

Submitted By:

Chuck M Callum

The attached RC is submitted in support of Proposal 61 and contains transcripts from the 1977 and 1978 Board of Fish (BOF) meetings when the Cape Igvak Salmon Management Plan (CISMP) was discussed and enacted. The transcripts confirm the following:

- When the CISMP was adopted, a key motivating factor behind allocating 15% of the Igvak sockeye harvest to Kodiak was the BOF's desire to share the income Chignik made from the Igvak fishery with Kodiak in order to alleviate economic hardship Kodiak was experiencing at the time.
- If the BOF could justify adopting the CISMP due to a need to assist the Kodiak economy, the BOF can amend the CISMP to provide economic relief to Chignik during a period of significant economic hardship.
- The 300,000 / 600,000 harvest projections adopted by the BOF were based on assessments of dollar and per pound fish values applicable 40 years ago. The BOF believed that the 300,000 / 600,000 projections would provide adequate protection to Chignik based on economic values relevant in 1978.
- In the past 40 years, both dollar and sockeye values have declined, but the CISMP's allocation percentage and harvest projections have remained the same.

**Selected Board of Fisheries Transcripts
on the Cape Igvak Interception Fishery
Meetings of December 1977 and April 1978**

January 1999

Transcribed and Submitted
by Chignik Seiners Association
Box 46, Chignik Bay, Alaska 99564

Table of ContentsPage

Public Testimony December 1977, Tapes # 35 & 36 -----	1
Boris Kosbruk (Chignik) -----	1
<i>Boris argues that the Cape Igvak interception fishery is not historical and points out that a recent tagging study suggests that Chignik sockeye are being caught on the South end of Kodiak Island.</i>	
Ray Anderson (Chignik) -----	2
<i>Ray points out that the Board's unanimous vote to close the non-historical Igvak interception Fishery in 1970 was foiled by a court injunction on a technicality.</i>	
Tom Casey (Kodiak) -----	2
<i>Tom argues for the fairness of an economic allocation from Chignik to Kodiak based on Chignik's relative wealth as compared to Kodiak.</i>	
 Board Deliberations, December 1977, Tape #65 -----	 3
<i>The Chair appoints a committee whose goal it is to 'resolve' the Cape Igvak issue that evening. Gordon Jensen is appointed Chairman of the committee and Nick Szabo says that he will be attending. The next morning Chairman, Nick Szabo, reports that while the committee discussed several options that the committee had failed to reach an agreement. Chairman, Nick Szabo, asks if anyone would like to make a motion to "adopt any particular concept". An unidentified Board member makes a motion to "adopt this concept", but fails to be specific about which concept he means, prompting Nick Szabo to ask if he is talking about option three specifying the 15% allocation. The Board member agrees. After a brief discussion during which one Board member expresses his opinion that he thought that the allocation was going to be 10% the motion goes to the vote. The Board votes four in favor two opposed and one absent to approve the concept and instructs staff to work on the details of the plan for discussion at the next meeting in the spring.</i>	
 Board Deliberations, April 1978, Tape # 51 & 52 -----	 6
<i>Jim Beaton expresses the belief that a 600,000 guaranteed sockeye harvest in Chignik would provide a strong economic base. 'Jimmy' Huntington states that he feels that the 600,000 guarantee is not enough and shows a one sided picture. Jim Beaton states that Kodiak people feel that Chignik is getting too rich and that they want a piece of the action. Jim Beaton is very sympathetic with the sacrifice that Chignik fishermen have gone through to build up the run but he says that other people have short memories about this. Jim Beaton concurs with Gordon Jensen and Calvin Fair in the opinion that the Kodiak fishermen's attitude toward sharing of the salmon resource is a one way street and that Kodiak fishermen wouldn't want to share if they were in Chignik's position. Jim Beaton says that while Kodiak has some good runs that they aren't seen as having a bonanza like some see Chignik having. Jim Beaton suggests that the difference between Kodiak income and Chignik income is great enough to trigger a limited entry problem that could result in the state giving or selling more Chignik permits that could expand the Chignik fleet to 150. He states that it is in Chigniks long term interest to give up this allocation now rather than end up with half later. Jim Beaton states that the Kodiak people have found a way to use the Board to get a piece of the Chignik action but hopefully a small portion and that if it gets out of hand he is willing to take a hard look at doing away with Igvak in the future. After having voted 4/2 in support of the concept of allocating 15% in December of 1977 the Board voted 6/0 at this meeting in April of 1978 to approve the management plan.</i>	

December 1977
Board of Fisheries
Public Testimony
Selected Transcription by CSA
From the Board Audio Tapes
Tapes # 35 & 36

