

SALMON MANAGEMENT OPTION HEARING SUMMARY

Date: March 27, 2000	Hearing Officer: Dr. Hans Radtke
Location: Pony Village Motor Inn North Bend, OR	Other Council Members: Mr. Burnie Bohn
Attendance: 36	NMFS: Mr. Chris Wright
Testifying: 17	Coast Guard: None
	Salmon Team Member: Mr. Curt Melcher
	Council Staff: Dr. John Coon
<u>Organizations Represented:</u> Brookings Harbor Chamber of Commerce Klamath Fishery Management Council Klamath Management Zone Fisheries Coalition Oregon South Coast Fishermen Port of Brookings Harbor	

Synopsis of Testimony

Of the 17 people testifying:

- Eleven represented or commented primarily on the recreational fishery.
- Five represented or commented primarily on the commercial fishery.
- One commented primarily on community issues.

Commercial Troll Comments

All trollers were generally in support of Option I. Additional comments included the following:

- The season structure in Option III that cuts off the area between the Oregon-California border and House Rock is not fair to Oregon trollers.
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and National Marine Fisheries Service should restrict planting of striped bass in areas which are inhabited by listed coho stocks.
- Trollers should be allowed to keep fin clipped hatchery coho.

Recreational Comments

All those who spoke about the recreational options supported a one fish bag limit in the Klamath management zone (KMZ) to get the maximum fishing opportunity (see attached written statement #1). Option I with the selective coho fishery in July was preferred for the area north of Humbug Mountain. Other comments expressed by the participants included the following:

- Utilize the full Klamath River fall chinook ocean harvest allocation and if any fish remain, allow them to go to escapement, not to the inriver sport fishery.
- Using the 20% buffer with the two fish bag limit in the KMZ is ludicrous as the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) consistently over estimates the recreational effort and catch by a significant amount and is based on a two fish bag and the higher effort occurring during 1986 through 1990. Completion of a new KOHM should receive high priority.
- More days should be added to Option II (primarily in July and August) to account for the overestimates of the KOHM, and consideration should be given to allowing six fish in seven days.

- The harvest of the Karuk Tribe should be included in the accounting of Klamath River fall chinook allocation.
- To protect coho, limit planting of stripe bass and take action to reduce pinniped and avian predation problems.
- Managers should ensure enforcement and harvest accounting in the Indian gillnet fishery.

Other Testimony

One person spoke regarding the need for consistent commercial and recreational fishing opportunities to support the coastal communities and reduce substance abuse and other social problems. He also noted the need for better data from which to make management decisions.

Written Statements (Attached)

1. Port of Brookings Harbor and Klamath Fishery Management Council Statement before the Pacific Fishery Management Council, North Bend, Oregon, March 27, 2000.

PFMC
03/31/00

PORT OF BROOKINGS HARBOR
AND
THE KLAMATH MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
STATEMENT BEFORE
THE PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL,
NORTH BEND, OREGON 97459

March 27, 2000

My name is Russ Crabtree. I am the Executive Director for the Port of Brookings Harbor and Vice Chairman of the Klamath Management Zone Fisheries Coalition. The KMZFC is a bi-state organization comprised of Northern California and Southern Oregon Coastal Communities dedicated to conservation of the resource and continuing the economic return to coastal fishing communities. The Klamath Management Zone Fisheries Coalition and the Port of Brookings Harbor, for numerous years, has approached the fishery issues with one single purpose or focus and that is to always advocate for equality and parity within the fisheries for all concerned.

My preparatory comment is: despite the downturns in economic contribution in recent years, the commercial and recreational fishing industry is still an important component to many coastal communities. The Coastal communities of Northern California and Southern Oregon always have maintained the position of parity and equality in the fisheries, but today some disturbing events are unfolding which have caused major concern for the fate of our valued way of life. Today, we see major groundfish reductions based upon flawed scientific data, and are told it is the best available information from which to make decisions.

This may be true, but the fact still remains that an industry's very lifeline is at stake and it is our opinion that this is unjustified given the current state of affairs. The Pacific Fishery Management Council should continue and join with industry to demand accountability of the scientific information used to justify harvest and allocation of a public owned fisheries resource. Never should one federal agency, such as National Marine Fisheries, be able to interpret reauthorization of the Magnuson Act in such a stringent manner without the coinciding interpretation and solution to the impact to communities and fishermen.

In the Klamath Management Zone Ocean Recreation, Option II is the only viable option that provides time and opportunity for the fishermen. This is the only option that is a community development proposal; the other two options are not based upon KMZ communities' consensus. In the past, fishing restrictions were based upon the KMZ Ocean Recreational season structure, due to the need to reduce Klamath Chinook and Oregon Natural Coho impacts.

Today, given the harvest level of this fishery, these fishing dampers should be lifted and Option II revised to adjust for more flexibility in this fishery. This

equated to a 17% harvest share for the KMZ Ocean Recreational fisheries. Since then, the allowable harvest for the fisheries has only reached a 50% harvest level, due to the season restrictions and structures that are currently in place. Also, this year we learned that the Klamath Harvest Model only models two fish and has never given this fishery credit for reducing to a one fish bag limit or the other fishing restrictions. It is our opinion, that Option II should be revised to reflect a more liberal season structure. One suggestion is an increased number of days. Today, the question of reallocation of the Klamath Chinook, a finite resource, is again being examined and we understand that the in-river recreational range is being established in a range of 15% to 19%. This year's 19% in-river recreational harvest reallocation by California Fish and Game Commission is a decision that did not take into consideration the consensus regulatory process or escapement goals of fisheries management.

In the PFMC deliberation process, we respectfully request due consideration be provided to the severe consequences and ramifications of any Klamath in-river Fall Chinook, State of California, reallocation decision. The communities of Northern California and Southern Oregon coastal economies have already suffered economic hardships due to current salmon fishing restraints and to further restrict one group for the benefit of another is the height of injustice.

Our comments are as follows:

1. Each year specific allocations of Klamath River Fall Chinook are made to in-river sport fisheries, ocean sport and commercial fisheries. These allocations have been relatively stable since 1993 when the U. S. Department of Justice Solicitor's Opinion reserved a 50% allocation for in-river tribal fisheries.
2. This yearly change in allocation above 15% simply magnifies severe repercussion impacts to the marine fisheries in both states, Oregon and California.
3. Any, after the fact, increases to the in-river sport's allocation profoundly impacts the ocean season setting process as Klamath Fall Chinook are the limiting factor in mixed-stock ocean Chinook fisheries, again in California and Oregon.
4. The ocean areas with high Klamath River Chinook impacts have already been seriously curtailed which is accomplished, to the extent possible, by season structures and foregone fishing opportunities. To the contrary, an in-river impact is and should be counted directly as fish for fish impact and only results in a benefit for a portion of the Klamath Management Zone economy which, unlike the ocean mixed stock fisheries, benefits a larger geographical area.

5. When fish are reallocated, like the attempt last year and the movement this year, it quickly becomes a public reality of the forces at work and the futility of enduring the allocation process with the known outcome being the elimination of the ocean fisheries within the Klamath Management Zone.

Please understand that our most adamant position, simply stated, is that the fisheries must manage with parity in the allocation process and always approach, with utmost care, to achieve equality for all concerned, and not just for one specific group at the expense of another. Never should one group's action be allowed to impact another group for no other reason than to achieve an inappropriate redistribution of a finite public resource. Too many other stakeholders stand to lose substantially in order for this type of action to be allowed to take place.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Respectfully submitted,



Russ Crabtree

Executive Director for Port of Brookings Harbor

Vice Chairman for Klamath Management Zone Fisheries Coalition

