

DCTF Members and facilitation team,

Just so it is clear, I, as one of the only two sport reps on the task force, and from Crescent City, was not consulted on this proposal, nor do I endorse all elements, especially those related to sport changes. It should be made clear that this proposal is coming from the commercial sector of Crescent City fishermen and not the “Port of Crescent City”.

The only provisions that I and, I believe, my other sport rep on the task force would agree with in this proposal, at least for the northern section, are the cotton requirements and no sport/commercial fishing in the same season.

As mentioned in workgroups and informally with other task force members throughout this process to this point, us sport reps have not developed proposals or weighed in heavily about the commercial fishery management and would appreciate the same level of deference when it comes to making suggestions for changes in the sport fishery.

Given this proposal, and how this process has been handled thus far, I would now also disagree with recommendation 3 to continue the DCTF (a change from my original position) unless it’s purpose is only to address commercial management. Alternatively, if it continues with the scope of addressing the entire fishery (commercial, sport, and charter), then it should be re-configured to adequately include a representative number of voices from those different sectors. The conversations and debate on the task force through this process to date have almost entirely involved issues about ‘fairness’, competition, and exclusivity regarding the commercial sector, as they rightfully should be since it represents 99% of the resource extraction. Thus recommendations for ACTUAL reform (not proposed stall tactics based future votes, etc.) of the fishery, should not elevate sport regulation reform to a number 2 recommendation, if at all, until serious proposals for commercial measures are put forth from the task force.

Respectfully,

Kevin McKernan