

#1

From: **Andrew Massi** <[andrewmassi03@gmail.com](mailto:andrewmassi03@gmail.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 7:48 AM  
Subject: Ca salmon alternatives  
To: [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

I am writing this to voice my strong support for alternative 1. It provides that largest ammount of recreational fishing opportunities while only having a small impact on strained Klamath river stocks and allows anglers to target Sacramento river fall run fish. Also, it will allow other ground fish stocks to recover and not take a hit like they did during the last salmon closure. We are just seeing the halibut and rockfish near shore numbers improving. Thank you for all the hard work that you do and taking the time to hear our comments.

Andrew Massi  
[\(916\) 764-1232](tel:(916)764-1232)

---

#2

From: <[HMBKaren@comcast.net](mailto:HMBKaren@comcast.net)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 5:01 AM  
Subject: Please Keep Salmon Fishing Season Open  
To: [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

Dear PFMC,

I am a recreational fisherman who lives in Half Moon Bay (San Mateo County).

Along with my wife and son, I enjoy salmon fishing very much. It is a family friendly sport where we all enjoy family time in the great outdoors. Fishing for other types of fish is simply not as fun or rewarding as catching, and eating, ocean fresh salmon.

We of course by the necessary licenses (already purchased for 2017) and follow all of the fishing rules exactly as prescribed.

>>>>> Please help my family by voting for Alternative 1 for your salmon fishing decision.

And for God's sake, please do NOT vote for Alternative 3 - this would be an economic disaster for California and for my family's Summer plans!

Thank you and please keep up the good work.

Sincerely,  
John Gross  
351 Granelli Ave.  
Half Moon Bay, CA. 94019

#3

From: PETER <pbdavidson7@comcast.net>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 6:53 AM  
Subject: California recreational salmon season  
To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

To whom it may concern,

I strongly support Alternative 1, which achieves all of the conservation criteria established by the Council and provides the most opportunity for fishermen and the greatest economic value to California. I strongly object to Alternative 3, which provides no material additional protections for Klamath fish and will have a devastating economic impact.

Thank you for your consideration.

Pete Davidson  
Martinez, CA

---

#4

From: **Michael Mansuy** <[mmansuy@sbcglobal.net](mailto:mmansuy@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 6:54 AM  
Subject: Support for Alternative 1  
To: "[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Napa, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,

Matthew Michael Mansuy  
**Mike Mansuy**  
[707-331-4779](tel:707-331-4779)

#5

From: **Laura** <[laura@localocean.net](mailto:laura@localocean.net)>  
Date: Wed, Mar 15, 2017 at 2:44 PM  
Subject: Salmon season public comment Letter attached  
To: "[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Please find my public comment on the 2017 salmon seasons attached.

Thank you

Laura Anderson



March 15, 2017

To: Pacific Fishery Management Council  
From: Laura Anderson, owner Local Ocean; ODFW Commissioner  
Re: Oregon 2017 Commercial salmon season options

Dear Sir or Madam:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the options for the Oregon Commercial Troll salmon season.

***I strongly support Option 1 as the best alternative for Oregon business, the fleet and the resource.***

As a restaurant and fish market, Local Ocean relies on a steady supply of fresh seafood for my summer customers. Option 1 is the best option for consistency of supply and is therefore best option for seafood consumers, restaurants and specialty fish retailers.

As a commissioner for the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife I am also very concerned about limiting impacts to the weak run of Klamath River fish. I believe Option 1 balances the need to avoid incidental catch of Klamath fish, with the needs of consumers.

Concerns about the Southern fleet being closed down in Option 1 are also important. As a fish buyer in Newport, I would welcome the Southern fleet to come fish and sell in the central coast if their season is closed due to these impacts.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "LA Anderson", written over a white background.

Laura Anderson

Owner, Local Ocean Seafoods

#6

From: **Mike Glick** <[wisehart@impulse.net](mailto:wisehart@impulse.net)>

Date: Fri, Mar 10, 2017 at 8:12 AM

Subject: 2017 Ocean Salmon Regulation Comments

To: [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

I think it is important to look at the reality of the recreational fishing fleet in Morro Bay/Avila and how unfair the regulations were last year. We do not want a repeat of those unfair regulations this year.

We were told by DFW that one reason for the June closure of sport salmon in MB/PSL was because they consider it 'equable' to give recreational fishermen a 2 month season(Apr/May) and commercial a two month season(May/Jun).

It is not 'equitable' to give recreational fishermen who typically are limited to weekends only (due to work and kids in school, etc.) a 2 month season with a 2 fish bag limit while giving commercial also a 2 month season when they are out there all the time on big boats (weather or not) with no bag limit. Also, the commercial fleet is much more mobile and can move to where the fish are located (as happened last year when the comm fleet descended on Avila in June) while rec fishermen typically only fish out of their home port.

Additionally, the weather is so poor (windy) in April in the MB/Avila area that there are typically very few 'fishable' days for rec fishermen in small boats. As sport fishermen, if you are going to force a 2 month season on us and call that 'equitable', we would much prefer it to be May/Jun when the weather is more suitable for small boats and the kids are out of school. Giving rec fisherman April when the weather is typically so poor and there are few fishing 'opportunities' because of weather for recreational anglers in small boats who are typically limited to fishing on the weekends while giving commercial June when the weather is typically calm and there are way more 'fishable' days is extremely unfair and disrespectful of the needs of the recreational fishermen.

If the rec impact rate on WR is a concern in June then the rec size limit could be raised to 26" for that month. It should also be noted that there are not typically large 'party' boats in MB/Avila that target salmon so the needs of party boat charter fleet are not a concern in MB/Avila with regard to the recreational fishing regulations (specifically size limit). That is only a concern for port areas to the north like Monterey where there is a fleet of large charter boats that target salmon. Therefore, regulations that are limited to MB/Avila ('Monterey South') do not affect charter boats to the north.

Mike Glick  
Santa Barbara, Ca.  
[805-450-6487](tel:805-450-6487)

#7

From: **Craig Zora** <[czora@comcast.net](mailto:czora@comcast.net)>  
Date: Wed, Mar 1, 2017 at 8:42 AM  
Subject: [http://www.thedailyworld.com/news/projections-indicate-state-salmon-fisheries-will-again-be-tempered-by-low-coho-runs/?utm\\_source=The+Daily+World&utm\\_campaign=29377b4579-Newsletter+Daily+Update&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_term=0\\_e632e0b0b6-29377b4579-229079825](http://www.thedailyworld.com/news/projections-indicate-state-salmon-fisheries-will-again-be-tempered-by-low-coho-runs/?utm_source=The+Daily+World&utm_campaign=29377b4579-Newsletter+Daily+Update&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_e632e0b0b6-29377b4579-229079825)  
To: "Herring, Chad J (DFW)" <[Chad.Herring@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:Chad.Herring@dfw.wa.gov)>  
Cc: [commission@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:commission@dfw.wa.gov), [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

Chad,

What is being done to limit interception of our salmon up north? This is the elephant in the room and no one talks about it. Now is the time to start....

