

United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters (USAG) submitted a proposal for the Board of Fisheries' (BOF) January meeting but it was deemed not worded as regulation language and we are told it will be a discussion item for this work session. It is our wish that the BOF create a task force (or use the current Joint Regional Planning Team) to look at allocation based on overall value to each commercial user group. Previous BOFs have discussed how many overlapping Southeast allocation plans and historic sharing percentages of wild and enhanced fish affect each other.

Generally BOF proposals ask this board to look at a specific gear groups' side of an individual allocation plan to support their particular position or imbalance while ignoring other fleets' shortfalls in other areas. It is not our intent to ask you to look at things from one position, rather to look at the whole picture to see long term trends. It would be an injustice to shift value from one gear group to another to satisfy one allocation plan while ignoring that effect on another gear groups' traditional economic viability. USAG does not wish to gain another fleets' share of the pie through a value grab, only to maintain our traditional harvest sharing percentages by working together with the other commercial gear groups.

Currently, fleets below their allocative range of enhanced fish have been allowed increased opportunity to harvest them in common property fisheries. The consequence of this is that wild fish harvested in this increased opportunity are not counted as a value shift in the Enhanced Allocation Plan. The Enhanced Allocation Plan first adopted in 1994 has been in place well over 20 years, yet large imbalances still occur. This and every plan should be reevaluated to see if the assumptions and predictions made were correct and to take into consideration unintended consequences of those actions. The attached "*Southeast Alaska Enhanced Salmon Allocation: A Twenty-year Retrospective*" is an informative draft analysis of the Plan.

The accompanying data provided by ADF&G looks at salmon contributions to the user groups in three ways, natural production/wild, hatchery-produced/enhanced and overall by year, and as a five-year rolling average (comparable to how we look at enhanced alone). The five-year rolling average helps smooth out the highs and lows and shows long term trends. If you look at the overall value from 1994 when the Enhanced Allocation Plan was formed to 2016, you will notice that seine value has gone up, troll down and gillnet is constant, yet according to the Enhanced Allocation Plan the seine is just below their allocative range.

The problem we perceive is a gear group below their enhanced allocation range can gain value according to the Enhanced Allocation Plan, which would increase their share of the overall value. It is doubtful that the intent of the Plan was to allow for economic growth of a particular gear group at the expense of another yet this is now the case. We feel that incorporating overall value into the Enhanced Allocation Plan where a gear group trending downward in overall value would be allowed increased enhanced opportunity, is a fair system in that it protects each gear groups' current and historic economic share of the region's harvest.

Currently, representatives on Joint Regional Planning Teams and Regional Aquaculture Associations' Board of Directors are only allowed to discuss allocation based on enhanced fish yet many of their decisions also involve wild interception. These are likely to be the same fleet-elected leaders to make up this proposed overall value task force as well.

