December 24,2001

Mr. Chuck Tracy
Pacific Fishery Management Council
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97220-1384

Dear Chuck:

Subject: To move Pt. Arena salmon boundary line to Albion buoy

As per our conversations, I would like to address two concerns that make this request to move the Pt. Arena boundary line a necessity: weather and anchorages.

Boundary line openings create derby style openings; thus, creating dangerous conditions. In the case of the Pt. Arena line, it creates extreme safety hazard because of weather, no anchorages, and long distances to port. In the 2001 season I personally witnessed a number of close calls for fishermen by being forced to fish below the line in extreme weather conditions. Boats from Ft. Bragg traveling down to Pt. Arena find themselves caught in bad weather with no available place to anchor; forcing them to make their way back above Pt. Arena. On several occasions, myself and other skippers of larger boats, escorted groups of smaller vessels around Pt. Arena in case they broke up or sank. It might not be common knowledge among non- fishermen that the weather will back off once above Pt. Arena, allowing these smaller boats to travel safely up the beach to find an anchorage. The big question, and concern, is when will one of these vessels not find themselves back to that safety zone. The death of a fisherman will speak volumes for the necessity of the Pt. Arena boundary line being adjusted. Do we have to wait that long?

A logical new position for the line without changing the effectiveness of the boundary is the Albion buoy. By making the Albion buoy the new line, it not only eliminates the chance of weather related incidents, it opens up a host of safe anchorages currently not available. The only anchorage now available is Arena Cove, which is completely filled with moorings or is hard rock bottom which is not good holding ground . The new boundary will create seven new safe anchorages: Manchester Beach, Greenwood, Cuffeys Cove, Navarro River Mouth, Albion Bay, and then north of Albion, Little River and Big River. Having seven safe anchorages helps relieve the safety problems of a derby style fishery.

Making boundaries according to the lineage of the coast line is irrelevant; fishermen go by GPS to determine whether they are in accordance to the boundary. A lighthouse is easily obscured by fog, or the position of your boat in relationship to the land can be deceptive. Making boundaries in reference to land is old school.

I do not know any fishermen that would disagree with this boundary adjustment.

Chuck, I would appreciate it if you could pass this letter around to those in a position to make a difference. If you feel a petition signed by fellow fishermen would contribute to this cause, please let me know and I will make that happen.

Sincerely,

John Josephs
F/V Barracuda

cc: Robert Treanor, Executive Director

Ian Tattam
4602 SW 55th Pl.
Portland, OR 97221
(503) 297-4338
psu18148@pdx.edu

January 30, 2002

Sam Sharr
Marine Salmon Fisheries Manager
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
P.O. Box 59
Portland, OR 97207

Re: Hook restrictions in ocean and coastal waters salmon fisheries

Dear Mr. Sharr:

The use of circle hooks (as defined by STT 2001: p. 17) has been required in some California salmon fisheries for several years now. Circle hooks are designed in a fashion to minimize hookings in critical areas, such as the esophagus. Avoiding such critical hooking locations is desirable, especially in fisheries conducted on a selective basis.

"Critical" hooking locations are those which greatly increase the probability of mortality for released fish. The available evidence, as summarized by Lindsay et al. (1998), suggests that for adult salmonids the gill arches, eyes, and esophagus are critical hooking locations. Hookings in these locations contribute to mortality at a rate that is greatly disproportionate to their occurrence. I evaluated the chinook hooking mortality data presented by Schroeder et al. (1999) by assigning individual mortalities to their hooking location observations (Schroeder et al. 1999; Table 15), based upon the control recapture rate of 46%. For chinook captured with bait, this indicated a total of 13 mortalities. Their observations suggest that 92% of these 13 mortalities were associated with critical hooking locations, although critical hooking locations were observed in only 20% of all bait-group chinook. When lure and bait strata were combined to increase sample size, the pattern remained. That is, 73% of the total mortalities occurred to fish which had a critical hooking location, although those fish accounted for only 15% of the total catch. This interpretation of the data presented by Schroeder et al. (1999) suggests that the catch and release mortality observed in a fishery hinges on the rate of hookings in critical locations.

