

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526



**THE ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES 2010/2011
PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE COOK INLET, KODIAK
AND CHIGNIK FINFISH; AND
KING AND TANNER CRAB (STATEWIDE, EXCEPT
SOUTHEAST/YAKUTAT) REGULATIONS**

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES

January 16-19, 2011

CHIGNIK FINFISH

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.

Chignik Groundfish

- 83 Establish 58 foot vessel size limit in parallel Pacific cod fisheries.
- 84 Modify Pacific cod fishery registration requirements.
- 85 Reduce jig allocation to 5 percent for state-waters Pacific cod fishery.
- 86 Establish rollover criteria for state-waters Pacific cod jig allocation.
- 87 Reduce jig allocation to 5 percent for state-waters Pacific cod fishery; however, pot fleet may take jig allocation if no registered jig gear.
- 88 Change season opening date for state-waters Pacific cod fishery to March 15.
- 89 Establish weather delay criteria for opening the Chignik District Tanner crab fishery.
- 90 Establish pre-season registration deadline to participate in state-waters Pacific cod fishery.
- 91 Implement prior participation requirements for registering for the state-waters Pacific cod fishery.
- 92 Allow deep water pot gear storage prior to the opening of the state-waters Pacific cod fishery.
- 93 Repeal one type of mechanical jigging machine gear.
- 94 Modify fishing season regulation that allows groundfish to be taken at any time in the Chignik Area.

Chignik Subsistence Salmon

- 95 Open area to subsistence fishing.
- 96 Open area to subsistence fishing.

Chignik Commercial Salmon

- 97 Open commercial salmon fishing concurrently with the Chignik Bay and Central District in the Western District.
- 98 Increase Chignik purse seine length.
- 99 Modify the salmon management plan.

Chignik Sport Fisheries

- 100 Reduce king salmon bag limit to 1 per day with annual limit of 2.
- 101 Prohibit barbed hooks and bait.

CHIGNIK FINFISH PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 28.530. Lawful gear for Chignik Area. Establish 58 food vessel size limit in parallel Pacific cod fisheries as follows:

During the federal and state parallel cod fishery no vessel larger in length than 58 feet will fish inside of 3 miles.

ISSUE: Limit vessel size to 58 feet in the Chignik Area parallel groundfish fishery for both Western and Central Gulf.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fisheries inside state waters will not be protected from vessels larger than 58 feet.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Chignik retains a sustainable resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Local vessels and crew.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Vessels larger than 58 feet.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Marketing Association (HQ-10F-012)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 28.506. Chignik Area Registration. Modify Pacific cod fishery registration requirements as follows:

To add state and parallel fisheries to 5 AAC 28.506 Chignik Area Registration section (b).

ISSUE: The influx and effort of super 58 foot seiners.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Quota will be caught at a faster rate. This is supposed to be a small boat fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Smaller volumes delivered equates to better recovery and quality of the product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people of Chignik and fishermen who traditionally fish cod fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Larger vessels.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Marketing Association (HQ-10F-022)

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan. Reduce jig allocation to 5 percent for state-waters Pacific cod fishery as follows:

Change the guideline harvest for jigging and hand troll to 5% of the allowable harvest, for the pot fishery to 95%.

ISSUE: Pot and Jig guideline harvest in the Chignik Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Allowable harvest will go unharvested.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Finfish fishers whom fish with pots.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, for the last three years, the jig quota was largely unfinished by the jigging fleet.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow floaters to process in the Chignik Area without restrictions. This still may not get any interest from the jigging fleet.

PROPOSED BY: Endurance Fisheries, Inc. (HQ-10F-004)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 28.537(c)(3). Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan. Establish rollover criteria for state-waters Pacific cod jig allocation as follows:

On March 21, an allocation rollover of the jig GHL will occur to all legal gear types if there is no vessel registered to use jigging machines or hand troll gear and further, if by April 1st there has not be one or more deliveries made against the jig allocation, the jig GHL allocation will rollover to all legal gear types on that date.

