

CTA Board

November 24, 2014

Hello again already,

I know I have not effectively communicated the perspective I believe we need to have if we are to be responsible and effective players in fishing industry politics.

I appreciated the questions Mary Ann put forth at the session last night. It is so important we ask the right questions and I think they were good. What are the concerns of each of the parties involved? Where is the common ground? Can we cooperate towards common aims? Over the past two years I have spent countless hours listening and learning. How do others perceive us? What threat do we pose? What do you think?

Why is 176 got everyone all bent out of shape? Because it is their perception that coming into our allocation *short term* could only occur at the expense of their opportunity and that is over reach. For example: The chums that we catch in Eastern Channel are fish they would have taken in Deep Inlet. Nets are fine with that but for us to demand they stand down during the best fishing time is considered over reach and an insult. They support us having more access or opportunity and we say thanks but it is not enough. They give us Crawfish for example and we say well OK but we want them to meet 6 more demands plus we want access to Deep Inlet. This kind of crazy istactless to be polite.

Back to 176. Industry is concerned about 176 because it highlights our lack of confidence that we can work things out amongst ourselves without Board of Fish action. I for one think we have things going our way and that we have way more to

lose than gain! I believe this the view of most trollers that I have talked to.

Sounds like a broken record does it? I know some of you don't share this perspective. I am still learning, but just about all of the observations and predictions I shared in that "What Happened" report about last spring's negotiations have born out in fact. I also urge you to read and reread the thread of emails amongst CTA board this week. Sorry to have to admit a lot of it is my boring stuff but I think we need to reflect on what has happened, what is happening, and make informed, reality-based decisions moving forward. You have a huge responsibility -get informed.

I am addressing the board as "you" because I have to resign. I am wearing too many hats, take it all seriously, and I believe I can act more effectively for our fleet without having to submit to two boards. Besides, some of you have pointed out that I am going insane, an observation I have taken seriously. I did cross the line with my last minute "in your face" plea to take a different approach. Consider it a dash across the highway to try to save a friend instead of going to the crosswalk and waiting for "walk".

Because of present CTA action there is a battle heating up and it will affect the entire industry. Our (trollers) ability to work in concert with other groups is being *severely* hampered. What do we stand to gain in all this, really? At what cost? We CTA are so narrowly focused! Max Worhatch in his appeal to CTA asks, "What do trollers think?" What will be your response? Can this self-appointed single focus board respond? Will you be able to say honestly you are representing the voice of the entire troll industry? The thought that we might take our misunderstood

proposal right to the board of fish literally horrified me! ATA board has taken up (at my request) discussion on ATA's position on 176. I was given permission to share the following post from ATA board member Joel Kawahara:

“ ... I will not vote until we hear from the ChumTrollAssociation. I would like to add industry solidarity as an important factor in our thoughts on this proposal and as we look at all the BOF proposals. For the guys who live in P-burg, Wrangell, Haines, and Ketchikan, the net fleets are bigger than in Sitka. The port of Seattle is mostly seiners and gillnetters now, seiners and trollers in Port Townsend. There is much cross interest in these ports and we see how much each fleet contributes to the economy we call commercial fishing. I do not want to indict the Sitka mentality as the cause of this conundrum, but I do want to address why my sensitivity to the opinion of the other fleets towards all trollers weighs as heavily as the economic argument that has driven prop 176.

Consider the development issues of the Transboundary River mines. Do gillnetters really need those rivers? They can hide in the THAs and make a living and not buck the system. Yet the gillnetters are with us and the seiners against this kind of development.

Consider the king salmon allocation battle and the development of the sport management plan, greatly aided by ATA's participation at BOF. We had full support of the nets to get this done, even though the nets have pretty much decided kings are not going to be a big part of their future income. Out of this came the halibut allocation at the NPFMC. ADFG looked at the king salmon allocation battle as a template for the charter halibut allocation and proposed elements of it to the NPFMC. Even FVOA and PVOA are our friends now because of this.

To me, the evidence points to us needing each other as much as

we need fish. We can not foretell how decisions made in 1993 on king salmon affect a halibut decision 20 years later, so we need to make sure we believe in the principles behind our decisions where \$ is NOT the only principle. (If \$ was the only reason to do this, we are terrible business people)

Having written this I believe our ATA vote here needs to concentrate on of what we believe sharing is and what we are willing to do as a fleet to achieve this.”

Those like Joel, who have been around for decades and served us in industry leadership, activists and advocates for commercial fishermen and for preservation of our priceless resource have this perspective. When he is speaking of industry solidarity how many of you thought ATA plus CTA against the nets?

Communicate, don't insulate! Jim Moore

P.S. I hereby submit my resignation