

ACR 1

Increase subsistence fishing opportunity for salmon in the Copper River District (5 AAC 01.610).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.
5 AAC 01.610(g)

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

Copper River drift gillnet subsistence users have, for years, had time and area taken away, providing a sharp decline in opportunity to harvest subsistence fish, which is Constitutionally mandated to be the highest priority for this fishery, which is catch limited with the lowest limits of any subsistence fishery on the Copper River, while harvesting from mixed stocks. The loss of time and area is owed largely to the fact that the management of the subsistence fishery is linked to the commercial fishery, and these should be decoupled in order to prioritize subsistence. Since the Board of Fish passed Proposal 51 at the last Prince William Sound/Copper River meeting it placed into statute, subsistence users have effectively lost multiple opportunities that would have previously been available co-occurring with the lost commercial periods, and the Saturday subsistence openers between. In addition, new expanded inside area closures for the commercial fishery have been applied to the subsistence fishery each year, requiring subsistence users, often in small river skiffs, to cross dangerous ocean bars in the Gulf of Alaska to participate. We seek to limit the extent to which subsistence opportunity can be curtailed by Emergency Orders issued by Department of Fish and Game managers, especially prior to the start of the Commercial fishery. We further seek to maintain inside waters as open to subsistence fishing throughout the season before we have a completely avoidable and needless tragedy occur, which is inevitable when river skiffs are forced to cross ocean bars to fish in the Gulf of Alaska.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

We prefer subsistence fisheries to be open from the regulatory start of the subsistence fishing season until 48 hours before the first Commercial fishing period in all waters, and for subsistence users who are not also Commercial operators to be allowed to subsistence fish in all waters during subsistence-only periods.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED BELOW.

for a fishery conservation purpose or reason:

to correct an error in regulation:

to correct an effect on a fishery that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:

The Board of Fish adopted Proposal 51 for the purpose of Chinook Salmon conservation, substantially modifying a proposal submitted by the National Park Service that sought an escapement-based trigger for Commercial openers based on sockeye passage. The Board did not adequately consider impacts to the subsistence fishery and should act to restore our access to these subsistence resources, remove unnecessary restrictions on a catch-limited fishery, remove

ACR 2

Specify escapement objectives that must be met prior to opening the Copper River District to commercial fishing for salmon (5 AAC 24.310).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC: 24.310 (a)

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

Although the Board attempted to reduce early season Copper River salmon exploitation and allow adequate upstream escapement of Chinook Salmon at the 2024 Board of Fisheries meeting in Cordova through Proposal 51 / RC122, May sonar counts continue to be consistently below ADF&G's Miles Lake objective levels, Chinook escapements have required inseason emergency restrictions and closures, and appear to be well below the Sustainable Escapement Goal level — and especially when inriver subsistence and sport harvests are considered during the 2026 season.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

(a). The Copper River District may only open after May 21 by emergency order **when at least one Miles Lake sonar daily objectives has been met**, and may be closed by emergency order **until the midpoint of an up-to-date Miles Lake sonar cumulative objective has been met**.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED BELOW.

for a fishery conservation purpose or reason:

Although the commercial fishery “could theoretically,” be adequately restricted by emergency order to achieve May sonar objectives with more consistent and sustainable harvest rates throughout the entire season — this has not happened in the past three years. The most desirable early-returning salmon continue to be harvested at a significantly higher-than-sustainable rate by the commercial fishery. An Alaskan writer has compared salmon management with driving in that both should be done within the lines, however, during the 2026 season, in particular, the State’s commercial management vehicle for Upper Copper River salmon spent most of the season with all wheels in the ditch and appears to have failed in achieving either the overall sonar salmon escapement goal or the Chinook Salmon Sustainable Escapement Goal. Therefore, 5AAC 21.310 (a) should be amended to provide more consistent harvest opportunity throughout the entire season and to avoid unsustainably high harvests at the start of the season.

to correct an error in regulation:

Not Applicable

to correct an effect on a fishery that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:

