

Re: Proposals 138, 139, 140, 142, and 143

To whom it may concern,

I oppose proposals 138, 139, 140, 142, and 143.

If adopted these proposals would close Area 1 to drift gillnetting. Regardless of their intentions, the result would be the reallocation of economic resources from Homer up the Inlet. If Area 1 is closed to fishing, the 100 plus drift boats that fish out of Homer for the first part of the season and deliver fish here would have to relocate up the Inlet, taking their business with them.

When asked "Who is likely to suffer?" on the mentioned proposals there was not one word of the economic losses to the City of Homer and the many small business that support the Upper Inlet Drift Fisheries. As owner of a marine trades business in Homer the result of these proposals would be a direct loss of income. I'm only one of many small family-run marine trades businesses that would be affected. In addition, it would create a loss in hours, and possibly employment, for the 12-15 employees who support their families through my business. It would also result in the loss of a substantial amount of revenue to the Homer Harbor possibly causing harbor rate increases to make up for lost revenue.

I feel that if there is a biological concern of Upper Inlet salmon stocks that Fish and Game already has the tools it needs to manage the fishery and they are the appropriate body to regulate closed areas. Given that there is no stock identification survey that proves that closing Area 1 would in fact increase Upper Inlet fish stocks, I feel that it's best to not adopt proposals 138 through 143 and leave the biological management to Fish and Game.

I don't think that it is the Board of Fisheries intention to reallocate economic resources from one community to another. Passing these proposals based on a few groups' armchair biological management ideas would do just that, having far reaching consequences for an unknown gain.

Sincerely,

Matthew Alward