

HB 52

Testimony Packet

House Resources Committee

February 11, 2022
VIA EMAIL ONLY

(Representative.Josiah.Patkotak@akleg.gov)

Representative Josiah Patkotak, Chair
Alaska House Resources Committee
State Capitol Building Room 124
Juneau, Alaska 99801

RE: OPPOSITION TO HOUSE BILL 52

Dear Chairman Patkotak:

My name is Bridget Maryott and I am a resident of Homer, AK. One reason my family moved to Homer was because of the access to the unmatched beauty of Kachemak State Park.

I oppose any lands being removed from Kachemak State Park, especially for a failing commercial business that already owes a substantial amount of money to the State of Alaska. HB 52 does not meet the Constitution's requirement that Alaska's lands and waters be managed "for the maximum benefit of its people" and sets a dangerous precedent by giving public resources to private interests.

I would also encourage you to look past the false narrative that closing the hatchery will harm the China Poot Dipnet Fishery. This is simply not true as we saw when the Tutka Bay Hatchery was closed from 2005 to 2013.

I strongly oppose HB 52 and recommend you reject it.

Thank you for your time,

Bridget Maryott
53650 Mansfield Ave
Homer, AK 99603

Cc: House.Resources@akleg.gov

--

Bridget M Maryott

My name is Josh Wisniewski. I live in Seldoiva on the south side of Kachemak Bay. I am a commercial set net fisherman and my fishery is directly affected by the Tutka Bay Lagoon hatchery. I am writing in opposition of HB 52. Thank you for considering my comments in the attached letter, and for your public

service on behalf of all Alaskans

--

Josh Wisniewski

907-623-7144

RE HB 52

To all participating legislators

My name is Josh Wisniewski, I live on the south-side of Kachemak Bay, at Barabra Point near Tutka Bay where I set net and longline halibut with my skiff as well as subsistence fish for myself and other families and elders in my community who are not able to fish for themselves.

I am writing you as a Kachemak Bay Lower Cook Inlet set-net fisherman in opposition of HB 52 I am not able to call in to testify to the hearing regarding HB 52 but I still wanted to communicate my concerns to you regarding this proposed legislation. I believe it is generally considered through only a partially informed perspective that presumes the hatchery supports our commercial fisheries much more than it actually does.

As a Kachemak Bay set-net fisherman, I along with all Cook Inlet salmon fisherman, pay an aqua-culture enhancement tax to help support CIAA. I do not in any way benefit from the production of pink salmon at the Tutka Bay hatchery, nor do I feel that its potential benefits to a limited members of the Lower Cook Inlet seine permit holders outweigh the hatchery's long term ecological impacts to the Tutka Bay lagoon, which was historically a crab, shrimp and herring nursery area.

As a Cook Inlet permit holder I contribute to paying for the hatchery as do all Cook Inlet salmon and set net permit holders, though on the Lower Inlet Seine fleet benefit from the hatchery. I not only do-not benefit from it, I lose revenue and fishing income from it, plus have extra wear on my gear and body.

I(and my neighbors) predominantly target wild sockeye. We also target Chinook, chum and coho, but primarily we are a "WILD" sockeye fishery. All of my fish are sold to a local buyer who exclusively buys wild fish. And I direct market fish to local area families. When pink salmon from the Tutka hatchery begin to flood my nets, and the ratio of pink salmon to red salmon becomes high (10 pinks to one sockeye) or similar. I lose my market because my buyer will not purchase hatchery pink salmon.

At .25 per lb. and a 3 lb. average I make .75 cents on a pink salmon. At 5 lb. average and a price from \$2.00-\$3.00 I make \$10.00-\$15.00 per sockeye. I have to catch close to 15 pink salmon to equal the price of one sockeye, and sockeye generally will steer away from nets flooded with pinks, for which I do not have a market, nor can I catch a large enough quantity to earn a living.

Additionally as a set net fisherman I am just wearing out my body for nothing. I fish by myself, and I can get by even when I am scratch fishing for sockeye based on the work I have done to develop a market and buyer relations based on the high quality of the fish I deliver. Hatchery pink salmon created solely for the benefit of the Lower Inlet seine fishery have a negative impact on my fishing

I can lose up to a month of fishing time when pinks start hitting hard. Some of my neighbors simply pull their gear and quit fishing even when our season is open for another 2 months because of the number of pink salmon limit their success with sockeye, which is our target species.

I am not in this fishery to get rich, but because I live a traditional Kachemak Bay skiff fishing way of life as part of my subsistence life-way The income I make from set netting is essential to my subsistence salmon and halibut fishing.

It is not generally acknowledged or discussed that all Inlet salmon fishermen pay a tax to support CIAA and the Tutka hatchery, effectively subsidizing the Lower Cook Inlet seine fleet, that has higher earnings, and reduces my fishing time and revenue.