The point of this ACR is to clarify conservative management within the regulation, thereby assisting management in meeting sustainable escapement goals and providing more sustainable and consistent harvest opportunity for all user groups throughout the entire season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

ACR 3

Reduce statewide private nonprofit salmon hatchery egg-take capacity to less than 100 million eggs annually (5 AAC 40.XXX).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.
5 AAC

Title 16.10.470(f) Title 16.10.445(a)

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

Alaska is releasing about 1.9 billion hatchery salmon per year. In total North Pacific nations are releasing more than 5 billion hatchery salmon. These releases require nutrition far in excess of the capacity of the Pacific Ocean's available food supply. Alaska's wild salmon stocks are starving and not abundant. Alaska's hatchery production needs to be less than 100 million salmon annually.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

Alaska's total hatchery production and releases need to be less than 100 million salmon annually.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED BELOW.

for a fishery conservation purpose or reason:

a) PWS, Chignik, and Area M all have failed to meet their pink salmon production goals. Too many hatchery fish have depleted the available marine food supply and wild stocks are being harmed.

to correct an error in regulation:

to correct an effect on a fishery that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

Wild Alaskan fish stocks will continue to not meet production and escapement goals. Fishermen will continue to suffer economic injury from poor fishery management of excessive hatchery salmon releases. The North Pacific salmon food web will remain in depleted status.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

Just want the State of Alaska hatchery programs to stop harming wild salmon stocks and the North Pacific Ocean ecosystem.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

ACR 4

Clarify allowable remote-controlled vehicle use and modify hook definitions in sport fishing regulation (5 AAC 75.020 and 5 AAC 75.995).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 75.020 Sport fishing gear and 5 AAC 75.995 Definitions.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

I would like them to address weather or not there will be restrictions on the use of drones and Remote-control boats to drop off bait. I would also like the wording of hook, hooks and single hook and single-hook to be addressed in the fishing regulations. The fishing regulations should be easier for the public to understand how they can be expected to follow the rules if they can't even understand them? It is the response ability of the angler to understand the rules and regulations but wording them in such a manner is going to lead to not only confusion but fines and loss of privileges. Its not right that we make regulations that even ADFG has to spend 15 minutes just to make the call on if it's a trouble single hook or a single only hook there's so much wrong there.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

Redaction of single hook, hook, multiple hook use in the fishing regulation book and use more common language. Such as Trouble hook, double hook, the word multiple hook should be used when you can use two or more hooks such as a dry dropper when fly fishing. For the second one it should be a yes or no to using remote control equipment to aid in catching fish

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED BELOW.

for a fishery conservation purpose or reason:

to help anglers understand regulations and to make it where there isn't a giant gray area when it comes to remote control aid

to correct an error in regulation:

to correct an effect on a fishery that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

Nothing anglers will be in a constant state of confusion

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

It is allocative

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

It makes it easier for the anglers, which is the goal of making the regulations more difficult to read and makes them less likely to go outside and enjoy fishing.

ACR 5

Reclassify European green crab from a class A to a class B banned invasive species (5 AAC 41.075).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 41.075 Classification of banned invasive species.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

European green crabs are classified as a Class A banned invasive species under 5 AAC 41.075. The status quo policy related to European green crabs requires people to acquire an aquatic resource permit to trap them and allows those without licenses to only note the location and share information about the encounter with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Although this might be a sufficient policy for other invasive species relegated to a specific, isolated location, the status quo is insufficient for preventing the spread of European green crab, which travel great distances of their own accord on oceanic tides when in their larval state. This makes it difficult to know when and where they will establish populations. Alaska's shoreline is approximately 47,300 miles long and is very sparsely populated according to State of Alaska estimates. With this reality in mind, local community involvement will be essential in overseeing and managing this problem as it evolves. The current categorization of European green crab as a Class A: Banned invasive species inhibits the public's ability to address the problem, of which many are interested in solving.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

