

Prop 34- I firmly oppose proposition 34. I believe that the premise that some gillnetters are ignoring the current regulations requires an increased distance between gear and a near complete ban on gillnetting in shallow water in specifically the Ugashik district is flawed. If gillnetters are allegedly breaking the current laws it would seem more enforcement would be the solution not an expansion of fishing area for setnetters. I believe this proposal is intended to greatly decrease fishing area for gillnetter and provide an unfair advantage to set netters in the Ugashik district. I believe this is not only unfair but also unnecessary. According to the ADF&G 2022 Run Summary, Ugashik set netters harvested 11 percent of the district catch while their allocation is only 10 percent. If they are catching more than they are allocated, I do not see the necessity to grant them special fishing privileges. Additionally, why should Ugashik set netters be entitled to special protections that are not granted to set netters operating in other districts? Dago Creek is an important fishing area for both set netters and gillnetters. I believe the current arrangement does require some awareness and caution when operating during fishing periods but is safe and maximized fishing opportunities for both gear types. Some simple cooperation and communication on the water is all that is required to keep Dago navigable and safe. A drift net ban is completely unnecessary.

Prop 35- I firmly oppose prop 35. Again, I think that if the alleged problem is that driftnetters are not adhering to the 100ft rule then the solution should be more enforcement focus on this issue not an expansion of the distance. As the proposal says there have only been 8 citations given during the last 5 years, which does not seem to indicate this is a regular occurrence. If enforcement makes it more of a priority and citations for such offenses increases dramatically then perhaps a change in the rules is warranted but to preemptively make a rule change which eliminates so much potential fishing area for one gear type seems premature and unjust. If it is indeed a safety issue that would indicate that the set netter is very close to their net and should be able to capture/report the incident. I completely understand and support the current buffer zone. Set netters should not be impeded by gillnets and I think the current regulations support that as is with no increase necessary.

Prop 42-45: I oppose the elimination of the D permit regulation. I believe the D permit helps all participants in the fishery by removing nets from the water. Even if you choice not to fish a D permit you are benefiting because there is less boats on the water and less competition. Given how profitable the fishery has been recently a removal of the D system would cause a huge increase in the number of boats fishing and amount of gear in the water.

Prop 46: I am in favor of allowing permit stacking. I think that the more boats fishing with D permits the more profitable the fishery is for all participants. It is much like a permit buyback but it is solely funded by the fishermen wishing to fish an additional 50f of gear.

Prop 49-54: I am in favor of opening the eastside general district management area after all rivers reach their upper end escapement goals. I think that if the state

cannot afford to enforce the boundaries late season, which is currently what is happening, it creates a terrible situation that only benefits a few fishermen that have no problem breaking the law. It puts everyone else at a disadvantage for no reason. As long as the fish taxes are accurately collected and the rivers have reached their goals I see no downside to this rule change. I strongly support it and think it would make for a much more equitable and fair end of the season.