

**Comment to the Alaska Board of Fisheries on Bristol Bay Finfish Proposal 279****March 8, 2020, By Joe Chythlook**

**Mr. Chairman and Board Members, thank you for this opportunity to make comments regarding Bristol Bay finfish proposal 279 before you at this meeting.**

**First of all, the topic of this proposal has been before this Board several times since it was first enacted as proposal 43 on December 2003 Board of Fisheries meeting which passed then as amended to allow fishermen to try to save costs and allow some latent permit holders to fish then as extra crew because of the sudden downturn in fish prices back then and to allow economic benefit to both boat captains that chose to do so and to have up to fish 200 fatoms of gear. The second reason was to help harvest extra run of fish that were projected to return in higher numbers to Bristol Bay during 2004 for at least one season. The regulation was to sunset on 12/31/2004.**

**Since then, it has come back before this Board 5 more times.**

- 1. In 2006 as proposal 21, which was tabled to the Board restructuring committee with possible action to be taken in the next BOF cycle.**
- 2. In 2009 as proposal 20. Where I believe no action was taken.**
- 3. In 2012 where action was passed to adopt with amended language as given in RC 93.**
- 4. In 2015 as proposal 51. The proposal failed 1-5.**
- 5. Then, most recently, during the regular 2018 Bristol Bay Finfish BOF cycle as proposal 25 which failed to be adopted 0-5.**
- 6. Now, it before you again as proposal 279.**

**Mr. Chairman and Board members, my point is, this issue has been before past Board members and to some of you in the regular Bristol Bay Finfish proposal cycles at least 6 times. And I believe adequate actions have already been taken to address the concerns expressed in the current proposal 279 which is again before you at this time. But my request and suggestion to you would be to please take no action on this because of the recent action you already took during the last Bristol Bay Finfish meeting which was held in Dillingham November/December 2018.**

**Secondly, it was placed on the agenda because you took action to do so. However, I am not sure it fits the Agenda Change Request criteria as spelled out in 5 AAC 39.999. POLICY FOR CHANGING BOARD AGENDA. If it does, it is stretching it in my opinion.**

**Finally, as mentioned by the comments from some Nushagak Fish and Game Advisory Committee members, it is hard for the public at large to follow proposals that are put on the BOF or BOG agendas out of cycle, because, just like anywhere else in the State, most people have come to rely on and making their comments to proposals during regular Boards cycles. d**

**Thanks again. Please consider my comments as one best possible directive to deal with 279.**