

VI. MANAGEMENT CONCERNS

Quotas

Some confusion arose during the 1985 season as to whether or not the Council's adoption of quotas for individual fisheries also established overall season quotas. The SPDT emphasizes that its assessments are made on the basis of total impacts of all regulations adopted by the Council. Quotas for individual fisheries are regarded as part of total season impacts and unless each fishery is managed within quota limits, the SPDT's regulatory impact analyses are invalid. Where overall season quotas are established, there is a need for guidelines for adjustments necessary to compensate for deviations. The Council's intent as to the treatment of quotas as independent or part of season limits must be clarified to avoid misunderstanding. The Council should recognize that there is likely to be a strong tendency to exceed individual quotas under an independent quota system, resulting in greater than anticipated ocean fishery impacts and unrealized expectations for inside fisheries and escapements.

Subdividing an overall quota into small subquotas may create problems with the manageability of fisheries. Several fisheries in 1985 were constrained by quotas that were so small that the likelihood of overharvest was greatly increased. The potential for exceeding quotas is especially acute for management of troll fisheries because of the capacity of the fleet to harvest large quantities of fish within very short time periods. In many instances, the amount of effort that may be exerted in a given fishing period is difficult to predict and control. The July all-species fishery off the Washington coast serves as an example of the large numbers of coho that can be taken during a short period of time. Effort and fish availability were so high during this fishery that existing catch monitoring systems were incapable of effectively constraining catches within the established quota.

Quotas were applied inappropriately as a management measure in 1985. The August 21 troll fishery in the Columbia River area illustrates the unrealistic use of a quota as a means to limit harvest. There is no practical way a quota can be used to control catch in a one-day fishery. Prior to opening the fishery, it was determined that the catch would likely exceed 10,000 coho, the established quota. When fishery impacts are expected to exceed the allowable stock impacts, the fishery should not be opened under quota management. The establishment of a quota for this fishery was misleading to the public and impractical to implement.

Inseason monitoring, or measurement of non-catch fishery impacts, is difficult or impossible and creates a situation in which management intent is vague and fishery control is impaired. For example, the pink directed troll fishery and associated coho and chinook quotas were a mixture of harvest and hooking mortality impacts, but actual control of the fishery rested with monitoring of the relatively incidental chinook catch. The chinook harvest exceeded the harvest component of the quota while the total impact of the fishery probably did not exceed preseason expectations.

The SPDT urges the Council to carefully consider the use or applicability of quotas to insure their proper application as management measures to constrain fishery impacts.

Columbia River Estuary (Buoy 10) Sport Fishery

The large sport catches (74,400 coho and 12,200 chinook in 1984 and 25,400 coho and 2,700 chinook in 1985) in the Buoy 10 to Astoria-Megler Bridge area demonstrate the need to coordinate between ocean and inriver fisheries so that all fishery impacts are considered. In 1984, the Buoy 10 sport fishery was adopted on the premise of a "clean fishery" with catches targeting on surplus Columbia River hatchery stocks. However, the catch composition of the 1984 fishery indicated that significant and unanticipated harvest impacts were occurring on the stocks that constrained the allowable ocean harvest. The 1985 season was authorized inseason and catches for the first open period (August 18 through August 22) were applied to ocean chinook and coho quotas for the Columbia River management area. After closure of the ocean recreational fisheries in this area at midnight on August 22, subsequent Buoy 10 seasons were allowed from August 31 through September 2 (coho only) and September 6 through September 29 (all species). These latter seasons did not count towards the ocean quota. The August 31 through September 2 season was constrained by a separate 10,000 coho quota whereas no quota restrictions applied to the later September fishery.

The 1985 preliminary tag data analysis by the joint Oregon and Washington staffs to evaluate the catch composition of the Buoy 10 fishery in terms of local versus non-local and surplus versus depressed stocks became available in early February. The 1985 tag data indicate that Columbia River coho comprised 85 percent of the total coho catch similar to 1984 (84 percent), Table VI-1. Oregon coastal wild coho comprised 8 percent of the 1985 coho catch, a slightly higher percentage than the 6 percent estimated in 1984. Washington coastal and Puget Sound coho stocks comprised 3 percent of the 1985 Buoy 10 fishery. It is interesting to note that the tag data indicated that the highest percentage of the Washington coastal and Puget Sound stock impacts occurred in the September 6 through September 29 period Table VI-1. Tag data from both 1984 and 1985 indicate that coho stocks of concern (i.e., OCN, Washington coastal) do contribute to the Buoy 10 fishery to varying degrees and their impacts need to be considered.

The BPH chinook stock was one of the principal stocks of concern in managing the 1985 Buoy 10 fishery. The 1985 tag data indicate a 7 percent contribution (176 fish) of BPH chinook compared to a 19 percent contribution (2,322 fish) in 1984 Table VI-2. The changed abundance of the various chinook stocks in 1985 compared to 1984 was probably the major reason for the reduced contribution of this stock in the Buoy 10 fishery in terms of numbers and percentage. However, the later opening of the fishery, August 18 in 1985 versus August 9 in 1984, may have been a contributing factor.

