

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES
December 2-7, 2011
**PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AND UPPER COPPER RIVER/
UPPER SUSITNA RIVER 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.

**PROP
NO. (96)** **SUBJECT**

PWS Groundfish and Herring (8)

- 43 Restrict summer use of commercial bottom gear within three miles of shore.
- 44 Increase the rockfish bycatch allowance to sidestripe shrimp and sablefish from 10 to 30 percent.
- 45 Repeal one definition of mechanical jigging gear.
- 46 Revise regulations to include Eastern Gulf and PWS.
- 47 Amend dates of skate fishery in Eastern Gulf and PWS.
- 48 Allow for retention of spiny dogfish in Eastern Gulf and PWS.
- 49 Amend the current regulation to accurately reflect management lines and remove the reference to trawl gear for herring.
- 50 Clarify thresholds needed to open herring fishery in PWS.

PWS and Copper River Subsistence and Personal Use (26)

Subsistence (21)

- 51 Review the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery C&T finding.
- 52 Specify open periods in the Copper River District subsistence fishery.
- 53 Amend regulation to combine subsistence areas in PWS.
- 54 Establish a positive C&T finding for the Chitina dipnet fishery.
- 55 Reclassify the Chitina dipnet fishery a subsistence fishery.
- 56 Amend the Copper River King Salmon Management Plan.
- 57 Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 58 Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 59 Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 60 Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 61 Prohibit netting of whitefish and lake trout in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 62 Prohibit netting of whitefish and lake trout in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 63 Prohibit netting of whitefish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 64 Prohibit netting of whitefish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 65 Prohibit netting of whitefish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 66 Prohibit bycatch, require ADF&G notification, and set season in the whitefish fishery.
- 67 Require ADF&G notification, set season, and limit bycatch in the whitefish fishery.
- 68 Establish closed areas and seasons, and prohibit bycatch in the whitefish fishery.

- 69 Establish closed area; and set season dates in the whitefish fishery.
- 70 Restrict netting of whitefish in Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 71 Establish lake trout spawning closures in Tyone lakes complex. (*This proposal is listed under both Subsistence and Sport Fishing for this meeting.*)

Personal Use (5)

- 72 Rescind allocation reduction in the Chitina personal use fishery.
- 73 Increase harvest limit of king salmon in the personal use fishery.
- 74 Allow for retention of king salmon in the personal use fishery.
- 75 Increase limit for sockeye salmon in the Chitina personal use fishery.
- 76 Delay opening of Chitina personal use dipnet fishery.

PWS and Copper River Commercial Salmon (43)

Permit Stacking (2)

- 77 Amend the regulation to allow use of two set gillnet permits in Eshamy District.
- 78 Amend gear restrictions in PWS salmon purse seine fishery.

Fishing Gear (9)

- 79 Ban use of deep gillnets in Montague District prior to Coghill, Eshamy, and Unakwik districts opening to deep gear.
- 80 Further define keg or buoy.
- 81 Remove intent language and clarify anchoring and towing of drift gillnet gear.
- 82 Revise purse seine mesh restrictions for commercial seining in PWS.
- 83 Allow a purse seine chafing and border strip for the PWS salmon purse seine fishery.
- 84 Amend gear restrictions for PWS salmon purse seine fishery.
- 85 Reduce gear limits for PWS salmon purse seine fishery.
- 86 Revise lead mesh size for commercial seining in PWS.
- 87 Revise lead mesh size for PWS salmon purse seine fishery.

Fishing Districts (4)

- 88 Create a subdistrict in the Coghill District for commercial salmon fishing.
- 89 Amend boundaries for the Northwest, Eshamy, and Coghill districts and Esther Subdistrict.
- 90 Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Eshamy District.
- 91 Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Coghill and Northwestern districts.

Fishing Seasons (1)

- 92 Revise season description for the purse seine fishery in the Eastern, Northern, Northwestern, Southwestern, Montague, and Southeastern districts.

Closed Waters (3)

- 93 Close designated areas to commercial fishing in PWS.
- 94 Correct geographic description of closed waters in PWS Area districts.
- 95 Expand closed waters in Sheep Bay of the Eastern District.

Management Plans (5)

- 96 Close commercial salmon fisheries in Main Bay, PWS, to avoid the 4th of July.
- 97 Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Main Bay alternating gear zone.
- 98 Amend regulation regarding the Wally Noerenberg hatchery plan.
- 99 Change the south end marker in the Armin F. Koernig Hatchery THA.
- 100 Adopt closures for sockeye salmon in Eshamy Lagoon.

PWS Management and Allocation Plan (12)

- 101 Revise the gillnet/seine allocation plan.
- 102 Amend the allocation plan for Eshamy District set gillnet group.
- 103 Amend the allocation plan for Eshamy District set gillnet group.
- 104 Designate area in the Coghill District for drift gillnet and purse seine gear.
- 105 Remove the gillnet fleet from the Coghill District on established dates.
- 106 Redefine the Coghill District boundary and open the district on an alternating gear type basis.
- 107 Drift gillnet group will have exclusive access to AFK chum salmon.
- 108 Reallocate chum salmon for the seine fleet in Port Chalmers.
- 109 Discontinue remote release of chum salmon at Port Chalmers and release them at Wally Noerenberg Hatchery.
- 110 Eliminate the mandatory closure prior to July 18 and amend fishing time and area provisions for the Southwestern District.
- 111 Modify the cost-recovery salmon harvest in PWS.
- 112 Increase period of time used in calculation of allocation in PWS allocation plan.

Use of Aircraft (1)

- 113 Amend regulation regarding use of aircraft in PWS commercial fishery.

Reduce Hatchery Production (2)

- 114 Reduce hatchery production of chum salmon in PWS.
- 115 Reduce hatchery production of chum salmon in PWS.

Copper River Commercial Salmon (4)

- 116 Add restrictions on homepack from commercial fishing.
- 117 Establish an optimal escapement goal (OEG) for Copper River king salmon.
- 118 Restrict commercial fishing inside barrier islands prior to June 15.
- 119 Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Copper River District.

PWS and Copper River Sport (19)

Prince William Sound (6)

- 120 Increase sockeye salmon bag limit and allow snagging in Eshamy Bay.
- 121 Reduce sockeye salmon bag and possession limit in PWS.
- 122 Establish coho salmon limit for non residents in Hells Hole freshwater fishery.
- 123 Close Ibec Creek to sport fishing above the Copper River Highway.
- 124 Close 18 Mile Creek to sport fishing for coho salmon.
- 125 Amend Prince William Sound trout size regulations.

Upper Copper River/Upper Susitna River (13)

- 126 Allow king salmon fishing on Gulkana River five days per week June 10-August 10.
- 127 Restrict guided sport fishery when commercial fishery is restricted.
- 128 Establish a limit for shipping of fish out of state for non-resident sport fishermen.
- 129 Modify lake trout regulations in four area lakes.
- 130 Establish a maximum size limit for lake trout in Lake Louise and Crosswind Lake.
- 71 Establish lake trout spawning closures in Tyone lakes complex. *This proposal is listed under both Subsistence and Sport Fishing for this meeting.*
- 131 **Note: Proposal 131 was a duplicate of Proposal 71 and has been pulled.*
- 132 Close Paxson and Summit lakes to lake trout fishing September 1–October 1.
- 133 Allow use of bait October 1–July 31 in Paxson and Summit lakes.
- 134 Restrict guided sport fishery on Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 135 Restrict guided sport fishery on Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes.
- 136 Modify rainbow trout regulations in Summit Lake (Tebay River drainage).
- 137 Align the Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan with area regulations.
- 138 Open Tolsona Lake to sport fishing for burbot.

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES
December 2-7, 2011
PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AND UPPER COPPER RIVER
UPPER SUSITNA RIVER FINFISH

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 28.230. Lawful gear for Prince William Sound Area. Restrict summer use of commercial bottom gear within three miles of shore as follows:

Commercial bottom gear is prohibited within 3 miles of any shoreline between May 15th and September 1st.

ISSUE: The current commercial bottom gear practices throughout the peak sport-fishing season have caused a depletion of fish resources for individual anglers. The current commercial practices, which made fishing safer for commercial fishermen, it now transferring additional risk to individual and subsistence fishermen since near shore depletion of the resource has forced anglers and subsistence fishermen to travel farther and farther to access fish resources. A viable option to prevent near-shore depletion is to limit commercial bottom gear no closer than 3 miles from any shoreline between May 15th and September 1st.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Anglers will continue to take unnecessary risk to catch fish and expend more resources. Fish stocks near local communities will continue to suffer a decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Quality of the public fish resources will rebound near local communities for personal consumption and reduce personal risk to the general public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Consumptive anglers and subsistence users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Commercial users will be slightly inconvenienced by this change but will still be able to harvest public resources as they did prior to current management system.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Restrict bottom gear fishing all together between May 15th and September 1st. Assumed to be too restrictive at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Prince William Sound Charter Boat Association (HQ-F11-040)

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 28.265. Prince William Sound Rockfish Management Plan. Increase the rockfish bycatch allowance to sidestripe shrimp and sablefish from 10 to 30 percent as follows:

During sablefish and sidestripe shrimp fisheries, all rockfish in excess of **30** [10] percent, round weight, of all sablefish and sidestripe shrimp on board the vessel, must be weighed and reported

as bycatch overage on an ADF&G fish ticket. Any proceeds from the sale of excess rockfish shall be surrendered to the state.

ISSUE: Over the past 15 years, deep water rockfish populations have increased significantly. Fishermen should benefit, rather than having it forfeited or promote increased waste.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fishermen working depths of 200 – 500 fathoms will be plagued with bycatch overages, increasing potential overhead and waste.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Knowing very little of the profits from the catch will be surrendered to the state, can only improve quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Deep water long liners and shrimp trawlers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? ADF&G will have reduced added income.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A bycatch averaged over several trips or season. Difficult to implement.

PROPOSED BY: Jon Van Hying (SC-F11-007)

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC 28.230.(h)(2) Lawful Gear for Prince William Sound Area.
Repeal one definition of mechanical jigging gear as follows:

(h)(2) **repealed** [A SINGLE CONTINUOUS LINE WITH NO MORE THAN 150 HOOKS].

ISSUE: This definition of legal commercial gear for jig and hand troll groundfish fisheries creates confusion among fishermen, is difficult to enforce, and is inconsistent with actual fishing practices. Additionally, this definition of mechanical jigging gear is not recognized by the National Marine Fisheries Service as a legal gear type during federal groundfish fisheries, potentially resulting in conflicting gear regulations when coordinating state- and federally-managed Pacific cod fisheries.

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

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All fishery stakeholders 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-F11-356)

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 28.089. Guiding principles for groundfish fishery regulations.
Revise regulations to include Eastern Gulf and PWS as follows:

5 AAC 28.089. The provisions of this section do not apply to the ground fisheries in the Eastern Gulf of Alaska and the Prince William Sound Area.

ISSUE: Eastern Gulf and PWS are exempt from 5 AAC 28.089.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Justification for reducing bycatch and maximizing benefits to regions and local areas are nonexistent for PWS and EGOA.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Economies of EGOA and PWS as well as fisheries resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Robert A. Smith (HQ-F11-042)

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 28.083. Permit requirements for skates and rays. Amend dates of skate fishery in Eastern Gulf and PWS as follows:

5 AAC 28.083(a)....may be taken only under the conditions of a miscellaneous finfish permit
(2)[SPECIFY SEASON DATES] open concurrent with halibut;
(7)[REQUIRE OTHER CONDITIONS DETERMINED BY THE COMMISSIONER TO BE NECESSARY FOR CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PRUPOSES.]

ISSUE: Huge biomass of skate infesting PWS and EGOA. Existing fishery is done in about 12 seconds. Skate compete with all other ground fish for the same food.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Skate will continue to proliferate and continue to depress halibut and crab populations in PWS and EGOA.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen, processors, local economies, any one interested in ecosystem management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Robert A. Smith (HQ-F11-043)

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 28.084. Fishing season, landing requirements, and utilization for sharks. Allow for retention of spiny dogfish in Eastern Gulf and PWS as follows:

5 AAC 28.084(b) For the purposes of this section “sharks” are species of the order *Lamniformes*, *Spualiformes*, and *Carcharhiniformes*, **with the exception of spiny dogfish. Vessels longlining in the PWS EGOA Area with a miscellaneous finfish permit may retain spiny dogfish.**

ISSUE: Proliferation of spiny dogfish. Currently dogfish is only allowed to be retained as bycatch with other species whose abundance is unrelated to dogfish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Dogfish resource will continue to be wasted.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Processors, fishermen, local economies and regions, anyone interested in ecosystem management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Waiting for management. It didn’t happen.

PROPOSED BY: Robert A. Smith (HQ-F11-044)

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 39.165. Trawl gear unlawful. Amend the current regulation to accurately reflect management lines and remove the reference to trawl gear for herring as follows:

5 AAC 39.165. Trawl gear unlawful.

(1) waters of Prince William Sound enclosed by **a** line[**S**] from Point Whitshed to Point Bentinck, **a line** from Cape Hinchinbrook **Light** [(60° 13.96' N. LAT., 146° 39.12' W. LONG.)] to seal rocks **light** [(60° 09.96' N. LAT., 146° 50.12' W. LONG.)] to Zaikof Point (60° **19.00'** [18.96] N. lat., 146° **55.00'** [55.12] W. long.), and from a point at 60° **11.00'** [10.96] N.

lat., 147° 20.00 [20.12] ' W. long. on the northwest side of Montague Island, north to a point at 60° 30.00' [29.96] N. lat., 147° 20.00' [20.12] W. long., then east to a point at 60° 30.00' [29.96] N. lat., 147° 00.00' [00.12] W. long., then northeast to Knowles Head (60°] 41.00' [40.96 N. lat., 146° 37.50' [37.62] W. long.), [except that trawls may be used to take herring during the open commercial herring food and bait season];

ISSUE: The trawl closure area description in subsection (1) of 5 AAC 39.165 should be identical to that in regulation 5 AAC 31.235(a)(1). Currently, the two are different, but the correct description is found in 5 AAC 31.235(a)(1). Trawl is not a legal gear for herring.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Enforcement is difficult and confusing when lines are similar, but not identical, are referenced in separate regulations, and affect identical activities (trawling). These regulatory references were identical at one time and need to be realigned to avoid confusion. The trawl reference may cause confusion among users.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishermen, management, and enforcement personnel will benefit from consistent and accurate reference to closure areas and legal gear types.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-292)

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 27.365. Prince William Sound Herring Management Plan; 5 AAC 39.210. Management plan for high impact emerging fisheries. Clarify thresholds needed to open herring fishery in Prince William Sound as follows:

The following changes are proposed for 5AAC 27.365.

(a) Make explicit the intended meaning of "threshold": replace spawning biomass threshold with spawning biomass productivity threshold

(b) Identify a role for the status "below threshold": At the beginning of a second year with the projected spawning biomass less than the productivity threshold, the Commissioner will announce whether applications will be received from (group?) permit holders for one-time, one year, allocations for the exclusive purpose of development, testing, and demonstration of new and restored higher-value, higher-benefit uses of the resource.

Numerous modifications and additions are needed in 5AAC39.210 to cover the special needs associated with an "emerging, high-impact" initiative that by design is conditional and temporary.

The Commissioner needs the option of delegating to a community board.

Many of the tasks here fit within what is called today Management Procedure. The Commissioner needs the option to use that process, to apply initiation support, to call upon individuals who have expertise in building a Management Procedure approach.

ISSUE: a. The Pacific herring fishery in Prince William Sound has been closed and idle since 1994. (There were two spring fisheries (1997, 1998) and three winter fisheries (1997-1999).) All extraction-related activity is at full stop because mature adult herring have biomass "below threshold" as defined in 5AAC27.365:

The minimum spawning biomass threshold is 22,000 tons, and no fishery may be opened if the estimated spawning biomass is below this threshold level.

b. The long closure is a problem, but it is only one part of the problem. The second part consists of the set of known, now idle, problems that will all simultaneously become "live problems" with the first announcement of a herring fishery in Prince William Sound.

The three primary features of this second part are described next. The presentation then returns to the specific area where the Board can, through the adoption of more precise language, turn this present problem into opportunities for locally crafted solutions.

i. Can the herring fishery afford herring management?

- ◆ In every decade since the 1980s, herring management in Alaska has become more sophisticated, more rigorous, and more expensive.
- ◆ That rigor is not an option. Through actions such as 5AAC39.212 and 5AAC27.463, the Board has indicated that it expects the management plan for a commercial fishery that targets an important forage fish to exhibit such rigor in its solutions for sustaining the target species and for sustaining the functions of the ecosystem dependent on the target species.
- ◆ There are difficult, unfinished assessment problems left over from before the crash in 1993, in particular, uncertainty over stock size estimates, traceability of assessment estimates to biologically well-defined observables, calibration.
- ◆ What part of management, what part of the budget will provide scientifically sound, operationally equitable solutions to 128 pound permits, a stock with a history of epizootics, an informed community regarding stress, pounds, and disease, and four-years of research in peer reviewed journals from Seattle-based scientists?
- ◆ If the herring stock at record biomass with record quotas and an unbroken run of 34 years of open fisheries is having trouble affording the herring management that produced that

record, then we all have really big problems. (Southeast Alaska staff, 2004; Southeast Alaska staff, 2005; Hebert, 2006; Hebert and Kelley, 2007; Hebert, 2010)

ii. Getting by with half ::soon less.

- ◆ Sometime in the 1970s, possibly earlier, herring roe fishing in British Columbia was vertically integrated. They did it all harvest, roe extraction, and final salting and curing. The industry met whatever standard the buyer required and sold only finished product.
- ◆ Canada passed a federal statute banning the export of unprocessed Canadian fish.
- ◆ Atlantic Canada harvests, extracts roe (Atlantic herring), exports frozen roe ("herring roe").
- ◆ Alaska, the last colony, exports frozen whole herring for roe ("roe herring").
- ◆ Between 1996 and 2008, total herring landings in Alaska and in British Columbia were about equal. Exchange adjusted annual exvessel values for British Columbia fishermen are more than twice that for Alaska fishermen, often three times greater. Annual total export value for British Columbia herring products is twice that for Alaska exports.
- ◆ Herring fishery managers in Alaska and in British Columbia manage stocks with nearly equal landings. Alaska managers must get by with revenues to the State from those landing that are less than half the revenues to British Columbia.
- ◆ Because of the Canadian export ban, the only alternative to roe herring from Alaska has been a higher priced processed product.
- ◆ In February 2011, buyers began to pressure Prince Rupert City Council to support a petition to the Federal government to eliminate the export ban (and to export Prince Rupert jobs to China). This year, the Council voted to support keeping the export ban.

iii. SlowFood, Arc of Taste, Food Security, Marine Stewardship Council, value-added herring. Burke and Phyne (2008) is the best one-stop economic analysis, history, options.

- ◆ The Slow Food Foundation for Biodiversity established its Arc of Taste to identify, preserve and promote significant or at risk heritage items. In 2005, herring spawn on kelp (Native producers in BC) became Canada's fourth entry. A Norway entry is cured and smoked herring.
- ◆ Three UAF schools now have a proposal before the Alaska legislature for a five-year program for Alaska food security. (Does not include fish resources.)
- ◆ The salmon fishermen have done all the hard work on "value-added."
- ◆ The Marine Stewardship Council has certified many herring fisheries in Europe, including the Hastings herring and mackerel fleet, a community fleet of hand-beached

wooden gillnet boats: annual harvest 10MT; certification requested and sponsored by the Hastings Council.

c. A natural opportunity has been hidden by the interpretation of a specialized, technical term according to its vernacular usage.

The "minimum threshold," in 5ACC27.365 (also called "cutoff threshold") is a key concept and a key parameter in the management method called "graded threshold" or "variable rate" in Alaska. During the late 1980s and early 1990s, persons affiliated with or collaborating with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game were among the developers and first implementers of a method to identify the thresholds and harvest rates that optimize average yield and yield stability through repeated, multi-decade simulations of the stock. In a report on their application of the method for Togiak herring, Funk and Rowell (1995) give us the following description of the role and purpose of the "cutoff threshold" in variable rate management and in 5AAC27.365.

Two types of thresholds can be defined::: A conservation threshold, below which a population may experience complete reproductive failure, might be defined...de- signed to prevent extinction. Alternatively, for Pacific herring and many other exploited species, a productivity threshold is defined in terms of quickly rebuilding a population to commercially productive levels....:productivity are always higher than conservation thresholds... (emphasis added)

After nearly twenty years, there is little that looks like "quickly rebuilding :::to a commercially productive level," This suggests that the productivity threshold for Prince William Sound is not 22,000 tons. (Zheng and co-authors (Zheng, 1994; Zheng et al., 1993) reported a productivity cutoff threshold near 22,000 tons from their analysis of a "normal" Prince William Sound. Although they described the effects of assessment error on the optimal threshold and extraction rate, they did not mention any attempt to describe Prince William Sound with greater realism for assessment error and for ecosystem uncertainty due to the oil spill. From our own work, the properties described by Funk and Rowell require a cutoff threshold greater than 50,000 tons (Kiefer et al., 2011).)

