

RC: _____

Submitted by Joseph Person

I am writing this RC in regards to ACR 17. Unfortunately, it was addressed several hours ahead of its scheduled time on the agenda so my opportunity to address it prior to board action was extremely limited. Furthermore, I was reassured by the Department that they understood the issued and could explain it to the Board. This was not the case and it was grossly misrepresented. ACR 17 effects exactly one situation. The situation where a fisherman is allowed to fish three thirty-five fathom nets 29 meshes deep, that is a full complement of "shallow" gear. In this one, precise, exact situation I am requesting the ability to be able to fish 4 shorter nets with an aggregate length of 105 fathoms that are 29 meshes deep, that is a full complement of "shallow" gear. There is zero substantive change to the management plan in any ways, it is merely a wording issue. All other situations and "step-downs" are tangential to the issue and completely unaffected by the ACR.

All of the discussion about two thirty-five fathom nets is completely irrelevant to the ACR. Yes, in this case a short net fisherman will be disadvantaged to someone who fishes standard thirty-five fathom nets, but as pointed out this is somewhat unavoidable and a result of the free choice of the fisherman to fish shorter nets. I will point out here the fact that unlike board member Kluberton's proposition it is not actually feasible for these fisherman to just fish 35 fathom nets. Coming up with a 35 fathom net is certainly doable, however a set-net site is a fixed location with two permanent anchors. One can not simply set a longer net in the same spot for a multitude of reasons, one being that it might no longer have the required distance of separation to nearby locations. This information is provided merely to inform the Board.

I will reiterate here that ACR 17 solely asks for a proper definition of "full complement of 29 mesh deep gear" in the situation where that is what the board CLEARLY intended to be allowed. The lack of understanding displayed in today's discussion merely reaffirms that the Board did not understand the effects of the language and that it had unintended consequences.

Joseph Person