

Subject: [Fwd: Proposed Changes to Catch Area 2A Pacific Halibut Catch Sharing Plan]
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Mon, 03 Oct 2005 08:55:02 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Proposed Changes to Catch Area 2A Pacific Halibut Catch Sharing Plan
Date: Fri, 30 Sep 2005 13:59:45 -0700
From: Tom Merriman <tmerriman@masco.net>
To: <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Pacific Fish Management Council
7700 NE Ambassador Place
Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97220

Council

As a private fisherman I would wish to comment on the "Proposed Changes to Catch Area 2 Halibut 2006".

Washington Statewide
1. No Problem.

Washington North Coast Subarea
,2,3, and 4 -- No Problem

Washington South Coast Subarea
5-6-- No Problem

Washington and Oregon Columbia River Subarea
7. No Problem

I would like to see the C.R.S. open to ground fish > 40 fathom June 1 thru Sept. 30 as this Subarea has no real potential (near shore) rockfish harvest areas as available in other

Oregon Waters. Also the waters off the Colombia River (Astoria Canyon) have a extremely low incidental Yellow Eye/Canary by- catch. The waters are very rich in Yellowtail

Rockfish and Black Cod.

8. Increase the allocation of the Columbia River subarea from the proposed 5% to 10%. This would reduce the allocation in the Central Oregon subarea from the proposed

92% to 87% which is a greater representation of the average of fish not harvested in this catch area for the last 4 years. Why let this allocation go unharvested year after year.

9. Increase Oregon and Washington's contribution to the Subarea by a factor of 100%. Split season is fine.

Oregon Statewide

10. No Problem

Oregon Central Coast Subarea

All Depth Fisheries

11. No Problem

12. No Problem

13. This proposal is unfair to all other Catch Areas in Washington and Oregon. If after the Labor Day weekend 25,000 pounds or more remain available to harvest than

the Central Oregon Coast subarea will transfer 30% of the uncaught quota to other Oregon subareas. The legal daily limit will remain at one fish.

Rationale-- This proposal to up the daily limit from 1 to 2 fish is an unfair economic advantage to one or more ports in the Central Oregon subarea that will direct

much needed tourist dollars away from the economically depressed areas of the Northern Oregon and Southwest Washington Coasts. The bulk of pressure on the Columbia

River subareas on halibut is on the charter boats on the weekdays and weekend sports boats. These tourist dollars are spent equally between out of state and local

(Oregon/Washington) residents. The ports of Ilwaco and Chinook (Wa. C.R.S. ports) service a predominantly Oregon and local S.W. WA. resident client base traveling

predominantly on Oregon Highways and servicing local Oregon Business and infrastructure. To gift only one area within Oregon extra fishing potential and fish is most certainly

unfair and possibly not legal.

14. see above #13

15. No Problem

Nearshore Fishery

16. Do not allow any Halibut on all-depth days if rockfish are onboard vessel.

Rationale-- Avoid any chance of mistakes by enforcement officials.

ALSO

I would wish to see the Nearshore Halibut Fishery opened to include all areas within Oregon Territorial

Waters. There is a near shore *incidental* N. Coast halibut

harvest area that is centered around the Tillamook Head near shore waters, although these waters are out of the Normal transit area of fishers off the Columbia River, these areas are targeted on full day bottom fish charters operating from Columbia River ports. These full day charters were once a mainstay of survival back in the mid 80's when the salmon fishing was non-existent. Again these near shore fisheries would be available to Columbia River fishers to also develop the Sand Dab and other flatfish potential possibly taking pressure off ground fish and rockfish because the C.R.S. lacks rocky structure as is prevalent in the Central Oregon Coast subareas. These are vast areas of flat sand and gravel areas that not only hold halibut but also other flatfish and codfish.

Thank you for your consideration,

Tom Merriman

2504 Sahalee Dr East

Sammamish, Wa. 98074

425-487-6161

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Subject: [Fwd: Halibut annual limit]
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Mon, 03 Oct 2005 08:55:37 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Halibut annual limit
Date: Sun, 2 Oct 2005 22:18:54 -0700
From: Ronald McDougall <JORONMCD@peoplepc.com>
To: <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

I am against having an annual limit on halibut.
There is already a 2 fish possession limit in any form. I feel that this is more than adequate.

