Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Board of Fisheries
PO Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526
(907) 465-4110
www.adfg.alaska.gov

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES

Index to Select Findings and Policies Tab
Southeast and Yakutat Finfish and Shellfish 2018 Meeting

Finding / Policy	Reference #
GENERAL POLICIES – SEE COMMONLY USED POLICIES PACKET	
Joint Board Petition Policy	5 AAC 96.625
Sustainable Salmon Policy	5 AAC 39.222
Salmon Escapement Policy	5 AAC 39.223
Joint Board Generated Proposal Criteria	2013-270-FB
Findings regarding Operating Procedures Policy for Written Public Comment	2012-268-FB
Findings regarding Operating Procedures for the Motion to Reconsider	2012-267-FB
Delegation of Authority to Correct Technical Errors before Filing Regulations	2006-250-FB
Policy on Emergency Petition Process	2000-203-FB
Policy on Development of Findings	1999-184-FB
Findings on Policy for Mixed Stock Fishery	1993-145-FB
Allocation Criteria	1991-129-FB
Alaska Board of Fisheries Standing Rule	1991-128-FB
Procedure for Delegation of Authority	1988-118-FB
SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT: SESSION 1 - SHELLFISH	
Charge to the ADF&G and Southeast King & Tanner Crab Taskforce	2002-214-FB
Finding Regarding Tanner Crab Pot Limit in Southeast Alaska	1997-166-FB
Policy on King and Tanner Crab Resource Management	1990-04-FB
SOUTHEAST AND YAKUTAT: SESSION 2 - FINFISH	
Hatchery Protocol	2002-215-FB
Southeast Alaska Area Enhanced Salmon Allocation Management Plan	1994-148-FB
Southeast Alaska Chinook Salmon Allocations	1993-142-FB

Alaska Board of Fisheries
2002-214-FB

Charge to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
and Southeast Alaska King and Tanner Crab Task Force

The Alaska Board of Fisheries requests the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Southeast Alaska King and Tanner Crab Task Force work together to develop a draft Southeast Alaska Tanner Crab Management Plan and an associated suite of regulations for consideration by the board during the next Statewide King and Tanner Crab Board of Fisheries meeting. We understand that the department and the task force have discussed these issues during the March 2002 board meeting and have found agreement upon the current problems and short-term goals, as well as a vision statement for the fishery. Based upon these agreements, the board believes that a management plan and regulatory framework can be developed that will best achieve the goals and visions set out here. Additional time will also allow the department, in consultation with industry, to refine the Tanner crab stock assessment program and develop a longer time series that will allow quantitative assessment of the stock. Because the department is uncertain about the effects of the measures contained in Proposals 481 and 482A, the board believes the best course of action is for the department and industry to work together under guidelines set by the Board of Fisheries. While this plan is developed, the department will continue to manage the fishery in a conservative manner.

Following is an outline of the current fishery problems and a vision for the sustainable management of the Southeast Alaska Tanner crab fishery:

A management plan and associated regulations should address the following problems and goals:

1) Reduce fishing pressure in "core areas";
2) Reduce handling of females and sublegal males;
3) Develop the time and tools to allow for inseason management;
4) Develop an abundance based management plan with preseason guideline harvest levels (GHLs);
5) Continue a conservative management strategy until a new management plan is in place;
6) Maintain the concurrent season with golden king crab;
7) Continue and develop the stock assessment program in consultation with industry and communicate the goals and protocols of this program with the fleet.

The management plan and associated regulations should be compatible with a vision for the sustainable management of the Southeast Alaska Tanner crab fishery, outlined as follows:

1) Abundance based management by area with preseason GHLs, incorporating information about all stock segments;
2) Survey and stock assessment protocols in place that are understood by stakeholders;
3) Inseason management targeting specific area GHLs;
4) Follow the policies set out in the board's King and Tanner Crab Policy.

ADOPTED: March 21, 2002
Anchorage, Alaska

Ed Dersham, Chair
Alaska Board of Fisheries

VOTE: 6-0-1

97-166-FB

previously
(Finding #97-01-FB)

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES

FINDINGS REGARDING TANNER CRAB POT LIMIT IN SOUTHEASTERN ALASKA AREA (AREA A) (PROPOSAL #45)

The Alaska Board of Fisheries (board) discussed Region 1 Shellfish Proposal #45 submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) to reduce the maximum number of pots by each Tanner crab fishing vessel in Statistical Area A from 100 pots to 50 pots. This discussion took place on October 28, 1995 during proposal deliberations, after all staff reports, public comments, and advisory committee comments had been received. All board members, with the exception of Trefon Angasan, were present. The board amended the proposal to set the maximum number of pots at 80, and passed the amended proposal by a vote of 6-0, with one absent. This action was intended to balance the immediate resource conservation concerns with needs of the industry. The board developed the following findings during their discussions:

1. The department does not have a pre-season stock assessment program to determine stock strength in the Southeastern Alaska Area (Statistical Area A) commercial Tanner crab fishery. The intensity of the commercial fishery has increased significantly during recent fishing seasons and the guideline harvest level has consistently been exceeded during the past three seasons. The catch contribution of the recruit class has increased to between 66 and 77 percent of the catch. The department estimated a season length of 11 days during the impending season. The department can not gather fishery data through fish tickets or logbooks to provide management decisions in season which would result in stock savings.

2. While a reduction in the pot limit to 50 pots would result in an estimated season length of 21 days and provide the department with the ability to manage in-season, this reduction in pot limit would also place a severe economic constrain on the participants.

3. The board discussed other possible solutions to reduce the risk of overharvest that included: a reduction in the GHR; a reduction in fishing time; a split season with the ability to gather necessary fishery data between two separate openings; and means to improve the data gathering process which could include the use of cellular phones and FAX machines.

4. The amendment to 80 pots per vessel was made with the understanding that the department and industry would form a cooperative group to improve the flow of immediate information from the fleet to the department. This group will be composed of department personnel, processor personnel, fishermen, tender operators, and representatives of fishermen organizations (i.e. from the Petersburg Vessel Owner's Association).

97-166-FB (Previously 97-01-FB)

5. The desired objective is for the department to receive, on a daily basis, catch and effort information from the industry through the use of new communication technology. Industry indicated through the public hearing process that they were willing to purchase cellular telephones and faxes, and provide information to the department on a daily basis.

6. If the plan developed by the cooperative group does not solve the situation, the board has instructed the department to take actions necessary to provide for harvests within the allowable levels. These actions could include a reduction to a 50 pot per vessel limit.