ISSUE: Lost harvest opportunity in the Chignik state waters Pacific cod fishery occurs in some years. This manifests when no one elects to fish the 10% jig gear allocation. In those instances the Chignik P-cod fishery would be better served if a rollover of the 10% allocation were to occur to all legal gear types early enough in the season to be targeted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In some years the Chignik state waters P-cod fishery will be underutilized by a full 10%. This will be unavoidable in the absence of a

rollover clause when there are zero vessels registered for using jigging machines or hand troll gear.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Chignik state water P-cod fisheries and the Chignik village communities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one as jig and hand troll P-cod fishers will keep the full 10% gear specific allocation provided a single vessel for that gear type registers before March 21.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limit the rollover to 1/2 the allocation. Economically and biologically there is no apparent need to leave 1/2 the allocation on the table if there is not jig effort as was the situation in the 2009 fishery.

PROPOSED BY: City of Chignik (HQ-10F-017)

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan. Reduce jig allocation to 5 percent for state-waters Pacific cod fishery; however, pot fleet may take jig allocation if no registered jig gear as follows:

Pot fisherman in the Chignik Management Area may take the entire quota, unless someone registers for the jig fishery and only 5% of the quota is allocated to the state cod jig fishery.

ISSUE: Non-use or participation in the Chignik cod jig fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Economic loss to the people who fish cod in the Chignik Area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal's intent is to utilize the whole resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who are involved in the fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Marketing Association (HQ-10F-010)

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 28.537. Chignik Area Pacific Cod Management Plan. Change season opening date for state-waters Pacific cod fishery to March 15 as follows:

The commissioner shall open a state waters season in the Chignik Area on **March 15** [MARCH 1].

ISSUE: The Chignik state waters opening for the Pacific cod fishery is too early. March is a severe weather month for the Chignik costal area and, as a consequence, local small-boat fishery participation is extremely disadvantaged. The fishery should open later to more appropriately provide fishing opportunity for everyone while still ensuring good product quality, marketability and free competition.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Chignik state waters P-cod fishery will continue to exclusively favor the large boats greater than 50 feet because they can better handle typical March sea conditions and further, maintaining the March 1 opening date will preserve the high risk scenario for small boats and their minimal participation in this common property fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, however, a March 15 opening date would ensure high product quality harvest at a time when roe content and body condition (weights) are good; further, a later opening date will encourage local processing and, importantly, stimulate the local economy through more job opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The local villages will be better served by increased employment and revenue and it would benefit local small boat operators and their crews.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The large boat fleet due to the increased competition from the local fleet who will be able to fish this common property fishery following adoption of a slightly later fishery opening date.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? An April 1 opening date was preferred but rejected to minimize the impact on the large boat fleet. Allocating based on boat length was rejected as being potentially divisive.

PROPOSED BY: City of Chignik (HQ-10F-016)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 35.510(b). Fishing seasons for Registration Area J.

Establish weather delay criteria for opening the Chignik District Tanner crab fishery as follows:

The opening of the state waters season will be delayed for 24 hours if the National Weather Service marine forecast issued at 4:00 a.m. on the scheduled opening date.

ISSUE: Bad weather on Tanner crab openings.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unfair advantage of larger vessels and unwanted danger to crew and vessels.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Smaller vessels and crews.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Don Bumpus (HQ-10F-013)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 28.506. Chignik Area Registration. Establish pre-season registration deadline to participate in state-waters Pacific cod fishery as follows:

A registration deadline of January 15 is in effect, in the Chignik Management Area.

ISSUE: Create a registration date of January 15 in the Chignik State Cod Management Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More effort from vessels from other federal fisheries, when Chignik is the only state cod fishery open.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It insures the resource for the local economy.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who registers by January 15.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Marketing Association (HQ-10F-011)

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 28.506. Chignik Area registration. Implement prior participation requirements for registering for the state-waters Pacific cod fishery as follows:

Require three years of prior participation with a minimum annual harvest of 100,000 pounds or five deliveries annually to register.

ISSUE: The increasing over capitalization of a fully utilized fishery (Chignik Statewater Pacific cod pot fishery).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The economic viability of the harvesters dependent on the fishery will be severely impacted and marginalized.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal will slow down the ever increasing race for fish promoting better handling and care of the resource resulting in better quality and price.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Current harvesters dependent on the stability of the fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? New entrants.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limited entry, tonnage, trip limits and owner on board.

