

Currently, there are 80 personal use fisheries statewide.

Ramifications of this bill are neither explained nor rationalized.

It is very premature and misguided to initiate a dialogue about who gets to catch the last fish.

Therefore, I cannot support SB 42.

John McCombs,

Kenai

---

Good morning Senator Giessel and fellow committee members.

I am strongly opposed to SB 42

This bill will divide Alaskans and is not needed. The allocations for the PU fisherys are in the escapement goals and the commercial fishery is managed to meet these goals. It does not matter if the run is strong or weak. So there is no reason to believe that the PU fisherys will not have a fair opportunity to harvest salmon.

Since the inception of the PU fishery the Board of Fish has been very attentive to making sure these fisherys are managed to get fish into the dip nets of Alaskans. The Board of Fish just increased the bag limit for the PU on the Copper river this winter.

If Alaskans truly want to own the resource then they should truly want to share in the conservation of that resource if at some point it is needed to fulfill escapement goals and for sport fishing users up river. Not Alaskans are PU fisherman, Alaskans are sports fishermen and they are commercial fishermen.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide you with my thoughts on this issue.

Michael Bowen

---

hello, my name is Anthony Matveev And I reside at 6955 w.moose ridge circle ,wasilla AK 99654. I have commercially fished for over 16 years .i strongly oppose SB 42 the Personal Use Priority bill

---

My name is John Johnson and I am a life long resident of Cordova for 58 years. My sole income comes from commercial fishing on the Copper River and Prince William Sound and I have been on a commercial fishing boat for 54 years and owned my own commercial fishing business for 46 years.

I Oppose SB 42 for many reasons. I see SB 42 as another re-allocation of our fishing resources while putting the burden of conservation of these resources on the commercial fishing fleet.

The conservation of our fishing resources should be shared by all user groups that are taking the fishing resources.

I am completely Opposed to SB 42.

John Johnson

---

Senator Giessel,

I live on the Hillside in South Anchorage and am a constituent of yours. I have been a commercial salmon fisherman here in AK since 1978. My deckhand and family live in Girdwood. I am writing to strongly oppose SB42 granting Personal Use fisheries priority over other users. If SB42 becomes law it will negatively impact my small Alaska business and thousands of others throughout the State.

Personal Use seafoods harvesters by number are DWARFED by other Alaskan consumers who buy their salmon and other Alaska seafood in the grocery store and specialty seafood outlets like 10th and M Seafoods, New Sagaya, Costco, and Copper River Seafoods just to name a few of the Anchorage retail seafood outlets let alone the many other commercial outlets throughout the State supplying hungry Alaskans that are not Personal Use consumers. Should their access to the resource be trumped by the minority in the Personal Use fishery?

I am licensed by the State to sell part of my catch that has been processed by a certified facility to my own customers. Fee's Custom Seafoods in Whittier (also in your district) processes up to 10,000 pounds of my catch every year that I sell as vacuum packed frozen fillets to largely Alaskan home pack customers who buy 15 to 100 pounds of fillets for their personal use year after year. One customer tells me every year that he reminds his friends that he can't afford to go dip-netting on the Kenai or Copper Rivers when he can buy professionally caught, and cared for vacuum packed fillets of salmon for \$11.00 per pound. Again , should these Alaskans take a back seat to PU Alaskans?

SB 42 not only negatively affects small business producers like me but also Alaskan processors, transporters and wholesale and retail outlets throughout the State. Should all of us and the thousands of jobs that are dependent on commercially caught salmon and other seafood resources be forced to stand behind PU fishers?

Many in the PU fishery complain year after year that they need more fish, more fish, ever more fish. But I am here to tell you that there is rampant waste in that fishery. For years I worked as a volunteer at the Bird Treatment and Learning Center in Anchorage as a volunteer during the winter when I was not fishing. In the spring around this time of year it was time to clean out the freezer. Cooler after cooler of ill processed, freezer burned and inedible salmon would come through the doors, some of it so bad we had to reject it as not even fit for eagle food. Got to get rid of the old for a fresh batch that we won't fully use! Bird TLC's massive storage would fill to the brim until we had to turn away donors and I can only assume that it then went to the dump. A call by your staff to Bird TLC and the Alaska Zoo will easily confirm this waste of a precious Alaska resource.

Please consider that SB42 pits one Alaskan user group, a vocal minority, against other Alaskan consumers and reject this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Steve Aberle

---

My name is C. Scott Thomas, I am an Alaska resident, born and raised here. I have been fishing for over 40 years in the state. I have participated in sport, guided sport, commercial, personal-use, and subsistence fisheries throughout the state. My wife and daughters were also born and raised in the state and have also been "fishermen" for more years than we have fingers/toes. **I strongly oppose SB 42.**

Fishing is paramount to our family, friends, community, and State. It is my understanding that the Alaska State Legislature is currently considering a personal use priority for Alaska's fishing resources. I believe this would place personal use fisheries above all other users except subsistence. This bill undermines the state's recognized subsistence priority and pits user groups against each other. Furthermore in times of scarcity all should share the burden of conservation. Alaskans as a whole need to be responsible for the health of Alaska's fishing resources, this means working together on a level playing field to protect what is important to all of us.

