCUSSION:** The board heard that this proposal would decrease the sport allocation in years when the return exceeds 1,000 fish. It noted concern with the harvest of hatchery fish and problems with the harvest sharing arrangement in the Crystal Lake Management Plan.**PROPOSAL NO. 136****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Change king salmon allocation percentage from 80-20 to 50-50**DISCUSSION:** The board concluded the 80-20 allocation was equitable and that an increased allocation would have benefited nonresidents more than residents. Sport fishery harvest is not meeting its current allocation.**PROPOSAL NO. 137****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify drift gillnet king salmon allocation from fixed 7,600 to 2.9 percent all gear**DISCUSSION:** Gillnetters are the only gear group with a set cap for their allocation of Pacific Salmon Treaty king salmon. A percentage would be abundance-based and aligns gillnetters with the other gear groups.**PROPOSAL NO. 138****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Increase the sport allocation of Chinook salmon from 20 to 30 percent**DISCUSSION:** This proposal was similar to Proposal 136. Sport fishery harvest is not meeting its current allocation.**PROPOSAL NO. 139****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Provide a sliding Chinook allocation based on abundance for sport and troll fisheries**DISCUSSION:** The Pacific Salmon Treaty has no provisions to “bank” fish from a previous year for harvest the following year. It would reallocate the troll fishery to the sport fishery.**PROPOSAL NO. 140****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Specify application of sport overage/underage in allocation each year**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 139.**PROPOSAL NO. 141****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Liberalize sport fishery for Chinook in May or June when sport fishery underage occurs in the prior year**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 139.**PROPOSAL NO. 142****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Liberalize sport fishery for Chinook in May or June when sport fishery underage occurs in the prior year**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 139.

PROPOSAL NO. 143**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Allow anglers the use of two rods in the winter during years of high Chinook abundance or when a sport fishery underage exists**DISCUSSION:** The department noted the Pacific Salmon Treaty has no provisions to “bank” fish from previous years. It would be difficult to enforce unless the use of two rod was applied to all sport fish species.**PROPOSAL NO. 144****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Repeal nonresident annual limit, and during years of high abundance, allow bag limit of two Chinook salmon in May**AMENDMENTS:****DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 145.**PROPOSAL NO. 145****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Liberalize sport regulations for Chinook salmon during years of high abundance**AMENDMENTS:** When the king salmon abundance index is greater than 1.5 the commissioner shall, by emergency order, implement the following management measures in prioritized order: (1) at an abundance index of 1.51 to 1.75: resident bag limit of 3 fish and the use of 2 rods per angler during October through March; and nonresident bag limit of 2 fish in May, and 1 fish for the remainder of the year, and an annual limit of 4, but no more than 5, fish for the entire season. (2) at an abundance index of 1.76 to 2.0: resident bag limit of 3 fish and the use of 2 rods per angler during October through March; and nonresident bag limit of 2 fish in May, and 1 fish for the remainder of the year, and an annual limit of 5, but no more than 6, fish for the entire season. (3) at an abundance index greater than 2.0: resident bag limit of 3 fish and the use of 2 rods per angler during October through March; and nonresident bag limit of 2 fish in May and June, and 1 fish for the remainder of the year, and an annual limit of 6 fish for the entire season.**DISCUSSION:** The board supported this action because it would facilitate harvesting Alaska’s entire Pacific Salmon Treaty quota.**PROPOSAL NO. 146****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Repeal nonresident annual limit, and during years of high abundance, allow bag limit of two Chinook salmon**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 145.**PROPOSAL NO. 147****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Repeal nonresident annual limit, and during years of high abundance, allow bag limit of two Chinook salmon**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 145.**PROPOSAL NO. 148****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Repeal nonresident annual limit, and during years of high abundance, allow bag limit of two Chinook salmon in May**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 145.**PROPOSAL NO. 149****ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Increase the nonresident annual limit for Chinook salmon to four during years of high abundance

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 145.

PROPOSAL NO. 150

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Repeal nonresident annual limit for Chinook salmon

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 145.

PROPOSAL NO. 151

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Increase nonresident annual limit for Chinook salmon

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 145.

