

EVOS ANNUAL PROJECT REPORT

Project Number: 02636,03636

Project Title: Fisheries Management Application

PI Names: Kenneth Adams, Ross Mullins

Time Covered by Report: March '02 - Sept. 31 '03

Date of Report: Sept. 8, 2003.

Due to the extremely late approval of our proposal in FY'02, we were advised by staff to include project activities for both FY'02 and FY'03 into this single report. Project objectives are identical in both years.

Work Performed:

Fishermen designed this project so that project activities would be undertaken on a full-time basis before and after the annual fishing season and on part-time basis during the fishing season. Since the project began, we have conducted 5 fishery community workshops for the Prince William Sound (PWS) region in Cordova on a number of topics including herring, hatchery, and general fisheries issues. Participants in the workshops have included ADF&G Resource Management personnel, marine scientists from a variety of locations, local processors, and salmon hatchery managers, representatives from city government, the Native Village, fishermen and GEM personnel. All workshop proceedings have been recorded and transcribed and provide complete meeting accounts. Project results attained to date are consistent with the project objectives.

Our basic goal was to initiate the process for development of fisheries management applications. We began with identification of the resource dependent community's issues and needs. Since herring and salmon provide the basis for PWS fisheries and therefore are of great economic importance to this region, most identified needs have been focused upon these species.

We have attained some success in focusing attention upon herring issues and have indirectly aided the achievement of a fishery management application. We facilitated the involvement of Dr. Gary Marty, a fisheries disease specialist from UC Davis, with his development of a training workshop aimed at identification of herring disease for ADF&G personnel. Herring in PWS are subject to outbreaks of VHS apparently related to population stress. Dr. Marty had participated in our herring workshop and expressed his desire to conduct a disease identification class for ADF&G. We can truly say we aided the process in achieving a resource management application from his fundamental research.

With respect to pink salmon, our workshop process identified the need for implementation of the pink salmon fry survival model developed during the SEA program. In FY'04 Proposal Invitation, GEM acknowledged these needs and invited a proposal for a 1-year planning effort with the likelihood of a subsequent 3-year implementation proposal invitation. Through collaboration with the Principle Investigator of the pink salmon fry model, we supported and encouraged his submittal of a proposal responsive to the GEM invitation. Unfortunately, the proposal submitted was rejected for noncompliance with invitation protocols and the budget surpassed the invitation's funding limitation. We were discouraged by this result. However, the PWSFRAP process was successful in that it did indeed result in a need identification and a means to resolve the need by implementation of a research result developed during the SEA program. Further, a willing partnership with GEM was established for proposal development with the likelihood of proposal implementation. We had in fact initiated development of a bridge from the fundamental SEA science to a fisheries management application.

Our project activities have remained true to the objectives, methods, and study area presented in our proposal. There have been no unusual developments of the our project's progress and we will only state that actual attainment management applications to help resolve an identified community need is a time consuming and laborious process. Results are not readily achieved. This has been true even for our PWS community where we have the advantage of SEA research assets at our disposal. In this regard, we are unique throughout the entire Oil Spill impacted area. It is here in PWS where resource community needs continue to arise and that the likelihood for achievement of management applications from fundamental descriptive science is greatest. We continue to aid the bridge building process, calling attention to the need to seek application of results for the resource dependent community. We stand to improve our community's utilization of natural resources and help provide the means for GEM's response to the community.

The experience gained from our project in FY'02 and '03 has allowed some insights into a means for increasing community participation in projects such as ours. It is our belief that successful attainment of a management application to address the community's needs would significantly improve the public's perception for the utility of scientific results application. In effect, the public is not apt to be swayed by process as much as by attainment of tangible project results. To realistically involve the community in GEM's developing program will demand patience and dedication on both sides.

Future Work

The proposal we submitted for FY'04 varies from our earlier submitted proposal in several regards. Having the benefit of successfully advancing through the GEM proposal review process, we were obligated to revise our proposal to be responsive to recommendations made by the STAC, the Executive Director, staff, and peer reviewers. We therefore altered the duration of our proposal to 1 year from the originally proposed 3 years. We specifically identified the objective of conducting a several day workshop in Cordova to explore the means to improve pink salmon return forecast accuracy and to introduce the PWSFRAP community involvement process to other locations in the Spill impacted region. We have chosen the cities of Seward and

Homer in which to expand our activities as well as to continue the process we have begun for PWS in Cordova. Aside from these differences from our earlier proposal, our approach will be fundamentally the same. We will seek resource community needs identification and prioritization, and assessment of existing research assets which may be utilized in a plan for resolving the identified needs, and the development of a proposal that may be submitted to GEM for plan implementation. In effect, we will continue to serve as the GEM/Resource Community interface, bridge and aid dissemination of information between the communities and GEM. We facilitate and encourage community involvement in the GEM program. This is a mutual and potentially very valuable partnership to attain.

Coordination and Collaboration

The very nature of our community workshop is one of coordination and collaboration. As mentioned early in this report, representatives of the resource community's various offices, agencies, and capabilities have participated in our workshops. In addition to local participation, we have extended our outreach to former SEA Principle Investigators and others in locations far removed from Alaska and have benefited from their collaboration our workshops.

The workshop format provides the means for free discussion of topics of interests to participants. Recorded dialogue and resulting workshop transcripts are typically rich in content and are valuable documents. They help provide the insights around which information flows: community to GEM and visa versa. The information flow is the result our collaborative process.

Community Involvement/TEK/Resource Management Applications

The project we propose for FY'04, as previously mentioned in the Future Work section of this Report, has had the advantage of successfully advancing through the GEM proposal review process. The favorable comments received from the STAC, Executive Director, staff, and peer reviewers all attest to the success our community involvement project has achieved in FY'02 and '03. Further, we are greatly encouraged by reviewer comments that the likelihood of our project initiating resource management applications is very high. This is the essential intent of our project and acknowledgement of the success our labors have attained is appreciated. We propose to continue our efforts in FY'04 to aid the development of management tools for the benefit of the fisheries community and to further the mutually beneficial collaborative relation with GEM.

With respect to TEK, we have had the benefit of direct participation in our workshops by representatives from the local Native Village and have also reached out to villagers in Tatitlek via email correspondence. Through the intermediation of Mr. Paul McCollum of Chugach Regional Resource Commission and Dr. Maryanne Bishop of the PWS Science Center we established contact with residents of Tatitlek who were interested in our future workshops dealing with PWS herring especially regarding subsistence uses of that resource. We will keep residents of that community apprised of our future workshop schedule and will reach out to residents of Chenga as well.

Information Transfer

Our project, as described in this report, is essentially a community involvement project, i.e.: not a project that adheres to scientific protocols including the need to publish results in professional journals. As previously mentioned, workshop proceedings are recorded and transcribed and provide valuable records of workshop activities. We maintain and distribute copies of transcripts from the PWSFRAP office located in Cordova at the Fishermen's Union Hall and also provide copies of workshop transcripts to EVOS/GEM.

We have made presentations regarding the objectives, methods, status, and goals our project has attained to various fishing community organizations including the PWS Aquaculture Corporation, Cordova District Fishermen United, Council of the city of Cordova, Fish Caucus meeting of the Alaska State House of Representatives, the EVOS Trustee Council and at the January '03 annual EVOS Symposium in Anchorage. We have been in attendance at both the '02 and '03 annual symposia and have participated in a variety of related meetings held during that week.

Budget

There have been no difference or problems between actual and budgeted expenditures, nor any substantial changes in allocation of funds among budget form line items.