I don't think that is equitable or fair that I both pay for the hatchery in a tax and lose fishing opportunity and income because of it. Of the 1387 issued limited entry permits of Area H Cook Inlet Regional Association members, 1109 are active of three gear types:

590 – set net beach fishing businesses

502 - drift boat fishing businesses

17 – seine boat fish businesses

Only the 17-seine boat have limited access IF the Tutka pink hatchery opens to them. CIAA takes the lions share.

The remaining 1092 have no access which gives special fishing privileges to only 1% of the 1109 Area H Cook Inlet Fishing businesses. It excludes access to 99%, yet makes them pay 2% of their harvest each year.

Drift and most set net gear types are limited to fishing outside any fishery that is supposed to be benefited by the CIAA hatchery programs of Tutka Bay, Port Graham, nor Trail Lakes hatchery remote releases of: Resurrection Bay, Bear Lake, Leisure Lake, Hazel Lake, Tutka Bay. These are all designed to serve the interests of the Lower Cook Inlet seine fleet, but paid for by all Inlet salmon fishermen

Since 2008, CIAA Annual Reports have obscured details of CIAA programs, wasting valuable revenue on expensive meaningless glossy public relations presentations that divert its membership, while deleting disturbing financial information of the chronic insolvency precipitating over \$16,000,000 in loans that few even know about.

Each Regional Aquaculture Association is different and has different preferences for beneficial uses. For instance, PWS Regional Association prefers pink salmon, while 200 miles away the Cook Inlet regions x vessel value is made up of only 1.7% pink salmon. Cook Inlet preference is sockeye is for wild sockeye.

The Tutka hatchery has never been wildly successful. It doesn't support a financially lucrative fishery such as hatchery fisheries in Prince William Sound or southeast Alaska. Most year the fish caught there are simply used to support CIAA operations and result in a financial loss. The Tutka fishery therefore primarily supports seiners contracted to catch fish made by the hatchery to keep the hatchery running. CIAA describes how this hatchery also supports the China Poot dip net fishery. A small personal use fishery is of great value and I don't dispute that.

But it isn't fair to have the burden for it placed on a skiff fisherman such as myself who subsidize it and lose income to support it. In all other areas where hatcheries support commercial fisheries such as in Prince William Sound and Southeast Alaska all the area participants who pay for the operation are able to participate in the harvest. And ½ to 2/3 of the production are available for harvest. This is in no way reflected in CIAA hatchery fisheries

Ecologically speaking Tutka Bay is a shallow lagoon with limited currents and upwellings. Hatcheries throughout Alaska are situated in deep water embayment with rich upwellings to contribute nutrients to growing salmon. In contrast operation of the Tutka hatchery has a negative impact on the lagoon, and simply is not located in a setting conducive to hatchery production.

Concurrently flooding millions of pink salmon fry that begin growing and feeding in Kachemak Bay is prohibitive to the recovery and growth of our shrimp and crab populations here in the Bay which were historically of legendary proportions and supported a large small boat fleet and multiple processors.

CIAA has wasteful processes that also includes dumping of fish waste in Tutka Bay. I see this every year fishing my IFQ halibut out of my skiff in Tutka Bay. We also know there is increasing concern over how flooding the north pacific with billions of pink salmon fry out compete wild stocks and have contributed to reduced size. In my short life-time I have seen the size of big Kenai sockeye and king salmon shrink, as I know have many others.

I would urge you to consider this range of issues in considering this Bill. I would support CIAA moving their operation to a more suitable setting on the outer coast, and scaled enhancement and habitat improvement in wild systems in this area. Though I likely would not benefit from these actions, I would no longer be negatively impacted by the Tutka Bay Lagoon. Alternatively, if the Lower Cook Inlet seine Fleet was singularly responsible for a hatchery in a suitable area to supports a seine fishery I would support that action.

CIAA does operate a hatchery in the deep waters of Port Graham. Tutka Bay lagoon operations could be shifted there, if they had community buy-in from the Port Gamble and Nanwalek federally recognized Tribes

There are alternatives to the Tutka Bay Lagoon hatchery available to CIAA. CIAA have failed to turn a profit in Tutka and have millions of dollars in outstanding loans to the State to the detriment of the lagoon, and fishermen like myself who are paying with our losses to support the Lower Cook Inlet seine fleet, and who will be liable if/when CIAA goes bankrupt.

I urge you to consider that this action does not necessarily support Homer's fisherman as much as it is presented as such by a small sector. Virtually all my income contributes to the Homer economy. I hope you are able to consider this issue with an open mind as you consider the implications of HB 52.