Ronald McDougall
1110 Olympic View Way
Aberdeen Wa. 98520
joronmcd@peoplepc.com

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Subject: Sport Halibut quota Columbia River
From: "Butch & Terri Smith" <coho@willapabay.org>
Date: Tue, 4 Oct 2005 21:32:11 -0700
To: "Chuck Tracy" <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>
CC: "Mark Cedergreen" <mcedergreen@olynet.com>

PFMC
7900 N.E. 82nd Ave.
Portland, OR. 97220

Re: Halibut

Dear Councilmembers;

I would like to take this time to give you my written testimony on the Columbia River Sports Halibut. I've testified before this council on the importance of not splitting the Columbia river on any fisheries. I attended a large users meeting in Astoria, Oregon on August 18, 2005 and to my surprise and the surprise of some of the state officials at this meeting every person except one was not in favor of splitting the rivers halibut quota. The thinking of the user groups was that there would be some years that Oregon would be able to give some additional fish and some years that Washington would be able to give some additional fish to the river. We still believe that splitting the river is a very dangerous path to take and an enforcement nightmare. If all the users can agree that it is a bad idea, I think we should agree to maintain the Columbia River as one management zone, when one state fishes we all fish. We would urge your consideration to leave the Columbia River one management zone for halibut, and all fisheries. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely Yours,

Butch Smith
Pres. Ilwaco Charter Assoc.
SAS Vice Chair.

Subject: [Fwd: halibut]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Tue, 04 Oct 2005 13:28:00 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

----- Original Message -----

Subject: halibut
Date: Tue, 04 Oct 2005 13:14:11 -0700
From: Rick Andersen <rvprorick@hotmail.com>
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Concerning the halibut limit. I am totally opposed to the yearly limit proposal. This has not worked for sturgeon and the columbia. This is simply a way to discriminate against user groups. The private boater ,who obvisily puts more money into state and local econimmes than any other, would take the hit on this. Please do not pass this proposal. thanks, Rick Andersen pres. RVPROINC.

Don't just search. Find. Check out the new MSN Search!
<http://search.msn.click-url.com/go/onm00200636ave/direct/01/>

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Subject: [Fwd: Halibut fishing]
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Tue, 04 Oct 2005 11:48:23 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Halibut fishing
Date: Tue, 04 Oct 2005 11:33:19 -0700
From: Rick Migliacio <rick.migliacio@alaskaair.com>
To: <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov> <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Hi

I was reading on your web site about the proposed changes for Washington. I am opposed to the 5 annual bag limit. How is this going to extend the season. Last year I caught 1 Halibut maybe next year I will be luckier. Also Having staggard days to extend the season makes no sense when people plan vacations like myself I usally plan fo a week and pay good money to stay at local hotels or resorts to stay and fish this would have me paying for nights in hotels and days of no fishing.

Rick Migliacio
2532739013

This inbound e-mail message has been scanned for Viruses and Content and cleared by AAG MailScan

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Subject: Halibut

From: BRANCHOFIC@aol.com

Date: Tue, 4 Oct 2005 12:28:33 EDT

To: Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov, culvemkc@dfw.wa.gov, anderpma@dfw.wa.gov

CC: mcedergreen@olynet.com, coho@willapabay.org, spirit.spirit@verizon.net, curt.melcher@coho2.dfw.state.or.us

October 1, 2005

PFMC

7900 NE 82nd Ave.

Portland, Oregon 97220

Re: Halibut

Dear Sirs:

I am writing to express my opposition to WDFW's proposal to institute a yearly limit on Halibut. Although this proposed regulation is well intentioned, and appears on the surface to be logical, it is fatally flawed and has been proven to be ineffective and counter productive.

In 1989 WDFW implemented a 15 fish annual bag limit (it is currently 5) for Sturgeon on the Columbia River with the intent of maintaining a year round fishery. The rationale for this regulation was the same as stated in the "*WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE REPORT ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE HALIBUT CATCH SHARING PLAN FOR 2006*" that was presented to the council at the September meeting. In this report WDFW states that "The annual bag limit would accomplish the objective of providing an opportunity for more individuals to participate in the recreational fisheries" while admitting that "selecting a limit amount, which is less than the amount of days open to fishing could **POTENTIALLY** (emphasis added) extend the season".

What we learn from 16 years of experimentation on Sturgeon annual bag limits is that it has been a complete failure with unintended negative consequences. Not only did it not achieve the objective of extending the season it resulted in widespread non-compliance of catch record recording. Individuals regularly buy both a Washington and an Oregon license with the intent of recording 5 fish on each license and then "losing" one of the catch record cards. The same thing would happen in Neah Bay with anglers buying Canadian licenses and claiming their Washington caught fish were caught in Canadian waters. Anglers obtain a second catch record card using an alias, second address, or a phony social security number. These same anglers consistently refuse to record their catch unless enforcement is present and many fish go unrecorded. Catch record card data is corrupted and as a result is worthless for catch monitoring and enforcement purposes. This is the exact opposite of what WDFW states is another goal to be achieved by implementing this measure.

The ethics of these widespread actions are the subject of another discussion but will not change reality. Even more unfortunate is that catch record non-compliance is not restricted to the anglers that catch more than 5 fish per year. If WDFW wants to "require all anglers to complete a catch record card for Halibut caught in all marine areas" it does not require implementation of an annual limit. And if the department wants to use the catch record card "for catch monitoring and

enforcement purposes” it is best that an annual limit is not implemented to ensure catch record card accuracy.

