Afternoon,

Thanks for forwarding my comments Glenn! Quyana to you all for moving so quickly on this and I really look forward to the progress to come on these issues :)

I'm writing to provide further comment on the draft criteria since I've had a little more time to digest it. The only recommendation I have now is in regards to the "Are the adjacent lease sites negatively impacted and to what extent?" I think broadening the language would be helpful to the board and fishermen to look at "impacts" (whether they be positive or negative) to other fishermen and the fishermen affected by the proposal- giving a much better picture and frame for the board to understand and contemplate proposals holistically. My concern with the current language is that it's very limiting to just contemplating potentially negative impacts. While I know the discretion to decide whether or not claims of negative impacts is going to be left up to the board I think it's safe to assume someone is always going to be able to claim they're going to be negatively impacted by a change in regulation so it's probably not the most effective question to ask. Using broader language to look at what all of the impacts are (positive and negative) frames the criteria to look at the bigger picture and more towards progress and solutions to problems fishermen are facing. While I realize this may be considered semantics to some, I really think the way you ask a question is very important- especially when considering looking at impacts overall of these types of proposals.

Thanks again and look forward to the report/discussion at the upcoming AYK meeting.

Have a great weekend,

Alannah Hurley  
(907) 843-1633