I support my fellow Inlet area fishermen including Lower Inlet seine fisherman on many conservation issues we work on together such as halibut management, Concurrently I believe they are aware of the impacts the hatchery has on our fishery and the inequity of having all Cook Inlet fisherman pay for a hatchery that is supposed to benefit them. Thus I do not support HB 52 and appreciate your consideration of my comments on this issue

Please consider our opposition to HB 52. We prefer to preserve the integrity of Kachemack Bay Park and re-purpose the idle hatchery facilities for park related purposes.

Jere Murray, Seldovia

Sandra Murray, Seldovia

Please support House Bill 52 as amended:

Dear Chair and Committee members,

I'm a life-long Alaskan, and nearly 60 resident of Kachemak Bay, currently living in Homer (since 1974). I grew up in an area directly bordering what is now Kachemak Bay State Park. I feel a strong attachment to this Park and surrounding areas. I've spent many days in Tutka Bay, both before and after the advent of the Tutka Bay Lagoon Hatchery. If one didn't know the Hatchery were there, one wouldn't be aware of it while exploring the greater expanse of Tutka Bay. Only when one goes into the Lagoon, itself, do you become aware of the facility. And since I only enter the Lagoon when chasing fish, it hardly seems to me to be a "scar on the viewscape". Most people I know who go into the Lagoon are doing so to catch fish – the overwhelming majority are sport fishermen, from what I've observed. Obviously, the Hatchery facilitates this endeavor.

I also work for a seafood processing company as a Fleet Manager. This job lets me work from my home in Homer rather than being at sea all the time, as I did for 5 decades prior. If the Hatchery were to be shut down, my job would become tenuous at best. The fleet I manage counts, in no small part, on the future success of Tutka Bay Lagoon Hatchery and the fish stocks it provides or enhances. (Sockeye as well as Pink salmon). If the Hatchery were to be forced to close, many of these boats would move to other areas in Alaska to make their livelihood. And so would go my job.

I appeal to you to support HB52.

Thank you,

Bob Nathanson

907-299-3791

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Re: Support for HB52

Dear Speaker Stutes and Members of the House Fisheries Committee,

As a resident of the Homer area and commercial salmon seining owner/operator in Kodiak, it is clear that the Tutka Bay Lagoon Hatchery benefits both subsistence and commercial user groups. It enables residents of the area to access sockeye salmon to fill their freezers with, critical in an era where the resource is more competitively sought after than ever statewide.

The Lower Cook Inlet seine fishery is one of the most locally owned salmon fisheries in the state and the benefits of the hatchery returns are of direct and positive effect to the residents of Homer.

Thank you for your consideration,

Myles Purington

F/V Nomad

Homer, AK

Dean Natural Resource Committee-

Thank you for the opportunity to submit input on HB52. My name is Chase Lamborn. I represent myself. I am a researcher out of Utah State University and I have been conducting research on the Kenai Peninsula over the last two years.

I have provided below a brief overview of the published research on how hatchery pink salmon have likely been affecting other fish populations. As with all research, these results are not 'fact' but they do indicate that hatchery pink salmon are affecting natural salmon populations. Therefore, I oppose HB52 to reduce the number of hatchery pink salmon putting pressure on natural salmon populations.

Hatchery programs between Alaska, Japan, and Russia have released an annual average of 4.4 billion salmon into the North Pacific Ocean between 1990-2015 (Ruggerone and Irvine, 2018). Because of hatchery-origin salmon, the abundance of pink, chum, and sockeye salmon in the North Pacific Ocean is higher now than at any time since the collection of relatively comprehensive statistics began in 1925; and now hatchery salmon represent approximately 40% of all chum, pink, and sockeye salmon biomass for the region (Ruggerone and Irvine, 2018). Researchers have continually found a correlation between the number of hatchery-released fish and the decline in natural-origin salmon size and age at maturity.

Looking at 90-years of data, Ruggerone and Irvine (2018) found a strong negative correlation between the number of hatchery-origin salmon and average adult salmon weight and length, specifically finding that weight has gone down with the increase in hatchery fish. Other research has also found correlations between these two factors (see Debertin et al., 2017; Hilborn and Eggers, 2000; Lewis et al., 2015; Ruggerone et al., 2016; Shaul and Geiger, 2016). However, as the director of Fisheries Research of Alaska Department of Fish and Game said to the Board of Fish, “correlation is not causation” (Medred, 2021). Recent research is documenting how interactions between the two variables are more complicated because of several confounding factors (Ward et al., 2017). Oke et al. (2021) found hatchery production alone accounted for only a small amount of the total variance in the declines of adult salmon size; however, hatchery pink salmon abundance was the only variable negatively related to salmon body size in chinook, chum, sockeye, and coho salmon. Salmon dynamics in the ocean are difficult to research; however, most of the research is showing that hatchery-origin salmon are likely contributing to density-dependent dynamics in the ocean and negatively affecting natural, wild salmon populations.

