



Columbia River Salmon Fishery Policy Workgroup (CRW)

Public Comments received between June 18, 2020 through June 24, 2020

This is a compilation of comments received at through our online public comment portal after the Joint-State PRC was put on hold.

From: [Kloepfer, Nichole D \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Barbara Baker](#); [Bob Kehoe](#); [Brad Smith](#); [Dave Graybill](#); [Donald McIsaac](#); [Anderson, James R \(DFW\)](#); [Larry Carpenter](#); [McBride, Tom A \(DFW\)](#); [Linville, Molly F \(DFW\)](#); [Thorburn, Kim M \(DFW\)](#)
Cc: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#); [Lothrop, Ryan L \(DFW\)](#); [Tweit, William M \(DFW\)](#); [Warren, Ron R \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: FW: Thank you to Washington Fish and Wildlife Commissioners
Date: Thursday, June 18, 2020 10:14:38 AM
Attachments: [Thank you, Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission.docx](#)

From: Irene Martin <i7846martin@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2020 10:12 AM
To: Kloepfer, Nichole D (DFW) <Nichole.Kloepfer@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Thank you to Washington Fish and Wildlife Commissioners

Hi Nikki,

I'd appreciate it if you would forward a note of thanks I have written to the Fish and Wildlife Commissioners, which I have attached here, and also to the Director.

All good wishes, and thanks to you also for your work in all these meetings.

Irene and Kent

P.O. Box 83,
Skamokawa, WA 98647,
June 18, 2020.

Dear Washington Fish and Wildlife Commissioners,

I would like to thank you all for your continued progress on reforming Harvest Policy C-3620. Kent and I very much appreciated the vote in favor of moving the suggested revisions out for public review last week. Together, Kent and I have over 100 years of fisheries experience (actually rather a daunting prospect, now that I think of it!) and this is probably the most arduous long-term process we have ever been involved with. The first meetings on the topics that ultimately became part of the policy began around 2006. I was part of the first couple of work-groups that followed. So you will understand why we feel strongly that these issues have had plenty of public comment and input over a very long period of time, and that decisions need to be made to resolve issues that have arisen due to this Policy.

We are concerned that so much staff time has gone into working with a Policy that lacked a sufficient scientific basis to support it. Staff have also had to deal with a great deal of conflict during this period, and other issues have emerged, such as predation, that deserved more attention than has been possible, given limited staff time. Our hope is that with a more stable, informed policy, attention can be given to issues of habitat and recovery that are ever-present.

We would also like to commend the Commission and Department for embarking on the strategic plan, and will be commenting on ensuing drafts of that document. The debate over Policy C-3620 reflects larger issues regarding allocation of critical natural resources, including salmon and other species, water, habitat, urban development and others that are directly related to Washington's urban/rural divide. The Commission does not lack challenges at this time!

We will be commenting in the future regarding the drafts of both documents, but just wanted to thank you all for enduring last Friday's grueling session, and moving ahead on this process.

Sincerely,

Kent and Irene Martin

360-795-3920

From: [123ContactForm](#)
To: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: Contact the Policy Review Workgroup
Date: Friday, June 19, 2020 3:51:40 PM

Name	Carla Boeringa
Email	boeringac@gmail.com
Address	Richland Washington
Comments	<p>Absolutely no on nets in the main channel of the river. As a sportsperson up river we keep getting smaller seasons, smaller limits or absolutely no season. We also keep getting told by our governor and environmental groups that to save the salmon we have to tear down the dams. Well if you let them net the main channel and our fish count goes down you are just giving them the ammunition to do exactly that.</p> <p>More money needs to be put into hatcheries and some of them need to be better managed.</p>
Attachment	

The message has been sent from 96.39.206.165 (United States) at 2020-06-19 18:51:36 on Edge 18.18362
Entry ID: 149

From: [Commission \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Barbara Baker](#); [Bob Kehoe](#); [Brad Smith](#); [Dave Graybill](#); [Donald McIsaac](#); [Anderson, James R \(DFW\)](#); [Larry Carpenter](#); [McBride, Tom A \(DFW\)](#); [Linville, Molly F \(DFW\)](#); [Thorburn, Kim M \(DFW\)](#)
Cc: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: FW: Commercial Netting on the Lower Columbia
Date: Friday, June 19, 2020 9:10:16 AM

