

From: <jamescswilkinson65@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, Mar 18, 2016 at 5:59 PM

Subject: Wdfw salmon closure

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

On a specific issue, the WDFW has proposed 3 options for coastal salmon fishing opportunities, with all of them being abysmal compared to prior seasons. The reason for these options are due to low Coho salmon return projections for 2016. One of the options being widely considered as the ultimate end result is the complete closure of ocean coastal salmon fishing for recreational and commercial NONTRIBAL fisheries. While I am not opposed to an ocean closure should the need arise, I am appalled that the only closures being contemplated apply to recreational and commercial NONTRIBAL fisheries. The Boldt Decision allotted 50% of any available quota to tribes, while the remaining 50% goes to all other interests. This in and of itself is a travesty, but what makes this year so egregious is that tribes are fully intent on having their salmon seasons this year, and are pushing hard to shut down non-tribal seasons.

According to the Boldt Decision, if there are two fish available in a quota (being that which is over and above escapement goals for the perpetuation of the species), then my understanding is that the tribes get one of those fish, and all other interests may target the other fish. So if the projected returning runs are so bad as to contemplate that there isn't sufficient numbers to permit a season, due to not attaining escapement goals or protecting ESA listed runs, they why would the tribes be able to have a season? If the fish numbers are adequate for the tribes to have a season, then the tribes are only entitled to 50% of whatever those numbers are, and we would all have a season of some kind or another.

Recreational fishing is far and away the biggest economic boon to our state, when compared to commercial and tribal contributions to the state economy. Sport fisheries contribute billions of dollars to the local/state economies, and widespread economic devastation will occur to coastal communities and state coffers should fishing be closed. I would urge those making decisions to carefully weigh any closures, particularly selective closures that seek to deny others access to quota for the benefit of one specific entity such as those closures being considered by fishery managers today. WDFW doesn't have a stellar track record in forecasting fish returns in any event.

Thanks for all you do.

From: Phoebe <phoebelenhart@charter.net>

Date: Sun, Mar 20, 2016 at 12:42 PM

Subject: Devastating low numbers of salmon in the Pacific Ocean

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Pacific Fishery Management Council,

This E-mail is sent to your attention regarding the most recent news about devastating low numbers of salmon in the Pacific Ocean. The scientists estimate that only 3% of the salmon survived the drought in CA last year.

When you look at a survival rate of 3% the big "E" word appears: extinction! The salmon in the Pacific Ocean are not of a quantity to ensure the survival of the species.

It is your responsibility to protect the salmon from extinction. As we all know, extinction is forever. I think that ALL salmon fishing, commercial and recreational, needs to be cancelled in 2016. And that the shutdown of salmon fishing in the Pacific Ocean be extended until there are adequate stocks of salmon of all of all species can thrive.

I hope you will be proactive on behalf of the salmon. The conditions in the Pacific Ocean (warming and algae) are not conducive for marine life. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Phoebe Lenhart
phobelenhart@charter.net
107 Humboldt Rd.
Crescent City, CA 95531

From: raulduke52 <raulduke52@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Sun, Mar 27, 2016 at 5:51 PM
Subject: alternative III
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Ms. Dorothy Lowman,
Chair Pacific Fishery Management Council
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 101
Portland, OR 97221

SUBJECT: Monterey Recreational Salmon Season (Agenda Item E.1.f)

Chair Lowman and Council Members:

The undersigned individuals, organizations, and businesses strenuously oppose Alternative III in the Monterey management areas, both North and South, for recreational anglers. We appreciate the need to reduce impacts on winter-run Chinook salmon, but the changes implemented last year (for the 2015 salmon season) have proven effective and adequate. Further closures are not warranted and would do unnecessary harm to both recreational anglers and the businesses that serve them.

The recreational salmon season has already been severely cut back in the Monterey management areas. Last year, the 2015 season took away a month from Monterey North and two and a half months from Monterey South. With the further cuts proposed in Alternative III, the Monterey North season would see a cumulative reduction of three months, leaving only three months open. The Monterey south season would see a cumulative reduction of four months, leaving only two months open.

The collapse seen in the winter-run population has nothing whatsoever to do with ocean fishing. The responsibility lies wholly with inland water managers, specifically the Bureau of Reclamation, whose poor judgment – compounded by drought – has decimated the 2013 and 2014 winter-run brood. Only changes in water operations will allow the winter-run to recover. Overly constraining recreational ocean fishing seasons is not a meaningful tool in recovery.