Board members: Nick Szabo, Chairman - Kodiak , Jim Beaton - Juneau, Calvin Fair - Soldotna, Jimmy Huntington - Galena, Gordon Jensen - Petersburg, Ted Duncan - Anchorage, Herman Schroeder - Dillingham

TAPE 35 SIDE A

[376] Boris Kosbruk (Chignik): “Well, you have to realize that False Pass is somewhat of a historical fishery and that this mainland district was first fished in '64 and in effect get [unintelligible] about 1968. And another interesting point was that, correct me if I'm wrong Jack, but I think that there was a tagging program last summer in the west end of Kodiak. And uh, the only reason I know about this is that I, I asked them to recover two of them, but I think there was about twenty-seven recovered at Chignik. I heard somebody saying a few minutes ago that that was local stock, but how come I got twenty-seven tags in Chignik? [384] They're not only intercepting our fish in Cape Igvak and the mainland district, but they're also intercepting us in the West end of Kodiak. So.

[432] Jim Beaton: “Yeah, you're pretty well versed Boris. Either you or one of the staff could tell us. They're only tagging—supposed to be tagging studies we've had—we've only had one or so. But if the best data you have, you know, can you make an estimate roughly of what percentage *are* Chignik fish? Maybe Jack could answer that best. To have, you know, your best [?].”

Staff: “I think we've settled on eighty percent and this may be on the low end. It could be a lot higher than that. We calculate how many Chignik fish were interceptors. We utilize 80% because that's what we can derive from the tagging studies that we did in 1968 and 1969.”

Nick Szabo, Chairman: “It's more conclusive data then, than say when False Pass does [unintelligible]. You're pretty comfortable with that 80% figure, isn't that right?”

Staff: “Well, the tagging studies that we did in 1969 are pretty conclusive. It was a good, good tagging study and I think it was supported by the 1968 tagging study, and then we followed it in 1970 by using some scale analysis, certain [circulli] count relationships and on more of a biological interpretation of the separation of the runs, and it completely supported the fact that they were Chignik fish. We certainly would have liked to have done more. We had more places that we had to put our money in other words, more higher priorities—or trying to get some answers in other places.”

[450] Boris: ”Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to point out that, of course I mentioned it, that they started in the Igvak area about 1964 and of course didn't get [unintelligible] until 1968. However, they started Kilokak rocks near Imuya Bay there, which is farther down our way, about five, six—six years ago? So, you know, they're really a new fishery and I think that they Board should really look at that.

TAPE #35 Side B – Ray Anderson (Chignik)

[363] And another thing – if you allocate, or whatever, a certain amount of fish to one group, you open up a whole new ball game here. This is not a historical fishery. I'll take it back to 1970 when the Board met in Cordova. It was the Board's desire at that time, they voted unanimously, to close the Cape Igvak Fishery down until July 21st. Well, the Kodiak fishermen got an injunction against the Fish & Game Board and the outcome was that – it wasn't that they had closed the season down that the judge was concerned about – it was the fact that it was improperly advertised. At that time I think you had to have a proposal 60 days on paper before you can act on it. Well, anyway, the judge said that it wasn't legal so everybody went fishing. [379]

TAPE #36 Side A

Tom Casey (Kodiak)

[146] I personally wouldn't be here today to ask you to risk the Chignik escapement to make the Kodiak fishermen rich. I am here instead to ask that you to consider an allocation of fish that will more evenly distribute the income from that valuable sockeye fishery over a greater number of people.

I agree with Jim Huntingtons statement yesterday when he said that, felt that, fishery resources of Alaska belong to everyone around the state and not just a few select people

I don't think that public resources that belong to all Alaskans should be cashed in by a very few and that's what has happened in Chignik right now....

[221] I think the goal of this board should not be to preserve this one sided distribution of public resource wealth but rather to build strong economies in Alaskas coastal towns this board should take a lot more even handed sharing of that salmon wealth...