PROPOSAL NO. 152

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Establish Chinook salmon possession limits for all anglers equal to the annual limit for nonresidents

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 201.

PROPOSAL NO. 153

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Allow charter operators and crew to retain king salmon

DISCUSSION: The board took no action on this proposal because the topic is scheduled to be addressed at the Board of Fisheries meeting in March 2006.

PROPOSAL NO. 154

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Increase resident and nonresident bag limits for Chinook salmon in the Ketchikan area at the start of statistical week 20

DISCUSSION: The board heard that no other areas that have a high abundance of hatchery produced king salmon are funded by sport fish money, and that mixed stocks, including potential 33 percent Pacific Salmon Treaty fish, are in the area during this time period.

PROPOSAL NO. 155

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Reduce hatchery production of pink and chum salmon in Southeast Alaska by at least 50 percent of the 2003 production

DISCUSSION: There department stated that there is little or no correlation between high hatchery releases and small wild stock returns. The board noted a restriction of this magnitude would likely be detrimental to commercial fishing. The actions of previous boards were also considered along with the authority of the board to control hatchery production.

PROPOSAL NO. 156

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Establish corridor hatchery chum salmon fisheries in District 8

DISCUSSION: The board took no action due to the author's desire to withdraw.

PROPOSAL NO. 157

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Establish troll/net allocation objectives for chum and sockeye salmon

DISCUSSION: The board examined the fact that this proposal may limit the different gear groups' ability to harvest chum and sockeye salmon beyond their historic levels.

The department felt it may be difficult to put into regulation. The board discussed potential disruption to people when they are out on the water fishing.

PROPOSAL NO. 158**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Allow drift gillnet fishing in spring troll areas in District 8 when there are no directed king salmon fisheries

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the possibility that opening of gillnet areas in District 8 could potentially affect areas set up for spring troll and that catching salmon earlier in the fishery could potentially affect fishing time for other gillnet fisheries in Southeast Alaska because fish caught at this time would count toward the 7,600 king salmon cap. The board noted the author's desire to withdraw the proposal and took no action.

PROPOSAL NO. 159**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Modify the boundaries in the Neets Bay Hatchery Management Plan

AMENDMENTS: 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.

DISCUSSION: The board discussed effective management to harvest summer chum salmon returning to Neets Bay. The current makeup of the surrounding fisheries was explained by the department.

PROPOSAL NO. 160**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Nakat Inlet hatchery management plan for gillnet and troll harvest

DISCUSSION: The board recognized the considerable public input leading up to this step. The board discussed the gillnet and troll fleet having the Nakat SHA as an exclusive area and the purse seine fleet having Kendrick Bay as an exclusive area. It considered whether gillnetters would receive more than the allotted percent allocation of enhanced fish in years to come. The Department of Law indicated a legal deference of hatchery management plans.

PROPOSAL NO. 161**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Require the RPT to determine amount of enhanced fish harvested in the common property fisheries by hatchery associations

DISCUSSION: The board noted that in Southeast Alaska there is already a RPT in place to address hatchery allocation issues and while this proposal allows more local input into hatchery cost recovery operations. The board questioned the repercussions for hatcheries that do not prove they meet production goals. The board noted hatchery returns are not certain and that smaller hatcheries lack the resources to conduct these types of studies.

PROPOSAL NO. 162**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Modify Deep Inlet Management Plan to address early king salmon fisheries

AMENDMENTS: From May 1-May 21 the waters described in (b) of this section will be closed west of 135° 21.52' W. longitude.

DISCUSSION: Discussion was whether to maintain the 2:1 ratio of gillnet to seine under the current management plan, since there has been no participation by seiners in recent years prior to mid-June. The seine fleet believes this may be a good opportunity for the gillnet fleet to offset some of the lost revenue that may arise from a reduced Taku/Stikine Chinook directed fishery. The board considered that modifications to the Deep Inlet THA could be made to maintain traditional troll fishing opportunity during the May period.