From: dean oakes <outlook_79AC0726B7C6AA91@outlook.com> **On Behalf Of** dean oakes
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2020 8:17 AM
To: Commission (DFW) <COMMISSION@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Commercial Netting on the Lower Columbia

As a former member of the Anadromous Fish Advisory Council to the Director I would like to express my concerns on any decision to allow any netting in the Lower Columbia River during periods of critically low return run numbers of anadromous fish in the Columbia River. We are in a time of more consistent closures of normal recreational fishing seasons due to insufficient numbers in the runs, causes for the shortages are not accurately determined or addressed at any level I see at this point. Many sportsman, more than I have ever seen in my 60 years of fishing and hunting, have decided to not purchase licenses this year, sell their boats and gear and find other things to do with their time and resources. This is another tragic event in a time that seems to be headed toward disaster and not recovery in the anadromous fish area and others that fall under governmental control. Watching the current political landscape, I would venture to say many people's former fishing time and resources will be spent seeking accountability and maybe even culpability for the demise of this resource without proper consideration for it's survivability. Past WDFW disfunction on solving fixable issues of predation by seals at fish ladders, poorly controlling and barely holding accountable off shore fishing by many Countries and commercial entities, showing an inability to enforce, arrest or meaningfully educate people violating game laws, especially large scale poachers, uninformed young folks and homeless that are reducing numbers of fish of all kinds in Eastern Washington really undermines any confidence the sports community has in the WDFW. I know that license fees were taken to the General Fund years ago by some uninformed non-fishing political dolt (we call that the moment of destruction of the WDFW) and the monies WDFW receives are not enough to do or solve many things with the current thinking in place. I would urge you to think of a license as a vote in your favor, start asking for ideas to solve local problems in the field and don't give all the Columbia River fish away to the same old commercial quotas and expect to have respect and funding from the sportspeople and voters. Thank you.

Dean Oakes
Liberty Lake, WA
509-951-3785

From: [Commission \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Barbara Baker](#); [Bob Kehoe](#); [Brad Smith](#); [Dave Graybill](#); [Donald McIsaac](#); [Anderson, James R \(DFW\)](#); [Larry Carpenter](#); [McBride, Tom A \(DFW\)](#); [Linville, Molly F \(DFW\)](#); [Thorburn, Kim M \(DFW\)](#)
Cc: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: FW: Help us save our fisheries for future generations
Date: Friday, June 19, 2020 11:52:14 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Nello Picinich <nello.picinich@ccawashington.org>
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2020 10:34 AM
To: Commission (DFW) <COMMISSION@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Help us save our fisheries for future generations

Dear WDFW Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

The prior Commissioners who adopted the bi-state Columbia River policy were visionaries who knew that we needed to change the way our fisheries are managed. They realized that the status quo was no longer acceptable. They made some difficult but necessary decisions in order to help move the management of our fisheries into a new era of conservation. Please support the conservation legacy of those visionaries who served on the Commission before you by adhering to the initial key tenets of the policy and mandate the removal of gill nets from the lower mainstem Columbia River.

Thanks again.

Sincerely,

Nello Picinich
12614 NE 105th Ct
Vancouver, WA 98662
nello.picinich@ccawashington.org

From: [Commission \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Barbara Baker](#); [Bob Kehoe](#); [Brad Smith](#); [Dave Graybill](#); [Donald McIsaac](#); [Anderson, James R \(DFW\)](#); [Larry Carpenter](#); [McBride, Tom A \(DFW\)](#); [Linville, Molly F \(DFW\)](#); [Thorburn, Kim M \(DFW\)](#)
Cc: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: FW: Columbia River Policy comments
Date: Friday, June 19, 2020 12:15:55 PM
Attachments: [2020-6-14 Comments fo Commission on Facts in C-3620 testimony, part 1..docx](#)

From: Robert Sudar <fallcreek734@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2020 10:53 AM
To: Kloepfer, Nichole D (DFW) <Nichole.Kloepfer@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Columbia River Policy comments

Nikki: I criticized the inaccurate testimony at last week's Columbia River Policy hearing and said I would send a rebuttal with facts to correct the misleading statements. I ended up writing two items for the Commissioners. Please share the attached letter with the Commission and pertinent staff. I'll send the second item later today. Thank you!