7. If the plan developed by the cooperative group succeeds, the pot limit could be increased to the original 100 pots by future actions of the board.

At Sitka, Alaska

Date: January 29, 1997

Approved: 4/0/0/3 (Yes/No/Absent/Abstain)

Larry L. Engel

Larry Engel, Chair
Alaska Board of Fisheries

POLICY ON KING AND TANNER CRAB RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

GOAL AND BENEFITS

It is the goal of the Alaska Board of Fisheries and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to manage king and Tanner crab stocks in a manner that will protect, maintain, improve, and extend these resources for the greatest overall benefit to Alaska and the nation. Achievement of this goal is necessarily constrained by the requirement to minimize: (1) risks of irreversible adverse effects on reproductive potential; (2) harvest during biologically sensitive periods of the life cycle; (3) adverse fishery impacts on non-targeted portions of stocks; and (4) adverse interactions with other fish and shellfish stocks and fisheries.

Management of these fisheries for the purpose of achieving this goal will result in a variety of benefits which include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) maintaining healthy stocks of king and Tanner crabs of sufficient abundance to insure their continued reproductive viability and the maintenance of their role in the ecosystem;

(2) providing a sustained and reliable supply of high quality product to the industry and consumers which will provide substantial and stable employment in all sectors of the economy relating to these fisheries; and

(3) providing opportunities for subsistence and personal use fisheries on these stocks.

The Alaska Board of Fisheries also recognizes the benefits of managing for the highest socio-economic benefit when such action does not conflict with the previously mentioned biological constraints.

POLICIES

To achieve the management goal and provide the benefits available from these resources, it is necessary to set policies which will protect stocks and provide for optimum utilization of these resources. It is the policy of the Alaska Board of Fisheries to:

1. Maintain crab stocks comprised of various size and age classes of mature animals in order to maintain the longterm reproductive viability of the stock and reduce industrial dependency on annual recruitment, which is extremely variable. Benefits of this policy are most apparent when weak recruitment occurs. As population abundance and structure change with declining recruitment, harvests should be reduced.

2. Routinely monitor crab resources to provide information on abundance of females as well as prerecruit, recruit, and postrecruit males. This is necessary to detect changes in the population which may require adjustments in management to prevent irreversible damage to the reproductive potential of each stock and to better achieve the benefits listed above. Harvests must be conducted in a conservative manner in the absence of adequate information on stocks.

3. Protect king and Tanner crab stocks during biologically sensitive periods of their life cycle.

Closure of the fishing season is necessary at times surrounding the annual mating, molting, and egg hatching periods in order to reduce unnecessary mortality of soft animals, disturbance during mating, and damage to egg clutches.

4. Minimize handling and unnecessary mortality of non-legal crabs and other non-target animals. Capture and handling of females, sublegal males, and animals of other species results in a loss of reproductive ability and biomass that may be detrimental to a stock.

5. Maintain an adequate brood stock to rebuild king or Tanner crab populations when they are depressed. Maintenance of an adequate brood stock takes precedence over short term economic considerations. When populations are at or below threshold, the minimum stock size that allows sufficient recruitment so that the stock can rebuild itself, fisheries must be closed and must remain closed until there is adequate brood stock.

6. Establish management measures in each fishing area based on the best available information. Stock and fishery characteristics, as well as available data, vary from area to area within Alaska. Actual management practices in each area will vary accordingly.

7. Establish regulations which will help improve the socio-economic aspects of management by: harvesting crab when their meat yield is highest; providing for fair starts and closures to seasons; insuring enforceability of regulations; and other measures providing for an orderly fishery.

The Board recognizes these policies may not result in maximization of physical or economic yield. They will, however, provide better biological protection and help preserve the reproductive viability of king and Tanner crab stocks which inherently vary in abundance due to environmental conditions. It will also increase the stability and longevity of the king and Tanner crab fisheries beyond that provided by a recruits-only fishery.

MANAGEMENT MEASURES

The following management measures are available as tools to be used in order to carry out the policies on king and Tanner crab management. Individual measures should be applied as necessary in areas and fisheries depending on available information and fishery characteristics.

1. **Harvest Rates.** Harvestable surpluses available from king and Tanner crab stocks depend on the size and condition of the individual stock. Harvest rates represent the percentage of the legal stock that may be harvested during the biological season in accordance with the goal and policies of the Board.

Exact harvest rates in each situation are chosen based on abundance of prerecruit males and females as well as legal males, the established minimum size or the actual size of crab landed, percentage of females bearing eggs, and the ratio of recruit to postrecruit males. When the acceptable annual harvest rate has been reached in an area, that area must be closed to fishing. Changes in harvest rates should appear in fishery management plans to be reviewed by the public and the Board.

When stock abundance and condition in a management area are such that there is no harvestable surplus, the area or a portion of the area must be closed to fishing. Such areas must remain closed to fishing until the stock recovers to a level WHICH IS EXPECTED TO PRODUCE A SUSTAINED HARVESTABLE SURPLUS.

2. **Size Limits.** Size limits have a dual role in management. They provide some protection against over harvest and also provide for improved product quality. To provide for protection

against over harvest on stocks where harvest rates are unknown or difficult to regulate, size limits are set to increase the probability of mating prior to harvest. For example, in some cases king crab size limits have been set at two average molt increments above the estimated average size at maturity and Tanner crab size limits have been set at one average molt increment above estimated average size at maturity because Tanner crab are known to produce multiple egg clutches from a single mating.

Smaller size limits may be established where stock size is accurately known and harvest rates are precisely controlled since harvest rates will have to be lowered to prevent over fishing.

Larger size limits may be established to insure better marketability of the crab or provide increased long term yield by limiting harvest of animals below a suboptimal size.

3. **Sex Restrictions.** Harvest of king and Tanner crabs is limited to males only in an attempt to provide full fertilization of females and increase the chances of reproductive success. This is particularly important at low stock levels. During periods of average or high abundance, in areas where stock size is accurately known and harvest rates are precisely controlled, this restriction may be eliminated if it is demonstrated that the abundance of females results in no increase in recruitment to the fishery.

4. **Fishing Seasons.** Biological seasons should be set to minimize the harvest of king and Tanner crabs during times surrounding the annual mating, molting, and egg hatching periods and for a sufficient time after molting to allow safe handling and acceptable product quality. Within the acceptable biological fishing season, actual fishing times may be further modified for economic reasons, such as to ensure high meat content of legal males and to reduce dead loss in the landings.

