

February 21, 2020

Jim, well here I go please forgive me if I jump around a bit, as this dog and pony show has been going on for some time now. When this stakeholder process began some of the stakeholders, me included, questioned how NOAA/NMFS can possibly comply with MSA by stating the FMP will only affect the EEZ portion of Cook Inlet. I and the two organizations that have so called forced your hand to have our committee at all, believe one must manage salmon from somewhere in the mid Pacific to the gravel they hatched from and return to regenerate the salmon population. This must be done with the best available science, all biological issues included. Which leads me to the definition of science as I know it. By one of the definitions its knowledge learned through experiments and observations of the results. Similar to the Bayesian methodology, random data points to hopefully indicate a best guess at what might happen, I do stress might. The states experiment continues to fail miserably, they continue to not pay attention to the results of their experiment. The state seems to be stuck on the mindset that more fish in the rivers will return more, even as the returns to the very same rivers are in steep decline. With that said, why is it Dr. Cunningham presented his data on the Kenai river escapement goal, if the conversation wasn't going to include the gravel portion of a salmon's life? I must also disagree with the Dr.'s work up as it follows the Bayesian mind set, all the while not looking to the historical data set which fully display's, what has and what has not given the optimum results recruitment/yield/msy. Had his work weighted the observation of a real historical data set(experiment) I believe it would have looked closer to the historical success of years gone by. In Dr. Cunningham's work one thing I do agree with is the suggestion he once offered that if a system over escaped one year the next years goal should be to try to be near or a bit lower than the lower end range of escapement. Many years ago, when I got serious in the business world my accountant shared with me, if I were to take the same set of books to three different accountants the results would be three different bottom lines would most likely present themselves. I continue to carry that mindset into other considerations of my life. Fish population models included (fresh and saltwater). I am always cautious of the good old boy pier review process, hence my adding to my doubts. And now once again the Salmon stakeholder committee is thrown another what I call a distraction, by council staff, Beluga's. The reason I say this is because the normal habitat for the Beluga's is substantially not in the EEZ portion of Cook Inlet. So once again, this conversation takes me to my interpretation of the FMP must incorporate all waters from somewhere in the mid Pacific to the gravel that the salmon spawn and rear in. Now that I'm here, I'll circle around to Beluga's. In my historical reference having more than once witnessed many Beluga's in the Kenai river from early July till mid-August, before the motorized PU fishery started and now, I haven't seen any and haven't heard of

any reported sightings during this time period. In conclusion of this real time set of facts, the proper thing to do is discontinue the motorized portion of the PU fishery if one really wants to protect these endangered whales. That is the least we can do unless us as human's wish to see in our life spans the Beluga's go the way of the dinosaurs. The motorized PU fishery interferes with their long-established feeding pattern, hence harassment. Speaking to feeding Beluga's in the one of the document's I reviewed, it mentioned that for belugas to have higher birthing success there was a noticeable association between Chinook and Coho abundance (Ecosphere January 2020 page 11). Now that I've exposed that situation, since the early run of Chinook salmon to the Kenai are basically only harvested by the in-river users, how do they fit in this mix of things? I'm also confident once you figure in **actual** catch and release mortality, in river users are the major harvester group of all. As far as, management measures myself and Mr. Huebsch have had discussions about this somewhat. I'm sure we will be able to expand on these measures more during our two-day meeting, even if we end up with only using a day and a half. I think I will try and close out my rant as you may view it (I view it as just the facts) once again this Board of Fish cycle proved why we are where we are now. The total disregard for biological escapement goals (BEG's) in favor of Optimal escapement goals (OEG's) in all goals set or reset during the 12-13 (the days all blended) meeting. I attended and fully participated in every portion of this meeting once again, while witnessing no change in the methodical gutting of the Cook Inlet salmon fisheries chance at being able to represent anything close to being compliant with MSA standards. More prescriptive management in state and federal waters of Cook Inlet, more hard dates for time and area. I can assure you that I have allot more to say but will choose to end it here with this one last thought. It's my understanding that most if not all the issues that I mentioned above are in fact also addressed in the 10 national standards of MSA, which in my estimation is the framework of an FMP. Now that you have succeeded in unleashing me, please share with all you see fit in viewing my rant of facts. Looking forward to the upcoming two day meeting. I'm hoping that some of the Beluga people will be able to attend.

This submission is my personal submission not to be confused with any committee, association, group that I am a member of or have/do participate with.

Dan Anderson