PROPOSAL NO. 163**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Increase time and area allowed for chum salmon cost recovery**DISCUSSION:** The board examined the idea that the cost recovery fishery would take less time allowing more time for the rotational fishery as well as the possibility the seiners may be displaced by the special harvest area.**PROPOSAL NO. 164****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify Hidden Falls THA Management Plan**DISCUSSION:** The board felt this was a housekeeping proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 165****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Allow minimum mesh restriction during king salmon fishery in Deep Inlet**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed using mesh restrictions to reduce the incidental harvest of local wild sockeye in this newly established hatchery fishery.**PROPOSAL NO. 166****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Open the traditional drift gillnet fisheries by emergency order**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that gillnetters thought their ability to start earlier in the day would allow delivery of better quality fish to the processors whereas the seiners thought this would create a conflict between gear groups. The department suggested that this proposal could improve fish quality and the economic efficiency of the fishery without jeopardizing sustainability.**PROPOSAL NO. 167****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Reduce the sockeye salmon cap for Hawk Inlet purse seine fishery to 10,000 total**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 170**PROPOSAL NO. 168****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Repeal 58 foot salmon purse seine vessel length limit**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed whether individual fishermen would have the ability to pack more fish thus enabling them to stay on the grounds longer and alleviate tender concerns. The department noted that as the world market changes this may better allow seine fishermen to produce value added products. The board noted that the potential for a larger vessel to fish in more inclement weather in District 4 may pose some management concerns with treaty fish; however, the department stated it could still effectively manage the fishery. The board elected not to adopt this region-wide approach.

PROPOSAL NO. 169**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Require first 4,000 sockeye harvested in Hidden Falls THA be donated to Angoon and Kake

DISCUSSION: The Department of Law advised the board that it can only allocate the opportunity to harvest but that it does not have the authority to transfer ownership. The board noted commercial fishermen could voluntarily choose to donate fish. The board invited the local fish and game advisory committee to develop recommendations to address local needs.

PROPOSAL NO. 170**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Modify sockeye salmon cap for Hawk Inlet purse seine fishery (exclude hatchery fish)

DISCUSSION: The board examined concerns of purse seine permit holders and an agreement that enhanced sockeye salmon should not count towards their cap of sockeye salmon under the Northern Southeast Seine Salmon Fishery Management Plan. The board noted Alaska's position within the Pacific Salmon Commission which is that enhanced fish should not count towards a hard cap. The board noted that gillnetters would have more salmon available to harvest in Districts 11 and 15 as more fish would pass through to the inside waters. The department was concerned that the management of the Hawk Inlet fishery should be consistent with management of other fisheries in the region and with policies in regulation. The board discussed the current cap, possible adjustments, and the feasibility of in-season management.

PROPOSAL NO. 171**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Allow use of downriggers and increase number of rods used by hand trollers

AMENDMENTS: Modified provisions for use of downriggers and specified seasonality of changes.

DISCUSSION: The board discussed being allowed to have extra gear (poles) on board increasing the efficiency in the change-over of gear between fisheries. The board noted that hand trollers would have more opportunity with the use of two rods on two down riggers. The department stated the PSC treaty specifies that fishing techniques should be frozen so that incidental mortality is not increased. The Department of Public Safety noted that charter clients may go onboard hand trollers with a crew member license and have no limit on the amount of king salmon they can catch and retain, and if the fish are not sold there would be no record of the harvest.

PROPOSAL NO. 172**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Allow use of downriggers and increase number of rods used by hand trollers

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 171.

PROPOSAL NO. 173**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Allow use of downriggers and increase number of rods used by hand trollers

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 171.

PROPOSAL NO. 174**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Allow use of downriggers on a hand troll vessel

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 171.

PROPOSAL NO. 175

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Increase number of gurdies allowed on hand troll vessels west of Cape Spencer

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the reduction in the number of hand troll permits. The board also examined the hand troll harvest 80/20 split. The board considered the allocative nature of this proposal due to increased effectiveness in the hand troll fleet.

PROPOSAL NO. 176

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Require barbless hooks in commercial troll fishery

DISCUSSION: The department explained that the use of barbless hooks could decrease incidental mortality but the drop-off mortality could increase and negate positive effort of barbless hooks. The net result of barbless hooks is not known at this time.

