

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 18.360. Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan. Reduce the Cape Igvak Section allocation from 15 percent to 7.5 percent of the total Chignik Area sockeye salmon catch, as follows:

5 AAC 18.360 (b) (c) Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan is amended to read:

The Department shall manage the fishery so that the number of sockeye salmon in the Cape Igvak Section by Area K fishermen shall approach as near as possible 7.5% [15%] the total Chignik sockeye salmon catch through July 25.

What is the issue you would like the board to address and why? The Cape Igvak Section fishery was established in 1978 as an allocation fishery on Chignik-bound sockeye salmon. At the time Kodiak sockeye stocks were depressed from over-fishing. The two Chignik runs were healthy, and it was deemed reasonable to ‘share the wealth’ with Kodiak, a measure of income redistribution which some now believe is quite fashionable or progressive. Things have changed dramatically at Chignik and Kodiak from the 1970’s. While Chignik’s two sockeye runs are still healthy, the Area L salmon fishery is not. Chignik has gone from supporting several shore-based processors to none now owing to economic conditions within the Chignik fishery. Unlike Kodiak, Chignik’s single industry, for all practical purposes, is salmon fishing. There are simply no jobs available, and our villages are losing residents.

When the Board assigned an allocation of Chignik sockeye salmon to the Igvak fishery in 1978 Kodiak had been harvesting less than 500 thousand sockeye salmon annually (avg. 1958-67: 437,000; avg. 1968-77: 494,000(ADF&G, Jackson et al. 2015)). Now according to ADF&G, Kodiak is averaging about 4.5 times that amount for the last 10-years (avg. 2006-15: 2.2 million sockeye harvest (J. Jackson, 11/16/15)).

The Board is requested to roll-back the Cape Igvak allocation by 50%, from an allocation of 15% to 7.5%, a measure that would improve the Chignik salmon fishery and overall Chignik conditions. Chignik salmon fisherman have no hatcheries to draw upon, and our local pink and chum runs are not managed to provide economic sustainability as was well addressed at last year’s Board of Fisheries. Chignik salmon fishermen contribute 2% of their catch in a tax to support local management and safeguard fisheries habitat. This includes funding for an annual smolt study (to ADF&G), Black Lake and Chignik habitat monitoring (to FRI), and in-season stock separation genetics (to ADF&G). Chignik is battling for economic survival, and it has no options available for supplemental salmon production similar to those as achieved in Kodiak. We believe that relief from the Cape Igvak Section fishery on Chignik bound sockeye salmon is quite reasonable to the degree proposed.

PROPOSED BY: George Anderson

(HQ-F16-042)
