

Subject: [Fwd: 2008 sport salmon season]::: For Supplemental
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Thu, 20 Mar 2008 14:44:55 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: 2008 sport salmon season
From: Shirley Barnhart <barnhart2@suddenlink.net>
Date: Thu, 20 Mar 2008 12:14:25 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

I am one of a large number of small boat owners from northern California who greatly enjoy the opportunity to fish for ocean salmon. I'd like to comment on one of your proposed 2008 recreational fishery options for the Klamath Management Zone (KMZ).

Option 3 proposes 3 separate holiday fishing periods totalling a 10 day season in the KMZ. This may be an easy answer for the fishery manager, but it is not a good way to provide opportunities to fish, particularly for small boat owners. Very likely 10 days of fishing will not happen. Last year during the 3-day Memorial Day holiday there were 2 days with small craft advisories and gale warnings. These are hazardous conditions for fishermen who may attempt to fish because they know it is their only opportunity to do so. The larger party boats might get a full 10 day season but not those anglers with smaller boats.

The holiday-only fishing also would concentrate fishing pressure, severely crowding launching and parking facilities. Most small boaters fishing out of Trinidad, California, must use the cable-launch which results in a long line of boats waiting to be launched and a floatilla of returning fishermen waiting to be brought ashore.

I propose a 20-salmon or 10-salmon punch card which would allow fishing over a longer period and provide safe, enjoyable trips planned according to ocean conditions. Party boat operators would probably be fully booked during the holidays but would also be able to make other trips when they had enough reservations.

We don't need to keep many ocean salmon, but we would like to have opportunities to fish.

Dr. Roger A. Barnhart
Fishery Scientist (Retired)
Bayside, California
(707) 822-6089
barnhart2@suddenlink.net

2008 sport salmon season.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822 Content-Encoding: 7bit
-------------------------------------	--

Subject: [Fwd: No Salmon fishing]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Thu, 20 Mar 2008 14:45:19 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: No Salmon fishing
From: HERBHOLM@aol.com
Date: Thu, 20 Mar 2008 16:01:55 -0400 (EDT)
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Its about time that this nonsense about hatchery fish is inferior and more hatcheries be built. Indian tribe's must be stopped from putting nets across the river. The last count more than seven hundred and fifty nets are in the Klamath river. They sell salmon door to door and on the streets in Eureka and Arcata California. Then the fish and game say that it can't be stopped.

I have been a fisherman for the past thirty years. I don't wish for welfare from the government. Its time that you stop politicizing the resources. This is bull crape at its worst. These problems didn't start till you started your management program of the salmon.

Herb Holm
2821 Fairfield Street
Eureka, Ca. 95501

Create a Home Theater Like the Pros. [Watch the video on AOL Home.](#)

No Salmon fishing.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822 Content-Encoding: 7bit
------------------------------	--

Subject: [Fwd: `salmon closure]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2008 08:08:12 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: `salmon closure
From: Mark Gavasse <twoboys@cruzio.com>
Date: Thu, 20 Mar 2008 18:21:23 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

I believe that all you do is see the problem in the past. With all the political decisions that have been made concerning the uses of the rivers you have the nerve to tell the fisherman that they are the only ones that need to pay a price for the mis-managed rivers and fisherys. With the water diversions and all the other corporate interests why is it that the fisherman are the only ones that seem to be responsible or taking a financial hit. Shut down a power plant, close off water to the farmers, tell los angelos that we have no water, why is that with all the corporate mis-management that the poorest of all the people involved, the one that really has the least effect on the problem bears the brunt of the entire problem. If you can answer my concerns you should run for president. Look at the source not the easy target; how can you possibly feel good about who is bearing the brunt of the mismanagement of our fisherys. Please feel free to let me know when your ready to explain the reality of the problem. I have two children 3 and 5, they have not caught their first salmon yet, my greatest memories growing up was fishing for salmon, if you think that my children don't deserve to catch a salmon please come over for dinner some time and explain to them that it was the fisherman's fault. I would love for you to respond to me. Good luck in life, Mark Gavasse /fishing for life

`salmon closure.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822 Content-Encoding: 7bit
----------------------------	--

Subject: [Fwd: 2008 Salmon Season Suggestion]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2008 11:46:55 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: 2008 Salmon Season Suggestion
From: Norman & Charlotte Dolan <cndolan@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2008 11:43:31 -0800
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Gentlemen,

The predicted size of the Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery is admittedly a major concern for those that commercially take fish for profit. These are people that work hard to earn a living and support their families. Sport fishing is however another matter and should be considered on its own merits. The support industries of sport fishing bring in millions of dollars annually to merchants selling rods, reels, boats and repair services to mention only a few sources where our money is spent.

A “Catch and Release Program”

for Salmon is an opportunity for the Federal and State management to minimize the economic effect of the coming two years of fishing restrictions and at the same time minimize the issue of further depletion of our Salmon fisheries.

Please reply.

Capt. Norm

4722 Santa Rosa California, 95405

cndolan@sbcglobal.net

2008 Salmon Season Suggestion.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822 Content-Encoding: 7bit
--	--

Subject: [Fwd: Salmon Closure]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2008 13:57:09 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: Salmon Closure
From: Trent Alexander <talexander@sportchalet.com>
Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2008 11:56:14 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

I read the three options for possible closure of the Salmon season along the pacific coast. I vote for complete closure, no commercial or sport fishing of salmon this year. Even though I am an avid fisherman I say give the fish a break. It will be better for the fish and the fisherman in the long run. Maybe next year allow a short season with a very low daily bag limit for sport fishing and no commercial fishing at all.

Thank you,

Trent Alexander

This email is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the message and notify the sender.

Salmon Closure.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822
	Content-Encoding: 7bit

Subject: [Fwd: California/Oregon Chinook Salmon fishing 2008]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Mon, 24 Mar 2008 09:26:56 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: California/Oregon Chinook Salmon fishing 2008
From: John Tribuzio <jtconcrete@charter.net>
Date: Sun, 23 Mar 2008 16:46:23 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

To Whom it may concern,

Close it down completely this year. For 5 to 10 years if that is what it takes to save this run. Get together and screen the pumps. Cut flows if needed. Re-build habitat for the delta smelt, etc. You will be remembered as the ones responsible for this extinction if you do not do everything possible to prevent it.