requested by Jensen

**Total Ex-vessel / Overall Salmon Values**

**Ex-vessel value in five-year rolling averages**

	Seine	Troll	Driftnet	S+T+DGN Total	Seine	Troll	Gillnet
1985	\$52,018,934	\$25,009,669	\$17,083,901	\$94,112,504			
1986	\$53,893,815	\$28,074,767	\$14,585,793	\$96,554,375			
1987	\$22,739,529	\$25,368,212	\$19,227,191	\$67,334,932			
1988	\$53,314,374	\$29,827,740	\$32,342,986	\$115,485,100			
1989	\$91,241,060	\$23,526,234	\$20,578,737	\$135,346,031	54%	26%	20%
1990	\$44,821,503	\$31,101,694	\$16,439,366	\$92,362,563	52%	27%	20%
1991	\$36,071,105	\$25,162,099	\$12,037,061	\$73,270,265	51%	28%	21%
1992	\$51,054,882	\$29,351,980	\$20,850,361	\$101,257,223	53%	27%	20%
1993	\$52,894,318	\$26,642,558	\$15,904,271	\$95,441,147	55%	27%	17%
1994	\$61,164,567	\$38,943,302	\$17,207,769	\$117,315,638	51%	32%	17%
1995	\$55,806,812	\$16,673,792	\$16,899,040	\$89,379,644	54%	29%	17%
1996	\$42,813,455	\$16,394,667	\$14,430,995	\$73,639,117	55%	27%	18%
1997	\$40,813,997	\$18,853,651	\$11,143,699	\$70,811,347	57%	26%	17%
1998	\$45,509,746	\$14,974,147	\$11,345,286	\$71,829,179	58%	25%	17%
1999	\$56,402,089	\$20,442,587	\$11,489,118	\$88,333,794	61%	22%	17%
2000	\$38,060,764	\$14,786,178	\$10,940,909	\$63,787,851	61%	23%	16%
2001	\$48,742,800	\$17,191,517	\$11,316,836	\$77,251,153	62%	23%	15%
2002	\$20,244,170	\$13,164,474	\$8,132,853	\$41,541,497	61%	24%	16%
2003	\$26,705,739	\$14,812,555	\$8,903,210	\$50,421,504	59%	25%	16%
2004	\$31,672,452	\$29,016,910	\$11,778,867	\$72,468,229	54%	29%	17%
2005	\$36,073,649	\$26,770,816	\$12,753,519	\$75,597,984	52%	32%	17%
2006	\$27,536,028	\$34,645,633	\$20,007,955	\$82,189,616	44%	37%	19%
2007	\$49,646,050	\$30,985,116	\$15,081,267	\$95,712,433	46%	36%	18%
2008	\$40,986,039	\$36,566,992	\$24,209,429	\$101,762,460	43%	37%	20%
2009	\$48,417,377	\$22,942,077	\$18,578,453	\$89,937,907	46%	34%	20%
2010	\$56,238,100	\$31,945,182	\$26,618,998	\$114,802,280	46%	32%	22%
2011	\$122,177,082	\$32,413,206	\$31,126,506	\$185,716,794	54%	26%	20%
2012	\$73,082,389	\$29,855,484	\$37,475,213	\$140,413,086	54%	24%	22%
2013	\$154,063,995	\$41,312,132	\$29,456,345	\$224,832,472	60%	21%	19%
2014	\$58,358,331	\$46,554,302	\$28,379,708	\$133,292,341	58%	23%	19%
2015	\$55,228,071	\$25,793,745	\$20,621,205	\$101,643,021	59%	22%	19%
2016	\$36,497,295	\$32,187,715	\$22,194,539	\$90,879,549	55%	25%	20%

<b>1985-93</b>				
<b>Average</b>	<b>\$50,894,391</b>	<b>\$27,118,328</b>	<b>\$18,783,296</b>	<b>\$96,796,016</b>
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>19%</b>	

Allocation Plan

Percentages

5 AAC 33.364      44-49%      27-32%      24-29%

<b>'94-'16 Average</b>	<b>\$53,314,826</b>	<b>\$26,401,138</b>	<b>\$18,264,857</b>	<b>\$97,980,822</b>
<b>Ex-vessel</b>				
<b>Percentage</b>				
<b>1994-2016</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>19%</b>	