---

Dear Senator Giesel,

My name is Dan Bilderback, I am a commercial salmon fisherman who fishes on the Copper River Delta and Prince William Sound. This has been my livelihood for 45 years. I also sport fish for salmon and enjoy it immensely. I currently live at 4623 Campus Circle, Anchorage, AK with my wife Christine.

I would like to strongly urge you not to support SB 42 which would give the State of Alaska Personal Use category an equal access priority with the Subsistence users over the Sport and Commercial user groups. SB 42 is divisive legislation for Alaskan Residents.

Fish and Game has to Manage for brood stock and subsistence as a mandated priority. If the Personal User group is thrown into this mix it makes Management much more complicated for ADF&G to achieve.

Personal use was created by the Board of Fisheries to give the people of Alaska access to fish resources for recreational and household personal consumption. As such, Personal Use has been given a generous quota and access that has, due to its popularity, only increased with time. I believe that to circumvent the Board of Fish's authority to allocate resources within fisheries would be a detrimental to all users.

As I said, I have been in the fisheries for a long time and frankly I'm tired of seeing that some people feel that they are ENTITLED to the resource because they have the political clout at the moment.

I would be glad to clarify any of the points I have made.

Thank You Senator

---

I Oppose any priority of fish allocation to any fishery. I believe Fish and Game Management should be left to THE Department of fish and Game and the Board of Fish. And the Game Board. The people set by our states current laws to manage such resources. I believe changes in HB 42 would cause unfair distribution of states assets.

Gary Swan, Anchorage, Ak.

---

Sen. Giessel:

Please consider the long term negative consequences of establishing an additional group priority for utilization of fishery resources. While the subsistence priority is constitutionally mandated, placing one group--personal use--in a category that supersedes other uses is a recipe for unnecessary conflict between user groups who presently have ample opportunity to plead their cases at the Board of Fish level. Personal use fisheries have expanded with higher levels of participation indicating that the alleged problem of access is not the critical issue that proponents of the measure allege. There is little evidence that would convince me that diligent personal use harvesters cannot get a catch. It is also important to realize that waste of the resource can easily occur when a priority would make the access to the resource less restrictive.

My personal experience and observation of others leads me to believe that there is a covert market for trade of personal use fish that undermines the state's efforts to effectively manage resources. I have friends who consistently catch more personal use fish than they and families can possibly use. Lots of it gets shipped outside to family and friends. Is it in the states interest to provide people in other states--I don't think so! A personal use priority would encourage more of that kind of activity.

Consider also that commercial harvest of fish resources returns various tax benefits directly to the state general fund while personal use costs the state in management and enforcement as well as siphoning off product from uses that are taxed directly. After all, the state has a constitutional mandate to manage its resources for the benefit of all citizens. We don't allow personal users to tap into the pipeline. Fishery resources are obviously different, but nonetheless, in these times of budget crisis, it is grossly irresponsible to further compromise the income of commercial fisheries for the specific benefit of a few.

As a commercial fisherman for nearly forty years and Anchorage resident with children all living here, I am requesting that you please do not allow SB42 to pass out of the resources committee.

Chip Treinen

---

Hello,

I am a life long Alaska, born in Anchorage and raised in rural Alaska. Now currently living in Anchorage attending college. Fishing is a huge part of my life. This bill will upset the balance we have currently set up between all the different types of fishing throughout our great state. Personal use fisheries should not take

priority over other user groups besides subsistence fisheries. The number of Alaskan's that participate in sport and commercial fishing outnumber the personal use fisherman by far. As Alaskan's we need to stick together in sharing our resources in times of low fish populations. The long term effects of this bill will be detrimental to the sustainability of our fish populations throughout the state.

Thank you,

Kari Gilman

---

Dear Senator Giessel, My name is Yakov Reutov I am a commercial fisherman ,have been since i was a young boy fishing with my dad ,this personal use priority legislation concerns me a lot, I rely on comm fishing as my only source of income to support my family and so do alot of my friends, I would like the state to support commercial fishermen as the priority fishery because there will always be enough fish for personal use if comm fish are the priority but not the other way around, i am afraid for me and my childrens future if this legislation passes ,please help us by voting no on the personal use priority bill ,Thank you

---

Senator Giessel

I want to let you know that as a 61 year resident of Homer I am very much opposed to SB 42. During my lifelong residency I have been a commercial, sport and personal use fisherman of Alaska's salmon resources. In times of low returns the responsibility for maintaining Alaska's resources should be borne by all user groups. We all have alternatives for harvesting during times of low abundance at other locations or species. This bill will create greater conflict among user groups.

Thank you -

Chris Moss

---

I am writing you this to tell you that our fishing family opposes SB 42. Please don't put Alaskans against Alaskans. Thank you.

Brooke Andrews

Jon Andrews

Nora Andrews

Josie Andrews

---

I totally oppose SB 42.

