FYI

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "gerber" <gerber@presys.com>
To: "PFMC-Rep" <spirit.spirit@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, March 05, 2004 1:37 PM 
Subject: Dan

> > Attached is an email I sent to PFMC today.
> >
> > My thought is to "raize halllll" about cutting the sports fishing
> > allocation of 88,000 fin clipped coho catch for the reasons setforth
> > below. If an old 88 worked last year, try it again this year. So long
> > as we dont start intercenc fights between commercial and sports lobby.
> >
> > I have also put out the word to various sports types that they need to
> > speak up about he start of the coho season off Oregon. That as best I
> > could figure, June 19 would allow more fish, but smaller fish. July 1
> > would mean bigger fish, but fewer fish. I thought most would prefer
> > more fish. But I could be wrong. So I urged people to write. If the
> > agreed or did not agree.
> >
> > Hope all of this is helpful
> >
> > Bill Fielder and I attended the hearing called by ODFW to explain
> > Preseason Report I STock Abundance Analysis for 2004 prepared by the
> > Salmon Technical Team which is part of the PFMC.
> >
> > As far as I could tell we were the only two sports fishermen in
> > attendance. There were strong contingencies representing guides,
> > charter boats and the salmon troll industry. Because of the total
> > absence of input from sports fishermen, I took it upon myself to speak
> > for them.
> >
> > To summarize:
> >
> > - CHINOOK STOCKS remain healthy, should return is about the same
> > numbers as last year, but Canadian fisheries may take substantially
> > more chinook. Spring Chinook stocks may reach record numbers.
> > - As for OCN COHO:
> >   - In 2003 the PRERICTED RETURN was 118,000. The actual number
> > that
> > returned was 2278.8. Thus the "model" only predicted 42% of the actual
> > return.
> > - The this is the 3rd year in a row that the model has
> > DRASTICALLY
> > UNDERSTATED RETURNS.
> > 2002 71K predicted,276K returned, 24% of run predicted
> > 2001 50K
> > predicted, 163K returned, 31% of run predicted
> > -I urged ODFW to push for drastically reworking the model. It
> > was
> > my
> > opinion that the model is a complete failure during years when
> > there
> is
> at least reasonable fresh water production and good ocean conditions.
> As I understood the time to revisit and review the model is 2005. I urged ODFW to push very hard on this issue, starting now with an eye toward 2005.
> -Preversely, the model does not take into account the huge increases in OCN production. Therefore, the more OCN's produced, the larger the % of OCN's in the ocean mix. Thus the more OCN's that will be hooked incidentally. I believe the current model contemplates 30% of hooked and release OCN's will die. All fisheries are allowed a 15% impact [kill rate if you will] on OCNs. No increase in impacts are allowed if robust rebounds occur in OCN populations. So in a year when hatchery production is estimated to be down [the model to predict hatchery returns seems to be reasonably accurate] and OCN production is up, and even though there are many more OCN's, the current thinking is that the model will lead to a reduction in the ocean sports coho fishery on fin clipped coho. [If the model has again understated that the return, and we will see twice or three times as many OCN's as predicted, the situation becomes even more ludicrous.]

> -Further the model is based upon the PARENT POPULATION population of the fish off our coast this year. Therefore, the ocean catch is not calculated upon the estimated 151K OCNs that will return. The OCN impacts are based upon the adult counts taken in 2001 or 161K. Jack returns on the Siuslaw were the largest on record [admittedly an erratic indicator, but another indicator of a huge return this fall of OCN's.]

> -Further, when ocean conditions turn around, and FUTURE OCN POPULATIONS FALL, as they will almost certainly do so, the impacts will not be calculated upon the existing and depleted population returning in the teeth of an El Nino, but upon robust parent populations that returned to good ocean conditions.

 IT IS MY OPINION THAT THE "MODEL" IS SO FLAWED IT NEED TO BE COMPLETELY REWORKED TO ACCOUNT FOR THE RECENT INCREASES IN OCN ABUNDANCE AND TO ACCOUNT FOR FUTURE BAD OCEAN CONDITIONS.

 The model is federal law, and not something that ODFW can try to change. ODFW must go to the PMFC and seek changes. Until that model is reworked, the sports ocean fishery on fin clipped coho will continue to look like the people who are setting these fisheries [PMFC] fell thru the rabbit hole and set them in Oz [if I may be allowed to mix metaphores.]

 The other issue at the meeting was when to begin the coho season.
 Again, remember the season is limited by OCN impacts, and nothing else. We were told that there are fewer OCNs off the Oregon Coast in June than in July. Therefore, if we begin our season in June, we will probably be allowed to catch more coho. However, as we all know, the fish are much smaller in June. Bill and I talked this over, and thought most fishermen would prefer to catch more fish, than bigger fish. Also an earlier opening would give the South Coast a better shot at fin clipped coho which tend to move north early in the season and away from the South Coast.

 I did not feel very strongly that my thought represented what most fishermen thought. Therefore, I suggest that those of you who have
email, or wish to write, do so. Even if you agree with me. That to
give PFMC and ODFW some sense about what the sports fishermen want done
with the season. Start July 1 - bigger but fewer fish. Start June 19 -
more but smaller fish. I dunno.
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