

Kuskokwim River Salmon Management Working Group

1 (800) 315-6338 (MEET) Code: 58756# (KUSKO)

ADF&G Bethel toll free: 1 (855) 933-2433

Meeting Summary

November 30, 2012

Called to order at 9:00am at ADFG in Bethel and adjourned at 1:50pm. Eight of thirteen members were present and a quorum was established.

AGENDA ITEMS:

- 1.) New Business: Discussion topics.
 - a) Recommended Kuskokwim River Escapement goals.
 - b) Alternative Kuskokwim River Salmon management plan (*Doug Molyneaux presenting*)
- 2.) Old Business
 - a) Kuskokwim Area Board of Fish Proposals: Proposal 106
 - b) Report: ADF&G Chinook Salmon Symposium in Anchorage on October 22-23 (*Greg Roczicka*)
 - c) USFWS Information request Letter (*included in the November 3rd packet*)
 - d) Action items from previous meetings:
 - i. Select a representative to attend the Board of Fish on behalf of the KRSMWG
 - ii. Working Group suggestions for improving the Kuskokwim River management plan.
 - iii. Discussion/approval: Bev Hoffman's letter to recruit an upriver elder (*letter distributed on September 29th and included in the November 3rd packet*).
 - iv. Discussion of the Iyana Gusty Award (*raised by Bob Aloysius during the August 22 meeting*).
 - v. Lamont Albertson's letter in support of HB332 (*March 30 meeting*)
 - vi. Lamont Albertson's letter in support of USFWS participation in the KRSMWG (*March 30 meeting*)
 - vii. Review of KRSMWG Bylaws *Tabled until 2013*
 - viii. Update KRSMWG Seats (roll-call list, possible alternates) *Tabled until 2013*

WORKING GROUP ACTION ITEMS:

- 1.) Working Group Representatives to attend the January meeting of the Board of Fish in support of WG proposals and opinions on proposals before the Board this cycle (*Greg Roczicka and LaMont Albertson*).
- 2.) Distribute the approved recruitment letters for the Upriver Elder seat on the KRSMWG (*Bev Hoffman and staff*).
- 3.) Letter of Support of USFWS participation in the KRSMWG (*LaMont Albertson*).
- 4.) Letter in support of legislation to establish a Chinook salmon research endowment, consistent with the HB332 in 2012, but in the new legislative session (*LaMont Albertson*).

WORKING GROUP MOTIONS:

- 1.) Approve the Agenda. Motion Passed unanimously.
- 2.) Approve the Departments Recommended Chinook salmon Escapement Goal package for the Kuskokwim River and tributaries. Motion failed.
- 3.) Requesting the BOF to direct the Department to work with the Working Group over the next cycle to develop an appropriate OEG package for Chinook salmon management in the Kuskokwim watershed. Motion Passed.
- 4.) Support the alternative management plan currently under development with the consultation of the 'Guidance Committee.' Motion passed.
- 5.) To approve the draft letter of recruitment for an Upriver Elder representative. Motion passed unanimously.
- 6.) Appoint Greg Roczicka and LaMont Albertson, or alternates of their choice, to attend the Board of Fish meeting and January as representatives of the Kuskokwim River Salmon Management Working Group. Motion Passed unanimously.
- 7.) To Table discussion of the USFWS Information Request letter from October. Motion Passed unanimously.

PEOPLE TO BE HEARD: *There were no comments offered during People to Be Heard.*

Kevin Bartley, a graduate student with USF&WS, spoke via teleconference late in the meeting. Kevin informed the group that paperwork regarding his project was going forward and he was hoping to be in Bethel before the Christmas holidays or shortly after. Chairman Greg Roczicka stated that this announcement was more appropriate for the 'People to be Heard' section of the meeting than at the end.

NEW BUSINESS: *Two major Discussions:*

1.) Recommended Kuskokwim River Escapement goals.

- A few questions regarding the Kuskokwim River Chinook Salmon Escapement Goal memo (*Page 4 of the November 30 Working Group packet. Also distributed within the summary for the September 27 meeting on Page 27 and via email from staff to Working Group members sent September 29*).