Craig Zora  
[360-589-9854](tel:360-589-9854)

From: Craig Zora <[czora@comcast.net](mailto:czora@comcast.net)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 2, 2017 at 7:28 AM  
Subject: Question  
To: "Herring, Chad J (DFW)" <[Chad.Herring@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:Chad.Herring@dfw.wa.gov)>  
Cc: [commission@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:commission@dfw.wa.gov), [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

Chad,

Why is there such a gap between the two models? It makes you wonder how reliable these prediction models really are if the results are so apart.

From the Aberdeen Daily World:

The forecast for Willapa Bay salmon was released at a meeting in Montesano last week, predicting very low returns of all species except chum. The Grays Harbor forecast was also on the agenda for that meeting, but a wide gap between the forecast models of the state and Quinault Indian Nation has put the numbers for fall Chinook and coho on hold. Again, only chum are expected to make a decent return in Grays Harbor fisheries.

Craig Zora  
360-589-9854 (text only)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Craig Zora** <[czora@comcast.net](mailto:czora@comcast.net)>  
Date: Fri, Mar 3, 2017 at 2:39 PM  
Subject: Received your message  
To: [James.Scott@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:James.Scott@dfw.wa.gov)  
Cc: [commission@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:commission@dfw.wa.gov), [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

Please send me a summary of where we are with negotiations with Canada (and Alaska) on salmon interceptions. What is the trend? Are interceptions going down?

Have a nice weekend.

Craig Zora  
[360-589-9854](tel:360-589-9854) (text only)

From: **Craig Zora** <[czora@comcast.net](mailto:czora@comcast.net)>  
Date: Wed, Mar 8, 2017 at 7:23 AM  
Subject: FW: APPS: Notification Subscription Reminder  
To: [mike.scharpf@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:mike.scharpf@dfw.wa.gov)  
Cc: [pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)

Mike,

We discussed this on the phone. Are you opposed to all these projects because there is not a **monitoring component**? I would think at this time we cannot afford the monitoring but habitat will be reopened even if use cannot be quantified.

Your thoughts?

Craig Zora  
[360-589-9854](tel:360-589-9854) (text only)

Applications List

- 4 of 4 item(s)

View	Application Name	Project	Application Type	Pre-App?	Applicant Information	Status	Submitted Date	Latest Status Updated Date	Method	Latitude	Longitude	County	WRIA	Stream Number	Stream Name
	10175 - Fish Habitat Enhancement Permit#: 2017-6-80+01	Newskah Road Fish Barrier Correction Project	Standard	N	Lonnie Crumley (Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force) 2090 West Beerbower Road , Elma , WA 98541	HPA Issued (Active)	01/26/2017	03/07/2017	Paper	46.92265	-123.82646	Grays Harbor	22 - Lower Chehalis - Downstream of Porter	9999	Unknown Stream Number
	10096 - Fish Habitat Enhancement Permit#: 2017-6-79+01	Taylor Creek South Bank Road Fish Barrier Correction Project RCO #16-1776	Standard	N	Lonnie Crumley (Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force) 2090 West Beerbower Road , Elma , WA 98541	HPA Issued (Active)	01/17/2017	03/07/2017	Paper	46.97472	-123.39246	Grays Harbor	22 - Lower Chehalis - Downstream of Porter	9999	Unknown Stream Number
	10088 - Fish Habitat Enhancement Permit#: 2017-6-81+01	Geissler Creek Fish Barrier Correction Project	Standard	N	Lonnie Crumley (Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force) 2090 West Beerbower Road , Elma , WA 98541	HPA Issued (Active)	01/17/2017	03/07/2017	Paper	47.00008	-123.67461	Grays Harbor	22 - Lower Chehalis - Downstream of Porter	0266	Unnamed
	1676 - Standard Hydraulic Project Permit#: 2014-6-285+01	W. McBryde Culvert Replacement	Standard	N	Scott Boettcher (Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority) 2601 Capitol Way S, Olympia , WA 98501-3326	Amendment (Inactive)	10/24/2016	03/07/2017	Online	46.98784	-123.60665	Grays Harbor	22 - Lower Chehalis - Downstream of Porter	9999	Unknown Stream Number

#8

From: Eric Benjamin <ejbenja@yahoo.com>  
Date: Wed, Mar 15, 2017 at 4:03 PM  
Subject: Oregon Salmon troll season comments  
To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

To Whom It May Concern,

Hello, I would like the opportunity to express my opinion that may weigh in with the Council's decision on the 2017 North of Cape Falcon commercial salmon season.

I would like you to know that I am concerned about the potential loss of commercial ocean troll salmon seasons . I purchased a Oregon Limited Entry Troll Permit last Fall and got it transferred to my boat, this was a large cash outlay to purchase the permit, then in order to transfer the permit from the old owner to my boat I had to commercially license my boat, myself and pay to instate the permit about \$800 total, all this just to get the permit transferred and I didn't even get to fish last year. Additionally I had to spend significantly more money on safety equipment to meet the Federal safety requirements for commercial fishing vessels. I purchased two cold water immersion suits, a category 1 EPIRB, a satellite telephone, a host of flares, fire extinguishers, a life raft, handheld emergency VHF radio, all this totaling \$5500 Now again this year I have had to pay to renew my permit, commercial fishing vessel license, crew fishing license, personal fishing license, HMS permit totaling almost \$900 and I still have not got to fish yet. We are nearing April and I am looking eagerly forward to recouping the money I have poured out to participate in this fishery only to find out there is a strong chance there won't even be a season.

This letter is not meant to be cry for sympathy but rather a plea for consideration for the commercial user group to be afforded a reasonable opportunity. I would advocate that any fish allocated to ocean harvest be given commercial priority as the recreational fishers have opportunity in bays and rivers unavailable to commercial ocean salmon troll permit holders. Additionally recreational impacts on ocean Coho salmon are much higher in down Chinook salmon years. I would advocate that any ocean Coho salmon harvest allowance be given commercial priority first to make up for lost opportunity on Chinook salmon through September 15th after which if any quota remains it could be transferred to the recreational fishers. A last thought, do away with the traditional September NON selective Coho salmon season and transfer wild Coho salmon impacts to the commercial fishers for increased opportunity.