PROPOSAL NO. 177

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Increase hand troll gurdies from two to four

DISCUSSION: The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 175.

PROPOSAL NO. 178

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Require Chinook be offloaded between winter/spring and summer/winter fisheries

AMENDMENT: A person that participates in the winter salmon troll fishery must offload all fish from the person's vessel before participating in the spring salmon troll fishery.

A person that participates in the summer salmon troll fishery must offload all fish from the person's vessel before participating in the winter salmon troll fishery.

DISCUSSION: The board noted this proposal allows for the department to have better accounting of the harvest.

PROPOSAL NO. 179

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Limit spring troll areas to those in 2002

DISCUSSION: The board noted that commercial gear groups are not the only ones paying for hatcheries. The department stated that conducting task force meetings would be both expensive and time consuming while the department already conducts public meetings each spring to discuss troll fisheries. The department explained its need of flexibility to try new spring areas to target Alaska hatchery kings.

PROPOSAL NO. 180

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Establish spring troll fishery in Yakutat

AMENDMENTS: During May and June in the waters of Yakutat Bay east of a line from Point Manby to Ocean Cape, a spring troll fishery may be allowed during one day each week with a maximum season harvest of 1,000 king salmon. Manage the commercial set gillnet fisheries in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River based on sockeye run strength. Increase allowable gear in the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River set gillnet fisheries to include one net, not to exceed 20 fathoms, with a mesh size no less than seven and one-half inches and no more than 45 meshes deep for the directed taking of

king salmon during periods both open and closed to the retention of sockeye. **DISCUSSION:** The board noted that conducting a fishery and sampling harvest would allow department to assess presence of Alaska hatchery fish in Yakutat Bay. Department protection of local wild stocks has been considered by allowing this fishery only in years when the projected return to the Situk River exceeds a certain level. The board discussed the limiting the total harvest to 1,000 kings although it is likely that 1,000 will not be caught. The department felt that fishing effort is likely to remain local since fishery would be open only one day per week.

PROPOSAL NO. 181**ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Establish criteria for combining spring troll fishing areas**AMENDMENTS:** The commissioner may by emergency order combine two or more adjacent spring fishery areas and combine the associated non-Alaska hatchery harvest caps if each of the fisheries have Alaska hatchery compositions of 25 percent or greater for three or more consecutive seasons.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated that this proposal simplifies management of spring fisheries for the department by reducing number of fisheries that area managed individually. The board discussed the idea that this proposal allows a combination of spring areas with provisions for increasing the allowable catch of treaty kings above what is allowed in a single spring area. The board also discussed the ability for trollers to avoid the need to offload when changing areas.**PROPOSAL NO. 182****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Modify spring troll Alaska hatchery percentages**AMENDMENTS:** No more than 1,000 non-Alaska hatchery-produced salmon may be taken in a fishery if the percentage of Alaska hatchery-produced salmon taken in that fishery is less than 25 percent of the king salmon taken in that fishery. No more than 2,000 non-Alaska hatchery-produced salmon may be taken in a fishery if the percentage of Alaska hatchery-produced salmon taken in that fishery is at least 25 percent but less than 35 percent of the king salmon taken in that fishery. No more than 3,000 non-Alaska hatchery-produced salmon may be taken in a fishery if the percentage of Alaska hatchery-produced salmon taken in that fishery is at least 35 percent but less than 50 percent of the king salmon taken in that fishery. No more than 5,000 non-Alaska hatchery-produced salmon may be taken in a fishery if the percentage of Alaska hatchery-produced salmon taken in that fishery is at least 50 percent but less than 66 percent of the king salmon taken in that fishery. There is no limit on the number of non-Alaska hatchery-produced salmon that may be taken in a fishery if the percentage of Alaska hatchery-produced salmon taken in that fishery is 66 percent or more of the king salmon taken in that fishery.**DISCUSSION:** The department stated by adding more levels, it would have more flexibility in managing the fishery, and reduce the risk of exceeding treaty caps. The board discussed the possibility of increasing hatchery catch of fish for commercial or sport fishermen and noted that trollers were in support of proposal.**PROPOSAL NO. 183****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Change pink/chum fishery opening date from June 29 to 30**AMENDMENTS:** In Cross Sound, in the waters of Section 14-A west of the longitude of Point Dundas, south of the latitude of Point Dundas and east of the longitude of the

southern tip of Taylor Island to 58°10'N. lat., then east to Althorp Light, then north to the light at the entrance to Elfin Cove, pink and chum salmon may be taken from Monday through Friday each week beginning on the second Monday in June through June 30 or until 500 king salmon are taken, whichever occurs first.