Casie Stockdale, of Bethel, called attention to page 5 of the memo and the suggestion that managers consider alternatives to the Biological Escapement Goal described in the memo. Casie noted a table on page 4 of the memo that contained a description of four potential goal ranges described for each of two methods for calculating goals: Traditional and Bayesian. She further noted that some goals described ranges set higher than the one chosen by the Department and that the final statement of the memo suggested that the "Escapement Goal Team strongly consider alternative goals based on other factors." Casie went on to ask, if each of the goal ranges suggested were reported to show a 95% probability of an expected yield of salmon of at least 100,000, were there any negative implications of choosing one of the higher ranges?

Kevin Schaberg of the Department explained some of the differences between the traditional method and the Bayesian method for determining the goal ranges. One of the most important was that Bayesian developed goals have tended to perform better in the real world, and this was largely attributed to their greater ability to account for uncertainty than goal ranges developed through the traditional methods, and the Bayesian ranges tended to be lower than corresponding 'traditional' ranges.

Casie alluded to the statement suggesting that the team consider other factors, and asked what other factors had been considered by the team.

Kevin listed two factors: 1) a reluctance to choose a range with a low end that was below any that had yet been observed in Kuskokwim River Chinook migrations, and 2) ensuring that yields would be large enough to account for escapement and subsistence. He tried and failed to recall a third consideration. *-Kevin listed reasons given in the AYK escapement goal memo announcing Department intended escapement goal recommendations. This memo is different from the one being discussed above, and is the official recommendation method instead of an accounting of the analysis done. For more details on the reasons given for choices made regarding these goals, see the WG meeting summary for September 27, page 23, first paragraph.*

Casie, recognizing that the Bayesian method incorporates uncertainty with the data, asked how uncertainty in the model was dealt with.

Kevin said that the Department had chosen to work with the ranges that account for 80% precision and this helped account for that uncertainty in part by making the goal ranges wider.

Casie asked how these methods could be seen to cope with issues of decreasing densities of fish upriver, weak stock protection, and sex ratios.

Kevin stated that the Department is aware of these issues but reiterated the position that the escapement goal is not an appropriate vehicle for dealing with them.

Doug Molyneaux and Dan Gilikin discussed some experimental production models that account for sex ratios and age composition/relative contribution to the population.

Kevin said that the Department had been experimenting with these and at this point they were more of an academic enterprise. Kevin did say that recent experimentation, in which females had been used as the primary focus of the productivity model, had provided results that were very similar to the model currently being used, which does not break out spawners by sex.

Mike Thalhauser wanted to know why the memo provided several options for a BEG and the final choice was an SEG.

Kevin Schaberg explained that a BEG is determined biologically centering on maximum sustained yield (msy). He said that an SEG was chosen since the focal point was placed well above msy. The recommended goal no longer fit the criteria of being a biological escapement goal, as other factors had been considered when making the choice. In answer to a further question from Mike, Kevin asserted that there was essentially no difference between the weight placed on, or the methods used to manage toward and determine whether the escapement goal had been reached. Mike said that the way he interpreted the regulations, he believed there was a difference.

- Over the past several months, there has been much discussion of an upcoming Department report that explains the analysis behind the choice of Chinook salmon escapement goals that will be presented at the Board of Fisheries. There were several comments/questions regarding this report, due to be published by the end of December. *Note: this report was published on December 28, 2012 and is now available on the Board's web page.* http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/regulations/regprocess/fisheriesboard/pdfs/2012-2013/ayk/fms12_08.pdf

Tom Doolittle wanted to know when the report would be complete. Kevin Schaberg hoped that it would be completed and through peer review by the time of an upcoming meeting between USF&WS and the Department on the 12 of December. When asked about whether the FW Service would be allowed to comment on the report, Kevin said that all commentary would be reviewed and considered prior to publishing of the report.

Tom asked whether the types of density dependence relationships, concepts at the core of the productivity model used to develop the goals, had been proven for all species. Kevin responded that these relationships were well established for Chinook salmon, the species affected by this discussion.

Kay Larson-Blair, with OSM, wanted to know whether the components of all the data collection would be explained in the report. Kevin Schaberg responded that brief explanations would be made but for more detail, interested individuals would refer to the reports cataloging the results of each individual study that had contributed to the analysis. An exhaustive references section would be present at the end of the report (*standard protocol for scientific and agency reports*).