I feel strongly that the ocean salmon quotas should be given commercial priority over recreational based on the simple premise that commercial fishers make their living in the ocean, much of the time when recreational craft cannot or should not be even be on the ocean. For commercial fishers it is a job and a paycheck, for the recreational fishers it is simply a fun day on the water with a chance to bring home some fish for the freezer. The recreational fishers can fish for many other species in many other waters.

In conclusion I would like to thank all who read this for their time and influence in these tough ocean times, your dedication and support is highly valued by myself and many other commercial fishers alike. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Most Cordially,

Eric J. Benjamin & Laura C. Long  
F/V Steelheart

#9

From: Doug Wilgis <Doug.Wilgis@viavisolutions.com>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 9:00 AM  
Subject: 2017 Salmon Season Alternitives  
To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Greetings after reading the alternatives available I support Alternative 1 for the 2017 Ocean Salmon Season.

It meets all of conservation goals, minimizes economic and recreational impacts and complies with Magnuson Stevens standards.

Doug Wilgis

Optical Fabrication Engineer III  
Viavi Solutions  
1402 mariner Way  
Santa Rosa, CA 95407  
+1 707 525 7726 (direct)  
www.viavisolutions.com

[doug.wilgis@viavisolutions.com](mailto:doug.wilgis@viavisolutions.com)

---

#10

From: john walthew <johnwalthew@yahoo.com>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 9:33 AM  
Subject: PFMC Salmon Alternatives Public Comment - Support for Alternate 1  
To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Hello,

I am sending this email to show my support for California Recreational Alternate 1.

Alternate 1 provides California recreational fisherman the most opportunity and economic value with 324 days of fishing in all zones except the Klamath and 89,553 angler days. Alternate 3 provides no real increases in protection of the Klamath Fall run chinook and fails to meet Magnuson Stevens standards of maximizing economic benefit while ensuring sustainable fisheries.

Regards,

John Walthew

#11

From: <[phdonohoe@aol.com](mailto:phdonohoe@aol.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 9:28 AM  
Subject: Salmon Season Alternatives  
To: [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

Dear PFMC,

I am a tax paying recreational fisherman who supports the maintenance and improvement of our salmon stocks. I am writing to you today to express my support for Alternate 1, my reasons as follows:

1. California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone. This is the alternative I support.
2. California Recreational Alternative 1 provides for 324 days of fishing in all zones except the Klamath, with 89,553 angler days. This is the alternative I support.
3. California Recreational Alternative 2 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for somewhat less opportunity and economic value than Alternative 1 – from \$14 to \$48 million in direct sales in California alone. While this is much better than Alternative 3, it is not as good as Alternative 1; I therefore support Alternative 1.
4. California Recreational Alternative 2 provides for 272 days of fishing in all zones except the Klamath, with 78,675 angler days. While this is much better than Alternative 3, it is not as good as Alternative 1; I therefore support Alternative 1.
5. California Recreational Alternative 3 provides for no real increases in protection for Klamath fall run Chinook sub-stocks (at most, only 4%), but results in large economic losses in forgone sales in California (from \$10 to \$40 million). We cannot accept Alternative 3.
6. California Recreational Alternative 3 fails to meet Magnuson Stevens standards of maximizing economic benefit while ensuring sustainable fisheries. We cannot accept Alternative 3.
7. Salt-water recreational direct sales create and support nearly 23,000 jobs in California alone.
8. Salmon fishing is a critical factor for the 1.1 million recreational salt-water anglers in California.
9. Salmon fishermen recognize the disastrous impacts the last several years of drought have had on our salmon fisheries, we have been making significant sacrifices for several years.
10. Recreational fishermen are willing to continue to do our part to ensure the health of our salmon fisheries, and we support conservative regulatory measures that balance opportunity with real and measureable protections for our salmon runs

Yes I am a Coastside Fishing Club member and yes I copied the talking points from our website, however I am a very concerned fisherman and I believe we need to implement Alternate 1 to best support the fishing stocks and the fishing community.

Thank you for listening.  
Patrick Donohoe  
[phdonohoe@aol.com](mailto:phdonohoe@aol.com)

#12

From: Yahoo! Mail <tmmarking@sbcglobal.net>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 10:32 AM

Subject: Agenda item E.3. Salmon Management 2017

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Dear Chairman Pollard and Council:

Re: Klamath River impacts

The March meeting concluded with the KMZ being eliminated from all Chinook Salmon opportunity for the 2017 year. That is indeed unfortunate, since the economic loss to our KMZ area will be close to a \$1 M estimated in the economic report in the Preseason Documents with over 17,000 angler trips lost. While closely reading the information in the Preseason Report I, attending the pre-meeting salmon informational meeting at Santa Rosa, and reviewing the Salmon Preseason II report from 2016, a few observations seem relevant.

Last year the KMZ was predicted to harvest 639 age 4 spawners. In fact only 206 were harvested, 32% of the predicted amount. Currently, in 2017, 295 age 4 spawners are predicted to be caught, and it is likely, only about 50% of that prediction would have been caught due to the low return numbers and Klamath River conditions in 2014, 2015 and 2016. Had the fall fishing in September of 2016 been eliminated in the KMZ, the 86 age 4 spawners caught last fall could have provided probably 4-5 weeks of fishing in May-June of 2017. It is obvious that the model is over predicting the abundance levels, and over predicting the recreational harvest in the KMZ.

Our impact to Klamath spawners is very low in May and early June. The KMZ area ports could certainly have had several weeks of fishing very early in the season to provide us some limited opportunity to harvest some of the Sacramento River fish that are prevalent early in the season. Hopefully, in the future the fall fishing will be eliminated when the Geometric Mean is less than the MSST and environmental condition warrant a more aggressive approach to reduce Klamath impacts late in the summer and fall. The 5 days allowed last September effectively eliminated about 5 weeks of fishing this year. That is a very harmful impact on the economics of our region. It is difficult not to be a somewhat bitter knowing that our lost opportunity allows the south of 40d 10' area opportunity to harvest the fish that we are being denied.

Hopefully, the Salmon Managers can be more proactive in the future to spread the fishing opportunity to all areas of the Coast and not single out the KMZ so severely. These conditions will most likely be with us for several more years while the Geometric Mean will be about 16,000 fish since the escapement returns of the last two years and this year will be probably the lowest on record. We are just at the start of this very difficult cycle. Hopefully, the KMZ will not be denied all salmon opportunity for the next several years.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tom Marking, recreational angler

#13

From: Joel Peterson <joel@tehforce.net>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 10:25 AM

Subject: California Recreational Salmon Fishing 2017

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Dear Council,

I have been an avid fishing angler residing in California for over 20 years. I understand the environmental, water resources and manmade issues that are affecting our California Salmon. I ask that you please support Alternative 1 because it supports the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone. Alternative 1 provides for 324 days of fishing in all zones except the Klamath, with 89,553 angler days.