Letting it get to this point is a criminal act in my opinion.

I would like to see the various agencies work together and accomplish the seemingly impossible.

This is a chance to show what can be done when we come together as a united team of concerned groups and individuals.

We owe it to our children and grand children.

Apathy and cynicism are growing toward state and Federal Government. It is up to you to do what is right. You will sleep better, too.

Sincerely,

John G. Tribuzio
3995 Bobolink Circle
Reno, NV 89508

California/Oregon Chinook Salmon fishing 2008.eml
--

Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Encoding: 7bit

Subject: [Fwd: IMPORTANT Salmon Season Closure: Good idea]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Mon, 24 Mar 2008 09:27:13 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: IMPORTANT Salmon Season Closure: Good idea
From: "Shamshoian, Peter" <Peter.Shamshoian@kla-tencor.com>
Date: Sun, 23 Mar 2008 18:03:17 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Hello,

I'm a recreational fisherman in the Monterey Bay. I like to fish but I always fish alone. I live in the south San Jose area and work in a professional capacity so I don't have a lot of buddies ready to go fishing. What I notice on the water is a handful of regulars that always have a full boat (whoever is available that day to count as another person to increase the boats legal take) and take 6 to 10 Salmon and seem to fish 3 to 5 times per week. They always talk about going to work in the afternoon like they're self employed. Don't get me wrong, they're really nice people.

My problem is that most of us don't have that kind of time. I fish every other week at best and frankly I'm not a good fisherman. I consider myself lucky to get one fish and it seems I only get one about every third time I fish. However I think I put more into the fishing economy than the regulars. I bought a lifetime license and a boat. I buy all new gear every time I fish because I really don't have the whole thing organized like the regulars. I don't have the time. My wife complains that every Salmon I get is \$500. I think I caught a total of 5 fish last season and I went as much as I could find the time to do so. But I do really enjoy getting out on the water and occasionally getting my son or daughter to go along.

I think there's a lot of people like me. I think we spend the majority of the money spent at the fishing shops and piers. I would be happy if there was simply a one fish per boat limit or a 6 salmon per season limit. I'm in heaven catching one fish and I listen to all these local guys who say they got 7 fish and they're looking for their go-home fish. They've got freezers full of the stuff and distribute it to their neighborhoods.

If you want to destroy the livelihood of people in the sportfishing business, close the season. If you want to throw them a lifeline at the least cost in terms of numbers of fish; Limit the take to a fish per day per boat, or a fish per rod and a 2/boat limit. I bet you'll reduce the fish take by 80% and keep the spending on fishing at 80% of normal. The regulars actually buy very little. They put everything together themselves. Guys like me that fish once a month are the ones that keep the tackle shops in business. We buy everything new every time we fish.

Please consider the idea. Keep the dream alive and the interest in the younger generation. Let a father take his son and try to catch just one fish. Limit the experts who are taking 300 to 400 fish in a season trolling 5 lines in their big boats.

Thanks for your consideration,

Peter Shamshoian

IMPORTANT Salmon Season Closure: Good idea.eml

Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Encoding: 7bit

Subject: [Fwd: support Option III]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Mon, 24 Mar 2008 09:27:33 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: support Option III
From: jim <owenevan@sti.net>
Date: Sun, 23 Mar 2008 04:34:22 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Need to shut down completely the commercial and sports fishery to save the salmon.
Jim Evans
Mariposa CA

support Option III.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822 Content-Encoding: 7bit
-------------------------------	--

David Allan
Commercial Nearshore Fisherman,
Ca. Lic. #L08224, Ca. Fish Receiver Lic#60374-00
P.O. Box 3073, Carmel, Ca 93921
davidallan7@hotmail.com, Phone: 831-624-6059

Pacific Fisheries Management Council
pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
Pacific Fishery Management Council
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 101
Portland, OR 97220

Subject: Salmon Season Restriction Issue/Groundfish Fishery Idea

Dear Council members,

The frightening issue of the severe shortage in the Sacramento River fall-run salmon stock has been headline news and the economic impact of the proposed actions are sure to be catastrophic on all the West Coast fishing industry, the coastal communities of both California and Oregon. There may be no alternative but to impose deep restrictions to save what was, in the past years, a robust stock upon which thousands of citizens and communities have depended. The impact will go beyond the fishermen themselves, as stakeholders. As described in major newspapers across the nation, the blow will also negatively impact the restaurant, food market, and the tourism industries along the West Coast, and probably nationwide. Combining this with the recession our nation is experiencing, the coastal communities and the fishery stakeholders are in for severe injury. There may be no alternative to this catastrophe.

However, as a stakeholder in the West Coast fisheries, I would like to submit an idea that might provide at least a bit of mitigation to the damage. My idea arose from reading news comments by salmon fishermen. Among the comments, the interviewed fishermen stated that with a severe salmon closure, they would have to resort to available crab or rockfish fisheries to which they may have access. **So, my idea would be to provide some temporary access to these alternatives. Specifically, you might consider reopening the March/April rockfish closure, as well as the lingcod closure for the month of April.** It is well known that the rockfish and lingcod stocks have made significant rebounds in most areas over the recent years as a result of the restrictions enacted over the past decade (including the closure months, rockfish size limits in California, and limited access to certain groundfish like the Nearshore Fishery in California, of which I am a permit-holder). This idea which I provide may be rather insignificant in the “big picture”, and only covers a month or so, but in such a desperate situation, **any** sort of economic mitigation for our coastal communities would be welcome. Implementing such an idea might provide salmon fisherman who would seek alternative fisheries like the open access rockfish (including Slope and Shelf, as well as Nearshore to those who also hold such permits) could provide a bit of economic relief, and **summed up with other similar ideas**, could help to save the livelihoods of fishermen and community stakeholders from complete destruction.