- Similar to considerations surrounding the expected report from the Department, the USF&WS had stated an intention of publishing a report of their own examining the analysis and choices around providing an escapement goal strategy for Kuskokwim River Chinook salmon. At the time of the November 30th meeting, the agency was preparing to take its analysis to the next step. *USF&WS OSM sent a letter to the BOF on January 8 regarding its position on the Escapement goal selection. This letter was distributed in an email to the Working Group in an email from Chris Shelden on that date.*

Dan Gilikin informed the Working Group that the agency would soon be convening an expert team to evaluate the model and the analysis that had led to the escapement goals being recommended. He expected this team to begin meeting the following week in preparation for the December 12th meeting. He said that the team intended to present its findings to the state and give them a chance to respond prior to the BOF meeting. He listed members of the team, including: Dan Gilikin, Shareef Siddeek (biometrician with USF&WS), Stephen Fried (leading expert with that agency), and Kay Larson-Blair.

Bev Hoffman of Bethel noted that the agency had been looking at the state's data and recommendations for some time. She asked whether they yet had any opinion to share. Dan Gilikin responded that the team had not yet met to evaluate the information and that the formal analysis had not yet begun. He said that, as had been stated in the agency's letter to the BOF, they would remain neutral until the analysis was done. Tom Doolittle said the agency had not had enough time to process the information.

Doug Molyneaux asked whether USF&WS had a timeline for completing its analysis and making its results public. Dan stated that the agency hoped to have preliminary analysis by the December 12th meeting.

- Kevin Schaberg repeatedly made the point that an escapement goal, once adopted, will be reviewed on a three year cycle. If it is found to be insufficient, it will be changed.
- In answer to a question from Tom Doolittle, Kevin Schaberg stated that the model does a good job of describing what we actually see and then applying a density dependence curve to use an observed relationship to make predictions. The causation is not described by the model and only after such a model exists can you begin to investigate the causes of an observed pattern. A salmon experiences many factors in freshwater and salt water that affect its survival and therefore have an effect on any model used to describe observed conditions. Therefore, habitat may not be the only constraining factor.

Tom was asking about saturation of habitat and Kevin pointed out that freshwater habitat is not the only factor that may or may not limit survival through a density dependent affect. The mortality could be occurring at any life stage and in any environment used by the salmon. Based on the model alone, one would not have a definitive cause because it is only observing the affect.

- Casie Stockdale asked whether large volumes of males seen in high abundance could be the reason that so few offspring return: if the population was primarily composed of males with many fewer females present, would this create a situation where managers felt enough fish had escaped, and yet the actual number of breeding females had been too small to sustain the population at replacement levels? Kevin Schaberg answered that there had been a lot of males in the years in question, but there had also been a lot of females. Proportion of males to females is an important factor, but one shouldn't ignore that fact that large numbers of females had been present and were reproductively successful.
- James Charles asked whether the BOF could change the goals if they didn't agree. Department staff explained that the goals set by the Department would be placed on the books regardless. However, if the Board identified a serious concern, it would be able to direct the Department to develop an Optimal Escapement Goal (OEG) that managers would then be bound to manage for. A Goal of this type does not replace other types of goals, but it becomes more important than they are and managers must seek to meet them. An SEG or BEG are determined using only the biological information, but an OEG can be considered based on other factors, such as economic or cultural. The recommended Goal would stay in regulation until the Board chose to remove the OEG, or until the Department identified another goal based on new information.
- Doug Molyneaux suggested that it might be unlikely that the board would reject the department's goals under these circumstances. When Mike Thalhauser asked whether a management plan was essentially an OEG, Doug Molyneaux responded that it was not. *–Some confusion may exist here. BOF proposal 106 from AVCP discusses adjustments to the management plan, but the main thrust of the proposal is to encourage the BOF to adopt an OEG. These two distinct entities are combined in the AVCP proposal and this may have served*

to confuse some stake holders as to the difference between an escapement goal and a management plan.