I do not support Alternative 3 because it provides no real increases in protection for Klamath fall run Chinook sub-stocks (at most, only 4%), but results in large economic losses in forgone sales in California (from \$10 to \$40 million). Alternative 3 fails to meet Magnuson Stevens standards of maximizing economic benefit while ensuring sustainable fisheries.

As a salt-water angler, I recognize that salt-water recreational direct sales create and support nearly 23,000 jobs in California alone. Salmon fishing is a critical factor for the 1.1 million recreational salt-water anglers in California. Salmon fishermen recognize the disastrous impacts the last several years of drought have had on our salmon fisheries, we have been making significant sacrifices for several years. Recreational fishermen are willing to continue to do our part to ensure the health of our salmon fisheries, and we support conservative regulatory measures that balance opportunity with real and measureable protections for our salmon runs.

Please take these points into consideration in choosing Alternative 1 which benefits all of California in the long run.

Thank you,

Joel Peterson  
Brentwood, California

#14

From: Nicholas Maurer <NMaurer@ohlone.edu>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 10:07 AM

Subject: California Recreational Salmon Season 2017

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

Dear Council,

I have been an avid fishing angler residing in California for over 30 years. I understand the environmental, water resources and manmade issues that are affecting our California Salmon. I ask that you please support Alternative 1 because it supports the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone. Alternative 1 provides for 324 days of fishing in all zones except the Klamath, with 89,553 angler days.

I do not support Alternative 3 because it provides no real increases in protection for Klamath fall run Chinook sub-stocks (at most, only 4%), but results in large economic losses in forgone sales in California (from \$10 to \$40 million). Alternative 3 fails to meet Magnuson Stevens standards of maximizing economic benefit while ensuring sustainable fisheries.

As a salt-water angler, I recognize that salt-water recreational direct sales create and support nearly 23,000 jobs in California alone. Salmon fishing is a critical factor for the 1.1 million recreational salt-water anglers in California. Salmon fishermen recognize the disastrous impacts the last several years of drought have had on our salmon fisheries, we have been making significant sacrifices for several years. Recreational fishermen are willing to continue to do our part to ensure the health of our salmon fisheries, and we support conservative regulatory measures that balance opportunity with real and measureable protections for our salmon runs.

Please take these points into consideration in choosing Alternative 1 which benefits all of California in the long run.

Thank you,

Nick Maurer

#15

From: **Jm S** <JEANMICHEL@msn.com>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 10:51 AM  
Subject: 2017 Salon season: I support alternative 01  
To: "[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear PFMC council,

I support alternative 01 for this upcoming 2017 san season.

Why?

California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone. This is the alternative we support.

I do not support alternative 02 and 03.

Salmon fishermen recognize the disastrous impacts the last several years of drought have had on our salmon fisheries, we have been making significant sacrifices for several years.

Recreational fishermen are willing to continue to do our part to ensure the health of our salmon fisheries, and we support conservative regulatory measures that balance opportunity with real and measureable protections for out salmon runs

Thank you very ,  
Jean-Michel Sicaud  
1710 Wickham Rd  
San Jose, Ca 95132

---

# 16

From: <[smorozumi25@gmail.com](mailto:smorozumi25@gmail.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 11:12 AM  
Subject: Upcoming salmon season in California  
To: "[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear committee members,

As a long time salmon fisherwoman and member of Coastside Fishing Club, I strongly support alternative 1 of the salmon season possibilities. I feel that it supports sustainability of the salmon stock and gives the best opportunity to maximize the fishing days and financially support the salmon industry.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Sharon Morozumi

#17

From: Eric Gottlieb <esgeo75@gmail.com>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 11:56 AM

Subject: California ocean chinook salmon alternatives 2017

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

To whom it may concern,

I appreciate the opportunity to voice my strong preference for alternative 1 or 2 for the upcoming season.

I typically fish on the ocean for salmon about once to twice a month during the season, normally in the Monterey-north to San Francisco zones. I don't own a boat, but usually go out with a 6 pack charter operation as a paying customer. Obviously there would be some lost revenue to the fishery given alternative 3, including about 80% of my input. From my understanding, there is only a marginal statistical increase in the Klamath population's chances of not collapsing by adopting alternative 3.

I feel the alternative 3 restrictions represent an undue burden to place on the recreational fishing community, given the numerous factors that have negatively influenced this population. At risk is another important factor as well. The community involvement of time and capital in volunteer net pen projects intrinsically relies on those that contribute getting the opportunity to "reap what they sow". Taking away the right to fish is a definitive step towards weakening the relationships between sportsmen stakeholders and the regulatory entities. It is in the interest of all involved (including fishes) to build and maintain what has become a productive relationship between the users and managers of the resource. Sportsmen see the resource as more valuable than its simple economic valuation, which in itself implies a long term commitment to the system. Simply stated, those who fish for salmon care more about salmon than anyone else. Maybe a better solution is to look at what else can be done to mitigate issues in the Klamath population and devise strategies to better involve the fishing community in meeting these challenges.

Between alternative 1 and 2, I would support either drastically over alternative 3, but would like to see some presentation of what the marginal effectiveness of alternative 2 over 1 is expected to be. Given I love to fish, I would like alternative 1 the most if it is deemed suitable.

From a personal perspective, I eat the salmon I catch during the season year round (canned or frozen in offseason). I have harvested 20 fish since 2014. Over 90% of the "meat" my family consumes is what I harvest with my annual sportfishing license. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to recreate in a way that also sustains me and my family. I hope an alternate can be adopted this year that allows that to continue. I am happy to provide further comments or input as needed. Thank you for your time and energy in addressing this important issue.