To have any sort of positive effect, you would have to decide on and enact this mitigating measure as quickly as possible...on the first day of your meetings.

Thank you for listening to my small idea, and I hope you give it some consideration.

Sincerely,

David Allan

March 20, 2008

Mr. Chuck Tracy
Pacific Fisheries Management Council
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 101
Portland, OR 97220-1384

RECEIVED

MAR 24 2008

Dear Mr. Tracy,

PFMC

I am writing in response to the recent article in The Oregonian, "Salmon season looks dead" about the projected numbers of Sacramento River fall Chinook salmon returning to spawn this season. The low numbers of salmon are truly alarming.

As David Ortman states in your press release, "ocean conditions have been poor, and there are a lot of things that can go wrong for salmon in freshwater." Many of the things that can go wrong for salmon are within our control. The salmon are struggling to survive because their ecosystem has been disrupted in too many ways. They cannot cope with low water levels because too much river water is diverted for irrigation, they cannot cope with chemicals from farming and industry in the water. They have lost spawning habitat from logging and from dams that alter river currents and temperatures. And once they are in the ocean they cannot survive if there is not enough food or if too many of them are caught before they can mature and return to spawn.

I do not work in the salmon fishing industry and I realize that if the Pacific coast salmon season is closed or very limited this year it will not directly affect my income. I realize this puts me in a very different position from the many people whose income does depend on salmon fishing either directly or indirectly. I am merely someone who really enjoys eating salmon. But when your news release uses words like "dire, sudden collapse, and unprecedented low level" when describing this year's salmon runs it certainly captures my attention.

In spite of the work that the Council and many groups in California, Oregon and Washington do to protect the salmon, we are clearly not doing enough. It is obvious that the salmon need our help now more than ever. Reduced fishing for a season will hurt, but losing the salmon forever is unthinkable and irreversible. A year of reduced fishing will hopefully be a step in the right direction.

Sincerely,



Jan Steinbock
2736 SE Palmquist Road
Gresham, OR 97080

Milstein, Michael. "Salmon season looks dead." The Oregonian. 15 Mar 2008

Subject: [Fwd: Salmon data]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Wed, 26 Mar 2008 16:26:41 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: Salmon data
From: Bob Hather <rkhather@charter.net>
Date: Wed, 26 Mar 2008 15:22:37 -0800
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
CC: Melvin de la Motte <mdelamotte@gmail.com>

Please enter for the record my comments for the March 29 2008 hearing regarding salmon.

In my 35 years of actively sport fishing for salmon along the Pacific Coast I have probably observed more about the habits of salmon than any of your consulting biologists.

In my humble opinion, I believe the alarmingly low counts of salmon last year, especially in the Sacramento River system were do the salmon deciding not to return up the rivers after a 137 year drought. If I'm correct, the return this year will be substantially higher than normal. We won't know until the salmon season is over. Evidence for this lies in the fact that since the rockfish season opened south of Point Conception, many more incidental salmon catches have occurred than normal. In fact, for there to be any incidental catches of salmon taken with rockfish gear, the fish stocks have to be very strong.

I suggest you provide for a sampling by opening the salmon season for a week or two in April so you can make an accurate assessment of the condition of the salmon stocks beyond your river count.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bob Hather
3675 Sequoia Dr.
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

(805) 541-4992

owner- Fishreports.net
Director- Central Coast Fisheries Conservation Coalition

Salmon data.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822
	Content-Encoding: 7bit

Everett E. Baldwin
P.O. Box 1611
Aberdeen, Wa 98520

Ph. (360) 533-0178
Cell: (360) 500-0084
E-mail: everettrobyne_41@msn.com

March 13, 2008

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Attn: North of Falcon Comments
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 101
Portland, OR 97220-1384

RE: NORTH OF FALCON PROCESS-2008. SEASONS SET FOR COMMERCIAL AND SPORT FISHERS.

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the:

As you know there are hundreds of thousands of sport fishers here in the Pacific Northwest contributing millions annually to fish programs and other conservation efforts.

Despite that, we the sport fishers have been deliberately shut out of the debate over how seasons are set and in the amount of salmon, crab and halibut we are allowed to catch.

In 2000, in the final version of the Interior Appropriations bill, a provision was included that eliminated preference for the Native American fishers under the Endangered Species Act, the preference that had been present in Secretarial Order 3206- The Department of the Interior which is an amendment to the Endangered Species Act. That year, in FY2000, in Section 127 of the Appropriations bill, language was inserted that eliminated from Secretarial Order 3206 the following item: Principle 2. Paragraph C., subsection (ii) ..."the conservation purpose of the restriction cannot be achieved by reasonable regulation of non-Indian activities". Or more plain terms the playing field was leveled, and in conservation situations Indian fishers no longer had preference, not over time on the water, not over the fish taken, not over affected habitat, not over anything.

The Endangered Species Act was never intended to give one group preference over the other. Unfortunately, due to the language that was eliminated in 2000

in a bill signed by then President Clinton, prior to 2000 that was exactly what happened.

You would think that with this law change, that there would have been a change in management practices to match the letter of the law-but no, things have continued as before in violation, since 2000 of federal law.

I am a salt water fisherman who enjoys fishing in the ocean and especially the bays, including the Willapa and especially Grays Harbor, particularly area 2-2 east of the Buoy 13 line- also known as the John's River Fishery. This had been a well developed highly participated in fall salmon fishery which was bringing a lot of money into the local economy. At one time this season opened in August. It then went to a Sept. 1st opener which was later pushed back to a Sept. 16th opener. Then last year the coup de grace for the whole thing, the October 1st opener, at a time when the weather is dangerous due to sudden "screamer" wind storms that come out of nowhere and the rough water so bad that many who used to fish that area in September in nicer weather were no longer able to fish. Many have sold their boats and said the hell with it-they are tired of getting screwed by WDFW and their "back-door" deals with the tribes. Not me. Me and some others I know who also love to fish for salmon are going to exercise our rights under federal law and insist that whether the fish are ESA listed or not, that if we are not going to be allowed to fish in our usual and customary places and times for salmon due to any conservation action, (this includes shortened or impractically placed seasons) that the tribal fishers are not going to fish either.