- Doug Molyneaux felt that adjustments to the tributary goals were drastic and represented too big of a chance to take. He suggested an additional buffer be placed on the goals as a safeguard against unforeseen problems. Kevin Schaberg agreed that this plan represented a significant change and the methods were new to the area. He went on to clarify that, had the original methods that were used to develop Kuskokwim Tributary escapement goals (the percentile method) been used to update the current goals, all the goals that we currently had on the books would have been adjusted downward. This would have occurred either way as more information came to light and improved the Department's understanding of Kuskokwim Chinook productivity.
- Casie Stockdale voiced some concern for the availability of funding to continue monitoring the tributaries as inputs for management. Kevin stated that though funding was uncertain, ADF&G would continue to seek funding to continue existing projects and possibly to initiate other projects to fill data gaps that currently exist.
- Ray Collins of McGrath stated the hope that in the coming year, the group would work on developing a set of tools for management to find ways to allow people to harvest fish while letting some escape to the upper system. He was hoping for some mechanism other than complete closure. Bev Hoffman agreed, and said that this was one of the things she liked about the alternate plan.
- Dan Gilikin asked whether the Department was planning on continuing the management plan evaluation process in the near future or through the next cycle. Kevin Schaberg said that staff had discussed the evaluation process going forward, specific to achieving escapement goals. There had been no resolution but there is some interest in continuing that work. Dan suggested that the Department might consider using some of the expected new funding for outreach to help with this evaluation process.

2.) Alternative Kuskokwim River Salmon management plan (*Doug Molyneaux presenting - See November 30 meeting packet for details*).

Doug Molyneaux introduced the alternative management plan effort by describing how the effort was initiated, who had been involved, and listing the dates of meetings (*page 16 of the packet*). Doug went on to discuss the plan and all of the proposed changes, both those that had been agreed upon by all parties and those that still caused disagreement.

- During the discussion, Doug Molyneaux made it clear that he had seriously considered and incorporated most or all of the suggestions given to him by stakeholders throughout the development process. During that process each of these components had been discussed by the committee and either refined or discarded.
- Fish and Game staff stated that they had participated fully in the process and had compromised whenever possible. However, they felt the plan was overly redundant and overly prescriptive, which could make things too rigid for managers and make it difficult to manage effectively in a changing landscape of incoming information. The department

voiced concerns and said that if these could be adequately addressed, the department could support the plan. Some of the concerns presented legal difficulties, and Department staff believed these would be rejected by the Board. The most contentious concerns are listed below:

- **Managing for the “midpoint” of the goal range:** Doug and others have suggested that management should aim for the midpoint of the escapement goal range in order to have a better chance of falling within it. The Department accepted that the criterion of the midpoint would benefit the beginning of the commercial fishery because it would trigger that fishery only after a large enough number of Chinook salmon had been identified, relaxing concern about reaching escapement goals. However, the plan also required that a projection of meeting the midpoint necessary for allowing unrestricted subsistence fishing. This was considered far too draconian and unjustified based on the historical observed Chinook salmon runs. Therefore, the group was able to reach consensus with reference to using the midpoint of the goal to influence the date of the onset of the commercial fishery, but not with regard to “opening” the subsistence fishery (currently the subsistence fishery is open until closed). Doug Molyneaux agreed to consider these arguments in the next iteration of the alternate plan.
- **Including language that could be redundant to or in conflict with other regulations:** The alternative plan defines what types of gear can be used in commercial and subsistence fishing, specifically with respect to allowable mesh size, and how and when fish wheels can be used. These issues are both addressed in other regulations (5 AAC 07.331 and 5 AAC 01.270 respectively). The Department of Fish and Game must avoid writing redundant or conflicting regulations and must resist any attempt at creating such conflict or redundancy. With respect to mesh size in the commercial fishery, there is another proposal currently under consideration that would achieve similar goals to those suggested in the alternative management plan (Proposal 110, as discussed in Info Packets from 21 August and 3 November).
- **Defining a harvest cap for salmon species in years of low abundance:** Managers suggested that defining a harvest cap was unnecessarily prescriptive, and that it could lead to commercial fishermen under-reporting their catch so that they would be allowed to continue fishing. Managers favored more ambiguous terms, such as suggesting that only “negligible” incidental catch would be allowed.
- Tom Doolittle of USF&WS stated that he didn't see any problems with the plan but stated that the federal inseason manager would have to look at the plan. When asked whether Gene Peltola was “tuned in” to the situation, Tom and Dan Gilikin responded that he was. Tom also stated that any of agreement with this plan would be predicated on whether it complied with Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.
- Casie Stockdale of Bethel voiced a concern that the BOF might pick and choose from this plan rather than adopting it in its entirety. Doug Molyneaux and Greg Roczicka both attested to the fact that once the information is presented to the Board, the management plan will go beyond the control of the committee. He asserted that it was important that the Working Group be represented at the meeting to help guide the process.

