

**SUMMARY MINUTES
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
MARCH 2, 1997
RED LION HOTEL, PORTLAND, OR
MEETING #48**

2:00 pm March 2, 1997

McIsaac: I convene the 48th meeting of the Klamath Fishery Management Council (KFMC). Let's bring the meeting to order, and introduce the members.

Members present: Nat Bingham, Dave Bitts, Rob Collins (for L. B. Boydston), Hal Cribbs (for Virginia Bostwick), Troy Fletcher, Jerry Grover, Paul Kirk, Pliny McCovey, Donald McIsaac, Rod McInnis, Keith Wilkinson

Other speakers: Jerry Barnes, Rich Dixon, Mike Orcutt, Dave Webb, Jim Welter

1. Review, approve agenda

McIsaac: Is there any input for today's agenda?

Wilkinson: I would like to insert a report on the disposition of the mid-program review that took place at the last Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force (KTF) meeting.

McIsaac: Let's put it between Items 2 and 3.

Grover: I have a question regarding estimated ocean landings of Klamath fall chinook for the 1996 management season. We've had pieces of data but not the whole table presented to us. Can we get it all in the record?

McIsaac: Jerry Barnes, can we fit it under #9? We are interested in details on where were they caught. What was the catch in the ocean of Klamath fish last year?

Barnes: There are limited data I can give you. Rich Dixon has it. He will be here this afternoon.

Grover: My other question, Mr. Chairman, regarding the 1996 management season: how had the megatable been changed by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)? How had it been modified regarding the late returning spring chinook salmon?

McIsaac: Let's include this under Agendum 9.

Grover: For the 1997 management season: given the projection is low overall, the numbers for projected five-year-olds is 7200 fish. There was a late harvest last year of about 2500 fish. Have they been taken into account? Can we get that information?

McIsaac: We'll also put that under #9.

2. Review handouts (staff)

Agendum 3: A) Letter from Blair Hart, President, Shasta River CRMP, dated February 26, 1997

Agendum 9: B) Ocean Stock Size Projections and Appropriate Harvest Levels for Klamath River Fall

Chinook, 1997 Season (February 24, 1997)

C) Revised Page 8 of Ocean Stock Size Projections and Appropriate Harvest Levels for Klamath River Fall Chinook, 1997 Season

D) Klamath Fall Chinook Population Parameters

E) 1996 Ocean Landings

Agendum 10: F) Memorandum from Rich Dixon, CDFG: Calibration of the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) for 1997

G) Harvest Model Results (3 pages)

Agendum 11: H) Harvest Rate Model Results (2 pages)

Agendum 16 I) Klamath Ocean Harvest Model Run, 3/2/97, (1997 with 1996 Season)

Agendum 19 J) Proposed Initial Salmon Management Options for 1997 Non-Indian Fisheries (SAS Report B.3)

Agendum 20 K) Klamath Ocean Harvest Model Run, 3/5/97

L) Klamath Ocean Harvest Model Run, 3/2/97, (Calibration Run)

3. Correspondence with the Shasta River CRMP (Fletcher)

Fletcher: I haven't fully drafted a letter, but I'll have time to run a draft by you later this week. I talked to Dave Webb and Blair Hart, and told them we have an interest in meeting with them on harvest issues to follow through on our commitment made last September. I said it's fair for us to ask them questions, too, about habitat management, to move forward to educate each other.

This new letter [Handout A] raises new questions. Dave Webb did a detailed analysis, and we need to look good at it. I don't know if we can answer this question in such a short time. I want to run Webb's analysis by my staff, and it would be appropriate for Jerry Barnes and the Technical Advisory Team (TAT) to look at it too. I can get written words this week, but I need time for technical analysis.

McIsaac: This letter [Handout A] is dated February 26, 1997, but I just saw it seconds ago. I concur with Troy. There is quite a lot of work and thought in this letter. We do need to take this seriously. I suggest members take time, look at the work, and that Troy expose us to a draft on our agenda for Tuesday evening. This would allow members to have their staffs look at this before Tuesday.

Fletcher: It's encouraging someone did all this work. I commend Dave Webb.

McIsaac: I ask staff to modify the agenda to look into this.

Added Agendum: Mid-program review of Klamath River Basin Restoration Program

Wilkinson: At the KTF meeting last month, the subcommittee to develop and distribute the Request for Proposals (RFP) and recommend a contractor for the mid-program review (which I chaired) recommended a contractor for selection, but this was not initially accepted by the KTF. Finally, after significant discussion, the contract with Kier and Associates was approved, after striking items 9.1 and 9.2. The selection subcommittee is now done.

The KTF appointed an oversight committee, which will be chaired by Troy Fletcher.

Fletcher: I want to talk to Ron about contracting requirements. I hope to have the oversight subcommittee meet around April 18, 1997. Harvest monitoring efforts [in items 9.1 and 9.2] were taken out of the RFP. We should consider a mid-program review for this body (the KFMC). I was opposed to the RFP, because I thought harvest and management and escapement goals should have gone to this body, not the KTF.