What difference does it make whether the herring fishery is closed by a "productivity" threshold or by a "conservation" threshold?

This question was considered by Collie (1991) as he searched for evidence of density dependence in the then new recruitment time series for Prince William Sound and Sitka Sound herring (Collie, 1991),

The value of maintaining a large spawning population to enhance recruitment appears quite limited (Fig. 8). Nor is there clear indication of depensation at low abundance. Thus there is no compelling biological reason for closing the fishery below a threshold biomass. However there may be a biomass threshold below which it is uneconomical to conduct a fishery at all. :::it may be more important for managers to conserve the different geographic components:::

Two others reach the same conclusion. In 2001, Hammarstrom and Otis presented to the Board

revised values for threshold and extraction rate for Kamishak Bay District. In the review of the threshold analysis, they report (Hammarstrom and Otis, 2001), "herring recruitment success in Kamishak Bay appears [to] be related more to environmental factors than spawning stock level." Our work on a dynamics for both Prince William Sound and Sitka Sound herring has reached a similar conclusion, but with two abundance configurations, an upper and a lower, both stable. The stability arises from juvenile production determined by ecosystem constraints and density-dependent interactions between juvenile cohort such that "recruitment" is not a function of spawning biomass. Rather, adult abundance is a function of recruitment and adult mortality. (Kiefer et al., 2011)

Any catch of adults in the "low abundance" configuration (i.e., "below threshold") will, according to the above conjecture, leave recruitment unchanged and decrease adult biomass. Because the outcome of any action relative to expectations is seen four years after the fact, initial actions must be precautionary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There is no pathway known within existing Department operations that is mandated, equipped and staffed to take a community from a twenty-year closure through restart of a fishery with 5 separate fisheries and over 250 permits.

It can only be pulled off locally. That requires resources and some degree of authorization or acknowledgement. This proposal seeks to set that in motion by starting with a common problem that is apart from the tensions over allocation and access from prior practice.

With no progress on a new perspective on utilization of herring, management will gradually lose competency until fisheries are crashing and the whole idea of commercial fishing herring goes away.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal pursues new uses, heritage uses. The issue of quality is for a later phase.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? One reason for proposing the creation of opportunity for access to the resource where none now exists is that it adds and does not take from any stakeholder.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Abandon commercial fishing on herring. Although it has yet to be done, there remains the belief that a herring fishing can be a plus for all rather than a theft from the commons.

PROPOSED BY: Vince Patrick (HQ-F11-227)

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 01.616. Customary and traditional subsistence uses of fish stocks and amount necessary for subsistence uses. Review the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery C&T as follows:

If the BOF reviews the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery and determines that fishery no longer meets the criteria of being a subsistence fishery, the fishery should be re-classified as a personal use fishery with all the same methods and means, season timing, and fish bag limits as currently exists in regulation for the subsistence fishery.

ISSUE: The Alaska Board of Fisheries adopted a definition of the phrase, "subsistence way of life," in March, 2010. The definition states that a subsistence way of life means a way of life that is based on consistent long-term reliance upon fish and game resources for the basic necessities of life. At that same meeting, when the Chitna dipnet fishery was reviewed in light of the new definition, the BOF voted unanimously to continue the Chitna fishery as a personal use fishery. The board did not feel that fishery rose to the level of being a subsistence fishery.

I think it is appropriate for the BOF to review the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery in light of the new definition of a subsistence way of life.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without a review of the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery, in many peoples' minds, an inequality of how subsistence/personal use fisheries are classified in and around the Copper River will continue to exist.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not directly in most cases. In years of weak returns, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game can more easily restrict or close a PU fishery than a subsistence fishery. In average to strong return years, no difference in the fishery would be noted.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone because better management control over the harvest of returning salmon can be done under a PU fishery designation. A healthy resource benefits all user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? In weak return years, if this fishery were re-classified as a PU fishery, harvest could be limited or eliminated. That could impact some users. Commercial fishermen who would otherwise normally harvest fish for home use in this fishery could supplement any loss of PU fish by utilizing the "home pack" option.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leaving the situation status quo would only continue hard feelings between Interior residents who felt cheated when the Chitna dipnet fishery was continued as a personal use fishery and the Cordova residents who currently enjoy a subsistence fishery but who are in similar circumstances to the Interior residents utilizing the Chitna fishery. A fair and impartial review of the Copper River District salmon subsistence fishery, which was created prior to the development of the definition of a subsistence way of life, should eliminate

any concerns of unequal treatment of fisheries classifications for Alaskan residents dependent on these fisheries for filling their home freezers.

PROPOSED BY: Howard Delo (HQ-F11-017)

PROPOSAL 52 - 5 AAC 01.610. Fishing seasons. Specify open periods in the Copper River District subsistence fishery as follows:

Keep the existing regulation but add that subsistence fishing will also be open for a 24 hour period beginning each Saturday at 0700 throughout the season and when regularly scheduled commercial periods are suspended.

ISSUE: Current regulations for subsistence fishing in the Copper River District only provide opportunity when the commercial season does not open or during commercial periods when the season is underway on a regular schedule. In previous years, the department has opened subsistence fishing by Emergency Order when the regular commercial schedule has been suspended. The department has eliminated this practice and has stated that reasonable opportunity is being provided for during the commercial periods.

1. Subsistence users who work during the commercial openers have no opportunity to participate in the fishery as it is currently structured.
2. Subsistence opportunity during suspension of the commercial fishery is not available.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence opportunity in the Copper River District will continue to be the privilege of those with paid vacation, those able to afford time off or those not working.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence users in the Copper River District will have reasonable and realistic opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Open subsistence fishing 24/7 as in the Glennallen Subdistrict – that much time is not necessary to provide opportunity and potentially fill allowable bag limit given the gillnet harvest method.

PROPOSED BY: Copper River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-154)

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 01.648. Prince William Sound Subsistence Salmon Fisheries Management Plan; 5 AAC 01.645. Subsistence bag, possession, and size limits. Amend regulation to combine subsistence areas in PWS as follows:

A new regulation combining the 4 separate subsistence areas into one subsistence area, which would define one subsistence area in Area E with one set of rules regarding legal gear. This could be:

5 AAC 01.648. Prince William Sound Subsistence Salmon Fisheries Management Plan
(c) Salmon may be taken for subsistence purposes in those waters of the Prince William Sound Area as described in 5 AAC 24.000, only as follows:

- (1) salmon may be taken only by gillnets as described in 5 AAC 01.620(3), except that pink salmon may be taken in fresh water by dip nets only;
- (2) no fishing is allowed within the closed waters areas described in 5 AAC 24.350 and 5 AAC 39.290 for commercial salmon fisheries; only pink salmon may be taken in fresh water;

Have one set of bag and possession limits for the above described area. This could be:

5 AAC 01.645. Subsistence bag, possession and size limits.

(b) In the Prince William Sound Area as described in 5 AAC 24.200 the annual subsistence salmon limit is as follows:

- (1) 15 salmon for a household of one person;
- (2) 30 salmon for a household of two persons;
- (3) 10 salmon for each additional person in a household over those specified in (2) of this subsection;
- (4) no more than five king salmon may be taken per permit.
- (5) upon request, a permit for additional salmon will be issued with the following limits:
 - (A) no more than a total of 50 salmon for a permit issued to a household with one person, of which no more than five may be king salmon;
 - (B) no more than a total of 100 salmon for a permit issued to a household within two or more persons, of which no more than five may be king salmon.

ISSUE: The current set of regulations in the 4 separate PWS Subsistence Areas (Tatitlek, Chenega, Copper River and PWS) is far more complex than is needed to provide for the subsistence needs of Alaskans in this area. These regulations were crafted in the 1980's when Tatitlek and Chenega residents could have exclusive access to the areas described in the current 01.648. In addition, there is no direct mention of subsistence harvest in the PWS general area in regulation so current subsistence management of areas outside of the Copper River District and the two areas described in 01.648 must be inferred.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current situation will continue where:

- A Chenega resident who chooses to harvest salmon in the area around his village will be precluded from subsistence fishing in other parts of PWS and the Copper River District,
- Bag limits vary greatly in areas of close proximity,
- Legal gear types vary greatly in areas of close proximity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, the quality of the salmon harvested will remain the same.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence users in PWS will benefit from access to all areas of PWS in a given season rather than being forced to choose only one area and then being locked out of other areas. Tatitlek and Chenega harvests have been minimal in recent years despite unlimited subsistence bag limits this is because the Tatitlek and Chenega subsistence areas do not include areas that have significant numbers of returning sockeye salmon. This solution will allow resident of these villages to harvest the increased bag limit from enhanced returns to the Main Bay hatchery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leaving the current set of regulations vague and incomplete, but this reduces user access to subsistence resources in PWS.

PROPOSED BY: Glen Dune Lankard (HQ-F11-334)

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 01.616. Customary and traditional subsistence uses of fish stocks and amount necessary for subsistence uses. Establish a positive customary and traditional finding for the Chitina dipnet fishery as follows:

Chitna salmon would be designated with a positive C&T finding.

ISSUE: Allocate sufficient time at the meeting for the presentation of “new evidence” and reclassify the Chitna Dipnet Fishery as a State of Alaska subsistence fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Salmon at Chitna have customarily and traditionally been used for subsistence every year for over 100 years. In 2002, the federal government recognized customary and traditional use of salmon in Chitna. In 2008, this Board recognized that all other freshwater fish in the area have been customarily and traditionally used for subsistence. The Chitna Dipnet Fishery was used as a specific example of the type of activity that would be protected as subsistence under the original State subsistence law. In 2003, that protection was removed by a 4-3 vote of the Board who relied on misleading statistics from the Subsistence Division that focused on comparing randomly sampled Chitna users with handpicked AHTNA elders from the Glennallen subsistence fishery. The majority of the Board felt that because Chitna users come from urban centers they could not support a positive C&T finding.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Over 10,000 Alaskan families who participate in the Chitna Dipnet Fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. This is not an allocative proposal. The dipnet fishery would not necessarily be allocated additional fish under a subsistence classification. If

all salmon escapements are forecast, or counted to be below the total allocation for all upriver uses, the dipnet fishery would have a higher priority over commercial and sport uses.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. A customary and traditional used fishstock, for subsistence purposes, should be protected by a positive C&T finding.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-210)

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 01.616. Customary and traditional subsistence uses of fish stocks and amount necessary for subsistence uses. Reclassify the Chitina Dipnet Fishery a subsistence fishery as follows:

Reclassify the Chitina Dipnet Fishery as a State of Alaska subsistence fishery.

ISSUE: When the Board of Fisheries changed the classification of the Chitina Dipnet Fishery from subsistence to personal use in 2003, the decision was based on incorrect and incorrectly presented data. The decision was influenced by a flawed analysis of "users" rather than "uses" as required by the Joint Board's subsistence policy and procedure. The Department's position, stated in testimony, was that it "...did not need to follow Legislative intent..." The Department position provided to the Board was in opposition to the Legislative intent of the State's subsistence law.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A recognized and important Alaska subsistence use will not be provided the priority use it deserves. Thousands of families across Alaska, dependent on the Chitina Dipnet Fishery for their wild salmon needs, will not be provided the protections a subsistence priority would provide.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, during times of poor salmon returns, the subsistence priority would provide for the highest priority use – Alaska residents' subsistence needs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The over 10,000 Alaska families who participate in the Chitina Dipnet Fishery because of a higher priority for fish for Alaskans to eat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. No additional fish would be harvested from the fishery, but it would have allocation priority to a recognized Alaskan subsistence use.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Filing to ask the Alaska court to review the decision of the Board of Fisheries in 2003. It was rejected to provide an opportunity to review and correct the classification administratively.

PROPOSED BY: Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (HQ-F11-139)

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan. Amend the Copper River King Salmon Management Plan as follows:

5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan. (a) The department shall manage the Copper River commercial, personal use, [AND] sport, and subsistence fisheries to achieve a sustainable escapement goal of 24,000 or more for king salmon. For the purposes of managing these fisheries, the department shall consider the best available information regarding harvest, age composition, and escapement, including escapement information obtained from mark-recapture studies, aerial surveys, or by other means.

(b) In the commercial fishery, during the statistical weeks 20 and 21, the commissioner may open no more than one fishing period per statistical week within the inside closure area of the Copper River District described in 5 AAC 24.350(1)(B)(c) In the sport fishery,

(1) in the upper Copper River drainage, the annual limit for king salmon 20 inches or greater in length is four fish;

(2) if the commissioner determines additional conservation measures are necessary to achieve the escapement goals, the commissioner may, by emergency order, use the following management measures in the following priority order:

(A) reduce the annual limit for king salmon;

(B) modify other methods and means not specified in this paragraph;

(C) designate the fishery as a catch and release fishery only;

(D) close specific waters to sport fishing for king salmon

(d) In the Chitina Subdistrict personal use dipnet fishery,

(1) the annual limit for king salmon is one fish;

(2) if the commissioner determines additional conservation measures are necessary to achieve the escapement goals, the commissioner may, by emergency order, close the Chitina Subdistrict personal use dipnet salmon fishery to the retention of king salmon.

(e) In the Glennallen Subdistrict subsistence fishery, if the commissioner determines additional conservation measures are necessary to achieve the escapement goals, the commissioner may, by emergency order, restrict the retention of king salmon or modify methods and means to reduce king salmon harvest in the Glennallen Subdistrict subsistence fishery.

ISSUE: The Board of Fisheries (board) adopted the Copper River King Salmon Management Plan (CRKSMP) at its December 1996 meeting. This management plan specifically addressed management of the commercial, personal use, and sport fisheries of the Copper River. The CRKSMP was updated and modified during subsequent board meetings in 1999, 2002, and 2005. Modifications included establishing and updating the sustainable escapement goal (SEG) in 2002 and 2005, and removal of the personal use fishery reference when the Chitina Subdistrict was classified subsistence in 1999. Reference to the personal use fishery was inadvertently left out of the CRKSMP when the Chitina Subdistrict was reclassified as personal use in 2003 and has remained absent from the management plan. Due to recent poor Copper River king salmon runs, the Chitina Subdistrict personal use fishery was closed to retention of king salmon during portions of the 2009 and 2010 seasons. The proposed language reflects recent management actions. Secondly, the recent poor king salmon runs to the Copper River have initiated discussion of the need to restrict retention of king salmon in the Glennallen Subdistrict subsistence salmon fishery to ensure the escapement goal is met. Although the authority for such restrictions exists in Alaska Statute (AS 16.05.020, 16.05.050, and 16.05.060), specific guidance within the CRKSMP for

inseason management of the Chitina Subdistrict personal use and Glennallen Subdistrict subsistence salmon fisheries provides additional justification for department staff and the public regarding Copper River king salmon management actions.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Specific management guidelines ensuring achievement of the king salmon escapement goal for the Copper River will continue to address only two of the four fisheries that target king salmon on the Copper River.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishery managers and the public will benefit from clear, concise regulations and management plans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-308)

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 01.625 Waters closed to subsistence fishing and 5 AAC 77.570 waters closed to personal use fishing. Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

Stop all netting.

ISSUE: Netting of fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All fishing will be deleted.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Ensures that over harvesting doesn't happen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Over 95% of the people.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Less than 5% of the people.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Karl Moe (SC-F11-016)

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing. Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

No netting of fish in these lakes.

ISSUE: Netting of fish in Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Tyone Lake.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The loss of lake trout due to being caught in nets.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The netting of white fish produces incidental lake trout netting. This will deplete mature lake trout from these lakes.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All persons.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer but adopt new or old ways to harvest white fish allowing lake trout to be able to survive as well.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limiting the size of net. This would still produce incidental fish caught in nets.

PROPOSED BY: Tom and Ellen Frohlich (SC-F11-017)

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing. Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

Stop the abuse of netting fish.

ISSUE: People are netting whitefish and taking trout in mass amounts.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Sport fishing will cease to exist.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The fish can thrive in their natural environment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The fish, sportsmen, fishermen of all ages.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who were previously abusing the environment.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Jake Moe and Brynn Moe (SC-F11-018)

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing. Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

No netting.

ISSUE: Netting of whitefish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Won't be any food for the lake trout.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? More bait fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sportsmen will have a fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Danae Williams (SC-F11-015)

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing. Prohibit netting of whitefish and lake trout in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

There will be no netting of white fish or lake trout.

ISSUE: The netting of whitefish and incidental lake trout.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The fish will be depleted and will not recover.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The fish would have a chance to replenish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Every one.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Gene Moe (SC-F11-013)

PROPOSAL 62 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing. Prohibit netting of whitefish and lake trout in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

There will be no netting of whitefish and incidental lake trout in Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Lake Tyone.

ISSUE: The netting of white fish and incidental lake trout in Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Lake Tyone.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The depletion of fish in Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Lake Tyone.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Lake Tyone would be able to have white fish and lake trout reproducing and maturing to retain a healthy population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen and households who wish to catch and eat fish now and in future generations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Jane Newby and Susitna Group (SC-F11-010)

PROPOSAL 63 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing. Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

No netting of whitefish.

ISSUE: Netting of white fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will threaten the lake trout population and disrupt the ecosystem.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It protects the balance of the ecosystem.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future generations and current sport fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who would like to net white fish.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There is only one solution.

PROPOSED BY: Jenna Kroll

(SC-F11-014)

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing. Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

Stop all netting of fish in Tyone, Lake Louise, and Lake Susitna.

ISSUE: Stop all netting of fish in Tyone, Lake Louise, and Lake Susitna.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All fish will be depleted. There will be a shortage of fish for sport fishing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The lake would be able to reproduce and maintain a sustainable number of fish for a long time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Nets would be removed by locals.

PROPOSED BY: Dorothy Tideman

(SC-F11-011)

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing. Prohibit netting of fish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

No netting of any fish in Lake Louise, Susitna Lake and Tyone Lake.

ISSUE: Stop netting of all fish in Lake Louise, Susitna Lake and Tyone Lake.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Depletion of all fish. Leaving none for sport fishing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The lake would better be able to reproduce and maintain a sustainable number of fish forever.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everybody.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Vigilantism.

PROPOSED BY: Larry Roberts (SC-F11-012)

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 01.610. Fishing Seasons; 5 AAC 01.620. Lawful Gear and gear specifications. Prohibit bycatch, require ADF&G notification, and set season in the whitefish fishery as follows:

Under **5 AAC 01.610. Fishing seasons.** Add the following language:

Any species (except as provided in 5 AAC 01.610(e)) taken incidentally by gillnet may not be retained and must be immediately released

Under **5 AAC 01.620. Lawful Gear and gear specifications.** Add the following language:

Gillnets used for subsistence fishing of freshwater finfish, other than salmon, may be operated only as follows;

- (1) With 24 hour prior notification to ADF&G identifying the specific water body
- (2) May only be fished under the ice
- (3) Must be re-located a minimum distance of 500 feet if greater than 4 lake trout are caught in a set

ISSUE: Excess and possibly deliberate bycatch of lake trout in subsistence whitefish nets.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Possible harm to lake trout stocks.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, but helps eliminate deliberate bycatch of nontarget species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All that are interested in preserving lake trout stocks.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those that benefit from subsistence fishing for whitefish with nets in open water. Those that purposely target lake trout with whitefish subsistence permits.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered a set starting date for season, but freeze up is variable in different lakes from year to year and figured open water fishing allowed the most opportunity for abuse of this fishery.

PROPOSED BY: Copper Basin Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-200)

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 01.610. Fishing seasons (e) Rainbow trout and steelhead; and 5 AAC 01.630. Subsistence fishing permits; Require ADF&G notification, set season, and limit bycatch in the whitefish fishery as follows:

Require subsistence whitefish permit holders to notify ADF&G, 24 hours prior to deploying gear. Season dates for subsistence whitefish; Nov. 10-March 31st. No more than 5% total bycatch will be allowed for the season for each permit holder.

ISSUE: Excessive lake trout bycatch by subsistence whitefish users.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increasing utilization of whitefish by subsistence users will result in unsustainable levels of lake trout bycatch---potentially leading to a closure of the sport fishery on some of the more accessible lakes.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Recreational fishermen, area businesses that serve recreational users. Local residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one should “suffer “through the implementation of this regulation. Subsistence users of whitefish should welcome a regulation that encourages sustainability of a fisheries resource.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? limiting issuance of subsistence permits to residences within a 25 mile radius of the lake to be fished. Rejected because of questions concerning legality.

PROPOSED BY: Paxson Fish & Game Advisory Committee (SC-F11-001)

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing. Establish closed areas and seasons, and prohibit bycatch in the whitefish fishery as follows:

(A)Closure of the Lake Louise/Susitna Lake and Susitna/Tyone channels totally to subsistence whitefish netting to ensure the natural movement of all finfish.

Coordinates for proposed area closure Lake Louise - Susitna Channel area: Lake Louise 62-21-14-53N by 146-38-8-11W to 62-21-25-56N by 146-37-33-60W and Susitna Lake 62-21-22-84N by 146-38-18-76W to 62-21-43-06N by 146-38-14-43W. Area between these four points proposed for closure.

Coordinates for proposed area closure Susitna Lake - Tyone Lake area: Susitna Lake 62-28-34-98N by 146-40-34-03W to 62-28-21-57N by 146-40-31-36W and Tyone Lake 62-28-51-76N by 146-39-56-85W to 62-28-47-12N by 146-39-39-87W. Area between these four points proposed for closure.