Robert Sudar

June 14, 2020

To: Washington Fish & Wildlife Commission

From: Robert Sudar

Re: Fact-checking public testimony and management history

Commissioners:

I spoke about the Columbia River Policy three times during your meeting last week – about conflicts in the Policy with RCW 77.50.120; about the Policy itself; and about my frustration with inaccurate testimony, and how the Commission has done little to deal with it so it tends to confuse whereas the intent should be to inform. Saturday morning I said I would send a response to you in regards to what I think was misleading testimony. I think it is helpful to first know some of the history in Columbia River salmon management before the current situation can be understood. Here is that part of my response. You will notice that we have been discussing allocation conflicts for a long time -- 14 years in fact since the first meetings, which explains why we believe strongly we need to revamp Policy C-3620 as soon as possible to rectify the economic harm to the gillnet fleet that has occurred during this lengthy period.

The history of recreational/commercial disagreements in salmon fisheries throughout Washington, not just on the Columbia, is quite long but I won't try and discuss all of that. However, I will provide some historical context around Policy C-3620.

In 2006, a Working Group was convened by Washington and Oregon to look for a long-term solution to allocation conflicts regarding the sharing of spring Chinook impacts between recreational and commercial fishermen. I was a commercial representative in that process. After lunch at the third meeting the recreational representatives left the working group, saying that they didn't think the process would produce the proper results.

In 2008-2009, another Working Group was convened with some of the same members (including me), but this time including three Commissioners from each state who would be making the final decisions. At the third meeting, the six Commissioners said they were going to meet alone in an adjoining room and make their decision. I thought this was odd because we'd never talked about specific allocations. After a long absence, they emerged and said that they thought 65% sport/35% commercial was fair. However, the full Oregon Commission rejected this decision and so a sharing matrix was developed with a 5% hold-back of unutilized impacts to resolve the difference between the two Commissions. I've testified before about that matrix, which worked well until it was replaced by Policy C-3620.

In August of 2012, former Oregon Governor Kitzhaber told his Commission that he wanted them to create a new Policy for Columbia River salmon management that would remove gillnets from the mainstream. He said that he "believed" a lot of things about what was best for the future fisheries in the Columbia, but he didn't provide any evidence. He said his letter was motivated by an initiative on the Oregon ballot, funded by the Coastal Conservation Association (CCA), that would have eliminated commercial salmon fishing in the Columbia. (The initiative failed that November by a 2:1 margin.)

In September of 2012, another Working Group was established in response to Kitzhaber's letter. There were four recreational members and four commercial members. I was one of the commercial members of that working group, too. There were three F&W Commissioners from each state and they would make the final determination on a future policy. At the first meeting, I asked the moderator when we would be discussing the merit of this proposal, based on the existing science. I was told that we weren't there to discuss the proposal, we were there to implement it. We were told there would be one more meeting, maybe two, at which time a final decision would be made. At the end of the meeting, staff was given a number of assignments based on questions from the stakeholders.

There was a Washington Commission meeting in early October, at which time public testimony on the proposed policy was taken. In mid-October the second working group meeting was held. There was some public testimony taken, and the commercial and recreational stakeholders each made a short presentation. Then as staff prepared to begin

reviewing the documents we had finally received in the two days prior, the three Washington Commissioners said that they had a presentation they wanted to make. They went on to present a lengthy plan that included some portions of the items we had received, but continued to lay out a stepped removal of the commercial fishery from the mainstem along with major increases in smolt production in the Select Areas. None of this was based on discussions amongst the working group members, and the Oregon Commission chairwoman, Bobbi Levy, finally said that she wanted to hear assurances from staff before the next meeting that the proposal would create no more than 5% financial harm for the commercial fishery, or what adjustments were needed to accomplish that benchmark.

A second public Commission meeting was held in early November to again take testimony. At that meeting, staff reported that NOAA fisheries would not approve the full increases in smolt releases proposed in the policy document so far. The cuts were around 2 million coho smolts, which had been modeled to provide the bulk of the Select Area earnings increase, and later a 50% cut in Select Area Bright (SAB) releases from 2 million down to one million.

The Friday before the last working group meeting in Seaside, Oregon, we received the final proposed plan – a 42 page document – and the modeling from Oregon staff that was intended to show that this proposal would meet or exceed Commissioner Levy's 5% standard. More public testimony was taken before the meeting, Oregon staff (tried) to explain their modeling, each working group member was allowed to make a final statement and then the Policy was approved.

