I AM THE AUTHOR OF PROPOSAL #84 AND SPEAK STRONGLY IN FAVOR OF THIS PROPOSAL. MANY YEARS AGO, WHEN IT WAS RECOGNIZED THAT KING SALMON COULD BE AT RISK IN THE NAKNEK RIVER DRAINAGE, SPORT FISHERMEN BANDED TOGETHER AND INITIATED STEPS THAT WOULD ASSIST IN PROTECTING THE VIABILITY OF THIS SPECIE. THERE ARE 3 MAIN TRIBUTARIES THAT OFFER KING SPAWNING AREAS ON THE NAKNEK RIVER, IN ADDITION TO THE RIVER ITSELF. PAULS CREEK, KING SALMON CREEK AND BIG CREEK. OF THESE THREE TRIBUTARIES BIG CREEK IS THE LARGEST AND CARRIES BY FAR THE LARGEST NUMBER OF SPAWNING CHINOOK. .

WHEN CONTEMPLATING CLOSURE OF CERTAIN AREAS TO PROTECT THE KING SALMON, WE HAD TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THAT THE NAKNEK RIVER WAS UNIQUE IN IT'S NATURE AND DID NOT ACCOMMODATE CERTAIN GEAR GROUPS AS READILY AS OTHERS. THE GEAR GROUP IN THIS INSTANCE WAS THE FLY FISHERMAN, THEY WERE ALSO THE MAJOR USERS OF THE TRIBUTARIES DUE TO THE INABILITY TO EFFECTIVELY OR SAFELY FLY FISH FOR KING SALMON ON THE NAKNEK RIVER. IT WAS DECIDED THAT BOTH PAULS CREEK AND KING SALMON CREEK SHOULD BE CLOSED FROM THE MOUTH UP, BOTH TRIBUTARIES HOSTED SPAWNING GROUNDS THAT WERE RELATIVELY CLOSE TO THE RIVER AND THEY BOTH WERE SHOWING SIGNIFICANT SIGNS OF STRESS IN LOW ESCAPEMENT NUMBERS RELATIVE TO HISTORICAL DATA.

BIG CREEK, ON THE OTHER HAND WAS EASILY AND CONSISTENTLY REMAINING WITHIN THE ESCAPEMENT GOALS AND WAS A MUCH LONGER TRIBUTARY WHERE SPAWNING FOR KING SALMON DOES NOT OCCUR UNTIL APPROXIMATELY 10 MILES UP THE CREEK, WITH MOST FISH SPAWNING EVEN FURTHER AWAY FROM THE RIVER. OVER 90% OF ALL SPORTFISHING OCCURS WITHING 5 MILES OF THE CREEK MOUTH. THE SPAWNING AREAS ARE PRIMARILY ACCESSIBLE BY BOAT WITH LIMITED PLANE ACCESS ONCE YOU ARE AROUND 30 MILES UP THE CREEK.

IF ADOPTED THIS PROPOSAL WOULD NOT INCREASE THE HARVEST FOR KINGS AS IT IS SPECIFICALLY FOR CATCH AND RELEASE ONLY AND IT WOULD ONCE AGAIN ALLOW A GEAR GROUP TO HAVE ACCESS TO A SPECIE THAT CURRENTLY IS NOT SAFELY ACCESSIBLE FOR THEM ON THE NAKNEK RIVER ITSELF.

PROPOSAL 85 I SUPPORT, AGAIN THIS WAS AN UNINTENTIONAL CONSEQUENCE OF THE BIG CREEK CLOSURE IN 2013.

PROPOSAL 86 I WOULD SUPPORT WITH MODIFICATION, THIS SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED FOR UN-GUIDED SPORT FISHERMEN AS GUIDES ARE ALREADY REQUIRED TO SEND IN ALL CATCH INFORMATION EVERY 14 DAYS IN LOG BOOK FORM AND IT WOULD BE REDUNDANT AND LEAD TO BAD INFORMATION IF BOTH HARVESTS ARE BEING RECORDED, ONE FROM THE GUIDES INFORMATION AND ONE FROM THE HARVEST TICKET, WHEN ONLY ONE FISH IS BEING HARVESTED.

PROPOSAL 87 I DO NOT SUPPORT, I SEE NO BIOLOGICAL REASON FOR THIS RESTRICTION AND DO SEE AN AWFUL LOT OF HEAD ACHE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL IF ADOPTED. THEY WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE, IN THE FIELD, TO USE THEIR JUDGMENT IN DECIDING IF ANYTHING A SPORTFISHERMAN WAS USING REMOTELY RESEMBLED AN EGG OR EGG CLUSTER. THE SPORT FISHERY WOULD GAIN NOTHING FROM THIS HEADACHE IF THE PROPOSAL WERE ADOPTED.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION, I WELCOME ANY QUESTIONS ANYONE MIGHT HAVE.