

Testimony to the Alaska Board of Fisheries

From:

Bruce Schactler

PO BOX 2254

Kodiak Alaska

The links below are submitted in response to the Board's request for them, based on my testimony today, January 7, 2014 in Kodiak.

There are many documents from the Washington Division of Fisheries, the Canadian Fisheries Department, NOAA, ADFG and the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission and more that one can find through Google that discuss and credibly document the extreme contribution of Aquaculture to the population of King Salmon in the North Pacific and to Kodiak Island in particular..... Just use your imagination and start searching.

What these papers all show is that since the early 1980s the releases of Juvenile Chinook Salmon increased yearly to over 400M in 1988 which coincide with the jump in Chinook harvest in 1988. The releases in 2012 are still approaching 300M juvenile Chinook salmon.

After an odd harvest of 41K Chinook salmon in the Kodiak salmon fishery in 1993, ADFG sampling in 1994 showed that commercial salmon catches of coded wire tags and salmon marked by a "fin clip" method were 80+% Canadian Hatchery fish, with none from Kodiak or Cook Inlet and only a few from SE Alaska.

The 2012 Genetic study of Trawl bycatch on the GOA showed nearly the same stock make up. As I remember, there was a trawl survey of coded wire tags and fin clip in the 90's with much the same results.

Most of the Chinook salmon harvested in the Kodiak Salmon fishery in 2013, were outside the run timing for the Karluk and Ayakulik systems. The fish averaged only 6 lbs, and which shows that the vast majority of the harvest was actually from smaller fish. Fish this size are likely only 2 years old and far from spawning.

Kodiak Island waters are internationally famous for amount and diversity of feed for all species. The 30 years of Pacific Aquaculture has consistently put an inordinate amount of Chinook salmon originating from the East and West Pacific Rim and the variety of studies over the years shows it.

<http://www.npafc.org/new/publications/Bulletin/Bulletin%20No.%204/077-091Heard.pdf>

[http://www.npafc.org/new/science\\_statistics.html](http://www.npafc.org/new/science_statistics.html)

Insurance, fuel, material, equipment and labor have all increased while the price of fish is where it was in 1980! If we dilute this tentative equation with more and more boats to the extent of the 80's and 90's, the effect on my business should be quite clear with simple math. If the sizes of our runs go into an extended down turn in production, Investment will be lost to the point of the extreme!

This proposal is written to give some small economical encouragement to purchase more than 1 permit which will begin to reduce the ridiculous number of latent permits in the Kodiak Area. By taking 200 fathoms OUT of the fishery, a person would be allowed a little extra gear that may, at times, allow the harvest of fish to pay for the investment. IT DOES NOT JUST DOUBLE UP THE GEAR FOR THE PURCHASER OF THE 2<sup>ND</sup> PERMIT!!

This is not the same as the gillnet stacking proposal, which DOES allow the use all of the gear from every permit owned. The gill net fishery also allows to lease extra gear and to joint venture their gear. All of these provisions allow the gillnet permit holders to continue to gain more gear that increases their viability and efficiency, which I support.

At 217 unused permits, there are way more than enough latent permits to give entry level opportunity for new entrants, even if this proposal were to pass as I suggest. If every permit holder fishing today were to buy a 2<sup>nd</sup> permit (which is not likely) there would still be nearly 50 permits still available to enter the fishery.

As the BOF continues to deal with gillnet/seine conflicts because of declining economics, I adamantly suggest that the reduction of the fishery's seine gear will dramatically reduce the potential for these conflicts to increase.

That some cannot afford another permit, or that all boats cannot handle more gear is not a reasonable argument. The same argument could say that they cannot afford a better vessel or a new net or better equipment or even a new truck to drive.

I would suggest that a 2<sup>nd</sup> permit could let a permit holder to eliminate the lead web in the net OR add 50 fm of net. To insure that this "incentive based buy back" stay just that, I suggest that once the 2 permits are combined, that they cannot be separated and resold as 2 separate permits again.

As a 39 year participant of the Kodiak Purse Seine fishery, I am very afraid that we will be back to an unprofitable fishery if the growth in the fleet continues.

#95 seems like a reasonable and fair proposal.

The proposals to include gillnet in seine areas or to close seine areas and the Igvak proposals are all OLD proposals that EVERY Board of the past has rejected. They are ALL simply allocative proposals that address no biological or management problems. The various Kodiak management plans are time tested as very successful and if there were difficulties, they would be addressed by the Department.