The reason I went through this timeline is because it was stated last week that there were many meetings besides the three work group meetings that led to the final policy. My point is that maybe there were, but they weren't public meetings and at no point, outside of the three working group meetings, were the four commercial representatives involved in any of those additional discussions that led to the final Policy.

Similarly in 2017, when the next version of Policy C-3620 was passed by the Commission, the updated version wasn't made available until several days after the vote was held. In fact, there was a motion and a second to accept the updates before staff even presented the new Policy to the Commission.

Discussions around Columbia River salmon sharing have been a long, arduous process. None of the current Commissioners were involved in 2006, but many of us testifying now to the Commission were involved, and had been for years prior. We have defended our industry with facts and data, but we are rarely included in the meaningful conversations that create these policies. In 2017, at his final meeting, Commissioner Mahnken said that when he came on the Commission he intended to bring science to the process, but instead he found that politics often played just as big a role in decisions. As I said on Saturday morning, that should be unacceptable. Salmon management needs to be built around science, and there is ample data to illuminate the discussion. That is why we support these current revisions as a starting point for a new policy that reflects the facts and the results of the last eight years.

From: [Kloepfer, Nichole D \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Larry Carpenter](#); [Bob Kehoe](#); [Brad Smith](#); [Dave Graybill](#); [Donald McIsaac](#); [Anderson, James R \(DFW\)](#); [Thorburn, Kim M \(DFW\)](#); [Barbara Baker](#); [Linville, Molly F \(DFW\)](#)
Cc: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Commission info, item #2
Date: Friday, June 19, 2020 1:56:38 PM
Attachments: [2020-6-15 Fact checking public testimony on Columbia River salmon policy, part 2.docx](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Robert Sudar <fallcreek734@gmail.com>
Date: June 19, 2020 at 1:31:28 PM PDT
To: "Kloepfer, Nichole D (DFW)" <Nichole.Kloepfer@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Commission info, item #2

Nikki: Attached please find the second item that I mentioned I'd like you to send to the Commissioners and appropriate Department staff before the weekend. Thanks for doing this, and have a fun, safe weekend! Let me know if you misplace the email! Robert Sudar

June 14, 2020

To: Washington Fish & Wildlife Commission

From: Robert Sudar

Re: Fact-checking public testimony and management history

Commissioners:

I spoke about the Columbia River Policy three times during your meeting last week – about conflicts in the Policy with RCW 77.50.120; about the Policy itself; and about my frustration with inaccurate testimony, and how the Commission has done little to deal with it so it tends to confuse whereas the intent should be to inform. Saturday morning I said I would send a response to you in regards to what I think was misleading testimony. I think it is helpful to first know some of the history in Columbia River salmon management before the current situation can be understood. Here is that part of my response. You will notice that we have been discussing allocation conflicts for a long time -- 14 years in fact since the first meetings, which explains why we believe strongly we need to revamp Policy C-3620 as soon as possible to rectify the economic harm to the gillnet fleet that has occurred during this lengthy period.

The history of recreational/commercial disagreements in salmon fisheries throughout Washington, not just on the Columbia, is quite long but I won't try and discuss all of that. However, I will provide some historical context around Policy C-3620.

In 2006, a Working Group was convened by Washington and Oregon to look for a long-term solution to allocation conflicts regarding the sharing of spring Chinook impacts between recreational and commercial fishermen. I was a commercial representative in that process. After lunch at the third meeting the recreational representatives left the working group, saying that they didn't think the process would produce the proper results.

In 2008-2009, another Working Group was convened with some of the same members (including me), but this time including three Commissioners from each state who would be making the final decisions. At the third meeting, the six Commissioners said they were going to meet alone in an adjoining room and make their decision. I thought this was odd because we'd never talked about specific allocations. After a long absence, they emerged and said that they thought 65% sport/35% commercial was fair. However, the full Oregon Commission rejected this decision and so a sharing matrix was developed with a 5% hold-back of unutilized impacts to resolve the difference between the two Commissions. I've testified before about that matrix, which worked well until it was replaced by Policy C-3620.

In August of 2012, former Oregon Governor Kitzhaber told his Commission that he wanted them to create a new Policy for Columbia River salmon management that would remove gillnets from the mainstream. He said that he "believed" a lot of things about what was best for the future fisheries in the Columbia, but he didn't provide any evidence. He said his letter was motivated by an initiative on the Oregon ballot, funded by the Coastal Conservation Association (CCA), that would have eliminated commercial salmon fishing in the Columbia. (The initiative failed that November by a 2:1 margin.)