We propose reclassifying the European Green crab from Class A: Banned Invasive Species to Class B: Banned Invasive Species under ADF&G regulation 5 AAC 41.075. This change would allow people to kill them when they come across European Green Crabs and harvest them. There would be no need to reword the existing regulation, the only change would be moving European green crab from Class A: Banned Invasive Species to Class B: Banned Invasive Species.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED BELOW.**for a fishery conservation purpose or reason:**

Regarding item a, in the 2002 Alaska Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plan, ADF&G acknowledged the threat EGC posed to Alaskan fisheries (Fay, 2002). "Because king, Tanner and Dungeness crab all use shorelines as nursery areas, a green crab invasion has the potential to significantly impact recruitment needed to maintain Alaska's valuable crab and halibut fisheries" (Fay, 2002, p. 6). As these environments become more compromised through erosion and degradation of key plants like eelgrass, native fisheries like salmon, herring, and Dungeness crab are unable to maintain a consistent population yield and replenish their stocks year after year (Drinkwin et al, 2019; Weingartner, 2026). McDonald (2001) found that EGC consistently outcompeted Dungeness crab for shelter one-on-one due to the former's superior pincer strength and aggressive behavior (McDonald et al, 2001). This causes Dungeness crabs to retreat to parts of the coast that leave them more exposed to predating fish and birds (McDonald et al, 2001).

Furthermore, EGC threatens Southeast Alaska subsistence and personal use clam fisheries as they have significantly depleted populations in Maine in the 1950s from 8.5 million pounds to just 0.6

ACR 6

Establish a 10 consecutive day closure between June 10 and June 23 for seine and drift gillnet gear in the *South Unimak and Shumagin Islands June Salmon Management Plan* (5 AAC 09.365).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 09.365. South Unimak and Shumagin Islands June Salmon Management Plan.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

This ACR requests re-instatement of Proposal #127 (RC245) approved by the Alaska Board of Fisheries at the February 2026 Alaska Peninsula Area M meeting. The Board of Fisheries voted (4-3) to **“Establish a 10 consecutive day closure between June 10 and June 23 for seine and drift gillnet gear. Amended with substitute language found in RC245. Further amended (A) on the top of page 2 of RC245, changing 16 hours per day to 24 hours per day.**

Our original proposal problem statement read as follows:

The Alaska Peninsula / Shumagin Islands (Area M) is managed by a 3-year Alaska Board of Fisheries (BOF) cycle instead of an in-season escapement management as almost all other Alaska salmon fisheries are regulated.

In February of 2023, the Alaska Board of Fisheries adopted a South Unimak and Shumagin Islands Management Plan that may have encouraged under-reporting of harvest of Coastal Western Alaska (CWAK) chum, while the chum stocks that the Plan intended to protect clearly remain in increasingly critical condition across Western.

Coastal Western Alaska (CWAK) chum and king salmon have been in severe decline to the point of extirpation in some discrete stocks. That situation only worsened in the 2023 and 2024 AYK salmon seasons. This includes the Yukon River, Kuskokwim River, Unalakleet River and the Nushagak River. The predominant AYK chum producing rivers are the Yukon and the Kuskokwim. The relationships between the intercept of chum in Area M and the declines of CWAK chum has never been adequately established to understand the social and ecological impacts of Area M fisheries on AYK salmon and subsistence communities. But in times of severe concern over the sustainability of AYK stocks, it is not a matter of every fish counting but every egg counting for fecundity on the spawning grounds.

The Alaska Sustainable Salmon Policy (SSP/ 5AAC 39.222) requires that “the burden of conservation” of a depleted species be shared. In 2022, Bering Sea Fishermen’s Association, along with several tribal consortiums, wrote a letter to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game noting “If ADF&G does not limit June commercial harvest opportunities within Area M, the ensuing unmitigated interception of AYK-bound chum all but assures the destruction of AYK Region economies and traditional subsistence lifestyles, and places the entire burden of conservation on the shoulders of AYK Region subsistence users. The survival of our communities depends upon ADF&G’s intervention.” Even more significant, it could mean the extirpation of some chum stocks entirely.