5. **Guideline Harvest Levels (GHL).** A preseason estimate of the level of allowable king and Tanner crab harvest is established for each fishery. In those fisheries with accurate population estimates the appropriate harvest rate is applied to the best point estimate to determine the GHL. For those fisheries without surveys or historical catch information adequate for estimating the population size, the GHL will be set based on historical fishery performance, catch, and population trend.

6. **Closed Areas.** To minimize the handling and unnecessary mortality of non-legal and/or molting crabs, or to prevent conflicts with other fisheries or stocks, it may be necessary to close portions of management areas.

7. **Gear Types.** Fishing for king and Tanner crabs is limited to pots, ring nets, or diving gear depending on area. This type of gear provides the most manageable type of fishery while minimizing potential damage to target and non-target portions of the stock or other species. Biodegradable panels are required in pots to minimize adverse effects of lost gear. Escape rings, large mesh panels, or other measures may be required in gear to meet the policies of the Board.

8. **Inseason Adjustments.** Inseason adjustments may be made to the guideline harvest level and length of the fishing season. Information upon which such adjustments are based may include: (1) overall fishing effort: (2) catch per unit of effort and rate of harvest; (3) relative abundance of king or Tanner crabs; (4) achievement of guideline harvest level (GHL); (5) proportion of soft-shelled crabs and rate of dead loss; (6) general information on stock condition including adequacy of reproductive stock; (7) timeliness and accuracy of catch reporting; (8) adequacy of subsistence harvests, (9) THE IMPACT OF SEVERE OR UNEXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS ON THE HANDLING AND TRAPPING MORTALITY OF CRAB, AND (10) other factors that affect ability to meet objectives of the policy. When this information shows that continued fishing effort would jeopardize the reproductive viability of king or Tanner crab stocks within a registration area, or continued fishing would be counter to the goal and policies established by the Board, the registration area or a portion of the registration area will be closed by Emergency Order.

9. **Other Measures.** To meet the goal and policies for management of these fisheries, it may be necessary for the Board to adopt additional regulations OR MANAGEMENT MEASURES. CONTROLLING DISEASE, REDUCING HANDLING AND TRAPPING MORTALITY DURING SEVERE OR UNEXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS, SPECIFYING registration requirements, tank inspections, gear storage, gear limitations, and other measures including regulation of other shellfish and finfish fisheries may be necessary in order to promote the protection and best overall usage of the king and Tanner crab resource toward the stated goal.

(#90-04-FB, March 23, 1990)

Adopted: March 23, 1990
Anchorage, Alaska

Vote: 7/0

B. Hodson

Bud Hodson, Chairman
Alaska Board of Fisheries

Alaska Board of Fisheries
and
Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Joint Protocol on Salmon Enhancement
#2002-FB-215

Background: In actions taken in January 2001 and June 2002 the Alaska Board of Fisheries stated its intent to institutionalize a public forum to bring a statewide perspective to issues associated with hatchery production of salmon. Accordingly, the department and board agreed to enter into this joint protocol to coordinate department and board interaction on certain aspects of salmon hatchery policy and regulation.

Authorities: The commissioner of the Department of Fish and Game has exclusive authority to issue permits for the construction and operation of salmon hatcheries. The Board of Fisheries has clear authority to regulate access to returning hatchery salmon and to amend, by regulation, the terms of the hatchery permit relating to the source and number of salmon eggs. The Board of Fisheries' authorities also include the harvest of fish by hatchery operators and the specific locations designated by the department for harvest (see AS 16.10.440(b) and Department of Law memorandum to the board dated November 6, 1997).

Statement of Intent: It is the intention of the commissioner of the Department of Fish and Game and the chairman of the Board of Fisheries that meetings be held on a regular basis wherein the department will update the board and the public on management, production, and research relating to Alaska's salmon enhancement program

Protocol: The joint department-board meeting on hatchery described here will take place at a mutually agreeable time and place during regularly scheduled meetings of the board. The meetings will provide a forum for open discussion on a mutually agreed upon agenda of hatchery topics. The agenda may include site-specific as well as regional or statewide hatchery issues. These salmon enhancement meetings will not be open for regulatory actions and no hatchery-related petitions or agenda change requests (ACRs) will be considered as action items. These meetings are open to the public. At its discretion and upon appropriate notice, the board may open the meeting to public comment.

The hatchery meetings will provide an opportunity for the board and the public to receive reports from the department on hatchery issues including: production trends, management issues, updates on hatchery planning efforts, wild and hatchery stock interactions, biological considerations, and research. Requests for report from the department may be made during the board's work session during meeting years when there is a hatchery forum scheduled.

As appropriate, the board and department may agree to invite other state and federal agencies, professional societies, scientists, or industry spokespersons to attend and to contribute information on particular topics, or sponsor other discussions, such as marketing or intrastate effects.

Dated: June 28, 2002

Ed Dersham, Chairman
Alaska Board of Fisheries

7-3-02
Frank Rue, Commissioner
Alaska Department of Fish and Game

94-148-FB

FINDING OF THE ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES

SOUTHEASTERN ALASKA AREA ENHANCED SALMON ALLOCATION MANAGEMENT PLAN [5 AAC 33.364]

(Previously Finding #94-02-FB)

The attached report was developed by the Southeast Alaska Allocation Task Force (SATF) for Proposal #239 for the 1993/94 board meeting cycle. The board deliberated the proposal at its board meeting in Ketchikan, Alaska on January 17, 1994.

The Board incorporates by reference the attached SAFT report as its findings for 5 AAC 33.364 adopted on January 17, 1994.

Adopted: January 19, 1994 @ 11:21 am
Ketchikan, Alaska

Vote: (6:0:1) Yes: No: Absent, Angasan)

T. M. Elias

Tom Elias, Chairman
Alaska Board of Fisheries

BACKGROUND: In March 1991 Mike Martin, Chairman of the Board of Fisheries, asked the Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (NSRAA) and the Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (SSRAA) to coordinate the development of a southeast wide allocation plan for all enhanced salmon.

The issue concerned the benefits commercial fishermen received from the enhancement activities, especially in relation to the amount of the 3% Salmon Enhancement Tax (SET) paid. The issue was different between the Regional Associations and could not be resolved. Numerous proposals have been submitted to the Board of Fisheries to resolve the issue but none were acted upon. Chairman Martin requested that the two Regional Associations consider an all Southeast Alaska Allocation Plan to include all enhancement activities: Fish and Game FRED division, Independent Non-profit Aquaculture corporations; and Regional Aquaculture Associations.

