

Submitted By
chris good
Submitted On
1/11/2018 9:32:58 AM
Affiliation

Phone
6045151319
Email
gladrags@shaw.ca
Address
2417 tongass ave
ketchikan, Alaska 99901

Hello,

My name is Chris Good and i am a commercial Geoduck clam fisherman in Southeast Alaska. I am writing in support of bill 91.

The Geoduck clam fishery in Alaska has, for many years, needed the ability to regulate the flow of product onto the maket, the fishery has been attempting to do this now for a decade. The author of this bill is an ideal candidate to discuss the dramatic effects of this management on a shared market.

There are however, many reasons that Bill 91 is necessary:

Safety: SE Alaska geoduck is a managed on usually a 6 hr, one day per week fishery. There are many experienced capable divers in our fleet and for the most part, the only thing that separates a highliner from everyone else is the spot. Once the test results are known, fishermen race to the most productive beds and anchor out until the opening. There are continual conflicts regarding proximity to other vessels, and the hazards the come with both anchoring too close to other vessels in sometimes very tough conditions, and diving under this arrangment cannot be understated.

Conservation: The SE Alaska geoduck fishery has very specific regulations surrounding survey diving prior to an opening for good reason, the potential for poaching is this fishery is a real concern. Bill 91 creates a scenario that greatly reduces the ability to benefit from illegal poaching.

The most understated conservational benefit of this bill however is that, it gives fisherman the ability to seek out different and potentially undocumented geoduck beds. In the rush to land the biggest load, smaller, slower, and often deeper geoduck beds are not utilized. In some cases, these beds can contain better quality clams, and giving fishermen the ability to target a better quality product, in a shifting market, on underfished geoduck beds should be considered a priority.

Economics: The goal of any fishery should be to maximize profits from landings; fishermen everywhere are transitioning to better marketing practices, and value added products. The highest geoduck values are based on a slow steady supply of live, high quality clams. In 1992 I started my career in this Industry in British Columbia, where the fishery is managed on an IFQ. Then as it is today, fishermen recieve a daily phone call from buyers, with specific volume requests that ensure higher ex-vessel values. This system helped propel Geoducks into the highest valued fishery in the province. Alaska operates under what seems like the polar opposite of this success story, and i continually recieve phone calls from Canadian fishermen concerned with the potential weekly disruption of geoduck markets.

Of equal concern is the drop in Sardfa revenue due to the lower prices that come from over harvesting. Based on ADFG's average price calculations, i would conservatively estimate roughly a million dollars in lost tax revenue since 2006. I believe the fishery's expenses are only slightly less than the tax revenue generated by the 10 year average ex-vessel price.

In summary, there is a consensus among permit holders that this bill should be supported. My hope is that our fishery is afforded the necessary leeway to properly implement these changes, and quite potentially others, to perfectly suit our fishery's continually evolving reality.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Regards,

Chris Good.