Respectfully,  
Eric S Gottlieb  
251-656-5738

Menlo Park, CA

#18

From: Dave Hilger <dave.hilger@yahoo.com>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 12:28 PM

Subject: Please consider option #1

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

To PFMC,

My name is David Hilger, and I am writing to you today in regards to the upcoming salmon season. I understand that our normal season is in jeopardy due to a number of alarming statistics that have recently been released about our salmon numbers. I am completely supportive of any measures that would protect this natural resource. I do not though, support decisions being made that are not completely backed by scientific data. The pushing of option number 3 is totally unacceptable. Option 3 is too extreme and is economically devastating to the state of California's sport fishing community. I highly encourage you to address this pressing issue with nature and scientific data in mind, while also protecting the economy. If you choose option 3, you will be making a political knee jerk decision while denying Californians equal access to natural resources that are guaranteed in our state's constitution. Through research of my own, I believe that option 1 is the best option for the upcoming season. Option 1 addresses the salmon numbers while also protecting our economy. Please show us that you care about our natural resources as well as the people who rely on these resources, therefore avoiding being a political pawn. I also encourage your members to address the governments who have allowed this tragedy to take place in the first place. Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Respectfully,

David Hilger

---

#19

From: Randy Byard <rbyard22@gmail.com>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 12:52 PM

Subject: Salmon Season Alternatives

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

I reviewing the 3 alternatives for the California recreational fishing season I adamantly oppose alternative 3 and offer my full support/endorsement of option 1. It is clear to me that alternative 1 achieves all the conservation criteria while also providing the most fishing opportunity as well as economic benefit, either through direct sales or job creation/sustainability. Recreational salmon fisherman certainly recognize the impact the drought has had on this precious fishery and have been making significant sacrifices for years. We are more than willing to continue doing our part to conserve the health of the fishery, but also want to be able to provide the economic benefit that the over 1.1 million of us fisherman provide the state and local businesses. Thank you for taking note of my support for alternative 1.

Regards,

Randy Byard

#20

From: Jeff Richards <jeff@jwrichards.com>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 12:38 PM

Subject: Salmon season alternatives - Support Alt 1, Oppose Alt 3

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

My comments are regarding the 3 salmon season alternatives proposed at the latest PFMC meeting. I am an environmentalist. But I am also a consumptive user of our natural resources, in this case salmon.

Recreational fisherman are the single best stewards of the resource. We are the only people on the water without a profit motive. Commercial fishermen are making a living. NOAA and DFW people are earning a paycheck. We are spending our precious discretionary income on fishing.

Using NMFS numbers (National Marine Fisheries Service. 2016. Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2014. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-163, 237p) from page 43 of FEUS 2014\* each salt water angler day in CA provides for \$604 in direct sales (2.657B\$ from 4.4 million trips) – or more conservatively \$178 if one excludes durable costs.

Taken in combination with the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) you can extrapolate the following as the economic benefits of the three proposed alternatives are:

Alternative 1 - This alternative provides for the most fishing days open and for the greatest effort while meeting the conservation objectives for all stocks – including the constraining Klamath River fall Chinook control rule impact rate of 8.1%. In direct trip related costs this alternative provides for \$16 million in sales, and upwards of \$54 million in total (including durable) direct sales.

It provides for the most fishing days in all areas, and for the greatest economic benefit in all areas.

Alternative 2 - Compared to Alternative 1, this alternative provides for somewhat fewer fishing days open and for the somewhat less effort while meeting the conservation objectives for all stocks – including the constraining Klamath River fall Chinook control rule impact rate of 8.1%. In direct trip related costs this alternative provides for \$14 million in sales, and upwards of \$48 million in total (including durable) direct sales.

Compared to Alternative 1, this alternative provides for the 10,878 fewer fishing trips, resulting in a loss of nearly \$2 million in direct trip related sales (\$6 million in total sales – including durable costs). While providing for significant opportunity and sales, it does not provide any additional protection for the critical Klamath River stocks. And without any improvement in there is no justification to forego the economic benefit provided in Alternative 1.

Alternative 3 - I am opposed to Alternative 3. It provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook). Compared to Alt 2 this is a reduction of 55,808 angler days (71% reduction), and a reduction of 66,678 angler days from Alt 1 (74% reduction).

Thus compared with Alt 1, this Alt (3) results in a net loss of \$12 million in direct trip related expenses, and upwards to \$40 million in total (including durable costs) direct sales. Similarly compared with Alt 2, Alt (3) results in a net loss of \$10 million in direct trip related expenses, and upwards to \$34 million in total (including durable costs) direct sales.

Considering the small marginal gain in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook sub-stocks, and the large losses in recreational angling expenditures,

The Magnuson-Stevens Act has a requirement to maximize benefits to the nation while ensuring sustainable fisheries. Alternative 3 fails to meet the MSA requirements. It is un-necessary and too costly.

Unfortunately I will be unable to attend the PFMC meeting in Sacramento to make public comment. Hence the email If anyone cares to discuss this further my contact details are below.

Regards;

Jeff

-----  
Jeff Richards  
Cell: (650) 575 9255

---

#21

From: **Bill Frangieh** <[bill@aseroins.com](mailto:bill@aseroins.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 12:42 PM  
Subject: support for Alternative 1 or 2 and oppose Alternative 3  
To: "[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Los Gatos, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,

Bill Frangieh | Principal Owner  
200 N. Almaden Blvd. 3rd Floor San Jose, CA 95110  
Desk: [408-289-5906](tel:408-289-5906) | Cell: [650-619-3659](tel:650-619-3659) Fax: [408-271-1802](tel:408-271-1802) Email: [bill@aseroins.com](mailto:bill@aseroins.com)

#22

From: Sean Lamb <[sean.lamb@att.net](mailto:sean.lamb@att.net)>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 12:53 PM

Subject: Comments in Support of Alternative 1 for Recreational Salmon Season

To: "pfmc.comments@noaa.gov" <[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council,

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Redwood City, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,

Sean Lamb

---

#23

From: **Carl Moyer** <[carlmarc@astound.net](mailto:carlmarc@astound.net)>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 1:15 PM

Subject: salmon

To: [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

I support California Recreational Alternatives #1 or #2.

Carl Moyer

---

#24

From: **Anthony Camilleri** <[acamilleri@comcast.net](mailto:acamilleri@comcast.net)>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 1:16 PM

Subject: Upcoming Salmon Season.

To: "[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)>

As a boat owner for more than thirty years ,fishing out of Halfmoon bay, San Francisco, and Bodega bay for Salmon and other species, I urge you to please consider alternatives 1 and 2 for The upcoming Salmon Season....Thankyou.....Anthony J. Camilleri Jr.(Recreational fishing)

#25

From: MICHAELSITTS <michaelsitts@comcast.net>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 1:23 PM

Subject: California Recreational Salmon Season

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council,

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Danville, C. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value - from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic stocks (87% risk with fishing / 83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your continued commitment to our fisheries,

Sincerely,

Michael Sitts  
1203 Cheshire Circle  
Danville, CA 94506

In my view the Council should know that Alternative 3 is not acceptable. Additional considerations below:

1. California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone. This is the alternative we support.
2. California Recreational Alternative 1 provides for 324 days of fishing in all zones except the Klamath, with 89,553 angler days. This is the alternative we should support.
3. California Recreational Alternative 3 provides for no real increases in protection for Klamath fall run Chinook sub-stocks (at most, only 4%), but results in large economic losses in forgone sales in California (from \$10 to \$40 million). We cannot accept Alternative 3.
4. California Recreational Alternative 3 fails to meet Magnuson Stevens standards of maximizing economic benefit while ensuring sustainable fisheries. We cannot accept Alternative
5. Salt-water recreational direct sales create and support nearly 23,000 jobs in California alone.
6. Salmon fishing is a critical factor for the 1.1 million recreational salt-water anglers like me in California.
7. Salmon fishermen recognize the disastrous impacts the last several years of drought have had on our salmon fisheries, we have been making significant sacrifices for several years.
8. Recreational fishermen are willing to continue to do our part to ensure the health of our salmon fisheries, and we support conservative regulatory measures that balance opportunity with real and measureable protections for our salmon runs.