The Boards of Directors of NSRAA and SSRAA agreed to accept the challenge. They formed a group that first met on March 29, 1991 in Ketchikan. The group called itself the Southeast Allocation Task Force (SATF). The SATF is composed of six voting members, three each from NSRAA and SSRAA, and each association provided one seiner, one troller, and one gillnetter for a total of two people from each gear type on SATF. All decisions were by consensus. No meeting was held without six voting members present.

There were two non-voting members on the SATF, one each from the FRED Division and a representative from the independent non-profit aquaculture corporations. DIPAC represented the independent seat. Also, each Regional Association provided one staff member, Pete Esquiro represented NSRAA and Don Amend represented SSRAA. The staff and non-voting members are resource people who provided technical input and comments when appropriate. The SATF also has had technical input from the NMFS at Auke Bay, the limited entry commission, and other people as needed.

All meetings were publicly held. Announcements were made southeast wide in newspapers and radios. Public attendance was minimal, but a few showed up at each meeting. These people were allowed to address the SATF as recognized by the chair. There was no appointed sport representative, but these interests were present at a few meetings. There was a total of five meetings.

The SATF developed the number of fish caught and this was reviewed by scientists at the Auke Bay Laboratory. The value of the fish was provided by the Limited Entry Commission. The data does not include enhancement activities by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Metlakatla Indian Community (MIC) on Annette Island, or the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). The production at NMFS is small and experimental. Although the production by the MIC is significant and they also harvest Alaska enhanced fish, this was not included because their harvest and production cannot be controlled by the State.

The USFS conducts many habitat enhancement activities, but the numbers cannot be verified or evaluated. All of S.E. Alaska was included (Districts 1-15), but the Yakutat area was excluded.

The base period for data analysis was 1985. Production prior to 1985 was not significant and most projects were just coming on line. The data was evaluated through 1990 and will be updated annually as it becomes available. Averages were based on this period when production was still increasing and changing. Estimates were made based upon all currently permitted capacity when at full production. Future production was based on planned increases in capacity, but not yet permitted or operational.

The development of the agreement was based on catches by power and hand trollers, purse seiners, and drift gillnetters. Set nets were not included and are not used in the areas analyzed. Sport, sport charter, subsistence, and personal use were not included. The agreement was based only upon those who pay the 3% SET. No allocation was suggested for these other groups. The belief was that they are restricted by bag limits and an allocation of enhanced fish is inappropriate.

The guidelines will be submitted to the Board of Fisheries and may be set in regulation, or developed into policy. The guidelines will be used by the Regional Planning Teams (RPTs) as one element in the evaluation of permit requests and proposed production changes. The Commissioner of Fish and Game will consider the guidelines when evaluating permits or establishing special harvest areas. The Commissioner of Commerce of Economic Development will consider them in determining salmon enhancement loans for changes in production. The Board of Fisheries will use it to make decisions concerning gear group disagreements that involve enhanced fish production. The guidelines are viewed as goals to achieve and remain flexible for changing conditions, such as management changes, treaty changes, gear changes, legislative changes, etc. It was not intended for Fish and Game management to use in managing the common property fishery, except in a very few special instances.

REPORT OF THE SOUTHEAST ALASKA ALLOCATION TASK FORCE (SATF) FOR ENHANCED SALMON

Following are the fourteen (14) guiding principles which were developed along with rationale statements for each:

1. The primary goal of the Southeast Alaska salmon enhancement program is to provide additional fishing opportunities and revenue to traditional common property fisheries.

(A) Performance Goals: Hatchery program plans and performance, over time, should provide a 70% contribution (after broodstock) to common property fisheries. Out of recognition for those hatcheries not receiving any salmon enhancement tax (SET) revenues, a 60% contribution (after broodstock) to common property fisheries is an acceptable goal. This goal should be expanded to 70% when these non-association hatcheries retire their existing debt obligation to the State of Alaska.

(B) Operators of hatcheries and other enhancement projects will use these performance goals in designing the annual management plans they submit to the joint Regional Planning Team (RPT) for review prior to approval by the Commissioner.

(C) It is recommended that enhancement programs that achieve these performance goals be given priority from the Dept. of Commerce and Economic Development on the requests for funding from the Fisheries Enhancement Revolving Loan Fund.

(D) Common property fisheries means those fisheries available to the people for common use.

Rationale: The enhancement programs are primarily for the benefit of the common property fishery and not for the benefit of private or state ownership. To assure the emphasis is on the common property fisheries, the 70% and 60% performance goals specified in 1A shall be used in evaluating projects. Although contributions to the common property fisheries will vary from year to year depending on run strength, survival rates and management, the long term benefit must be to the common property fisheries. No penalty for failure is suggested. However, hatchery proformas should include these production goals and, if not achieved over time, it is intended that management changes be made to assure these goals.

Broodstock are not included because they were viewed the same as escapement goals. Broodstock do not financially benefit anyone directly and are essential for continued production (see number 3).

2. Management of traditional "wildstock" fisheries are not to be restricted by cost recovery needs (economic escapement) of hatcheries.

Rationale: This concept is embodied in Alaska Statutes (AS 16.05.730). The SATF could not envision any circumstance where a wildstock fishery should be interrupted to assure a cost recovery harvest.

3. Restrictions on conduct of traditional "wildstock" fisheries to meet broodstock needs should be absolutely minimal and should be clearly documented by adequate production and harvest data. Protection of broodstock should only occur in close proximity to terminal areas. (Consistent with AS 16.05.730, and regulations 5 AAC 40.005 and 5AAC 40.220).

Rationale: The SATF recognizes the importance of broodstock. However, broodstock alone should not drive a common property fishery. Protection of broodstock should only occur in close proximity to terminal areas and only when the wildstocks can be adequately harvested in another area. The need for protection of broodstock in any area must be documented by showing that broodstock goals are adversely affected and the area contains significant broodstock. However, it is not intended that an operator manipulate activities just to ask for

broodstock protection. For example, by conducting cost recovery harvest without taking proper steps to assure broodstock collection.

4. Enhancement projects should include tagging or marking that will allow determination of the amount of production harvested in the various fisheries.

Rationale: It is recommended that adequate tagging programs be required under the Commissioner's authority (AS 16.10.400). Operator estimates are not adequate for estimating contribution to common property fisheries. Tagging or marking programs are essential; however, because the technology for marking fish is still evolving, no method is recommended. It is assumed that the most reliable and cost effective method will be used.