References

- Ruggerone, G. T., & Irvine, J. R. (2018). Numbers and Biomass of Natural- and Hatchery-Origin Pink Salmon, Chum Salmon, and Sockeye Salmon in the North Pacific Ocean, 1925–2015. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries*, 10(2), 152–168. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mcf2.10023>
- Debertin, A. J., Irvine, J. R., Holt, C. A., Oka, G., & Trudel, M. (2017). Marine growth patterns of southern British Columbia chum salmon explained by interactions between density-dependent competition and changing climate. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 74(7), 1077–1087. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2016-0265>
- Hilborn, R., & Eggers, D. (2000). A Review of the Hatchery Programs for Pink Salmon in Prince William Sound and Kodiak Island, Alaska. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 129(2), 333–350. [https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8659\(2000\)129<0333:AROTHP>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8659(2000)129<0333:AROTHP>2.0.CO;2)
- Lewis, B., Grant, W. S., Brenner, R. E., & Hamazaki, T. (2015). Changes in Size and Age of Chinook Salmon *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* Returning to Alaska. *PLOS ONE*, 10(6), e0130184. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0130184>
- Ruggerone, G. T., B. A. Agler, B. Connors, E. V. Farley Jr., J. R. Irvine, L. Wilson, and E. M. Yasumiishi (2016). Competition between Pink and Sockeye salmon at sea and its influence on Bristol Bay Sockeye Salmon forecast error. *North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission Bulletin* 6: 349– 361.

Shaul, L. D., and H. J. Geiger. 2016. Effects of climate and competition for offshore prey on growth, survival, and reproductive potential of Coho Salmon in Southeast Alaska. North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission Bulletin 6: 329– 347.

Ward, E. J., Adkison, M., Couture, J., Dressel, S. C., Litzow, M. A., Moffitt, S., Neher, T. H., Trochta, J., & Brenner, R. (2017). Evaluating signals of oil spill impacts, climate, and species interactions in Pacific herring and Pacific salmon populations in Prince William Sound and Copper River, Alaska. PLOS ONE, 12(3), e0172898. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0172898>