The runs for Grays Harbor and in fact, for the ocean, are not looking good for 2008 as you well know. Now the big question is: "How is this going to be handled?" Every time I ask what the tribes are doing to help conserve the low runs in Grays Harbor and tributaries, and elsewhere, I either get-no comment, or if I write I hear back-nothing. This is no longer acceptable and I am aware of fishermen who are prepared to get arrested fishing out of season out there to take this matter to Federal Court if that is what it takes to get us some equity and parity with season lengths and times compared to the tribal fishers. What has happened is that we have steadily and incrementally been taken off the water by the fish managers while in the meantime the tribal non-discriminatory gillnets continue to clog the bays and lay across the rivers-business as usual while our boats sit in our driveways. This is no longer going to be acceptable.

If the runs are so low the sport fishers are not even allowed to start fishing until the season is nearly over-then why are you allowing commercial gillnet fishers to continue to fish at the expense of the sport fishers? If the runs are that low, if conservation is needed, whether the run is listed under the ESA or not, then shut it down-to everyone! Let's have everyone make some sacrifices and if we don't get to fish at least the sport fishers will see they are getting treated fairly for the

first time in history. If WDFW is so afraid of their tribal "co-managers" that they are too intimidated to take the enforcement action they have already been empowered to take for at least the past 8 years, then perhaps we need to bring in U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service enforcement officers to help them do their job. Maybe in the process they can help figure out why half the salmon, halibut, clams, etc., the Indians are taking don't even get fish tickets attached to them so they can be claimed against the tribal quota. This is an ugly problem that has been hiding in plain sight for too long. Everyone knows they do it, but no one can get the responsible parties to do anything about it-the sport fishers just get to fish less and take less fish as a result.

Fish managers try to say they know what the tribes are doing. They don't. There is no way they can know. There are too many fish being sold out of the back of pickups. With taxpayers paying \$200,000.00 per fish and more to try and conserve endangered species of salmon, this is an enforcement shortcoming we the taxpayers can no longer afford. As my brother has said, "Where the tribes are concerned, who's counting the fish?" The answer is no one! This is an arrangement that so far has worked quite well for the tribes.

So this is what we expect this year. Fair and equitable treatment in the setting of seasons and quotas. The Boldt decision in 1974 guaranteed the tribes up to 50% of the fish. It didn't say they had to take half the fish each year. Since the Boldt decision however WDFW has managed the fish runs as though it does. This is wrong-headed and certainly hasn't contributed to the conservation environment needed to conserve and maintain our fish runs. The ability to discriminate and return protected fish to the water lies solely with the hook and line fishermen, not the netters who wait until the fish dies thrashing in the net before they check to see what it so they won't have to return a protected fish back to the water alive. These behaviors haven't been occurring in a vacuum. Many of us have witnessed the behaviors indicated in this letter and as I have already indicated we expect the fish program managers, both state and federal, to step up to the plate and do the right thing starting with this year's North of Falcon process.

Sincerely,

Everett E. Baldwin

Subject: salmon problems
From: Charles Tamagni <atarborists@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 2008 06:20:17 -0700 (PDT)
To: Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov

Chuck, I have been keeping track of the chatter regarding the non-existent 2008 salmon season. While I have read about potential reasons for the low count, ie. Calif current, pollution, over pumping to the southland, etc. While we cannot alter the Calif. current, we can alter some of the other potential problems. Just closing down the season is not good enough for us fisherman. We want to know what you are doing or going to do about the problems that can be altered. If it takes shutting down pumping stations at different times of the year to allow for the smolt to make it down stream so be it. I am well aware that is not an easy thing to do, however some tough decisions are ahead. Once the decision is made to close the season, we demand to hear what is being done to fix it. I have been fishing salmon for 34 years and to see it get voted away is not right. I would love to hear back from you but doubt you have the guts to call one of us lowly fisherman. Chip Tamagni Paso Robles, California (805) 431-2602

Chip Tamagni, Certified Arborist #WE 6436-A

Office: (805) 434-0131
Cell: (805) 431-2602
Fax: (805) 466-1528

Looking for last minute shopping deals? [Find them fast with Yahoo! Search.](#)

Subject: Please pass the Salmon harvesting ban.

From: Sky Skach <sky.skach@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, 28 Mar 2008 11:25:12 -0700

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

I am writing to provide my support for the salmon harvesting ban along the Oregon and California coast. As a native Oregonian I am aware of the economic impact of this decision but believe the survival of the salmon runs is priceless. As I am sure you know, the salmon evolved with the landscape and are an important method of returning nutrients from the ocean to the landscape making Oregon and California the fertile landscapes we enjoy and prosper from. I am writing to encourage your organization to finalize and implement the ban on salmon harvesting and give depleted population several seasons to recover.

Sincerely,

Sky Skach

Subject: [Fwd: 2008 Salmon Season]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2008 08:13:16 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>
CC: Jennifer Gilden <Jennifer.Gilden@noaa.gov>

Subject: 2008 Salmon Season
From: Jim Gaumer <jgaumer@shocking.com>
Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2008 12:49:14 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Ms. Jennifer Gilden
Communications Officer
Pacific Fishery Management Council

Dear Ms. Gilden:

I recommend you adopt Option 3, a total closure on both the commercial and sport fishing season for salmon along the west coast of the United States. The biologist report that the fall Chinook run for the Sacramento River drainage is projected to be 58,200 spawning salmon. Conservation goals for this run is 122,000 to 180,000 spawning Chinook. To allow any harvest of this stock would be unconscionable, and it would make a mockery of the conservation goals. I can see no way you can in good conscience allow any harvest to occur in 2008. This said, if during the fall it is determined that enough fall Chinook have returned, or are returning, to the Sacramento River drainage, an emergency opening should be considered. I make this recommendation even though I am an avid salmon fisherman.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

Jim Gaumer
580 Paseo Companeros
Chico, CA 95928

2008 Salmon Season.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822
	Content-Encoding: 7bit

Subject: [Fwd: Chinook Salmon 2008 Season Guide Lines]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2008 08:13:39 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: Chinook Salmon 2008 Season Guide Lines
From: Michael Edwards <deenmike@msn.com>
Date: Thu, 27 Mar 2008 20:01:27 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

To whom it may concern.