I have harvested fish in a lot of ways for the past 34 years In Alaska. I live in Sitka. I raised my kids there. I am a commercial fisher , owning halibut and black cod IFQ s. I love to sport fish and also harvest fish for personal and subsistence use too.

I feel every user group needs to be responsible for the health of the fisheries and fish resources.

Commercial harvest of all the fish resources is vitally important to all the towns in S E Alaska where I live. To have the management of this incredibly important resource be controlled by politics instead of fishery management is extremally alarming and dangerous to the health of all fisheries.

At this point in time nearly all personal use fishers have their needs met.

There is no reason to change it.

Please oppose SB 42. Thank you

Carolyn Nichols

---

I am an Alaskan resident, born and raised here and a US Coast Guard Captain and commercial fisherman since 1963. I have fished in PWS/Copper River since 1988. Prior to that, I held commercial permits in Cook Inlet, False Pass and Bristol Bay.

In addition to my career as a commercial fisherman, I have always been a sport and subsistence harvester and as such, I think it is important that we remember that harvesters be equally responsible for the health of our fishing resources. There is no point in pitting Alaskans against Alaskans!

In all fairness, personal use harvesters have been able to consistently meet their needs. Commercial fishing and the many small businesses and communities who depend on the economic benefits would be impacted.

Please do not support this bill. The last thing we need is to divide Alaskans further!

Thank you for your consideration!

Doug Heimbuch

---

Chair of Senate Resources Committee

I been a commercial fishing man for 35 years here in Alaska and I'm opposing SB 42. I do my "Personal Use" fishing by using my Sport Fishing License. It does just fine for me and I know all my friends are doing the same.

We don't need another priority group: We have Subsistence, Alaska Native, Sport and others groups like, Traditional Fishing, Fishing by Proxy, etc..

Ric Vrsalovic

---

Dear Senator Giessel,

My name is Nikolai Yakunin, we live in the community of Nikolaevsk, 9 miles from Anchor Point. My family and the community was established on commercial fishing, we have been fishing and living in Alaska since 1970. My wife and I raised a family on commercial fishing income, now our grandchildren are starting to get into commercial fishing, but will there be any commercial fishery for them to enter, especially in Cook Inlet?

I see this unfortunate bill pitting Alaskans against Alaskans and the end of too many peoples lively hood, starting with my own family!

Senator Giessel please remember us when you vote on this Bill!

God Bless You,

Nikolai Yakunin

---

Senator Giessel,

I am a 2nd generation commercial fisherman out of Petersburg Alaska, I have two kids also from Petersburg who are 3rd generation commercial fishermen. Between the 3 of us we employ 10 different individuals that depend on access to our historical fisheries. These are our livelihoods and they support the 10 families plus our family's as well as the support of services in Petersburg along with tax that helps our city.

We oppose SB 42.

Bill Connor

---

Dear Senator Giessel,

I strongly urge you to take any measures at your disposal to insure that our fisheries managers' jobs are not further complicated by prioritizing subsistence fisheries. Our resources should be managed on a strictly biological basis. Again, I urge you to NOT give subsistence fisheries priority.

Sincerely, Carl Tauriainen

Nikiski

---

Senator Giessel-

I am a commercial fisherman from Petersburg. I currently fish salmon, halibut, crab, and herring here in southeast. I am the president of the United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters, and serve on our local advisory committee to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I got my first job fishing when I was 11. I'm 54 now. 100% of my income comes from commercial fishing.

I am adamantly opposed to SB 42. Our current system of management of our resources already addresses all user groups. If there are conservation issues, the first user group to be affected is already commercial fishing. Management of our salmon resources is recognized as the best in the world. It also makes little sense to me to marginalize an industry during such a tough economic time in our state. The fishing industry remains vibrant and active through low oil prices, poor fish prices, poor tourism years, and just about anything you can throw at it. As you know, commercial fishing is the lifeblood of coastal communities. It provides jobs, fishing and processing, as well as service industries.

I have a wife and four children. Part of our family leisure time is personal use fishing. It is a wholesome fun activity, and gives me the opportunity to teach my children responsible use of our resources. Having grown up here in southeast, I know full well how blessed we are to have a well managed resource that provides not only personal use, but also enables a vibrant industry that has proven under current management to thrive. It will continue to thrive with current management practices. At no time in my life have I felt deprived or challenged by the commercial fishery.

Respectfully,

Max Worhatch

---

Sen. Giessel,

I am opposed to SB 42 the the Personal Use Priority bill. I feel that the current fish management structure is more than adequate for my community in Haines and the Northern Lynn Canal. The health of the runs should be prioritized over any user. The salmon runs should be managed with science and not politics.

The system works well in my town and my district. Subsistence and sport user's needs are currently met. Subsistence fishermen have special areas in the Chilkoot and Chilkat river systems where they can fish for salmon in both in the salt

water and in the river systems. Sport fishermen have ample time and area to fish for salmon. Currently commercial salmon fisherman are the only group that is actively managed to keep escapement in the rivers high.

