

Madam Chair and members of the Board,

My name is Jared Danielson. I'm a fourth-generation fisherman and a member of Concerned Area M Fishermen.

I'm here today with a simple point: the best available science does not support additional June restrictions.

The standard should be straightforward: if we're going to restrict a fishery, we should be able to show a measurable benefit — not just assume one.

The June Area M fishery has been studied for decades. Millions of dollars — and extensive work in genetics, stock composition, tagging, and harvest-rate analysis — have gone into understanding it. It is one of the most scrutinized mixed-stock fisheries in the state.

All of that work keeps pointing to the same thing: **June just isn't where you get measurable leverage.**

As outlined in RC 96, the 1987 chum tagging work shows recoveries were dominated by Bristol Bay, with the Yukon only a minor share.

That matters because it speaks directly to what this Board is being asked to assume — that restricting June in Area M will translate into measurable improvements elsewhere. The science does not support that assumption.

To put this in perspective: **June CWAK harvest rates are low single digits.** Meanwhile, the uncertainty in the overall run estimate is roughly tenfold larger than what we take.

We're trying to weigh ounces on a truck scale.

With that level of uncertainty, even substantial changes to June restrictions would be too small to reliably show up on the spawning grounds. Any expected change would be buried in uncertainty. It's simply undetectable.

In conclusion, if I put myself in the Board's position, I need to know that before we add more burden to a fishery that's already been restricted, we can demonstrate a measurable difference at the river — grounded in evidence.

Because the proposals before us will cause certain harm, the burden should be on showing a benefit that is **detectable and repeatable** — a change that clearly shows up in the river data, exceeds normal uncertainty and year-to-year noise, and holds up across years.

So I'm asking the Board to apply a measurable standard:

If the best available science cannot demonstrate a measurable improvement at the river, then additional June restrictions are not supported.

Thank you.

Jared Danielson