

Forwarded message -----

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

Date: Sat, Feb 17, 2018 at 3:04 PM

Subject: 2018 Ocean Salmon Regulation Comments

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

Cc: [Mike.Burner@noaa.gov](mailto:Mike.Burner@noaa.gov), Marc Gorelnik <[gorelnik@gmail.com](mailto:gorelnik@gmail.com)>, Jim Yarnall <[jimyarnall@gmail.com](mailto:jimyarnall@gmail.com)>

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 only in Avila/Morro aka Monterey "south" (the same size limit and hence impact "rate" as commercial). 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)

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

Date: Sat, Feb 17, 2018 at 3:35 PM

Subject: RE: 2017 CDFW Salmon Comments 2-28-17 Deadline

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

Cc: [Mike.Burner@noaa.gov](mailto:Mike.Burner@noaa.gov), Marc Gorelnik <[gorelnik@gmail.com](mailto:gorelnik@gmail.com)>, Jim Yarnall <[jimyarnall@gmail.com](mailto:jimyarnall@gmail.com)>

Regarding the 1:9 WR impact rate for recreational fishery in June in Morro Bay/Avila versus the 1:200 impact rate for commercial for the same area/month as reported in "CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WINTER-RUN CONSERVATION MEASURES IN 2017 OCEAN FISHERIES ("Recommendations..."), I have noted several serious problems in the analysis that call into question the validity of these numbers.

1- As noted in previous comments, the impact "rates" neglect to include mortality of released shorts which intentionally introduces significant (one order of magnitude, i.e. a factor of 10) errors specifically regarding commercial impact rates. When mortality rate of released short fish is included in the calculation the commercial impact rate is actually very similar to the recreational impact rate. Mortality of released shorts has a much greater impact on the comm rate than sport, and not including that factor artificially biases impact rate calculations heavily in favor of comm. Additionally, there is no scientific reason to neglect this factor since the data necessary to include it seems to be readily available and the calculation is relatively simple.

2- For the purpose of calculation of the MB/Avila ocean harvest impact rate, the document "Recovery of Coded-Wire Tags from Chinook Salmon in California's Central Valley Escapement, Inland Harvest, and Ocean Harvest in 2012" ("Recovery of Coded...") and the document "Recommendations..." report that the whole area of "Monterey" includes both "North" and "South" and the analysis does not distinguish the fishery specific to the Morro Bay/Avila "sub-port" so it is not clear how they can come up with different results for Morro/Avila versus Monterey "North". In other words, the whole Monterey "management area" data is presented as one lumped model but no justification (only incomplete data) is given for the difference reported between Monterey "North" and "South" in the above referenced "Recommendations..." and "Recovery of Coded..." documents and incomplete sub-port specific actual data is given or referenced for MB/Avila. The different results for North and South do not seem to have any mathematical/data basis that can be replicated using the information provided. It appears that the only way sub-port specific impact rates are analyzed for the recreational fishery is using incomplete, extrapolated "landings" data and the data set is so small as to be statistically insignificant and fraught with errors.

3- Per report "Sacramento River Winter Chinook Cohort Reconstruction Analysis of Ocean Fishery Impacts" dated August 2012, table A2 lists the WR size distribution versus month but this data appears to be lumped together for the whole fishery irrespective of the major port area or sub-port area. This may or may not be a valid assumption but no justification is given. Additionally, no corresponding age-vs.-size is given for all other stocks which would seem to make it impossible to distinguish differences in impact "rate" for recreational versus commercial since the main (read: only) reason given for the difference in rates is the size limit difference (24" for rec and 27" for comm).

4- Using the reported CWT recovery rates for WR for the Morro/Avila it would seem that the amount of data is so small that it would not be statistically meaningful or accurate to draw any real conclusions about Morro/Avila sub-port specific impact rates without much more data/analysis. For example, in 2014, 590,623 WR were CWT marked and tagged and 1 total (emphasis definitely added!!!) WR sample collected south of Point Sur ("Recommendations..." page 8) which hardly seems statistically significant to draw any meaningful conclusions but is, rather, anecdotal at best.

This seriously calls into question the validity of the 1:9 and 1:200 numbers or really any sub-port specific conclusions reported for the Morro Bay/Avila fisheries with regard to WR impacts.

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

From: **Mike Glick** <[wisehart@impulse.net](mailto:wisehart@impulse.net)>  
 Date: Sat, Feb 17, 2018 at 3:57 PM  
 Subject: Comments on CDFW Recommendations for the 2018 Salmon Season  
 To: [pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov](mailto:pfmtc.comments@noaa.gov)  
 Cc: [Mike.Burner@noaa.gov](mailto:Mike.Burner@noaa.gov), Marc Gorelnik <[gorelnik@gmail.com](mailto:gorelnik@gmail.com)>, Jim Yarnall <[jimyarnall@gmail.com](mailto:jimyarnall@gmail.com)>

I believe that one major flaw in the analysis that forms the basis for the contention in the 2017 CDFW report recommending closure of recreational fishing on June 1 for “Monterey South” while leaving commercial fishing open in June is that the analysis neglects the impact rate (and actual impact i.e. WR fish killed) of **mortality of released short fish** (fish below the respective size limit). That is to say that the impact rate for commercial in June is artificially (and erroneously) low (1:200) while the impact rate for recreational in June is artificially, erroneously, (and by design) high (1:9). It is “by design” because CDFW has set the rec size limit at 24” during June while the comm size limit is 27” and then they refer to that as the justification for closing rec fishing in June. If that were actually true then a more reasonable and fair approach is to just change the rec size limit to 27” and then that whole issue goes away. And it is not “equitable” to give rec the two months of April/May when the weather is too rough to fish in small boats while they give comm May/June when the weather is good (and based on the 2016 and 2017 seasons the fishing didn’t get good in Avila/Morro until June when the fish showed up).

Based on the information that I have been able to receive from the people involved with the analysis and decision making process, if the mortality of released shorts is included, the impact rate for commercial in June is actually 1:21.3 (with 32.9 fish actually killed) while the recreational impact rate in June (for a 24” size limit) is 1:15.2 (6.6 actual fish killed).

To actually make an ‘apples to apples’ comparison, if the rec size limit were increased to 27” (same as comm) the recreational impact rate drops to 1:27.8 (3.6 actual fish killed).

I recognize that these numbers may be slightly inaccurate due to the inaccuracies and limitations of the data that I have been given but with ‘better’ data the results may change in magnitude but the relative comparison between commercial and recreational will not significantly change. Therefore, if commercial is left open in June there is no logical reason to close recreational fishing in Monterey South since the comm impact rate, in reality, is actually higher than rec in June if you compare apples to apples (i.e. change rec size limit in June for Avila/Morro ONLY to 27”).

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

FISHERY TYPE	IMPACT RATE NEGLECTING MORTALITY PER CDFW REPORT	WR IMPACT NEGLECTING MORTALITY OF RELEASED SHORTS (# OF WR KILLED)	IMPACT RATE INCLUDING MORTALITY (PER NOAA DATA) *	ACTUAL WR IMPACT INCLUDING MORTALITY OF RELEASED SHORTS (# OF WR KILLED)
COMMERCIAL 27" SIZE LIMIT	<b>1 : 200</b>	3.5	<b>1 : 21.3 **</b>	32.9
RECREATIONAL 24" SIZE LIMIT	<b>1 : 9</b>	11.1	<b>1 : 15.2 ***</b>	6.6
RECREATIONAL 27" SIZE LIMIT	<b>1 : 200</b>	0.5	<b>1 : 27.8 ****</b>	3.6