Thank You for taking the time to read my opinion for the 2008 season. (Salmon)

I have written many letters in the Past few months with Very few reply's if any at all. Most have been written to the ODFW members in different and many Departments. Most of my reply's came back as, we are sorry we do not have any jurisdiction on this matter and will send it on to the right Dept. I'm hoping that this leter is read and has some meaning by you.

First! My pet pieve since 2005 has been the problems we are having with the Chinook, Coho, Salmon up and down the Pacific North West.

I have fished these waters for some 45 plus years and no I have never seen the numbers of our Salmon Stocks going south. They have been for at least 4 and maybe 5 seasons. It is definetly not a new problem that has come about in the last couple of season, even though they have definetly been the worst.

After reading an article in the Orgonian today as it was sent by fax to me to take a look at and what the council is proposing. In this article there are a couple issues I have stressed to the ODFW for Months. In my opinion it is not Ocean conditions where our problem lies. If we continue to address this as if that is the major concern adressing Salmon Runs we are going to run completely out of Salmon in the next few season, sooner than later.

We have seen over the years a lot worse ocean conditions than we had 3 years ago. Infact, according to my caculations 3 years ago we had pretty good conditions outside. But! Reguardless the ODFW can't seem to ever have any other excuses of why we are having proplems unless it is ocean related.

I have listened and spoke with many Biologist in the last couple of decades and its always the same thing, Ocean Conditions, Ocean Conditions. Our problems are with large numbers of Salmon up and down the pacific North West from California to the Washington/Alaska Border. Not a river here and one there with a little smaller runs than usual this season because of warm water, bait numbers down, and a few other factors. Our Salmon fishery is in the Toilet.

In the Orgonian the ODFW Guru MR. Bales indicated that our Spring Runs havn't been hit as hard as our Fall fishy has. Well! If that was right maybe we would have a Springer Run in the Rogue River would we not? Or the Umpqua, would we not? But explained MR Bales, we are not having a Spring Chinook Problem because these fish travel in completely different areas. Forign Fleets, Hake ,Polic cannery boats. Well, MR Bales if the Fall fish returned as early as the Springers maybe there wouldn't be as big of a problem as we are having. The Columbia Springers are the only Springers not having a Problem and that has not proven to be a fact Quite yet.

This issue is State wide not one river here one river there All the Rivers are affected by low Runs. The Willamett Springers all time Lows but they are letting them fish those fish when it should be closed. So where are the Springer Runs?

Also indicated was the Sacremento River which makes up the BULK of Oregon's offshore Salmon catch each summer. Wow! does that ever put a pot on to boil. Why? is it that the Sacramento River makes up of most of the Catch in Oregon? Are we saying the Sacramento puts way more fish into its system than all the rivers in Oregon? I don't think we can go that far But! they have a much better system than the ODFW has that is for sure. For its size we don't see an 1/8 of those numbers in the Rogue River. Just a long as the SAC! The Umpqua as long as the Sac. All in All we need more fish in

these systems once the problem is taken care of (The No Fish Problem).

Here we go with the Real culprit to our fisheries!!!!!! Net fishing off shore from the Foreign Polic to Hake fisheries, The offshore cannery fleet taking everything that can't swimm through a net and is proessed. If we don't think million of pounds of Salmon are not being intersepted by these fisheries someone needs to have there heads examined. Literally!! The second huge problem is the Alaskan and Canadian offshore net fisheries targeting Salmon of all species. When the ports of Alaska closed for 3 weeks due to having too many Salmon being proccesed you don't think that might be a hint of the numbers they are catching and let me tell you they are not Alaskan Fish, definetly not there own. So you think Wasshington and Oregon Salmon might be in those nets?

When Canada broke the treaty with the US because they blamed Alaskan offshore commercial fleets as targeting there fish, then indicated scew you we can play that game too. So they start supposedly targeting Alaskan fish. You don't think they are doing the same? fishing on our fish. Hell yes they are. The Odfw Does not have a clue where these fish go from the time they enter the river untill they return. When they indicate Sacramento fish don't stray to far north, and that is a huge problem for that fishery if the water conditions are not working in the fishes favor. But in the same turn they indicate that the majority of Salmon caught in Oregon are Sacramento fish. Then how in the hell do they know how far North they actally go? They do not know!

If the ODFW would work together with the STEP program in each of our streams we would have a hell of a better return. The STEP has proven that. But! The ODFW doesn't want to look bad to the general public. At this point and for quite a few years they couldn't look any worse than they do now. When writing to the ODFW if you can get by the Assistant to the Assistant to find whom you'd like to read what you have to say should be justifies also. Everyone else is suffering through hard times but the ODFW has more people sitting on there ---than any other public servant. Losen up a few of these seats, put that money into the works to get our fishery back on track.

Is there such a thing that the sportsman of the State that purchase license and tags each season to catch a fish will ever see that money go directly to the funding of our fish and game. We don't have the dollars to get the issues done now, like watch the 200 mile limit on forign fleets targeting our fish, more dollars in our hatchery programs to raise more fish larger, people whom know actually what they are doing at the hatchery facilities instead of wiping out hatchery fry because of neglect. I feel for this council having to find plus issues to get us on the right track.

Remember one thing, Down the road if the Commercial net fishery by Foreign fleets and Alaska are not looked into you have not seen anything yet. The Ocean is not the Culprit here. We would have been better off with Mother Nature running things than the ODFW.

Thank you for your Time and I hope you are able to put this together.

