

Board of Fish members and interested parties:

Below is my RC. Thank you for your time and attention in these thorny matters.

Sincerely,

David Richey, commercial troller
Sitka, Alaska

RC for proposal 80-87 re: SEAGO's PC 642

The SEAGO proposal is an annoying act of chutzpah and bad faith presented to the Board of Fish solely by one *part* of the sport category, that being charterboat operators. But guess which dog didn't bark? Territorial sportsmen.

The SEAGO proposal is a laughable non-starter for the commercial troll fleet, of course, but worse, the SEAGO proposal enjoys little to no advocacy from or by sportfishermen and women. Why?

Because the SEAGO proposal is based upon self-interest from and for the charter industry under the auspices of incidentally helping resident sport anglers (it does not). And perhaps too because territorial sportsmen recognize that commercial trollers contribute significant tax dollars to the hatchery programs we all enjoy, whereas the charterboat industry pointedly does not. (In fact, the charter fleet contributes nothing in this respect. This seems ... odd. And unfair.) And lacking the will to get its own house in order by establishing a limited-entry system for its ever-burgeoning charter fleet, the largely unregulated charter industry now wants 5% *more* of the commercial/sport pie -- evidently just because they got the brass to ask for it. Apparently the charter fleet is hoping the troll fleet will "negotiate" some figure under the long-established 80% by making this absurd ask.

Is this ask reasonable? Of course not. In my heart of hearts, I prefer simply retaining the status quo (80/20), but -- because a ridiculous hostile proposal has been forwarded by the charter fleet and is presently being entertained (because protocol compels it) -- said proposal needs to be countered. So:

The Amendment

RE: Proposals 80-87 on Southeast Alaska sport and commercial King Salmon management, which are based upon the 2019 Treaty Agreement, I propose:

- 1) an *increase* in the troll harvest ceiling to 85% of the combined troll/sport allocation in Tiers 2-4 (Tiers h-f). Leaving charter-sports with 15%.
- 2) All gear groups (including and especially the charter fleet) must have in-season management and manage to a harvest cap. Hard numbers, fair to all.
- 3) Every single pound of salmon that commercial trollers land is accounted for and taxed to contribute to the common weal of our hatcheries. The same stringent expectation should be applied to the charter industry.

Reasons for this amendment.

- 1) Treaty Pay-back clause doesn't allow Alaska to go over annual allocation. Regrettably, there ain't no wiggle room from an Alaskan perspective.
- 2) Since 2018 and the advent of Stocks of Concern (SoC), Charter-Sports have not caught their quota. The Sport underage varied from a minus 7,318 Chinook to a minus 1,396; when SoC management was introduced, Charter-Sports averaged 17.5% of the Charter-Sport/Commercial Troll allocation and troll averaged 82%
- 3) Since the new Treaty Agreement in 2019, the Charter-Sports average harvest was 18% and Troll averaged 83%
- 4) Since SoC Charter-Sport has not even harvested their 20% -- so why are they now asking for more? Commercial trollers are asking for more because, as Alaskan fishers who are part of a multi-state treaty, it's imperative to catch all of Alaska's quota and not leave fish on the table.

History

- 1) In 1994 the BOF changed the Charter-Sports and Troll allocation from 17/83% to 20/80%. At the time it was agreed that this provided plenty of fish for sports. It was understood that sports would no longer ask for more.
- 2) And yet: SEAGO is now asking for more fish despite their inability to catch their current allocation.
- 3) In 1998, the original Treaty iteration promised Alaska more fish in the future as the Federally funded hatcheries ramped up. 189,419 adult Chinook returned to the Bonneville dam in 1995. In 2015 a record 1,337,101 returned. Why is SEAGO not fighting for more fish at the Treaty negotiations instead of attempting to rob resident

long-time harvesters of fish they can't even catch? Does that makes sense to anyone?

4) The Columbia and Snake River now comprise a large potion of the SEAK harvest.

Pitting SEAK anglers against each other is counterproductive to Alaskan interests. Surely the Board of Fish cannot support this? (A more promising strategy would be if SEAGO joined ATA in supporting Alaska residents and demanded our historic fair share of fish from the Pacific Treaty process.

David Richey, commercial troller

Sitka, Alaska

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)