DISCUSSION: The board considered this action a technical adjustment to the regulations.

PROPOSAL NO. 184

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Modify definition of high abundance waters

AMENDMENTS: Waters off the west coast of Yakobi Island between the latitude of Yakobi Rock at 58°05' N. latitude and the latitude of Cape Cross at 57°55' N. latitude, to a distance of one mile from the main shoreline of Yakobi Island.

DISCUSSION: The board discussed adjustment to allow room for trollers to keep out of high traffic areas and simplify the boundary description by eliminating fraction in GPS coordinates. The board noted that the change is small, moving line south about one-third of a mile south of current location.

PROPOSAL NO. 185

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify summer catch allocation percentage from 70-30 to 60-40

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the intent, which was to eliminate spikes in harvest and provide a more consistent supply of fish to market. The board determined this proposal to be allocative in nature in that it allocates kings to trollers fishing in northern part of region, where catch rates tend to be more stable throughout summer. The department stated king catch rates in southern outside waters are best early in season. The board concluded that this proposal would not be good for the fleet internally because of difference in the northern and southern fleet and noted strong opposition within fleet. The board also acknowledged the possibility that the fleet may not catch entire king quota in a second opening if king abundance is low. The board noted stress among the fleet with the current allocation and that a 60/40 split would cause further stress.

PROPOSAL NO. 186

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify summer troll fishing periods in 108-10 to seven days per week

DISCUSSION: The board discussed the higher chum release in Anita Bay and noted that there is no troll rotation in Anita Bay. The department stated that 100 percent of Anita Bay chum is marked so it may be identified. The board discussed the fact that chum troll gear is species specific, that troll participation would most likely be minimal, and that trollers would like time in District 8 without gillnetters. The board noted that the boost from 8 million to 22 million released in Anita Bay was done from SSRAA internal funding and that Neets Bay has a 200,000 chum cap for trollers. The board discussed the gillnetting opening 2-3 days a week during the sockeye fishery in July while trollers get the same time and area, which the board recognized creates difficulties. The board noted that the USAG withdrew their support for Proposal 156 which was a similar proposal for gillnetters.

PROPOSAL NO. 187

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Change summer troll fishing opening date from July 1 to mid-July or August 1

DISCUSSION: The board determined that this was an allocative proposal. The board considered recent king harvest data which shows troll incidental mortality is lower than what the model predicted. The board compared this to sport incidental mortality which is higher.

PROPOSAL NO. 188

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Change summer troll fishing closure date from September 20 to 30

DISCUSSION: The department noted that the observed coho runs have shifted later in recent years, and those later runs are larger coho that are worth more. Since 1994 the fishery has been extended to September 30 eight times, however the department stated extensions are easier to justify than closures. The department found that the current system was working fine. Data was discussed showing trollers taking 75 percent of coho in 2005 and gillnet and troll catches both being within 3 percent of the current allocation.

PROPOSAL NO. 189

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow hatchery coho troll fishery in Behm Canal through October 7

DISCUSSION: The board considered the current Coho area and the success rate of the current fleet. The board discussed the fact that 97 percent of Neets coho are caught in the common property fisheries and the percent of Neets Bay coho in the common property fisheries ranges between 40 percent and in the high nineties. The board was informed that in some years, broodstock could be an issue; typically broodstock comes from the Whitman Lake Hatchery but in some years broodstock is taken from Neets Bay. The department observed that the wild stocks would be impacted by this fishery. The board discussed the departmental authority to expand the fishery by emergency order.

