

CHIGNIK FINFISH

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 01.475(2). Waters closed to subsistence fishing. This proposal would amend the regulation to allow subsistence salmon fishing in the Chignik Lake tributaries of Clark River and Home Creek.

5 AAC 01.475. Waters closed to subsistence fishing.

(2) in Black Lake, or any tributary to Black Lake or Chignik Lakes **except those waters of Clark River and Home Creek from their confluence with Chignik Lake upstream one linear mile.**

ISSUE: During some years the present regulation may not provide reasonable opportunity for subsistence users to meet their needs.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence fishermen will continue to have limited opportunity to harvest their late season subsistence salmon.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chignik Area subsistence salmon users, fishery managers, and Division of Subsistence personnel.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07F-257)

FAVOR **OPPOSE**

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services PC2

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 01.470. Lawful gear and gear specifications. This proposal would amend the regulation to restrict subsistence gillnets to obstruct no more than one half the wetted width of any fish stream.

5 AAC 01.470. Lawful gear and gear specifications. (a) Salmon may be taken by seines and gillnets, or with gear specified on a subsistence fishing permit, except that in Chignik Lake salmon may not be taken with purse seines. **Subsistence gear may not obstruct more than one half the wetted width of any fish stream open to subsistence salmon fishing.**

ISSUE: Salmon returning to small rivers and tributaries open to subsistence salmon fishing may be over harvested by subsistence fishermen or prevented from reaching local spawning grounds during specific times of the year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Subsistence fishermen may over exploit local rivers and tributaries and prevent returning salmon from reaching spawning grounds, and subsistence harvest opportunity may lost if an area could be opened to limited harvest opportunity.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence fishers, fishery managers and enforcement personnel.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Using EO authority to expand closed waters in order to prevent stream blockages.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07F-258)

FAVOR **OPPOSE**

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services PC2

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 15.357(c)(1). Chignik Area Salmon Management Plan. This proposal seeks to amend the regulation that opens the Eastern District in the Chignik Management Area concurrently with the Chignik Bay and Central districts during June.

5 AAC 15.357(c)(1) during June, the commercial salmon fishery may [SHALL] open concurrently with the Chignik Bay and Central districts, and the openings shall be based on achieving the Black Lake sockeye salmon escapement goals;

ISSUE: The current regulation opens the Eastern District concurrently with the Chignik Bay and Central districts based on Black Lake sockeye salmon escapement goals during June. Given the remote location and sporadic effort in the Eastern District during June, the department often does not know the amount of commercial fishing effort occurring in this area. This proposal would allow the department to better document effort and manage the fishery by opening the Eastern District upon request when Black Lake sockeye salmon escapement goals are achieved. This information is particularly useful when Black Lake sockeye salmon escapements are at or near minimum thresholds for commercial fishing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continue to limit management flexibility.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishery managers. Chignik fishermen may also benefit during years when surplus pink and chum salmon are available for harvest and commercial fishing would otherwise be closed due to sockeye salmon escapement concerns under the current regulation.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07F-255)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 15.357. Chignik Area Salmon Management Plan. Restrict commercial fishing in Chignik to improve subsistence fishing opportunities as follows:

Chignik Lagoon Council would like to see no commercial fishing in Area L before June 5 of each year, or before the Chignik weir get 30,000 to 40,000 escapement.

ISSUE: Subsistence opportunity. Residents need their subsistence fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents from the Chignik area will not be able to get their subsistence fish from the early run. Elderly rely the first run fish to can their fish and to freeze for the winter. First run fish have more fat in them.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All residents in our area that subsistence fish.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Lagoon Village Council

(HQ-07F-424)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 15.200(c)(e). Fishing Districts. Amend regulation to include Castle Bay in Central District as follows:

The Central District will include Castle Bay, excluding that portion of the bay within 1/4 mile of the tip of Castle Cape. Management of the Central District will remain the same as it is now.