PROPOSED BY: Ronald Kavanaugh (HQ-10F-204)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 28.532. Groundfish pot storage requirements for Chignik Area.
Allow deep water pot gear storage prior to the opening of the state-waters Pacific cod fishery as follows:

Fisherman may store gear at depth not more than seven days prior to a commercial opener with all bait and containers removed and the doors secured fully open.

ISSUE: Groundfish pot storage. Storage of gear in waters not more than 25 fathoms. This regulation addresses gear storage following a closer but not prior to a commercial opener.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? State P-Cod fisherman whom relies solely on the State water fishery will continue to be at a disadvantage due to the federal fishery regulations allowing the federal fisherman to store gear at depth just outside of the three mile limit.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Due to the tender rotation it would allow the processor to have top quality controls. All fishers would be on the same rotation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Due to the weather this time of year it would allow the fisherman whom has smaller vessels and gear more time to get their gear on the grounds. The smaller boat has to make multiple trips.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change the Federal Regulations.

PROPOSED BY: Endurance Fisheries, Inc. (HQ-10F-005)

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 28.530. Lawful Gear for Chignik Area. Repeal one type of mechanical jigging machine gear as follows:

(f)(2) **repealed** [A SINGLE CONTINUOUS LINE WITH NOT MORE THAN 150 HOOKS].

ISSUE: This definition of mechanical jigging machine creates confusion for fishery stakeholders and is inconsistent with actual fishing practices.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishery managers and the public 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-10F-150)

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 28.510 Fishing Seasons For Chignik Area. Modify fishing season regulation that allows groundfish to be taken at any time in the Chignik Area as follows:

(a) Unless otherwise specified in this chapter, groundfish may be taken **only during seasons established by emergency order or under a permit issued by the commissioner** [AT ANY TIME].

ISSUE: Current Chignik Area regulation states that groundfish may be taken at anytime. In practice, groundfish may only be taken from state waters when parallel or state-waters seasons are open. This internal inconsistency has caused confusion among fishermen participating in groundfish fisheries inside state waters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Regulations will continue to create confusion for fishery participants, managers and law enforcement agencies.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The public and agencies will benefit from clear and consistent regulatory language.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-10F-149)

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 01.470(a). Lawful gear and gear specifications; and 5 AAC 01.475(2). Waters closed to subsistence fishing. Open area to subsistence fishing as follows:

Rewritten 5 AAC 01.470(a) would read:

(a) Salmon may be taken by seine, [AND] gillnets, **spear and/or hook and line that may be attached to a rod or pole** or with gear specified on a subsistence fishing permit, except that **hook and line gear may not be used** in Chignik River **and power purse seine gear is permitted only in Chignik River from Mensis Point downstream and hand seining is permitted only in Chignik River, Chignik Lake, and in the waters of Clark River and Home Creek, from each of their confluences with Chignik Lake to a point one mile upstream.** A gillnet may not be staked or anchored or otherwise fixed in a stream, **slough or side channel to where** it obstructs more than one-half the width of [THE WATERWAY AND ANY CHANNEL OR SIDE CHANNEL OF THE WATERWAY] **that stream, slough or side channel.**

With the above suggested re-write of 5 AAC 01.470(a), 5 AAC 01.475(2) should then be repealed.

ISSUE: Biologically and culturally, it is unreasonable to designate all waters of Black Lake and its tributaries, Black River and its tributaries, and Chignik Lake tributaries closed to local subsistence fishing other than as permitted in Clark River and Home Creek as defined in 5 AAC 01.475(2). The Chignik River system's sockeye and coho stocks are sustainable and healthy; evident by escapements and commercial fishery management practices and harvest records. Legalizing more subsistence fishing areas in the Chignik River drainage is not expected to result in an increase in harvest or changes in harvest patterns. Nor will it compromise or degrade any stock or spawning area. This is founded on the basis that more Chignik River drainage areas are and have been traditionally fished for subsistence than currently permitted under 5 AAC 01.475. The purpose of amending 5 AAC 01.470(a) and 5 AAC 01.475(2) is to bring these regulations into conformity with existing practices, and encourage accurate subsistence catch reporting while respectfully acknowledging local subsistence needs, practices, and culture.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In many areas of the Chignik River drainage, traditional and customary subsistence practices will remain unlawful and subsistence catch reporting will continue to be compromised.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All residents and subsistence users in the Chignik area. Also State fishery managers as it will foster more accurate subsistence catch reporting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo was rejected as it is well recognized that Chignik subsistence users have fished, at minimum opportunistically, in Chignik waters technically unauthorized by regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Lagoon Village Council. (HQ-10F-007)