- Ray Collins of McGrath and Mark Leary of Napaimute complimented Doug's efforts in putting the alternative plan together.
- Kevin Schaberg with the Department stated that he kept hearing people say that management was going forward without public input. Kevin stated that this was untrue and that public input had been solicited and incorporated at every stage, from agreeing on a preseason management plan to enacting management inseason, to the production of a recommended escapement goal package and input into the alternative management plan. He said that people often confused decisions they did not like with the Department ignoring their concerns.
- When asked whether the Department would support the alternative plan, John Linderman stated that the Department would be able to support portions consistent with the discussion already made. He said that the divergence of thought would make the process more complicated. He also stated that the most recent iterations of the plan would be used as a draft for the Department as well in putting together its discussion points for the Board meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

1.) Kuskokwim Area Board of Fish Proposals: Proposal 106

In the final moments of the meeting, the Working Group discussed BOF Proposal 106, and though they didn't vote on this proposal directly, they determined that, through support of the Alternative Management Plan initiative, the decisions of the Working Group were consistent with those suggested by the proposal. See discussion above under New Business '2.), and below under comments for Motion 4.

2.) Report: ADF&G Chinook Salmon Symposium in Anchorage on October 22-23 (Greg Roczicka)

Greg stated that he had attended the meeting on behalf of, and at the expense of, the Working Group. He said that on the morning of the first day, he had felt that the focus had been largely a rehash of the state of King salmon across the state. The afternoon session had gone into more detail on the 'lack' of understanding of Chinook productivity. "I'm sorry to say but it sounds almost like, it was so frustrating, like it almost doesn't matter what we do on the Kuskokwim when it comes to actual management for our fishery within this drainage. That survivability once [Chinook] hit the oceans, the changing weather patterns that we are seeing, and different factors as far as the prevailing winds now coming out of the North east driving the smolt offshore out to where they are more subject to the predation of the pollock fish, not the pollock fishery but the pollock fish... significantly reducing the survivability of the first year at sea and some of the other factors... it's almost we send out record escapements and there's hopefully record numbers of smolts going out to sea but they don't come back. And it's not just the pollock fishery itself." He said it was a real tough thing to come to terms with.

3.) USFWS Information request Letter (*included in the November 3rd packet*)
See discussion below for Motion 7.

4.) Action items from previous meetings:

a) Select a representative to attend the Board of Fish on behalf of the KRSMWG. *See comments for Motion 6 below.*

b) Working Group suggestions for improving the Kuskokwim River management plan. *See discussion above, New Business, Item '2.)'*

c) Discussion/approval: Bev Hoffman's letter to recruit an upriver elder
Letter distributed on September 29th and included in the November 3rd packet. See comments below, Motion 5.

d) Discussion of the Iyana Gusty Award (*raised by Bob Aloysius during the August 22 meeting*). *–This item was not discussed and will appear on the next meeting agenda.*

e) Lamont Albertson's letter in support of HB332 (*March 30 meeting*).
This item was not discussed.

This bill would have supported the creation of an endowment for the scientific study of Chinook salmon in Alaska. By the time the Working Group became aware of and voted on supporting this measure, a letter of support would have been superfluous. If a similar bill is presented in the upcoming session, a letter of support would be consistent with the spirit of the motion on March 30, 2012. Conversations with co-chair LaMont Albertson suggest that if such a bill is presented, a letter from Working Group chairs may be drafted, recognizing the intent of the Working Group from early 2012.

f) Lamont Albertson's letter in support of USFWS participation in the KRSMWG (*March 30 meeting*). *This item was not discussed.*

There is no deadline for this letter and it may be drafted before the next Working Group meeting.

WORKING GROUP MOTIONS:

MOTION 1: Approve the Agenda. Motion Passed unanimously.

COMMENTS FOR MOTION 1:

There was a brief synopsis of the Agenda items and discussion of agenda structure. There were no changes made from the original Agenda.

MOTION 2: Approve the Departments Recommended Chinook salmon Escapement Goal package for the Kuskokwim River and tributaries. Motion failed (2 yea, 6 nay).

COMMENTS FOR MOTION 2:

Mike Williams of Akiak commented that he felt that the Department's recommendation had been explained well and appeared to be sustainable. Mike was inclined to support the recommendation.

Greg Roczicka of Bethel stated that he preferred to frame the question differently. Not that he so much agreed or disagreed with the recommendation, but that he felt that other concerns could be considered and refined in the process of defining an OEG.