[238] ...I think the least we can do is to share the income in a slightly more equitable basis rather than a four to one basis.

~~~~~

December 1977  
Board of Fisheries  
Board Deliberations  
Selected Transcription by CSA  
From the Board Audio Tapes  
Tape # 65

Board members: Nick Szabo, Chairman - Kodiak , Jim Beaton - Juneau, Calvin Fair - Soldotna, Jimmy Huntington - Galena, Gordon Jensen - Petersburg, Ted Duncan - Anchorage, Herman Schroeder - Dillingham

Tape #65 Side A - Board Deliberation on Cape Igvak Proposal

[087] I was going to appoint Gordon Jensen chairman of the "Chigivak" committee (laughter) and uh if Gordon wishes there will be a room available up in the Ptarmagin room to have a Chigivak committee meeting this evening so what time would you like to meet with your committee?

Well, what time are you going to meet again?

Oh, I'm... well I thought we would probably...you know, if it was alright with you that we would meet tonight on that Chigivak thing and see if we can resolve that tonight and then we will be through with Westward area

OK lets met at seven then.

Ok the Chignivak committee is going to meet at seven in the Ptarmagin room...

[108] Meeting ends for the evening  
Minutes begin next morning with the roll call

Beaton, Fair, Huntington, Jensen, Ted Duncan is absent (?), Schroeder, Szabo,

Nick Szabo: Please note that a quorum is present – call the meeting to order. Well the .. we only have a couple of things remaining on the westward area. I don't know if we made much progress on the Chigivak thing last night or not but uh there was a suggestion made that if the Board could agree on a concept on this Igvak thing it would give it to staff to work on and they could bring back a final plan in the spring meeting. It's a pretty complicated management scheme, as everybody is probably aware by now. So, I don't think we should spend a whole lot more time on this thing. I think its been hashed and rehashed enough be if we can agree on what we want to do, whether we want to leave it like it is or agree on some new management scheme or whatever why uh we can adopt that and move on to other things and let the staff have some time to work out the fine points.

[138] So, last night the last thing we were talking about that option three with the minimum catch as so forth and the 15% figure in there but we never had any, but we never took any, we never reached any agreement on it so would any care to uh move that we adopt any particular concept on this thing.

I move we adopt this concept

Are you talking about the option three, 15% 600,000 minimum catch at Chignik?

Yes

OK

Staff will work on this

Any discussion

Yeah I thought it was 10%

Oh well uh ----- Jim do you have anything

Jim: that 15%, that's an outer limit, is that the idea?

Yeah

That's a top limit?

[170] Nick Szabo: Yeah, I think the idea is that on the weak years there would be no fishing at all and on the good years, you know, there would be a little bit more I think that's the idea is that ... they would pull back drastically on the weak years then on the bigger years you know they'll you will be able to share a little bit on things.

So what you are saying is that on a year like this coming year the chances of even getting 15% are practically nil unless it's a really big year, right?

Yeah.

Well - on years of less than 1.3 there won't be any fishing at all.

Go ahead

Then 600,000 minimum catch is that locked into the concept also

Yeah

All those in favor of the concept raise your hand

One two three four [motion carried 4/2 (according to the tape log)]

All opposed

The concept is adopted

Ok Paul you've got something to do this winter

General laughter (189)

Ok uh I might as well dispense with proposal 92

Mr. Chairman I'm going to prop 104, the herring ...

Oh how about prop 92 let's get rid of that while its fresh in our minds (laughter)

Ok #92

(200) Allow 30% of the forecast at Chignik harvest between June 14 and July 20 to be taken by Kodiak fishermen at Cape Igvak and open the Cape Ivgak fishery on a day per day basis with Chignik after July 20.

Move to adopt

Second

There has been a motion to adopt and a second to adopt prop 92

Is there any discussion?

All those in favor

Opposed

Motion fails

~~~~~

April 1978
 Board of Fisheries
 Board Deliberations
 Selected Transcription by CSA
 From the Board Audio Tapes
 Tape # 51 & 52

Board members: Nick Szabo, Chairman - Kodiak , Jim Beaton - Juneau, Calvin Fair - Soldotna, Jimmy Huntington - Galena, Gordon Jensen - Petersburg, Ted Duncan - Anchorage, Herman Schroeder - Dillingham

Tape #51 Side A

[The Igvak Management Plan, having been approved in concept the previous December, is now being discussed for final approval. The staff has done considerable work on draft management plans but they have significant questions of the Board regarding their intent.] [As this transcription starts, the discussion is surrounding what the attitude toward the 15% allocation is. A guarantee? A target? Not to exceed? Are fishing periods set under certain conditions or are they guidelines so that management has flexibility?]

[402] Staff: I don't think there was any problem with the 'not to exceed 15%'. It was whether we were to allow the chips to fall where they may under these guidelines at anything under 15% or whether we were to strap them and try to achieve that 15% if we could. That was the problem. You see, as I recall there were some votes for anything from zero to five or ten and then what came up was 15% - not to exceed 15% was what was filled into that slot. Now this is what I would like to know.

Nick Szabo: Jim?