We support recreational management Alternatives I or II in the Monterey management areas. That structure has proven effective at reducing ocean contact rates.

Sincerely,

Greg Gartrell
4829 Agree Ct
Sacramento CA 95842

seacap26@yahoo.com

David Hilger

Harry N Johnson
2295 Elizabeth Rd
McKinleyville, CA 95519

Sandy Tomei

William J. Hennessey
bhennes116@gmail.com

Jean-Michel Sicaud
1710 Wickham Rd
San Jose CA 95132

Nicholas Maurer
NMaurer@ohlone.edu

Ethan Derby

Nick Reisbeck
nreisbeck@gmail.com

Ron Lloyd
Pacific Grove, Calif

Brian Richards
Walnut Creek, CA, 94598

John Janssens

Hernan Paez
125 Boggs Ct
Vallejo CA 94589

Jeff Richards
226 Frances Lane
San Carlos, CA, 94070
Email: jeff@jwrichards.com

Todd Fraser owner of Bayside Marine in Santa Cruz Harbor

Thomas Richards

Michele and David King
2001 Doris Ave
Los Osos CA 93402

David Rossman
9 Jules Drive
Novato, 94947
Email: david@kingpac.com

Michael Caporale
Moderator, Coastside Fishing Club

Larry Cadd

From: Kevin Schoonhoven <kjschoonhoven@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2016 at 2:21 PM
Subject: Agenda Item E.1.f
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

I'm sending this email to urge you to stick to Alternative 1 or 2 but to not adopt Alternative 3. Keep it the same as last year.

Kevin Schoonhoven
Vallejo, CA

From: Perry Menchaca <pmenchaca49@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, Mar 26, 2016 at 8:12 AM
Subject: Washington State Coho Closure Comments
To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Sir,

I would like to comment on the Washington State proposals for limiting impact on the depressed coho returns. As a long time recreational fishermen, I fully support a moratorium on coho fishing for this upcoming season. To be effective, and simplify enforcement, we need to close coho retention in salt AND in rivers. Also, if the true intent is to protect the fish. ALL STAKEHOLDERS must participate in the closure. Sportsmen, Commercials and Tribes. NO COHO RETENTION MEANS NO RETENTION FOR ANYBODY. If you close retention for sportsmen and allow the tribes and/or commercials to fish you will have some very upset constituents.

Close coho this year. Close both salt, sound and terminal fisheries. AND close it for retention by EVERYBODY! Have a backbone, do what's right by the fish, and fair to everyone!

Perry Menchaca
2116 143rd St. Ct E
Tacoma, WA 98445
Baywolf9@hotmail.com

From: Tom Dolan <tom@montereybaycharters.com>
Date: Sun, Mar 27, 2016 at 7:43 AM
Subject: Agenda Item E.1.f.
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

I VOTE REJECT Alternative III for salmon season for Monterey Bay.

I have enough trouble making ends meet without you people arbitrarily cutting off my income.

If there are no fish after June then what's the problem with us at least trying to catch them anyway. It's called fishing, not catching.

Captain
Tom Dolan
Monterey Bay Charters
www.montereybaycharters.com

From: harrybush <bushcontrolsystems@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Mar 27, 2016 at 9:59 AM
Subject: E.1.F
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

NO ON OPTION III, KEEP THE SAME AS LAST SEASON, HARRY

From: Gregg Hover <gregghover@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 28, 2016 at 8:12 PM
Subject: Agenda Item E.1.f. - Public Comments
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

I would like to speak against any shortening of the salmon season for boaters out of Santa Cruz. Hardly anyone goes out for salmon anymore. Closing early will not really make a difference.

How about closing down ALL SALMON FISHING IN STREAMS AND RIVERS!!!
As they attempt to make it to their spawning site of choice, LEAVE THEM ALONE!!!
This would result in many more fish spawning and then coming down to the ocean.

Please do not limit sport salmon fishing in the ocean any further. Thank you.

Gregg Hover

From: <captbob44@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 29, 2016 at 1:18 AM

Subject: Tighten up the commercial

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

The commercial guys are mowing down the salmon. I love to fish for chinook. They are awesome fish. I think the Commercial guys catch too many. Getting to be too many people. Need to save fish more for sportsman. Getting harder to come home w two fish. Also all these hatch fish aren't good " my thoughts again".