The driving force behind this problem is the perception that the regulation does not achieve it's objective, that it discriminates against the individual, and that annual bag limits reallocate catch from the private boat fleet to the charter fleet. This is the opposite of WDFW's assertion that "Placing an annual limit on all anglers would treat everyone in the same fashion, and would be more likely to accomplish the objective". And again, it results in an additional negative consequence. The perception of reallocation creates unwanted user group conflict. When the council imposed a weekly limit (4 fish in 7 days) in the recreational ocean fishery it created just such a conflict. The hard feelings between the two user groups was so intense that it was 15 years before they could work together again. The weekly limit has been eliminated from the fishery because it didn't achieve the objective of extending the season and was proven to be unenforceable. The annual bag limit is also unenforceable. In the 16 years that Sturgeon have had an annual limit not a single individual has been cited for violating this rule in spite of widespread noncompliance.

WDFW indicates that the annual bag limit was sent out for public comment due to "a considerable number of comments and suggestions". It is worth noting that during the three stakeholder meetings, where stakeholders actually attended, the issue was believed to have been put to rest. Sport fishing interests, representatives of LaPush, and Neah Bay advocated no yearly limit and were lead to believe the issue was no longer on the table.

Do we really need a regulation that doesn't work, is unenforceable, creates user group conflict, corrupts catch record card data, and furthers the misconception that WDFW favors one group over another?

Sincerely,

Steve Watrous
President
Columbia Pacific Anglers

Subject: [Fwd: annual bag for Halibut]
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Wed, 05 Oct 2005 08:18:39 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

----- Original Message -----

Subject: annual bag for Halibut
Date: Wed, 05 Oct 2005 02:14:31 +0000
From: frack26@comcast.net
To: culvemkc@dfw.wa.gov
CC: anderpma@dfw.wa.gov, pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Gentlemen:

I am writing to express my opposition to WDFW's proposal to institute a yearly limit on Halibut. Although this proposed regulation is well intentioned, and appears on the surface to be logical, it is fatally flawed and has been proven to be ineffective and counter productive.

It is time that you quit giving all the fish to the commercial and Indian fisheries, The sportsmen support your agency and all your programs with our moneys but end up getting nothing out of it Thank you.

Thank you

Thomas J Kula
Sportsman.

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Subject: [Fwd: Halibut Yearly Catch Limit Proposal]
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Wed, 05 Oct 2005 11:47:12 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Halibut Yearly Catch Limit Proposal
Date: Wed, 05 Oct 2005 18:33:16 +0000
From: Mike Gabrielson <mikegabrielson@hotmail.com>
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Sirs:

I am writing to express my opposition to WDFW's proposal to institute a yearly limit on Halibut. Although this proposed regulation is well intentioned, and appears on the surface to be logical, it is fatally flawed and has been proven to be ineffective and counter productive.

In 1989 WDFW implemented a 15 fish annual bag limit (it is currently 5) for Sturgeon on the Columbia River with the intent of maintaining a year round fishery. The rationale for this regulation was the same as stated in the "WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE REPORT ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE HALIBUT CATCH SHARING PLAN FOR 2006" that was presented to the council at the September meeting. In this report WDFW states that "The annual bag limit would accomplish the objective of providing an opportunity for more individuals to participate in the recreational fisheries" while admitting that "selecting a limit amount, which is less than the amount of days open to fishing could POTENTIALLY (emphasis added) extend the season".

What we learn from 16 years of experimentation on Sturgeon annual bag limits is that it has been a complete failure with unintended negative consequences. Not only did it not achieve the objective of extending the season it resulted in widespread non-compliance of catch record recording. Individuals regularly buy both a Washington and an Oregon license with the intent of recording 5 fish on each license and then "losing" one of the catch record cards. The same thing would happen in Neah Bay with anglers buying Canadian licenses and claiming their Washington caught fish were caught in Canadian waters. Anglers obtain a second catch record card using an alias, second address, or a phony social security number. These same anglers consistently refuse to record their catch unless enforcement is present and many fish go unrecorded. Catch record card data is corrupted and as a result is worthless for catch monitoring and enforcement purposes. This is the exact opposite of what WDFW states is another goal to be achieved by implementing this measure.

The ethics of these widespread actions are the subject of another discussion

but will not change reality. Even more unfortunate is that catch record non-compliance is not restricted to the anglers that catch more than 5 fish per year. If WDFW wants to "require all anglers to complete a catch record card for Halibut caught in all marine areas" it does not require implementation of an annual limit. And if the department wants to use the catch record card "for catch monitoring and enforcement purposes" it is best that an annual limit is not implemented to ensure catch record card accuracy.