B) Change the opening date of the subsistence whitefish fishery from October 1 to November 15 to ensure the protection of lake trout spawning and to avoid collision of boats/nets due to the still active boating season until the lake area is fully frozen.

C) Release all incidental bycatch dead or alive back into the lake system.

ISSUE: Overfishing of lake trout and burbot in the subsistence whitefish gillnet fishery in the Lake Louise, Susitna, and Tyone Lake area. Gillnet fishermen are setting nets across navigable portions of the Lake Louise/Susitna and Susitna/Tyone channel areas creating a safety hazard at the same time allowing no escapement of all species of finfish. These gillnet fishermen are also specifically targeting lake trout spawning area during October.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A) Lake trout, burbot, and other finfish caught as "bycatch" will be depleted and not available for future generations, due to overfishing/overharvesting of the bycatch via whitefish subsistence nets.

B) Possible collision between watercrafts/boats and gillnets in the narrow channel areas. (Cabin owners frequently travel these channels in September and October in the dark.).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality will improve as this measure will lead to conservation and rebuilding of the resource for future years. Despite the lack of data in stock and biomasses the proposed season restrictions will greatly reduce fishing pressure to maintain a healthy balance of all species of finfish which are currently at a historic low level. We need to exercise a precautionary approach to fisheries conservation and management.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those that would benefit are sport and subsistence users that will reclaim a customary and traditional fishery that has been jeopardized by the unethical methods being used at this time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The individuals that net in open water periods by boat.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No fishing at all but rejected to allow people to still have their customary and traditional use.

PROPOSED BY: John & Yvette Delaquito (HQ-F11-177)

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing. Establish closed area and set season dates in the whitefish fishery as follows:

Close the Lake Louise/Lake Susitna Channel to freshwater fish subsistence gillnets. The closed area would extend ¼ mile beyond the channel on both the Lake Louise and the Lake Susitna side of the channel. Also, change the opening date of the "freshwater fish subsistence permit" to December 1st.

This would limit some user groups targeting fish in concentrated shallow water areas and prohibit gillnet use during "OPEN" water.

ISSUE: The decline of quantity and quality of lake trout and whitefish in the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna, Lake Tyone waterway. As residence of Lake Louise and having fished the waterway since the mid-sixties we and other locals have seen a notable decline of this fishery. The USER base has changed with time and the increase of demand has exceeded a sustainable yield. More and more boats fish the Lake Louise waterway every year, with their "high tech" electronics they are quite efficient at catching lake trout. Another element on the demand side of the equation is the Cormorants – it's just been in recent years that we have seen a large increase in the numbers of Cormorants. And another user group is the "freshwater fish subsistence permit" users, their numbers have increased in recent years. Some user groups abuse the resource by targeting the lake trout during the spawning cycle. The lake trout are extremely vulnerable in the shallow water spawning areas. Regulation changes are merited to protect the lake trout during their spawning period and preserve a sustainable yield for the future.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The demand will continue to grow with all user groups and the fragile slow growth resource will continue to decline. The "catch" will continue to be less fish and smaller fish.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes – absolutely. Protecting the lake trout during their spawning cycle and in shallow concentrated areas will result in greater yield - which will increase the survival rate - which will add to the food supply - which will increase numbers and enhance quality. And in time should restore the number of larger lakera which have suffered a serious decline in recent years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Present and future generations of fishermen. All USER groups - also, the local, area wide and State economies.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Simmons (HQ-F11-212)

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; and 5 AAC 77.570. Waters closed to personal use fishing. Restrict netting of whitefish in Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

Limit the amount of white fish netted; no coincidental lake trout in nets; add more regulatory patrolling.

ISSUE: No netting of white fish while taking trout.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? No more fish.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, less waste and squander.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sport fishermen, and residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The environmentally unconscious.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Patrolling personally.

PROPOSED BY: Jesse Moe and Bridget Moe (SC-F11-009)

**Note: This proposal is listed under both Subsistence and Sport Fishing for this meeting.*

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 01.625. Waters closed to subsistence fishing; 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area. Establish lake trout spawning closures in Tyone Lakes complex as follows:

Close lake trout fishing on the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna, Lake Tyone Waterway from September 1st to October 15th.

ISSUE: The decline of quantity and quality of lake trout in the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna, Lake Tyone waterway. Being residents of Lake Louise and having fished the waterway since the mid-sixties - we and other Locals have seen a notable decline over the years. Especially in the last 15 - 20 years. The user base has changed with time, which has increased the demand on a slow growth resource. More and more boats fish the waterway every year - with their "high tech" electronics they are quite efficient at catching lake trout. Cormorants - (another user group) its just been in recent years that we have seen a large increase of Cormorants on this waterway. Another user group that has increased in recent years is the "freshwater fish subsistence permittees". Various user groups target spawning areas during the spawning cycle. The lake trout are extremely vulnerable in the shallow water areas during their spawning period. One of the triggers that's part of the spawning period is water temperature. Water temperature varies from year to year during that time. We have seen lake trout spawn from early September to mid-to late October.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The demand of user groups will continue to grow - which will increase strain on a fragile resource resulting in decline of supply. The fishery will suffer in numbers and quality as it has in recent years.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes - absolutely ! By allowing the spawners to spawn (unmolested by some user groups) the yield will more - which will increase the survival rate -

which will add to the food supply - which will result in an overall increase of lake trout. Also, in time a recovery of larger lakers will improve quality of the resource. The larger lake trout have suffered a serious decline in recent years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Present and future generation fishermen. The local, area wide and state economies.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Simmons (HQ-F11-199)

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan. Rescind allocation reduction in the Chitina personal use fishery as follows:

Rescind regulation.

ISSUE: Chitina personal use fishery being reduced by 50% if commercial fishery is closed more than 13 consecutive days.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskan families forced to other uncustomary means to help feed their families.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chitina Dipnetters Association (HQ-F11-108)

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan. Increase harvest limit of king salmon in the personal use fishery as follows:

Restore retention of king salmon to at least 5 per family and 1 for individuals.

ISSUE: Chitina personal use fishermen being reduced and for the past three (3) years eliminated from keeping king salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chitina personal use fishermen being forced to spend more income to feed their family.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? non-state residents.

PROPOSED BY: Chitina Dipnetters Association (HQ-F11-110)

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan. Allow for retention of king salmon in the personal use fishery as follows:

As long as commercial and sport fisheries are allowed to fish or retain any king salmon, personal use fishermen will be allowed to retain kings 2-3 days per week at the fisheries manager's discretion.

ISSUE: Chitina sub-district personal use dipnetters being eliminated from keeping king salmon and bearing a bigger part of the conservation of the resource on the Copper River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chitina subdistrict personal use dipnetters being eliminated from keeping any king salmon to feed their families while others (commercial and sport fish) only being restricted in the number they can keep or the amount of time they can fish.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chitina sub-district personal use fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The conservation burden will be more equally shared by all user grounds.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chitina Dipnetters Association (HQ-F11-107)

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC XX.XXX. Regulations Title. Increase limit for sockeye salmon in the Chitina Personal Use Fishery as follows:

Increase limit as follows for red salmon in the event kings are eliminated due to a conservation concern-

- 1 person household = 20 reds
- 2 person household = 35 reds
- 3 person household = 45 reds
- 4 person household = 60 reds
- 5 or more person household = 75 reds.

ISSUE: Reduction in king salmon in the Chitina personal use fishery to 1 and elimination of kings the last three (3) years, this equals a reduction of meat to feed families.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chitina personal use fishers being forced to spend more income to feed their family.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chitina Dipnetters Association (HQ-F11-109)

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 77.591. Copper River Personal Use Dip Net Salmon Fishery Management Plan. Delay opening of Chitina personal use dipnet fishery as follows:

Open the dipnetters season June 15th of each year.

ISSUE: Delay the Personal Use/Dipnetters fishing until June 15th.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The amount of "native salmon" going up to spawn at the Upper Copper River, Copper Lake, Tanada Creek, Mentasta Fish Creek, Indian River and Sinona Creek, needs to get through. When you have 9,000 to 10,000 dipnetters/personal use fishermen fishing, they are catching a lot of the Native fish, the State of Alaska" DO NOT check all or very few of the permits and amount of fish caught "it isn't a very accurate count without the Check Point. The State of Alaska needs to reinstall the 24 hour Check Point at the Chitina Five Mile Airport, State of Alaska use to have the Check Point in the 80's. I have a subsistence fish camp/fish wheel located at the Airport, when the first run of Native salmon comes to Chitina, we average approximately 5 to 20 salmon the last few days of May, to the first 15 days of June, after the dipnetter start fishing, the amount of fish we catch is 50% less.

The first run Native stock going to the Upper Copper River are the stronger fish because of the distance they have to travel, they run the middle of May, through the month of June. The later

run of salmon spawns in the Gulkana, Tazlina, Kulitina Rivers, they start going up these river approx. June 15th, and there is generally more of them.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal would increase the amount of native salmon stock, to reach the Upper Copper River to spawn.

Delaying the Dipnetter personal use season will increase the amount of native salmon to reach the Upper Copper River spawning streams.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All the fishermen will benefit, commercial, subsistence and personal use. This will keep the stock of stronger native salmon in the Copper River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer, delaying the personal use season 1 week will not affect the amount of salmon they are requiring to catch on their Personal use permit, the salmon season is open for them until the end of October.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limit the number of people that are listed to use the personal use fish wheels, at Chitina, 50 to 100 name is to large of a list to keep track of who is using the fish wheel and how many fish they have caught.

I knew some of the fish wheel owners that are hauling a lot more fish than their permits allow, every weekend. Also they are processing the fish in their motor homes, freezing and canning on site.

With the State of Alaska Check Point, at the Chitina Airport the State of Alaska would have a accurate count of salmon harvested, and then they will know the amount of salmon that escaped to the spawning streams. This will make it better for everyone, more salmon getting to the spawning stream

PROPOSED BY: Elmer V. Marshall (HQ-F11-207)

Note, a board committee has identified the following proposal as a “restructuring” proposal. A restructuring proposal is one that is likely to have substantial economic, social, or biological impacts and may require significant changes to the management of a fishery. The proposed regulatory change may strive to improve the value of a fishery by providing new and increased opportunities to: 1) raise the revenue generated from harvested fish (e.g. through improved quality); or 2) lower the cost of fishing operations; or 3) improve conservation.

The board is seeking additional information on this proposal in order that it can be fully evaluated. During the October 11-12, 2011 worksession, the board will:

- a) Determine if the proposal is complete;*
- b) Determine if there are outstanding questions or information needed;*
- c) Confirm that board has authority to act on the proposal; identify any aspects of the proposal where board may need additional authority to make decisions;*

- d) Identify whether CFEC, Dept. of Commerce, Dept. of Labor or other agencies need to be consulted on issues raised by the proposal and if so, bring staff together to schedule work and process; and
- e) Identify proposal's review process and schedule.

The additional information requested in order to fully evaluate this proposal can be found in the 11 questions contained in the board's Restructuring Proposal Form (see Page xiv). The board invites the author and the public to submit any additional information to help in the evaluation of this proposal.

PROPOSAL 77 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Amend the regulation to allow use of two set gillnet permits in Eshamy District as follows:

5 AAC 24.331 would be changed as follows:

1) in the Eshamy District

(a) Notwithstanding 5 AAC 39.240(a), no more than two setnet CFEC interim-use or entry permit card holder may operate together when both are in compliance with 5 AAC 39.107.

No person may [OPERATE, OR] have on board a vessel, more than 150 fathoms of set gillnet in the aggregate;

ISSUE: Setnetting traditionally has tended to be a family endeavor. Current PWS regulations do not allow a family with more than one permit to work in the safest, most convenient and efficient manner. The need to allow permits to operate together is already recognized in the PWS fishery. In the Copper River and Bering River districts, 5 AAC 24.331 already states "no more than two vessels may operate together..." Also 5 AAC 06.331 (f) governing Bristol Bay setnetters states "...a person may assist in operation or transportation of additional set gillnet gear..." Currently about one-third of the setnet permits in PWS are owned by families with two or more permits. By not allowing PWS setnetters the option of joint operation, they are being unduly hindered.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Potential safety issues. Since setnetting is family oriented, youth often have permits. Under current law, if a dangerous situation arises, parents legally would have to standby and hope their children can handle it. Of course they wouldn't, which shows another problem with current law. Having fished with a two permit family, I know there are times the current law is ignored. Such as when one boat going through all the gear while the other boat sells and goes to prepare dinner. If two permits decide to operate together, they should not have to break the law to be the most efficient and have the convenience two permits can provide.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It may improve quality of the resource harvested. It may allow the fish to be brought to the tender quicker. It could keep one boat from having to travel large distances between nets, if the other boat could pick the distant net, and reduce the time the fish are in the boat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone in the setnet fishery who decides to join operations. Any families who currently own more than one permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I cannot think of any reason anyone would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions were considered.

PROPOSED BY: Michael E. Brown (HQ-F11-035, previously HQ-08F-168)

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specifications and operations. Amend gear restrictions in PWS Salmon Purse Seine Fishery as follows:

Vessel with two valid PWS salmon purse seine permits onboard are allowed to use less than seven inch mesh in the body of their leads. Vessels with one valid PWS purse seine permit on board will still be required to use at least seven inch mesh in the body of their lead.

ISSUE: To many vessels purse seining in PWS.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The active purse seine fleet will continue to grow until it reaches close to the 267 permits licensed for the PWS purse seine fleet.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All salmon purse seiners in PWS will realize some benefit. The active purse seine fleet has increased from a low of 101 active permits in 2005 to 174 in 2010. Each year another 10 to 20 vessels are added to the seine fleet. Currently there are 267 purse seine permits licensed for PWS.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I do not think anybody will suffer by allowing permit stacking in the PWS purse seine fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I would like to see purse seines in PWS limited to the 150 fathom of salmon web. Eliminate the 75 fathom lead from being used. I do not think the seiners in PWS would support the removal of using their leads. Fishermen by nature always want more gear and bigger boats.

PROPOSED BY: Leroy L Cabana (HQ-F11-073)

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Ban use of deep gillnets in Montague District prior to Coghill, Eshamy, and Unakwik districts opening to deep gear as follows:

5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations.

(6) before the first Monday in July, unless modified by emergency order, in the Coghill, Unakwik, and Eshamy districts **and the Port Chalmers Subdistrict of the Montague District,** gillnets with a mesh size of less than eight inches may not be more than 60 meshes in depth and gillnets with a mesh size of eight inches or greater may not be more than 40 meshes in depth;

ISSUE: The use of illegal deep gillnets (greater than 60 meshes) in the Coghill, Eshamy and Unakwik districts prior to those districts opening to deep gear later in the season as described in 5AAC 24.331.

These illegal gillnets are being brought over from the Port Chalmers Subdistrict where they have been legal in the early season since 2009.

Beginning in 2009, as a result of the PWS Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Management Plan established by the Alaska Board of Fisheries in 2005, drift gillnet permit holders have been permitted to harvest hatchery chum salmon in the Port Chalmers Subdistrict of the Montague District from June 1 - July 30. Deep gillnets were permitted during the first year of this fishery and in all years thereafter. There has been numerous instances observed by permit holders of other drift fishers traveling from the Port Chalmers sub district early in the season with deep gear to other districts where this gillnets greater than 60 mesh are illegal.

This proposal would permit **ONLY** the use of shallow gillnet gear in the Port Chalmers Subdistrict early in the season until other districts in PWS open to deep gillnet at which point deep gear would be legal in the Port Chalmers Subdistrict as well.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Illegal use of gear will continue, with the result of enforcement expending more man hours. Continued unfair advantage given to fishers that use illegal deep gear fishing next to fishers using legal gear.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would actually help increase quality of the PWS chum and pink gillnet salmon fisheries. Processors have in the past, complained of low quality harvest, by deep gillnets. Fishers using 60 mesh nets are able to clear their nets quicker and the salmon quality is therefore increased.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishermen who desire to fish competitively with other participants in the early season Port Chalmers fishery and also fish legally in other districts open in the early season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Only commercial gillnet fishers that continue to use illegal gear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Marking corks differently for deep gear. This would be overly complex for both stakeholders and enforcement. This would also result in an increased cost to participants in this fishery.

2) A complete ban on gillnets deeper than 60 mesh is an option, though gillnet fishers would be at a disadvantage during the pink salmon harvest, fishing alongside seine vessels, with deep nets.

PROPOSED BY: James Mykland (HQ-F11-011)

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Further define keg or buoy as follows:

(f) Except for the end of the drift gillnet attached to the vessel operating the gear, each end of a drift gillnet in operation must have a red keg or buoy attached. For purposes of this regulation, the keg or float may not be a CFEC registered vessel or other motorized vessel.

ISSUE: Recently, commercial permit holders in Area E have been using motorized vessels as kegs or buoys when drift gillnet fishing. Other permit holders, as well as law enforcement officers, have reported numerous occasions where drift gillnet gear has been operated in a nontraditional manner. This includes both vessels towing perpendicularly on the deployed drift gillnet and having the powered “keg” tow the far end of the gillnet back to the vessel while the gear is being hauled in shallow water, effectively pursuing the gear.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? These types of violations will continue without further clarification of this regulation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishing permit holders.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-283)

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 24.331. Gillnet specifications and operations. Remove intent language and clarify anchoring and towing of drift gillnet gear as follows:

(c) For the purpose of this regulation, a gillnet shall be considered to be a drift gillnet unless it has been [INTENTIONALLY] set, staked, anchored or otherwise fixed.

...

(f) Notwithstanding 5 AAC 39.105(d) (3), a person may not operate a drift gillnet when the vessel to which it is attached is grounded, or when any part of the gillnet is grounded above the waterline.

(g) A person may not use mechanical power to hold a vessel in substantially the same geographical location while attached to a drift gillnet.

ISSUE: Some drift gillnet permit holders allow their drift gillnets to become anchored or otherwise made fast to the bottom in the waters surrounding Esther Island and in other locations in Prince William Sound (PWS). This is done either by piling leadline on the beach or in shallow water and then setting the net, or by setting across submerged boulders that secure the net. Under current PWS regulations set gillnets may only be used in Eshamy District. Currently, when drift gillnet boats “rock down” or allow their gear to stop drifting, either by grounding or using of mechanical power, they are preventing access to the fishery resource by those fishermen who are using gillnets legally.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? De facto set gillnetting will continue in districts outside of the Eshamy District and drift gillnet permit holders who comply with regulations will be prevented from harvesting the fishery resource in areas obstructed by these improperly used gillnets.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Drift gillnet permit holders who comply with regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-290)

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 24.332(a). Seine specifications and operations. Revise purse seine mesh restrictions for commercial seining in PWS as follows:

Except for the first five fathoms in length of the purse seine, a purse seine may not be less than 200 meshes or more than 330 meshes in depth, or less than 125 fathoms of more than 150 fathoms in length, hung measure. A cork line border strip may be used, not to exceed 5 meshes of more than 4” stretch measure. Body web of seine may not exceed 300 meshes of more than 3 ½” stretch measure and a chafing strip above or below the lead line not to exceed 25 meshes of more than 5” stretch measure. Leads deeper than the seine, exceeding 75 fathoms in length or with mesh size less than 7” may not be used except as specified in 5 AAC 39.260(f).

ISSUE: Salmon seine specifications for PWS need to be updated so modern efficient seine construction techniques can be used by net builders.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Seinners in PWS will have trouble taking advantage of efficient new net improvements.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seiners.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: CDFU-Seine Division (HQ-F11-053)

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specifications and operations. Allow a purse seine chafing and border strip for the PWS salmon purse seine fishery as follows:

The new regulation would read exactly like the regulation prior to 2008, except that a corkline collar of up to 5 and one half meshes will be allowed and not considered for measurement of the 325 mesh depth restriction.

ISSUE: Seine specifications for Prince William Sound were changed three years ago to make most of the salmon seine nets utilized in PWS illegal. Specifically, the allowance of a chafing strip 25 meshes above the leadline of mesh size up to 7" was deleted. We need this provision written back into 5AAC24.332. Also, we need a corkline boarder collar of 5 and one half meshes also added into the regulation, with this 5 and one half meshes not counted towards the 325 mesh depth restriction.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? More than 90% of the salmon purse seine nets used in Prince William Sound will continue to be illegal.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? My proposal is nothing more than bringing the seine specification regulation into compliance with the purse seine nets that most PWS purse seine fishermen are using.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The vast majority of the purse seine fishermen will benefit because their purse seine nets will be considered legal again.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don't see that my proposed regulation will harm anyone.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The only other solution for this problem is for most of the PWS seine fishermen to remove their 5" or 7" chafing strips and replace them with a 4" or less chafing strip. They would also need to remove their corkline boarder collars that they've been using. This changing of the fishing nets will benefit no one except the net suppliers and net hangers.

PROPOSED BY: Alan Kapp (HQ-10F-016)

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specification and operations. Amend gear restrictions for PWS salmon purse seine fishery as follows:

The total aggregate length of a seine is 225 fathoms, including any lead.

