

To: Fisheries Special Committee - Rep. Steve Thompson (Chairman), Rep. Craig Johnson, Rep. Scott Kawasaki, Rep. Alan Austerman, Rep. Bob Herron, Rep. Lance Pruitt, and Rep. Bob Miller

I ask you to OPPOSE HB 20

Once, again it is an attempt at reinstating an already failed House Bill, known as HB 266, for the purpose of overturning the Board of Fisheries decision on Proposal 201 that was decided on March 21, 2010.

To have the Board of Fisheries place restrictions on all other non-subsistence fisheries before restricting personal use fisheries when a harvest of a stock or species is limited; will bring detrimental consequences.


For, example if you consider the Chitina Subdistrict there are approximately 8,000 personal use dipnetters. If, those personal use fishers are not restricted when a harvest of a stock or species is limited; this proposal by de facto (being such in effect though not formally recognized) can place the personal use dipnet fishery at a higher priority than the subsistence users of the Glennallen Subdistrict, due to the Chitina Subdistrict's proximity to run timing. House Bill 20 will contradict the Board of Fisheries decision of Proposal 201. Proposal 201 dubbed the Chitina Subdistrict as an area for an outdoorsmen lifestyle and the dip netting that takes place is seen as a recreational activity; while the Glennallen Subdistrict, was dubbed as an area for people who live a "subsistence way of life."

Implementation of HB 20 will no longer allow for a sharing of the burden of conservation. Without sharing the burden of conservation among commercial, personal use, and sport fisheries will add to the pressure on the fishers who are trying to make a livelihood from Alaska's resources. Section 15 of Article 8 places the State with the obligation to prevent economic distress among fishermen and those dependent upon them for a livelihood. Allowing the Chitina Subdistrict personal use dipnet fishery, to have higher priority over commercial and sport will bring detrimental social and economic ramifications for the community of Cordova.

In order to share the burden of conservation we need to keep "preferences among beneficial users" in place. All Alaska residents have reasonable opportunity and "equal access" to engage in subsistence, commercial, personal use, or sport fisheries, and the necessary requirements are in place to sustain a healthy resource for all users. We need to remember the original intent of "personal use", which is to allow Alaskan residents reasonable opportunity to harvest in a time of abundance.

Thank you for this time to testify, and again please OPPOSE HB 20.

Sincerely,

X 

Eric C. Lian

CDFU Gillnet Division Chair

E-mail: best.salmon.llc@gmail.com