

# VERBAL TESTIMONY ATA (ALASKA TROLLERS ASSN)

I shouldn't be here today. Our issue was resolved last March and our in-cycle meeting isn't until 2025.

But our negotiated agreement, signed by all three user groups, RC 178, somehow mutated into what is the ideal outcome for non-resident users.

What Trollers, TSI, and SEAGO agreed to in RC 178 was out-of-state harvesters would be held to their allocation and catch the lion's share of their Chinook allocation in the Spring when no one else is fishing kings. Because this handicapped Alaska Residents, who mostly fish in inside waters, we agreed that resident harvesters would be held harmless.

What we did **not** agree to or sign on to was: "Non-residents, fish all year irrespective of abundance - abundance of charter and bareboat or king salmon - entirely unabated whatsoever and hey, we'll cover it."

So we came out of the negotiations having maintained our 80/20 split only to learn, in ADF&G's August 4<sup>th</sup> Press Release, that sport was over by 15,000 kings which ended up being over 17,000. And then to learn the reason for the overage was the "mutation" of RC 178: The regulatory mutation that entirely invalidates the concept of an 80/20 split. The 80/20 split is the only safeguard trollers have to incentivize the non-resident sector to manage themselves at all OR seek the highest allocation possible in the Treaty setting, for that matter.

This is so messed up. We, with the resident sportsmen, are in the same allocation pot with an insatiable non-resident fishery. Basically the only restraint on them are the bag limits and the in-season management which disappeared this year. Both ATA and TSI have stated we would not have agreed to the regulations as "mutated".

And both our groups wonder why we have to fight at every turn to defend ourselves against non-resident participants. This is Alaska! Our year round presence, our long history as a gear group, the established infrastructure throughout our small communities, our very high resident permit ownership rate and our State Constitution should give us a priority. And I will say, the first priority should be resident sport fishers, in their quasi-personal use / subsistence fishery, then our fishery for all the reasons I just stated.

For now though, please reinstate the original language that is in RC 178 which is Proposal 259 as this board already passed it and the new tiers. Thank you.

RC  
9