# Harvest Estimates: 6/24/2017 Subsistence Opportunity Prepared by USFWS 

This document presents harvest and effort estimates as well as fisher-trip information for the subsistence salmon fishery opportunity on the Kuskokwim River that occurred on June 24, 2017 within the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge (YDNWR) boundaries. The production of these estimates was a highly collaborative effort between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the Orutsararmuit Native Council (ONC), and the Kuskokwim River Inter-tribal Fisheries Commission (KRITFC) in cooperation with the Bering Sea Fisherman's Association (BSFA). These estimates encompass the portion of the YDNWR between and including the villages of Tuntutuliak and Akiak. Harvest and effort estimation was conducted by USFWS staff using the same methods as in 2016, as described in Staton and Coggins (2016). Please contact Ben Staton (benjamin_staton@fws.gov) for a copy of that report, or if you have any questions regarding these estimates.
USFWS had the opportunity to discuss the sampling and analytical methods used and the results obtained from these efforts with ADF\&G and KRITFC and no alterations were suggested.

## Opportunity Details

The YDNWR Federal In-season Manager, with authority delegated by the Federal Subsistence Board and in consultation with the KRITFC, announced a subsistence fishing opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users to harvest fish other than Chinook salmon within the YDNWR waters. Chinook salmon caught incidentally by Federally-qualified subsistence users were allowed to be retained. The opportunity was 12 hours in duration, starting at 12:01PM June 24 and ending at 11:59PM June 24.

## Data Sources

- A total of $\mathbf{2 7 2}$ fisher interviews were used in this analysis.
- 97 fisher interviews collected by ONC from the Bethel boat harbor were used.
- 32 fisher interviews collected by ONC from Bethel area fish camps were used.
- $\mathbf{6 3}$ fisher interviews collected by KRITFC/BSFA community-based monitoring efforts were used.
- $\mathbf{8 0}$ fisher interviews collected by USFWS law enforcement officers were used.
- 256 interviews were from drift boat fishers.
- 16 interviews were from set net fishers.
- USFWS flew 3 aerial surveys to count drift boats and set nets.


## Effort Estimates

- A total of $\mathbf{4 4 7}$ drift boat trips were estimated to have occurred during the opportunity.
- During aerial survey flights between Tuntutuliak and Akiak, we observed:
- 359 drift boats between 1:00PM and $2: 30 \mathrm{PM}$,
- 213 drift boats between 5:00PM and 6:10PM, and
- 79 between 8:45PM and 10:10PM.
- Of the drift boats counted on the second flight, we estimated that $\mathbf{7 3 \%}$ of them were also counted during the first flight.
- Of the drift boats counted on the third flight, we estimated that $\mathbf{9 4 \%}$ of them were also counted during the second flight.
- $\mathbf{2 5}$ drift boat trips were estimated to have began and ended during times that were not flown.
- We observed $\mathbf{3 8}$ set nets fishing during the opportunity.


## Harvest Estimates

- An estimated total of $\mathbf{3 3}, 470(29,290-\mathbf{3 7}, 910)$ salmon were harvested.
- An estimated total of $4,560(3,780-5,410)$ Chinook salmon were harvested.
- An estimated total of $\mathbf{2 0 , 4 1 0}(\mathbf{1 7 , 6 8 0}-\mathbf{2 3}, \mathbf{3 1 0})$ chum salmon were harvested.
- An estimated total of $\mathbf{8 , 5 0 0}(\mathbf{6 , 9 2 0}-\mathbf{1 0 , 2 2 0})$ sockeye salmon were harvested.
- Harvest by set nets accounted for an estimated $\mathbf{3 , 8 3 0}(\mathbf{2 , 3 6 0} \mathbf{- 5 , 8 5 0})$ total salmon ( $\mathbf{1 3 \%}$ Chinook salmon, $\mathbf{5 2 \%}$ chum salmon, and $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ sockeye salmon).