Oke, K. B., Cunningham, C. J., Westley, P. A. H., Baskett, M. L., Carlson, S. M., Clark, J., Hendry, A. P., Karatayev, V. A., Kendall, N. W., Kibele, J., Kindsvater, H. K., Kobayashi, K. M., Lewis, B., Munch, S., Reynolds, J. D., Vick, G. K., & Palkovacs, E. P. (2020). Recent declines in salmon body size impact ecosystems and fisheries. Nature Communications, 11(1), 4155. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17726-z>

~~~~~

Chase C. Lamborn

---

Thank you, Mr Chair and members of the committee. My name is Kasey Aderhold. I was born, raised, and I am a resident of Homer Alaska. I am representing myself and I am in opposition to House Bill 52.

This is a park issue and I would advise that it be settled as such. It doesn't make sense to cut out an oversized chunk of the park (temporarily or permanently) just because the hatchery isn't in compliance with the new management plan. Kachemak Bay State Park is a unique and important environment, and we don't want to get this wrong. I think it is worth taking the time to explore our options that do not resort to removal of this land from park management.

House Bill 52 is too rash and sets a bad precedent for all of our parks. Park management plans must be able to be developed without fear that conflicts with narrow interests may end up in a loss of park land that is meant for the good of the public.

The hatchery has been given ten years of continued operations in which a solution could be sought out. The Bay, the creatures that live there, including myself, the future of fisheries within it... these are all worth taking the time and energy to get it right while keeping the park intact for the highest and best use of the land. I respectfully encourage Representative Vance to withdraw House Bill 52. Thank you for your time and consideration of this testimony.

Sincerely,

Kasey Aderhold

--

Kasey Aderhold, Ph.D. Earth Sciences

[kasey.aderhold@gmail.com](mailto:kasey.aderhold@gmail.com)

---

Delayna West  
I support HB 52  
Thank you

Sent from my iPhone

---

I support HB 52.  
I support Tutka Bay Hatchery and the Alaska Hatchery programs.

Sonja Nelson  
Homer, Alaska

Sent from my iPhone

---

To whom it may concern:

I have lived in Alaska since 1976. One of our most unique resources is the State Park System. From Wood River-Tikchik to Kachemak Bay State Park, I have visited many. I have also visited Tutka Bay Lagoon and believe it is one of the Kachemak State Park's jewels. To give the 124 acre Tutka Bay Lagoon area to CIAA is ridiculous and outrageous. To further defile the action by calling it a "trade" for a parking lot 20 or so miles away is ludicrous. Based on the financial figures it appears that the Tutka Bay Lagoon Hatchery is an annual loser and has far outlived its useful life. From a fishery management perspective it is no better.

This boondoggle needs to go away. As an Alaskan sportsman, I do not support HB52 and need to see the Legislature publicly discuss this bill with financial, economic and fishery management facts explored. They then need to vote for Alaskan sportsmen and fishermen based on those facts, not based on corporate lobbying.

Barry Santana

3397 N Meadow Lakes Dr

Wasilla, AK 99623

and Pedro Bay, AK 99647

---

To whom it concerns,

I support HB52. Tutka Lagoon Hatchery is important to my livelihood and my family. I support solving the legal land issues.

Kindest regards,

Lisa Airaudi

Sent from my smartphone

---

Hello!

I support HB52. Protect Tutka Lagoon Hatchery!

Alaskan citizen,

Julia

---

I would like to write to support HB 52. I support Tutka Bay hatchery and the hatchery program in the state. Tutka benefits personal use, subsistence, sport, and commercial fishing. This is a common sense approach to clarify and simplify operations. ADFG should have the direct oversight of Tutka as hatchery operations fall under their authority. Thank you. Tom Nelson. Homer, AK

Sent from my iPhone

---

Please protect Tutka lagoon hatchery. So many benefit when this project is managed well.

Thank you for your hard work!

Daniel

Sent from my iPhone

---

Unitarian Universalists of Homer P.O. Box 15332 Fritz Creek, AK 99603 (907)491-1355  
UUHomer@gmail.com

February 11, 2022

House Resources Committee: House.resources@akleg.gov Chair Rep.josiah.patkotak@akleg.gov  
Rep.Calvin.Schrage@akleg.gov, Rep.Mike.Cronk@akleg.gov, Rep.Zack.Fields@akleg.gov,

Rep.Ronald.Gillham@akleg.gov, Rep.Sara.Hannan@akleg.gov,

Rep.Grier.Hopkins@akleg.gov, Rep.Thomas.McKay@akleg.gov,

Rep.George.Rauscher@akleg.gov, House Speaker: Representative.Louise.Stutes@akleg.gov, President of the Senate: Senator.peter.micciche@akleg.gov Homer Senator Senator.Gary.Stevens@akleg.gov

RE: House Bill No. 52(Fsh) In The Legislature Of The State Of Alaska Thirty-Second

Legislature - Second Session By The House Special Committee On Fisheries

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above legislation which would remove

2

approximately 123 acres from Kachemak Bay State Park that the Tutka Bay Lagoon Hatchery (TBLH) sits on, basically handing the site over to the contractor, Cook Inlet Aquaculture Association (CIAA). This misguided Bill falsely implies that China Poot sockeye run depends on the Tutka Bay Lagoon Hatchery; violates the authorizing legislation for the Kachemak Bay State Park (KBSP) and Critical Habitat Area (KBSHA; would continue to threaten salmon and other habitat through the disease-producing operation of TBLH; and would do little for the economy of the Kachemak Bay area. Our specific comments are as follows:

#### I. HB-52 Violates the Purpose and Intent of the KBSP Implementing Statute

The Alaska state legislature mandates that the lands and waters of KBSP be managed as a

