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Overview

- Updating Community Profiles for North Pacific Fisheries – Alaska
- Alaska Community Survey
  - Method
  - Preliminary results
- Next steps/timeline
Increasing focus in NOAA: Incorporating community voices into fisheries decision making process

Nation-wide effort to profile fishing communities
- Provide information on relationship between communities and fisheries
- Use to support fishery management decisions

AFSC published North Pacific profiles for 136 communities

Profile use: FMPs, EIS, socio-econ impact assessments, NPFMC decisions, research background, city plans, academics

Community inclusion criteria = commercial fisheries involvement

Planning for Profiles update
- Redo of community selection process (include commercial, recreational, and subsistence indicators)
- Selection method: Data envelopment analysis
- Survey: collect unreported information
Alaska Community Survey

- Survey development:
  - Community meetings
  - Cognitive interviews
- Method: Mail survey
  1. Telephone recruitment call
  2. Advance letter
  3. First copy of survey
  4. Reminder postcard
  5. Telephone follow-up
  6. Second copy of survey
- Response rate up with cooperation with CDQ groups/regional NGOs
  - 109 communities – 60.2% as of 9/8/11
  - Expect 70%+ response
  - 3 refusals
Selection of fishing communities: 
Data Envelopment Analysis

- Goal: determine level of engagement in and dependence on fishing for a suite of communities
- Frontier = highest level of fishing involvement
- Indicators for commercial, recreational, and subsistence
- Ranking from 0 to 1, chose all communities above median
**Population**

### 2010 population

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>290,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Degree population fluctuations due to fishing sector

#### Annual population peak

- Constant population
- Peak in Jan-Mar
- Peak in Apr-Jun
- Peak in July-Sept
- Peak in Oct-Dec

#### Timing of seasonal residents

- Summer: 80%
- Winter: 60%
- Fall: 40%
- Spring: 20%
- All year: 5%
- None: 0%

#### Degree population fluctuations

- Entirely: 35%
- Mostly: 30%
- Somewhat: 25%
- A little: 15%
- Not at all: 10%
Public infrastructure

- Fish cleaning station
- Construct new docks
- Electricity at dock
- Roads serving docks
- Fuel tanks at dock
- Harbor dredging
- Dry dock space
- Boat cleaning station
- Water and sewer pipelines
- Sewage treatment
- Alternative energy
- Community center/Library
- Emergency response
- School
- Post office

- Completed in last 10 years
- Currently in progress
- Plan to complete in next 10 years
Fisheries contribution to revenue

- Communities supported by locally collected fees/taxes and state sharing programs (e.g., shared fisheries business tax)
  - 64% do not collect fees/taxes locally

- Public services maintained by fishing industry
- Support local economies
- 58% rely on state and/or local fisheries related fees/taxes to support community
Fisheries support businesses
Hub communities

Where do people go for fishing related services?
Fisheries policy concerns

“We are in the process of developing a community quota entity for the purpose of purchasing and managing quota shares of eligible fish and sport halibut permits for our community. This process has proved to be challenging.”

“Our salmon returns are dying as the pollock trawlers continue to intercept salmon bound for our region’s rivers.”

“Sport fish halibut permits have created a negative effect on some local sport fish businesses.”

“If the federal resource agencies fail to act to better manage the growth of the sea otter population our commercial fishing sector will decline unnecessarily.”

“Every time fishing rights are allocated to one group over another, we see a class system fall in place that upsets the natural competitive balance of business. If you track the ownership of permits in Alaska it has further enhanced the state mentality of large corporation-owned business vs. the small town business that supports Alaskan communities.”
Missing communities

- 72 communities still missing
- Most were profiled in 2005 (63%)
- 8% in the Arctic
- 9% >200 mi inland
- 31% CDQ communities (43% of CDQ communities)

**2010 population**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>30,661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps and timeline

• Continue collecting surveys through end of September
  — Analyze full range of responses
  — Social network analysis of how communities are connected

• Processor Profiles Survey
  — Implementing summer/fall 2011
  — Expect 70%+ response rate

• Community Profile Update
  — Research assistants to be hired fall 2011
  — Draft profiles completed early 2012
  — Receive community feedback