Maybe there are some fishing runs in the state that could benefit from this. I personally feel that if a particular run of fish is not healthy enough for one group of fish to fish on, it is not healthy for any group to fish on. I am seeing this now with Chilkat River king salmon numbers. All harvesting groups are going to be managed with the intent of decreasing catches. The run is not healthy enough to fish on, therefore no one should fish for them.

I am an Alaska Native commercial fisherman who owns and fishes a drift gillnet boat near Haines. I have captained the boat for three years, having settled my family here to make our living. We have a good relationship with local subsistence and sport fishermen, primarily because of the way our local stocks are managed equally among the groups. I have fished commercially with my family my entire life - my father fished commercially his whole life and his father before him. I am able to carry on the third generation of this business in the community I love because there are still fish for me to responsibly fish. Please help continue that tradition for all commercial, subsistence and sport fishermen by opposing SB 42.

John Hagen

---

Dear Senator Giessel,

My name is Steve Merritt and I am a commercial fisherman living in Craig, Alaska. I oppose SB 42 which seeks to provide a priority for personal use fisheries second only to subsistence. I do not believe that such a priority is necessary or reflects the true nature of personal use fisheries.

The concern I have with SB 42 is that it undermines the confidence of the Alaskan people in the Board of Fisheries process. When issues develop concerning the sustainability of the fisheries resource in Alaska, I have every confidence that the Board of Fisheries process will handle it fairly and appropriately. Bills of the nature of SB 42 are just selfish attempts to micro manage that process which is world renown as being one of the best.

Ask yourself, why is it necessary for the personal use fishery to be treated on a level equal to that of the subsistence fisheries of this state? My answer is it shouldn't.

Subsistence fisheries have been granted highest priority in times of resource shortages, because they are intended to provide **the basic necessities of life** for rural residents.

Personal use fisheries are not in my opinion anywhere near the importance level of the subsistence fishery. There is no reason what so ever that the personal use fisheries can not be managed under the 8 allocation criteria standards used by the Board of Fisheries in managing sport, commercial and charter fisheries of Alaska.

Will someone starve if their sport bag limit is reduced? No. Commercial fisheries reduced? No. Charter fishery restrictions? No. Personal use limit? No. Subsistence? **YES!!** So why elevate personal use to a level it truly does not belong?

So in closing I ask you to oppose SB 42 and leave the management of the personal use fisheries in the hands of the Board of Fisheries. This process has proven itself capable and there are not any signs that it is beginning to fail. I urge you to keep your confidence in that process and do not fall prey to the inappropriate belief SB 42 is necessary!! IT is NOT!!



---

Good Morning Sen. Giessel,

What a tough two years (and beyond) the 29th Legislature is having to endure. Between deficits, ensuing budget cuts, and marijuana regulation, where is the silver lining?

In my opinion Senator, one aspect of the silver lining is not passing SB 42. This is a one page bill fraught with future nightmares.

The current field as it exists: commercial, sport, and personal use, is balanced on a certain level. Not perfect perhaps but fairly balanced. To place 1 of these higher than the other 2, at this point in time, is a mistake.

No to Senate Bill 42.

Respectfully Submitted

Mike Peterson

Douglas

---

This bill does live up to its name of Alaskans -First Fishing Act. I am a personal use fisherman and lifelong Alaskan. The opportunities abound for All Alaskans to partake in our fisheries in many different forms. Please do not put one use other than subsistence as a priority over others. The numbers of Alaskans accessing their resources thru Sport and Commercial fisheries is equal in number if not greater than the participants in PU fisheries. Please do not upset the balance and culture of stewardship that comes with sharing in abundance and conserving in times of low populations swings. Alaskans know how to work together to keep our resources the envy of the world. Thank you, Darin Gilman

---

Dear Senator Giessel and Members of the Senate Resources Committee:

Please consider this as my public testimony and make it part of the record.

My name is Dennis Zadra and I live in Cordova, Alaska. I want to go on the record as being strongly opposed to SB 42 – The Personal Use Priority Bill. This is nothing more than an attempt by one user group to reallocate resources in fisheries that are 100% allocated. We have a Department of Fish and Game and a Board of Fish Process that is responsible for managing the salmon resources, and they do a very good job of it. This Bill is an attempt to go around the Board of Fish, and would be disruptive to that process.

I have been a commercial fisherman for 26 years as well as an Alaskan resident. Our community and many others around the State rely on commercial fishing as our economic backbone. SB 42 would take salmon away from the commercial sector and give them to the personal use sector. Currently the personal use fishers are allowed 45 salmon per year for a household of 2 with 10 additional salmon for each additional house member. That is 130 salmon fillets per year per family of 4, which is a lot more than is used by my family every year. Can you imagine what it would do to the commercial industry if every Alaskan family were allowed this much fish before we were allowed to harvest any excess?