- (a) ...no purse seine may be less than 200 meshes or more than 325 meshes in depth, [OR LESS THAN 125 FATHOMS OR MORE THAN 150 FATHOMS IN LENGTH, HUNG MEASURE] or with mesh size greater than 4 inches. **The first 25 meshes above the leadline may be a chafing strip, with a mesh size no larger than seven and 1/2 inches. A border strip attached to the corkline may also be used.**

ISSUE: I would like the Board of Fisheries to repeal the requirement for PWS seiners to use 7” mesh size lead web, in the last 75 fathoms of our 225 fathom seines.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This is an archaic regulation based on a time when most PWS seiners used detachable leads to access shallow water, and because their boats were too small to carry a full 225 fathom seine, they kept a 75 fathom lead in their jitneys (skiffs) with the advent of modern, larger boats, gear and techniques, more and more fishermen use leads permanently attached to the seine. Prince William Sound has become primarily a hatchery fishery and when the department opens the fishery, the goal is to harvest all the fish above and beyond cost recovery, or after escapement is met. Lead web is so large it allows pink salmon to swim through its 7” mesh size. Why should we burn fuel and go through all the effort to catch all excess fish with gear that allows our target species to swim through it? This makes no sense at all. I am also convinced that lead web tows much harder through the water. Therefore, we burn more fuel to tow this kind of seine. This change would not prohibit the use of lead web, if a fisherman still wants to use lead web or a detachable lead (double pinning) for the last 75 fathoms of their net they still can. It simply allows the choice of using lead web or not.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will reduce the amount of gillnet in large meshed lead web.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen who use and prefer permanently attached leads a single 225 fathom seine.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo is wasteful, archaic and inefficient.

PROPOSED BY: Jamie Ross (HQ-F11-347)

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specifications and operations. Reduce gear limits for the PWS salmon purse seine fishery as follows:

Salmon purse seine vessels may fish 150 fathoms of salmon gear, no leads will be allowed.

ISSUE: To much purse seine gear in PWS.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Congestion will continue to increase in the PWS salmon purse seine fleet. Management for escapement of wild stocks will be more difficult.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Every salmon purse seine vessel in PWS, 75 fathoms less gear to buy or repair.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Folks who sell or repair salmon seine gear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Leroy L. Cabana (HQ-F11-117)

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 24.332. Seine specifications and operations. Revise lead mesh size for commercial seining in PWS as follows:

5 AAC 24.352 sentence #2 – Leads deeper than the seine, exceeding 75 fathoms in length may not be used except as specified in 5 AAC 39.260(f).

5 AAC 39.260(f) where the use of lead is permitted a purse seine vessel may not have or use more than one lead of legal length and depth, without purse rings attached.

ISSUE: Pink salmon escaping through the lead web. As pink salmon mature they lose their fear of nets, boats, plungers, etc. As a result they commonly swim through the 7” mesh of the lead.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Excessive buildups of late season pink salmon become more likely. Reducing the possibility of buildups is to everyone’s benefit including both common property fisheries and cost recovery operations.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. More effective harvest out front results in fresher fish, better quality and increased value.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seiner; wishing to increase efficiency and value.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Rob Nelson

(HQ-F11-062)

PROPOSAL 87 - 5 AAC 39.260. Seine specifications and operations. Revise lead mesh size for PWS salmon purse seine fishery as follows:

5AAC39.260 (f) Where the use of leads is permitted, a purse seine vessel may not have or use more than one lead of legal length and depth, without purse rings attached, and with a minimum mesh size of six inches, except that a lead may have a cork line border strip not to exceed five meshes of less than of less than seven-inch stretch measure and a lead line chafing strip not to exceed 25 meshes less than seven-inch stretch measure.

ISSUE: Seine specifications for lead web-size needs to be updated to account for shrinkage of used web as nylon shrinks when it gets wet and is used for several years.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Seiners who were in compliance with regulation after the initial purchase of 7-inch lead web will be forced to be bound by a regulation that is unduly costly to them. If regulation is modified it will allow seiners to continue using their leads with no negative consequence to their fishery.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seiners.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Timothy J. Moore

(HQ-F11-118)

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 24.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts and sections. Create a subdistrict in the Coghill District for commercial salmon fishing as follows:

Create a subdistrict in the Coghill district to include waters north of Pt Pigot at 60.48.21N 148.20.90W to a point along the Coghill district boundary at 60.47.56N 148.18.46W and waters west of a line from 60.47.56N 148.18.46W to Pt. Pakenham at 61.00.429N 148.04.363W to be named the Beetles Bay subdistrict. This subdistrict would be managed for wild stock escapement and opened by emergency order when escapement levels warrant a harvest.

ISSUE: Currently wild stock systems on the west side of Port Wells tend to be open to Drift gillnet gear in general district openings targeting Coghill sockeye and WHN chums even though these west side wild stock systems may lack sufficient escapement to have a targeted fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Potential intercept of wild stock pink and chums salmon bound for these systems is detrimental to escapement in years of low abundance to these streams.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In weak wild stock returns these systems would have added protection to help insure minimum escapements, all users would benefit from this.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None that I can see.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Tom Nelson (HQ-F11-049)

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 24.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections. Amend boundaries for the Northwest, Eshamy, Coghill districts and Esther Subdistrict as follows:

5 AAC 24.200 would be rewritten to reflect the above changes with an emphasis on protecting wild salmon stocks.

ISSUE: Currently, excessive harvest of wild stock pink and chum salmon are occurring during fisheries targeting hatchery sockeye and chum salmon in the Main Bay and Coghill districts. This excessive harvest chronically affects escapement into historic seine districts, leading to closures and restrictions on time and area to the seine fleet during the historic July wild pink and chum seasons. The board should redraw the boundaries for the Northwest, Eshamy, Esther, and Coghill districts to expand the Northwest district to within ½ mile of Esther Island, move the Coghill district north of a line from Point Pakenham to the north shore of Esther Passage, and change the Esther subdistrict to all waters within ½ mile of Esther Island west and south of Esther Island. The board should further restrict the area open to drift gillnetting in the Main Bay and Eshamy districts to more of a terminal harvest area, with input from the department as to what would be most practical and efficient, in order to provide the highest priority to wild salmon stocks.

If wild stock escapements warrant expanded fishing opportunity in the Main Bay and Eshamy district, the department shall also open the Northwest district to the seine fleet.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued interception and overharvest of wild salmon stocks will occur while prosecuting hatchery returns. This will continue to detrimentally impact the areas open to the seine fleet during the July and August returns. Furthermore, the board and the department must manage for wild stock escapement over enhanced harvest.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The seine fleet will benefit if escapement goals in traditional seine areas are met and expanded opportunity to harvest wild stocks becomes available.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The gillnet fleet will suffer in the short term while learning to harvest in a terminal fishery as the seine fleet currently does. Also, the gillnet fleet would be giving up some of the wild salmon stocks currently intercepted.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The issue of wild stock interception has been before the board for several cycles and has been the subject of two petitions, with no action taken until the present time. One possible solution may be to further limit mesh size and depth or length on gillnets. However, expanding mesh size might allow small pink salmon to slip through, it is doubtful that it would have any meaningful impact on chum interception. The terminal harvest model has been proven and is used extensively on the seine fleet, and should also be imposed upon the drift gillnet fleet to prevent interception of wild stocks.

PROPOSED BY: Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-235)

PROPOSAL 90 - 5 AAC 24.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections. Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Eshamy District:

(h) Eshamy District: waters [WITHIN ONE NAUTICAL MILE OF THE MAINLAND SHORE FROM THE LONGITUDE OF THE OUTER POINT ON THE NORTH SHORE OF GRANITE BAY TO THE LONGITUDE OF THE LIGHT ON THE SOUTH SHORE OF THE ENTRANCE TO PORT NELLIE JUAN LIGHT]. east of a line from the entrance to Port Nellie Juan at 60° 35.87'N. lat., 148° 06.11'W. long. to a point approximately 1 nautical mile offshore at 60° 36.87'N. lat., 148° 06.11'W. long. and enclosed by a line beginning at 60° 36.87'N. lat., 148°06.11'W. long. to 60°36.144'N. lat., 148°03.72'W. long., to 60° 31.17'N. lat., 147° 56.43'W. long., to 60° 30.038'N. lat., 147° 55.58'W. long., to 60° 26.12'N. lat., 147° 54.12'W. long., to 60° 25.30'N. lat., 147° 55.10'W. long., to 60° 24.45'N. lat., 147° 55.99'W. long., to 60° 24.04'N. lat., 147° 58.90'W. long., to Granite Point at 60° 24.94'N. lat., 147° 57.97'W. long.

ISSUE: The current regulation describes the district boundary line one nautical mile off the mainland shore between the Port Nellie Juan light and Granite Point. This line is convoluted and difficult for the drift gillnet fleet to identify using current GPS technology. This proposal will create a line that is approximately one nautical mile offshore defined by 10 sets of latitude and longitude coordinates. The last point is the location of the historical plywood markers. This line has been used by stakeholders and Alaska Wildlife Troopers as the boundary for the Eshamy District.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The existing line one nautical mile from the mainland shore will remain convoluted and difficult to identify using widely available GPS technology.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishermen, department staff, and enforcement staff will benefit from fishing boundaries that are identified by GPS coordinates.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-285)

PROPOSAL 91 - 5 AAC 24.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections. Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Coghill and Northwestern districts:

(f) Coghill District: waters north and east of a line from Point Pigot (60° 48.21' N. lat., 148° 20.90' W. long.) to a point west of Point Culross at 60° 45.45' N. lat., 148° 11.07' W. long. and from Point Culross (60° 45.58' N. lat., 148° 08.74' W. long.) to a point west of Culross Light at 60° 45.16' N. lat., 148° 07.87' W. long. to Point Perry (60° 45.05' N. lat., 147° 57.62' W. long.) to the west island of the Bald Head Chris Islands at 60° 47.97' N. lat., 147° 51.62' W. long. to a point on the mainland at **60° 49.26' N. lat., 147° 51.20' W. long.** [60° 49.33' N. LAT., 147° 51.12' W. LONG.]

(1) Esther Subdistrict: waters of the Coghill District south and east of a line from [AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED ON THE WESTERN SHORE OF ESTHER ISLAND AT 60° 48.06' N. LAT., 148° 08.54' W. LONG.] **a point on the western shore of Esther Island at 60° 48.08' N. lat., 148° 08.54' W. long.** to [ESTHER ROCKS TO POINT CULROSS] **Esther Rock (60° 48.08' N. lat., 148° 10.67' W. long.) to Point Culross (60° 45.58' N. lat., 148° 08.74' W. long.) to a point west of Culross Light at 60° 45.16' N. lat., 148° 07.87' W. long.** and south of a line crossing Esther Passage from 60° 49.51' N. lat., 147° 52.62' W. long. to 60° 49.51' N. lat., 147° 54.82' W. long.;

(2) Granite Bay Subdistrict: waters of Port Wells, east of a line from Esther Rock at 60° 48.08' N. lat., 148° 10.67' W. long. to a point at 60° 51.68' N. lat., 148° 09.84' W. long. and to a point at 60° 55.81' N. lat., 148° 05.89' W. long., including all waters of Esther Passage north of a line at 60° 49.51' N. lat.;

(g) Northwestern District: waters south and west of a line from Point Pigot (60° 48.21' N. lat., 148° 20.90' W. long.) to **a point west of Point Culross at 60° 45.45' N. lat., 148° 11.07' W. long. and from** Point Culross (60° 45.58' N. lat., 148° 08.74' W. long.) to a point west of Culross Light at 60° 45.16' N. lat., 148° 07.87' W. long. and from a point on the southern end of Culross Island at 60° 38.31' N. lat., 148° 08.62' W. long. to a point approximately 1.5 miles west of Port Nellie Juan Light at 60° 34.86' N. lat., 148° 08.62' W. long. to the Eshamy District boundary at the light on the south shore of the entrance to Port Nellie Juan Light, including Culross Passage and waters of Culross Bay.

(1) Whittier Subdistrict: waters west of a line from Point Pigot to a point at 60° **45.85'** [40.71] N. lat., 148° **13.73'** [13.87] W. long., including Passage Canal, Blackstone Bay, and Cochrane Bay;

(2) Culross Island Subdistrict: waters east of a line from Point Pigot to a point at 60° 40.71' N. lat., 148° 13.87' W. long., south of a line from Point Pigot to **a point west of Point Culross at 60° 45.45' N. lat., 148° 11.07' W. long. and from** Point Culross to a point west of Culross Light at 60° 45.16' N. lat., 148° 07.87' W. long., including waters of Culross Bay and Culross Passage and north of a line from a point approximately 1.5 miles west of Port Nellie Juan Light at 60° 34.86' N. lat., 148° 08.62' W. long., to a point on the mainland at 60° 36.46' N. lat., 148° 11.37' W. long.;

ISSUE: Inaccurate and unclear regulatory boundary descriptions are present in regulation for the Coghill and Northwestern districts. The northeastern boundary of the Northwestern District is in error based on adjustments made to the common Coghill District boundary at the 2005 Board of Fisheries meeting. The coordinates describing the southern point of the eastern boundary to the Whittier Subdistrict is being adjusted to correct a typographical error. The current latitude and longitude coordinates in regulation that define the eastern boundary of the Coghill District describe a point approximately 160 feet east of Squaw Point and approximately 300 feet into Squaw Bay. This point should be on Squaw Point. This deviation is due to Loran imprecision when this point was put into regulation in the 1960s. In addition, the current northwest boundary of the Esther Subdistrict is a line that is approximately 120 feet south of the Granite Bay Subdistrict boundary. The coordinates for Culross Point and at Culross light are not given in the Esther Subdistrict regulatory description.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? These issues will continue to be corrected annually by the department by emergency order.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishermen, resource managers, enforcement staff, and the public will benefit by having clarity in these regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-286)

PROPOSAL 92 - 5 AAC 24.310. Fishing seasons. Revise season description for the purse seine fishery in the Eastern, Northern, Northwestern, Southwestern, Montague, and Southeastern districts as follows:

- (a) The Copper River District is open and closed by emergency order.

- (b) The Bering River District is open and closed by emergency order.
- (c) In the Coghill and Unakwik districts, salmon may be taken only during seasons established by emergency order.
- (d) In the Eshamy District, salmon may be taken only during seasons established by emergency order.
- (e) In the Eastern, Northern, Northwestern, Southwestern, Montague and Southeastern districts, salmon may be taken only during [SEASONS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER] **regularly scheduled bi-weekly 12 hour openings established by the department to begin no earlier than June 1. Openings may be expanded or restricted as necessary to protect wild and enhanced salmon stocks. If run strengths are sufficient to warrant additional fishing time, such fishing time shall be established by E.O. Authority.**

ISSUE: Currently, management decisions are based upon aerial surveys for the seine fleet, while gillnet seasons tend to open weekly until there is a need to restrict a fishery. The problem with aerial surveys is that they fail to provide information until salmon reach their natal streams, when they are usually off-limits to harvest opportunity. The board should direct the department to conduct weekly openings for the seine fleet in the same manner as seine fleets are managed in other areas of the state and reduce time and area if warranted by catch rates and other data. By failing to use the fleet as a test fishery, the department's management decisions are based upon stale information. In the case of the 2010 season, salmon returns were much stronger than predicted and opportunity to spread the fleet out and provide product to processors occurred later than necessary.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to rely solely on aerial surveys and their own test boat to determine run strength and composition to the detriment of the seine fleet.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. In times of strong returns, more salmon will be harvested outside the terminal harvest areas, improving flesh quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The department will obtain more timely data regarding salmon returns to PWS and the seine fleet will have an opportunity to spread out and provide higher quality product to market.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This proposal does not seek to remove allocation from another gear type.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There was discussion with the department regarding the efficacy of utilizing a gillnet vessel fishing a transect line, similar to Cook Inlet. However, the seine fleet is uncomfortable with the gillnet gear type fishing areas historically open to seine only. Also, there is an issue regarding stock composition based upon species and whether a

gillnet would provide accurate data because the catch rate would be variable depending on mesh size, depth and color.

PROPOSED BY: Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-236)

PROPOSAL 93 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed waters. Close designated areas to commercial fishing in PWS as follows:

The following areas are closed to commercial salmon fishing, July 1 - August 31

The area east of 148.02, west of 147.52, north of 60.38, south of 60.42

The area east of 148.10, west of 148.05, north of 60.43, south of 60.46

The area east of 148.22, west of 148.18, north of 60.47, south of 60.51

The area east of 147.52, west of 147.48, north of 60.03, south of 60.05

The area east of 147.49, west of 147.43, north of 60.29, south of 60.31

ISSUE: The diverse geographic locations of salmon hatcheries in Prince William Sound disperse commercial purse seining throughout much of western Prince William Sound. When pink salmon are being harvested the efficiency of harvest captures the majority of coho salmon in the area also and at times nearly eliminates sport harvest opportunities in much of western Prince William Sound.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued lack of sport fish opportunity for coho salmon in western Prince William Sound, particularly in August.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will improve coho salmon sport fishing consistency and relieve pressure on the small natural coho runs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport fishermen and local businesses associated with sport fishing.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Commercial fishermen have been restricted to smaller and smaller areas over the years to better target specific runs. These restrictions will further condense their fishing areas, however, it would have a very small effect on total harvest.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Other options included asking for several more small areas as well as larger areas that would not only provide sport fishermen larger areas to fish but protect natural coho runs as well. These were rejected as the areas are too large and it is felt that these 5 areas along with current restrictions in place will provide sufficient consistent sport fish opportunity to western Prince William Sound sport fishermen.

PROPOSED BY: David Pinguoch (HQ-F11-146)

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed Waters. Correct geographic description of closed waters in PWS Area districts as follows:

(3) Eastern District:

(A) Simpson Bay, north of 60° 38.00' N. lat., Orca Inlet and Nelson Bay south and east of a line from Salmon Point to Shepard Point, and all of Orca Inlet southeast of Hawkins Island;

(B) Sheep Bay: north of a line from **60° 42.02' N. lat., 145° 55.12' W. long.**, [60° 41.97' N. LAT., 145° 55.27' W. LONG.] to 60° 41.66' N. lat., 145° 55.52' W. long., **and north of a line from 60° 41.14' N. lat., 145° 56.27' W. long., to 60° 40.84' N. lat., 145° 56.56' W. long.;**

(C) Comfort Cove: east of a line from **60° 42.96' N. lat., 146° 05.67' W. long., to 60° 42.70' N. lat., 146° 05.78' W. long.** [60° 42.97' N. LAT., 146° 05.62' W. LONG., TO 60° 42.71' N. LAT., 146° 05.72' W. LONG.];

(D) Olsen Bay: north of 60° 44.06' N. lat.;

(E) Beartrap Bay: east of a line from 60° 44.86' N. lat., **145° 59.64' W. long., to 60° 44.55' N. lat.** [145° 59.57' W. LONG., TO 60° 44.56' N. LAT], 145° 59.62' W. long.;

(F) St. Matthews Bay: east of a line at **146° 18.09' W. long.** [146° 18.12' W. LONG.], and within 500 yards of the northwestern shore, north of 60° 45.36' N. lat.;

(G) Two Moon Bay: south of a line from **60° 44.74' N. lat., 146° 30.15' W. long., to 60° 44.63' N. lat., 146° 30.93' W. long.** [60° 44.86' N. LAT., 146° 30.32' W. LONG., TO 60° 44.66' N. LAT., 146° 30.92' W. LONG.];

(H) Irish Cove: south of a line from **60° 46.13' N. lat., 146° 26.84' W. long.** [60° 46.16' N. LAT., 146° 26.82' W. LONG.], to 60° 46.06' N. lat., 146° 26.62' W. long.;

(I) Whalen Bay: east of a line from **60° 49.23' N. lat., 146° 15.17' W. long., to 60° 48.59' N. lat., 146° 16.02' W. long.** [60° 49.26' N. LAT., 146° 15.22' W. LONG., TO 60° 48.61' N. LAT., 146° 16.02' W. LONG.];

(J) Fish Bay: north of **60° 48.92' N. lat.** [60° 48.81' N. LAT.];

(K) Landlocked Bay: within the bay east of **a line in the narrows from 60° 51.13' N. lat., 146° 34.05' W. long., to 60° 51.42' N. lat., 146° 34.12' W. long.** [AT 146° 34.12' W. LONG.];

(L) Galena Bay: east of a line from **60° 55.64' N. lat., 146° 38.16' W. long.** [60° 55.61' N. LAT., 146° 38.22' W. LONG.], to 60° 56.41' N. lat., 146° 36.23' W. long., and within 1,000 yards of the north shore between **60° 57.13' N. lat., 146° 38.83' W. long., and 60° 56.81' N. lat., 146° 36.55' W. long.** [60° 57.11' N. LAT., 146° 38.82' W. LONG., AND 60° 56.76' N. LAT., 146° 36.52' W. LONG.];

(M) Jack Bay: south and east of a line from 61° 01.75' N. lat., 146° 34.58' W. long. and 61° 01.01' N. lat., **146° 34.34' W. long.** [146° 34.42' W. LONG.], and within 1,000 yards of the terminus of all other salmon streams of the bay;

