

Grays Harbor Advisory Committee

Policy Development Workshop

November 18, 2013

MEEING AGENDA & NOTES

Advisors – Allan Hollingsworth, Andy Mitby, Bob Lake, Dave Hamilton, Duane Inglin (on phone), Jack Hollingsworth, Joe Durham, Norm Reinhardt, LeeRoy Wisner.

WDFW – Jim Scott, Ron Warren, Kirt Hughes, Mike Scharpf

Public -

6:00 to 6:05 Welcome

DFW JS – note the powerpoint presentation provided to the FWC included an error. The revised presentation has been provided to the advisors, Commission, and updated on the website.

6:05 to 6:15 Draft Policy (hand out copies of 11-15-2013 draft)

DFW JS – Ron

DFW RW – accepted track changes, only the information that was altered following our discussion last week is identified in track changes format.

ADV – Geographic distribution. Guiding Principal #7.

ADV – Need to maintain commercial as commercial not only the WDFW managed fishery.

ADV – disagree with the assertion that all commercial fisheries are to be lumped.

ADV – Foregone opportunity, would like to better understand that as it related to Grays Harbor.

DFW – We here the concern as to whether or not this policy will effect change in how resources are being shared. Continue to believe that this is an important step, provided the Commission adopts the draft we provide for their review. If they do not adopt it, the fall back is the current one-line in the NOF policy.

6:15 to 8:00 Draft Policy Sharing Sideboards

Spring Chinook – see comments in “Grays Harbor Basin Salmon Management Concepts 11-15-13 with 11-18-2013 comments.docx”

Fall Chinook –

ADV – Commercial input needs to include considerations for coho opportunity, not what is left over from the sport fishery.

DFW JS – you would like for the Commissioners to see larger Chinook impacts when the coho return is expected to be large.

ADV – Says rec is 22%, what was the Commercial share over those 4 years (19.75%???)

DFW JS – We will look into that.

ADV – Don’t understand that perspective.

DFW JS – Still see conservation being everyone’s primary objective and these are difficult questions that the Commission will need to address.

ADV – To elaborate. We let a lot of coho go upstream in very large runsizes.

ADV – Agree there are sports that spend a lot of effort catching and releasing and that is an issue too.

ADV – So during high coho abundance the Commercials should get more chinook impacts? Yes.

Battery Failure on audio.

ADV – Clarification. Isn’t the impact already factored in? Is the proposal that the commercial share on a small run should be higher than 16.75%.

ADV – If you go to the Rec side – allowing only 1.75%; leaves very little opportunity.

ADV – presentation of this information is confusing. The 1.75% is really 4:94% w/in the NT share. Sliding scale on runsize is too concerning considering our forecast success. Similarly the upriver guys would continue to take it in the shorts.

ADV – percentages on a small run, I don't know. It takes ~ 60 Chinook a day in October. The commercials need blocks of about 60 in mid-October. Only need a handful in November. That is why set in stone percentages will not work as well as blocks of fish – impacts.

ADV – charts of input were from both recreational and commercial – out of 100%. Only Jim Scott knows how these #'s were created.

DFW JS – pretty straight forward. These were simply adjusted to reflect the allocation of all harvest versus only within the State Managed Fishery. The intent was to present in as neutral manner as possible.

ADV – How many sports fished in the GH watershed in 2012 and 2013. I suspect this is a small percent. The Consumers need to be recognized in this equation. **What is the percent of the revenue from sport licenses and commercial fees (license and landing) that fund the hatcheries?**

DFW JS – re-focus on the finalization of the sideboards.

So far - Commercial Chinook impacts are needed when the coho RS is large
- Improved presentation of the information

ADV – We need to be intellectually honest; improved #'s, better representation of impacts in all fleets.

ADV – Opt A rec input, they don't want us fishing. There is no equity there. Tough to moving forward working with a group that does not want us on the water. We need to have the numbers clarified and backed out to the 100% WDFWF managed share. On a small chinook run we need 40%.

DFW JS – would love to reach consensus. Back up is to reflect this input of each sector.

ADV – Back to the 1.75%, those number were compiled from the advisors and the public input; wasn't this select group.

ADV – Do you have the Advisors only. The opt A is one-sided, opt B is more in the ballpark.

DFW JS – moving to the recreational FW/MA split. Looking for potential changes to the table.

ADV – Concede these numbers to the extent that the MA fishery takes really big bites. No selling out, just saying. To that end, the lesser efficient fleets ought to be favored at low runsizes. Might be an artifact of big bit out-front. Stepping back to the Sport/Commercial – take the average of the two alternatives.

ADV – Chum allocation within the sport seems inaccurate and misleading to suggest that more than zero percent is allocated to the marine area.

ADV – caveat with adaptive management. Until then, FW >99%: MA <1%.

ADV – Can we improve modeling?

DFW JS – Yes.

ADV – Dedicated saltwater guy. Conservation concern, and conservation should come first. Would like the department to consider a modified fishery in the MA. When we have opened out there it has been a bloodbath. More active monitoring inseason. To that end, implement fisheries in smaller bites. Alternatively, why can't allow limited retention in the season. Unharvest impacts could then be transferred to the commercial fishery.