### Hatchery-Produced Salmon Values

### Allocation value in five-year rolling averages

	seine	troll	gillnet	Yearly Value	Seine	Troll	Gillnet
1985	\$3,428,844	\$1,420,786	\$1,200,076	\$6,049,706			
1986	\$2,770,790	\$2,400,444	\$1,245,862	\$6,417,096			
1987	\$4,298,648	\$1,460,796	\$1,426,244	\$7,185,688			
1988	\$5,475,727	\$1,987,416	\$4,547,547	\$12,010,690			
1989	\$2,718,810	\$1,599,441	\$2,323,091	\$6,641,342	49%	23%	28%
1990	\$2,318,017	\$3,774,529	\$1,780,854	\$7,873,400	44%	28%	28%
1991	\$2,353,588	\$3,837,368	\$2,217,805	\$8,408,761	41%	30%	29%
1992	\$6,652,722	\$4,782,046	\$4,653,863	\$16,088,631	38%	31%	30%
1993	\$11,089,282	\$4,353,481	\$4,934,886	\$20,377,649	42%	31%	27%
1994	\$8,876,576	\$5,317,271	\$3,797,692	\$17,991,540	44%	31%	25%
1995	\$14,789,338	\$2,871,032	\$7,169,053	\$24,829,423	50%	24%	26%
1996	\$12,061,185	\$3,224,761	\$4,184,597	\$19,470,543	54%	21%	25%
1997	\$10,752,998	\$3,004,073	\$4,037,169	\$17,794,241	57%	19%	24%
1998	\$9,277,676	\$1,973,521	\$3,792,912	\$15,044,109	59%	17%	24%
1999	\$10,061,642	\$3,461,492	\$4,110,113	\$17,633,247	60%	15%	25%
2000	\$17,113,326	\$3,465,550	\$6,219,903	\$26,798,778	61%	16%	23%
2001	\$7,170,159	\$3,752,912	\$4,852,294	\$15,775,364	58%	17%	25%
2002	\$3,645,488	\$2,303,490	\$3,627,174	\$9,576,152	56%	18%	27%
2003	\$3,744,188	\$2,774,408	\$3,385,285	\$9,903,881	52%	20%	28%
2004	\$5,498,187	\$4,139,539	\$5,400,059	\$15,037,785	48%	21%	30%
2005	\$4,405,236	\$3,522,736	\$4,707,650	\$12,635,622	39%	26%	35%
2006	\$15,109,033	\$4,192,671	\$12,215,370	\$31,517,075	41%	22%	37%
2007	\$6,531,971	\$4,728,923	\$8,851,525	\$20,112,418	40%	22%	39%
2008	\$16,158,998	\$7,319,611	\$16,385,073	\$39,863,682	40%	20%	40%
2009	\$12,746,563	\$4,032,749	\$12,255,256	\$29,034,568	41%	18%	41%
2010	\$17,451,677	\$7,215,190	\$15,728,240	\$40,395,107	42%	17%	41%
2011	\$15,430,492	\$9,109,654	\$20,391,332	\$44,931,479	39%	19%	42%
2012	\$34,363,203	\$8,113,226	\$28,453,598	\$72,137,175	42%	16%	41%
2013	\$24,834,517	\$13,266,168	\$19,221,485	\$57,303,369	43%	17%	39%
2014	\$12,912,970	\$8,786,771	\$17,772,977	\$37,637,261	42%	18%	40%
2015	\$16,689,459	\$6,063,853	\$13,068,340	\$35,821,652	42%	18%	40%
2016	\$10,513,342	\$5,018,230	\$11,450,087	\$26,981,660	43%	18%	39%

<b>1985-'93</b>				
<b>Average</b>	<b>\$4,567,381</b>	<b>\$2,846,256</b>	<b>\$2,703,359</b>	<b>\$10,116,996</b>
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>27%</b>	

<b>Plan %</b>	<b>44-49%</b>	<b>27-32%</b>	<b>24-29%</b>	
<b>1994-'16</b>				
<b>Average</b>	<b>\$12,614,705</b>	<b>\$5,115,558</b>	<b>\$10,046,834</b>	<b>\$27,748,962</b>
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>36%</b>	