The driving force behind this problem is the perception that the regulation does not achieve it's objective, that it discriminates against the individual, and that annual bag limits reallocate catch from the private boat fleet to the charter fleet. This is the opposite of WDFW's assertion that "Placing an annual limit on all anglers would treat everyone in the same fashion, and would be more likely to accomplish the objective". And again, it results in an additional negative consequence. The perception of reallocation creates unwanted user group conflict. When the council imposed a weekly limit (4 fish in 7 days) in the recreational ocean fishery it created just such a conflict. The hard feelings between the two user groups was so intense that it was 15 years before they could work together again. The weekly limit has been eliminated from the fishery because it didn't achieve the objective of extending the season and was proven to be unenforceable. The annual bag limit is also unenforceable. In the 16 years that Sturgeon have had an annual limit not a single individual has been cited for violating this rule in spite of widespread noncompliance.

WDFW indicates that the annual bag limit was sent out for public comment due to "a considerable number of comments and suggestions". It is worth noting that during the three stakeholder meetings, where stakeholders actually attended, the issue was believed to have been put to rest. Sport fishing interests, representatives of LaPush, and Neah Bay advocated no yearly limit and were lead to believe the issue was no longer on the table.

Do we really need a regulation that doesn't work, is unenforceable, creates user group conflict, corrupts catch record card data, and furthers the misconception that WDFW favors one group over another?

Sincerely,

Mike Gabrielson

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Subject: [Fwd: Halibut Issue]

From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Date: Fri, 07 Oct 2005 08:08:55 -0700

To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Halibut Issue

Date:Wed, 5 Oct 2005 14:10:09 -0700

From:john herrling <jherrling@msn.com>

To:<pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>, "M Culver" <culvemkc@dfw.wa.gov>, "p
anderson" <anderspma@dfw.wa.gov>

To all concerned,

I am writing to express my opposal to the now once again proposed yearly limit of five halibut per angler. I attended the share holder meetings on these issues and this proposal was deleted from the list by majority agreement. It was obvious at the meetings that there were a few Charter Operators and Phil Anderson from WDFW interested in pursuing this agenda. It was finally agreed to by representatives at the meetings from PSA and other Sports Anglers, The Charter Boat Association, Forks/LaPush and Neah Bay that this was not something that was desirable or wanted and Phil Anderson finally deleted it from the list of proposals and told us it would not be presented as part of the halibut sharing plan. Now WDFW comes back and wants to do it again after telling us all they wouldn't claiming that it's what everyone wants. It appears to me that WDFW is operating in it's own little world and really doesn't care to honor what it agreeded to and really doesn't seem to care what the rest of us want.

Thank you for your time,
John Herrling

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Subject: [Fwd: halibut]
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Fri, 07 Oct 2005 08:09:56 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

----- Original Message -----

Subject: halibut
Date: Wed, 5 Oct 2005 19:22:41 -0700
From: Bob Reudink <pelagic@copper.net>
To: <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

I am as as a sport fisher diametically opposed to another catch limit as done on sturgeon . I feel this discriminates sport fishing ...is supporting commercial interests and decreases economic return .

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Subject: [Fwd: Halibut]
From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Mon, 10 Oct 2005 10:54:56 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Halibut
Date: Sun, 9 Oct 2005 19:37:48 -0700
From: <manjendan@peoplepc.com>
To: DJ <WPackroom@bbafiberweb.com>, <anderpma@dfw.wa.gov>, <culvemkc@dfw.wa.gov>, <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

October 9, 2005

Dear PFMC;

Here we go again. It didn't work for sturgeon so now we're going to try the annual bag limit on the halibut fisheries.

I live in Washougal and fish the Columbia River for sturgeon as often as I can. Every year I see an increase in the number of guides and charter boats trying to make a living off of the sturgeon fishery. When sturgeon season closes, they switch to walleye. Will walleye be next for the annual bag limit?

Some fisheries, such as halibut, walleye and sturgeon, should not be used to help someone buy a \$40,000 guideboat and an "Outback" hat, just so ten executives can get on board and have their pictures taken with a fish they'll never eat. Not everything should be for sale.

Please reconsider the implementation of an annual limit on halibut.

Sincerely,

David P. Johnson
5503 SE Hans Nagel Rd.
Washougal, WA 98671

(360) 835-5724

manjendan@peoplepc.com

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Subject: (no subject)

From: "PFMC Comments" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Date: Tue, 11 Oct 2005 08:19:44 -0700

To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

----- Original Message -----

Date: Mon, 10 Oct 2005 22:30:48 -0700

From: <Vern@cablespeed.com>

Reply-To: <Vern@cablespeed.com>

To: <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

No Annual limit on Halibut, Please. **NO ANNUAL LIMIT ON
HALIBUT, PLEASE. VERN GARRISON,
360-379-0548**

Pacific Fishery Management Council