

HMS FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARY

Date: January 29, 2002	Hearing Officer: Dr. Hans Radtke
Location: Astoria, OR Red Lion Inn Pacific Room 400 Industry Astoria, OR 97103	Other Council Members: NMFS:
Attendance: 7	HMSPDT: Mr. Jean McCrae
Testifying: 4	Council Staff: Mr. Dan Waldeck
<u>Organizations Represented:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· United Anglers of Southern California· U.S. Coast Guard· Washington Trollers Association	

Synopsis of Testimony

Of the 4 people testifying, generally:

- 2 represented the recreational fishery.
- 2 represented the commercial fishery.

Commercial Comments

One speaker remarked about the proposed management cycle, commercial permits, and drift gillnet closures. He suggested the Council refrain from HMS management decisions during the July-September period, as this is the peak of the West Coast-based albacore fishery. Relative to commercial fishing permits, he suggested permits be issued to a person or entity, because if limited entry is developed it will be necessary to tie catch history to an individual, which reduces problems in identifying who can claim past participation during the qualifying period. Also relative to permits, he questioned whether Canadian albacore fishers in U.S. waters should be required to hold U.S. HMS permits. He contended that if U.S. HMS fishers are required to hold permits, Canadian fishers in U.S. waters should also be required to hold permits. Relative to the proposed drift gillnet closed area, he asked for clarification as to the bounds of the closed area. He concluded by complimenting the Council process.

The second speaker was a drift gillnet fisherman who commented on the proposed management action that would close waters north of 45° N latitude to drift gillnet gear. He is one of a small number of fishermen who fish with drift gillnet gear in this area. He opposes the proposed closure, noting the area from 36° N latitude to 45° N latitude is already closed to drift gillnet gear. His fishery takes less than 100,000 pounds of swordfish and thresher shark per year and the shark resource is apparently healthy. He encouraged the use of bycatch avoidance devices rather than a closed area.

Recreational Comments

A charter boat operator noted his preference for logbooks rather than observers. However, he would support both observers and logbooks if all operators were affected equally.

The second recreational representative noted strong interest in the FMP by recreational anglers in Oregon and Washington. He expressed interest in including a harvest guideline for bluefin tuna.

Number of Written Statements Submitted at the Hearing = 1

Dr. Don McIsaac, Executive Director
PFMC
7700 NE Ambassador Place
Portland, OR 97220

1/28/02

Douglas Fricke
Commercial At-Large HMS A/P
110 Valley Road
Hoquiam, WA 98550

Subject: Testimony to 1/28/02 PFMC Hearing on HMS at Olympia, Wa.

I do have three short comments on the "Draft Fisheries Management Plan and ESI for U. S. West Coast Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species". However my main propose as the Northern at-large commercial representative to the PFMC HMS Advisory Panel is to listen to the comments of area industry individuals in order to relate their concerns to the PFMC through the HMS Advisory Panel.

My comments follow:

- Paragraph 8.3.5 Management Cycle - Please do not schedule any of the HMS decision making or review requirements during July through the end of September as that is the middle of the albacore tuna fishermen's season for the U. S. West Coast.
- Paragraph 8.5.1 Permits - There needs to be clarification that the HMS fishing vessel permit is issued to a person or entity that can retain a clear right to the catch history. If limited entry comes in the future, we need to avoid the problem of who can claim the catch history. Also, for the purpose of control and management, shouldn't there be a requirement for Canadian vessels to obtain a similar permit to fish albacore in the U.S. EEZ?
- Paragraph 8.5.4 Drift Gillnet Fishery Management Measures - there needs to be clarification of the new closures off of Washington and Oregon. The "proposed action" talks about new closures but there is no description of the closures.

I would like to conclude by complimenting the PFMC process for recognizing suggestions by industry in the past and correcting inaccuracies that were included in past draft documents.