**Natural Production Values  
(Ex-vessel minus hatchery-produced)**

**Natural production  
value in five-year  
rolling averages**

	seine	troll	gillnet	total	Seine	Troll	Gillnet
1985	\$48,590,090	\$23,588,883	\$15,883,825	\$88,062,798			
1986	\$51,123,025	\$25,674,323	\$13,339,931	\$90,137,279			
1987	\$18,440,881	\$23,907,416	\$17,800,947	\$60,149,244			
1988	\$47,838,647	\$27,840,324	\$27,795,439	\$103,474,410			
1989	\$88,522,250	\$21,926,793	\$18,255,646	\$128,704,689	54%	26%	20%
1990	\$42,503,486	\$27,327,165	\$14,658,512	\$84,489,163	53%	27%	20%
1991	\$33,717,517	\$21,324,731	\$9,819,256	\$64,861,504	52%	28%	20%
1992	\$44,402,160	\$24,569,934	\$16,196,498	\$85,168,592	55%	26%	19%
1993	\$41,805,036	\$22,289,077	\$10,969,385	\$75,063,498	57%	27%	16%
1994	\$52,287,991	\$33,626,031	\$13,410,077	\$99,324,098	53%	32%	16%
1995	\$41,017,474	\$13,802,760	\$9,729,987	\$64,550,221	55%	30%	15%
1996	\$30,752,270	\$13,169,906	\$10,246,398	\$54,168,574	56%	28%	16%
1997	\$30,060,999	\$15,849,578	\$7,106,530	\$53,017,106	57%	29%	15%
1998	\$36,232,070	\$13,000,626	\$7,552,374	\$56,785,070	58%	27%	15%
1999	\$46,340,447	\$16,981,095	\$7,379,005	\$70,700,547	62%	24%	14%
2000	\$20,947,438	\$11,320,628	\$4,721,006	\$36,989,073	60%	26%	14%
2001	\$41,572,641	\$13,438,605	\$6,464,542	\$61,475,789	63%	25%	12%
2002	\$16,598,682	\$10,860,984	\$4,505,679	\$31,965,345	63%	25%	12%
2003	\$22,961,551	\$12,038,147	\$5,517,925	\$40,517,623	61%	27%	12%
2004	\$26,174,265	\$24,877,371	\$6,378,808	\$57,430,444	56%	32%	12%
2005	\$31,668,413	\$23,248,080	\$8,045,869	\$62,962,362	55%	33%	12%
2006	\$12,426,995	\$30,452,962	\$7,792,585	\$50,672,541	45%	42%	13%
2007	\$43,114,079	\$26,256,193	\$6,229,742	\$75,600,015	47%	41%	12%
2008	\$24,827,041	\$29,247,381	\$7,824,356	\$61,898,778	45%	43%	12%
2009	\$35,670,814	\$18,909,328	\$6,323,197	\$60,903,339	47%	41%	12%
2010	\$38,786,423	\$24,729,992	\$10,890,758	\$74,407,173	48%	40%	12%
2011	\$106,746,590	\$23,303,552	\$10,735,174	\$140,785,315	60%	30%	10%
2012	\$38,719,186	\$21,742,258	\$9,021,615	\$69,483,059	60%	29%	11%
2013	\$129,229,478	\$28,045,964	\$10,234,860	\$167,510,302	68%	23%	9%
2014	\$45,445,361	\$37,767,531	\$10,606,731	\$93,819,623	66%	25%	9%
2015	\$38,538,612	\$19,729,892	\$7,552,865	\$65,821,369	67%	24%	9%
2016	\$25,983,953	\$27,169,485	\$10,744,452	\$63,897,890	60%	29%	10%
<b>1985-'93</b>							
<b>Average</b>	<b>\$46,327,010</b>	<b>\$24,272,072</b>	<b>\$16,079,938</b>	<b>\$86,679,020</b>			
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>19%</b>				
<b>Plan %</b>	<b>44-49%</b>	<b>27-32%</b>	<b>24-29%</b>				
<b>1994-'16</b>							
<b>Average</b>	<b>\$40,700,121</b>	<b>\$21,285,580</b>	<b>\$8,218,023</b>	<b>\$70,203,724</b>			
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>12%</b>				