5. The State of Alaska should commit to an adequate mark recovery program for all enhanced salmon to provide harvest and production data.

Rationale: It is recommended that those responsible for enhancing fish should pay for the marking, but only the state has the resources to conduct the tag recovery program. The allocation agreement will not work unless the state commits to a mark recovery program. Also, there was evidence that the tag recovery program was not being conducted equally among the gear types or species harvested. For example, troll chinook fisheries have been more intensively sampled, while the seine harvest has been sampled the least of the gear groups. The tag recovery program should be designed to provide an equal level of confidence in the contribution of enhanced salmon to each gear type.

6. Habitat enhancement and restoration projects where marking is not feasible will not be counted. Other field projects where marking is feasible and economically acceptable will be counted.

Rationale: Lake fry plants, stream bioenhancement, stream rehabilitation, and other enhancement strategies are frequently conducted with small numbers of fish in remote areas. It may not be practical or economically feasible to mark the fish. These enhancement and restoration projects are encouraged and it is recognized that they contribute to the common property fisheries, but they will not be counted in the allocation percentages. However, where feasible, marking should be conducted.

7. The allocation percentage goals will be used to provide a fixed target for production.

Rationale: Enhancement projects and production goals have frequently been established based on political expediency or the economic viability of the operator. However, whenever fish are released and the returning adults harvested, an allocation is made. The allocation can become disproportionate based on the number of fish and where they are released.

It is desirable that new production, or revised existing production contribute to achieving the

allocation percentage goals established. This however, should not be the only criteria used to judge the desirability of new or revised production. If such new or revised production is "projected" to unbalance the distribution of enhanced salmon, and the change in production is otherwise considered desirable, the RPT will evaluate the overall enhancement program to determine what adjustments may be necessary to bring distribution of the harvest into compliance with the allocation percentage goals and make recommendations to the Commissioner.

8. Allocation percentage goals will be long term.

Rationale: It is recognized that survival rates can vary considerably within and among enhancement projects throughout S.E. Alaska. Also, variations in the management of the common property fisheries influence the harvest rates. The allocation percentage goals are not expected to be attained each year, but should be attained over the long term. Any change in production takes two to five years to impact a fishery. Therefore, allocation percentage goals should be based on a minimum of five year increments (see number 9).

9. Overall contribution of revenue from salmon enhancement projects should be evaluated using the most recent five year average. Adjustments should be implemented only after discrepancies are determined to exist in the five year average for three consecutive years.

Rationale: See number 8 above. The distribution of enhanced fish is expected to vary widely from year to year. A five year rolling average was used because it constitutes a production cycle and levels year to year variation. It is recognized that a single abnormal year can change the five year average outside the range of the allocation percentage goals; therefore, the guidelines establish a three year period of consistent discrepancy before any change is made.

10. The joint RPT will evaluate current enhanced salmon production and the distribution of harvest revenues and update this on an annual basis.

(A) Each facility should be evaluated after a minimum five years of operation to determine whether the 70% or 60% common property contribution, referred to in guiding principle 1A, is being achieved or to determine the realistic production and common property contribution for the facility.

(B) The joint RPT will conduct an evaluation to determine when the allocation percentages are not being achieved and adjustments are necessary.

(C) The joint RPT will recommend to the Commissioner adjustments to facilities' annual operating plans as necessary to accomplish the desired allocation goal.

Rationale: The SATF believes the joint RPT is the appropriate body to review the contribution data. The joint RPT is responsible for establishing and maintaining the comprehensive salmon plan, under the Commissioner's authority, and is responsible for recommending permit changes for production to the Commissioner.

11. Achieving these allocation percentage goals should not result in any modifications, in time or area, to the traditional "wildstock" fisheries. Minor modification may be considered to allow experimental or test fisheries that would not adversely impact wildstocks.

Rationale: The SATF strongly believed that the common property fisheries for wildstocks should not be manipulated in order to achieve the allocation percentage goals. However, this is not intended to preclude experimental or test fisheries, special hatchery access fisheries, or the establishment of new special harvest areas in order to access enhanced fish. For example, this could include the June troll fisheries for chinook, or late season openings, or other special openings used to target enhanced fish as long as wildstocks are not adversely impacted. It is recommended that the department allow targeted fisheries on enhanced stocks when they will not adversely impact sustained yield of wildstocks. The department should work closely with hatchery operators in establishing these fisheries, keeping in mind the 70% and 60% contribution goals. The harvest of enhanced salmon in a targeted wildstock fishery is considered incidental to the harvest of wild stocks.

12. There should be no inseason changes in management of enhanced salmon in or out of the special harvest areas to achieve the allocation percentage goals.

Rationale: These guidelines are established to reach long term allocation percentages. Inseason common property fisheries adjustments should not be considered to meet allocation goals. No adjustment of wildstock fisheries should be allowed in order to meet the allocation percentage goals.

13. When adjustments are deemed necessary to the distribution of the harvest to meet allocation percentage goals, the following tools should be used: (1) special harvest area management adjustments; (2) new enhanced salmon production; and (3) modification of enhancement projects production, including remote releases. Hidden Falls shall remain a seine/troll terminal harvest area (Consistent with 5 AAC 33.374).

(A) The joint RPT will make appropriate recommendations through the Commissioner to facility(s) annual operating plan(s) to attain allocation goals.

(B) Facilities may request changes in operating plans to meet allocation requirements.

Rationale: New production and facility modifications to meet the allocation percentage goals are long term changes and will take five to ten years to have an impact. Changes in special harvest areas can be used in the short term to help modify any imbalances that occur.

For example, special harvest areas can be designated to only one gear group or the fishing time allowed to different gear groups could be adjusted. The effectiveness of this will also be contingent on the gear type and the targeted species. The SATF expects these adjustments will be reviewed by the joint RPT, and the joint RPT will make recommendations to the Commissioner as to the most appropriate action needed to achieve the allocation percentage

goals. It is anticipated that short term solutions such as special harvest area management adjustments will only be used until decisions concerning long term adjustments can take effect. The allocation percentage goals will also be considered when reviewing permit alteration requests. If new production is not feasible or desirable, changes in remote releases can include new sites, change in species composition, change in the numbers of salmon released, or a combination of these.

14. The allocative percentages will be:

Note: The following percentages refer to the total value (nominal dollars) of enhanced salmon. These percentages are not intended to apply to wildstock allocations.