(N) Mineral Creek Delta, Gold Creek, and Kadis Creek: **north of a line from 61° 07.45' N. lat., 146° 23.75' W. long., to 61° 07.45' N. lat., 146° 29.80' W. long.** [60° 48.81' N. LAT.];

(O) Head of Port Valdez: waters east of a line from a point west of the Valdez boat harbor at **61° 07.47' N. lat.** [61° 07.46' N. LAT.], 146° 22.67' W. long., to a point on the south shore at **61° 05.13' N. lat.** [61° 05.16' N. LAT.], 146° 17.82' W. long.;

(P) Allison Creek, Sawmill Creek, and the Alyeska Safety Zone: within 200 yards of the shore from Allison Point at 61° 05.16' N. lat., 146° 20.72' W. long. to a point west of Sawmill Creek at 61° 04.81' N. lat., 146° 27.32' W. long.;

(Q) Sawmill Bay, Valdez Arm: north of a line along 61° 03.14' N. lat. [61° 03.16' N. LAT.] in the northern arm of the bay and west of a line from 61° 03.14' N. lat., 146° 47.41' W. long., to 61° 02.74' N. lat., 146° 47.27' W. long. [ALONG 146° 47.32' W. LONG.] in the western arm of the bay;

(4) Northern District:

(A) Long Bay: north of a line from 60° 59.09' N. lat., 147° 14.52' W. long. [60° 59.06' N. LAT., 147° 14.42' W. LONG.], to 60° 58.97' N. lat., 147° 13.17' W. long. [147° 13.32' W. LONG.], north of a line from 60° 59.24' N. lat., 147° 16.35' W. long., to 60° 59.26' N. lat., 147° 16.59' W. long. [60° 59.26' N. LAT., 147° 16.52' W. LONG., TO 60° 59.31' N. LAT., 147° 16.92' W. LONG.], north of a line from 60° 59.14' N. lat., 147° 16.93' W. long., to 60° 59.03' N. lat., 147° 17.32' W. long. [60° 59.16' N. LAT., 147° 17.12' W. LONG., TO 60° 59.06' N. LAT., 147° 17.52' W. LONG.], and west of a line from 60° 58.46' N. lat., 147° 16.52' W. long., to 60° 57.52' N. lat., 147° 16.56' W. long. [147° 16.62' W. LONG., TO 60° 57.31' N. LAT., 147° 16.52' W. LONG.];

(B) Eaglek Bay: north of 60° 53.46' N. lat.;

(C) Wells Bay: east of a line from 61° 00.59' N. lat., 147° 25.59' W. long. to 61° 00.16' N. lat., 147° 25.48' W. long. [61° 00.56' N. LAT., 147° 25.82' W. LONG. TO 61° 00.21' N. LAT., 147° 25.62' W. LONG.], and north of a line from 61° 00.17' N. lat., 147° 28.88' W. long., to 61° 00.11' N. lat., 147° 29.31' W. long. [61° 00.21' N. lat., 147° 28.92' W. long., to 61° 00.06' N. lat., 147° 29.42' W. long.];

(D) Siwash Bay: west of a line from 60° 57.48' N. lat., 147° 39.73' W. long. [60° 57.46' N. LAT., 147° 39.72' W. LONG. TO 60° 56.97' N. LAT.] to 60° 56.97' N. lat., 147° 39.52' W. long.;

(E) Jonah Bay: west of a line from 60° 00.82' N. lat., 147° 38.63' W. long. to 60° 59.96' N. lat., 147° 38.51' W. long. [147° 38.62' W. LONG.];

(F) Unakwik Inlet: within 1,000 yards of the terminus of all salmon streams north of 60° 51.97' N. lat.;

(6) Coghill District:

(A) Esther Passage: east of a line from 60° 51.49' N. lat., 147° 54.65' W. long. to 60° 52.36' N. lat., 147° 54.85' W. long. [60° 51.26' N. LAT., 147° 54.62' W. LONG. TO 60° 52.16' N. LAT., 147° 54.72' W. LONG.];

(B) College Fiord: within 500 yards of the terminus of Coghill River and within the cove immediately north of the Coghill River mouth;

(7) Northwestern District:

(A) Blackstone Bay: south of a line from 60° 45.95' N. lat., 148° 29.56' W. long. [60° 45.97' N. lat., 148° 29.52' W. long.] to 60° 45.81' N. lat., 148° 26.61' W. long. [148° 26.62' W. LONG.];

(B) Passage Canal (Shotgun Cove): south of a line from 60° 48.11' N. lat., 148° 33.08' W. long. to 60° 47.90' N. lat., 148° 32.09' W. long. [148° 33.02' W. LONG. TO 60° 47.91' N. LAT., 148° 32.12' W. LONG.];

(C) Cochrane Bay: southwest of a line from 60° 39.61' N. lat., 148° 25.41' W. long. [60° 39.56' N. LAT., 148° 25.42' W. LONG.] to 60° 38.11' N. lat., 148° 24.57' W. long., west of a line from 60° 43.76' N. lat., 148° 22.52' W. long., to 60° 41.45' N. lat., 148°

23.09' W. long. [60° 41.51' N. LAT., 148° 23.02' W. LONG.], and Surprise Cove west of a line from **60° 45.89' N. lat.** [60° 45.86' N. LAT.], 148° 22.02' W. long. to **60° 45.12' N. lat., 148° 22.31' W. long.** [60° 45.16' N. LAT., 148° 22.32' W. LONG.];

(D) Long Bay (Culross Passage): west of a line from **60° 41.87' N. lat., 148° 15.74' W. long.** [60° 41.86' N. LAT., 148° 15.72' W. LONG.], to 60° 41.61' N. lat., 148° 15.52' W. long.;

(E) Port Nellie Juan (Mink Creek): northwest of a line from 60° 35.66' N. lat., 148° 13.82' W. long., to 60° 34.56' N. lat., **148° 16.47' W. long.** [148° 16.37' W. LONG.];

(F) East Finger Inlet: north of 60° 32.51' N. lat.;

(G) West Finger Inlet: north of a line from 60° 34.16' N. lat., 148° 27.02' W. long., to 60° 34.11' N. lat., **148° 26.21' W. long.** [148° 26.22' W. LONG.];

(9) Southwestern District:

(A) Dangerous Passage: within 1,000 yards of all salmon streams in Dangerous Passage between 148° 08.87' W. long., and 148° 02.62' W. long.;

(B) Ewan Bay: west of **148° 08.35' W. long.** [148° 08.32' W. LONG.];

(C) Paddy Bay: north of a line from 60° 23.97' N. lat., **148° 06.07' W. long.** [148° 06.02' W. LONG.] to 60° 23.91' N. lat., **148° 04.91' W. long.** [148° 04.92' W. LONG.];

(D) Jackpot Bay: north and west of a line from **60° 20.74' N. lat., 148° 13.18' W. long., to 60° 20.52' N. lat., 148° 13.41' W. long.** [60° 20.71' N. LAT., 148° 13.12' W. LONG., TO 60° 20.56' N. LAT., 148° 13.37' W. LONG.];

(E) Whale Bay: south of 60° 14.16' N. lat.;

(F) Port Bainbridge: north of a line from **60° 09.72' N. lat., 148° 19.96' W. long., to 60° 09.68' N. lat., 148° 20.56' W. long.** [60° 09.56' N. LAT., 148° 20.17' W. LONG., TO 60° 09.71' N. LAT., 148° 20.12' W. LONG.];

(10) Montague District:

(A) Zaikof Bay: south of 60° 16.86' N. lat., and within 1,000 yards of the southeastern shore of the bay from a point at **60° 17.94' N. lat., 147° 00.15' W. long.** [60° 17.91' N. LAT., 147° 00.12' W. LONG.], to a line at 60° 16.86' N. lat.;

(B) Rocky Bay: west of a line from a point at **60° 21.30' N. lat., 147° 06.66' W. long.** [60° 21.26' N. LAT., 147° 06.62' W. LONG.], to a point at **60° 20.54' N. lat., 147° 05.61' W. long.** [60° 20.56' N. LAT., 147° 05.62' W. LONG.];

(C) Stockdale Harbor: east of a line from a point at **60° 19.56' N. lat.** [60° 19.51' N. LAT.], 147° 12.02' W. long., to a point at 60° 18.26' N. lat., 147° 11.72' W. long.;

(D) Port Chalmers: within a line from a point at 60° 16.97' N. lat., 147° 12.62' W. long., to a point at **60° 16.06' N. lat., 147° 12.63' W. long.** [60° 16.11' N. LAT., 147° 12.62' W. LONG.], from a point at **60° 15.37' N. lat., 147° 12.31' W. long.** [60° 15.36' N. LAT., 147° 12.32' W. LONG.], to a point at 60° 14.16' N. lat., 147° 14.42' W. long., and from a point at 60° 13.86' N. lat., 147° 14.77' W. long., to a point at **60° 13.56' N. lat.** [60° 12.56' N. LAT.], 147° 16.82' W. long.;

(E) Hanning Bay: east of a line from a point at **59° 58.93' N. lat., 147° 41.46' W. long.** [59° 58.86' N. LAT., 147° 41.52' W. LONG.], to a point at **59° 57.15' N. lat., 147° 42.99' W. long.** [59° 57.21' N. LAT., 147° 42.92' W. LONG.];

(F) MacLeod Harbor: east of a line from a point at 59° 53.26' N. lat., 147° 46.12' W. long., to a point at 59° 52.46' N. lat., 147° 46.52' W. long.;

(G) Montague Strait: within 500 yards of the northwestern shore of Montague Island from **60° 04.61' N. lat., 147° 28.82' W. long., to 60° 03.13' N. lat., 147° 33.17' W. long.** [60° 04.56' N. LAT., 147° 28.72' W. LONG., TO 60° 03.16' N. LAT., 147° 33.22' W. LONG.], and from **60° 02.10' N. lat., 147° 34.28' W. long., to 59° 59.94' N. lat., 147° 40.57' W. long.** [60° 02.06' N. LAT., 147° 34.32' W. LONG., TO 59° 59.97' N. LAT., 147° 40.62' W. LONG.];

(11) Southeastern District:

(A) Port Etches: east of a line from **60° 21.09' N. lat., 146° 33.94' W. long.** [60° 21.06' N. LAT., 146° 33.92' W. LONG.], to 60° 20.06' N. lat., 146° 32.72' W. long., and south of a line from 60° 19.71' N. lat., **146° 34.11' W. long.** [146° 34.12' W. LONG.], to 60° 19.01' N. lat., 146° 35.62' W. long.;

(B) Constantine Harbor: within the harbor from **60° 21.25' N. lat., 146° 36.29' W. long., to 60° 21.04' N. lat., 146° 37.10' W. long.** [60° 21.21' N. LAT., 146° 36.82' W. LONG., TO 60° 21.06' N. LAT., 146° 37.02' W. LONG.];

(C) Shelter Bay, Hinchinbrook Island: east of a line from 60° 26.31' N. lat., 146° 40.12' W. long., to 60° 25.66' N. lat., 146° 40.02' W. long.;

(D) Anderson Bay: south of a line from **60° 28.24' N. lat., 146° 30.78' W. long., to 60° 28.42' N. lat., 146° 31.20' W. long.** [60° 28.26' N. LAT., 146° 30.82' W. LONG., TO 60° 28.41' N. LAT., 146° 31.17' W. LONG.];

(E) Hawkins Cutoff-Orca Inlet Area: south of a line from 60° 27.86' N. lat., 146° 19.72' W. long., to **60° 27.65' N. lat., 146° 21.39' W. long.** [60° 27.66' N. LAT., 146° 21.32' W. LONG.], and Orca Inlet and Nelson Bay south and east of a line from Salmo Point to Shepard Point, and all of Orca Inlet southeast of Hawkins Island;

(F) Canoe Passage: south of a line from **60° 31.18' N. lat., 146° 07.43' W. long., to 60° 31.13' N. lat., 146° 07.07' W. long.** [60° 31.16' N. LAT., 146° 07.32' W. LONG., TO 60° 31.06' N. LAT., 146° 06.92' W. LONG.];

(12) in other streams or rivers: within 500 yards of the terminus of the stream or river or as posted as specified in 5 AAC 39.290.

ISSUE: The department has reviewed and identified inconsistencies and errors in the description of geographic coordinates describing closed waters in regulation. The department has plotted regulatory coordinates to closely match existing regulatory coordinates or traditional marker locations while conforming to current geospatial coastline standards. The department relied on marker locations plotted on U.S.G.S. topographical maps utilized during Prince William Sound marker maintenance trips. The department plans to conduct surveys to better define the location of select closed water markers during the 2011 season and prior to the December 2011 Board of Fisheries meeting. Any updates to the proposed language will be made available for public review when department comments are submitted for proposals. This proposal is intended to correct and update the closed waters regulations and maintain the historical intent of the closed water areas currently in use.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to write emergency orders at the beginning of each salmon season to correct inconsistencies and errors in regulation. Alaska Wildlife Troopers will continue to have difficulty enforcing closed water regulations.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Commercial fishermen, resource managers, enforcement staff, and the public will benefit by having clarity in the closed waters regulations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-287)

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed Waters. Expand closed waters in Sheep Bay of the Eastern District as follows:

(3) Eastern District:

...

(B) Sheep Bay: north of a line from 60° 41.99' N. lat., 145° 56.11' W. long., to 60° 41.17' N. lat., 145° 55.87' W. long. [60° 41.97' N. LAT., 145° 55.27' W. LONG., to 60° 41.66' N. LAT., 145° 55.52' W. LONG.];

ISSUE: The closed water area within Sheep Bay is in shallow water and is close to the terminus of Sheep and Koppen creeks. During large negative tides, salmon stocks from these two systems, depending on the stage of the run, swim out of the closed water area and then are available to harvest during open fishing periods. The risk of commercial harvest of fish necessary for escapement would be reduced if the closed water area were expanded to include deeper water adjacent to the shallow delta formed by these two creeks. The expanded closed water area will allow for timely harvest near the terminus of Sheep and Koppen creeks when a harvestable surplus of salmon is available. Fish quality may be improved with increased fishing opportunity throughout the salmon run.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the closed water area is not expanded, the department will continue issuing emergency orders for expanded closed waters within Sheep Bay to protect escapement to Sheep and Koppen creeks.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The timely harvest of salmon stocks near the terminus of Sheep and Koppen creeks may improve the quality of fish harvested in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Prince William Sound commercial salmon purse seine fleet will benefit from timely and more frequent fishing opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-288)

PROPOSAL 96 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed waters. Close commercial salmon fisheries in Main Bay, PWS to avoid the 4th of July as follows:

Coordinate commercial opening dates to avoid the 4th of July. The fishery already has periodic closures. It does not seem there would be that much negative effect on the catch, if one the closures was on, and around, the 4th of July.

ISSUE: Conflict between commercial salmon fishermen and sport fishermen on the annual 4th of July holiday in Main Bay, Prince William Sound. Main Bay is a very popular destination for sport fishermen on the 4th of July holiday (over 70 boats last year). The last several years, the commercial fishery was open on the holiday, and there were problems of harassment. The commercial guys do not like all the small sport boats in, and around, their nets. They made that clear by their actions, and in running their nets (literally racing between sport boats at anchor, with obvious disregard for folks not there for the commercial fishery). Their radio chatter also confirmed their displeasure with the sport fishermen's presence. The sport guys were unhappy because the only reds available for snagging were the ones small enough to pass through the nets, and the commercial guys were acting like they owned the bay.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unknown, but a lot of things are possible with animosity between users, in such close proximity to each other.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The sport guys would benefit by increased catch, and less possibility of engaging in conflict with the commercial guys.

The commercial guys would have the opportunity to spend the holiday with their families, without worrying about losing their share of the catch. They would also not have to put up with all the sport guys for those several days. The commercial guys are there because there is an opening they cannot afford to miss, no matter how uncomfortable it makes the situation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It is possible no one would suffer. The reds will still be there for the nets, after the 4th of July.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: David Lofland

(HQ-F11-022)

PROPOSAL 97 - 5 AAC 24.367. Main Bay Salmon Hatchery Harvest Management Plan. Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Main Bay Alternating Gear Zone:

(d) In the Main Bay Subdistrict south of a line **from 60° 31.34' N. lat., 148° 05.49' W. long., to 60° 31.44' N. lat., 148° 05.71' W. long.** [FROM 60° 31.43' N. LAT., 148° 05.67' W. LONG. TO 60° 31.36' N. LAT., 148° 05.52' W. LONG.] (Main Bay Alternating Gear Zone)

ISSUE: The historical latitude and longitude coordinates that define the Main Bay Alternating Gear Zone identify points that are submerged. The proposed coordinates keep the historical line, but extend it to shore on both east and west ends.

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

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The line defining the Main Bay Alternating Gear Zone will remain offshore, adding confusion and unneeded complexity to this fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Set and drift gillnet stakeholders who fish in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-289)

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 24.368. Wally Noerenberg (Esther Island) Hatchery Management Plan. Amend regulation regarding the Wally Noerenberg Hatchery Plan as follows:

Amend 5 AAC 24.368. Wally Noerenberg (Esther Island) Hatchery Plan. (a) The department, in consultation with the hatchery operator, shall manage the Esther Subdistrict, **the Granite Bay Subdistrict** and the Perry Island Subdistrict to achieve the corporation's escapement goal for the Wally Noerenberg (Esther Island) salmon hatchery.

ISSUE: In 2005, the Alaska Board of Fisheries (BOF) adopted proposal #39 creating the Granite Bay Subdistrict (GBS) as a hatchery subdistrict to more efficiently achieve the Wally Noerenberg Hatchery (WNH) chum salmon cost recovery goal and to provide a tool of access for the seine fleet harvest of the enhanced chum salmon bound for WNH. When placed into regulation, it was only included in 5 AAC 24.370 rather than in both 5 AAC 24.368 and 5 AAC 34.370 and therefore does not capture the intent of the proposal as adopted by the BOF and made clear in the record.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulation as published will remain in conflict with its intended purposes and complicate management of the fishery. Lengthy commercial fishing openers within the GBS, ostensibly to target Coghill Lake sockeye salmon have resulted in large harvests of enhanced chum salmon, significantly slowing run entry into the

WNH Special Harvest Area (SHA) and greatly limiting PWSAC's ability to consistently achieve the chum salmon cost recovery goal.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Conservative management by ADF&G in all or part of the Esther Island Subdistrict as a way to compensate for the aggressive harvest schedule in the adjacent GBS has led to prolonged fishing closures, and as a consequence, buildups of unharvested chum salmon sometimes lasting several weeks. ADF&G's ability to manage the GBS for corporate escapement would increase run entry into the Esther Subdistrict and allow for timely and consistent schedule of fishing periods, reducing buildups and improving quality of the fish harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? ADF&G, PWSAC, fishermen and processors.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Redefine the Esther Island Subdistrict boundaries by including either a portion or all of the GBS. This solution was rejected as it would effectively have the same result and far simpler to record the 2005 board approved proposal into regulation.

PROPOSED BY: Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation (HQ-F11-057)

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 24.365. Armin F. Koernig Salmon Hatchery Management Plan.
Change south end marker in the Armin F. Koernig Hatchery Terminal Harvest Area as follows:

5 AAC 24.365 (b) The Armin F. Koernig Hatchery Terminal Harvest Area consists of the waters of Sawmill Bay (Evans Island) north and west of a line from 60° 03.63' N.lat., 147° 59.45' W. long., to 60° 02.774' N.lat., 148° 01.040' W.long., to 60° 02.63' N.lat., 148° 01.70' W. long., excluding the Armin F. Koernig Hatchery Special Harvest Area.

ISSUE: South end marker set in the Armin F. Koernig Hatchery Terminal Harvest Area is problematic and hazardous to boats, nets and crew due to its proximity to a reef and its limited space to set a seine.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The seine fleet, which is spending more and more of its season inside of the Terminal Harvest Area will continue to fish a problematic and dangerous set.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Seine fishermen inside the terminal harvest area will benefit in that more boats will be able to safely fish the south end, relieving congestion on the north end and other sets inside the terminal harvest area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Maintaining the status quo, however this will continue to be an unsafe and difficult set.

PROPOSED BY: CDFU, Seine Division (HQ-F11-059)

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed waters. Adopt closures for sockeye salmon in Eshamy Lagoon as follows:

Anadromous stream closures in Eshamy Lagoon will remain in effect unless it is determined by ADF&G that maximum escapement goals will be exceeded

Or

Commercial fishing will not be permitted at any time inside the Eshmay Lagoon ADF&G markers located approximately 1/2 mile from the ADF&G cabin unless it is determined that maximum escapement goals will be exceeded if the area remains closed

ISSUE: Inequitable division of sockeye salmon between sport and commercial in western Prince William Sound.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued inequitable division of sockeye salmon between sport and commercial fishermen in Western Prince William Sound.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Keeping the area inside the ADF&G markers will improve sport fishing opportunities and reduce conflict with boats anchored inside the ADF&G markers being in the way of commercial drift netters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport fishermen and boaters anchored inside the ADF&G markers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Drift netters who have historically fished inside the lagoon/ADF&G markers will have to fish either outside the lagoon or outside the ADF&G markers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Both solutions were proposed.

