

---

**From:** Baker, Rachel S (DFG)  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 6, 2020 2:11 PM AKST  
**To:** Andy  
**Subject:** RE: Can you give me some more talking points?  
**Attachments:** C2 Draft Council Motion 12-6.docx

Try again.

---

**From:** Baker, Rachel S (DFG)  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 6, 2020 13:42  
**To:** Andy <graylight@alaskan.net>  
**Subject:** RE: Can you give me some more talking points?

Here's what we've got.

---

**From:** Andy <graylight@alaskan.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 6, 2020 08:10  
**To:** Baker, Rachel S (DFG) <rachel.baker@alaska.gov>  
**Subject:** Can you give me some more talking points?

This is roughly what I want to say but I would like to have. Couple of more rationale points about why I support the state's position..... Got anything for me?

## C-2 Salmon FMP

As the only active fisherman on this body, and a resident of Seward, I find this issue to be one of the most difficult and troubling that has come before this Council. After six years at this table, I have grown accustomed to making hard decisions, and when necessary picking winners and losers in a fair and equitable manner. This action today, a result of a lawsuit which mandated a compressed timeline for action, has the potential of negatively impacting fishermen, processors and communities from False Pass to Cordova, many who had no idea about this legal action or implications.

I feel for my friends and neighbors who will be financially impacted if the Council adopts Alternative 4. I was moved by the comments, particularly of some young fishermen, who

represent to me the future of the fishery. They put their faith in this Council process, participated like professionals the salmon FMP committee and if we adopt alternative 4, this process failed to serve them. I am concerned about what message we are sending these and other bright young fishermen, who take the time and effort to participate. Finally, I am concerned about what it means to make a decision that could result in the end of a fishery, in my back yard, that has been prosecuted for over a hundred years.

On the other hand

From the State's motion and rationale, it is clear that the State of Alaska feels that this action is a direct threat to the fundamental right to manage salmon in Alaska. I am not an expert on State's rights, but it seems like all parties agree that the State is who should be managing this fishery and who has been doing so for decades until this lawsuit brought this issue in front of the Council. If the States articulated position is the starting point of our deliberation, then that leads me to consider the other alternatives. Alternative 3 is fraught with challenges and really ends up with creating another impossible situation.

The truth is there is no good answer for this problem and that is what is so troubling about this action. .

I sincerely hope that a better solution can be found outside of the Council process.

I suspect this is not the last we will hear or see about action at this Council.

I will reluctantly support the State of Alaska's position on this action and support Alternative 4.