Salmon fisheries in the ocean and coastal waters of Oregon most frequently utilize baitfish (i.e., herring and large anchovies, or parts thereof) as an attractant. Use of these baits with conventional hooks, combined with the feeding tendencies of

coastal salmon, can frequently result in critical hooking locations. In 2001, I evaluated the effectiveness of circle hooks at avoiding critical hooking locations. All of the following observations occurred at the mouth of the Nehalem River, from mid-August through late October. I used both tandem circle hooks (5/0, Eagle Claw L197G), and the combination of an upper circle hook followed by a conventional hook (4/0). Observations by species (with the number of critical hooking locations in parentheses) follow:

Combined circle/conventional hooks: 6 chinook (0), 1 coho (0)

Tandem circle hooks: 5 chinook (0), 9 coho (1)

I did not conduct a paired test with the typically employed tandem conventional hook setup, however, anecdotal observations and past experience suggest that the rate of critical hookings would be substantially higher than that presented for circle hooks. The efficiency of circle hooks (in terms of catch per opportunity) seemed to be comparable to conventional hooks. Hooking location with circle hooks was primarily in the periphery of the mouth, most frequently behind the maxillary or at the juncture of the maxillary and roof of the mouth. I also note that coho display a tendency to roll when hooked (personal observation), which can result in a hooking in the head, eyes, operculum or body when the lower of tandem conventional hooks is in the periphery of the mouth. An additional potential advantage of circle hooks is that, due to the inward curve of the point, they appear to reduce the risk of such a "double" hooking.

I believe that, given the data and observations presented, required use of circle hooks could substantially reduce critical hookings, and thus mortality, of salmon in baitfish-dominated fisheries. Such regulations may potentially contribute to decreased angling mortality of wild fish, and therefore increased opportunity for harvest of hatchery fish. A broader evaluation and paired comparison of hooking locations with circle hooks and conventional hooks is needed. However, as data on survival with various hooking locations exists (e.g., Schroeder et al. 1999), a hooking-*location* study may be sufficient, rather than a larger hooking-mortality study. Does ODFW and/or PFMC have any ongoing studies or projects within which an evaluation of circle hooks could be incorporated?

Sincerely,

Ian Tattam

C: Steve King
John Coon, PFMC

References

Lindsay, R.B., R.K. Schroeder, and K.R. Kenaston. 1998. Spring Chinook Salmon in the Willamette and Sandy Rivers. Fish Research Project F-163-R-03. Annual Progress Report, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland.

Schroeder, R.K., K.R. Kenaston, and R.B. Lindsay. 1999. Spring Chinook Salmon in the Willamette and Sandy Rivers. Fish Research Project F-163-R-04. Annual Progress Report, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland.

STT (Salmon Technical Team). 2001. Preseason Report III: Analysis of Council Adopted Management Measures for 2001 Ocean Salmon Fisheries. PFMC, Portland.

February 14, 2002

Jay Beckman
P.O. Box 1159
Cannon Beach, OR 97110

Pacific Fishery Management Council
700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 200
Portland, OR 97220-1384

Dear Council Members:

I would like to address the Chinook Salmon session, South of Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain. I have commercial fished for 25 years and I am totally in favor of the earlier start date of March 20th. I would also like to request that the season be extended to November 15th instead of October 31st.

As I am sure you are aware it is a struggle to make a good living Salmon fishing. The earlier start date and later extended fishing date is an excellent opportunity for us to provide the quality Troll Salmon (vs. farmed fish) that is demanded by the market. Additionally, we receive a higher price for the fish because other areas are not open for Salmon fishing.

If providing a quota of Coho fish for the commercial fleet cuts time off our Chinook fishery, it is not to our advantage. The price of Coho is so low that the costs of fishing out weigh the income generated. I would much rather see the Coho given to the sports fleet and our Chinook season extended.

Thank you for your time. I anxiously await the opening of the season.

Sincerely,

Jay Beckman
F/V Legacy