This Bill does not represent all Alaskans will put Alaskan Fishing Families against other Alaskans and has the potential to destroy the commercial salmon fisheries, especially in Cook Inlet and the Copper River. This not only affects the fishing families, but the processing workers and all of the other infrastructure that is supported by these jobs. These are Alaskans also. Personal use fishers currently have an abundance of opportunity and salmon under the current management. All users need to be responsible for conservation at times of low abundance, and the mentality of just taking more from the commercial sector is not right. This is a complex issue and has been very well managed under the current allocation. Nothing needs to change.

Thank you for the opportunity to present my point of view.

Dennis Zadra

---

Senator Giessel,

My name is Mike Stockburger from Homer, Alaska. I am writing in opposition to SB 42, the Personal Use Priority Bill. As a long time Alaskan fisherman (36 years), I have participated in commercial, sport and personal fisheries across the state and currently own and operate Homer Boat Yard in Homer. I believe it would be a mistake to give priority to personal use fishing. Commercial fishing provides more residents availability to the state's fish than is true with personal use or sports fishing. Many of our residents just do not have access to the resource either because of physical or financial reasons. The commercial sector also provides jobs, either directly or indirectly to a majority of our citizens. Most of our coastal communities would not exist were it not for revenues provided by commercial fishing. I feel that personal use access to our resources for the residents of the State of Alaska are currently being met by sports and personal use harvesting regulations.

At this point in time, population control of many of the states fish species is predicated on commercial fishing openings and closures. Fish biologists have developed strategies to ensure proper escapement goals are met by controlling fishing time. The health of our fisheries must be protected and all users should be involved in guaranteeing our fish are available to our children and grandchildren. Please take note that our fish populations are, for the most part, very stable and there are enough to go around. The tools to ensure this continues are in place.

Please do not pass this bill, it endangers our most important resource, our fish!

Thank You,

Mike Stockburger

---

Dear Senator Giessel,

As a lifelong second generation Alaskan and third generation Area E commercial drift net fisherman I would like express my concern with the sb 42 Alaskans first bill. I was born in Cordova and alternated summers in Cordova and winters living a subsistence type lifestyle in the upper Copper River basin near McCarthy for most of my childhood. I am currently 24 and have been gillnetting on my own since I was 18. Currently I have 4 uncles, my father, and two brothers who also own and fish Area E drift permits as well as a sister and brother in law who setnet. To say that salmon is the lifeblood of my family would be understatement. At a time when Alaska's economy is struggling to push forward a bill that would potentially hurt the economy of a region, the state, and the many Alaskans to whom gillnetting is a source of income and way of life while mislabeling said bill "Alaskans first" seems wrong to say the least.

Sincerely yours,

Trae William Lohse

---

My name is

Mark Niver

I oppose SB 42 on the personal use priority....

Thank You. Mark

---

Hello!!! My name is Erik Kokborg , a 40 year resident of Alaska and commercial fisherman for the last 7 or so years. I live in Cordova with my wife and 13 year old son and we rely on commercial fishing for our income as well as putting food on our table. I used to be a personal use fisherman out of Fairbanks and can see both sides of the coin now. My family is much more reliant on our fishing resource now then it ever had been as a Chitina dipnetter...The majority of the households in Cordova rely on the commercial fishing industry in one form or another and the personal use fishery

should not take priority over an industry that supports so many Alaskans as well as the economic well being of the state.  
Thank you for your consideration, Erik Kokborg,

---

Please oppose Senate Bill 42 . As a 45 year resident of Alaska I take issue with the wording and intent of the Alaskans-First Fishing Act. This act does nothing but pit Alaskans against each other and will favor access for Alaskan Personal use fisherman over an equal if not greater number of Alaskans who access the same resources through either the Sport or Commercial Fisheries and fails to consider the Alaskan consumer whose sole access is through food service and retail outlets. Our resources and the balanced management we have through the sometimes rancorous Board of Fish process is envied throughout the world . Please do not politicize this issue and throw Alaska onto the road of forgetting that the resource comes first. Destabilizing the management system will only lead to less resource and less opportunity over time for All . Thank you, Shawn Gilman

---

Hello, I just wanted to point out that commercial fishing is a very financially risky business. Thousands of dollars, and weeks of preparation go into getting ready for a salmon season in the hope that there will be enough harvest to cover those expenses and provide for the fishermen, crew, and their families.

Though we participate in the personal use fishery each year it does not require nearly the investment or risk of commercial fishing. I realize that more people are affected by a personal use closure in years of low abundance but it is not nearly as devastating as it is to the families and crew who have so much time and money invested in the commercial fishery. As things stand without this bill all user groups take less fish on years of low abundance which is much more fair to all involved.

Thank you Aaron Nolan

---

Hi my name is Jason Metz I live in Soldotna AK. I believe most people who participate in personal use fisheries end up with more fish than they eat already. Please oppose SB 42 thank you and have a nice day. Commercial fisherman help put food on the table and support AK business

---

**RE: Oppose SB 42, Personal Use Priority**

Dear Chair Giessel and committee members,

I'm an Alaskan resident and I've been supporting my family commercial fishing for 21 years. I oppose SB 42. My small, local, family-run fishing business supports not only my family, but my crew and their families, the workers and tenders of my processor, and the many local marine trades business.

