

BOF Shellfish Comments:

Proposals 58, 59, 60: support

Our members believe that the 3S management standing for size, sex, and season manages the Dungeness crab fishery very well. We want a set summer and fall season like the rest of the west coast. We are in favor of repealing the tier system in place.

Proposal 69: support

In general, we support opening waters to our fisherman and oppose closing them.

Proposal 70-79: oppose

We represent a lot of guys and we don't think waters should be closed unless there is a conservation issue and then it needs to be closed to everyone. These opportunities are big to us. We have been fishing there for a long time, if the department doesn't see a problem there is no reason to kick us out. Also, Dungeness is an entry level fishery for younger generations that can afford an open skiff and small pot permits. Closing these waters would eliminate this opportunity to break into the fishing industry. Commercial fishermen have the opportunity to fish these areas for a few months out of the year. Personal use fishermen get 365 days a year in these areas.

Proposals 80-81: oppose

George Inlet already has a super exclusive fishery; our guys feel they should be content.

Proposal 82: oppose

No one needs that much gear to catch their limit.

Proposal 83: oppose

This could create an opportunity for people to illegally wet store their red crab until it opens on July 1.

Proposal 84: support

This fishery won't open as the regulations stand because the commissioner would have no control over how many boats would participate. We support allowing the commissioner to control how many permits would be given out.

Proposal 85: support

We want the department to be able to get more information on the fishery through logbooks.

Proposal 86: no position

Proposal 87: no position

Proposal 88: oppose

The use of cod pots could create a condition where tanners could be wet stored illegally

Proposal 89: oppose

We are concerned it would open in the Cape Spencer gully which is deep and is great for long line. That would make major gear conflict. Furthermore, there are great bays around this area which enables our smaller boats to long line here and have a place to anchor. A lot of small boats can fish there for longline and can't handle the gear conflict. They don't have the hydraulic power to deal with pot snarls. Also, our members are concerned that if this area was open during crab the crab caught here may be taken off the Icy Straight quota. We have guys that traditionally fish there and they shouldn't lose quota to this area.

Proposal 90: no position

Proposal 91: support

This is housekeeping and we support the department with it.

Proposal 92: oppose

We don't see a reason to change the current size limit.

Proposal 93: support

Proposal 94: oppose

The spawner index is the management style in Canada and their stocks have been decreasing for several years now.

Proposal 95: no position

Proposal 96: support

We would like the department to be able to conduct experimental management throughout all for southeast for shrimp, like they have in districts 6 and 7. We feel that the shrimp fishery needs more management.

Proposal 97: support

Some areas of district 1 are never fished because it is shut down before fishermen have a chance to move to these areas. This is a huge district and shouldn't be closed after a small portion has been fished.

Proposal 98: support

Catcher-processors are already doing this. We would like the department to get size-mix information from all shrimp fishermen.

Proposal 99: oppose

This would lead to more double hauling. Double hauling leads to an increased catch of small shrimp because they have not had time to sort themselves out on the bottom. Also, proposed reduction does not reduce the pot number by the same ratio for small and large pots. Shrimp fishermen should be able to choose how they want their long line set up. There doesn't need to be a regulation on it.

Proposal 100: oppose

We would like our guys to be able to carry a dungy pot for sport use and also fish the maximum allowable amount of shrimp pots.

Proposal 101: oppose

There is no way to know how many shrimp of the currently targeted shrimp fishery would be caught incidentally. Shrimp caught for personal use aren't even reported currently.

Proposal 102: no position

Proposal 103: oppose

We don't want to put a vessel length cap on shrimp trawlers. We have members with a boat larger than 65' that would like to be able to participate in this fishery.

Proposal 104: support

These regulations would prevent huge boats from controlling the shrimp beam trawl fishery. We want to see this fishery available to the small local fleet. This proposal would prevent a reoccurrence of what happened in Yakutat.

Proposal 105: no position

Proposal 106: support

We support the creation of a shrimp beam trawl task force

Proposal 107: oppose

Sport and personal use fisherman can set their shrimp pots in these waters 365 days a year. There is no reason not to allow commercial fisherman to fish it for a few weeks out of the year. Also, there is no conservation issue here. If there were it should be shut down to everyone.

Proposal 113: oppose

There is no biological reason to create a conservation area here. There are no endangered species in these waters that would be protected by it.