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 01.470(a). Lawful gear and gear specifications; and 5 AAC 01.745(2). Waters closed to subsistence fishing. Open area to subsistence fishing as follows:

5 AAC 10.470

(a) Salmon may be taken by seine [SEINES AND], gillnet [GILLNETS] , spear and/or hook and line that may be attached to a rod or pole or with gear specified on a subsistence fishing permit, except that hook and line gear may not be used in Chignik River and power purse seine gear is permitted only in Chignik River from Mensis Point Downstream and hand seining is permitted only in Chignik River and Chignik Lake and gill nets may be used only in Chignik River, Chignik Lake, and in the waters of Clark River and Home Creek, from each of their confluences with Chignik Lake to a point one mile upstream. A gillnet may not be staked or anchored or otherwise fixed in a stream, slough or side channel to where it obstructs more than one-half the width of that stream, slough [THE WATERWAY AND ANY CHANNEL] or side channel [OF THE WATERWAY].

With the above suggested re-write of 5 AAC 01.470(a), 5 AAC 01.475(2) should then be repealed.

ISSUE: Many traditional and sustainable subsistence practices in the Black Lake & Chignik Lake Watershed are unnecessarily disallowed under current regulation. Biologically and culturally, it is unreasonable to designate all waters of Black Lake and its tributaries, Black River and its tributaries, and Chignik Lake tributaries close to local subsistence fishing other than as permitted in Clark River and Home Creek as defined in 5 AAC 01.475(2). The Chignik River system's sockeye and coho stocks are sustainable and healthy evident by escapements and commercial fishery management practices and harvest records. Bringing subsistence fishing regulations into conformity with actual traditional practice in the Chignik River drainage is not expected to result in any changes to the subsistence harvest patterns which are longstanding and stable despite the adverse regulations which were not even understood until recently. For the same reasons it will not compromise or degrade and stock or spawning area. The purpose of amending 5 AAC 01.470(a) and 5 AAC 01.475(2) is to bring these regulations into conformity with existing subsistence fishing practices, and encourage accurate subsistence catch reporting while respectfully acknowledging local subsistence methods and means.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In many areas of the Chignik River drainage, traditional and customary subsistence practices will remain unlawful and subsistence catch reporting will continue to be compromised.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All residents and subsistence users in the Chignik area. Also, State fishery managers as it will foster more accurate subsistence catch reporting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo was rejected as it is well recognized that Chignik subsistence users have fished, at minimum opportunistically, in Chignik waters technically unauthorized by regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Lake Traditional Council (HQ-10F-034)

PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 15.357(e). Chignik Area Salmon Management Plan. Open commercial salmon fishing concurrently with the Chignik Bay and Central District in the Western District as follows:

From June 1 through July 5 in the Western District, excluding the Inner Castle Bay Subsection, commercial salmon fishing shall open concurrently with the Chignik Bay and Central Districts and the Inner Castle Bay Subsection for no more than two fishing periods up to 48-hours each with a minimum closure of 48 hours between fishing periods.