scenic park “in order to protect and preserve this land and water for its unique and exceptional scenic value.” AS 41.21.131(a). The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) has determined that the operations of TBLH directly conflicts with this mandate by producing an infectious Viral disease called Hematopietic Necrosis that makes production of salmon species other than Pinks impossible. The 1998 Tutka Hatchery Annual Management Plan and Reports (FMR) 07-42, signed by top ADF&G staff and deputy commissioner, states:

“Due to problems associated with securing a disease-free water, ‘Efforts to incubate and rear sockeye were plagued by the infectious hematopoietic necrosis virus (IHNV) in the Tutka hatchery, the experimental sockeye program was relatively short lived, suspended in 1998.’”

As a result, the Alaska Department of Natural Resources (ADNR) proposed park plan concludes that the TBLH is incompatible with the statutory purpose, intent, and definition of KBSP and that TBLH is operating under an illegal Interagency Land Management Assignment.

#### II. The Land Exchange Does not Cure the Unconstitutional Disposal of Legislatively

Designated Lands

According to the legal team researching HB 52:

When the Alaska Legislature created KBSP in 1970 these lands were withdrawn from the public domain and designated as special purpose sites under Article VIII, section 7 of the Alaska Constitution. Being legislatively designated lands, the executive branch is prohibited from disposing of any real property interests, including granting leases and easements.

...There are currently two legal issues with the Tutka Bay Hatchery within the Kachemak Bay State Park:

1. The hatchery constitutes an unconstitutional disposal of legislatively designated lands; and

3

2. Because the hatchery constitutes a disposal of legislatively designated lands, it requires an LWCF (Land and Water Conservation Fund) conversion to cure the disposal. A conversion includes finding alternate lands that can be added to Kachemak State Park and thus “replace” the state park lands “lost” by the hatchery.

House Bill 52 Sponsor Statement.

According to the HB 52 Sponsors, therefore, the unconstitutional disposal is cured

by including a land swap in the Bill that exchanges TBLH lands with Kachemak Bay State Park with other state lands. These lands include

...three parcels (A-C on the map) totaling approximately 266.67 acres in the Cottonwood-Eastland unit of the park. These parcels are contiguous with a portion of KBSP on the north side of Kachemak Bay about 17 miles northeast of Homer near East End Road. Parcel A would provide much needed road-based access to the underutilized Cottonwood Eastland unit of the park, offering enhanced recreational opportunities. Parcels B and C would connect adjacent portions of KBSP harmonizing park management objectives. HB 52 – Tutka Bay Lagoon Hatchery – Sponsored by Rep. Vance Briefing Paper

Contrary to this claim, however, Parcel B & C are not Legislatively Designated Park Lands. Parcel B already has a deed restriction designating it to be managed by State Parks. Similarly, Parcel C is already a conservation easement recorded in 1997 which delegates responsibility to DNR to manage the property as part of KBSP and includes the right of public access for ingress and egress over and through the parcel for the benefit of the general public.

### III. China Poot Sockeye

The Sponsors of HB-52 falsely claims that the diseased, insolvent TBLH provides fish to the popular China Poot sockeye commercial and dipnet fishery. However, because TBLH cannot successfully produce Sockeye, it could not possibly support the China Poot Bay fishery. In fact, in 2004, CIAA ended all of its TBLH annual full-sockeye salmon incubation and release programs and has yet to reinstitute them while it continues to search for a sockeye friendly freshwater release site. According to CIAA Director Dean Day: “... the sockeye broodstock at Tutka Lagoon has been challenging for a number of reasons ... as far back as 2014, we have searched for alternate locations. Port Graham was not successful for a number of reasons related to the volume of freshwater available. Kirshner has been investigated, but it’s a challenge. ...To date, we’ve been unable to locate an area.” Instead, according to ADF&G, the Sockeye that benefit the China Poot run come from Trail Lakes Hatchery near Moose Pass. In fact, rather than support the China

4

Poot Fishery, the continued operation at TBLH actually harms sockeye in general. An ADF&G Pathology Evaluation regarding the Hatchery previously stated: Even the shallow warming “salt water lagoon release site” that flows into Tutka Bay poses deadly problems for sockeye. The lagoon is shallow warming saltwater. Sockeye require freshwater. So, CIAA uses artificial lensing bags (a fake lake, floating

kiddy pool) that unfortunately also contributes to sockeye mortality. According to ADF&G's Glenn Hollowell "In many years, interruption of freshwater flow into the lensing bag, or breach in the lensing bag, has resulted in levels of mortality exceeding 30% minimum survival specified in 5 AAC 40.860." 