Necessary evil I guess. Thanks,

Bob Menefee

Tom and Sharon Kelly <kellytssj@hotmail.com>

March 30

Ya we all know W.T.A. wants to harvest the sub area quota in 3/4 then move to area 2. As an association we can sit back and let them dictate how we should manage area 3/4 or have a voice and manage it in a way that is more fair for everyone! To be honest The way the spring fishery was managed in area 3/4 last year was poor. Some considerations;

1.) with a season similar to what we had last year in area 3/4, surrounding communities such as Lapush, Neah Bay, Forks and Port Angeles don't get to reap the benefits they could potentially if we had a season that was managed to go well into June with weekly trip limits.

2.) Safety-as we heard from Pierre at the Port meeting in Westport I

personally witnessed several fisherman run themselves to near complete exhaustion and risk hazardous weather conditions last year with the way we managed area 3/4 and the shotgun style fishery. It's dangerous enough in this occupation and having to fishery that was manage the way it was last year only adds to the risk. To be brutally honest I'm surprised the Coast Guard doesn't step in and regulate hours of operation for a vessel and it's crew. Guys last year were going two and three days straight with very little to no sleep.

3.) I have personally talked to several people who I have a great deal of respect for including but not limited to, Chris Cameron on the Gallows Point, Brad Balderson on the Fish Hog, and Jeremy Brown on the Barcarolle as well as Ric Plumbo with Jack Mackerel Seafoods. All of these gentlemen along with the majority of the rest of the fleet that primarily fishes area 3/4 support a fishery that should be managed with weekly trip limits as opposed to either wide open or "per trip" trip limits.

4.) most of our friends from the W.T.A. that primarily fish area 2 and transit north into area 3/4 to harvest fish in the spring normally don't offload in either area three or four and sell their fish. They rather, transit back to the area 2 and sell down there leaving the communities of the north coast wondering how the area 3/4 quota was harvested so quickly.

5.) Leaving area 2 wide open with no trip limits still gives those who favor the more traditional style of spring fishery the opportunity to harvest with fewer restrictions.

6.) We should remain flexible in area 3 in case a substantial amount of fish show up in area 2 early on as we don't want to hamstring ourselves. If substantial Fish show up south we could close area 3 and keep area 4 open under the same weekly trip limit scenario. That way a fisherman could make the decision to either go south for the wide-open fishery or North under the trip limit restrictions.

7.) If we manage the area 3/4 Spring fishery the way we did last year we are likely to leave a substantial amount of halibut on the table that could be harvested in other states. However, with a weekly trip limit managed spring fishery a fisherman could justify a lower weekly chinook trip limit supplemented by incidental halibut harvest.

Thanks

t.k.

From: acmitby@comcast.net

Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 11:12:16 AM

Subject: PFMC comments

To whom it may concern,

It should be brought to the attention of the PFMC council what is being modeled in Willapa Bay for a recreational fishery in the marine area. As everyone knows the three ocean options for both recreational and commercial are skinny at best, even if option one is taken. One should be aware that region six has modeled a four fish bag limit, of which all four can be natural Coho. This is a fishery with very little monitoring and not much knowledge of what is being caught in the marine area at this time due to lack of sampling. This should not be allowed during a season such as this. The marine line for Willapa Bay recreational fishing should be move into the areas of 2U, 2R and 2M prior to September 1st, to avoid any natural Coho dipping into the marine area. After this time frame the outer area may be allowed to open as the dip-in fish will have passed.

If the line is to remain the same, then the bag limits should be the same as the ocean and only open when the ocean is until September 1st. This unregulated fishery should share the burden of conservation, like every other user group along the coast, until Sept. 1st when local stocks can be targeted.

Andy Mitby
concerned fisherman

From: William Hennessey <WHennessey@shoretel.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 29, 2016 at 8:11 PM

Subject: Agenda Item E.1.f.

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Alternative III is madness. It's not based on data and makes no sense. An entire region will suffer consequences for what? Help me to understand why this alternative was put forward. I've done some research and there is no rationale. Please reject this alternative.

Sincerely,
Bill Hennessey

PFMC
03/04/16