Mike Edwards

Chinook Salmon 2008 Season Guide Lines.eml

Content-Type: message/rfc8:
Content-Encoding: 7bit

Subject: [Fwd: Please choose option III for salmon closure]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2008 08:19:44 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: Please choose option III for salmon closure
From: Jeff Richelieu <jeffstreamline@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Sat, 29 Mar 2008 08:32:15 -0700 (PDT)
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Dear fisheries managers,

I am writing this letter regarding the salmon fishing regulations for the Sacramento River for the 2008 season. I am 41 years old and have fished the Sacramento river for the last 35 years, and I would like to see it available for future generations. I have no commercial interest in the salmon fishery. I am mostly a catch and release fisherman now, but I will occasionally keep a bright king salmon or two in the fall for eating.

With the collapse of the salmon stocks on the Sac. this year, I see no options, but to close the fishing season on the ocean and the river including the Feather and the American. Over the past 10 years there has been a huge increase in the number of guides on these river systems. These guides are out there everyday with up to 5 lines in the water and they are extremely good fishermen. They are pounding these fish at every turn, on every run, and are taking thousands of ripe salmon each year. Their goal is to "limit" their clients, so most dark salmon are killed and thrown in the box regardless of the quality of the meat.

These are extremely valuable fish because they are on the verge of spawning and returning millions of eggs to the system as well as their carcasses. They have survived all the many obstacles to reach this point in their life. I would speculate that every salmon taken in the river is worth 5 to 10 fish taken out in the ocean.

I have heard very few freshwater salmon fishermen stand up and take responsibility for their impact on the system. Everyone wants to point their fingers at everyone else, but the truth is that **we all have an impact**. Many guides will fish 5 days a week from July through December on the Sac. At a conservative average of 2 fish per day, that's about 200 fish per guide! I bet if you polled the guides they take a lot more fish per year than my estimate. Now multiply that by the number of eggs per fish and the number of guides. Say 10,000 eggs per fish multiplied by 100 females = 1 million eggs per guide !!! I have seen 20 guides at one launch ramp in one day, so the numbers are astounding if you do the math.

I am not writing this to pick on the guides, but to make the point that the sport fishermen have a significant impact on the fishery, as do the ocean fishermen, delta pumps, and ocean conditions.

We obviously can't regulate the ocean conditions, but we can regulate the fishermen and the delta pumps. **I would strongly encourage you to take the best course of action by closing the season to all salmon fishing in the ocean and rivers and to severely restrict the delta pumping activity.**

With the dramatic drop in the run that occurred last year, we don't have time on our side to wait and see what happens this year. These fish need our help now, so please act accordingly.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely,

Jeff Richelieu, concerned fisherman

Jeff Richelieu, PE
President, Streamline Engineering
Office: (530) 892-1100
Fax: (530) 892-1115
60 Independence Circle
Suite 201
Chico, CA 95973

Please choose option III for salmon closure.eml

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Encoding: 7bit

Subject: [Fwd: Salmon Closure +]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2008 08:22:41 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: Salmon Closure +
From: Bob Rist <ristr@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2008 15:12:36 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

I am a 71 year old person that has been involved in the fishing sport for many years. I would like to offer a few of my unscientific solutions to decline in the salmon population. The following are not necessarily in order of importance.

In reference to the Sacramento River influence on the salmon decline.

1. Reopen the Mill Creek hatchery south of Red Bluff. The more hatched, the more salmon. In my thinking this approach would be less costly than subsidizing the fisherman that have been put out of business by the decreased supply of their livelihood.
2. Curtail the increase in the population of the voracious striped bass in the San Joaquin Delta. Many times I have caught and released as many as twenty five under size stripers during an outing in the delta I am sure these fish are consuming many, many smolt released from the hatcheries.

Ocean and bay waters

1. Sea Lions: Conduct a study to ascertain the influence of the San Francisco Bay sea lions on the returning salmon to the Sacramento River/San Joaquin Rivers. The narrow straits of the Golden Gate Bridge provide an excellent source of food and easy pickings for the lazy lions who only have to float back to the docks to bask in the sun for the rest of the day. The so called animal friendly societies have allowed the sea lions to displace boat owners at the wharfs surrounding San Francisco as a tourist attraction... Wrong.
2. Russian River entrance into the sea: I have personally observed sea lions rolling off the shore at the entrance to the Russian River catching salmon and perhaps steelhead tossing them into the air as part of their eating regimen then returning the shore to bask again in the sun. Yes, I know that we all have to survive, however, get to the problem.
3. From my reading, I have learned that the curtailed upwelling of the ocean due to the change in the jet streams has had significant influence on the sustainability of the ocean food source beginning at the bottom of the food chain. This of course is something that we have no control of. Fish like others animals will go where they can eat and survive. As salmon have a wide migration pattern I would like to see documentation on how many other countries are taking out salmon as they roam the waters of the Pacific. I have a suspect that these records will not be made publicly for political reasons. What ever, cut to the chase.

As a closing remark; I have spoken to several individuals who reportedly have personal knowledge that the

seas lions are having a dramatic influence on the supply of salmon returning to the major rivers in Oregon and California. He also remarks that here used to be a bounty on the animals, shortly thereafter the salmon supply increased dramaticlty. I have read articles that sea lions are stationing themselves below the fish ladders on various rivers and voraciously devouring the soon to be spawning salmon.

If I am misinformed or incorrect please set me straight. I await your unpolitiial response.

Robert M. Rist
531 S. Merrill Ave.
Willows, CA 95988

Salmon Closure +.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822 Content-Encoding: 7bit
-----------------------------	--

Subject: Salmon Public Hearing Locations Unfair to Thousands of Fishermen
From: "McMillan, Terry" <terry.mcmillan@lmco.com>
Date: Fri, 28 Mar 2008 14:42:37 -0600
To: Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov

Chuck,
The choice of Eureka, Coos Bay, and Westport for Salmon public hearing locations seems quite unfair to thousands of other concerned fishermen. The impending Salmon fishing season decisions affect a whole bunch of folks unable to attend your sessions.

Although I am not an avid Salmon fisherman, I still desire to have the opportunity participate in Salmon recreational fishing. In the likely event the Salmon season will not open in Central/Southern California this year, can I suggest that you and your fisheries management group support a report card catch and release program so we can help you determine the extent of the Salmon population problem?

