

Submitted by Joseph Person

Proposals 124 and 125 and the Pink Salmon Plan in general.

The primary sentiment echoed over and over throughout this process is that the pink salmon returns to Upper Cook Inlet are grossly underutilized. The issue is entirely concerns over impact on other species present at that time. The fact remains that the Pink Salmon Plan as written might as well not even exist. There are two factors to consider.

1. **Having pink openings in the first place.** (Proposal 124)
 - Remember that this plan allows for a MAXIMUM of two openings every other year. In reality it has been one opening in 6 years. In any case impacts on non-pinks are minimal.
 - It is extremely difficult to meet the 50,000 trigger. The pink plan has been enacted one time since its writing for one single day of fishing.
 - The only other time the trigger was met in 2014 no pink opener was given due to the ESSN fishery being closed down due to the Kenai River Late-Run Chinook Plan.
 - This emphasizes the fact that if conservation concerns for other species are present, the department will not utilize it so concerns about that are unfounded.
 - Reducing the trigger to 25,000 as requested in Proposal 124 would make it significantly more likely to be met.
2. **Allowing for a reasonable expectation of harvest in the case of an opener.** (Proposal 125)
 - The current mesh size restriction basically insures extremely low participation in the fishery.
 - If we look at the one opener that has happened, based upon the previous regular opener I personally know of several Ninilchik fishing sites that could have single-handedly caught similar amounts of pinks to what was caught in the total harvest of the pink opener if they had been allowed to use their regular gear.
 - No one can afford to hang an entire set of pink gear for the chance of 3-5 openings a decade. (Ranges from 12-30+ nets for the larger sites)
 - Cook Inlet pinks can be very large and traditional sockeye gear can be highly effective.
 - If there is concerns about "targeting" on coho, then limiting to 5 1/8 would allow nearly everyone to use their traditional sockeye gear while excluding traditional coho gear which is significantly larger.

Finally I would like to emphasize that there is significant coho conservation criterion built into the plan that prevent any large harvest on coho from occurring. Furthermore ESSN exploitation rates have been established as so low that any coho harvest that takes place is insignificant as to overall run sizes and sportfish harvests. Of the two proposals in my opinion 125 is more important as it allows an opening, if given, to actually be prosecuted.