

5/13

Public Testimony of Kay Andrews
Proposal 250

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Alaska Board of Fisheries, staff and guests. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to be heard today, and on behalf of those who are unable to participate for various reasons who share my same thoughts opposing Proposal 250 which would establish provisions to allow a person to hold two Bristol Bay CFEC set gillnet permits to "stack" those permits and operate extra gillnet gear. Please do not allow dual set gillnet permit stacking in Bristol Bay, period.

Proposal 250 – 5 AAC 06.331 should not be approved by the Alaska Board of Fisheries because it is an unfair advantage to set gillnet commercial fishers in Bristol Bay who do not have the means of multiple sites or methods to deploy 100 fathoms a set, it reduces escapement goal efforts by allowing more fish to be caught, and infringes on the opportunity for the next generation in Alaska to participate in the fishery.

My name is Kay Andrews. I operate a set net site along with my husband and children in Ekuik, Alaska. I'm a Bristol Bay watershed resident from the community of Aleknagik. I am also a tribal member of the Aleknagik Traditional Council who also was an opponent organization to the restructuring of the fishery that allowed dual permit stacking in 2009. Did not the trial regulation sunset in December 2012 at the Alaska Board of Fisheries meeting held in Naknek?

Although I recently gained entry to the fishery, my late grandparents George and Lena Ilutsik were lifelong fisherman. My grandfather retired as a captain who delivered thousands of fish by scow for Columbia Ward Fisheries in Bristol Bay from the early 1950s to the late 1980s. My grandmother was a set net fisher in Ekuik to before entry permits were issued and after. They both worked hard in the Bristol Bay fishery both commercially and culturally by making a living wage while preserving food and supplies for the long winter months for their ten children. I remember my grandfather telling me stories about fishing in sail boats, and how spoiled the fisherman were today because of the motors they use to operate their boats, having lighter gear to pull instead of heavy wooden corks, and shelter from the elements. My husband and I have years of experience in the drift fishery, but we both are in the process of purchasing set gillnet permits made possible through our families and the State of Alaska's loan programs. We have ten children and four grandchildren. I'd like to thank that my grandfather and late mother are proud of us continuing the lifestyle they lived including my husband's parents who also set and drift in Bristol Bay and taught to theirs to do the same.

The proponents of Proposal 250 have a genuine desire to increase their bottom line; otherwise these kinds of proposals wouldn't be before you today. I ask you is it fair to allow dual permitting that would allow for possible four set net sites, extra gear at any potential one site, while the entry commission was developed to protect, preserve and provide equal individual entry opportunity into the fisheries of the state? It does not make sense to allow for such provisions that only benefit a few with adverse affects on more.

My maternal aunt was negatively impacted by regulation changes that allowed for those who had the capability to lengthen set net anchor lines further offshore it reduced her catch from nearly 50,000 pounds a year to maybe 20,000 pounds a year. This is significant especially if it is the only means to make a living in a year. When policy changes, it changes people's lives. There are some winners and yes it includes losers too.

I admire you for the difficult job you have sworn to undertake willingly. I appreciate the knowledge also shared by the CFEC professionals and others who work tirelessly to set policy and direction for a sound and enforceable fishery for all. Please take extra notice in the November 2012, CFEC Report, specifically referencing Bristol Bay Set Net Permit Stacking. I don't have enough time today to express all that is in that report concerning the negative impacts on local and resident fisherman of Alaska other than it has posed a threat to the structure of the fishery as a whole and limits local opportunity. For example, if the price of set gillnet did not rise from approximately \$25,000 to \$50,000. I would have had the opportunity to purchase a set gillnet permit for my son through my aunt, but I can not meet the percentage needed in order to meet that loan requirement now as I did in the past.

Please do not adopt proposal 250, it spoils those who have the means and methods to take advantage of the regulation, and spoils the fishery for those who do not.

Thank you for your help.