ISSUE: The current regulation providing up to two 48 hour fishing periods from June 1 through July 5 in the Western District, excluding the Inner Castle Cape Subsection, concurrent with Central and Chignik Bay Districts' fishing, expires on January 1, 2011. Permanent induction of a limited June 1-July 5 fishery in the Western District as was provided under the expiring regulation is justified.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chignik salmon fishers will be denied harvest opportunity on Chignik bound sockeye salmon in one-half of the Chignik Management Area. Denying such in the waters west of Chignik Bay will increase the likelihood of local stock over-escapement and compress the local harvest. This would be non-beneficial to the resource and to local processors who have limited product handling facilities. Permitting Chignik fishers to begin harvesting Chignik bound sockeye salmon earlier will reduce over-escapement risk and also provide alternative fishing area for local fishers when Igvak is fishing which typically suppresses the Chignik's sockeye catch in our Eastern and Central Districts.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The sockeye harvest will be more protracted. This will

aid in ensuring better product handling and local processing efficiency. Also importantly, run build-up periods should be reduced leading to fresher, ocean-bright product being harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The local villages of Chignik Lake, Chignik Lagoon, Chignik Bay, Ivanof Bay and Perryville, and all Chignik commercial salmon fishers and local boat owners who have invested in the fishery, including RSW and the local Chignik processor.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Limited fishing in the Western District would allow Chignik fishers to harvest local-bound sockeye salmon in their own waters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Adding three maximum 48-hour fishing periods in the Western District, excluding the Inner Castle Bay Subsection, from June 1 thru July 5. While biologically and economically this would be justified, the proposal was not submitted because of potential intra-area allocation concerns.

PROPOSED BY: George Anderson (HQ-10F-021)

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 15.332. Seine specifications and operations. Increase Chignik purse seine length as follows:

Change between 100 and 225 fathoms, to read, between 100 and 275 fathoms.

ISSUE: Increase the Chignik purse seine length from 100 to 275 fathoms in all areas except the Chignik Bay District.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chignik fishers will continue to be at a disadvantage to our neighboring areas (Area M and K).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Efficiency improves resulting in a better product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chignik fishers and processors.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Shorten Area M and K nets to 225 fathoms, Area M and K would resist.

PROPOSED BY: Endurance Fisheries, Inc. (HQ-10F-040)

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 65.020. Bag limits, possession limits, and size limits for Alaska Peninsula and Aleutian Islands area.; and 5 AAC 15.357. Chignik Area Salmon Management Plan. Modify the salmon management plan as follows:

Chignik sport harvests in river shall be limited to one (1) chinook per day with an annual limit of two (2) until 1,500 chinook pass the Chignik weir. Additionally, seine vessels will return chinook to the water unharmed until 1,500 chinook pass the Chignik weir.

ISSUE: Potential over-harvesting of chinook salmon during times of low abundance.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Escapement goals may not be met. Large harvests on early portion of the return. In years of low chinook abundance, all users should share the conservation burden to ensure adequate escapement.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Adequate escapement.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? All users.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Tom Corr (SC-10F-044)

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 66.020. Bag Limit. Reduce king salmon bag limit to 1 per day with annual limit of 2 as follows:

Catch and bag limit in the Chignik River to one king per day and two kings per year. No bait allowed.

ISSUE: With the increased sport fishing effort in the Chignik River we would like the bag limit dropped to one king per day and two per year to try and increase our returning numbers. And secure a stronger future for the sport industry and subsistence users.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Chignik River is slowly being over sport fished to the point of having poor escapement numbers. We are having a hard time even getting enough to subsist on. We are killing our king run.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, hopefully our escapement and king return will increase to better levels to produce a stronger run. The end outcome will secure a strong sport fishery and subsistence future for local people.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? By increasing our fish return the subsistence users and sport fishermen will have a secure future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Change the Federal Regulations.

PROPOSED BY: Peter Bumpus (HQ-10F-006)

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 65.022. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means in the Bristol Bay Area. Prohibit barbed hooks and bait as follows:

Sport fishers may use only barbless hooks and no bait.

ISSUE: King salmon sport fishing in the Chignik River system. Catch and release and the use of bait.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Mortality rate will increase over fishing can result due to the increase of sport fishermen into the Chignik Area over the past 15 years.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Although catch limits are in place it is not enough, this proposal will reduce the mortality rate of the king salmon and improve the sport.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit, the king salmon runs in the future will be stronger therefore the sport and subsistence user will continue to enjoy this resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The sport fishermen who rely on bait.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Rodney Anderson (HQ-10F-041)