[414] Jim Beaton: Well, the whole figure of 15%, I always felt that ... the whole redeeming feature - I know I ... talked this over with Jack, Arne and staff, you establish that there is a viable economic need in Chignik and the village of Perryville for x amount of dollars, you know I mean to keep this thing going and that the Kodiak people are in a sense encroaching - though they developed this fishery over there and they are not encroaching on it - in all the other economic factors built into it - why it appeared that this 600,000 was a figure that they had to have as a base and by already guaranteeing them that I have to assume then that 15% figure is something that you would shoot for - I don't want to shake up the people in Chignik or anything - but I mean that they have a double safety figure built in there in other words they are going to get them all if it's a low run so to speak and it isn't, why the 15% would just be based just on excess and in that sense I can see trying to shoot for the 15% rather than hold it down to you know 5% or something like that because its going to be in excess they are already going to have a strong economic base before we even shoot for that 15% figure if I if I follow this all correctly. Is that not correct? (428)

[428] Nick Szabo: Well Yeah I think that's the way we --- you know, I looked at the thing to, was that the ... was that there would be no fishing at Cape Igvak on during these certain years where the harvest wouldn't provide at least 600,000 so they [Kodiak] were giving up fishing and in return they were getting pretty much a goal of 15% but not to exceed that amount, you know. But I guess that's has to be clarified then you can just view this day for day thing as just guideline fishing periods and that this would be what they [Kodiak] would expect you know how the fishing periods would go but

that this wasn't either a maximum or guaranteed minimum amount but that staff would be given the flexibility to manage to get the 15% at Igvak as near as possible.[435]

Tape #51 Side A [457] JimHuntington- So, all we are ensuring in Chignik is 600,000?

Nick Szabo: Well, at least that much.

That's all we're (pause) but (pause) This is a kind of one sided picture, looks to me like.

Tape #51 Side B [151-165] Jim Beaton: "Let's call it what it is. Kodiak people want it and they think that Chignik is getting too rich and some people in the State also concur with that idea. You know in the legislature and other places and we're trying to look at this fairly and allocate the catch recognizing that Chignik has went through all of these years of building up the runs and that they should get the bulk of the investment of that run. I'm a really strong proponent of that if that they are the ones that really suffered and built this thing up and these other people, we call them the Petersburg Vikings in our country, but up in this country, Kodiak people have come up with a way of trying to get a piece of that action on our value judgement they're claiming that they're going to get some portion of it, but hopefully a small portion. If this thing gets out of hand then I think we're going to have to take a hard look at just doing away with Igvak in the future."

[427] Jim Beaton: We have determined that 15% is what we think is a reasonable economic allocation to the people of Kodiak. Now you got to keep in mind that the people of Kodiak have got some good runs of their own over there but they don't have the really bonanza type thing, at least in some peoples mind, and I know that Boris will think well one good year doesn't make a bonanza thing and I recognize that but I mean that the people in Kodiak have got a good year coming up but the catch per boat isn't all that impressive and they are trying to spread a little bit of that effort over to Cape Igvak.... [433]

Tape #51 Side B [553] Gordon Jensen: I think one of the things that sort of bothers people a little bit is this business of sharing. I think sharing as far as some of these bigger (pause), like Kodiak and some of these others, is a one way street. I think if they were in the position of having to share with someone else, I am sure they would have the same argument. But I feel that the number we set is the important thing and how they arrive at it isn't that important.

Nick: Calvin?

Calvin: Mr. Chairman I agree with what Gordon Jensen just said.

Nick: Jim?

Tape #51 Side B [562] Jim Beaton: I concur with this thing about sharing and the monolithic structure of Kodiak has always been a kind of specter over everyone but the thing about the 15%, why I went for it in the first place, rather than just say "Chignik all the way boys and Kodiak can go over there and play with there own fish" is that I think there all overtones to this whole thing like the whole concept of limited entry and having 90 boats in an area that have a very lucrative fishery and that fishery gets up to a point of being in the minds of the people of the state a real sweetheart deal or whatever you want to call it, whether they sacrificed or not people have a very short memory about the sacrifice and stuff, they just look at things and they are basically jealous. That's life and that's just the way people are. But I think that if you don't do certain things to compensate for this such as this type of 15% allocation you are going to get into a realm of maybe they start allowing more people into that fishery. Or Limited Entry might, the way it's written it would re-negotiate

and come up with either a lottery program or a buy-in program or something where they would expand that fishery. That's the way the law is written. They expand it to maybe 150 boats or something. I think in the long haul, I think it's in Chignik's advantage to just give a little bit of a percentage on this catch rather than get half of what they are getting...[576]

Tape #52 Side A [388] Chairman, Nick Szabo: There has been a motion and a second to approve the plan with the changes indicated on the plan there. Is there any further discussion on the approval of the Igvak plan. All in favor raise your hand.

A little clarification, are we still working on the two days guarantee?

Chairman: Yeah.

Ok.

Chairman: Ok. Opposed. Adopted unanimously.