PROPOSAL NO. 190

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Expand troll boundary from Cape Suckling to Cape St. Elias

DISCUSSION: The department expressed concerns over treaty ramifications. The board discussed the troll effort, which is greatest in late summer and fall. The board noted that moving to a safe anchorage was an important issue.

PROPOSAL NO. 191

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify winter troll harvest guideline accounting for Alaska hatchery fish and add-on

DISCUSSION: The board heard that king salmon sell for a significantly higher price in the winter fishery. The board noted that adding Alaska hatchery component to winter harvest would increase total winter harvest which would leave fewer kings to harvest in summer fishery and may increase incidental mortality due in an increased number of king non-retention days. The board discussed value increase for winter kings which may be similar to combined value of summer kings and coho. The board noted this proposal could cause less fishing days in the summer fishery.

PROPOSAL NO. 192

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Expand winter troll season in District 11

DISCUSSION: The board felt this proposal could be allocative between troll and gillnet fleets. The board also noted the kings harvested in Taku could count towards Taku

allowable catch since there are no time constraints for the Taku River king allowable catch.

PROPOSAL NO. 193**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Close Situk setnet fishery September 30**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that there are no conservation concerns for coho or steelhead in this area. The subsistence needs in the area were also discussed by the board.**PROPOSAL NO. 194****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Change opening day from Monday to Sunday**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the possibility that this proposal could improve fish quality and the economics of the fishery without jeopardizing the sustainability of the resource. The department had taken this action by executive order in 2004 and 2005, and conveyed this information to the board.**PROPOSAL NO. 195****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Expand open fishing periods**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the possibility that this proposal could improve fish quality and the economics of the fishery without jeopardizing the sustainability of the resource. The department had taken this action by executive order in 2004 and 2005, and conveyed this information to the board.**PROPOSAL NO. 196****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Manage the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River setnet fisheries based on sockeye run strength and increase allowable gear**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the proposal allowing Chinook salmon harvest on the Situk-Ahrnklin Inlet and Lost River in years that the abundance supports a fishery. The board noted the substitute language makes this proposal identical to Proposal 180 and therefore decided to take no action.**PROPOSAL NO. 197****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify Alsek fishery opening date for king salmon with Pacific Salmon Commission approval**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the fact that currently the PSC is working towards an agreement to hold this fishery, and noted that this agreement will have regulations in place to support this fishery once it is established by the PSC.**PROPOSAL NO. 198****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Require all CFEC permit holders to report the number of steelhead trout taken but not sold in Southeast Alaska and Yakutat.**AMENDMENTS:** Include king salmon over 28 inches by Commissioner's emergency order.**DISCUSSION:** The board addressed its ability to require all salmon species harvested in commercial harvest used for personal use to be reported on fish tickets and the intent of this proposal which is to provide for accountability of harvested salmon, not for the purpose of collecting fish taxes.

PROPOSAL NO. 199**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Increase the bag limit for coho salmon in Southeast Alaska to ten per day

DISCUSSION: The current bag limits are adequate and at times are not achieved. Even though coho stocks in Southeast Alaska are healthy, this would increase harvest by approximately 14,000 coho, which the board did not consider an adequate surplus. The board cautioned against the sport fishery looking like was a meat fishery.

PROPOSAL NO. 200**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow catch-and-release only for steelhead in Southeast Alaska

DISCUSSION: Steelhead runs have been stable since 1997, even though they have not rebounded completely from the pre-1997 lows. The current regulations protect approximately 95 percent of the steelhead in Southeast Alaska. A list of steelhead systems for catch-and-release only was considered as an alternative. This alternative list for catch-and-release regulations included all 23 "Fall-run" systems listed in the current Sport Fishing Regulation summary. Also requested to be included as catch-and-release only were the following systems: Ward Creek, Ketchikan Creek, Thorne River, Karta River, Klawock River. The board concluded that there is sufficient stock to allow limited harvest. The board preferred a proposal specific to the problem.

