

SALMON ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON
MARINE PLANNING

The Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS) has reviewed the reports under this agenda item and would like to thank the Ad Hoc Marine Planning Committee (MPC) and the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) for its work thus far engaging with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) on emerging offshore wind development issues. The SAS offers the following comments and additional emphasis for future engagement on this topic.

The SAS appreciates the previously stated concerns for better integration of the Council and BOEM processes. We remain concerned that the current lease process effectively means that impacts may only be mitigated after a lease issuance rather than prevented through development specifications, and measures are forced to be reactive rather than proactive.

Of most concern, the SAS notes a lack of information about recreational fishing effort, spatial extent, and commonly used areas. As recreational vessels and the sport fleet are not required to be equipped with vessel monitoring system (VMS), historic navigation patterns are not available. Essentially, no readily available data exists to accurately depict recreational fishing areas or transit areas: recreational fishers are not required to keep logbooks; dockside catch records monitor catch by angler trip and landing port, but not by area fished. Of particular concern is the lack of data for the recreational albacore tuna fishery, and the SAS is concerned that the Oregon call areas blanket the most commonly used albacore fishing and transit areas.

The SAS appreciates that there have been outreach efforts including listening sessions and interviews with recreational fishermen in affected areas, but is concerned that the information shared in these sessions continues to fall on deaf ears. Formalizing the inclusion these data types and its inclusion earlier in the area identification process would help to create a more representative picture of the true extent of fishing distribution and effort.

The SAS is also concerned about potential habitat impacts and the inability to examine, and therefore avoid, impacts due to two factors: lack of inclusion of designated priority habitats until late in the process; and lack of design requirements tailored to specific habitat types. The SAS would like to reiterate our position that consideration of fisheries data, and habitat in particular, as a requirement for site selection and design specification would alleviate a number of concerns.

PFMC
03/10/22