Seine - 44% to 49%
Troll - 27% to 32%
Gillnet - 24% to 29%

SUMMARY OF ALL SPECIES - VALUE
ADFG,SSRAA,NSRAA,PNPS
ACTUAL DOLLARS

SPECIES		1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	VALUE	TOTAL PERCENT
COHO										
	TROLL	$1,120,260	$2,112,686	$856,309	$632,589	$575,520	$2,615,031	$2,863,240	$10,775,635	71.7%
	SEINE	$242,393	$343,375	$253,299	$165,428	$111,567	$227,665	$282,951	$1,626,678	10.8%
	GILLNET	$141,413	$372,281	$191,580	$253,141	$63,014	$433,459	$1,161,273	$2,616,161	17.4%
CHINOOK										
	TROLL	$277,615	$287,758	$602,578	$1,006,808	$858,148	$969,528	$557,138	$4,559,573	86.6%
	SEINE	$19,863	$27,627	$8,421	$26,095	$62,598	$50,626	$65,441	$260,671	4.9%
	GILLNET	$8,192	$17,641	$20,803	$126,444	$84,369	$124,042	$64,549	$446,040	8.5%
CHUM										
	TROLL	$18,352	$0	$0	$228,299	$150,186	$122,652	$1,695	$521,184	2.0%
	SEINE	$2,434,775	$1,914,279	$3,415,435	$4,800,895	$1,608,162	$1,457,908	$1,634,402	$17,265,856	66.3%
	GILLNET	$495,683	$466,695	$979,408	$3,659,772	$1,392,331	$580,084	$687,235	$8,261,208	31.7%
PINKS										
	TROLL	$4,559	$0	$1,909	$12,166	$3,854	$67,318	$35,051	$124,857	3.4%
	SEINE	$460,262	$233,509	$432,197	$73,214	$475,615	$342,602	$359,697	$2,377,096	64.7%
	GILLNET	$313,174	$164,939	$64,125	$64,125	$307,825	$150,760	$108,524	$1,173,472	31.9%
SOCKEYE										
	TROLL	$0	$0	$0	$107,554	$11,733	$0	$0	$119,287	2.8%
	SEINE	$271,551	$252,000	$189,296	$410,095	$460,868	$239,216	$233,877	$1,856,903	44.2%
	GILLNET	$241,614	$224,306	$170,328	$444,065	$475,552	$492,529	$172,220	$2,220,614	52.9%
ALL SPECIES										
	TROLL	$1,420,786	23.5% $2,400,444	37.4% $1,460,796	20.3% $1,987,416	16.5% $1,599,441	24.1% $3,774,529	47.9% $3,457,124	43.1% $16,100,536	29.7%
	SEINE	$3,428,844	56.7% $2,770,790	43.2% $4,298,648	59.8% $5,475,727	45.6% $2,718,810	40.9% $2,318,017	29.4% $2,376,368	29.6% $23,387,204	43.1%
	GILLNET	$1,200,076	19.8% $1,245,862	19.4% $1,426,244	19.8% $4,547,547	37.9% $2,323,091	35.0% $1,780,874	22.6% $2,193,801	27.3% $14,717,495	27.2%
	TOTAL	$6,049,706	$6,417,096	$7,185,688	$12,010,690	$6,641,342	$7,873,420	$8,027,293	$54,205,235	

5 YEAR AVERAGE	1985 - 1989		1986 - 1990		1987 - 1991	
TROLL	$8,868,883	23.2%	$11,222,626	28.0%	$12,279,306	29.4%
SEINE	$18,692,819	48.8%	$17,581,992	43.8%	$17,187,570	41.2%
GILLNET	$10,742,820	28.0%	$11,323,618	28.2%	$12,271,557	29.4%
TOTAL	$38,304,522		$40,128,236		$41,738,433	

SUMMARY OF ALL SPECIES - VALUE
ADFG, SSRAA, NSRAA, PNPS
ACTUAL DOLLARS

SPECIES		1985-1991 VALUE	1985-1991 PERCENT	1985-1991 TOTAL	ANNUAL AVERAGE VALUE	ANNUAL AVERAGE PERCENT	1985 - 1991 TOTAL	ANNUAL FULL PRODUCTION VALUE	ANNUAL FULL PRODUCTION PERCENT	ANNUAL FULL PRODUCTION TOTAL	FUTURE POTENTIAL VALUE	FUTURE POTENTIAL PERCENT	FUTURE POTENTIAL TOTAL
COHO				$15,018,471			$2,145,496			$4,201,271			$4,201,271
	TROLL	$10,775,635	71.7%		$1,539,376	71.7%		$3,021,781	71.9%		$3,021,781	71.9%	
	SEINE	$1,626,677	10.8%		$232,382	10.8%		$540,786	12.9%		$540,786	12.9%	
	GILLNET	$2,616,159	17.4%		$373,737	17.4%		$638,703	15.2%		$638,703	15.2%	
CHINOOK				$5,266,281			$752,326			$5,473,258			$9,433,951
	TROLL	$4,559,573	86.6%		$651,368	86.6%		$4,773,109	87.2%		$7,400,573	78.4%	
	SEINE	$260,670	4.9%		$37,239	4.9%		$359,042	6.6%		$944,601	10.0%	
	GILLNET	$446,038	8.5%		$63,720	8.5%		$341,108	6.2%		$1,088,777	11.5%	
CHUM				$26,048,248			$3,721,178			$24,632,796			$24,632,796
	TROLL	$521,183	2.0%		$74,455	2.0%		$293,658	1.2%		$293,658	1.2%	
	SEINE	$17,265,856	66.3%		$2,466,551	66.3%		$16,010,792	65.0%		$16,010,792	65.0%	
	GILLNET	$8,261,209	31.7%		$1,180,173	31.7%		$8,328,346	33.8%		$8,328,346	33.8%	
PINKS				$3,675,421			$525,060			$2,197,760			$2,197,760
	TROLL	$124,856	3.4%		$17,837	3.4%		$57,882	2.6%		$57,882	2.6%	
	SEINE	$2,377,094	64.7%		$339,585	64.7%		$1,370,607	62.4%		$1,370,607	62.4%	
	GILLNET	$1,173,471	31.9%		$167,639	31.9%		$769,272	35.0%		$769,272	35.0%	
SOCKEYE				$4,196,805			$599,544			$2,150,891			$7,557,008
	TROLL	$119,287	2.8%		$17,041	2.8%		$51,810	2.4%		$112,610	1.5%	
	SEINE	$1,856,903	44.2%		$265,272	44.2%		$953,598	44.3%		$1,283,040	17.0%	
	GILLNET	$2,220,615	52.9%		$317,231	52.9%		$1,145,484	53.3%		$6,161,358	81.5%	
ALL SPECIES				$54,205,226			$7,743,604			$38,655,976			$48,022,786
	TROLL	$16,100,534	29.7%		$2,300,076	29.7%		$8,198,240	21.2%		$10,886,504	22.7%	
	SEINE	$23,387,200	43.1%		$3,341,029	43.1%		$19,234,824	49.8%		$20,149,826	42.0%	
	GILLNET	$14,717,492	27.2%		$2,102,499	27.2%		$11,222,912	29.0%		$16,986,455	35.4%	