In September of 2012, another Working Group was established in response to Kitzhaber's letter. There were four recreational members and four commercial members. I was one of the commercial members of that working group, too. There were three F&W Commissioners from each state and they would make the final determination on a future policy. At the first meeting, I asked the moderator when we would be discussing the merit of this proposal, based on the existing science. I was told that we weren't there to discuss the proposal, we were there to implement it. We were told there would be one more meeting, maybe two, at which time a final decision would be made. At the end of the meeting, staff was given a number of assignments based on questions from the stakeholders.

There was a Washington Commission meeting in early October, at which time public testimony on the proposed policy was taken. In mid-October the second working group meeting was held. There was some public testimony taken, and the commercial and recreational stakeholders each made a short presentation. Then as staff prepared to begin

reviewing the documents we had finally received in the two days prior, the three Washington Commissioners said that they had a presentation they wanted to make. They went on to present a lengthy plan that included some portions of the items we had received, but continued to lay out a stepped removal of the commercial fishery from the mainstem along with major increases in smolt production in the Select Areas. None of this was based on discussions amongst the working group members, and the Oregon Commission chairwoman, Bobbi Levy, finally said that she wanted to hear assurances from staff before the next meeting that the proposal would create no more than 5% financial harm for the commercial fishery, or what adjustments were needed to accomplish that benchmark.

A second public Commission meeting was held in early November to again take testimony. At that meeting, staff reported that NOAA fisheries would not approve the full increases in smolt releases proposed in the policy document so far. The cuts were around 2 million coho smolts, which had been modeled to provide the bulk of the Select Area earnings increase, and later a 50% cut in Select Area Bright (SAB) releases from 2 million down to one million.

The Friday before the last working group meeting in Seaside, Oregon, we received the final proposed plan – a 42 page document – and the modeling from Oregon staff that was intended to show that this proposal would meet or exceed Commissioner Levy's 5% standard. More public testimony was taken before the meeting, Oregon staff (tried) to explain their modeling, each working group member was allowed to make a final statement and then the Policy was approved.

The reason I went through this timeline is because it was stated last week that there were many meetings besides the three work group meetings that led to the final policy. My point is that maybe there were, but they weren't public meetings and at no point, outside of the three working group meetings, were the four commercial representatives involved in any of those additional discussions that led to the final Policy.

Similarly in 2017, when the next version of Policy C-3620 was passed by the Commission, the updated version wasn't made available until several days after the vote was held. In fact, there was a motion and a second to accept the updates before staff even presented the new Policy to the Commission.

Discussions around Columbia River salmon sharing have been a long, arduous process. None of the current Commissioners were involved in 2006, but many of us testifying now to the Commission were involved, and had been for years prior. We have defended our industry with facts and data, but we are rarely included in the meaningful conversations that create these policies. In 2017, at his final meeting, Commissioner Mahnken said that when he came on the Commission he intended to bring science to the process, but instead he found that politics often played just as big a role in decisions. As I said on Saturday morning, that should be unacceptable. Salmon management needs to be built around science, and there is ample data to illuminate the discussion. That is why we support these current revisions as a starting point for a new policy that reflects the facts and the results of the last eight years.

From: [Commission \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Barbara Baker](#); [Bob Kehoe](#); [Brad Smith](#); [Dave Graybill](#); [Donald McIsaac](#); [Anderson, James R \(DFW\)](#); [Larry Carpenter](#); [McBride, Tom A \(DFW\)](#); [Linville, Molly F \(DFW\)](#); [Thorburn, Kim M \(DFW\)](#)
Cc: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: FW: Contact the Commission: Commission Meetings
Date: Monday, June 22, 2020 10:11:20 AM

From: larry Nelson <larryanel@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2020 11:49 AM
To: Commission (DFW) <COMMISSION@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Contact the Commission: Commission Meetings

Name	larry Nelson
Email	larryanel@msn.com
Address	15503 74TH AVE E PUYALLUP WA 98375
Subject	Commission Meetings
Message	I find it hard to imagine how you can justify opening net fishing in the Lower Columbia when the salmon runs are so low. The State is expanding the Hatcheries trying to get enough fish to feed the Orca\'s . So does not make sense to me to take a large portion of fish from the Columbia at this time Thank You
Attachment	

The message has been sent from 71.212.99.193 (United States) at 2020-06-21 14:49:26 on Chrome 83.0.4103.106
Entry ID: 2094

From: [Commission \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: FW: Gill Nets are Not the Answer
Date: Monday, June 22, 2020 11:11:02 AM

Have 300 of these.