PROPOSAL NO. 201**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Define possession limit as the maximum number of fish a person may have in possession until returning to their domicile

DISCUSSION: The board heard that testimony that nonresident anglers were taking more fish than could reasonably be consumed by a normal person or family. Enforcement difficulties were identified. Some form of transfer documentation, annual limits for all concerned species, or a harvest record or punch card may be needed. The department uses the statewide harvest survey, log books, and onsite creel census to estimate the number of fish harvested. The board recommended a workgroup review this issue and prepare a proposal. It will prepare a draft charge statement for this workgroup for consideration during its February 2006 meeting. Stakeholders may obtain the services of a private research company to help identify abuse and study economic impact of developing proposals for this statewide issue.

PROPOSAL NO. 202**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit injured salmon from being released

DISCUSSION: The term 'mortally injured' would need to be defined by the board. Without on-site law enforcement, this would be virtually unenforceable. There are several fisheries that have developed management tools to address this concern, including closing areas.

PROPOSAL NO. 203**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Allow sport-caught pink salmon to be used as bait

DISCUSSION: The Commissioner has authority to identify other uses of salmon, including the use of salmon as bait. Until the Commissioner recognizes the use of salmon as bait, the board lacks authority to take action. The board will prepare a letter requesting the Commissioner identify use of salmon as bait. There are some species of salmon that are abundant and go to waste.

PROPOSAL NO. 204**ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow sport-caught chum salmon to be used as bait**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 203.**PROPOSAL NO. 205****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Allow two cutthroat trout per day and in possession, 9-inch minimum size limit, only one of which may be 25 inches or longer, in remote trophy cutthroat trout lakes**DISCUSSION:** The board concluded the current trout management plan was working to protect trophy-size fish.**PROPOSAL NO. 206****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Repeal the bag and possession limits for coho salmon in Yakutat Bay**DISCUSSION:** This proposal was considered a technical correction.**PROPOSAL NO. 207****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Restrict sport fishing gear to single hooks only on the Situk River**DISCUSSION:** The board noted a potential reduction in snagging; however, incidental snagging will not occur if an angler is using proper fishing techniques. The board did not believe changing gear would eliminate illegal snagging, although there was support of reducing success in snagging. The board discussed the incidence of scarring on the fish, the strong stock status, and the local interest for some regulatory action.**PROPOSAL NO. 208****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Restrict sport fishing in the Chilkoot River to designated hours from June 1 – August 31**DISCUSSION:** The board recognized that fishing in Alaska includes inherent risk of encounters with other forms of wildlife. This action would also reduce angler opportunity significantly. Early morning and late evening are some of the preferred times for fishing.**PROPOSAL NO. 209****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Adopt special regulations for Dolly Varden in Mud Bay, Chicken, and Freshwater creeks on Chichagof Island and Teardrop Creek on Chilkat Peninsula.**DISCUSSION:** Access to these streams has increased in recent years and there is increasing effort. The board examined whether this proposal moves towards ensuring that large Dolly Varden can be caught in the future, whether the current bag limit of 10 Dolly Varden per day is too high, and whether greater region-wide consistency is needed.**PROPOSAL NO. 210****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Allow catch-and-release only in Peterson Creek and adjacent saltwater area, with exceptions**DISCUSSION:** There is no biological concern with the steelhead stock in Peterson Creek, but it might be vulnerable because Peterson is a small creek.**PROPOSAL NO. 211****ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit snagging and the use of bait in saltwater area near Peterson Creek when steelhead and coho salmon are present

DISCUSSION: The board determined that protection of the returning steelhead could be ensured by department action, given the authority to extend freshwater regulations out into saltwater around the creek mouth. The department noted that when water conditions are low the access for fish from saltwater into Peterson Creek can be delayed during periods of small high tides.

PROPOSAL NO. 212

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit snagging in a portion of Fish Creek and adjacent saltwater area near Juneau

DISCUSSION: The department has, in the past, allowed snagging in the lower portion of Fish Creek by executive order in an effort to harvest surplus hatchery fish. The department does not plan to open this area to snagging in the future. The board concluded this proposal is unnecessary since the desired regulatory action (no snagging) will already be in effect.

