

January 18, 2018

Board Members,

Between our family members, we own 3 gillnet permits, fishing primarily in Deep Inlet and Lynn Canal. We do not agree with RC 153, the agreement between USAG and SEAS.

The Sitka fleet is relatively new since inception of the Deep Inlet terminal fishery and is 150 miles away from the next nearest gillnet fishery. The unique location and protected waters of the fishery has been ideal for new fisherman to enter the fishery and you have heard the concerns from a few of these fisherman.

This agreement in the first year takes half of their fishing days away before the season even starts, and takes 20-30 gillnet vessels that generally are fishing in Deep Inlet and moves them into fishing areas that are already being significantly affected by stock of concerns. We should actually be trying to reduce fishing pressure in areas where there are wild stock concerns.

We believe that a fairer agreement would be to adopt the SEAS proposal #145 for one day a week in Nakat Inlet THA that the proposer asked to be withdrawn, to adopt USAG proposal #141 submitted as USAG as originally submitted which changes the rotation schedule from 2:1 gillnet to seine to a 1:1 rotation. And while we aren't thrilled we could live with the amendments to proposal #157 regarding the Hawk Inlet sockeye cap in the USAG/SEAS agreement.

A 1:1 rotation provides the minimum amount of time to make fishing in Deep Inlet viable.

Deep Inlet is the only release site that gillnetters have access to for fish produced from NSRAA, our northern end regional aquaculture association that receives 3% enhancement tax.

DIPAC that produces a major portion of the enhanced chum salmon in the northern district does not receive enhancement tax.

See also RC 224 & RC 222.

Thank you for considering our perspective on a fair agreement that doesn't further impact our wild stocks that are struggling at this time. Protection of wild stocks should come first.

Sincerely,

Tim Grussendorf

Ty Grussendorf

Cody Grussendorf