

I am writing in support of HB 117. Anyone that has participated in Alaska commercial fishing knows there is one universal truth about fishing operations, there are no two operations alike. This makes it hard to write policies and laws that are all inclusive. HB 117 addresses the specific situation that occurs in set gillnetting in coop fishing. When I talked to a trooper this spring in Juneau, his comment was that he had not seen this type of operation before in Southeast. I was surprised, as our family begins our 60<sup>th</sup> year of operation next summer. Our first two permits were signed up for, not purchased. Our next two were purchased in the seventies. Since then, our family has fished four permits cooperatively which have since been transferred to children and grandchildren. Members of our family are at the fish site for the entire fishing season.

As a stay at home mom, on the shore, please don't insult me and generations of others by insinuating that I don't participate in the fishery because I am not in the skiff every pick. Those are fighting words to moms around the globe, not just at fish sites. Set netting is a shore based operation and my position as shore manager/cook/tender liaison/HR director/safety officer/paramedic/mechanic/the list could go on, is a necessary position. Not only does it make operations run smoothly, it is a safety issue to have someone on the beach to find the tender or guide skiffs safely to shore in bad weather. When it's dark and rough, I am the one on the beach with a light guiding the skiffs to shore. More than once, I have been the one on the radio able to communicate when the skiffs on the water needed assistance and could not reach anyone else because of location or bad weather, not just for our operation but others. It is **impractical and dangerous** and not beneficial to the fishery. So, unless you want to insult your mom, don't go there.

Obviously we have had our permits a while. The practice of combining fish caught on multiple permits onto one permit for delivery is not setting a new precedence. When we started, tenders came around at all hours to your holding skiff where you pitched your fish onto the tender by spearing them with a pugh then tossing them onto the tender, and definitely not separating them by permit. **This is our history and our precedence.** We have operated for a long, long time (And also, reported by my father-in-law, this was before they could afford rain gear, they wore aprons from the butcher.) To separate the fish by permit would again be **impractical and sometimes dangerous**, either causing skiffs to list because of imbalances or placing fishermen in peril in big waves having skiffs bang together to sort fish accordingly, or increasing fatigue because of increased work and time. As members of the fishing community, you understand the value of safety and also the value of rest, and definitely that time=money.

The fish caught are reported correctly by location to ADF&G. The permit holders are present at the fish site. Sometimes we're just not in the skiff. Typically, every year I end up in the skiff picking fish for some reason, someone leaves for school, is hurt, needs to do something on shore. Here comes the third string. As a result, I do get a few deliveries on my permit. I've tried retiring from picking fish at least 20 times.

Please support HB 117. It is the safest and most practical, has legal precedence as evidenced by historical operation, has the least impact to carbon footprint and is the best practice for the fishery.

Lauren Haughey