

Regarding proposal 193

During committee discussion proposer argued that as far as they knew the currently unregulated state waters were not fished but could potentially be fished with no regulatory oversight. This does indeed seem like a situation that the Board should address, however staff comments note that the harvest in the newly expanded area would likely increase by an unknown amount – a circumstance which was vigorously opposed by Bristol Bay fishermen who would likely be affected.

In committee I suggested that one way for the board to address the States legitimate interest in regulating all state waters while addressing the concerns expressed by Bristol Bay fishermen was to adopt regulatory authority over the area of concern and to close the newly added area to commercial fishing.

Submitted by Chuck McCallum