

Charles Skeek, F/V Outlook
Petersburg, Alaska, 99833

Board of Fisheries

January 15 – 23, 2018

Sitka, Alaska

Support for Proposal 94 & 104: Opposition to Proposals 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 105, & 106

Dear Chairman Jensen and Board of Fish Members:

My family and I have relied on the Sitka Sound Sac Roe fishery for two generations now. My father, Leonard Skeek, was a proud supporter of this fishery and was an original recipient of the permit when it became limited entry. He also introduced my brothers and I at young ages to subsistence ways in Sitka Sound following the sac roe fishery, and he remained a subsistence consumer up until his recent passing. My brothers and I still continue these traditions to this day. Cutting the harvest rate as in Proposals 98 and 99 would be particularly harmful to my operation, as my father passed this permit onto me. I can see how this could devastate income for many families around Alaska. There is no biological reason to reduce the harvest rate. The Department manages the herring fishery conservatively, and my father and I had always agreed. A historical biomass increase from 5,000 tons to 55,000 tons was always a clear indication for our family that management has had a responsible grasp on this fishery. Fishermen rely on sustainable and conservative management for our future, and my family still continues to rely on it.

I am opposed to Proposals 105 and 106 that seek to increase the area closed to fishing. The reasons stated are that subsistence needs cannot be met. The department has demonstrated that a 'reasonable opportunity' does exist, but participation by users has been declining over the past 30 years. Our family has never suffered from the inability to receive roe on branches any year. If sufficient effort is applied toward harvest of herring eggs, the eggs are sufficiently abundant to meet those needs. My family has remained has remained believers of these ideas.

Please reject these proposals.

Sincerely,

Charles Skeek