PROPOSED BY: David Pinguoch (HQ-F11-145)

PROPOSAL 101 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Revise gillnet and seine allocation plans as follows:

After determining which areas shall be open to the gillnet fleet and which areas will be open to the seine fleet, the current language regarding the economic allocation plan will be deleted and the existing language governing the opening and closing of seasons based upon the strength of wild and enhanced returns will guide the department.

(g) [IF THE DRIFT GILLNET OR PURSE SEINE GEAR GROUP HARVEST VALUE COMPARISON OF ENHANCED SALMON IS 47 PERCENT OR LESS OF THE PREVIOUS FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE EX-VESSEL VALUE COMPARISON OF THE COMMON PROPERTY ENHANCED SALMON STOCKS HARVESTED, AS CALCULATED BY THE DEPARTMENT UNDER (C) OF THIS SECTION, THEN IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING THIS CALCULATION THE DEPARTMENT WILL CONSULT WITH THE HATCHERY OPERATOR TO ADDRESS MAKING PROPORTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS IN COST RECOVERY DURING THE APPLICABLE YEAR TO CORRECT THE EX-VESSEL VALUE ALLOCATION PERCENTAGES TO THE DRIFT GILLNET AND PURSE SEINE GEAR GROUPS].

[(H) IF THE DRIFT GILLNET OR PURSE SEINE GEAR GROUP HARVEST VALUE OF ENHANCED SALMON IS 45 PERCENT OR LESS OF THE PREVIOUS FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE EX-VESSEL VALUE COMPARISON OF THE COMMON PROPERTY ENHANCED SALMON STOCKS HARVESTED, AS CALCULATED BY THE DEPARTMENT UNDER (C) OF THIS SECTION, THEN IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING THIS CALCULATION THE FISHERY SHALL BE MANAGED AS FOLLOWS:]

[(1) IF THE DRIFT GILLNET GEAR GROUP HARVEST VALUE IS 45 PERCENT OR LESS, THEN IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING THE CURRENT CALCULATIONS, THE DRIFT GILLNET GEAR GROUP SHALL HAVE EXCLUSIVE ACCESS TO THE PORT CHALMERS SUBDISTRICT TO HARVEST ENHANCED SALMON RETURNS FROM JUNE 1 THOUGH JULY 30, DURING FISHING PERIODS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER; AND]

[(2) IF THE PURSE SEINE GEAR GROUP HARVEST VALUE IS 45 PERCENT OR LESS, THEN IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING THE CURRENT CALCULATIONS, THE PURSE SEINE GEAR GROUP SHALL HAVE EXCLUSIVE ACCESS TO THE ESTHER SUBDISTRICT TO HARVEST ENHANCED SALMON RETURNS FROM JUNE 1 THROUGH JULY 20, DURING FISHING PERIODS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER.]

[(I) IT IS THE INTENT OF THE BOARD THAT THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SECTION DO NOT RESTRICT THE COMMISSIONER'S AUTHORITY TO TAKE EMERGENCY ORDER ACTION IF NECESSARY FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF WILD STOCKS EVEN IF IT AFFECTS THE ALLOCATION PERCENTAGES ESTABLISHED IN THIS SECTION.

(J) IN THIS SECTION, "ENHANCED SALMON STOCKS" MEANS SALMON PRODUCED BY THE PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AQUACULTURE CORPORATION.]

ISSUE: Eliminate the current economic allocation policy and move to management by time and area as is done in the rest of the state. Current policy attempts to allocate the economic income of the Prince William Sound fisheries between seine, set gillnet and drift gillnet gear types based upon a formula that has never worked and is unlikely to work in the future. The problem is

simple: the seine fleet harvests a high volume, low value salmon product relative to the gillnet fleets. The gillnet fleets harvests lower volume, higher value salmon. This creates a situation where apples are compared to oranges, and adjustments are made to apple production in an attempt to create more oranges.

As an example, even though the drift gillnet fleet realized a net increase of \$15 million in ex-vessel value between 2005 and 2007, the seine fleet was removed from the Port Chalmers in 2008, and the fishery was turned into a gillnet fishery because the seine fleets' total percentage of the ex-vessel value increased due to high returns and modest increases in price.

In turn, although the seine fleet had what could be considered a disastrous season in 2009, under the five year rolling average now utilized, the seine fleet would have to face several years of extreme hardship before any relief would be available due to both the triennial board cycle and the effects of recent returns on the five year average.

Each gear type should fish in its respective area and be managed based on the strength of returns, not on what another gear type caught last year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Every three years either the seine fleet or the gillnet fleet will be before the board seeking to take more apples from the other gear type and turn them into oranges because the current formula attempts to make $2+2=5$. This policy has been in place since 1993 and has never achieved the allocation formula as intended.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The short term could produce a slight gain to the seine fleet if the board returns the Port Chalmers subdistrict to the seine fleet. If the board does not change the current time and areas for each respective gear type, then there would be no immediate benefit to either gear type except to provide stability to the fisheries.

The board would benefit because it would not have to deal with proposed mechanisms to achieve an unachievable goal at each board cycle.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? If the board were to take action this year to give Port Chalmers back to the seine fleet, the gillnet fleet would face a short term detriment until the price or volume of pinks falls to such a number that the area would return to the seine fleet.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Over the past 6 board cycles, varying proposals have been generated and some have even been implemented, none have achieved the goal of a 50-50 ex-vessel allocation. The 50-50 split is an economic impossibility for the reasons stated above. To continue in an attempt to achieve the unachievable will do nothing but further divide the seine and gillnet fleets as the gear type falling below the allocation will constantly attempt to gain more from the other gear type, regardless of how much more money they made.

The status quo is rejected for the reasons stated above; a 50-50 split is unachievable when comparing high volume, low value species to low volume, high value species.

PROPOSED BY: Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-233)

PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Amend allocation plan for the Eshamay District set gillnet group as follows:

4. (f) If the set gillnet gear group catches five percent of more of the previous five-year average ex-vessel value of the total common property fishery for enhanced salmon as calculated by the department under (c) of this section, the year following this calculation beginning on July 10, the commissioner shall, by emergency order, open set gillnet fishing periods at 50% of the time assigned to the drift gillnet gear group. Opening times for both set and drift gillnet opening shall commence concurrently. [TOTALING NO MORE THAN 36 HOURS PER WEEK].

ISSUE: 2. When corrective measures were put in place within the allocation plan to restrict set gillnet harvest the management of the gillnet fishery in the Eshamay District on average allotted 72 hours per week of fishing time within the district. The intention of the correction measures was; beginning July 10 to reduce fishing time to the set gillnet user group by 50%, or 36 hours of eliminated fishing time of the weekly 72 hours the fishery remained open. Loss of 50% of fishing time was and remains a drastic reduction of fishing time to reduce set gillnet harvest, yet can serve as a guideline for equitable resolution. This proposal is based on continuation of the intended 50% reduction in fishing time beginning July 10.

However, since the implementation of the corrective measures to reduce set gillnet harvest there has been great variability in the amount of weekly fishing time that the Eshamay district is open to common property harvest. For the 2010 season all or portions of the Eshamay district have been open during the harvest reduction period up to 144 hours per week. This would have resulted in the set gillnet user group being excluded from harvest up to 108 hours of the 144 hours the common property fishery has been open. This results in harvest time restrictions of 300% over the intended restriction.

Also, since implementation of the corrective measures there has been great variability in the fishing time allocated to different portions of the Eshamay fishing district. One or several areas may be open to 48 hours per week of fishing time and adjoining areas may receive up to 144 hours per week. This is also a major management change since implementation. A more flexible means of restricting fishing time is needed to address this variability.

The problems needing board attention are adopting restrictions that are equitable and flexible enough to reduce set gillnet harvest when their harvest allocation percentage is exceeded without imposing unwarranted restriction.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The set gillnet user group will suffer inequitable, unintended restrictions in fishing time over and above the intention of the harvest restrictions as originally drafted in the allocation plan.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All participants benefit when fishery resources are harvested in a manner that is consistent with Board of Fisheries and all user group intent. This regulation originally proceeded through a committee and the original intent agreed to by all parties, that included both setnet, drift and seine representatives, was to reduce set gillnet harvest by 50% beginning July 10. Set gillnet users will benefit only in regard to having harvest restrictions set at levels as originally intended.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No party will suffer as harvests will be equitably assigned to all user groups as intended.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions were considered.

PROPOSED BY: PWS Setnet Association (HQ-F11-024)

PROPOSAL 103 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Amend allocation plan for the Eshamy District set gillnet group as follows:

(f) If the set gillnet gear group catches 4 percent or more of the previous five year average ex vessel value of the total common property fishery for enhanced salmon as calculated by the department under(c) of this section, the year following this calculation beginning on July 7, the commissioner shall, by emergency order, open set gillnet fishing periods totaling no more than 36 hours per week.

ISSUE: The allocation plan getting changed from its original percentages.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The setnet fleet will continue to increase its presence with more lease site being licensed and more gear being deployed anywhere they see the drift fleet being successful.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? NA.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The drift gillnet fleet fishing the Main Bay and Eshamy subdistricts by getting back some to the area and freedom the area used to have before the setnet fleet was allowed more than their historic 1% that was in the original allocation plan. Their historic number was less than one percent but was increased to one percent during the original drafting of plan.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one as Setnet fleet can keep catching more than their original allocation and then some.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Make the trigger 3% instead of 4%, rejected in the spirit of harmony.

PROPOSED BY: Shawn Gilman (HQ-F11-032)

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 24.330. Gear. Designate area in the Coghill District for drift gillnet and purse seine gear as follows:

Any opening in the Coghill District of waters north of Pt. Pakenham at 61.00.429N 148.04.363W to a point on the east side of College Fiord at 61.58.900N 147.59.750W would be open to drift gillnet and purse seine gear.

ISSUE: Returning traditional access by the seine fleet to wild stock Coghill sockeye prior to July 21 that was lost due to previous allocation policies that are no longer in use. Current allocation policy only uses PWSAC enhanced fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The seine fleet will continue to be denied traditional access to wild stock Coghill sockeye, and in years of abundant pink returns to Coghill river, a large portion of these pinks return before July 21 making them unavailable to the seine fleet.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? In abundant pink returns to Coghill River, the seine fleet could target these fish earlier in the return (prior to July 21) improving the quality of the harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The seine fleet would be returned traditional access to Coghill sockeye before July 21 as well as earlier access to Coghill pinks in abundant years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Perhaps gillnetters specifically targeting sockeye north of Pt Pakenham could see increased competition from seiners potentially fishing this area, however gillnet effort in this area is light and most of the gillnet fleet chooses to fish Esther chums, Main Bay sockeye, Port Chalmers chums, and Copper River sockeye that are returning at the same time.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Tom Nelson (HQ-F11-050)

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Remove the gillnet fleet from the Coghill District on established dates as follows:

(5) Coghill District:

(A) except as otherwise provided in this section, drift gillnet gear may be operated throughout the district during periods established by emergency order **from May 1 until July 10 and beginning the day after Labor Day until the close of the season;**

(B) beginning July [21] **10, until Labor Day** [WHEN THE HARVESTABLE SURPLUS IS PREDOMINATELY PINK SALMON], purse seine gear **exclusively** may be operated in the district during periods established by emergency order;

[(C) DURING A YEAR WHEN THE PURSE SEINE FLEET IS ALLOWED TO HARVEST ENHANCED PINK SALMON IN THE ESTHER SUBDISTRICT BEFORE JULY 21 UNDER]

[(H)(2) OF THIS SECTION, FROM JUNE 1 THROUGH JULY 20,]

[(I) THE GRANITE BAY SUBDISTRICT WILL BE CLOSED;]

[(II) IF THE COMMISSIONER DETERMINES THAT AN EMERGENCY OPENING IS NECESSARY IN THE GRANITE BAY SUBDISTRICT TO PREVENT FISH QUALITY DETERIORATION OF ENHANCED SALMON STOCKS RETURNING TO THE WALLY NOERENBERG HATCHERY, PURSE SEINE AND DRIFT GILLNET GEAR GROUPS WILL BE ALLOWED TO HARVEST THE SURPLUS SALMON IN AN AREA WITHIN THE GRANITE BAY SUBDISTRICT AS SPECIFIED BY EMERGENCY ORDER.]

ISSUE: Currently, there is a gear conflict in the Esther subdistrict during the August pink salmon returns, since more gillnetters have an economic incentive to pick pinks, nearly the entire gillnet fleet is now elbowing the seine fleet out of this fishery. Due to the volume of pink salmon, it is unfeasible to fish with alternating days for each group without sacrificing quality. The preferred solution would be to remove the gillnet fleet from the Esther subdistrict from July 10 until the day after Labor Day. Currently, the gillnet fleet enjoys exclusive access to the Esther subdistrict from the opening of the salmon season until July 21st during the chum season, the seine fleet should also be able to conduct an orderly harvest of the pink salmon fishery without the conflict associated with incompatible gear types vying for the same salmon.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current situation will continue to escalate, producing frustration among the participating fishermen and preventing an orderly fishery from occurring.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The gillnet fleet is not equipped to handle the large volumes associated with the pink salmon fishery. This has led to quality problems because gillnetters have had to wait for tenders, or have not had markets and either dumped fish or had

poor quality fish delivered to market. This quality issue hurts the salmon industry as a whole, but the statewide seine fisheries in particular since most seine revenue is derived from pink salmon that now go primarily to the fresh and frozen markets.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This proposal will benefit the seine fleet and the quality of product delivered to market.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The gillnet fleet will suffer in the sense that individual fishermen will not be able to participate in the fishery. However, since PWSAC is shifting cost recovery from chums to pinks, the gillnetters are realizing the economic benefit of the pink salmon without having to pick them. As cost recovery is shifted from pinks to chums, the gillnet fleet enjoys more common property chum opportunities than they would otherwise have.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Alternating days and/or having the gillnet fleet fish at night were considered and rejected primarily for quality reasons due to the high volumes of the pink salmon that enter the Esther subdistrict from July 10 until Labor Day. Also, there is already considerable numbers of gillnetters illegally “rocking down” and fishing part of their nets on the beach contrary to regulation. It is likely that if fishing is permitted at night that there would be enforcement issues with “rocking down” and fishing outside the legal boundaries.

PROPOSED BY: Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-234)

PROPOSAL 106 - 5 AAC 24.200. Fishing districts, subdistricts, and sections; 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Redefine the Coghill District boundary and open the district on an alternating gear type basis as follows:

Coghill District: (f) Coghill District: waters north [AND WEST] of a line from [POINT PIGOT (60° 48.21' N. LAT., 148° 20.90' W. LONG.) TO A POINT WEST OF POINT CULROSS AT 60° 45.45' N. LAT., 148° 11.07' W. LONG. AND FROM POINT CULROSS (60° 45.58' N. LAT., 148° 08.74' W. LONG.) TO A POINT WEST OF CULROSS LIGHT AT 60° 45.16' N. LAT., 148° 07.87' W. LONG. TO POINT PERRY (60° 45.05' N. LAT., 147° 57.62' W. LONG.) TO THE WEST ISLAND OF THE BALD HEAD CHRIS ISLANDS AT 60° 47.97' N. LAT., 147° 51.62' W. LONG. TO A POINT ON THE MAINLAND AT 60° 49.33' N. LAT., 147° 51.12' W. LONG.] **From Point Pakenham (Lat, Long) to the promontory on the north side of Esther Passage (lat, long).**

(A) [EXCEPT AS OTHERWISE PROVIDED IN THIS SECTION, DRIFT GILLNET GEAR MAY BE OPERATED THROUGHOUT THE DISTRICT DURING PERIODS ESTABLISHED BY EMERGENCY ORDER]; **The Coghill District shall be open on an alternating basis for drift gillnet and seine gear. In odd years, the drift gillnet fleet shall have the first opening, and thereafter alternating openings with the purse seine fleet. In even years, the purse seine fleet shall have the first opening and thereafter alternating openings with the drift gillnet fleet.**

ISSUE: This proposal requests that the Board open the Coghill district north of a line from Pt. Pakenham to a point on the north side of Esther Passage on an alternating gear type basis. One of the greatest threats to the economic viability of the seine fleet is the lack of time and area to harvest salmon species other than hatchery pink returns. The Coghill Lake sockeye stocks are chronically under-utilized by the drift gillnet fleet and would provide an additional opportunity to the seine fleet.

Furthermore, as PWSAC continues to take more cost recovery from pink salmon to pay for the production of predominately gillnet allocated sockeye and chum returns, the seine fleet faces even fewer harvest opportunity on pink salmon stocks, increasing the economic risk to the fleet which could be alleviated by some wild sockeye harvest opportunity.

Additionally, wild salmon stocks were removed from the current allocation plan with no regard to how this would affect the seine fleet. Currently, the only early wild stock opportunity for the seine fleet is the regular openings in the Unakwik district which are open to both seine and gillnet gear types. The Unakwik sockeye return is a historically small run with harvests anywhere from hundreds of salmon up to ten thousand salmon. This begs the question: If the small Unakwik sockeye salmon return is able to sustain regularly scheduled openings for both gear types, then why not the more abundant and under-utilized Coghill stocks?.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The seine fleet will continue to be a one dimensional fishery composed solely of enhanced pink salmon opportunity except in those seasons when wild pink stocks are abundant enough to support a common property fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, this is an allocative issue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This proposal would benefit the seine fleet.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This proposal would have a minor detrimental impact on the gillnet fleet, particularly in years when more cost recovery is taken from Esther chums and the terminal harvest area is not available. Also, some chum salmon may be taken on the south line that may be strays from the Esther enhanced return.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Another possible solution would be to provide regular openings in the Northwest District during June and July to provide opportunity for the seine fleet to harvest wild pink and chum salmon that are now intercepted by the drift gillnet fleet. This idea was rejected because it was unlikely that the department would agree to regular harvest opportunity in the northwest district with the current wild stock interception that occurs and the allocative thicket the incidental harvest of Main Bay sockeye and Esther chums would create should the seine fleet have such a harvest opportunity.

PROPOSED BY: Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-237)

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 24.370. Packers Creek Sockeye Salmon Management Plan.
Drift gillnet group will have exclusive access to AFK chum salmon as follows:

The drift gillnet group will have exclusive access to the chum salmon fishery at the AFK PWSAC hatchery at San Juan in Prince William Sound. The same seasonal start and end dates will be used, as will be used for the exclusive access that the gillnetters will have to the Wally Norenberg PWSAC hatchery at Esther.

ISSUE: The drift gillnet gear group (S03E) is far behind the purse seine group (S01E) in the PWS Salmon Allocation Plan. This has been the result of a very large increase in pink salmon prices.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The drift gillnet gear group will not receive their fair share of the allocation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? PWS drift gillnet group.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? PWS purse seine group that is now far ahead of the gillnet group in the allocation.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The drift gillnet gear group could have more access to the pink salmon fishery but that could lead to poorer fish quality because of harvest methods.

PROPOSED BY: John Lorentzen (SC-F11-020)

PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Reallocate chum for the seine fleet in Port Chalmers as follows:

The regulations would be rewritten to reflect the time and area available to the seine fleet prior to the “piggy bank” allocative model.

ISSUE: Return the Port Chalmers remote release chum return to the seine fleet to spread out the economic risk to the seine fleet.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The seine fleet will continue to be a one dimensional fishery composed solely of enhanced pink salmon opportunity except in those seasons when wild pink stocks are abundant enough to support a common property fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, this is an allocative issue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This proposal would benefit the seine fleet.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? This proposal would remove some time and area from the gillnet fleet.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Another solution considered is expanded area and removal of the July start date for the seine fishery in the southwest district, included as another proposal. Returning this area to the seine fleet would spread out the economic risk to the seine fleet and provide for a more orderly fishery than what is currently available in the AFK terminal harvest area.

The status quo was rejected as placing too much risk of economic failure on the seine fleet in the years of low pink salmon abundance, such as occurred in 2009.

PROPOSED BY: Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-238)

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 24.368 Big River Sockeye Salmon Management Plan.
Discontinue remote release of chum salmon at Port Chalmers and release them at Wally Noerenberg Hatchery as follows:

The remote release of chum salmon at Port Chalmers should be discontinued and those salmon should be released at the Wally Noerenberg Hatchery at Esther instead. History shows that remote release salmon have a far poorer return rate than salmon released at the hatchery they were raised.

ISSUE: The disastrous return rate of remote release chum salmon at the PWSAC remote release site at Port Chalmers in Prince William Sound.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The average individual drift gillnetter will receive thousands of dollars more in income if a similar return rate is realized, as has been in the past, for the chum salmon that have been released at the Esther Hatchery.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Drift gillnet gear group.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Purse seine gear group.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The drift gillnet gear group could have more access to the pink salmon fishery but that could lead to poorer fish quality because of harvest methods.