ACR 7

Establish a 10 consecutive day closure between June 10 and June 23 for seine and drift gillnet gear in the *South Unimak and Shumagin Islands June Salmon Management Plan* (5 AAC 09.365).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 09.365. South Unimak and Shumagin Islands June Salmon Management Plan.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

This ACR is a request for re-instatement of Proposal #127 (as RC245) that was approved by the Alaska Board of Fisheries at the Alaska Peninsula Area M meeting, February 2026, 4-3 vote to **“Establish a 10 consecutive day closure between June 10 and June 23 for seine and drift gillnet gear. Amended with substitute language found in RC245. Further amended (A) on the top of page 2 of RC245, changing 16 hours per day to 24 hours per day.**

(From the original proposal submitted by Orutsarmiut Native Council (EF-F26-143))

The Alaska Peninsula /Shumagin Islands (Area M) is managed by a 3-year Alaska Board of Fisheries (BOF) cycle instead of an in-season escapement management as almost all other Alaska salmon fisheries are regulated. In February of 2023, the Alaska Board of Fisheries adopted a South Unimak and Shumagin Islands Management Plan that may have encouraged under-reporting of harvest of Coastal Western Alaska (CWAK) chum, while the chum stocks that the Plan intended to protect clearly remain in increasingly critical condition across Western. Coastal Western Alaska (CWAK) chum and king salmon have been in severe decline to the point of extirpation in some discrete stocks. That situation only worsened in the 2023 and 2024 AYK salmon seasons. This includes the Yukon River, Kuskokwim River, Unalakleet River and the Nushagak River. The predominant AYK chum producing rivers are the Yukon and the Kuskokwim. The relationships between the intercept of chum in Area M and the declines of CWAK chum has never been adequately established to understand the social and ecological impacts of Area M fisheries on AYK salmon and subsistence communities. But in times of severe concern over the sustainability of AYK stocks, it is not a matter of every fish counting but every egg counting for fecundity on the spawning grounds.

The Alaska Sustainable Salmon Policy (SSP/ 5AAC 39.222) requires that “the burden of conservation” of a depleted species be shared. In 2022, Bering Sea Fishermen’s Association, along with several tribal consortiums, wrote a letter to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game noting “If ADF&G does not limit June commercial harvest opportunities within Area M, the ensuing unmitigated interception of AYK-bound chum all but assures the destruction of AYK Region economies and traditional subsistence lifestyles, and places the entire burden of conservation on the shoulders of AYK Region subsistence users. The survival of our communities depends upon ADF&G’s intervention.” Even more significant, it could mean the extirpation of some chum stocks entirely.

Any closure intended to protect migrating non-target species must be long enough for a significant number of fish to completely transit the South Peninsula fishing districts. Further, for a closure to

ACR 8

Amend the *Post-June Salmon Management Plan for the South Alaska Peninsula* to enforce king salmon caps with reductions in commercial salmon fishing time in the South Alaska Peninsula (5 AAC 09.366).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 09.366. Post-June Salmon Management Plan for the South Alaska Peninsula.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

The depletion of king salmon across the Gulf of Alaska is quickly becoming a crisis that threatens the very livelihood of Alaska's commercial salmon fleet. The South Alaska Peninsula commercial salmon fishery needs restrictions in place to deter the harvest of king salmon similar to the restrictions that exist in the Chignik Area.

This ACR is a request for re-instatement of Proposal #141 that was approved by the Alaska Board of Fisheries on a 5-2 vote February 2026 to **"Amend the Post-June Salmon Management Plan for the South Alaska Peninsula to enforce king salmon caps with reductions in commercial salmon fishing time in the South Alaska Peninsula."**

The positive action of the BOF was subsequently vacated by the Attorney General of Alaska in an action that may have violated the Administrative Procedures Act. (Case No. 3AN-26-05959 CI MOTION TO RECONSIDER filed by BSFA May 26, 2026 Superior Court for the State of Alaska.)