#26

From: **Ethan Derby** <[ethanderby@gmail.com](mailto:ethanderby@gmail.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 11:44 AM  
Subject: 2017 Salmon Season Alternatives.  
To: [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

I am writing to share my view on the three alternatives presented for California Chinook Salmon Season.

**I would very much prefer Alternative 1.** I live in the North Monterey region and this is the only area I fish. Salmon is a key fishery for me as it is 90% of my focus.

While Alternative 2 is not as good as Alternative 1 it is much better than Alternative 3.

**Alternative 3 should not even be considered as all!!!!**

Alternative 3 provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook). Compared to Alternative 2 this is a reduction of 55,808 angler days (71% reduction), and a reduction of 66,678 angler days from Alt 1 (74% reduction).

Thus compared with Alternative 1, this Alternative 3 results in a net loss of \$12 million in direct trip related expenses, and upwards to \$40 million in total (including durable costs) direct sales. Similarly compared with Alternative 2, Alternative 3 results in a net loss of \$10 million in direct trip related expenses, and upwards to \$34 million in total (including durable costs) direct sales.

Considering the small marginal gain in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook sub-stocks, and the large losses in recreational angling expenditures, Alternative 3 fails to meet the MSA requirements of maximizing benefit to the nation while ensuring sustainable fisheries. It is un-necessary and too costly.

**Again, Alternative 3 should not even be considered as all!!!!**

Thank you for taking the time to consider my opinion.

---

#27

From: Gabri, William <[William.Gabri@fmr.com](mailto:William.Gabri@fmr.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 2:05 PM  
Subject: Salmon Season Alternatives  
To: "[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)>  
Cc: "Byard, Randy" <[Randy.Byard@fmr.com](mailto:Randy.Byard@fmr.com)>

To Whom it May Concern:

After reviewing various Recreational Salmon proposals before the committee, I would like to wholeheartedly endorse Alternative 1. I feel it allows the positive economic benefit of this fishery to be realized by the many that depend on it statewide. Moreover, Alternative 3 is viewed as backward-looking, draconian and burdensome. It should be roundly rejected by the governing body.

Thank you for your consideration to this urgent matter,

William B. Gabri

#28

From: **Geza Paulovits** <[gpaulovits@gmail.com](mailto:gpaulovits@gmail.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 1:54 PM  
Subject: recreational salmon, 2017  
To: [pfmt.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmt.comments@noaa.gov)

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational fisherman raising my family in Half Moon Bay, CA. I frequently take my 7 and 9 year old sons fishing in the ocean and I am passionate about maintaining sustainable fisheries for future generations.

I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone. Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This radical alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

The only way to instill proper stewardship of our resources to the next generation is to have them actively participate in enjoying those resources. I urge you to do your part in approving Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season.

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.  
Sincerely,

Geza Paulovits  
Father, Fisherman, Environmentalist

---

#29

From: **C Paterson** <[cpkayak@sbcglobal.net](mailto:cpkayak@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 1:46 PM  
Subject: 2017 RECREATIONAL SALMON SEASON  
To: "[pfmt.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmt.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmt.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmt.comments@noaa.gov)>

I am greatly concerned about the prospect of a very brief salmon season. Salmon fishing is my favorite recreational activity of the year. California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone. This is the alternative I support. Furthermore, as a recreational salmon fisherman I have made large sacrifices in the previous salmon seasons, closures, shortened seasons to be exact.  
Sincerely Chris Paterson

---

#30

From: **Woods, Dan (DWoods)** <[DWoods@chevron.com](mailto:DWoods@chevron.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 1:44 PM  
Subject: 2017 Salmon Season - Support for Alternative #1!  
To: "[pfmt.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmt.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmt.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmt.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council,

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Walnut Creek, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of

the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value - from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic stocks (87% risk with fishing / 83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your continued commitment to our fisheries!

Sincerely,

*Dan Woods*  
**2300 Benham Ct.**  
**Walnut Creek, CA 94596**

---

#31

From: **Michael Lodge** <[mikeandthu@gmail.com](mailto:mikeandthu@gmail.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 1:40 PM  
Subject: California Recreational Fishing  
To: [pmmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pmmc.comments@noaa.gov)

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council,

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from San Ramon, CA. I am writing to advise you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three proposed alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value - from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic stocks (87% risk with fishing / 83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your continued commitment to our fisheries,

Sincerely,

Mike Lodge

---

#32

From: **Don Clark** <[dclark@vanbeurden.com](mailto:dclark@vanbeurden.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 1:34 PM  
Subject: SALmon Season  
To: "[pmmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pmmc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pmmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pmmc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Kingsburg, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the

conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,

*Don Clark*

VanBeurden Insurance Services, Inc.

[559-634-7137](tel:559-634-7137)

[559-906-5339](tel:559-906-5339) cell

[dclark@vanbeurden.com](mailto:dclark@vanbeurden.com)

---

#33

From: **Ronald Whang** <[ronwhang@gmail.com](mailto:ronwhang@gmail.com)>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 1:25 PM

Subject: 2017 salmon season

To: [pfmt.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmt.comments@noaa.gov)

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Napa, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,

Ronald Whang

1560 7th Ave

San Francisco, California 94122

---

#34

From: **Sitts, Michael (MikeSitts)** <[MikeSitts@chevron.com](mailto:MikeSitts@chevron.com)>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 1:25 PM

Subject: California Salmon Season

To: "[pfmt.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmt.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmt.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmt.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council,

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Danville, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value - from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic stocks (87% risk with fishing / 83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your continued commitment to our fisheries,

Sincerely, *regards*

*Mike Sitts*

Capt. Michael B. Sitts  
Chevron Shipping Company LLC  
Office: + 1925-842-8088  
email: [mikesitts@chevron.com](mailto:mikesitts@chevron.com)