2018 FMR 19-23. Finally, the Tutka hatchery has damaged the carrying capacity of the Bay and kills fish by causing poor saltwater circulation and low oxygen. Hollowell states "Sunny conditions combined with low tides resulted in anoxic conditions in the lagoon, causing the death of these fish during low tide cycles ... very large numbers of decaying carcasses in Tutka Lagoon Creek, resulted in significant mortality." Ibid. IV. The TBLH Does not Benefit the Local Economy That the sponsors of HB-52 claim that the TBLH is worth "saving" because "Alaska's salmon hatcheries account for the annual equivalent of nearly 5,000 jobs and \$218 million in total labor income, including all direct, indirect, and induced economic impacts. A total of \$600 million in annual economic output is connected to Alaska salmon hatchery production" Representative Sarah Vance, House District 31, House Bill 52 Sponsor Statement Session (January-April). While other hatcheries located in Alaska, such as the Solomon Gulch hatchery located in the Port of Valdez which regularly obtains a 11% return from salmon smolt releases, may contribute to these economic benefits, TBLH, which achieves about a 2% return, has been an economic disaster. Since 1991, when CIAA partnered with the state to operate the Hatchery, it has experienced a minimum annual loss of \$9 million dollars. This may have something to do with the fact that the Hatchery is currently operating without a business plan, or profit and loss statement. Other costs of the Hatchery include DNR and ADF&G administration including permitting planning teams, otolith recovery, annual reports, money borrowed by CIAA, and defending against lawsuits filed by the litigious CIAA so that it can continue to maintain its destructive environmental and economical practices within the State Park. Only about 20 commercial fishing boats benefit from HB 52. In fact, over the 30 years the hatchery has been in operation, only 11% of its meager returns have been harvested by anyone other than TBLH. Most of the fish have been harvested by CIAA in an attempt to cover operating expenses for the Tutka Hatchery. Despite this income, CIAA is indebted to the state in the amount of \$16 million, with most of the debt ultimately falling on the back of Cook Inlet commercial fishing families. These same commercial fishermen, who benefit from almost none

5

of the fish coming from TBLH, have contributed almost \$28 million to CIAA in Salmon Enhancement Taxes over the past 30 years. Clearly, therefore, when the Bill's sponsored claim that "House Bill 52 seeks to save Tutka Bay Lagoon Hatchery," Ibid, this will be at the expense of taxpayers, commercial fisherman and the local economy. Conclusion

HB-52 violates the purpose and intent of the KBSP implementing statute. The land exchange does not cure the unconstitutional disposal of legislatively designated lands because the lands in Eastland Creek – Cottonwood are already legally protected and managed under State Park jurisdiction. Nor does it in any way support the China Poot Sockeye run, and is, in fact, detrimental to Sockeye Salmon in general and is bad for the economy of the Kachemak Bay.

There is a reason that The Kachemak Bay State Park Citizen Advisory Board adopted a resolution in strong opposition to HB 52, and so many commercial and recreational fisherman along with businesses, organizations and individual citizens located in the Kachemak Bay area are opposed to this legislation. HB 52 is irresponsible, anti-commercial fishing, anti-community and presented with false and misleading statements. Please vote against adoption of HB-52 which will benefit only the Tutka Bay Lagoon

Hatchery which is little more than a feed lot that produces a pink salmon monoculture while desecrating the waters of the Kachemak Bay State Park and Critical Habitat Area. Hal Shepherd, Coordinator

---

I would like to voice my support for HB52. I grew up in Homer and on Kachemak Bay. I also grew up both sport and commercial fishing on Kachemak Bay and around the Tutka Bay Hatchery. The first year I fished on my own I ran a small seiner with no living quarters and we literally camped on the beach in Tutka Bay and fished returning pinks to the hatchery. The Tutka Bay hatchery has a long history of contributing opportunities for both sport and commercial fishing as well as contributing to the local economies. HB52 would be a good solution to the controversy created by the radical activists bent on eliminating the hatchery. Ironically many of the activists would actually like the hatchery to continue operating but only for the purpose of providing fish for sport and personal use. Tutka Hatchery provides opportunity for all user groups. Let's put this issue to bed by approving HB52. Thank you

---

Rob Nelson

---

I Homer L Huffman support HB52

As a long time Alaskan I appreciate that we must maintain and continue to improve or salmon stocks. As a commercial fisherman I also see Alaskan salmon stocks as a very important source of income and employment in or great state. This resources feeds many Alaskans, generates income in both sport and commercial fishing, and is enjoyed worldwide as a prized meal. Thank you for your support and have a great day

---

I support HB52. Tutka is very important to the livelihood of my family. I support solving the legal land issue.

The Roth Family

---

I support House bill 52 which will cure the land disposal issue and preserve Tutka Bay hatchery. The Chinapoot dipnetting is a very important thing my family and I rely on. Getting rid of it would greatly affect my life and the peoples lives around me. I'm a homer resident and I support Sarah Vances.

Libby Fabich  
907-299-4471

---

I strongly support HB52.

The Tutka Lagoon Hatchery is vitally important to my family, many of my friends, my employees, and not just the Kenai Peninsula but the entire State of Alaska.

Thousands of Alaskans benefit from the hard work of Cook Inlet Aquiculture which relies heavily on Tutka Hatchery.

If HB52 were to fail I believe the fall out would be massive. The communities of Seward and Homer would be in an uproar at the loss of their sockeye fisheries. Dipnetters and Sport Fishermen from all of

the State would be up in arms at losing fisheries they depend on. Seiners would go out of business. Local economies would be badly hurt.

Unfortunately, a very small group of people has made a lot of noise in opposition even promoting misinformation and trying to mislead the public. Their arguments lack scientific support. They continue to rehash the same rubbish that has been proven wrong. They blow things way out of proportion and turn minor challenges and issues into large untrue lies. Please to not fall for this smoke screen of fake news.