BACKGROUND: (as of August 18, 2026)

1) This regulation is one of five Board of Fisheries actions that were vacated by the Department of Law following the February 2026 Board meeting. Other regulations adopted by the Board were delayed in their implementation. To date, no public explanation or justification for these actions has been provided. In the absence of a clear rationale or transparent review process, the vacating of these regulations should be considered arbitrary and capricious. There is a distinct lack of consistency and fairness in the decision-making process by the Department of Law.

The Board of Fisheries considered, deliberated upon, and formally approved this regulation through its established public process. The Department of Law, the Department of Fish and Game, and the Department of Public Safety each indicated that there were no errors or omissions in the Board's consideration of the regulation. The regulation was properly proposed, reviewed, adopted, and approved for implementation through the required process and should therefore be reinstated and allowed to take effect as originally intended.

2) The Area M June salmon fisheries harvest depleted western Alaska Chinook and chum salmon stocks. While sockeye salmon stocks are the primary target of the Area M fisheries and provide significant economic value, the conservation of depleted wild Chinook and chum salmon stocks remains a critical management priority. Sockeye salmon are generally known to occupy surface waters, whereas Chinook and chum salmon tend to migrate at deeper depths, creating opportunities

ACR 9

Reduce maximum gillnet depth in the Alaska Peninsula Area to 70 meshes (5 AAC 09.331).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

Alaska Administrative Code Number 5 AAC: 5 AAC 09.331. Gillnet specifications and operations.

5AAC 09.331 Gillnet specifications and operations. (a) the size and operation for drift gillnets is as follows:

- (3) In the Northwestern, Unimak, and Southwestern Districts, no drift gillnet may exceed 70 meshes in depth.
- (4) beginning in 2027, in the Northwestern, Unimak, and Southwestern Districts, no drift gillnet may exceed 70 meshes in depth;

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

This ACR is a request for re-instatement of Proposal #147 that was approved by the Alaska Board of Fisheries on a 4-3 vote February 2026 to **Reduce maximum gillnet depth to 70 meshes. Amended with substitute language found in RC161. (attached.)**

The positive action of the BOF was subsequently vacated by the Attorney General of Alaska in an action that may have violated the Administrative Procedures Act. (Case No. 3AN-26-05959 CI MOTION TO RECONSIDER filed by BSFA May 26, 2026 Superior Court for the State of Alaska.)

BACKGROUND: (as of August 18, 2026)

1) This regulation is one of five Board of Fisheries actions that were vacated by the Department of Law following the February 2026 Board meeting. Other regulations adopted by the Board were delayed in their implementation. To date, no public explanation or justification for these actions has been provided. In the absence of a clear rationale or transparent review process, the vacating of these regulations should be considered arbitrary and capricious. There is a distinct lack of consistency and fairness in the decision-making process by the Department of Law.

The Board of Fisheries considered, deliberated upon, and formally approved this regulation through its established public process. The Department of Law, the Department of Fish and Game, and the Department of Public Safety each indicated that there were no errors or omissions in the Board's consideration of the regulation. The regulation was properly proposed, reviewed, adopted, and approved for implementation through the required process and should therefore be reinstated and allowed to take effect as originally intended.

2)The Area M June salmon fisheries harvest depleted western Alaska Chinook and chum salmon stocks. While sockeye salmon stocks are the primary target of the Area M fisheries and provide significant economic value, the conservation of depleted wild Chinook and chum salmon stocks remains a critical management priority. Sockeye salmon are generally known to occupy surface waters, whereas Chinook and chum salmon tend to migrate at deeper depths, creating opportunities for more selective harvest strategies. Significant conservation measures have been implemented

ACR 10

Amend Alaska Peninsula Area seine specifications to reduce net size (5 AAC 09.332).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 09.332. Seine specifications and operations.

Amend the seine specification to reduce the allowable size gear as follows:

(a) Purse seines or hand purse seines may not be less than 100 fathoms nor more than 250 fathoms in length. A purse seine or hand purse seine may not exceed 325 [375] meshes in depth. Seine mesh may not be more than three and one-half inches, except that the first 25 meshes above the headline may not be more than seven inches.