Casie Stockdale, LaMont Albertson, and Bev Hoffman all stated that they did not support the recommendation; citing the rapidity with which the recommendation had appeared and been presented, and a perceived "clumsy process."

MOTION 3: Requesting the BOF to direct the Department to work with the Working Group over the next cycle to develop an appropriate OEG package for Chinook salmon management in the Kuskokwim watershed. Motion Passed (6 yea, 1 nay).

COMMENTS FOR MOTION 3:

Mike Williams stated that he never wanted to see a repeat of the situation that had occurred in the summer of 2012. He felt that the objectives of management could be better achieved through the involvement of the villages.

MOTION 4: Support the alternative management plan under development with the consultation of the 'Guidance Committee.' Motion passed (6 yea, 1 nay).

COMMENTS FOR MOTION 4:

See comments under New Business #2: Alternative Management Plan.

MOTION 5: To approve the draft letter of recruitment for an Upriver Elder representative. Motion passed unanimously.

COMMENTS FOR MOTION 5: *None.*

MOTION 6: Appoint Greg Roczicka and LaMont Albertson, or alternates of their choice, to attend the Board of Fish meeting and January as representatives of the Kuskokwim River Salmon Management Working Group. Motion Passed unanimously.

COMMENTS FOR MOTION 6:

The motion was originally made to make Greg Roczicka the Working Group representative at the BOF meeting in January. After discussion, this motion was amended to allow the assignment of alternates to this position. There was some discussion on who would act as alternate and who could be available.

MOTION 7: To Table discussion of the USFWS Information Request letter from October. Motion Passed unanimously.

COMMENTS FOR MOTION 7:

Staff suggested that this item could be tabled for further discussion or tabled indefinitely. Working Group members agreed that tabling this item indefinitely would be sufficient and there was no further discussion on this point.

GENERAL COMMENTS FROM WORKING GROUP MEMBERS: *None.*

WORKING GROUP ATTENDANCE:

MEMBER SEAT:	NAME:
UPRIVER ELDER	<i>vacant</i>
DOWNRIVER ELDER	James Charles
COMMERCIAL FISHER	<i>absent</i>
LOWER RIVER SUBSISTENCE	Mike Williams
MIDDLE RIVER SUBSTENCE	Gerald Simeon
UPPER RIVER SUBSISTENCE	Mark Leary
HEADWATERS SUBSISTENCE	Daniel Esai
PROCESSOR	Stuart Curry
MEMBER AT LARGE	<i>absent</i>
SPORT FISHER	LaMont Albertson
WESTERN INTERIOR RAC	Ray Collins
Y-K DELTA RAC	<i>absent</i>
ADF&G	Kevin Schaberg
CHAIR	Greg Roczicka

Other Participants:	
<u>ADF&G Comm. Fish</u> : John Linderman, Jan Conitz, Kevin Schaberg, Chris Shelden <u>Sport Fish</u> : John Chythlook <u>Subsistence Division</u> : Hiroko Ikuta, Dave Runfola, Brandon Chapman	
<u>USFWS</u> : Tom Doolittle, Robert Sundown, Dan Gilikin, Kevin Bartley <u>OSM</u> : George Papis, Don Rivard, Pippa Kenner, Kay Larson-Blair	
Mike Thalhauser-KNA LaDonn Robbins-KNA Roberta Chavez-ONC Angela Denning-Barnes -KYUK Art Nelson-BSFA Doug Molyneaux	Jeff Sanders Henry Tikuin Casie Stockdale-Alterante Lower River Subsistence Dave Cannon- Alternate Middle River Subsistence Bev Hoffman- Alternate Sport Fisher

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS:

Alaska Department of Fish and Game (**ADF&G**), Orutsararmiut Native Council (**ONC**), Kuskokwim Native Association (**KNA**), Association of Village Council Presidents (**AVCP**), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (**USFWS**), Bethel Test Fishery project (**BTF**), Catch Per Unit Effort (**CPUE**), Coastal Village Seafoods (**CVS**), ADF&G Commercial Fisheries Division (**CF**), ADF&G Sport Fisheries Division (**SF**), Regional Advisory Council (**RAC**), Kuskokwim River Salmon Management Working Group (**KRSMWG or Working Group, WG**), Sustainable Escapement Goal (**SEG**), Biological Escapement Goal (**BEG**), Management Objective (**MO**), Amounts Reasonably Necessary for Subsistence (**ANS**), Emergency Order (**EO**)