ISSUE: The Central District should encompass Castle Bay, excluding that portion of the bay within 1/4 mile of the tip of Castle Cape. Castle Bay is an inner bay of Chignik Bay, and with its East-West orientation is parallel to the Alaska Peninsula. Geographically, Castle Bay fits with the Central District and is not in character with the Western District. Castle Bay also offers protection from most ocean-borne storms, especially southeasters, and being in the Central District, Castle Bay would give the fleet an alternative to plying more exposed outside waters under adverse weather. Safety should not be compromised, but with the current economic conditions there is more risk taking - fishing is a risky business by nature & it will be reduced. In further support of the proposal, Chignik cannot afford to miss out on any local-stock harvest opportunities. Chignik fishermen should have the option of more harvest opportunity within Chignik Bay than they currently have. This can be accomplished with a minor revision of the Central District boundary to include Castle Bay.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chignik has seen a more dramatic economic decline than surrounding areas since sockeye salmon prices began to deteriorate due to our almost total dependence on our sockeye salmon fishery for our income. Continuing lost harvest opportunities, especially under adverse weather conditions, will only contribute to rather than help to alleviate the economic hardship suffered by Chignik fishermen and communities as sockeye salmon prices remain extremely poor. Harvest opportunities will be risked and fishermen will have fewer alternatives to operate more safely and efficiently.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Possibly. Allowing a more sheltered area for fishermen to harvest in the Central district can result in better quality fish being produced during adverse weather conditions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chignik Fishermen, the five Chignik communities faced with severe economic hardships, and the local processor would benefit. There would be more local stock harvest opportunity under less risk.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one should be harmed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Seiners Association

(HQ-07F-203)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 15.357 (d). Chignik Area Salmon Management Plan.
Open the Western and Perryville districts in June and early July with the Chignik Bay and Central districts as follows:

Manage the Western and Perryville Districts the same as the Eastern District for June by substituting the following language:

5 AAC 15.357. (d): In The Western and Perryville Districts, during June, the commercial salmon fishery shall open concurrently with the Chignik Bay and Central Districts, and the openings shall be based on achieving the Black Lake sockeye salmon escapement goals;

- (1) from approximately June 26 through July 9,
 - (A) the Department shall evaluate the strength of the Chignik Lake run; and
 - (B) in order to allow the Department to assess the Chignik Lake run strength, commercial salmon fishing in the Western and Perryville Districts will, in the Department's discretion, be disallowed or severely restricted;
- (2) from the end of the transition period, described in (b)(2) of this section, until approximately August 20, fishing periods shall be based on the Department's evaluation of local pink and chum salmon runs, and its evaluation of the Chignik Lake sockeye salmon run; and
- (3) from approximately August 20 until the end of the fishing season, fishing periods shall be based on the Department's evaluation of local coho salmon runs, and its evaluation of the Chignik Lake sockeye salmon run.
 - (A) to ensure reasonable protection of the Kametolook River coho salmon run at Perryville, the Department will, at its discretion, maintain a closed water area of sufficient size in the Perryville District.

ISSUE: The current Chignik salmon management plan does not allow Chignik fishermen to harvest Chignik bound sockeye in our own Western District during June, resulting in Chignik fishermen being denied access to one half of their available fishing area. With the small fleet that currently exists (less than half of the 92 permits fished in 2006), the potential for significant overescapement is greatly increased if the fleet is not allowed more area to harvest sockeye as they enter the Chignik Management Area. Allowing Chignik fishermen to start harvesting Chignik bound sockeye as they enter our Western District will help mitigate the potential for overescapement. When the Igvak fishery is open, fishing in our Eastern, Central and Chignik Bay districts suffer, and we currently have no other available areas to fish.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chignik has seen a more dramatic economic decline than surrounding areas since sockeye salmon prices began to deteriorate due to our almost total dependence on our sockeye salmon fishery for our income. Continuing lost harvest opportunities will cause even greater economic hardship to the local fishermen and communities as sockeye salmon prices remain extremely poor. Significant overescapement problems could arise, further damaging our already distressed sockeye rearing habitat.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS

PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By allowing the sockeye harvest to be more spread out over more time and area it will promote a more orderly harvest, which should result in a better quality product.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chignik Fishermen, the five Chignik communities faced with severe economic hardships, and the local processor would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. It would simply allow Chignik fishermen the opportunity to harvest Chignik bound sockeye in their own area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Seiners Association

(HQ-07F-204)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Mark Wagner PC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 15.350. Closed waters. Repeal the closed waters area near Kupreanof Point as follows:

Repeal the following language: 5 AAC 15.350. Closed waters
(20) [FROM JULY 6 THROUGH AUGUST 31, ALL WATERS OF ALASKA IN THE IVANOF BAY SECTION, BETWEEN A LINE EXTENDING 135° FROM KUPREANOF POINT AT 55° 33.98' N. LAT., 159° 35.88' W. LONG., AND A LINE EXTENDING FROM 65° FROM 55° 34.90' N. LAT., 159° 37.10' W. LONG.]