(b) **A lead [LEADS] may not be [less than 50 fathoms nor] more than 100 [150] fathoms in length. The aggregate length of seine and lead may not be more than 250 fathoms in length. Only one lead may be used with a seine. [A LEAD MAY BE ATTACHED TO ONLY ONE END OF A SEINE, AND THE LEAD MAY NOT BE ATTACHED TO THE BOAT END OF THE SEINE.]**

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

This ACR is a request for re-instatement of Proposal #148 that was approved by the Alaska Board of Fisheries in a 6-1 vote at the February 2026 Alaska Peninsula/Area M meeting to Amend the seine specification to reduce the allowable size gear **Amended with substitute language found in RC208. (attached)**

The rapid increase of chum salmon caught in the June fishery in the South Unimak and Shumagin Island purse seine fishery. The South Unimak and Shumagin Islands June fishery has averaged approximately 572,000 chums per season over the past five years (2020–2024), which is among the highest five-year average in decades. In 2026, despite assurances of closures based on triggers, the incidental catch of chum in the June fishery was almost 490,000 chum harvest recorded.

In comparison, in February 2026, the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (NPFMC) approved a bycatch cap of 45,000 Western Alaska chum for pollock trawlers in federal waters of the Bering Sea / Aleutian Islands (BSAI).

This makes the Area M intercept fishery actual harvest in 2026 over 10 times the allowable chum bycatch of the BSAI. Even if we assume that only 25% of the Area M June chum salmon harvest were of Western Alaska origin, that still amounts to over 121,000 Western Alaska chum salmon harvested in 2026 – nearly triple the BSAI limit.

Chum stocks in the Arctic-Yukon-Kuskokwim region are struggling to even meet escapement goals. The huge changes made in the South Unimak and Shumagin Islands June fishery in 2004, coupled with the rapid growth of the purse seine fleet in recent years has resulted in this recent huge increase in chum interception in the June fishery. Purse seiners harvest over 90% of the chums caught in the South Unimak and Shumagin Islands June fishery.

ACR 11

Prohibit discard of Chinook salmon caught in purse seine gear in the Alaska Peninsula and Chignik areas (5 AAC 09.373 and 5 AAC 15.364).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 09.xxx. Retention of king salmon taken in a commercial fishery.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

Agenda Change Request (ACR) TO **RESCIND** action on Proposal #135 that was approved by the Alaska Board of Fisheries in a 4-3 vote at the February 2026 Alaska Peninsula/Area M meeting to *Create a new regulation to provide the department emergency authority to require nonretention of king salmon and to amend retention provision. Amended with substitute language found in RC149. Further amended to strike paragraph (b) from both the chapter 9 and chapter 15 sections of RC149.*

This action allowed the ADF&G commissioner emergency authority to allow non-retention of king salmon 28" or greater in length in the Area M purse seine (S01M) sector. Because of a delay in the Department of Law review of proposals, this action was not posted until a July 17, 2026 Sand Point Commercial Salmon Fishery Advisory Announcement #13 For Emergency Order #4-FS-M-SP-11-26):

5AAC 09.373. Retention of king salmon taken in a commercial fishery. (a) Notwithstanding 5 AAC 09.365(e), from June 1 through October 31, all king salmon 28 inches or greater in length caught by an S01M CFEC (purse seine) permit holder may not be retained and must be immediately returned to the water unharmed. (b) Notwithstanding (a) of this section, a S01M CFEC permit holder shall retain all visibly injured or dead king salmon caught by the permit holder and record the injured or dead king salmon on an ADF&G fish ticket. (c) For purposes of this section, "caught" means brought on board the vessel.

The mandatory retention of Chinook salmon as incidental catch in a sockeye-directed fishery is a critical CONSERVATION issue that is replicated in many other parts of the state. The Department noted that the language in the original proposal gave the Commissioner discretion on implementing non-retention, but the substitute language passed in RC149 was not discretionary.