-----Original Message-----

From: Joseph Bielas <bielas2629@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 10:30 AM
To: Commission (DFW) <COMMISSION@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Gill Nets are Not the Answer

Dear WDFW Commissioners,

It's hard to believe that we are still having this conversation .Gill nets do not discriminate.

Public participation is important to the future of our fisheries. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Columbia River policy.

Increased gillnetting in the mainstem of the Columbia River is not the answer to saving our imperiled salmon and steelhead. Gill nets are significantly less capable of harvesting hatchery fish while releasing wild fish than other more selective methods. Perhaps more importantly, gill nets also encounter, snare and kill a wide variety of non-target species including steelhead, sockeye, birds and other wildlife.

Gill nets are not the answer. Please adhere to the initial key tenets of the policy and mandate the removal of gill nets from the lower mainstem Columbia River.

Sincerely,

Joseph Bielas
1313 NE 82nd Ave
Vancouver, WA 98664
bielas2629@comcast.net

From: [Commission \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: FW: Prioritize Selective Fisheries on the Columbia River
Date: Monday, June 22, 2020 11:11:19 AM

Have 163 of these.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mr. & Mrs. Wallace Cogley <user@voterveoice.net>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 9:49 AM
To: Commission (DFW) <COMMISSION@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Prioritize Selective Fisheries on the Columbia River

Dear WDFW Commissioners,

Thank you for allowing the public to comment on this important issue.

A key guiding principle of the original Oregon-Washington Columbia River reforms was to prioritize selective recreational fisheries. After 8 years of failed implementation, one thing we have learned is that hook and line remains the best and most efficient form of selective fishing. It makes sense to prioritize recreational fishing in the Columbia River given the need for selective fisheries and WDFW's reliance on recreational license fees to help relieve budget shortfalls.

Please reject any changes to the policy that would allow mainstem gill net fisheries and instead adhere to the original objectives, which called for a prioritization of selective recreational fishing and no mainstem gillnetting.

Sincerely,

Wallace Cogley
11816 52nd Dr NE
Marysville, WA 98271
whcogley@yahoo.com

From: [Commission \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: FW: Columbia River Mainstream Killnet Fisheries
Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:38:42 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Larry Whalen <sturgeondad@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 2:34 PM
To: Commission (DFW) <COMMISSION@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Columbia River Mainstream Killnet Fisheries

With already diminished run expectations, allowing mainstream netting on the Columbia River is the most repugnant, pusillanimous example of bad management I have ever seen. Please do not allow this to occur!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Our fisheries scientists know what the right thing to do is, but they can not do it if politics trumps science and experience.

From: [Commission \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Barbara Baker](#); [Bob Kehoe](#); [Brad Smith](#); [Dave Graybill](#); [Donald McIsaac](#); [Anderson, James R \(DFW\)](#); [Larry Carpenter](#); [McBride, Tom A \(DFW\)](#); [Linville, Molly F \(DFW\)](#); [Thorburn, Kim M \(DFW\)](#)
Cc: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: FW: Columbia River Reforms
Date: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 12:51:36 PM
Attachments: [21140_2019ColumbiaTalkingPoints.pdf](#)
[ATT00001.txt](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: Ross Barkhurst <rp.barkhurst@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 12:06 PM
To: Commission (DFW) <COMMISSION@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Columbia River Reforms

The public was in effect duped by these reforms when issued. On the WA Commission, as with Willapa Policy improvements, the public and its advisors are sold a compromise, and then the Commission has allowed them to be whittled away at. Now we see the agenda of hopefully a few. I cannot improve over the attached talking points. This comes from myself, who with family has fished the Lower Columbia from St. Helens down through Buoy Ten. Steelhead destroyed, Chinook and Coho de minimus. That the department would even suggest a 2020 Spring Chinook gillnet season shows the insufficient care and concern for our Columbia Salmon and steelhead Resource. Please give that resource the care it will get with low impact low mortality recreational fishing. Long overdue.
http://centralpt.com/upload/560/Advocacy/2019/21140_2019ColumbiaTalkingPoints.pdf



Background

2017 and 2018, were the first years in our lifetimes with no mainstem commercial gill net fishery during the spring and summer seasons. Despite staff inaction in implementing many of the directives of the Columbia River Policy, the gill net reforms have been working. The recent recommendation by the Joint-State Committee to return gill nets to the lower mainstem Columbia is reckless and in clear contrast of WDFW's Department Goal #1: "Conserve and protect native fish and wildlife."