---

#35

From: **Starr, Michael** <[MPSc@pge.com](mailto:MPSc@pge.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 3:07 PM  
Subject: Alt 1 Yes  
To: "[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Napa, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely, Michael Starr [510 427 4602](tel:5104274602)

---

#36

From: **Pierre** <[pierre.g@gmail.com](mailto:pierre.g@gmail.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 2:57 PM  
Subject: I Support California Recreational Alternative 1  
To: [pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from San Francisco, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon

season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,  
Pierre Granier

---

#37

From: **Jim Gay** <[jamesrgay@comcast.net](mailto:jamesrgay@comcast.net)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 2:53 PM  
Subject: salmon seasons alternative  
To: [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

Please use alternative one..thank you .jim Gay

---

#38

From: **Ron Mason** <[ronlmason@comcast.net](mailto:ronlmason@comcast.net)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 2:04 PM  
Subject: Salmon season  
To: [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

To: PFMC Chair Herb Pollard  
Executive Director: Chuck Tracy  
Salmon Staff Officer Robin Ehlke  
Council members

For the recreational salmon seasons from Cape Falcon to Humbug Mt, Alternative I is clearly the best alternative and hence is my choice of the 3 alternatives. Besides the higher coho quota, the two parts of Alt I that make it clearly the best choice are the chinook season being open through Oct 31 and the non-selective coho season in Sept. For many of us sport fishermen, chinook are an interesting challenge and we appreciate the opportunity to fish for them throughout the season. The non-mark selective coho season has become very popular among sport fishermen, one obvious reason is the opportunity to catch coho of a significantly larger size than in the summer mark-selective season. Plus the facet of Alternative I that allows transferring any remaining quota from the mark-selective coho season to the Sept non-selective season on an impact neutral basis allows us an opportunity in Sept to catch fish that are sometimes difficult to find in the summer season, especially when ocean temps are above normal.

If for some reason Alt I cannot be the approved choice for the recreational salmon season from Cape Falcon to Humbug Mt, I urge you to incorporate as much chinook season (i.e., opportunity) as possible and to include at least some coho quota for a non-selective coho

season in Sept with the provision for transferring - on an impact neutral basis - any remaining quota from the summer mark-selective coho season to the Sept season.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the points in my correspondence.

Ron Mason  
Sport fisherman and boat owner  
Corvallis and Newport, Oregon

---

# 39

From: **Brad Loofbourrow** <[bradloofbourrow@gmail.com](mailto:bradloofbourrow@gmail.com)>

Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 3:17 PM

Subject: Salmon season

To: [pmmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pmmc.comments@noaa.gov)

My comments are regarding the 3 salmon season alternatives proposed at the latest PFMC meeting. I am an environmentalist. But I am also a consumptive user of our natural resources, in this case salmon.

Recreational fisherman are the single best stewards of the resource. We are the only people on the water without a profit motive. Commercial fishermen are making a living. NOAA and DFW people are earning a paycheck. We are spending our precious discretionary income on fishing.

Using NMFS numbers (National Marine Fisheries Service. 2016. Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2014. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-163, 237p) from page 43 of FEUS 2014\* each salt water angler day in CA provides for \$604 in direct sales (2.657B\$ from 4.4 million trips) – or more conservatively \$178 if one excludes durable costs.

Taken in combination with the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) you can extrapolate the following as the economic benefits of the three proposed alternatives are:

Alternative 1 - This alternative provides for the most fishing days open and for the greatest effort while meeting the conservation objectives for all stocks – including the constraining Klamath River fall Chinook control rule impact rate of 8.1%. In direct trip related costs this alternative provides for \$16 million in sales, and upwards of \$54 million in total (including durable) direct sales.

It provides for the most fishing days in all areas, and for the greatest economic benefit in all areas.

Alternative 2 - Compared to Alternative 1, this alternative provides for somewhat fewer fishing days open and for the somewhat less effort while meeting the conservation objectives for all stocks – including the constraining Klamath River fall Chinook control rule impact rate of 8.1%. In direct trip related costs this alternative provides for \$14 million in sales, and upwards of \$48 million in total (including durable) direct sales.

Compared to Alternative 1, this alternative provides for the 10,878 fewer fishing trips, resulting in a loss of nearly \$2 million in direct trip related sales (\$6 million in total sales – including durable costs). While providing for significant opportunity and sales, it does not provide any additional protection for the critical Klamath River stocks. And without any improvement in there is no justification to forego the economic benefit provided in Alternative 1.

Alternative 3 - I am opposed to Alternative 3. It provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but

dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook). Compared to Alt 2 this is a reduction of 55,808 angler days (71% reduction), and a reduction of 66,678 angler days from Alt 1 (74% reduction).

Thus compared with Alt 1, this Alt (3) results in a net loss of \$12 million in direct trip related expenses, and upwards to \$40 million in total (including durable costs) direct sales. Similarly compared with Alt 2, Alt (3) results in a net loss of \$10 million in direct trip related expenses, and upwards to \$34 million in total (including durable costs) direct sales.

Considering the small marginal gain in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook sub-stocks, and the large losses in recreational angling expenditures,

The Magnuson-Stevens Act has a requirement to maximize benefits to the nation while ensuring sustainable fisheries. Alternative 3 fails to meet the MSA requirements. It is un-necessary and too costly.

Regards; Brad Loofbourrow

---

#40

From: **staciekraft** <[staciekraft22@gmail.com](mailto:staciekraft22@gmail.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 3:31 PM  
Subject: salmon season 2017 for San Fran area  
To: [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)  
Cc: [talbano@addlins.com](mailto:talbano@addlins.com)

Voicing my support for Alternative 1 or 2 and oppose Alternative 3.  
We are in sacto area and fish for salmon a few times a year out of Bodega bay and only having one month would really be a bummer and make us cancel are reservations for vaca over there.thanks  
Kevin Kraft  
[916-505-6021](tel:916-505-6021)

---

#41

From: **Edwards, Gary** <[Gary.Edwards@haynesboone.com](mailto:Gary.Edwards@haynesboone.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 3:32 PM  
Subject: Salmon Season  
To: "[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)>

My comments are regarding the 3 salmon season alternatives proposed at the latest PFMC meeting. I am an environmentalist. But I am also a consumptive user of our natural resources, in this case salmon.

Recreational fisherman are the single best stewards of the resource. We are the only people on the water without a profit motive. Commercial fishermen are making a living. NOAA and DFW people are earning a paycheck. We are spending our precious discretionary income on fishing.

I heavily support alternatives 1 or 2 and oppose alternative 3. It is my understanding that, using NMFS numbers (National Marine Fisheries Service. 2016. Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2014. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-163, 237p), the economic impacts to the recreational fishing industry by implementing alternative 3 is not worth the marginal increase in protection for the Klamath fall run.