This will return the Western District of the Chignik Management Area to its historical boundaries and allow Chignik fishermen to resume recently lost traditional harvest opportunities.

Opening both Chignik and Area M sides of Kupreanof Point, but we don't think the Board can take action on the Area M boundary out of cycle, so that will have to wait until the next Area M BOF meeting.

ISSUE: The current Chignik salmon management plan does not allow Chignik fishermen to harvest salmon at Kupreanof Point. Chignik fishermen have been denied the opportunity to utilize this historical fishing area since the late 90's. The same is true for Area M fishermen on the other side of the boundary line.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chignik has seen a more dramatic economic decline than surrounding areas since sockeye salmon prices began to deteriorate due to our almost total dependence on our sockeye salmon fishery for our income. Continuing lost harvest opportunities will only contribute to rather than help to alleviate the economic hardship suffered by Chignik fishermen and communities as sockeye salmon prices remain extremely poor.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Potentially. Salmon caught on the capes are generally better quality, especially pinks and chums.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chignik Fishermen, the five Chignik communities faced with severe economic hardships, and the local processor would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. It would simply re-open a traditional fishing area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Opening both Chignik and Area M sides of Kupreanof Point, but we don't think the Board can take action on Area M boundary out of cycle, so that will have to wait until the next Area M BOF meeting.

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Seiners Association

(HQ-07F-205)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Mark Wagner PC3

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 15.357. Chignik Area Salmon Management Plan. Repeal the coho cap in Chignik fishery as follows:

Repeal the coho cap.

ISSUE: The 60,000 coho cap imposed on Chignik fishermen. Chignik fishermen did not protest when the cap was imposed in the spirit of fairness as Area M fishermen had previously had a coho cap imposed on them. The Board has since removed the coho cap from Area M, deeming it unnecessary. The coho cap is equally unnecessary in Chignik fishermen and communities as sockeye salmon prices remain extremely poor.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Chignik has seen more dramatic economic decline than surrounding areas since sockeye salmon prices began to deteriorate due to our almost total dependence on our sockeye salmon fishery for our income. Continuing lost harvest opportunities will only contribute to rather than help to alleviate the economic hardship suffered by Chignik fishermen and communities as sockeye salmon prices remain extremely poor.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chignik Fishermen, the five Chignik communities faced with severe economic hardships, and the local processor would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. It would simply allow us to return to our historical fishing pattern.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Seiners Association

(HQ-07F-202)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 15.357(d)(3). Chignik Area Salmon Management Plan. This proposal seeks to amend the regulation that opens the Western and Perryville districts in the Chignik Management Area from approximately August 20 solely based on the department's evaluation of local coho runs and Chignik lake sockeye salmon run.

5 AAC 15.357(d)(3) from approximately August 20 until the end of the fishing season, fishing periods **may** [SHALL] be based on the department's evaluation of local pink, chum, and coho salmon runs, and it's evaluation of the Chignik Lake sockeye salmon run.

ISSUE: After approximately August 20 the current regulation bases commercial fishing in the Western and Perryville districts on the department's evaluation on local coho runs and the Chignik Lake sockeye salmon run. This proposal would allow the department to open portions of the Western and Perryville districts for harvest of surplus late season pink and chum salmon when local coho and Chignik Lake sockeye salmon escapements are not achieved and the Western and Perryville districts would otherwise be restricted or closed to commercial salmon fishing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Potential lost fishing opportunity for surplus late season chum and pink salmon in the Western and Perryville districts during late August and early September.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fishery managers and Chignik fishermen.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (HQ-07F-256)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 15.357. Chignik Area Salmon Management Plan.
Develop a coho salmon management plan as follows:

When sockeye escapement is below minimums but harvestable amounts of coho are available, the department may open a targeted coho fishery where sockeye would not be retained in the catch but released to escape and spawn.