NOTES:
1. CURRENT ANNUAL PRODUCTION INCLUDES PERMITED CAPACITY OF EXISTING ONGOING PROJECTS USING ASSUMED SURVIVAL RATES AND AVERAGE PRICES, WEIGHTS
2. FUTURE PRODUCTION INCLUDES DEEP COVE CHINOOK, SNETTISHAM SOCKEYE, AND CHILKAT LAKE SOCKEYE ENHANCEMENT
   CHILLKAT WILL PRODUCE 264,000 SOCKEYE: 250,800 TO GILLNETTERS, 13,200 TO SEINERS
   SNETTISHAM WILL PRODUCE 320,000 SOCKEYE: 288,000 GILLNET, 32,000 SEINE
   BEAVER FALLS AND KLAWOCK WILL PRODUCE 259,000 SOCKEYE: 123,000 GILLNET, 130,800 SEINE, 5,000 TROLL (CURRENT PRODUCTION)
   DEEP COVE WILL PRODUCE 75,000 HARVESTABLE CHINOOK: 55,250 TROLL, 14,400 SEINE, 5,250 GILLNET
3. AAI ADDED NOVERRER 1992: 300,000; GILLNET, 239,000, SEINE, 61,000 CHUM
4. FUTURE POTENTIAL IS A BEST GUESS OF WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN. IT IS NOT AN ALLOCATION.

93-142-FB

Finding of the Alaska Board of Fisheries

Southeast Alaska Chinook Salmon Allocations
(Previously Finding #93-04-FB)

March 1992

The Alaska Board of Fisheries approved regulations allocating a fixed percentage of the chinook salmon harvest ceiling to the commercial troll and recreational fisheries during its March 7-15, 1992 meeting in Juneau, Alaska.

During the 1980s, many chinook salmon stocks along the Northwest Pacific coast and Southeast Alaska were depressed. To address this problem, the United States and Canada signed the Pacific Salmon Treaty in 1985, and a 15-year rebuilding program for these stocks was initiated. Under terms of the treaty, an annual catch ceiling is placed on the number of chinook salmon that can be landed by all gear groups in Southeast Alaska. Except for a 5,000 fish, pre-treaty production level and an annually calculated risk factor that accounts for the uncertainty in the estimate, chinook salmon produced in Alaskan hatcheries do not count against the harvest ceiling.

A base harvest or 263,000 chinook salmon was established under the Treaty. The gillnet and seine fisheries were provided separate allocations which allowed them to continue chinook harvests at slightly below their historic average. The recreational harvest which had fluctuated between 20,000 - 25,000 remained unrestricted. The troll fishery annual average harvest was reduced by approximately 23%. The reduction represented the Alaska contribution to the rebuilding program established under the Treaty.

In addition to harvest reductions, the Treaty provided funding to establish enhancement programs to rebuild chinook and other salmon stocks.

In recent years, the number of chinook salmon caught in the recreational fishery that count against the treaty catch ceiling has risen due to increasing abundance of some chinook salmon stocks and an increase in recreational fishing effort. The increase in the recreational harvest has reduced the number of chinook salmon available for harvest by the commercial troll fleet.

In meetings held from March 7-15, 1992, in Juneau, the Board of Fisheries considered a request from the Alaska Trollers Association to set aside a fixed allocation of the annual US/Canada Pacific Salmon Treaty chinook salmon ceiling for the commercial troll fishery. Staff from the Department of Fish and Game, the Department of Law, and the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission

presented a total of eleven oral reports designed to provide the board with a comprehensive understanding of the Southeast Alaska chinook salmon allocation issue. In three days of public testimony, the board heard from approximately 130 individuals and ten Southeast Alaska fish and game advisory committees. Additionally, a large volume of written public testimony was received.

After a lengthy debate on the issue, a majority of the board found that a fixed allocation was necessary to stabilize the chinook salmon catch allocation between the commercial troll and recreational fisheries. The board approved a regulation mandating the department to manage the Southeast Alaska and Yakutat commercial troll and recreational fisheries so that, after deducting 20,000 fish previously allocated to the commercial net fisheries, the commercial troll fleet would get 83 percent and the recreational fishery 17 percent of the allowable catch under the treaty. All fisheries are allowed to take additional chinook salmon that are of Alaska hatchery origin; this is in accordance with the hatchery add-on principle of the treaty.

In support of the allocation the Board found the following:

1. Personal use, sport and commercial fisheries have existed in Southeast Alaska since Territorial days. The guided recreational fishery is the most recently developed. It has experienced significant growth since 1984.

2. Commercial fisheries participation is subject to limited entry. Recreational fisheries participation is increasing. In 1985, 16,664 chinook were harvested by Alaska residents, or 67% of the total sport harvest. In 1990, 28,297 chinook were harvested by Alaska residents, or 55% of the total harvest.

   The Board found different characteristics among recreational users. Unguided recreational resident anglers have harvested chinook for many years. Guides, lodge owners, outfitters and charter boat operators were recognized as participants with an economic interest in the fishery. Non-residents make up the majority of clients to these businesses although they also serve resident anglers. The Board identified characteristics of the troll fishery. Eighty-five percent (85%) of permits are fished by residents, many are residents of rural Southeast communities. The fishery has a significant number of second and third generation participants. Of Southeast commercial fisheries, trolling may involve an entire family in fishing activity.

3. The Board unanimously recognized the importance of the resident recreational sport fishery in providing opportunity to take fish for personal and family consumption. Commercial fishermen were found to supply household needs from the commercial catch. It is the desire of the Board that residents harvesting for personal use suffer the least restriction to meet chinook allocations.