Under the current ADF&G management plans personal use already has a priority when there is a short fall of fish, and to set in statute a personal use priority will reduce ADF&G's ability to manage fisheries. Creating a personal use priority will make management plans even more complicated, which reduces flexibility. It would also remove the Board of Fisheries ability to set allocations on a case by case basis based on science and public input. There are over 100 personal use fisheries in the state and the long term effects of SB 42 to this broad range of fisheries are unknown.

This bill would limit access to fish for the many Alaskans who get their seafood from sport fishing, grocery stores and restaurants. It pits Alaskans against Alaskans. The intent by the Board of Fisheries establishing Personal Use fisheries is clear in 5ACC 77.001 (4) (b) which states "...allowed when that taking does not jeopardize the sustained yield of a resource and either does not negatively impact an existing resource use or is in the broad public interest." **Although the original intent was for personal use fisheries to not negatively impact the other uses, I fully support personal use fisheries, but on an equal footing with sport and commercial fisheries.** When there is low abundance all user groups should share in the responsibly of conservation.

Establishing a personal use priority will do nothing to ensure run strength or timing, and does not guarantee that fish will be in the rivers when people want to catch them. I urge you to leave the prioritization of fishery allocations within the Board of Fisheries, and the sustainable management of fisheries resources within ADF&G.

Thank you for your time,  
Matthew Alward & family

Owner Alward Fisheries LLC

---

Dear Chair Giessel and Committee Members, March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2015

***I respectfully oppose SB 42.*** I am resident of Alaska and have worked in the seafood industry for over 20 years. My small, local fishing business supports not only my family, but supports the workers and tenders of my processor, and the many local maritime support sector businesses.

Under the current ADF&G management plans, personal use already has a priority when there is a shortfall of fish, and to set in statute a personal use priority will reduce ADF&G's ability to manage fisheries. It would also remove the Board of Fisheries ability to set allocations on a case by case basis based on science and public input. The intent of the Board of Fisheries in establishing personal use fisheries is clear in 5ACC 77.001 (4) (b), which states "...allowed when that taking does not jeopardize the sustained yield of a resource and either does not negatively impact an existing resource use or is in the broad public interest."

I support personal use fisheries (my family participates in personal use fisheries), but on an equal footing with sport and commercial fisheries. ***When there is low abundance, all user groups should share in the responsibly of conservation.***

Establishing a personal use priority will do nothing to ensure run strength or timing, and does not guarantee that fish will be in the rivers when people want to catch them. ***I urge you to leave the prioritization of fishery allocations within the Board of Fisheries, and the sustainable management of fisheries resources within ADF&G.***

Thank you for your service.

Julie Decker

---

Dear Senate Resources Committee, I live in Spenard, Alaska, part of the big village of Anchorage, District I, when I do not reside on my vessel out of Cordova making a living commercial fishing. I have lived in my home since 1981. I came to Alaska in 1980. I have been part of the fishing industry since my arrival. I started out sport fishing. I have personally fished, and I have subsistence fished. I have been a part of the commercial fishing industry since 1984.

Fishing is how I support myself and family. It also provides an important part of my diet. The Landing taxes in each fishing community is an important part of the income which helps to provide the necessary infrastructure to support Alaskan communities and provide income to its citizens.

I OPPOSE SB42. Personal use should never be precedent-ed above subsistence use, that is why it is protected by the Alaskan constitution. Alaskans who do not already harvest fish by sport, personal or subsistence are able to access fishing resources through commercial harvest. The commercial management of Alaska Fisheries has assured escapement to provide fish for future generations, when necessary, mostly at the expense of commercial harvest times. All Harvesters need to be responsible for the health of Alaska's fishing resources, this includes sharing the burden of conservation.

Please honor your pledge to uphold the Alaska Constitution by opposing SB 42.

Thank you, William Evans

---

I am opposed to SB 42, this appears to be another unnecessary economic jab at the residents of Alaska that make their living from commercial fishing, not to mention pitting Alaskans against Alaskans. Apparently the ADF&G and BOF are not doing their job satisfactory enough for Senator Stoltze and others, I'm told that this is the seventh year in a row this legislation has been introduced by Senator Stoltze from Chugiak who is chairman of the push this time around, I don't see the need for this legislation and wonder who has what to gain from this especially after trying for so long to get this Bill introduced and passed into a law. I disagree with the senator and his supporters and think the senators should be putting their efforts towards Alaska's economic problems, after all who's going to pay the bills if you keep trying to put me and the like out of business. I know SB 42 will further economically impact both of my businesses as a Marine Surveyor and commercial fisherman. I am writing to you our senators, legislators and commissioner Cotton about my concerns over why we need for this new legislation.