As recreational fisherman, we, like you and your group, desire to rebuild our Salmon fishery and will do whatever it takes to accomplish that goal. Putting down our fishing poles and waiting for the resurgence of Salmon is not the only way we can help.

Sincerely,

Terry McMillan

805-937-8951(W) 805-260-9169 (C)
email: centralcoastfisherman@calmac.net

"Any sufficiently advanced bureaucracy is indistinguishable from molasses."

Unknown

Quotations by unknown authors

Subject: [Fwd: Comments on the Proposed Options for the 2008 Salmon Season]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2008 13:11:22 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: Comments on the Proposed Options for the 2008 Salmon Season
From: "Promani, Rudy" <RxP8@pge.com>
Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2008 12:50:16 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I have been a confirmed offshore salmon angler off the Northern California coast around San Francisco since I was 16 years old, a total of more than 36 years now. I am gravely concerned about how the options will affect the small businesses that have formed to allow anglers to take advantage of this fishery and their ability to survive. I believe some form of aid, both state and federal will be needed to allow these folks to maintain some semblance of a livelihood. I am also a Marine Biologist by both degree and formal training and completely understand that drastic measures are required. As a result I support the complete closure of the fishery to allow the maximum number of fish to return for spawning. This closure may have to be re-evaluated annually and extended as needed. Please remember that the fish that make it back to spawn this year will have an impact on the fish available 3-5 years from now! I also remember the banner season of just a few years ago and hope we can see a return of similar numbers.

Rudy Promani

Comments on the Proposed Options for the 2008 Salmon Season.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822 Content-Encoding: 7bit
--	--

Subject: [Fwd: nor-cal salmon fishing meeting april 1, 2008]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Tue, 01 Apr 2008 13:17:51 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: nor-cal salmon fishing meeting april 1, 2008
From: Dan Wenzel <bookmdano95570@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 01 Apr 2008 11:00:29 -0700 (PDT)
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

I will not be able to attend this meeting as I am not driving my truck in favor of the truckers fuel strike. I do however would like to voice my opinion on the Salmon fishing question. I feel that I am an intelligent and rational human. Why is it that the Salmon in the Sac. river have anything to do with the salmon in the far northern Cal. and Or. waters, these fish only go back to where they are hatched, if it does not effect the Washington and Alaska fish, then it won't effect the fishery north of the Sacramento. A fairer solution that would not cripple the economy, is to open the season to 2 fish which would include COHO (silvers as we say it). OH YEAH, these are on the in dangered list, even though we hook up with 8 COHO to every 1 KING, and when we let them loose the are killed by sea lions or seals or just die from trauma, The Feds took the wolves off the list and there is only 1,300 of them DUH. Anyhow why not 2 fish any specie, it would save the ECONOMY. I would however save over a \$1,000. that I would normally spend going fishing and enhancing the economy of the area and oh yeah license fees to CDFG, that'l help Californias economy, if you stop fishing altogether.

You rock. That's why Blockbuster's offering you [one month of Blockbuster Total Access](#), No Cost.

nor-cal salmon fishing meeting april 1, 2008.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822
	Content-Encoding: 7bit

Subject: [Fwd: Salmon Closures]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Tue, 01 Apr 2008 14:49:15 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: Salmon Closures
From: "Dr. Edward Bruno" <drbruno-drb@pacbell.net>
Date: Tue, 01 Apr 2008 14:40:51 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov
CC: Jim Gaumer <jgaumer@shocking.com>

Dear Sirs:

Complete closure is clearly the best option. The other options allow the loss of salmon already below stated conservation levels. If those levels had relevance when they were established, they must be respected at this point.

Additionally, complete closure will be less of a problem for enforcement. Complexity leads to ambiguity which creates additional problems for enforcement. Zero catch is clear and unambiguous.

Ed Bruno

1665 Park Vista Drive, Chico, CA

Salmon Closures.eml	Content-Type: message/rfc822 Content-Encoding: 7bit
----------------------------	--

Subject: [Fwd: 2008 Salmon]
From: PFMC Comments <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>
Date: Wed, 02 Apr 2008 10:19:26 -0700
To: Chuck Tracy <Chuck.Tracy@noaa.gov>

Subject: 2008 Salmon
From: Chris Marshall <chris_marshall@dot.ca.gov>
Date: Wed, 02 Apr 2008 10:02:14 -0700
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

I attended the public hearing in Eureka last night. As the meeting went long and somewhat off topic, I thought I would voice my preference here.

For recreational fishing, Option 1 provides for fishing on Memorial Day, July 4th, and Labor Day weekends. A total of 10 days of fishing. While this seems better than Options 2 & 3, it is terribly flawed for the following reasons:

Here on the northcoast of California, the ocean conditions limit our time to safely pursue salmon. My educated guess would be that of the 10 days allowed for fishing, the most days to safely fish would not exceed four. And conceivably, there could be no safe days to fish due to dangerous ocean conditions. With this limited opportunity on specific dates, you are indirectly encouraging boats to venture into unsafe conditions. Since these will be the only dates we're allowed to fish, boaters will no doubt take chances they ordinarily would avoid. This could lead to disaster. I wonder what the Coast Guard thinks of this option as proposed?

Another flaw of Option 1 is concentrating all salmon fishing opportunities on three holiday weekends. There are only three boat launching facilities in the Eureka/Trinidad area. And most people don't use Trinidad because of the cost and the hassle. Option 1, as proposed, would create such chaos at the launch facilities that most of the fishermen I know won't even bother to fish. There are just too many inexperienced boaters who clog the ramps with their ineptness. It could take hours to launch and pull out you boat. And the parking problems this would cause are inconveivable.

Only allowing salmon fishing on the specific dates proposed is short sighted. More convenient for regualtory and enforcement agencies, sure. But you're asking for trouble and disaster if Option 1 is adopted as proposed.