Both the 1984 and 1985 fisheries were authorized inseason rather than being planned for in the preseason regulation setting process. The SPDT continues to be concerned about unanticipated fisheries which are authorized inseason and which normally do not allow adequate time for review or have sufficient data to fully evaluate the harvest impacts. The SPDT feels the Council needs to include these types of fisheries in the preseason planning process so that all impacts are considered. The SPDT supports fisheries such as Buoy 10 which select for surplus local stocks where mixed stock management concerns

Table VI-1. Estimated Buoy 10 coho stock catch composition for 1985 and 1984 season total.^{a/}

Stock	1985 Catch ^{b/}				1984 Catch	
	Aug. 18-22	Aug. 31-Sept. 2	Sept. 6-29	Season Total		
				Number	Percent	
Columbia River						
Early	5,458	5,626	683	11,767	46	30,151
Middle	734	955	491	2,180	9	8,612
Late	<u>2,283</u>	<u>2,501</u>	<u>2,864</u>	<u>7,648</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>23,506</u>
Total	8,475	9,082	4,038	21,595	85	62,269
Washington Coastal						
Grays Harbor to Willapa Bay						
Hatchery	172	57	68	297	1	3,171
Wild	19	46	101	166	1	422
Olympic Peninsula	25	3	3	31	<1	1,294
Puget Sound	27	3	119	149	1	1,031
Oregon Coastal						
State Hatchery	138	82	32	252	1	1,274
Private Hatchery	527	222	88	837	3	597
Wild	1,125	668	264	2,057	8	4,301
California	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u><1</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	10,511	10,163	4,713	25,387		74,370

^{a/} Prepared by the inriver management staffs of Washington and Oregon.

^{b/} Preliminary.

Table VI-2. Estimated season total Buoy 10 chinook stock catch composition for 1985 and 1984.^{a/}

Stock	1985 ^{b/} Catch		1984 Catch	
	Numbers	Percent	Numbers	Percent
Columbia River				
Lower River Hatchery	1,571	59	6,673	55
Lower River Wild	0	-	220	2
Bonneville Pool Hatchery	176	7	2,322	19
Upriver Bright	746	28	1,697	14
Bonneville Egg Bank (Brights)	0	-	136	1
Cowlitz (Spring Chinook)	67	3	895	7
Total	2,560	97	11,953	98
Washington Coast Fall Chinook	0	-	14	<1
Oregon Coast Private Hatchery	85	3	0	-
Oregon Coast State Hatchery	4	<1	0	-
California	6	<1	210	2
Grand Total	2,655	100	12,177	100

a/ Prepared by the inriver management staffs of Washington and Oregon.

b/ Preliminary.

constrain harvest in other areas, but only when the total harvest impact of all fisheries on stocks of concern are accounted for in the impact analysis.

The Buoy 10 fishery experiences in 1984 and 1985 indicate the need to continue evaluation of: (1) catch, effort, and tag data by time period in the Buoy 10 and adjacent ocean fishing areas; (2) the fishing area (especially the outside boundary); and (3) the timing of the fishery. Salmon managers must address future Buoy 10 sport fisheries as they pertain to weak stock protection needs, harvest opportunity for stocks with surpluses, and equitable sharing of the resource and conservation burden.

Timing of Data Availability and Conflicting Meeting Schedules

Over the years the SPDT has been confronted with the conflicting pressures of providing data and reports to the Council as early as possible in face of the reality that much of the data would not be available until after a certain date.

With the adoption of the framework plan by the Council for 1985, a specific time schedule of events for report preparation that the agencies said they could meet was adopted by the Council. However, when the Pacific Salmon Commission became active in early 1986, a schedule of Pacific Salmon Commission and U.S.-Canada joint technical committee meetings was adopted that caused severe conflict and duplication of effort with the SPDT. Furthermore, other staffs who have responsibility for assembling certain portions of these data are now being asked by two separate groups for the same data. Since these data are under almost constant revision, this duplication of requests imposes an additional heavy load. The Pacific Salmon Commission schedule does not recognize the earliest time when necessary data would become available for planning the coming season's fisheries. The Pacific Salmon Commission scheduled their first commission meeting (February 17 through February 20) during the same week that the SPDT was scheduled to prepare 1986 stock status forecasts. To avoid this conflict, the SPDT moved its meeting a week earlier, even though this would severely tax the capability of management staffs to prepare necessary data. Furthermore, the U.S.-Canada technical committees scheduled meetings in early January to prepare reports on the 1985 fisheries. The SPDT had scheduled a meeting for January 27 through January 31 to prepare the same data for the fisheries south of British Columbia. These earlier meetings of Pacific Salmon Commission committees were scheduled in spite of the fact that it had been repeatedly pointed out that during the past ten years of involvement with the Council process, the report time frame that was developed by the Council was the earliest possible to have a meaningful product.

Another serious conflict occurred during early February when due to the unavailability of data, a joint U.S.-Canada chinook technical committee meeting scheduled for the week of February 3 was changed to the week of February ten--completely overlapping the SPDT meeting which already had been rescheduled earlier to avoid conflict with the Pacific Salmon Commission meeting on February 17. Another concern on this matter is the duplicative, excessive effort caused by these overlapping and poorly timed Pacific Salmon Commission meetings.

These conflicts of meetings and scheduling meetings before data are available create an impossible situation. The time frame adopted by the Council has been based on almost ten years of actual experience with management planning processes for the fisheries and stocks of Washington, Oregon, and California. The Pacific Salmon Commission must recognize this fact and adopt a schedule of meetings and reports that complement the Council schedule. Under current conditions, a tremendous amount of time and effort are being needlessly expended to prepare preliminary reports based on data that will almost certainly be changed--in many cases significantly--when final data become available. This would permit the small number of scientists serving both groups to provide meaningful data reports to both the Council and the commission as early as possible and with minimum duplication.

In light of current budget restraints and the actual reductions in both finances and personnel some agencies are facing, the elimination of this duplication of effort and unnecessary, increased work load becomes imperative. The Council may wish to write to the Pacific Salmon Commission in an effort to resolve this issue, and the SPDT would certainly welcome support in this matter.