This proposal should be considered a placeholder proposal to promote discussion between fishermen, local communities and Advisory Committees, Subsistence and Sport users, CRAA, the department, and other interested stakeholders. We understand that this concept is underdeveloped and will benefit from further discussion.

ISSUE: In years of weak late season sockeye runs, coho stocks go unharvested because the current management plan mandates closures for sockeye escapement. Further, published University of Washington studies have demonstrated that excess coho salmon escapements causes excess sockeye fry predation and corresponding damage to the Chignik sockeye resources.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued lost harvest opportunity on Chignik Lakes coho salmon and continued excess predation of sockeye fry from an over abundance of coho salmon fry.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chignik area fishers, local communities, and the local processor.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Seiners Association

(HQ-07F-201)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

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 9-11, 2007 worksession, the board will:

- a) Determine if the proposal complete;*
- b) Determine if there are outstanding questions or information needed;*
- c) Confirm that board has authority to act on proposal; identify any aspects of 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 33 - 5 AAC 15.330. Gear; and 5 AAC 15.xxx. New section. Allow drift gillnetting in the Chignik area as follows:

Allow drift gillnetting in the Chignik Area, by adding the following language to the Chignik management plan.

5 AAC 15.330. Gear.

- (a) Salmon may be taken only by **drift gillnet**, purse seine, and hand purse seine.

5 AAC 15.xxx. Gillnet specifications and operations.

(a) In the Eastern, Central, Western and Perryville Districts no gillnet less than 100 fathoms or more than 200 fathoms in length may be used.

(b) In the Chignik Bay District, no gillnets may be used.

(c) No gillnets may be more than 90 meshes in depth

5 AAC 15.xxx. Identification of gear.

(a) Each drift gillnet in operation must have at each end a bright red keg, buoy, or a cluster of floats plainly and legibly marked with the permanent vessel license plat (ADF&G) number of the vessel operating the gear, as well as the initials of the operator.

5 AAC 15.xxx. Registration.

(a) A person may not fish a vessel simultaneously as a purse seine vessel and a drift gillnet vessel. A person may change gear types anytime during the season if a written request is submitted to, and validated, by the Department.

ISSUE: Chignik permit holders are locked into one method of harvesting salmon – purse seining. There needs to be more flexibility in harvesting methods in order to allow fishermen to adapt to changing economic forces in the salmon industry. Chignik has seen a more dramatic economic decline than surrounding areas since sockeye salmon prices began to deteriorate due to our almost total dependence on our sockeye salmon fishery for our income. With the dramatic decrease in sockeye prices and the increase costs associated with seining (large crews, expensive nets, skiffs, outboards, fuel), coupled with the fact that Chignik is a low volume salmon fishery, fewer and fewer Chignik fishermen can afford to operate their fishing boats and as a result are going out of business. The poor returns have been especially crippling to the fishery in Chignik. Drift gillnetting, if allowed, would enable fishermen to drastically reduce their operating expenses and give them a chance to turn a profit, even on low volume, and thus stay in business.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The financial stress associate with poor sockeye prices and runs will continue without the relief that a new low cost fishery could have provided. More and more Chignik fishermen will go out of business, quickly destroying a local economy already teetering on the brink of bankruptcy.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By allowing fishermen to be able to drastically reduce costs they can get out from under the burden of needing to sacrifice quality for volume. With lower operating costs fishermen can better afford to slow down and take care of their catch. Drift gillnetting also provides for a slower rate of harvest than seining, which further allows fishermen to focus on taking proper care of their catch.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chignik Fishermen, the five Chignik communities faced with severe economic hardships, and the local processor would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Seiners Association

(HQ-07F-206)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Chignik Fishermen United PC1

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

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 9-11, 2007 worksession, the board will:

- a) Determine if the proposal complete;*
- b) Determine if there are outstanding questions or information needed;*
- c) Confirm that board has authority to act on proposal; identify any aspects of 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 34 - 5 AAC 15.330. Gear; and 5 AAC 15.xxx. New section. Allow hand and power trolling in the Chignik area as follows:

Allow hand and power trolling in the Chignik Area, by adding the following language to the Chignik management plan.

5 AAC 15.330. Gear

(a) Salmon may be taken only by **hand or power trolling**, purse seine and hand purse seine.