I have fished Kachemak Bay and Cook Inlet for 30 years averaging 80-100 days on the water a year. I have spoken with thousands of Alaskans about these issues. I can guarantee the majority of people are in favor of the hatchery. Most of these do not realize the war going on with the small group in opposition.

Please choose in favor of what is best for Alaskans from all over the State and pass HB52.

Thank you.

Rod Van Saun

“A dead thing can go with the stream, but only a living thing can go against it.” - G.K. Chesterton

Rod Van Saun

F/V Laissez-Faire

Zoenick Fisheries

Cell 907-953-6524

PO Box 39622

Ninilchik, AK 99639

---

Tutka and China poot sockeye are important to me and my family.  
I support this bill.

Brant Roth

Sent from my iPhone  
Representative Vance,

---

I Support HB 52 as a cure to the land disposal issue.

Regards,

Sean Palmer

--

Warm Regards,

/S/

Sean P. Palmer

---

In the late 70s Kachemak Bay was known as "one of the richest Bays in the world." We picked up dungeness crab at low tide, dug huge razor clams, and cooked shrimp on our boat engine blocks. 125 mollusk species were identified in Kachemak Bay never recorded anywhere else on earth. Those species have all but disappeared. Last month an Alaskan Fish and Game Biologist said "We manage by species not ecosystems." It is past time to manage species in light of ecosystems. Seems like Tutka Bay Lagoon would be a perfect place to begin the process.

Over the next 10 years if Tutka Lagoon Hatchery continues its lease from Kachemak Bay State Park they could both become part of a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. Internationally recognized Biosphere Reserves promote solutions reconciling conservation and sustainable development, including conflict prevention and management using best practices. Reserves provide funding and support to promote best practices for sustainable development and help exchange "know how". Kachemak Bay meets all criteria and with time and commitment this designation is possible. UNESCO Biospheres include all interested stakeholders in planning and management. Kachemak Bay Research Reserve, Alaska Maritime Wildlife Refuge, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration are interested in working with the Alaska Department of Natural Resources to make this happen. This is a solution. Tutka Lagoon would be ideal headquarters for the Kachemak Bay UNESCO Biosphere Reserve.

I'd like to personally salute CIAA for supplying Sockeye Salmon to Kachemak Bay over the years. The dip net fishery is one of my very favorite things in life, pretty much pure joy. I am thankful for the time, energy and expertise required and given to make that fishery happen. Finding brood stock has been extremely challenging for Cook Inlet Aquaculture Association making it difficult to enhance salmon production. I know you are aware of the DCCED debt CIAA owes the State of Alaska for over 15 million dollars in loans. They have never missed a loan payment but the loan uses Kachemak Bay State Park land that they lease as collateral, as well as all the permits owned by Cook Inlet Fishermen. The permits,

once worth \$200,000 are now worth \$20,000. For multiple reasons including warming and acidification of the oceans, navy war games in the middle of salmon runs, drilling muds being discarded into Cook Inlet...Cook Inlet Aquaculture is falling further and further in debt and those listed as collateral are responsible for more and more. No wonder DNR and Fish and Game Commissioners want to silence this illegal arrangement. Removing 123 acres of unique and exceptional land from a State Park, (which has the highest level of protection, to benefit all Alaskans ) - in order for a failing business to accumulate more debt - is no solution. It would be good if you legislators could figure out how to get that loan forgiven.

Cook Inlet Aquaculture Association could find a new location for the hatchery over the next 10 years, better suited for harvesting Sockeye salmon eggs. Tutka creek doesn't provide enough fresh water in the Lagoon and the low oxygen content makes it difficult to keep Sockeyes reared at Trail Lakes hatchery alive in net pens. Charging a fee for a China Poot Dip net personal use fishery permit over the next 10 years makes sense, as does a Sockeye Salmon Stamp - like a King Salmon stamp - to help support the well loved fishery. As you know, high-value sockeye salmon, coho, chinook and chum are no longer able to be produced at the Tutka Lagoon Hatchery due to the Infectious Hematopoietic Necrosis Virus (IHNV) that infects the fish. Due to poor water quality, it can now only produce pink salmon (much lower value than reds or silvers). This pink salmon monoculture makes it difficult for wild salmon species, clams, crab, shrimp and others to survive (and impossible to flourish) due to competition, lack of oxygen and food. Pinks retail for 1\$ a pound, Dungeness crab go for \$30 a pound. Spot shrimp \$25 a pound. There is currently no market for pinks in Kachemak Bay. Fish feces and carcasses don't flush out of the shallow lagoon well. Seine boats can't access the lagoon for most of a tide cycle.

A committee designated by the Legislature to assist in finding a better location would be very helpful. The biodiversity so vital to the future of Kachemak Bay is at stake here.

Please dedicate the land that is already in the process of being conveyed to the Park out East End Road, in a separate bill. It is in no way equivalent to the highly valued scenic waterfront property of Tutka Lagoon.

Thank you for your service and consideration.

Sue Christiansen

907-299-3944

---