Unfortunately I will be unable to attend the PFMC meeting in Sacramento to make public comment. Hence the email If anyone cares to discuss this further my contact details are below.

Regards,

Gary J. Edwards

---

#42

From: **Ted Carman** <[tedcarman@gmail.com](mailto:tedcarman@gmail.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 3:27 PM  
Subject: 2017 California Salmon Season Alternatives  
To: [pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Walnut Creek, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,

**Ted Carman**  
**925.577.8128**  
**tedcarman@gmail.com**

---

#43

From: **Paolo Zizzo** <[pzdoc@sbcglobal.net](mailto:pzdoc@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 2:29 PM  
Subject: Salmon fishing  
To: "[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Napa, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Paolo Zizzo D.O.

#44

From: **Dean Donaldson** <[highlandlassie@sbcglobal.net](mailto:highlandlassie@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 3:25 PM  
Subject: salmon season  
To: "[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Please see attached, signed document

thank you

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from San Jose, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,



Dean Donaldson

---

#45

From: **Roger Arnal** <[arnal42@gmail.com](mailto:arnal42@gmail.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 4:12 PM  
Subject: Salmon fishing  
To: [pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Daly City, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Alternative 3 is unacceptable to me as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic sub-stocks and dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish, the Sacramento fall run Chinook.

Sincerely,  
Roger Arnal

#46

From: **Paul Venker** <[paul@greengoinc.com](mailto:paul@greengoinc.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 2:17 PM  
Subject: 2017 Salmon Season  
To: [pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

My wife and I are recreational ocean salmon fisher people from Concord Ca. I am writing to inform you that we strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative (1) for the 2017 salmon season. After we carefully reviewed all three alternatives, it was clear that California Recreational Alternative (1) achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most fishing opportunity and greatest economic value - from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone. We were also surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative (3). This alternative is completely UNACCEPTABLE as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing / 83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook Salmon).

Thank you for considering our thought and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,

Paul & Brenda Venker

---

#47

From: **Boothe, Gary** <[GBoothe@lwsupply.com](mailto:GBoothe@lwsupply.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 2:47 PM  
Subject: 2017 Salmon Season  
To: "[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Napa, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,

Gary Boothe

Plumas Lake, CA

---

#48

From: **doug laughlin** <[douglaughlin3@gmail.com](mailto:douglaughlin3@gmail.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 3:28 PM  
Subject: 2017 Salmon Season  
To: [pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Moss Beach, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of

the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,  
Doug Laughlin  
Moss Beach, Ca.

#49

From: **Curt Cotner** <[clcotner@yahoo.com](mailto:clcotner@yahoo.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 4:13 PM  
Subject: 2017 Salmon Season  
To: "[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)>

Dear Pacific Fisheries Management Council:

I am a recreational ocean salmon fisherman from Gilroy, CA. I am writing to inform you that I strongly support the approval of California Recreational Alternative 1 for the 2017 salmon season. After carefully reviewing all three alternatives, it is clear that California Recreational Alternative 1 achieves all of the conservation criteria while providing for the most opportunity and greatest economic value – from \$16 to \$54 million in direct sales in California alone.

Also, I was surprised to see the details of California Recreational Alternative 3. This alternative is completely unacceptable as it provides at most a minimal 5% increase in protection to Klamath fall run Chinook genetic substocks (87% risk with fishing/83% risk with NO fishing), but dramatically reduces our ability to pursue our target fish (Sacramento fall run Chinook).

Thank you for considering my thoughts and for your commitment to our fisheries.

Sincerely,  
Curt Cotner

---

#50

From: **Kunio Narasaki** <[kunios@sbcglobal.net](mailto:kunios@sbcglobal.net)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 4:39 PM  
Subject: 2017 Salmon season, San Francisco area  
To: [pfmc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmc.comments@noaa.gov)

Sir,

As weekend fisherman, my son and I ask that you use the #1 or #2 options. I appreciate the fact that you are offering the 3 options, but the #3 option appears to be quite harsh.

I would ask that you select the #1 or #2 options so that I can help other associated businesses such as gas stations, bait shops, boat launches', etc.

Thank you for your consideration. Kunio Narasaki.

---

#51

From: **tkirchner** <[tkirchner50@yahoo.com](mailto:tkirchner50@yahoo.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 4:48 PM  
Subject: Salmon season comment  
To: [pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)

Dear Council,

My husband and I are residents of Gold Beach, Oregon. We are both recreational fisherman, primarily in rivers, when possible on the ocean. We've also fished the Salmon Derby in Brookings, OR. I'm not sure if my comments are relevant to your decision making, but I would like to say we both support your final decision 100% as we want to protect the salmon fishery for everyone and generations to come.

I'd like to comment on the river fishing regulations, which we feel should be addressed and regulated as well due to the numbers returning. I can say first hand that last year was our worst ever. We've heard the same from many fisherman, including guides. We didn't put one salmon, spring or fall in the freezer, canner or to eat fresh. The few caught were released as they were wild and we couldn't keep. We've been fishing steadily this spring and haven't seen one springer salmon caught in the Rogue River. Rumor has it a couple have been caught on guide boats, that I can't verify.

My concern I'd like to address is this: If you close the ocean or have a limited season, that will only increase the numbers of fisherman on our rivers here. So please consider limiting the number of guides, the number of fish they're allowed per season and the number of permits issued per river. Ideally we'd have one or two days per week we don't have to compete with guides for a spot on the river. Possibly even consider a limit for out of state licenses until the salmon recover.

So unless your closing the rivers to salmon fishing as well, which if necessary we'd understand completely, how about giving the salmon that do come in a better chance of surviving to spawn. As someone that loves to fish for, but more importantly loves to eat salmon, catches when fortunate a few to put up every year, and want our grandchildren and future generations to catch/eat wild salmon, please consider my recommendations and concerns in your final draft. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Thomas and Theresa Kirchner  
Gold Beach, Oregon

---

#52

From: **Chris Girard** <[cjg2606@hotmail.com](mailto:cjg2606@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2017 at 4:48 PM  
Subject: Support in favor of Alt 1 for North of Cape Falcon Salmon Season  
To: "[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)" <[pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)>

I would like to voice my support for Alternate 1 for the N. of Cape Falcon Salmon season. Please consider the following points:

1. That the Sept non-selective salmon fishery is important for opportunities in the late summer.
2. Being able to fish for chinook throughout summer and into October provides for a wide range of opportunities to fish when ocean conditions are favorable.

Best,

Chris Girard  
Eugene, Or  
[541-510-2975](tel:541-510-2975)

PFMC  
03/16/17