Table 1. Breakdown of relevant quantities by river stratum (area). Reported harvest is by both drift and set nets.

| Stratum | Interviews | Max. Drift Count | Max. <br> Set Net Count | Est. Drift Trips | Chinook <br> Salmon <br> Harvest | Chum <br> Salmon <br> Harvest | Sockeye <br> Salmon <br> Harvest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunt-Johnson | 42 | 85 | 3 | 105 | 880 | 3,430 | 1,650 |
| Johnson-Napaskiak | 76 | 131 | 8 | 157 | 1,580 | 8,340 | 2,800 |
| Napaskiak-Akaichak | 145 | 112 | 23 | 129 | 1,340 | 6,640 | 3,240 |
| Akiachak-Akiak | 9 | 31 | 4 | 55 | 760 | 2,000 | 800 |
| Total | 272 | 359 | 38 | 447 | 4,560 | 20,410 | 8,490 |

Table 2. Specific quantities for the decision framework used by the USFWS and KRITFC. Salmon/boat is total salmon harvest per drift boat and Ratio is the chum/sockeye:Chinook salmon ratio. Quantities were calculated using the harvest estimates for each species and the number of estimated number of boat trips, not the raw interview values.

| Area | Quantity | Mean | Lower 95\% | Upper 95\% |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Below Johnson R. | Salmon/Boat | 54 | 37 | 75 |
| Above Johnson R. | Salmon/Boat | 70 | 61 | 80 |
| Below Johnson R. | Ratio | 5.8 | 4.3 | 7.7 |
| Above Johnson R. | Ratio | 6.4 | 5.2 | 7.7 |

Figure 1. Distribution of relevant quantities from all collected drift boat interviews, excluding those conducted by USFWS law enforcement officers. $\mathrm{BBH}=$ Bethel boat harbor, $\mathrm{CBM}=$ community-based monitoring, $\mathrm{FC}=$ Bethel area fish camps.


## Appendix A: Bethel Boat Harbor Interview Information Detailed Summaries

## Information is for drift nets only

## Column Meanings

- Area: The area of the river the trip occurred in
- $\mathbf{N}$ : The number of interviews with fishing reported in each area
- Min: the minimum value among all interviews conducted in each area
- $\mathbf{2 5} \%$ : the value that $25 \%$ of the interview values fell below in each area
- Mean: the mean value among all interviews conducted in each area
- 75\%: the value that $75 \%$ of the interview values fell below in each area
- Max: the maximum value among all interviews conducted in each area

Table A1. Summary of catch rates for Chinook salmon by area (units are catch per 150 feet of net soaked for 1 hour).

| Area | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunt. - Johnson R. | 11 | 0 | 0.7 | 4.4 | 8 | 12 |
| Johnson R. - Napaskiak | 17 | 0 | 1.3 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 40 |
| Napaskiak - Akiachak | 67 | 0 | 1.3 | 4 | 5.8 | 26.2 |
| All | $\mathbf{9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ |

Table A2. Summary of catch per trip for Chinook salmon by area.

| Area | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunt. - Johnson R. | 11 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 32 |
| Johnson R. - Napaskiak | 17 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 11 |
| Napaskiak - Akiachak | 67 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 18 |
| All | $\mathbf{9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ |

Table A3. Summary of catch rates for chum/sockeye salmon by area (units are catch per 150 feet of net soaked for 1 hour).

| Area | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunt. - Johnson R. | 11 | 2 | 2.9 | 22.3 | 35 | 90 |
| Johnson R. - Napaskiak | 17 | 0.9 | 8 | 27.5 | 38.6 | 80 |
| Napaskiak - Akiachak | 67 | 0 | 10.1 | 29.6 | 40.6 | 160 |
| All | $\mathbf{9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 0}$ |

Table A4. Summary of catch per trip for chum/sockeye salmon by area.

| Area | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunt. - Johnson R. | 11 | 2 | 8 | 25 | 36 | 60 |
| Johnson R. - Napaskiak | 17 | 2 | 14 | 37 | 45 | 112 |
| Napaskiak - Akiachak | 67 | 0 | 11 | 33 | 44 | 120 |
| All | $\mathbf{9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ |

Table A5. Summary of species ratios (chum/sockeye:Chinook salmon) by area.

| Area | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunt. - Johnson R. | 11 | 0.2 | 3 | 4.2 | 6 | 8.3 |
| Johnson R. - Napaskiak | 17 | 0.7 | 2.5 | 9.7 | 11.1 | 34 |
| Napaskiak - Akiachak | 67 | 0 | 3.6 | 10.4 | 11 | 105 |
| All | $\mathbf{9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ |

Table A6. Summary of soak hours (the number of hours the net was actively fishing) by area.

| Area | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunt. - Johnson R. | 11 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 5.2 |
| Johnson R. - Napaskiak | 17 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 7 |
| Napaskiak - Akiachak | 67 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 6 |
| All | $\mathbf{9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ |

Table A7. Summary of trip start time by area.

| Area | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunt. - Johnson R. | $6: 00 \mathrm{am}$ | $10: 52 \mathrm{am}$ | $12: 04 \mathrm{pm}$ | $1: 15 \mathrm{pm}$ | $5: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Johnson R. - Napaskiak | $11: 00 \mathrm{am}$ | $12: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $12: 52 \mathrm{pm}$ | $1: 38 \mathrm{pm}$ | $3: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Napaskiak - Akiachak | $9: 30 \mathrm{am}$ | $12: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $1: 48 \mathrm{pm}$ | $3: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $10: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| All | $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 a m}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 \mathrm { pm }}$ | $\mathbf{1 : 2 6 p m}$ | $\mathbf{2 : 4 1 \mathrm { pm }}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 : 3 0 \mathrm { pm }}$ |

Table A8. Summary of trip end time by area.

| Area | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunt. - Johnson R. | $3: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | $6: 25 \mathrm{pm}$ | $8: 13 \mathrm{pm}$ | $9: 47 \mathrm{pm}$ | $11: 59 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Johnson R. - Napaskiak | $2: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $2: 52 \mathrm{pm}$ | $6: 11 \mathrm{pm}$ | $9: 47 \mathrm{pm}$ | $11: 59 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Napaskiak - Akiachak | $2: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $4: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | $6: 42 \mathrm{pm}$ | $9: 33 \mathrm{pm}$ | $11: 59 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| All | $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 p m}$ | $\mathbf{4 : 2 2 p m}$ | $\mathbf{6 : 4 7} \mathbf{p m}$ | $\mathbf{9 : 4 2 p m}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 : 5 9 p m}$ |

## Appendix B: Community-Based Monitoring Interview Information Detailed Summaries

## Information is for drift nets only

## Column Meanings

- Area: The village the interview occurred in
- $\mathbf{N}$ : The number of interviews conducted in each village
- Min: the minimum value among all interviews conducted in each village
- $\mathbf{2 5} \%$ : the value that $25 \%$ of the interview values fell below in each village
- Mean: the mean value among all interviews conducted in each village
- $\mathbf{7 5 \%}$ : the value that $75 \%$ of the interview values fell below in each village
- Max: the maximum value among all interviews conducted in each village

Table B1. Summary of catch rates for Chinook salmon by village (units are catch per 150 feet of net soaked for 1 hour).

| Village | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuntutuliak | 9 | 0 | 0.7 | 3 | 5.3 | 10 |
| Napakiak | 7 | 0 | 1.7 | 5.2 | 8.8 | 13 |
| Napaskiak | 20 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 4.4 | 5.9 | 16.8 |
| Kwethluk | 12 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 6.3 |
| Akiak | 11 | 0 | 1.8 | 3.9 | 5.6 | 10 |
| All | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 8}$ |

Table B2. Summary of catch per trip for Chinook salmon by village.

| Village | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuntutuliak | 9 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 18 |
| Napakiak | 7 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 16 | 25 |
| Napaskiak | 20 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 20 |
| Kwethluk | 12 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 17 |
| Akiak | 11 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 24 | 44 |
| All | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 4}$ |

Table B3. Summary of catch rates for chum/sockeye salmon by village (units are catch per 150 feet of net soaked for 1 hour).

| Village | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuntutuliak | 9 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 62 |
| Napakiak | 7 | 15 | 34 | 57 | 77 | 98 |
| Napaskiak | 20 | 4 | 14 | 28 | 40 | 70 |
| Kwethluk | 12 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 19 | 31 |
| Akiak | 11 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 25 |
| All | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 8}$ |

Table B4. Summary of catch per trip for chum/sockeye salmon by village.

| Village | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuntutuliak | 9 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 12 | 31 |
| Napakiak | 7 | 32 | 48 | 70 | 90 | 92 |
| Napaskiak | 20 | 9 | 34 | 58 | 76 | 150 |
| Kwethluk | 12 | 17 | 34 | 44 | 55 | 67 |
| Akiak | 11 | 15 | 21 | 36 | 48 | 100 |
| All | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ |

Table B5. Summary of species ratios by village.

| Village | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuntutuliak | 9 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 8.7 |
| Napakiak | 7 | 3.6 | 4.7 | 19.2 | 36.2 | 49 |
| Napaskiak | 20 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 13 | 12.5 | 68 |
| Kwethluk | 12 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 6.8 | 7.2 | 18.7 |
| Akiak | 11 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 21 |
| All | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 8}$ |

Table B6. Summary of soak time by village.

| Village | N | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuntutuliak | 9 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| Napakiak | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Napaskiak | 20 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| Kwethluk | 12 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| Akiak | 11 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 |
| All | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |

Table B7. Summary of trip start time by village.

| Village | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuntutuliak | $11: 00 \mathrm{am}$ | $11: 15 \mathrm{am}$ | $12: 28 \mathrm{pm}$ | $1: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $4: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Napakiak | $12: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $12: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $12: 54 \mathrm{pm}$ | $1: 40 \mathrm{pm}$ | $2: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Napaskiak | $8: 30 \mathrm{am}$ | $12: 15 \mathrm{pm}$ | $12: 59 \mathrm{pm}$ | $2: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $5: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Kwethluk | $12: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $12: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $12: 49 \mathrm{pm}$ | $1: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | $3: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Akiak | $12: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $12: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $12: 35 \mathrm{pm}$ | $1: 15 \mathrm{pm}$ | $2: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| All | $\mathbf{8 : 3 0 a m}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 p m}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 : 4 7} \mathrm{pm}$ | $\mathbf{1 : 3 0 p m}$ | $\mathbf{5 : 0 0} \mathbf{p m}$ |

Table B8. Summary of trip end time by village.

| Village | Min | $25 \%$ | Mean | $75 \%$ | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuntutuliak | $3: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $4: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $5: 05 \mathrm{pm}$ | $6: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $8: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Napakiak | $1: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $3: 52 \mathrm{pm}$ | $4: 26 \mathrm{pm}$ | $5: 45 \mathrm{pm}$ | $6: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Napaskiak | $1: 20 \mathrm{pm}$ | $3: 11 \mathrm{pm}$ | $4: 16 \mathrm{pm}$ | $5: 19 \mathrm{pm}$ | $9: 15 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Kwethluk | $2: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | $3: 45 \mathrm{pm}$ | $5: 45 \mathrm{pm}$ | $7: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ | $11: 35 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Akiak | $2: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | $5: 08 \mathrm{pm}$ | $6: 48 \mathrm{pm}$ | $8: 45 \mathrm{pm}$ | $11: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| All | $\mathbf{1 : 0 0 p m}$ | $\mathbf{3 : 3 0 p m}$ | $\mathbf{5 : 1 1 p m}$ | $\mathbf{6 : 0 8 p m}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 : 3 5 p m}$ |

The percentages in tables and figures on this page are interpreted as the percent of interviewed fishers that have at least met the category listed. E.g., $82 \%$ in the "Under Half" category indicates that $82 \%$ of reported fishers report that they are at least under halfway done with harvest for that species, some of those $82 \%$ may also be halfway done or over halfway, or completely done.
Table B9. Progress at meeting needs for Chinook salmon by village.

| Village | Under Half | Half | Over Half | Done |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuntutuliak | $82 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Napakiak | $71 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Napaskiak | $17 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Kwethluk | $42 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Akiak | $82 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| All | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ |

Table B10. Progress at meeting needs for chum salmon by village.

| Village | Under Half | Half | Over Half | Done |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuntutuliak | $91 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Napakiak | $100 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Napaskiak | $74 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Kwethluk | $83 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Akiak | $100 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| All | $\mathbf{8 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ |

Table B11. Progress at meeting needs for sockeye salmon by village.

| Village | Under Half | Half | Over Half | Done |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuntutuliak | $82 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Napakiak | $57 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Napaskiak | $65 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Kwethluk | $25 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Akiak | $82 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| All | $\mathbf{6 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 \%}$ |

Figure B1. Visual of the interviewed fishers' progress at meeting harvest goals for each three salmon species of interest. More grey on the left indicates fishers are close to meeting needs, less grey on left indicates fishers are far from meeting needs.


