

Dear Legislators,

As you can see from my previous email concerning SB 158, I expressed support for the legislation. However, with new developments concerning proposal 192 from the Board of Fish, I must withdraw my support for SB 158.

Just this last week I learned that the Board of Fish is proposing replacing set nets in the ESSN fishery with a very limited number of beach seine nets that will be 70 fathoms in length. The suggested number of beach seines is only 35-50. This will displace over 1300 set nets in the new proposed administrative area. Out of 442 permit holders, only 35-50 will be allowed to fish with beach seines. The allocation of these beach seines will be determined on if a permit holder holds a DNR beach shore lease. Alaska statutes state that possession of a DNR Shore lease IS NOT a requirement to fish in the set net fishery. The BOF generated proposal 192 out of cycle as the Cook Inlet Area meeting will be held next year and proposed beach seines should be discussed during that meeting. Not in a special meeting where oral arguments will not be heard on May 1.

If SB 158 is passed and the BOF passes proposal 192, then about 90 percent of the permit holders in the New Administrative Area WILL NOT get to fish or have a say in how the New Administrative Area will be prosecuted. The proposed new administrative area was not proposed in order to allocate the whole area to just a few beach fishermen and take future benefit from the others. If beach seines are implemented, then 600 ft offsets will be enforced that will also place any commercial dipnets well over 1200 ft from shore where in the past two years commercial dipnet fishermen typically fish within 100 feet from shore in skiffs. Set beach seines will kill the dipnet fishery.

By implementing a new administrative area and if proposal 192 is passed by the BOF, over 90% of the permit holders will be trapped in a no win situation and those permits will have little economic value.

Sincerely,

Russell Clark

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

On Thursday, March 26, 2026, 1:34 PM, Cheryn Clark <clark.farms@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Legislators,

As an ESSN permit holder and also my wife being a multiple permit holder, and two daughter that are both ESSN permit holders, we have some questions concerning SB 158.

- 1). There are currently about 442 permits may cause holders in the ESSN fishery. Will SB 158 reduce the number of permit holders and cause an influx of permits moved to other Cook Inlet fishing districts such as the Northern District, West Side, Kalgin Island, and Southern District that do not have the salmon run strengths to support an influx of permits without imposing possible future restrictions in these districts? The creation of a new administrative area does not need to be the cause of future fishery problems in other districts that already are fishing under restrictions.
- 2). Is there a mechanism that is fair to all permit holders in this bill when it comes to the reduction of permits where all permit holders are treated equally?
- 3). Are proposed beach seines going to be a factor in future permit reductions?

We are for the passage of SB 158 but it is important that its passage does not adversely affect other fishing districts and that all permits holders in the new administrative area are treated fairly.

Thank You,
Russell Clark
Kenai

To Honorable Louise Stutes and members of the House Fisheries Committee, my name is Mark Ducker. I fish in the Upper Cook Inlet set gillnet fishery would like to address some key issues with Senate Bill 158. I would strongly suggest this bill be assigned to every committee and let it die the death it is warranted. If this is a prelude to another ill-thought-out buyback program, it should die until the entire program is put to a vote for all owners of these permits to determine interest and funding. Otherwise, you are damaging the value of my permit and sites without reason or cause and will result in numerous lawsuits challenging this action.

- The current bill sponsor has a conflict of interest. The current bill sponsor, Senator Bjorkman, presently holds two Cook Inlet drift fishing permits and stands to gain significantly from this bill passing. Though it should be, this conflict of interest has not been presently disclosed.

- While I fail to see how, I have read that this change to CFEC permits is in the public interest.
- This bill took place without public meetings, was not stated to the public, and was not discussed with the public.
- With this bill being in the public's interest and being portrayed as a great idea; I am concerned as to why the senator felt the need to handle this with such secrecy.

This bill does not address sustained yield or how Salmon stocks, that are presently over escaping to unprecedented and unsustainable levels, will be controlled for sustained yield. In reference to at least three ADFG reports, there is a gross over escapement of Sockeye Salmon into the Kenai and Kasilof rivers. These levels are **UNSUSTAINABLE**.

A 300 percent Sockeye escapement, three times over the goal, into one of the rivers and a 500 percent escapement into the other showing well above the max escapement goal which is completely unsustainable.

The current large fish King Salmon goal is higher than the original all fish goal used to be and the probability of large fish was not considered when setting this goal. With at best only about fifty percent of fish being large.

Eastside Cook Inlet is the only area with paired restrictions. This is allowing all other user groups to fish while only singling out the beach fishers.

- The root of the problem is the large King Salmon goal being in place. I point out that this is the only area in the state where this is being done.

— Before any changes can be made to the Limited Entry Program, resulting in statewide implications, an independent review of the sonar program and reduction of the large fish goal must take place. Large fish make up a significantly low portion of the King Salmon population resulting in all remaining King Salmon to be unaccounted for and resulting in a violation of sustained yield management.

— According to statements made by ADFG, their sonar program has significant limitations consisting of: Issues with fish saturation

— Significant boat traffic

— Orientation of fish

— This is a Constitutional violation seen here by the defining of Stock. Stock is defined as: **A locally interbreeding group of Salmon distinguished by unique genetic, phenotypic, life-history, or habit characteristics.**

— All age classes and entire stock must be considered when setting escapement goals.

—

— The economy of fishermen's boroughs and the state are being harmed and should not be overlooked any longer.