5 AAC 15.xxx. Troll gear specifications and operations.

(a) Salmon may be taken by hand troll gear and power troll gear after August 15 and only in Eastern, Central, Western and Perryville Districts.

(1) to ensure reasonable protection of the Kametlook River coho salmon run at Perryville, the Department will, at its discretion, maintain a closed water area of sufficient size in the Perryville District.

(b) The maximum number of trolling lines that may be operated from a salmon troll vessel is as follows:

(1)from a power troll vessel:

(A) No more than six lines may be operated.

(2)from a hand troll vessel

(A) from each hand troll gurdy: only one line to which multiple leaders and hooks may be attached;

(B) from each fishing rod: only one line with no more than one leader and one lure or two baited hooks per leader;

(C) an aggregate of four fishing rods or an aggregate of two hand troll gurdies may be operated.

(c) A salmon troll vessel may have a fishing rod equipped exclusively for taking bait or a gillnet for taking bait of a mesh size of no more than two and one-half inches and made of no greater than number 20 gillnet thread.

(d) No more than six troll gurdies may be mounted on board any salmon power troll vessel.

(e) No more than two troll gurdies and four fishing rods may be on board any salmon hand troll vessel. A downrigger may not be used in conjunction with a fishing rod.

(f) For purposes of this section

(1) a troll gurdy is a spool- type device that is designed to deploy and retrieve troll lines, weights, and lures' the term "troll gurdy"

(A) includes a downrigger; and

(B) does not include a reel attached to a fishing rod;

(2) a hand troll gurdy is a troll gurdy powered by hand or hand crank that is not mounted on or used in conjunction with a fishing rod and is not considered power troll gear;

(3) a fishing rod is a tapering, often jointed, rode equipped with a hand grip and line guides, upon which is mounted a hand powered reel used to deploy and retrieve the trolling line;

(4) a downrigger is a device designed to be used with a fishing rode to deploy a line to a selected depth and retrieve the downrigger line and weight.

5 AAC 15.xxx. Registration.

(a) A person may not fish a vessel simultaneously as a hand troll vessel and a power troll vessel. A person may change gear types anytime during the season if a written request is submitted to, and validated, by the Department.

ISSUE: Chignik permit holders are locked into one method of harvesting salmon – purse seining. There needs to be amore flexibility in harvesting methods in order to allow fishermen to adapt to changing economic forces in the salmon industry. Chignik has seen a more dramatic economic decline than surrounding areas since sockeye salmon prices began to deteriorate due to our almost total dependence on our sockeye salmon fishery for our income. With the dramatic decrease in sockeye prices and the increased costs associate with seining (large crews, expensive nets, skiffs, outboards, fuel), coupled with the fact that Chignik is a low volume salmon fishery, fewer and fewer Chignik fishermen can afford to operate their fishing boats and as a result are going out of business. The poor returns have been especially crippling to the traditional August and September fishery in Chignik. While coho have returned in significant numbers, the poor sockeye returns have prohibited Chignik fishermen from being able to harvest the coho. As it is the coho are almost completely unutilized, resulting in a significant lost harvest opportunity, and there is concern among the fishermen that the coho may become relatively more dominant than in the past. When coho become relatively dominant they also consume lots of juvenile sockeye in the Chignik and Black lake and, therefore, tend

to suppress sockeye numbers. It is desirable to maintain the traditional species composition ratio between sockeye and coho in Chignik Lake and Black Lake.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The current underutilization of the coho stocks will continue. The financial stress associate with poor sockeye runs will continue without the relief that a new low cost high value fishery could have provided.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By allowing fishermen to be able to drastically reduce costs they can get out from under the burden of needing to sacrifice quality for volume. With lower operating costs fishermen can better afford to slow down and take care of their catch. Drift gillnetting also provides for a slower rate of harvest than seining, which further allows fishermen to focus on taking proper care of their catch.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Chignik Fishermen (primarily the local resident permit holders of the Chignik management area), the five Chignik communities faced with severe economic hardships, and the local processor would benefit by increasing harvest opportunity on currently unutilized late season coho by providing low cost high quality harvest opportunity. The resource will be benefited by balancing the harvest pressure across salmon species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Chignik Seiners Association

(HQ-07F-207)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Chignik Fishermen United PC1

F/V Ocean Gold PC4

Southeast Alaska Fishermen's Alliance PC5

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____