PROPOSED BY: John Lorentzen (SC-F11-023)

PROPOSAL 110 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Eliminate the mandatory closure prior to July 18 and amend fishing time and area provisions for the Southwestern District as follows:

2) Southwestern District:

(A) [THE DISTRICT IS CLOSED TO SALMON FISHING BEFORE JULY 18;]

(B) [ON OR AFTER JULY 18,] Bi-weekly 12 hour fishing periods beginning June 1 shall be established by the department, based on the strength of **chum and** pink salmon stocks, purse seine fishing periods may be [OPENED] **expanded or reduced** by emergency order;

(C) The San Juan subdistrict shall be opened by emergency order to facilitate an orderly harvest of chum salmon returning to the AFK hatchery.

The regulations would be rewritten to remove the July start date and provide expanded area for the AFK chum harvest.

ISSUE: Remove the mandatory July opening date for the Southwest district to provide more early opportunity for the seine fleet, particularly on the capes, and also to provide additional time and area for the orderly harvest of AFK enhanced chum salmon returns. Currently, the seine fleet is restricted to within the terminal harvest area during June and early July. This is problematic because the current area open only allows for two nets to be in the water at one time, and with the current size of the seine fleet, it is now common to have to wait two to three days just for one turn on the set.

Additionally, a weekly or bi-weekly fishing period district wide would provide the department with data on run entry and composition to be used in making management decisions. Should wild stock data indicate that reduced fishing time is warranted, the department has the authority to restrict time and area to protect wild stocks. Although some undesirable harvest of discreet wild stocks may occur, it is unlikely that a one or two day per week opening would have long term detrimental effects to the sustainability of those stocks.

Also, the department utilizes an aggregate escapement goal model for PWS. However, management decisions appear to be made based upon discreet stock analysis. Weekly or bi-weekly openings are compatible with the aggregate escapement goal model and are used extensively in other areas, such as Kodiak.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The seine fleet will continue to spend most of its time waiting for one turn every two to three days. A fishery in which only two boats can make a set at one time is inefficient and incurs great cost on those vessels participating.

Management decisions will continue to be made on unreliable test boat and aerial survey information at further cost to the State of Alaska and the seine fleet.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, better data and some limited harvests outside the terminal harvest areas will increase flesh quality of the salmon harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This proposal would benefit the seine fleet.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some interception of gillnet allocated enhanced salmon will undoubtedly occur.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The status quo was considered and rejected because the restrictions placed on the AFK terminal chum harvest are draconian and unworkable. A fishery in which only two vessels can deploy a net at one time is ill-conceived and inefficient.

Another option is to open the San Juan subdistrict during the AFK chum return and allow the department to manage the Southwest district by E.O. authority based upon the strength of wild and enhanced salmon returns. This option was rejected because it is unlikely that the department would actually open any seine area due to political pressure from the gillnet fleet.

PROPOSED BY: Northwest & Alaska Seiners Association, Inc. (HQ-F11-239)

PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 24.370. Packers Creek Sockeye Salmon Management Plan.
Modify the cost-recovery salmon harvest in PWS as follows:

All non-pink salmon PWSAC cost recovery from salmon harvests that would otherwise be harvested by the drift gillnet group will be discontinued as long as the drift gillnet group is more than 5% behind the purse seine group in the 50-50 allocation. The offset will be made up by additional cost recovery taken from pink salmon harvests.

ISSUE: The drift gillnet gear group (S03E) is far behind the purse seine group (S01E) in the PWS Salmon Allocation Plan. This has been the result of a very large increase in pink salmon prices.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Drift gillnet gear group.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Purse seine gear group.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The drift gillnet gear group could have more access to the pink salmon fishery but that could lead to poorer fish quality.

PROPOSED BY: John Lorentzen (SC-F11-021)

PROPOSAL 112 - 5 AAC 24.370. Packers Creek Sockeye Salmon Management Plan. Increase period of time used in calculation of allocation in PWS allocation plan as follows:

The current five year ex-vessel value time period that is now being used to figure the allocation will be extended to eight years as it is unlikely that the gillnetters will catch up to the seiners in only five years, even if there are additional concessions given by the Board of Fisheries at this meeting - - as the gillnetters are tens of millions of dollars behind the seiners in the allocation.

ISSUE: The drift gillnet gear group (S03E) is far behind the purse seine group (S01E) in the PWS Salmon Allocation Plan. This has been the result of a very large increase in pink salmon prices.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Gillnetters will not receive their fair share of the allocation.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Drift gillnet gear group.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Purse seine gear group.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The drift gillnet gear group could have more access to the pink salmon fishery but that could lead to poorer fish quality because of harvest methods.

PROPOSED BY: John Lorentzen (SC-F11-022)

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 24.378. Use of aircraft unlawful. Amend regulation regarding use of aircraft in PWS commercial fishery as follows:

If enforcement of 5 AAC 24.378 is not feasible, then eliminate the regulation.

ISSUE: It is my observation that aircraft are being used during open commercial fishing periods. I think enforcement is either lax or impossible. I would like to see enforcement of 5 AAC 24.378 or baring that, make flying legal for all participants.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Certain groups will maintain an unfair competitive advantage.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All commercial users will have equal opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Ken Jones

(HQ-F11-077)

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 24.370. Prince William Sound Management and Salmon Enhancement Allocation Plan. Reduce hatchery production of chum salmon in PWS as follows:

Reduce hatchery production to 24% of the year 2000 production.

ISSUE: Over production of chum salmon by the private, not-for-profit hatcheries. In January, 2001, these hatchery managers promised the Governor and the Board of Fisheries that they would reduce hatchery production of chum salmon by 24% and never increase it again. This promise has not been kept.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this problem is not solved, Alaska’s wild salmon stocks bound for Alaskan rivers, and Alaska residents, will be subject to unfair competition with hatchery fish. The recovery of wild chum salmon stocks will be delayed or reversed. Alaskan fishermen dependent on wild stocks for their subsistence needs will not have their needs satisfied. The in-river, commercial fisheries that many rural Alaskan communities economically depend on, will be curtailed or closed. Without healthy and robust Alaska wild salmon runs, the economy and cultural foundation of a majority of the Alaska communities will collapse.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes – This proposal would improve the quality of the Alaskan wild salmon resource because it would reduce the competition between wild chum and the over abundance of hatchery produced chum. It would also address the concern of “overgrazing” the ocean environment. Protecting Alaska’s wild salmon stocks should be the number one priority. These stocks have played a central role in the history of Alaska. The wild salmon stocks are the cornerstone of the region’s subsistence way of life.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence, commercial, and sport fishers throughout the region will benefit from passage of this proposal because of the importance of wild salmon stocks to present and future generations. The genetic diversity of wild stocks will provide for future needs as Alaskans face climate change. Wildlife populations dependent upon the returning wild stocks will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The false “commercial” entity created by the hatchery production will be reduced.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (HQ-F11-140)

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 24.XXX. New Regulation. Reduce hatchery production of chum in PWS as follows:

Reduce hatchery chum production as follows: Reduce hatchery production to 24% of the year 2000 production.

ISSUE: Over production of chum salmon by the private not for profit hatcheries. In January 2001, the hatchery managers promised the Governor and the BOF that they would reduce hatchery production of chum salmon by 24% and never increase it again-reference Joint Protocol on Salmon Enhancement #2002-FB-215. This promise has never been kept.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this problem is not solved, Alaska’s wild salmon stocks bound for Alaskan rivers, and Alaskan residents will be subject to unfair competition with hatchery fish. The recovery of wild chum salmon stocks will be delayed or reversed. The Alaskan fishermen dependent for their subsistence needs on these wild stocks will continue to have their needs not met, the in-river commercial fisheries, than many rural Alaskan communities are economically dependent upon, will be curtailed or closed. Without healthy and robust Alaskan wild salmon runs, the economy and cultural foundation of a majority of the Alaskan communities will collapse.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal would improve the quality of the Alaskan wild salmon resource because it would reduce the competition between the wild chum and the over abundance of hatchery produced chum. It would also address the concern of ‘overgrazing’ the ocean environment. Protecting Alaska’s wild salmon stocks should be the number one priority. These stocks have played a central role in the history of Alaska. The wild salmon stocks are the cornerstone of the region’s subsistence way of life.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence, commercial, and sport fishermen throughout the region will benefit from passage of this proposal. Wildlife populations dependent upon the returning wild stocks would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. The false ‘commercial’ entity created by the hatchery overproduction will go away.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-213)

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 24.XXX. New Regulation. Add restrictions on homepack from commercial fishing as follows:

Set a limit on homepack salmon to match the sport fishing possession limit, and prohibit any homepack for commercial fishers who engage in the Copper River Delta salmon subsistence fishery

ISSUE: Prohibit “homepack” of Copper River salmon, or limit homepack to the sport bag limit for the species caught, in the area caught, and to require a sport fish license for any salmon and a king salmon and harvest stamp card for kings retained as homepack. Allowing commercial fishers and their crew to convert their commercial harvest for personal consumption without a limit gives a preference above all other Alaskans who wish to catch and retain salmon for personal consumption.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Commercial fishers and their crew will continue to harvest and eat unlimited amounts of Copper River salmon while all other Alaskans who wish to harvest and eat these same salmon must purchase a license and adhere to strict daily and yearly possession limits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan who believe in equal access to our commonly owned salmon resources. Commercial fishers should not have a preference to harvest salmon for personal consumption simply because of their occupation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-206)

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan.
Establish an optimal escapement goal for Copper River Chinook salmon as follows:

The optimum escapement goal (OEG) for Copper River Chinook should be 30,000. The average escapement from 1999-2008 was 30,221.

ISSUE: Too low of BEG for Copper River Chinook. We would like the Board to conduct an escapement goal review and suggest that an appropriate goal should be an O.E.G. of 30,000 Chinook.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued unsustainable exploitation rates of early run Chinook based on artificially low BEG of 24,000.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The escapement goal prior to the current 24,000 BEG was a range of 28,000-55,000. The average escapement from 2004-2008 was 35,535. In 2009

and 2010 commercial harvest was less than 10,000. Upriver fisheries were shut down, or severely restricted, and escapement averaged 23,143. Continued management for a BEG of 24,000 is unsustainable. It allows commercial managers to over exploit the early returning stocks. A 94.9% exploitation rate occurred in May 2005, causing the commercial fishery to be closed from June 18-July 6 during which time the sonar goal was met with hatchery sockeye and the king escapement, for the year, totaled only 21,502.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. An OEG based of the ten year average escapement would promote recovery of depressed Chinook stocks and help prevent future restrictions on upriver fisheries or commercial closers.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? N/A.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-208)

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed Waters. Restrict commercial fishing inside barrier islands prior to June 15 as follows:

The Copper River District commercial fishery shall be conducted entirely outside the barrier islands until June 15.

ISSUE: Repeated poor escapement of early kings and wild sockeye. The inside closure mandated by the Board since 2003 during statistical weeks 20 and 21 have not been effective in rebuilding the early run component.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued unsustainable exploitation rates of early run king and wild sockeye.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Chronic overharvest of the early run component have resulted in 1) numerous restrictions on upriver fisheries, 2) failure to meet minimum Chinook escapement goals in 2002, 2005, and 2010 and 3) substantially reduced harvest levels of early season kings and sockeye. A complete commercial closure from June 18-July 6, 2005 because 21,104 Chinook were harvested by May 23, and sonar counts were less than 50% of the objective. The quality of the harvest will improve for all users when the early run rebuilds and provides a sustainable commercial fishery throughout the entire season. With higher escapement of early run (upriver) subsistence users will benefit with reliable returns. Fishery managers will not continue with ultraconservative management in season closures or restrictions, and reliance of late run fish to meet sockeye escapement goals.

Commercial managers will not have to guess as to the strength and timing of early run salmon when setting opening in May and early June. A reliable schedule of outside openings will spread

out the harvest on all stocks and help prevent closures caused by unsustainable harvest during early season commercial fishing in the mouth of the Copper River.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The salmon, ADF&G managers, and ultimately all users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The commercial fleet in the short term while the early run stocks rebuild.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Setting a minimum escapement past the sonar before inside openings. Rejected due to unreliability of sonar deployments.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-209)

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 24.350. Closed waters. Correct regulatory boundary descriptions in Copper River District as follows:

(1) Copper River District:

(A) within a line [FROM GOVERNMENT ROCK TO A POINT 500 YARDS SEAWARD OF THE JUNCTION OF MOUNTAIN SLOUGH, CENTER SLOUGH, AND EYAK RIVER, THEN EAST WITHIN A LINE BOUNDED BY ADF&G REGULATORY MARKERS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY TWO MILES SEAWARD OF THE GRASS BANKS, AND AT ALL TIMES WITHIN SLOUGHS AND IN BOSWELL BAY WITHIN THE BAY] from Whitshed Point south to a point at 60° 26.49' N. lat., 145° 52.86' W. long. to a point at Alaganik Slough North at 60° 24.65' N. lat., 145° 36.70' W. long. to a point at Pete Dahl East at 60° 20.44' N. lat., 145° 29.14' W. long. to a point at West Kokenhenik at 60° 14.88' N. lat., 145° 10.01' W. long. to a point at East "East Side" at 60° 14.83' N. lat., 145° 03.36' W. long. to a point at Coffee Creek East at 60° 14.19' N. lat., 144° 58.01' W. long. to a point at Charlie Mohr North at 60° 15.15' N. lat., 144° 56.43' W. long. to a point at Martin River North at 60° 15.29' N. lat., 144° 52.52' W. long. to a point on Strawberry Reef at 60° 13.93' N. lat., 144° 50.66' W., long. and at all times within sloughs and in Boswell Bay within the bay;

(B) except as provided in 5 AAC 24.361(b), the inside closure area defined as all waters north of line from [THE STEAMBOAT ANCHORAGE MARKER TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED AT THE EASTERN BOUNDARY OF COPPER SANDS TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED AT THE WESTERN END OF THE GRASS ISLAND BAR TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED AT THE EAST END OF THE GRASS ISLAND BAR TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED AT THE WESTERN END OF THE KOKENHENIK BAR TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED ON THE EASTERN TIP OF THE KOKENHENIK BAR TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED ON THE WESTERN TIP OF THE SOFTUK BAR TO AN ADF&G REGULATORY MARKER LOCATED AT COFFEE CREEK; BEFORE THE FIRST OPENING OF THE SEASON, THE DEPARTMENT WILL RELOCATE AND REINSTALL THE ADF&G REGULATORY MARKERS LISTED IN THIS SUBPARAGRAPH; IN THE FIRST EMERGENCY ORDER ISSUED FOR THE SEASON, THE COMMISSIONER WILL ANNOUNCE THE EXACT LOCATIONS OF THE REGULATORY MARKERS, BASED

ON THE MARKERS GPS LOCATION, THAT WILL DEFINE THE INSIDE CLOSURE AREA FOR THE SEASON; THE DEFINED INSIDE CLOSURE WILL REMAIN IN EFFECT UNLESS SUPERSEDED BY ANOTHER EMERGENCY ORDER;] a point at Steamboat South at 60° 22.31' N. lat., 145° 33.50' W. long. to the west side of the Pete Dahl entrance at 60° 18.89' N. lat., 145° 30.99' W. long. to the western end of the Grass Island Bar at 60° 18.30' N. lat., 145° 28.42' W. long. to the eastern end of Grass Island Bar at 60° 15.24' N. lat., 145° 17.89' W. long. to the western end of Kokenhenik Bar at 60° 15.00' N. lat., 145° 16.20' W. long. to the eastern tip of Kokenhenik Bar at 60° 13.65' N. lat., 145° 09.46' W. long. to the western tip of Softuk Bar at 60° 13.68' N. lat., 145° 05.78' W. long. to Coffee Creek West at 60° 14.13' N. lat., 144° 58.31' W. long.;

ISSUE: Painted plywood signs are no longer placed annually to mark the location of the grass bank line or the king salmon inside closure area referred to in 5 AAC 24.361. Copper River King Salmon Management Plan. Beginning in 2010, these points have been identified using latitude and longitude coordinates. The coordinates specified were put into place by emergency order (EO) in 2010 and 2011.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Obsolete language referring to plywood markers will remain in regulation for area managers to amend by EO annually.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both commercial and subsistence stakeholders will benefit from clear regulations describing fishing area in the Copper River District.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-284)

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 55.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for Prince William Sound Area. Increase sockeye salmon bag limit and allow snagging in Eshamay Bay as follows:

Daily bag and possession limits for salmon, except king salmon, are 6 per day/12 in possession, of which only 3 per day /6 in possession may be sockeye salmon and only 3 per day/3 in possession may be coho salmon, no size limit. **Daily bag limit for sockeye salmon will be increased to 6 per day/12 in possession by emergency order when sockeye salmon escapement reaches 20,500 at the Eshamy weir.**

Eshamy Lagoon **will be closed to sport fishing for sockeye salmon** [IS CLOSED TO SNAGGING] inside ADF&G markers on the lagoon shore (about ½ mile on either side of the

ADF&G cabin) **if determined by ADF&G that the minimum escapement goal will not be reached.** [UNTIL ADF&G ANNOUNCES THE ESCAPEMENT GOAL WILL BE MET.]

ISSUE: Inequitable division of sport/commercial sockeye salmon in western Prince William Sound. Average commercial harvest of sockeye in western Prince William Sound from 2005-2009 was approximately 774,000 fish. Average sport harvest in western Prince William Sound during the same period was about 5300 fish. Snagging is prohibited inside and ADF&G marker at Eshamy Lagoon until escapement has been met yet commercial drift netters are allowed to fish inside the markers before escapement goals are met. Commercial catch based on Eshamy and Coghill District drift and setnet harvests plus southwestern seine harvest. Sport harvest information is from sport fish survey data. I found no recent data specific to Eshamy sport harvest.)

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued inequitable division of sockeye salmon in western Prince William Sound.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal is intended to improve sport fish harvest for sockeye salmon in western Prince William Sound.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport fishermen in western Prince William Sound.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Commercial fishermen harvest of sockeye salmon in western Prince William Sound could be reduced by 1-2% if this proposal is adopted, reducing their percentage to 97-98%..

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: David Pinguoch (HQ-F11-144)

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 55.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for Prince William Sound Area. Reduce sockeye salmon bag and possession limit in PWS as follows:

The bag and possession limit for sockeye salmon in all waters of Prince William Sound is 3 per day and 6 in possession. The bag and possession limit for sockeye salmon in Coghill (all waters of Port Wells north of Pakenham Point) and all the waters of Main Bay and on the Copper River Delta remain at 6 per day and 12 in possession.

ISSUE: Over harvest of small sockeye salmon stocks. Sport fishing effort directed toward small sockeye salmon runs has increased greatly since the tunnel to Whittier has been opened to auto traffic. These small sockeye salmon stocks, for example Gun Boot Lakes, and Jackpot, are only a few hundred fish. They are concentrated in small locations and are easily caught. At times I have seen as many as 30 boats, both guided and unguided anglers fishing off the mouths

of these streams. At the current bag/possession limit set at 6/12, these stocks can easily be over harvested, and appear to be so each year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? These small native runs will cease to exist.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it helps to maintain natural sockeye salmon runs throughout Prince William Sound and into the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Eliminate snagging, but this is not practical as sockeye in these areas do not readily bite. Also considered reducing the bag limit on charter boat fishermen, but this would be a long term solution, and would have many loopholes to enforce.

PROPOSED BY: Brian West (SC-F11-008)

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 55.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for Prince William Sound Area. Establish coho salmon limit for non residents in Hells Hole Freshwater fishery as follows:

Limit nonresidents to 1 coho a day from Hells Hole freshwater fishery (maybe salt water as well).

ISSUE: Over harvest of sport caught coho salmon from Hells Hole by nonresidents for the past several years a large group of nonresidents have camped at Hells Hole for several weeks during the peak of the coho run. (10+ people are usually with this group) They each keep 3 fish per day and rely on their transporter to pick up their limits each day (via boat) to take back to a lodge for freezing. If seas are too rough the fish spoil. Each person likely leaves the state with at least 50 cohos from Hells Hole. I have been told many of the fish are illegally sold in Europe to finance part of the fishing trip. Reducing nonresidents limit to 1 fish would still allow them to take a reasonable number of fish home. Including salt water in the regulation change would prevent cheating (claiming the fish were take in the salt when they were not).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A repeat of the Shelter Bay coho population decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, simply a move to assure population sustainability.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users over the long term.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A small number of transporters and or lodge owners who now enable the overharvest.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Season harvest limit for nonresidents likely to hard to enforce.

PROPOSED BY: David Grinde (HQ-F11-348)

PROPOSAL 123 - 5 AAC 55.050. Waters closed to sport fishing. Close Ibec Creek to sport fishing above the Copper River Highway as follows:

Ibec Creek would be closed to sport fishing 3 miles above the Copper River Highway.

ISSUE: Access to spawning habitat in the Ibec River System, to avoid the crowds some anglers are traveling into the spawning areas of the most productive system on the West Copper Delta.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Habitat degradation including serious bank erosion and removal of spawners late in the season.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, blushed spawning coho would finally have a safe haven in this important system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups who want sustainable coho returns to Ibec Creek.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The few sport fishermen who feel it is necessary to pursue coho to the spawning areas of Ibec Creek.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closer at 2 mile spawning activity starts above 3 miles in Ibec.

