

2018 Willapa Bay North of Falcon Advisory Group Meeting

April 5, 2018

Region 6 Office, Montesano 6 p.m. – 8 p.m.

WDFW Staff: Chad Herring, Barbara McClellan, Lyle Jennings, Kim Figlar-Barnes, Curt Holt

Advisors: Norm Reinhardt, Francis Estalilla, Tim Hamilton, Steve Boerner, Marlisa Dugan, Andy Mitby, Greg McMillan and Lance Gray

Public: 6 individuals

NOF Review

Cuts many sectors of the state

PST 20% ER Coho & 20% ER Queets Coho

41% Columbia Tules & UpRiver Bright's

Commission Guidance - Caps to commercial and recreation fisheries. Evaluate fisheries rec. and week by week for commercial fisheries.

Recreational Fishery

Reduction 4 fish bag

Curtail high catch periods

Preseason 9% commercial aggregate 2018

2019 begin annual review of management policy

Boundary of WB Rec. Fishery Discussion

- Rec. harvests affected non-local fish and increased
- Option move boundary to reduce non-local fish impacts
- 38% or less impact to LCR chinook
- Could have a control zone similar to GH when conservation issues arise
- Need recommendations to deal with exploitation rate issues (ER)

How many impacts does ocean commercial have in numbers? What are commercials giving up?

Who fights for recreational fishers? Tokeland has not had a chance to develop fishery.

Chad: Control zone could be consideration. Options 1-3 are smaller than those of past, needed to meet management objectives. Commission budget policy 15-17 – directs agency to consider all fisheries statewide and economic consideration when shaping fishery packages. Some coastal communities rely on ocean fisheries – Neah Bay, La Push, Westport and Ilwaco. Kyle Adicks, Kirt Hughes and Lori Peterson part of representatives for salmon fisheries and policy.

Who had discussions for boundary changes? How can records be found?

Chad: CWT and other data shows that issues associated ESA listed and non-local species with exploitation rates need to meet management requirements. Willapa Bay fisheries impact non-local stocks.

Not closing area, a consideration could be a control zone for all fisheries. Reduce impact by moving the rec. line back to original location or further. Enforcement would be able to enforce changes in recreational line changes.

Do not like the idea of control zone closing? Who proposed line to be moved?

Chad: Commission guidance and PFMC recommendation. Models in NOF meetings have different exploitation rates listed for species. Post Lynwood LCR natural chinook ER Option 1 - 40.5%, Option 2 - 39%, Option 3 - 38%. Current line increases impact to species with ER concerns.

- Recommend to move line to marker 11 to reduce impacts, line used by commercial fishers in the past during spring sturgeon fisheries.

Years to come fisheries could be reduced; moving line may not be the biggest issue to be concerned with. Increases to 4 fish bag has contributed to impacts.

Chad: Data been collecting has enable us to see where the impacts have been occurring.

Why are the ocean fisheries still taking unmarked chinook? WB only impacted 27 chinook, why terminal rec. being impacted the most?

Chad: Ocean options are statewide issue; options are the lowest fisheries retention that have been proposed in many years.

What were the commercial impacts from 2012?

Chad: Past fisheries do not help with current 2018 NOF process.

- Draw line from Leadbetter Point to Toke Point.

Who will model savings from boundary changes?

Chad: Will discuss options with modelers.

- Leadbetter Point to marker 13. Could trade off wild Willapa fish to ocean fishers.

Chad: Line changes could help with impacts and impact conservation objectives of Willapa fish.

Modeling Discussion Option E & F

Advisor Suggestions:

1. Steve option E
2. Francis prefers either option
3. Lance would like to fish in 2N if possible. Not interested in R. Willing to give up later fishery for balance. Confused on hatchery Chum salmon returns. Why difference between modeling in GH? Need to analyze the 3-stream method versus 9-stream.

Chad: Return is low because the fish are not marked and many go to the spawning ground versus returning to the hatchery. WB and GH use different methods for forecasting. Need funding to expand to 9-stream.

4. Andy prefers option F. One Coho bag in marine area.
5. Greg prefers option F and not interested in R. Work backwards from October dates, remove days. See if that will improve time in N. Make commercial fishing days 24-hour days. Not willing to add tangle nets, only to front end. Please draw the old rec. line on the map and distribute at later date.

6. Tim why would tangle net not help to elongate season. Option E preference. Allow commercials to retain Chum all the way through season. Two fish bag limit for Coho and 1 wild Coho in FW. Request Norm record everything that Ron Warren, Director Scott and acting director say at PFMC in Portland.
7. Marlisa either option is good. F follows more of commission recommendation. Not in agreement with more commercial fishing earlier in the season for N. Like to see how it models out for impacts. Spreading out the season is better idea.
8. Norm concerned conservation issues, from 2015. Concerned with Coho numbers using 2-bag limit, prefer 1 bag limit. If rec. line is moved back, what does it do to the model? Numbers will change in the model. Rec. priority for the Chinook will change. Would like to know what the changes will be in the model if the line is moved. If line moves, will need conference call with advisors and let public listen in. Overall prefers either option.

Public Testimony:

Art Holman:

- Before line is moved should go with hatchery fish retention only, keep off wild stock.
- If we move the line, the sport fisheries will be gone.

