

Public Testimony to the Pacific Fisheries Management Council April 11, 2002  
By Kris Northcut- Harvest Manager, Quileute Tribe LaPush, Washington

There will be economic impacts in LaPush that will be felt by the Quileute tribe as a direct result of this closure for recreational fishing. As a result of these impacts and after reviewing Exhibit E.12 and E.12.b the following questions were raised in response.

1. Were the proper steps followed in the closure being brought forth?
2. What was the data used to make this decision?
3. What other alternative site were reviewed, and was an analysis provided to NMFS and the tribes regarding other Yellow eye habitat?
4. Was there a public comment period or forum, and if there was a forum where and when was it held?
5. Is this closure part of a Pacific Coast wide plan? The decision making process consider Oregon and California data as well. If Oregon and California data was considered were alternative closure areas delineated?
6. In the document E.12.b it sounds like the WDFW and NMFS are getting biological opinions from the charter fishermen. This is good for some local knowledge, but should this precedent be used to form a biological opinion that can result in a fishery closure, and not include more exhaustive science
7. There is a discrepancy in the total catch of Yellow eye for Neah Bay. For the year 2001 Figure #1 represents just short of 4000 fish being landed and in figure #3 Represents the catch being just short of 3000 fish. This is a 1000 fish discrepancy.
8. Figure #2 was badly labeled and potentially misleading.
9. Figure #1 & 3 shows the highest catch of Yelloweye coming into their port. LaPush only has one good halibut spot within 20 miles. Were other closure sites delineated for Neah Bay?
  
11. Looking at the data in figure #1 it looks as if Westport's Yelloweye numbers crashed by looking at how far they went down in numbers in 3 years. Was there some restrictions in place or was there a shift in fishing pressure, and if so to where. Looking at this chart this would have been something that would of caught my eye right away.

12. The question that comes to mind when looking at figure #4 is why add on to the Southern end of the closure zone. What is the basis for this decision? Was there a habitat assessment done in this area and this was the best available or was this just drawn out of a hat. There has to be biologically valid reasons for expanding an area for closure, and a process for disseminating the data to all stakeholders.
13. Figure #5, all other figures have 2001 #'s, why does figure #5 not have 2001 Numbers. The data for last year's numbers were left out.