I believe that this is another attempted power grab by the Sportfishing organizations under the guise of the **personal use fishery**. They want to kill the Cook Inlet commercial fishery and continue to profit from our rivers at all costs. Imagine my surprise to learn that the President of SCADA (the Southcentral Dipnetter's Association) Dennis Gease is also on the board of Bob Penney's new organization (AFCA), which seeks the abolition of setnets (and likely after that, all forms of commercial fishing in Cook Inlet). Oh, yeah, and the vice president of SCADA is also the vice president of AFCA (and the father of the Kenai River Sport fishing Association's Executive Director). So safe to say, the leadership of SCADA is actively seeking to eliminate other user groups and is directly linked to KRSA and AFCA. These are all facts that can be looked into this not a conspiracy theory, this game has been going on since the 1970s in Cook Inlet and has spread to Prince William Sound.

Yes my family members and I do commercial fish in Alaska and have done so for the last forty some years and yes I do presently drift gillnet in upper Cook Inlet so you can say I'm biased if you like. My point is that we have already have a system in place that has been working well so what is the need for this legislation other than to further the agenda of local sports fishing organizations. Alaska's fishery management program is renowned and Alaskan's are recognized worldwide for our commitment to sustainability of our fisheries resources, in order for Alaska to continue to enjoy sustainable fisheries resources we need to keep the politics out of our resource management.

In this time of economic uncertainty should we not be working to bring Alaskans together not pit them against each other. I am tired of people with lots of money and lobbyist making the rules to best their interests, this resource is how our family's survive and pay taxes in Alaska. I ask you to please not support SB 42 and allow our current Alaska State management process to continue doing the good job they are presently doing, we do not need more self interest laws we need unity and common goals.

Sincerely,

Paul C. Fleenor, AMS® #1101

---

I do use the Personal Use Fishery myself but am opposed to making this a priority. The two rivers impacted here on the Kenai Peninsula on the east side of the Inlet are already trampled through and through. Even so, they do not harvest enough of the red salmon during the peak of the run to prevent overescapement which leads to smaller return runs for that years spawn. Also, the amount of salmon allowed per person only makes sense if you are living in an isolated village and the only source of meat or protein is salmon. Last year one of the older retired men "dippnetting" (with a gillnet--which the Fish and Game has approved) on the Kenai said he caught 90 yesterday and was back for another 90 that day. What is he going to do with 90 fish??? or 180 fish???? He shouldn't have to fish again for another couple of years if he cans or freezer packs correctly.

If personal use if made a priority, then all other gear types would have to wait until all people in the State have gotten enough salmon for their tables. There will be no other harvest because the salmon will be done running. This bill is intended to stop all fishing on the East Side of Cook Inlet and to stop the Drift Fleet Inlet-wide. Nor does this bill address sport fishing on the Inlet or in the Rivers. All other fishing activity will be in obeisance to "Personal Use".

Thank you for listening to my request

Kathy Wallace

---

Dear Senator,

I have been a drift gill net fisherman in Cook Inlet since 1971. I strongly oppose Personal Use Priority Bill, SB 42. Please see that this monster dies now.

Reuben Sublett  
46 year resident of Sterling, AK

---

Dear Senator Giessel:

I appreciate your service to our State.

I wanted to let you know that I oppose the Personal Use Priority Bill, SB 42. I am a Commercial Fisherman and I have invested over \$300,000.00 in my boat and permit. There has been a lot of talk in the news about Alaskan's who are not invested in the Commercial Fishing Industry wanting to catch and keep as many fish as a Commercial Fisherman. I say to them "Become a Commercial Fisherman". Let them invest their hard earned money to attempt to make a living in the Fishing Industry.

Most Alaskan's know that the Commercial Fishing Industry provides a significant amount of jobs for Alaskans. If the Board of Fish continues to restrict Commercial Fisherman then pretty soon there will not be any Commercial Fisherman and the jobs that we provide will be lost forever.

Please support Commercial Fishermen.

Thank you,

Ty Wickline

---

Senator Giessel:

This brief note is to urge most strongly that you do not support SB 42 which seeks to establish a priority for personal use fishing over sport or commercial fishing in Alaska.

I am a commercial fisherman, 45 years in southeast Alaska while residing in Juneau, and a participant in the personal use fishery over those years. I oppose SB 42 for the following reasons:

It creates a problem where none really exists. Current fishery management policies provide adequately for the respective fisheries while maintaining the health of the marine resources.

Personal use needs typically are met. More effort may be required to cover those needs in some circumstances, but that is not in itself unreasonable and does not justify restricting other user groups.

The personal use fishery is not, and must not be misconstrued as, a subsistence fishery for urban dwellers.

Responsibility for contributing to the health and sustainability of the resource must continue to be shared by all users whenever resource levels demand harvest restrictions.

Asserting personal use priority in order to restrict commercial fishing obviously implies restricting jobs and coastal Alaskan economies without a clear compensating benefit.

The impetus for SB 42 appears to be nothing more than an extension of narrow regional differences between sport and commercial fishing interests. That is a terrible basis for statewide legislation.

SB 42, if enacted, will pit Alaskans against Alaskans as partisans in political one-upsmanship games regarding an issue that has little or no legitimate content.