PROPOSED BY: Copper River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-152)

PROPOSAL 124 - 5 AAC 55.050. Waters closed to sport fishing. Close 18 Mile Creek to sport fishing for coho as follows:

18 Mile Creek would be closed to sport fishing for coho north of a sign located just below the deep hole by the haystacks (a easily identifiable geologic feature) approximately 1000 yards from the confluence of alganic slough and 18 Mile Creek.

ISSUE: Access to spawning habitat in the 18 Mile System and removal of spawning salmon from a small road accessible system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Habitat degradation including serious bank erosion and removal of spawners from a small creek that is very accessible.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, blushed spawning coho would finally have a safe haven in this small accessible system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All user groups who want sustainable coho returns to the copper river delta.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Sport fishermen who feel it is necessary to pursue coho in the spawning areas of 18 Mile Creek.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Closing the entire creek too restrictive.

PROPOSED BY: Copper River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee (HQ-F11-153)

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 55.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession and size limits, and methods and means for the Prince William Sound Area. Amend Prince William Sound trout size regulations as follows:

(3) rainbow trout/steelhead/cutthroat trout

...

(C) in all other waters not specified in this paragraph, except the Copper River Delta Special Management Area specified in 5 AAC 55.033: may be taken from June 15 – April 14; bag and possession limit of two fish **with a minimum length of 11 inches and a maximum length of 16 inches.**[OF WHICH ONLY ONE PER DAY AND IN POSSESSION MAY BE 20 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; ANNUAL LIMIT OF TWO FISH 20 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; HARVEST IS TO BE RECORDED ON THE BACK OF THE SPORT FISHING LICENSE; FOR ANGLERS NOT REQUIRED TO HAVE A SPORT FISHING LICENSE, A HARVEST RECORD MAY BE OBTAINED WITHOUT CHARGE FROM DEPARTMENT OFFICES AND FISHING LICENSE VENDORS IN THE PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AREA.]

PROBLEM: Prince William Sound (PWS) represents the northern and western edge of the natural distribution of coastal cutthroat trout. While the presence of cutthroat trout has been documented for several stream and lake systems in PWS, the presence or absence of cutthroat is unknown for the majority of freshwater systems. Both resident and anadromous forms of this species have been identified in PWS. Anadromous populations are typically comprised of fewer than 1,500 individuals. The status of the cutthroat trout populations in PWS is unknown. Anadromous cutthroat trout populations in the sound were one of the few fish species determined to be impacted by the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and their recovery has not been determined. Since the tunnel to Whittier opened in 2001 fishing effort in PWS has increased, while the catch and harvest of cutthroat trout has declined.

Department studies conducted on cutthroat trout after the Exxon Valdez oil spill indicate PWS cutthroat trout typically reach sexual maturity at 11 inches and that a small proportion of each population exceeds a length of 16 inches. Using this data to manage PWS trout stocks is more appropriate than the more liberal statewide standards described in 5 AAC 75.220(c) Statewide management standards for wild trout.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The status of PWS cutthroat stocks is unknown and no fisheries-independent monitoring is in place to determine optimum harvest levels. Existing regulations may not be adequate to ensure the sustained use of some cutthroat trout populations (e.g., small anadromous populations).

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The public will benefit by better ensuring the sustained use of cutthroat trout stocks.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anglers who harvest cutthroat trout smaller than 11 inches and larger than 16 inches.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-313)

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Areas. Allow king salmon fishing on Gulkana River five days per week June 10 - August 10 as follows:

King salmon fishing on the Gulkana River will be open for five days per week, Tuesday 12:01 am thru Saturday 11:59 pm. June 10—August 10.

ISSUE: The king salmon escapement has been below target levels for the past 5 years. This is due to a number of factors, some of which cannot be controlled by regulation and some that can. ADF&G has the power to institute emergency closures on the Gulkana fishery during the season, but this is not always an effective tool. By the time an emergency closure is deemed necessary, it is often too late to produce the desired result. Also---emergency closures have a very negative effect on those who need to plan their vacation well in advance---suddenly they find that they can't fish.

On years when the water levels are low, king salmon are very vulnerable to over fishing on the Gulkana. It cannot be compared to larger rivers that are tougher to fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued low king escapements on the Gulkana.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishermen who desire a sustainable salmon fishery. Fishermen who need to plan vacation time in advance.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Possibly some fish guides.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Earlier season end date. Timed closures; 6:00 pm to midnight. We rejected these because the solution we propose seemed more equitable and carries with it less potential problems.

PROPOSED BY: Paxson Fish & Game Advisory Committee (SC-F11-003)

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Areas. Restrict guided sport fishery when commercial fishery is restricted as follows:

If the commercial fishery is closed for conservation measures on the inside waters during the commercial season at least one conservation measure will be instituted on the guided sport fishery. be it A, B, C or D.

ISSUE: The disconnect between conservation measures on the downriver and upriver commercial fisheries.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Upriver commercial guides gaining from "conservation" restrictions on the commercial drift fleet.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? NA.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users as stability will ensue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Limited entry for commercial salmon guides on Upper Copper River, Board of Fisheries has failed to address for decades.

PROPOSED BY: Shawn Gilman (HQ-F11-031)

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 52.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area; 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession and size limits, and methods

and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area. Establish a limit for shipping of fish out of state for nonresident sport fishermen as follows:

A valid nonresident sport fishing license entitles the bearer to ship on daily bag limit of each legal species out to the State of Alaska per year. All shipped fish shall be in a form and with enough skin attached so species and quality can be easily determined. All shipping containers will be labeled with a signed ADF&G export tag identifying shipper, license number, quantity and species and granting law enforcement agents the permission to open and inspect the contents. In addition, an ADF&G furnished export report and harvest data survey will be mailed prior to the fish leaving the State of Alaska.

ISSUE: Lack of information and a limit on the amounts of nonresident sport caught fish leaving the State of Alaska from the Prince William Sound, Upper Copper River/Upper Susitna River Areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued lack of accurate and timely information on the exploitation rates of this potentially ever expanding user group, with possible impacts on Alaskans' fish resources due to delayed or uninformed management decisions.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Good and timely information on harvest rates and trends is vital to good resource management. Identifying potential abuses and/or illegal exploitation benefits the resource and us all.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Future generations – from both the lessening of potential abuses on the resource and the availability of good and timely information on which to base wise management decisions. Identifying potential abuses and/or illegal exploitation benefits the resource and us all.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident fishermen who wish to take undocumented and unlimited quantities of fish out of the State of Alaska for whatever purpose will suffer the inconvenience of filing a report. This inconvenience can be lessened by providing nonresidents with the shipping label and report form on purchasing their license.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Making this regulation statewide, but it is not applicable this cycle.

PROPOSED BY: Ralph Lohse (HQ-F11-121)

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 52.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area and; 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area. Modify lake trout regulations in four area lakes as follows:

5 AAC 52.022.

...

(2) in all lakes, except Crosswind Lake, Lake Louise, Paxson Lake, Summit Lake, Susitna Lake and Tyone Lake, bait and artificial lures may be used; in Crosswind Lake, Lake Louise, Paxson Lake, Summit Lake, Susitna Lake, and Tyone Lake, a hook and bait may be used only as follows:

(A) from April 16 – October 31, only unbaited, single-hook, artificial lures may be used;

(B) from November 1 – April 15, only single-hooks may be used; bait may be used;

5 AAC 52.023.

...

(5) in Crosswind Lake,

...

(B) the bag and possession limit for lake trout is one fish, with no size limit; [24 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; LAKE TROUT LESS THAN 24 INCHES IN LENGTH MAY NOT BE TAKEN OR POSSESSED AND MUST BE RETURNED TO THE WATER UNHARMED],

(13) in Lake Louise,

...

(D) the bag and possession limit for lake trout is one fish, with no size limit; [24 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; LAKE TROUT LESS THAN 24 INCHES IN LENGTH MAY NOT BE TAKEN OR POSSESSED AND MUST BE RETURNED TO THE WATER UNHARMED],

(21) in Susitna Lake,

...

(B) the bag and possession limit for lake trout is one fish, with no size limit; [24 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; LAKE TROUT LESS THAN 24 INCHES IN LENGTH MAY NOT BE TAKEN OR POSSESSED AND MUST BE RETURNED TO THE WATER UNHARMED],

(26) in Tyone Lake,

...

(D) the bag and possession limit for lake trout is one fish, with no size limit; [24 INCHES OR GREATER IN LENGTH; LAKE TROUT LESS THAN 24 INCHES IN LENGTH MAY NOT BE TAKEN OR POSSESSED AND MUST BE RETURNED TO THE WATER UNHARMED],

ISSUE: Lake trout fisheries in Lake Louise, Susitna, Tyone, and Crosswind lakes have been restricted to a bag and possession limit of one lake trout over 24 inches since 1994. However, harvest and catch (used to estimate 10% hooking mortality) data from the Statewide Harvest Survey indicate that total fishing mortality of Lake Louise lake trout has exceeded estimated sustained yield in 12 of the past 15 years. The Board of Fisheries adopted the Wild Lake Trout Management Plan

(5 AAC 52.060; WLTMP) at its December 2005 meeting, which provided management guidelines to maintain lake trout harvest in area lakes within sustained yield. To reduce overall harvest within sustained yield levels and to remain consistent with the WLTMP, the current size limit and use of bait during the open water period must be eliminated to reduce overall lake trout biomass removal. These changes are proposed for all four lakes to align regulations in these and other (Paxson and Summit lakes) large lake, lake trout fisheries within the management area and to prevent shifting of angler effort due to the bait restriction.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Lake trout stocks in Lake Louise could decline, requiring restrictive regulations that would affect this and other fisheries in the area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; eliminating the size limit to allow a broader range of harvest and restricting bait should maintain harvest within sustained yield estimates.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers who enjoy fishing for lake trout.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Open water anglers who prefer to use bait.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Year-round bait restriction, in addition to the change in size limit; catch-and-release only.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-310)

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Areas. Establish a maximum size limit for lake trout in Lake Louise and Crosswind Lake as follows:

Lake trout 28 inches or greater in length must be immediately returned to the water. Trout under 28 inches in length may be kept, one per day, one in possession.

ISSUE: Inappropriate over harvest of mature, breeding trophy lake trout. Fisheries managers should focus on maintaining trophy lake trout for sport fishing, and thus maintain area and regional economic opportunities that benefit from a healthy trophy fish fishery.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The lake trout sport fishery will decline with overharvest of the breeding trophy trout. This will adversely affect the economics in the immediate vicinity and the associated regional supporting enterprises, leading to significant contribution to poor economic conditions in this rural Alaska region.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the smaller fish are a better quality for eating. There will be more trophy lake trout available to catch (and release) providing more opportunities for the

experience. This will support greater economic influx into the area businesses and communities who provide logistical technical support.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All sport lake trout fishermen, as well as the local and regional businesses that benefit from sport fishing enthusiast activities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The few people who are lucky enough to catch and want to keep the trophy fish for mounting (versus photo re-creation of the fish).

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Voluntary release of (trophy) lake trout 28 inches or greater in length. Not many people actually do release the trophy trout, they bring them home to show off, but never eat them. I've seen several people catch the trophy trout and not return them to the waters.

PROPOSED BY: Laurie Thorpe (HQ-F11-071)

**Note: This proposal is listed under both Subsistence and Sport Fishing for this meeting.*

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Areas; 5 AAC 01.610. Fishing Seasons. Establish lake trout spawning closures in Tyone Lakes complex as follows:

Close lake trout fishing on the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna, Lake Tyone Waterway from September 1st to October 15th.

ISSUE: The decline of quantity and quality of lake trout in the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna, Lake Tyone waterway. Being residents of Lake Louise and having fished the waterway since the mid-sixties - we and other Locals have seen a notable decline over the years. Especially in the last 15 - 20 years. The user base has changed with time, which has increased the demand on a slow growth resource. More and more boats fish the waterway every year - with their "high tech" electronics they are quite efficient at catching lake trout. Cormorants - (another user group) its just been in recent years that we have seen a large increase of Cormorants on this waterway. Another user group that has increased in recent years is the "freshwater fish subsistence permittees". Various user groups target spawning areas during the spawning cycle. The lake trout are extremely vulnerable in the shallow water areas during their spawning period. One of the triggers that's part of the spawning period is water temperature. Water temperature varies from year to year during that time. We have seen lake trout spawn from early September to mid-to late October.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The demand of user groups will continue to grow - which will increase strain on a fragile resource resulting in decline of supply. The fishery will suffer in numbers and quality as it has in recent years.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes - absolutely ! By allowing the spawners to spawn (unmolested by some user groups) the yield will more - which will increase the survival rate - which will add to the food supply - which will result in an overall increase of lake trout. Also, in time a recovery of larger lakers will improve quality of the resource. The larger lake trout have suffered a serious decline in recent years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Present and future generation fishermen. The local, area wide and state economies.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Wayne Simmons (HQ-F11-199)

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 52.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area. Close Paxson and Summit lakes to lake trout fishing September 1 – October 1 as follows:

Paxson and Summit Lakes are closed to lake trout fishing from Sept. 1- Oct. 1.

ISSUE: Excessive lake trout catch during spawning.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increasing high trout catch rates in late September when these fish are vulnerable in shallow water.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trout fishermen---by keeping Lake trout numbers near where they are presently.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who fish Paxson and Summit lakes during hunting season.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Different closure dates; Sept. 10-Oct. 1st. Rejected because there are some early trout spawners, especially in Paxson Lake. However discussion centered around as to whether this would be a balanced solution---protecting some trout while still allowing a trout fishery during hunting seasons.

PROPOSED BY: Paxson Fish & Game Advisory Committee (SC-F11-002)

PROPOSAL 133 - 5 AAC 52.022. General provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area. Allow the use of bait October 1 – July 31 in Paxson and Summit lakes as follows:

In Paxson and Summit lakes, Single hook, bait allowed Oct. 1-July 31st.

ISSUE: Increase fishing opportunity for sport fishermen during selected times of the year. This proposal is part of structured proposals for these two lakes. By reducing spawning impacts and potential bycatch issues, the opportunity for trout fishing during optimum times of the year for most users can be slightly increased.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Not the quality of the fish, but rather the quality and the success rate in the fishery.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The majority of sport fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Lifting the bait restriction for the entire season, Rejected as too liberal. Bait allowed Oct. 1--May 31, rejected as too restrictive. (considerable discussion).

PROPOSED BY: Paxson Fish & Game Advisory Committee (SC-F11-004)

PROPOSAL 134 - 5 AAC 52.037. Freshwater guiding requirements. Restrict guided sport fishery on Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

Restrict any guides before they get started there.

ISSUE: No commercial guiding on Lake Louise, Susitna and Tyone.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Overfishing. Depleted resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Less fish harvested, less pressure on this limited resource.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Families and people who fish as individuals.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, as the guides have not yet established use of this fishery.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Philip Iverson (SC-F11-005)

PROPOSAL 135 - 5 AAC 52.037. Freshwater guiding requirements. Restrict guided sport fishery on Lake Louise, and Susitna and Tyone lakes as follows:

No guide fishing on the Lake Louise - Susitna system.

ISSUE: Eliminate guides on the Lake Louise, Lake Susitna and Lake Tyone system. I have lived in Alaska over sixty years. My favorite place to fish was the Kenai River. When guides became very thick there I left and went to the Deshka River. It was good fishing until guides started there. Then I went to Talkeetna to Clear Creek. I saw an altercation there. A family was stopped in the upper side of a hole fishing salmon. A guide came up and tied up in front of them and started fishing. A gun came out and much yelling and screaming. Then the guide pulled up and left.

I have fished Lake Louise – Lake Susitna for the past forty years. Ethics of true fishing is still there. Fishermen are courteous to other fishermen. The amount of fish in these lakes is limited. No one has abused it.

Lake trout are also found in Lake Tustemina, Lake Silak, and Hidden Lake. In Unit 13, lake trout are in Tangle Lakes, Paxson Lake, Copper Lake to name a few. I would like to think we could have Lake Louise – Susitna without guiding.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The lakes will be over-fished. It will curtail individual sport fishery.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It would limit the number of fish taken.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? So far there are only one or two guides using these lakes, but if allowed they are likely to increase as has happened to the Kenai.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Probably no one, because as of yet this is not a fully used “guide” area. If guides are not encouraged to begin using it, it will remain for individuals, not commercial.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Gene Moe (SC-F11-006)

PROPOSAL 136 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.

Modify rainbow trout regulations in Summit Lake as follows:

5 AAC 52.023.

...

(23) in the Tebay River drainage,

(A) in Summit Lake,

(i) **repealed** [SPORT FISHING IS ALLOWED ONLY FROM JULY 1 – MAY 31;]

(ii) the bag and possession limit for rainbow/steelhead trout is 10 fish, which must be **14** [12] inches or less in length;

ISSUE: Summit Lake (a remote, high alpine lake in Wrangell-St. Elias National Park accessible only by aircraft) was barren of fish until rainbow trout were illegally stocked sometime around statehood. These fish grew exceptionally large in size (e.g., >32 in) and by the mid 1980s, the lake was well known for its trophy-sized fish. By 1999, the population had changed from a population dominated by larger-sized fish (e.g., >24 in) to a stunted population composed of smaller individuals (e.g., <10 in). The Board of Fisheries adopted a 10-fish bag limit, 12-inch maximum length, and spawning closure for rainbow trout in Summit Lake at its December 1999 meeting. In 2003, ADF&G initiated a long-term study to determine if a large-scale removal operation conducted over several years could change this population from its stunted state to a stable population composed of multiple size classes ranging up to 24 inches or greater. This project succeeded in creating a bi-modal size distribution of smaller and larger rainbow trout. Data from the project indicate that maximizing sport harvest of rainbow trout, up to 14 inches in length, is the most feasible regulatory means to attempt to maintain the improved size structure of the rainbow trout population in Summit Lake.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Once large-scale removal of rainbow trout is discontinued, the population will likely revert back to a stunted population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; anglers will be allowed to harvest a larger-sized fish and potentially catch trophy-sized rainbow trout.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers who wish to harvest rainbow trout and anglers seeking a fishery for trophy-sized rainbow trout.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No bag limit.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-311)

PROPOSAL 137 - 5 AAC 52.055. Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan. Align the Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan with area regulations as follows:

5 AAC 52.055. Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan.

(d) Regional management approach. Under the regional management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited artificial lures and the bag and possession limit is five fish. The season is open year round; however there are fisheries where catch-and-release fishing is imposed during part or all of the spawning period from April 1 through **May 31** [MAY 30].

(e) Conservative management approach. Under the conservative management approach, sport anglers may use baited or unbaited single-hook artificial lures. The bag and possession limit is two fish. The fishing season is open year round, and is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the spawning period of April 1 through **May 31** [MAY 30]. The use of size limits does apply to certain stocks and fisheries under this approach. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

...

(h) Special management approach. Under the special management approach, only unbaited single-hook artificial lures and unbaited single hook artificial flies may be used. Size limits may be imposed for certain fisheries and may include trophy designation, which is a fish 18 inches or greater in length. The bag limit is one fish, except that a fishery may be restricted to catch-and-release fishing, or closed. Single-hook waters may be established. The fishing season is open year round, but fishing is restricted to catch-and-release fishing during the April 1 through **May 31** [MAY 30] spawning period. If a fishery for a species other than Arctic grayling occurs in the same water body, the use of larger multiple hooks and bait on larger single and multiple hooks is allowed.

ISSUE: The Board of Fisheries adopted the Wild Arctic Grayling Management Plan at its January 2004 meeting. The intent of the plan was to provide protection to spawning Arctic grayling over the two-month period during which spawning occurs, April 1–May 31. Inadvertently, the date of May 30 instead of May 31 was included in the plan. In specific area regulations, April 1–May 31 is listed as the period for a spawning closure in three different systems. This proposal would align the management plan dates with those in area regulations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The specific area regulation dates for the spawning closure will deviate by one day in relation to the dates specified in the management plan.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishery managers, enforcement staff, and the public will benefit from clear, concise regulations and management plans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-F11-309)

PROPOSAL 138 - 5 AAC 52.023. Special provisions for seasons, bag, possession, and size limits, and methods and means for the Upper Copper River and Upper Susitna River Area.
Open Tolsona Lake to sport fishing for burbot as follows:

(24) in Tolsona Lake,

(A) **the bag and possession limit for burbot is two fish, with no size limit** [MAY NOT BE TAKEN OR POSSESSED AND MUST BE RETURNED TO THE WATER UNHARMED];

ISSUE: The Board of Fisheries closed the Tolsona Lake burbot fishery at its January 2003 meeting. The population had declined due to environmental factors and had been closed since 1998 by emergency order. The department has conducted annual stock assessment of the burbot population in Tolsona Lake since 1986 that has tracked the decline in the population and subsequent recovery. The department set a management objective requiring an estimated abundance of 1,500 burbot > 18 inches for two consecutive years to open the lake to sport fishing for burbot and ensure a sustainable fishery. Based on stock assessment, the population objective was achieved in 2008 and 2009.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Anglers will continue to be denied the opportunity to fish for burbot in a road-accessible lake.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; allowing a burbot fishery will diversify sport fishing opportunity in Tolsona Lake which is currently stocked with rainbow trout and supports a wild Arctic grayling population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Sport anglers who enjoy fishing for burbot.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-F11-312)