Spring Chinook

The Commission should continue to hold firm against mainstem spring "tangle" gill net fisheries.

- The gill net industry has benefited greatly from the increased hatchery production in the off-channel fishing areas. In fact, 2017's off-channel harvest of spring Chinook was the most valuable on record, despite it being an average run. 2018, was another large SAFE area harvest (10,981 fish!)
- The 12,000-plus spring Chinook landed in the off-channel gill net fisheries in 2017 exceeded the number of spring Chinook harvested in recreational fisheries above and below Bonneville Dam. There is no reason to allow spring "tangle" gill net fisheries to occur in the mainstem.

Summer Chinook

CCA strongly supports the Washington Commission's decision to prohibit commercial gill nets from the mainstem during the summer Chinook fishery.

- Summer Chinook have been prioritized for upriver fisheries in Eastern Washington, including the selective fishing practices of the Colville Nation.
- The recreational summer Chinook fishery is being managed as a selective fishery to help meet escapement goals for wild Chinook to the spawning grounds, which are not being met in some upriver tributaries.
- Commercial gill nets are incapable of select harvest of summer Chinook and unnecessarily catch and kill ESA-listed sockeye and steelhead as bycatch. Only 200 Snake River sockeye are forecast in 2019!

Fall Chinook

CCA remains concerned about the use of gill nets in this year's fall Chinook fisheries in zones 4 and 5. Gill net mortality rates on steelhead have been manipulated by staff to extend commercial fisheries.

- The gill net industry is claiming economic harm, but the 2017 fall Chinook gillnet fishery was cut short when it exceeded its allowable impact of ESA-listed B-run steelhead, a species caught as bycatch in this non-selective fishery. 2018's fall season closed early when run predictions fell dramatically short of actual return numbers.
- The Commission should carefully review the monitoring data from the 2017 fishery and mandate that any mortality rate changes be based on rigorous scientific studies, as was conducted with seines. Concerningly, the 2018 fall fishery was not extensively monitored.
- In 2017, information came to light about the impact that off-channel gill net fisheries are having on steelhead during the fall (potentially including B-run steelhead). CCA Oregon's discovery of dumped wild steelhead at a commercial boat launch outside of Astoria should lead to a re-analysis of the impact of these fisheries on steelhead.

From: [Commission \(DFW\)](#)
To: [Barbara Baker](#); [Bob Kehoe](#); [Brad Smith](#); [Dave Graybill](#); [Donald McIsaac](#); [Anderson, James R \(DFW\)](#); [Larry Carpenter](#); [McBride, Tom A \(DFW\)](#); [Linville, Molly F \(DFW\)](#); [Thorburn, Kim M \(DFW\)](#)
Cc: [Dobler, Myrtice C \(DFW\)](#)
Subject: FW: Columbia a river closure
Date: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 8:52:19 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Matthew Peck <mattp1421@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 4:03 AM
To: Commission (DFW) <COMMISSION@dfw.wa.gov>
Subject: Columbia a river closure

Dear Commissioner's,

Why would you ever allow a Sockeye fishery below the mouth of the Snake river?. This year the WDFW hyped the sockeye return as being the only bright spot in the 2020, Salmon forecast. You allowed a fishery, and it resulted in a early closure of our beloved summer Steelhead fishery.

Both years 2018, 2019 the predicted sockeye return was near 98k, and we fished steelhead thru July, this year we expect 245k to return and you pull the rug out from under us. Why is there a sockeye fishery below the mouth of the Snake river?, with the impacts being just 1%, due to low Snake river returns.

On a year when, we have been locked down, and slowly beginning a return to normal, the rug is yanked out from under our feet.

Please close sockeye, and reopen Steelhead, that are tracking above prediction.

Thank you,
Matthew Peck
mattp1421@icloud.com

Sent from my iPad