

*Chuck McCallum's public Testimony*

RC # \_\_\_\_\_

Mr Chairman and members of the Board of Fisheries

I am Chuck McCallum, fishery advisor for the Lake and Peninsula Borough

I am expressing my own opinions this morning.

The Borough represents fishing dependent communities on both sides of the peninsula including Port Heiden, Ugashik, Pilot Point, Egegik, Chignik, Chignik Lagoon, Chignik Lake, Perryville, and Ivanof Bay.

We strongly advise the Board to review the proposals before it with the guideline policy against expanding mixed stock fisheries upper most in mind. We also strongly suggest that it should be a basic and essential duty for the department to advise the Board when an action or proposal is likely to expand a mixed stock fishery.

With this in mind I voice opposition to the Cinder River proposal 149 while pointing out that the department comments include support for harvesting Cinder River stocks in excess of escapement but do not advise the board that the proposal would dramatically increase interception of Bristol Bay bound stocks by the Area M drift net fleet. Likewise the arguments of cycles past which mistakenly led the Board to approve the Area M fishery in the Outer Port Heiden section were based on incorrect assumptions that Bristol Bay stocks would not be disproportionally harvested and the fishery there should now be eliminated in keeping with proposal 155. Please listen to the residents of Port Heiden as they tell their stories of the negative impacts of this inappropriate fishery on their communities fishing economy and culture.

On the Chignik side please oppose the South East District Mainland, proposals 177 through 179, which all have the obvious result of expanding the interception of mixed sockeye stocks travelling to Chignik, Kodiak, Cook Inlet and other fully utilized terminal stocks.

Please listen to Chignik fishermen as proposals 185 and 186 call for some kind of conservation check or moderating measures on the fishery called Dolgoi Island in the WASSIP study where large proportions of Chignik bound sockeye are harvested.

Please support proposals 173 and 175 which call for changes in the management of local Chignik pink and chum stocks. Again I ask that you listen closely as the local Chignik fishermen describe how the fishery management of recent years and decades has established a pattern of significant underutilization of local pink and chum stocks and how these proposals appropriately address their concerns while not infringing on the departments flexibility to appropriately manage the stocks.

Please oppose proposal 189 which would allow dual permit vessels with increased gear limits as this would simply have the effect of pulling latent permits into the fishery and wildly expanding the amount of gear in the water which would have the obvious effect of inappropriately expanding a mixed stock fishery.

Thank you that concludes my comments.