McIsaac: Is there further discussion? I ask staff put this on a future agenda.

Before we get to Item #4, I want to add for the record that I have a letter from the Yurok Tribe designating Troy Fletcher as their representative on the KFMC, and a faxed letter from Virginia Bostwick saying she had an accident on the way here, and that Hal Cribbs will sit in for her.

4. Report from the Trinity River Task Force, including steps taken to fund monitoring required for harvest management (Grover)

Grover: The Trinity River Task Force (TRTF) reported two things on the table. One was the completion of a 12-year flow study. It is on the street now, for peer review. It will be completed in time for the Secretary to make recommendations for the 1998 water year. Simultaneously, the programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be out in May for implementation in September. The second thing was budgetary. The extension of the Trinity River Act authorized the restoration program through 1998, but no new money was added. Funding is subject to the committee that sees the water and science budget. There was money available in 1997 to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the Hoopa Valley Tribe, and the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR).

Regarding reauthorization of the Trinity Act: the Secretary seeks appropriation for the evaluation process after restoration is complete. The Coastal California Field Office is identifying monitoring and evaluation appropriation needs for Fiscal Year 1999.

Bits: Last fall you said you were retiring soon. Have you groomed a replacement to shepherd these appropriations in a timely manner, so this effort can continue?

Grover: I will be sending a letter of resignation to the Secretary because of my impending retirement. Cynthia Barry of my staff will serve as an interim replacement. She is an associate manager in our endangered species program. She should be a good candidate for that.

Bits: So in this respect, she will have big shoes to fill.

5. Report from the Klamath River Fisheries Task Force, including steps taken to fund monitoring required for harvest management (Bingham)

Bingham: My best wishes to Jerry Grover. I do not have much to report. We have the issue of full funding for harvest management under discussion. The KTF feels that the necessary funds should be sought and obtained by the agencies doing data collection. The KTF feels its funds are for the purposes of restoration. We're ready to act if there is a shortfall nonetheless.

McIsaac: I feel we have piecemealed together stopgap measures to keep the fishery sampling going the past couple of years. For the short term, the TRTF component is still going and the KTF isn't going away. Is the situation that there is no long-term security, but no immediate crisis?

Wilkinson: These crises erupt during the budget process, and that throws the budget process out of kilter. First the

KTF's Technical Work Group (TWG) assigns priorities to projects, then the budget committee does a lot of work assigning values to those various agendas, then after all that this other issue gets thrown in there. I have had some suggestions in the past. I suggest the Five Chairs discuss this issue. And I suggest we start this effort one year in advance, so we don't run into this crunch right at the time we need to secure funding for those programs. It shatters a lot of excellent work in the budget process.

6. Council discussion

Grover: When I was in DC years back working on the original legislation for the Klamath River Basin Fishery Restoration Program, it was a 20-year program authorized for \$21 million. We use \$1 million a year. After 20 years, we will still be left with \$1 million. If we could spread that out over six or seven years during the remainder of the life of the program, we could get \$1.14 million a year instead, and that could offset inflation and be dedicated to some of these crucial projects.

Bingham: Thanks for the reminder Jerry. Perhaps we could use it to cover half of our annual obligation to the Portland office, because we don't get a million a year; we send \$80,000 off the top to the USFWS.

McIsaac: Has the appropriation been made and is not subject to any decision-making in Congress?

Grover: Not quite. With a 20 year cycle, we will have \$1 million left over. If we would seek it, we could split the \$1 million up beginning in the 1999 budget cycle, which would give us six years to divvy it up between. I think we have enough support in the Klamath Basin to make it happen.

Fletcher: We've identified bigger funding needs than that at our last KTF meeting, plus the flow study effort being initiated. We need a unified effort to get funding for Klamath monitoring. When you compare the Trinity and the Klamath, there is a little inequity there.

McIsaac: These are good ideas. Staff, remind me to see that it is brought up at next Five Chairs meeting.

7. Public comment

Welter: I am Jim Welter from Brookings, Oregon. I brought you mail from the Klamath Coalition, Oregon South Coast Fishermen. I would like to see the KFMC have a spring meeting where we look over proposals and projected abundance, and hold that meeting in an impacted coastal community.

Kirk: We just had that meeting in Santa Rosa. For the last two years, this meeting has not been held in the Klamath Management Zone (KMZ) area, in order to coincide with the CDFG meeting in Santa Rosa. But that excludes a lot of user group people. Let's consider having a Brookings or Eureka location for next year's early spring meeting. The people in the Zone area are right. We tag our meeting with the CDFG public meeting to exchange information for our use. We need to let the Zone fishermen attend that KFMC meeting and hear that preliminary information.

McIsaac: I concur. In addition to these letters, I have received heat from some Oregon constituents who do not live near Santa Rosa. I think the last three years we have had work group meetings in Santa Rosa, but only this year had a full Council meeting there. I am sympathetic to having the meeting in the Zone area next spring, even though it is less convenient for KFMC members.