DFW JS – Coho. Changes?

ADV – Correlation between success of the inriver sport and the commercial fisheries out in front. There needs to be recognition of the impacts in commercial fisheries and their impact on sport.

ADV – provided a HANDOUT which that disputes those assertions.

ADV – How are you going to limit impacts? Lottery? How many can one fisher use? And what happened to 50:50.

DFW JS – looking for recommendations as the sideboards. The Commission is going to make a determination; I want to present the perspectives of each fishery. I hope all of you folks will engage in the discussion with the Commission.

ADV – like to see a 50:50 split on the Chinook side. Without the Chinook we cannot get on the coho.

DFW JS – for coho now does this option B reflect what you want to put in front of the Commission?

ADV – Like to see option C the version from the advisors.

DFW JS – those values are in here.

ADV – in the Ballpark, we achieve parity in the middle (between small and large).

ADV – Option A are not realistic.

ADV – Put it in the big %'age – whole share terms.

ADV – To go back to the concern for what the sportfishers are doing with their fish, they are not going to waste. We often take care of community members less fortunate.

ADV – Targeted versus incidental catch; where is that defined? NEEDs to be included. Dead damn fish is a dead damn fish.

DFW JS - #1 under each species. This is much cleaner than to define targeted, incidental, etc.

ADV – Option A/B disparity. An attempt to put the differences of perspective in front of the Commission as an advisory, to inform the Commission so the Commission can direct WDFW staff.

DFW JS - Chum

ADV – small RS versus large? Options A is backwards, Option B is about where it should be.

DFW RW – 23,100 and less at small; >33K at large.

ADV – whatever the surveys show is what it is, but I dispute the number the agency generates. EDT and Brix both showed chum in the upper basin are being seriously impacted and pushed towards extirpation.

ADV – Chum are critically important to all species. Within the basin. Think reviewing the chum goal might be valuable. Would like to see the goals for Humptulips and the Chehalis having separately defined goals.

DFW JS – Will talk that through internally.

ADV – Need those breakouts.

ADV – If you are not meeting an escapement goal for a give species, in a given river, how can you have a fishery in that river?

DFW RW – We don't offer kill fisheries when escapement is not predicted to be met.

ADV – Input was gathered early in the process. Need to have a report card on our outcomes. Year in and year out we are constrained by Chinook. We started with a mindset of conservation. Both fisheries have had to be curtailed; sport, no bait, barbless, etc.; the commercial fishery has not changed. Understand that for the commercial fishermen this is your livelihood, but there needs to be a different approach taken to truly implement a selective harvest fishery – wheels, traps, etc.

8:00 Public Comment – Questions

PUBLIC– We cannot get a viable chinook fishery because of the fisheries form 101 out.

PUBLIC– understand how this game is being played... under guiding principles #7, is that passage about including recreational fisheries going to be added in? Like to revisit that in the future. As for Boldt, commercial is commercial regardless of treaty versus NT and I don't see where there is room for the NT nets. Don't see the spring chinook trade of, for the commercial fishery. Like to see full accounting for harvest in the ocean. The Option A number are recreational the commercials should not have input into the sport. Chum split is far from 50:50.

[Unable to capture all of this comment]

PUBLIC– Comparing the mortality rate between sport and commercial cannot be done. The videos of the mishandling by the commercial fishermen is unacceptable. I know what the Indians are doing with there fish, it is not for sustenance, they are selling them. We don't need a dinosaur fleet that cost 3X's the revenue of the fleet, I am against welfare. The fleet needs to bought out and mothballed. If the Commission continues to provide for the commercial fishery I will be writing a lot of letters to the Governor Inslee requesting reappointments to the commission. Makes me puke. Not viable. *[Unable to capture all of this comment]*

Ron – Most has been covered. The recreational opportunity is the escapement. There are spawners in these rivers. We need those fish to be transferred upstream to the in-river fishery.

PUBLIC– If is we only NT the model might work. We need to start looking at the escapement goal. If you want a meaningful recreational fishery and there is not enough for the commercials need to have a lottery.

PUBLIC – Back to #7. Does that mean we might have the opportunity to move nets into the hatchery areas? Look at the advantages. Only hatchery and no conflict.

PUBLIC – What I see with these numbers is that WDFW claims to spent 385K to manage the fishery and the commercial fishery only makes 90K. In private industry the companies pay their way. The commercial fishery is subsidized and should not occur.

PUBLIC – Have fished every day since September 1, except high water. Less net more people fish. Get rid of 2A fishery.

PUBLIC – no nets – cannot find a place to park at Fuller Bridge.

Back to the Advisors

ADV – we all sport fish too. Question is where are GH chinook impacted? Need to get after PSC to get that turned around.

ADV – 4 days for nets and 3 days for sports.

ADV – Share of the sport fishers for not catching when the nets are in the water.

ADV – We never got to Humptulips. Concerned also that the Chehalis split on the Hump side is too high. **Need to look into the tag data for this.**

ADV– The Commission needs to push for timely reporting.

8:55

Closing