

Concerning 208

Mr Chairman and Board of Fish

I nearly spoke to this in committee yesterday but decided to take a little more time to organize my thoughts. I am James Moore, troller from Haines and I want to share just a couple of points.

I am not personally familiar with the specific areas and the fisheries that this proposal affects. I understand that the directed historic sockeye fishery occurs in the migration corridor for the Anita Bay hatchery Kings during the time it is opened in the spring to allow trollers to harvest the returning adult enhanced kings produced primarily for the troll fleet. Of course those wild stock sockeye fisheries should occur since no traditional wild stock fisheries should be managed based on the presence of hatchery fish.

I also understand that the area is miles from the terminal harvest area (THA) in which gear groups can specifically target kings.

It does not seem unfair to require the gear (mesh size) specifically designed for *maximum effectiveness for catching sockeye* be used in that sockeye fishery and the larger mesh size *designed to catch kings* (which would allow many sockeye to pass) be prohibited. Mesh size restrictions have been used in Districts 11 and 15 by ADFG to reduce the catch of Taku and Chilkat Kings.

This Proposal would address the allocation imbalance slightly by shifting some hatchery produced kings from the gear group farthest ahead (gillnet) to the gear group farthest behind (trollers) while at the same time improving the effectiveness of the sockeye fishery.

I would support 208 as amended in RC allowing the mesh size restriction be taken off after July 1.

I sincerely hope this helps. Jim Moore