4. Both commercial and sport fisheries have other stocks of salmon, groundfish and rockfish available for harvest. Each group attaches the highest value to chinook salmon. The Board recognized the importance of providing opportunity to harvest in the sport fisheries which may not be directly dependent on the number harvested. Public testimony expressed concern that the establishment of vessel moratorium and an IFQ system will limit commercial fisheries opportunity.

5. Both sport and commercial fisheries provide revenue to the state. Sport fisheries generate revenue through license sales and federal funds. Commercial fisheries generate revenue through license sales, federal funds, enhancement and raw fish taxes.

6. The larger communities of Ketchikan, Sitka and Juneau derive the greatest economic benefit from the tourism-oriented recreational fishery. These towns also benefit economically from their commercial fisheries. Sport fishing derbies also provide revenue to communities. Many Southeast rural communities are almost entirely dependent on income from the troll fishery. The degree of dependence on trolling by these rural communities was especially significant to the Board.

7. The Board recognized that while many commercial fishermen enjoy their occupation, it is the role of sport fisheries to provide recreational fishing opportunity in the state.

Besides providing stability to participants referenced in the allocation criteria, the Board found that management to achieve a specific number of chinook harvested inseason will be less disruptive to US Canada Treaty negotiations. This new management will assure that projected recreational harvests match actual harvest and will prevent overages in total gear catch which move the state out of compliance with the Treaty.

The allocation of 83% troll and 17% recreation fixes both fisheries at current levels. This type of allocation is not consistent with

past Board actions which recognize historic harvest levels and attempt to preserve them. In justification of departure from historic allocations the Board found the following:

1. Given current data available and present management capability, fixing the allocation at the current level of harvest is least disruptive to resident recreational angler fishing for personal and family use.

2. Fixing the allocation at current levels is least disruptive to present management. This allows ADF&G to exercise management options to maintain status quo rather than move back to prior harvest levels. Managing to achieve a specific harvest inseason is a new exercise for the Sport Fish Division and requires changes in budgeting and data collection. The Board specifically requested data collection on recreational effort and harvest by residents, non-residents, outfitted charter, guide and lodge participants.

It is the expressed intent of the Board of Fisheries that in establishing these fixed allocations to troll and recreational fisheries that all gear types (net, troll and sport) be managed to achieve their allocation separate from one another within the 7.5 percent range.

The board discussed establishing a separate allocation for guided sport anglers, but did not do so because of a lack of data on what portion of the historical catch came from this group as well as other legal questions.

In order to provide the necessary means to achieve the recreational allocation, the board established a management plan. The objectives of this plan are to allow uninterrupted sport fishing opportunity for chinook salmon in marine waters and to minimize regulatory restriction on unguided sport anglers. If the total seasonal harvest is projected to be within $\pm$ 7.5 percent of the allocation, no regulatory changes will occur to the fishery. If the total seasonal harvest is expected to exceed the allocation by more than 7.5 percent, the department may implement any of the following restrictions as appropriate:

- Prohibit charter guides and crew members from retaining chinook salmon while clients are on board.

- Reduce the bag limit and possession limit to one fish per day for guided sport anglers.

- Increase the chinooks salmon size limit from 28 to 30 inches.

- Ban the use of downriggers on charter boats.
- Ban the use of downriggers by all anglers.
- Close areas where the percentage of Alaska hatchery chinook salmon is low.
- Reduce the bag limit and possession limit to one chinook salmon per day for unguided recreational anglers.
- Reduce the sport fish chinook salmon bag limit to zero.
- Allow a trophy fish only fishery (greater than 40 inches).

However, if the fishery is projected to be more than 7.5 percent less than the allocation, the department may liberalize recreational fishing regulations as follows:

- Increase the bag and possession limit for unguided anglers.
- Increase the legal number of rods to two for unguided anglers.
- Decrease the minimum size limit.
- Increase the bag and possession limit for all anglers.
- Increase the legal number of rods to two for all anglers.

In order to improve catch reporting and assist in management of the recreational fishery, the department may:

- Establish a mandatory log book program to monitor the harvest and effort of guided sport anglers (charter boats and fishing lodges), outfitters and dry skiff rentals.
- Require an annual nontransferable harvest record.
- Require heads of all adipose fin-clipped chinook salmon, along with the date and location of their catch, be turned in to the department.
- Establish other reporting requirements necessary to obtain information required to implement the provisions of this management plan.

In addition to the above, the board also required that the department manage the 1992 summer troll fishery so that the

cumulative overage is reduced from the estimated overage of 38,000 chinook to about 10,000 chinook. In 1993, the department will deduct 1,700 fish from the sport fish ceiling, with the remainder of the existing overage to be made up by the commercial troll fishery. Further, beginning in 1992, each group will independently deal with the risk factor and be responsible for any accrued underage or overage.

For the commercial troll fishery, the board made the following changes:

June Fisheries

- Restrict the June hatchery access fishery in District 13 only to that area that is also open during the experimental fishery.

- Restricted the June hatchery access fishery in district 103 to that portion south of Tlevak Narrows and north of a line from Cape Chacon to Cape Muzon.

- Required trollers to keep fish caught in the hatchery access fishery separate from those harvested in the experimental troll fisheries and to report these fish separately on fish tickets.

- Reduced the number of chinook salmon that count towards the treaty ceiling that can be harvested from 40,000 to 35,000 during the June hatchery access and experimental fisheries.

- Made the starting dates for the June hatchery access and experimental troll fisheries more flexible.

Winter Fishery

- Changed the starting date for the 1993 and 1994 winter troll fishery from October 1 to October 11.

Summer Fishery

- The board made no specific changes to the summer troll fishery except to note that the savings from the June and winter troll fisheries should increase the number of chinook salmon available for the summer troll fishery.

Finally, the board charged a task force to develop recommendations, in the form of board proposals, concerning the summer fishery by

April 9, 1993. The main objectives of the task force are to ensure that the summer troll fishery for chinook be of at least a 10 day minimum duration with a goal of 20 days and to minimize the incidental mortalities to the greatest extent practicable. The task force will be comprised of trollers representing nine geographical areas including at least one hand troller, one lower 48 troller, one Native troller, one Alaska Troller Association board member, a chairperson, and two non-voting seats held by an Alaska Department of Fish and Game representative and a processor.

Michael R. Martin

Mike Martin
Chair
Alaska Board of Fisheries

Approved: Kodiak, Alaska - January 11, 1993
Vote: 7-0