Aside from fish tickets, the Area M fishery has no substantive way to verify actual harvest, or even collect genetic or ASL (age-sex-length) data on Chinook salmon. As mentioned many times by the Department during the February 2026 Area M Board meeting, this action will make it more difficult to assess actual king salmon harvest within the purse seine sector and make enforcement more difficult. It will compromise data collected in a test fishery prior to 2026. Like the discussion in Bristol Bay on the Chinook salmon of the Nushagak River, *we simply do not have enough data on incidental king harvest.*

The passage of this proposal (based on substitute language in RC149) was predicated on allowing king salmon that are considered to be still viable to be released in order to reach spawning. Sounds

ACR 12

Allow commercial fishing for salmon with set gillnet gear in the Southeastern District Mainland concurrent to commercial fishing periods for salmon in the Chignik Management Area (5 AAC 09.360).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC: 09.360 NEW

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

A lack of sufficient fishing opportunity for South Alaska Peninsula set net fishermen has resulted in disastrous fishing seasons in recent years; both 2024 & 2025 set net Sockeye salmon June harvests for the South Alaska Peninsula were 65% below the previous 5-year 2019-2023 season average set net gear Sockeye harvests, and the 2026 June South Peninsula Sockeye set net harvest was 81% below the previous 10-year average harvest for the set net fleet.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

South Alaska Peninsula set net fishermen are allowed to fish in the Southeast District Mainland whenever Chignik Management Area fishermen are permitted to fish.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED BELOW.

for a fishery conservation purpose or reason:

not applicable

to correct an error in regulation:

not applicable

to correct an effect on a fishery that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:

It was unforeseen that restrictions on set net fishermen in the SEDM for June and beyond could result in disastrous fishing seasons causing economic harm and forcing set net operations to fold.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

South Alaska Peninsula set net fishermen may be forced to go out of business.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

The SEDM allocation is part of the Chignik Management Plan; South Alaska Peninsula set net fishermen do not take a large portion of the harvest. This action is about survival for these fishermen.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

A potential federal fishery disaster determination has recently been requested by the local borough Assembly to the Governor.

ACR 13

Establish a statewide Chinook salmon retention and disposition reporting standard for commercial salmon fisheries (5 AAC 39.130).

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 39.130. Reports required of fishermen, processors, buyers, exporters and operators of certain commercial fishing vessels; transporting requirements.

Nushagak: 5 AAC 06.391(g) currently prohibits personal use retention in the Nushagak District.

Kodiak: 5 AAC 18.395 currently mandates release of chinook salmon in the seine fishery under certain conditions.

Southeast: 5 AAC 33.392 currently mandates release of chinook salmon in the seine fishery under certain conditions.

Troll: 5 AAC 29.140 currently mandates release of chinook salmon in the troll fishery under certain conditions.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

Chinook salmon all over Alaska are in varying stages of critical loss. This is a crisis we all share for both abundance and average size. This loss has occurred in recent years, with real concern over the loss of big genetics. We need uniform ways to measure and mitigate loss.

The state manages Chinook salmon toward escapement goals using removal data. However, it has no consistent standard governing what happens to a Chinook salmon caught in a commercial salmon fishery.

Across Alaska, a Chinook salmon taken incidentally may be discarded, retained and sold, or retained for personal use, with reporting and retention practices varying by area, fishery, and permit holder. Discarded fish generate no record at all. The department has acknowledged the gap. In explaining the January 2026 Nushagak District requirement, the commissioner said that the department needs hard numbers on the removal rate to calculate total returns.

Chinook salmon often pass through multiple commercial fisheries before reaching natal streams. The 2026 Yukon Chinook salmon run marked yet another year of catastrophic returns. Federal waters of the Kuskokwim mainstem and its spawning tributaries closed to Chinook salmon harvest by all users and all gear types for most of the 2026 season. Subsistence users have absorbed complete closure while the state cannot say with confidence how many Chinook salmon its commercial fisheries remove.

The board has begun to address this, but only in one district and only in a form that attempts to solve the accounting problem while creating additional issues. Under the Nushagak District rule adopted in January 2026(5 AAC 06.391(g)), all king salmon caught under a drift or set gillnet permit in the Nushagak District must be retained and may not be released, but retained king salmon