As mentioned at the meeting last night several times, I beleive some kind of punch card system would help aleviate the problems stated above. If a person was provided a punch card with a limited number of salmon allowed to be harvested, the season could be spread out where fisherman could fish in safer conditions and the boat ramps would be able to handle the pressure. A safer and less congested opportunity to fish would result.

A modified version of Option 1, with some kind of puch card system in place, is my preference.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris Marshall
Fisherman & Voter

RECEIVED

MAR 21 2008

PFMC

To: Manager, Pacific Fisheries Management Council, 7700 NE Ambassador Place, #101,
Portland, OR 97220

From: Ms. Phoebe Lenhart, 1518 Castillo, #2B, Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Date: 3-13-2008

Regarding: "Salmon fishing season"

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'WJ', located to the right of the 'From' field.

This letter is sent in reference to the frightening news in reference to the low numbers of salmon.

I support suspending all fishing of salmon until the numbers recover sufficiently to sustain the population for generations to come. I hope you do not succumb to pressure from the fishing industry, recreational fishers, etc I am very disappointed that your organization has allowed this to happen. This bad news regarding the salmon population should not be a surprise to you or anyone else in your organization. Please stop all salmon fishing immediately and suspend any further fishing until the species makes a full recovery. Their and our future depends upon your decisions and actions. Please be responsible.

Tom Peters
221 Dollison St.
Eureka, CA 95501
707-445-1666
tpete@reninet.com

April 1, 2008

Pacific Fisheries Management Council:
Re: 2008 salmon season disaster relief

I am writing to ask for your support for including SPORTFISHERMEN, along with commercial fishermen and fishing related businesses, in any proposed disaster relief for the 2008 Pacific salmon fishery. Your active support is critical for many reasons.

For many sportfishermen, salmon is the mainstay of our recreational activity. Switching to other fisheries and other areas, when possible, costs us considerable amounts for new equipment, longer ocean trips, travel, and license fees. Even in Eureka, Ca, the local charterboats will have to charge much more to compensate for the much longer runs to the bottomfishing grounds or for offshore albacore trips. Fuel is expensive!

The California DFG has data from salmon punchcards through 2007 showing fishermen's names and addresses and how many days they actually fished. Using this data, I would propose excluding 'casual' fishermen who fished for salmon 5 days or less last year. For fishermen who logged 6 days or more last year, there should be a 'per day' compensation allowed to offset other increased costs. I don't know what funds will be available, but a figure of maybe \$50/day seems appropriate and would cost only a small fraction of any relief package.

I doubt you will get many letters about this request. Most fishermen are in shock and have not thought through what it will take to switch to other fisheries or to travel to other locations. Sportfishermen have worked very hard and given much to restore and rebuild salmon populations. Whatever the reasons for the poor 2007 returns, it is crucial to the salmon to maintain this support. Participating in any disaster relief would both acknowledge our contributions and keep us engaged in restoration efforts. Ignoring us could seriously erode that commitment. We want more fish and will do whatever we can to help achieve that goal. If you decide we need the draconian measures you propose this year, we will support you to help rebuild stocks.. But please consider us and our sacrifice by urging our inclusion in disaster relief efforts.

We sportfishermen have considerable investments of time and money in our boats and equipment for the salmon fishery. For many of us, it is our MAJOR recreational activity for the entire year. Under the BEST option offered, the PFMC is about to render it all worthless unless relief becomes available to help us adapt.

You would help minimize our loss and help retain our support by making a real effort to include sportfishermen in any disaster relief that may result from your actions for the 2008 sport salmon season..

Thank you.
Tom Peters



Cc: Senator Diane Feinstein

Congressman Mike Thompson

Senator Barbara Boxer

CA State Assemblywoman Patty Berg

John H. Roush Jr. D.B.A
600 Deer Valley Road, #2-E
San Rafael, CA 94903-5517
(415) 499-5776
Fax (415) 499-5112
E-Mail: coljhroush@comcast.net



RECEIVED

MAR 21 2008

PFMC

March 12, 2008

Pacific Fishery Management Council
7700 N.E. Ambassador Place, Suite 101
Portland, Oregon 97220 503-820-2280

Dear Sirs,

May I suggest that you consider that as one of the principal threats to the diminishment of our salmon runs is the gross overfishing by large scale commercial boats utilized by Korean, Japanese and Russian fleets in the far northern waters and Bering Seas.

Some of us believe that they are rampantly exploiting the immature salmon which tend to thickly school and are thus readily located by sophisticated sonar used by those unscrupulous boat captains. Using small mesh nets of great length the juvenile stock can be wiped out, with no thought given to the consequences of taking immature fish in vast numbers.

That technique was proven to be the principal causation of sudden severe diminishment of atlantic salmon runs in the Scandinavian countries. Enterprising seiners had located massed schools of juvenile fish in far northern waters and had grossly over-harvested the fish with small-mesh nets. I believe both races of salmon range far north in their juvenile stage.

The Coast Guard has patrolled the 200 mile limit in northern waters and has found rampant disregard by these foreign vessels. They tell me that outward of the 200 mile limits the foreign boats have stripped the seas of all fish, thus their willingness to risk capture in invasion of our waters with their severe taking with ten mile or more long nets. The limited capacity of the Coast Guard to patrol, by virtue of insufficient ships, personnel and budget, has allowed the foreign scavengers to take the serious risks capture and loss of their boats by their intrusions.

We need to strengthen our ability to protect salmon runs by doubling the capacity of the Coast Guard to patrol our waters and enforce fisheries restrictions. That would be the most cost effective alternative to taking effective action to protect our important fisheries. We should advocate a considerable increase in the CG budget that would be needed to implement this proposal.

We need also to curtail the excessive diversion of our waters to the south. They should be encouraged to develop desalination and such other projects as may be needed as alternatives to over-exploiting our northern California waters, to our serious detriment.

Since the expenditure of large sums are being considered to mitigate the severe reduction in salmon runs, the above considerations should be thoroughly considered.

Please advise with your thoughts..

Sincerely,



JOHN H. ROUSH, JR., D.B.A.