

Regarding Proposal 208

It is important to realize in the conversation about the district 8 management of the gillnet fishery is that "sockeye management" is a term applied to the method of managing the fishery on the strength of the sockeye run. It in no way precludes the gillnet fleet from catching or even targeting other salmon species. The season is simply open, time and area managed, based on sockeye run strength. Our fleet harvests the bulk of our enhanced fish in our traditional common property fisheries. Adopting this proposal into regulation would set a dangerous precedent, adjusting wild stock managed fisheries to meet enhanced allocation needs.

The troll fleet in their summer season are managed on wild coho run strength, yet some choose to target pinks, and or chum. This was in fact how the chum troll fishery was developed.

An easier solution, since it appears this might be a gear conflict issue, might be adjusting troll time to not coincide with gillnet.

It is also important to note the while both fisheries have history in the area, this spring hatchery access area is a relatively new fishery.

While I realize the flexibility the board has in dealing with and changing proposals, I think it disingenuous for a commercial gear group to jump onto what was an apparent conservation concern that didn't exist and turn it into a very acrimonious fight between two gear groups over allocation.

It would be like the seiners supporting 228, the ten day troll closure, not because they agreed with the proposer, but because they are behind in their coho allocation.

Please oppose 208

Max Worhatch,

USAG