

**Prince William Sound Commercial Shrimp Proposals****Proposal 218 & 219.**

These proposals suggest a May 1<sup>st</sup> Start date for the fishery.

- Support for the proposals was withdrawn by the proposer.
- I have not seen or heard any information from the department suggesting a conservation need for these changes.
- There was little support during either public testimony or committee process for these proposals.
- I oppose both proposals strongly.

**Proposal 221 & 222**

These proposals seek to change the tri-annually rotating management system to address the problem of not reaching the GHL in Area 3.

- We have only fished Area 3 twice, both times with low participation. I am optimistic that the fleet can achieve greater harvest than in the past with current regulations, primarily due to changes in the makeup of the fleet and increased effort by more serious fishermen.
- The proposed changes have SIGNIFICANT impacts on the makeup and prosecution of the fishery beyond simply normalizing annual harvests. (Which they both would probably achieve, it is merely the cost of it that concerns me.)
  - Myself and most fishermen I have talked to think that Proposal 221 as detailed in the relevant RC would have the following effects on each area:
    - Area 1: Achieving the GHL with current caps on harvest in a single Statistical Area would be difficult.
    - Area 2: Effort would be almost 100% concentrated in Port Wells at start of season. An area very close to Whittier and popular with other user groups.
    - Area 3: Effort would be almost 100% concentrated in Port Nellie Juan at start of season. Another area very close to Whittier and popular with other user groups, and potentially (in my opinion) more prone to over fishing than the better areas in Area 1 and 2.
  - Proposal 222 would essentially remove the tri-annual rotation entirely and insure that the entire harvest came from current Area 1 and Area 2 every year. As evidenced by the historical harvest in the Non-Commercial Fishery this is likely sustainable, but if that is the desired end result this is an overly complicated way to achieve it.
  - Some fishermen believe these tradeoffs are worth it, because shrimp are just that hard to catch in Area 3.
- I and the majority of fisherman I have talked with during this meeting oppose both proposals and are in favor of maintaining the status quo, but recognize that we may just be putting the discussion off for 3 years if catches in Area 3 do not improve this year.

**Proposal 214**

This is my proposal regarding the current Total Allowable Harvest threshold that is required for a commercial fishery.

- I believe that the concepts layed out in the "Sustainable Salmon Fisheries Policy" regarding shared burden of conservation between user groups should apply to other fisheries as well.
- If there is not enough shrimp to support a fishery, then neither user group should fish.
- It is my intention that in the event of a total closure subsistence fisheries would continue to fish with their relatively low impact levels.
- I outline two options in my proposal and am fully supportive of either one at the Boards discretion.