It is truly offensive that issues such as this priority designation and time zone manipulations consume legislative time and attention in this year when real problems, such as revenue, are not open to discussion.

Thank you for your attention.

Jev Shelton

---

Please add my name to the list of people in strong opposition to SB 42. I have been an Alaska resident for almost 35 years. I have spent much of that time using the resources of Alaska's wonderful coast. Our coastal communities depend on the commercial fisheries which would be put at risk by this bill. There is a rich personal use fishery that co-exists well, and in some ways benefits from the hatcheries and management paid for by the commercial industry. I am supportive of both subsistence and personal use, but please allow the State Board of Fish to do their mandated job and manage the fisheries. This should not be legislated. Thank you, Pat Kehoe

---

Dear Sen. Giessel,

I write to ask you to not support the above referenced bill. The bill is overly broad and harmful to the local areas in which these fisheries are prosecuted.

It appears from interviews in which the sponsor has participated in that this bill is specifically directed at the Kenai River fishery.

Please consider;

\*The PU fisheries are already treated differently than all other fisheries, it's already managed as though it has priority. Both sport and commercial have been restricted or closed while the PU fishery on the Kenai remained open. People are getting their fish, their harvests continue to increase.

\*This Kenai fishery has the highest non-compliance rate of any fishery in the state. The latest statistics offered by the State(2013) show 35,211 permits issued....8,031 permit holders never returned their permits, even after two reminders. Why....because the Dept. Of Fish and Game and the Dept. Of Public Safety are afraid of the public outcry if 8,031 folks get \$200 citations as mandated by regulation.

\*In speaking with Fish and Game enforcement officers, they maintain that one in two fishers contacted on the beaches and in river are out of compliance with regulations and refuse to follow rules. Many, as they say, are belligerent, mostly due to alcohol use.

\*Should the City of Kenai and private landowners shoulder the burden of the PU fishers who have no respect for their property? Out of town PU fishermen leave their trash behind and actually defecate in landowners yards. As the Kenai City Manager recently commented at the Upper Cook Inlet Fish Board hearings, " I have three words to describe this fishery, OUT OF CONTROL".

\*What would be the effect of a priority? Would every management plan in the State have to be rewritten? After all, the priority will be Statewide, and for all species of fish. Imagine if I'm a PU fisher and I'd rather have my priority be catching Chinook salmon for my plate rather than sockeye? As this bill is written all other gear groups would have to shut down while my Chinook catch is prioritized! Using that scenario there would never be enough fish to go around and both the sport fishery and the commercial fishery would be devastated.

\*The bill, as written, could effect shellfisheries, herring, and all saltwater fisheries within State waters. Taken literally, and as written, would this bill foster demands for PU fisheries all over the State? Surely, if adopted, the State would suffer unintended consequences that have the potential to curtail sport and commercial fisheries and be devastating to local economies that rely on them. Thanks again for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ken Coleman

Kenai

63 year Resident

---

Dear Senator Giessel,

I am very concerned about SB 42. As a life long commercial fisherman and a third generation Alaskan fisherman i feel like this is an attack on a way of life and a culture.

My grandparents homestead here in the 50's because of the freedom, excitement, and connection to the land that commercial fishing brought to them. They were part of the movement that settled this great state and through the difficulties and hardships they overcame Alaska has become more accessible to those who came after. Both my father and i left the state for our college educations and had vast opportunists in the world outside of Alaska, but we returned to Alaska because of the culture and lifestyle of commercial fishing. We are here because of this culture, because of this freedom. We are land owners and small business owners and community members in this state. We are what makes Alaska strong. SB 42 is an attack on us!

My whole family has done its fishing in Cook Inlet where we have already given so much of our fishery to others. We gave to the sports fishery that came after we did. We gave to the burgeoning population of Mat-su valley that came after we did. We gave to the dip-net fishery that came after we did. We once fished the entire inlet it was efficient in every sense of the word, but now they force us to fish in restricted area's where the fish are not. Stuck mainly in the corridor we waste fuel, gear, our time, and our energy because it is intentionally inefficient. This is done under the shroud of conservation, but we all know its reallocation. I ask you where is truth? Where is honesty? Where is morality? I know that SB 42 may be popular, but is it any of these things? When you study the history and the faces of those who hold Alaska dear what does your conscience say?

I have never asked for priority over a farmers crops, a lumberjacks trees, or a miners sight. But, somehow it is seen as just to take away my ability to make my livelihood in the way that my family has since before Alaska was a state? Whether it is greed, ignorance, or political gain that motivates this assault it is unjust, immoral, and unconscionable.

I ask you to make a stand. SB 42 very well could spell the end of our fishery, which is already unjustly in decline. I ask you to do whats right; to stand up for truth and fairness. I am 25 years old i came back to Alaska for the freedom, the opportunity, and the adventure it offers. I saw what happened to the lower 48 (especially the western US) we have a chance to do it differently here. We have a chance to do it right. We have a chance for leadership rather than political gain. I love this state, this land, please don't let the Alaskan Dream die.

I would love to talk about this issue in more depth,

Taylor Evenson

---