PROPOSAL NO. 213

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit snagging in a portion of Salmon Creek and adjacent saltwater area near Juneau

DISCUSSION: Salmon Creek is in close proximity to the terminal harvest area of the DIPAC hatchery facility. The board recognized the incompatibility of user groups (sport anglers and those using snagging gear) in the proposed area. The intent of this proposal was to create an area that provided an alternative means of take. Part of the area in question is saltwater.

PROPOSAL NO. 214

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Rescind the sport fishery closure for sockeye salmon in Sitkoh Lake drainage

DISCUSSION: The board confirmed the subsistence fishery in the area by gillnet and dipnet, and considered if subsistence opportunity would be adequately protected. Most of the subsistence harvest occurs in saltwater. The department can use executive order authority if this is deemed necessary to close the sport fishery.

PROPOSAL NO. 215

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Rescind the sport fishery closure for pink salmon in Starrigavan Creek

DISCUSSION: The board questioned the desire to fish for pink salmon in an area of high abundance and discussed the escapement goal for this system. The area is managed for a large area, not a specific stock. The board noted that this is a desirable location for youth participation in fishing.

PROPOSAL NO. 216

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Allow harvest of hatchery kings in Sitka area streams with bag limit of five fish 28 inches or greater in length, and five fish less than 28 inches

DISCUSSION: This will allow for additional fishing opportunity.

PROPOSAL NO. 217

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Rescind sport fishery closure for pink salmon in Indian River

AMENDMENTS: For all freshwaters draining into the Sitka Sound Special Use Area, the bag limit for king salmon 28 inches or greater in length is five fish and the bag limit for king salmon less than 28 inches in length is five fish. Intent is that this freshwater harvest will not count toward the annual limit.

DISCUSSION: The heard support from the local hatchery manager. Clarification was provided that the only kings in this area would be hatchery strays that would otherwise be wasted. The department has the authority to expand bag limits in terminal harvest areas.

PROPOSAL NO. 218

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Allow use of bait from June 1 - November 15 and allow snagging for salmon only during periods established by emergency order in Blind Slough

AMENDMENTS: In the Petersburg/Wrangell vicinity, in Blind Slough, upstream of a line between Blind Point and Anchor Point, only unbaited, artificial lures may be used from November 16 - May 31; except during periods established by emergency order, a person may not intentionally snag, attempt to snag, or retain a salmon hooked other than in the mouth.

DISCUSSION: The Blind Slough area will be open at times of high abundance and closed during periods of low runs. Broodstock needs were met every year except one.

PROPOSAL NO. 219

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Reduce harvest limits for sockeye salmon in the Sweetwater drainage, and close a small portion of Hatchery Creek to sport fishing from June 1 - July 31

AMENDMENTS: In the Prince of Wales Island vicinity: Sweetwater Lake drainage, the sport fish bag limit for sockeye salmon 16 inches or longer is three fish per day, six in possession. In Hatchery Creek, from June 1 through July 31, sport fishing is closed from 100 feet upstream of the upper falls at the end of the USFS boardwalk, to 100 feet downstream of the lower falls.

DISCUSSION: The amendment assures that the possession limit is included in the change.

PROPOSAL NO. 220

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Reduce the bag limit for coho salmon in the Harris River to three per day

DISCUSSION: Based on escapement data, the coho salmon returns are adequate and the department has no conservation concerns for coho salmon in the Harris River at this time.

PROPOSAL NO. 221

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the use of bait year-round in the Harris River

DISCUSSION: Based on escapement data, the coho returns are adequate and have no conservation concerns for coho salmon in the Harris River at this time.

PROPOSAL NO. 222

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Repeal special provisions that apply to trout in One Duck Lake

DISCUSSION: The board considered this a technical correction.

OTHER ACTIONS TAKEN

Dungeness Task Force The board determined that the Southeast Alaska Dungeness Task Force successfully filled its charge (#2000-197-FB) and is no longer needed. The board voted to deactivate the task force.

Hugh Smith Lake Sockeye The board reviewed information presented by the department regarding the biological status of Hugh Smith Lake sockeye. It acted to remove this stock as a Stock of Concern under the *Policy for the management of sustainable salmon fisheries* (5 AAC 39.222).