Further comments?

Webb: I'm Dave Webb from the Shasta River CRMP. Thank you for your comments on our letters. We anxiously await hearing your feelings on this latest letter, individually or collectively. We are curious how or if

what we see here is actual.

McIsaac: Thank you for your very good writing. Do you have more copies?

Webb: Yes, but they aren't in color.

McIsaac: You have gone to considerable expense to put this together already. Staff, make color copies for the TAT. Dave, on Tuesday evening my biologist could talk to you if you are still here.

Fletcher: Dave, I don't see this happening fast. Maybe we could have you come to a TAT meeting on this issue.

Webb: It is important for me to report back to our group whether there is a serious response from you, or what the sense of the Council is on whether this is legitimate or not.

Orcutt: I'm Mike Orcutt, Hoopa Valley Tribe. I want to comment on agenda items #4 and #5. To add to Jerry Grover's report: since 1995 scientists in the Trinity River Basin monitoring group have identified tasks including activities required for harvest management. A couple of reports have come out, including budgets through Fiscal Year 1999.

Regarding Agendum 5: we need to have a similar endeavor on the Klamath side. George Kautsky is the subcommittee chair on the Trinity and has talked to the Klamath TWG on what is needed for stock age composition data, spawning escapements, that sort of thing. The Trinity has a well-developed process to identify monitoring needs including budgets. The Klamath Basin also needs that. The Hatfield Coordinating Committee, like the Five Chairs, calls for legislative coordination of groups from the upper basin to the estuary. This is an opportunity to identify needs in monitoring and funding mechanisms.

McIsaac: Questions? More public comment? Seeing none, the comment period is closed.

9. Additional information on stock size projections, and anticipated issues and constraints, to augment reports presented at the February 18, 1997 meeting (TAT, Council members)

McIsaac: Jerry Barnes?

Barnes: Rich Dixon just brought out a handout showing pre- and post- landings from last year. Rich?

Dixon: Here it is on a handout [Handout E].

McIsaac: Jerry (Grover), does this answer your question?

Grover: Yes.

McIsaac: Are there any comments from the Council relative to the actual performance relative to the expected?

Bits: I'm surprised to see so many areas where landings were lower than expected. The outstanding is exception Southern California (SOC) fours and north of Coos Bay (NOR) fours. Overall, it appears harvest on fours is closer to 12%. Is that correct?

Dixon: Yes.

Bingham: What is the run contribution rate? It seems you could get that if you take threes and fours out of all

stocks landings to see, for example, what the percentage of Klamath stock was in the SOC fishery or NOR. It will increase understanding of this issue.

Dixon: Jerry (Barnes) will give you data showing contribution rates.

McIsaac: The pattern of abundance of fours is higher than expected in the most northerly and southerly cells, but the central areas are lower. Are the sampling and coded wire tags (CWT) of juveniles up to snuff? Are these estimates as good as we've had in the past?

Dixon: Sampling was low in one Oregon case. In California we generally pool strata to achieve an expansion factor greater than 16.6. In Coos Bay, sampling of age fives was 4% (22 tags). If you calculate that through with the expansion, it equals the whole catch. About 850 fish. There are questions why the age-fives were so high. It was a function of sampling and expansion.

McIsaac: Except for that, was sampling as good as any other year? Were juveniles tagged at an acceptable rate?

Dixon: Yes, I haven't heard otherwise. Just this one case stood out very obviously.

McIsaac: Why don't we look at the fives question now?

Barnes: We added another revision of the stock projection [Handout B]. Page 8, Table 3, is still subject to review. Discard that other single page handout [Handout C]-- it is actually the same. This note at the bottom of Page 8 says there were an abnormally high number of fall fours. As of September 1, they are called fives. In past years, those fall fish would be deducted from the ocean allocation of the following year. We have chosen to ignore a lot of possible permutations of this information. The consensus of three of us on the TAT is on Page 8. In September, 69% of the recoveries were from the Coos Bay and Northern Oregon cells. We assumed if fish followed their normal migration pattern from south to north, then they would have already passed the mouth of the Klamath and becomes fives on September 1. That is our current conclusion. There are other considerations...if you take the projected harvest rate and divide it into the number of fours, you come out with some rather large numbers. There are some typos on the bottom of Page 8. Under the footnote, where it says 1998-1995, it should be 1989-1995. It should say summer, not "simmer" equivalents. There are discrepancies between the summary sheet and the text, but we can settle that now.

This was a consensus of four TAT members, including Mike Maahs. If there are further analyses or adjustments needed, we can ask Rich Dixon this afternoon.

McIsaac: Regarding age fives: there were 83 recoveries of tags in the ocean in this age class: 14 were in Oregon (10 in NOR, 1 in Coos Bay, 3 in the KMZ). The dates of those recoveries were just behind the first of September. One was recovered on September 2, and one on September 6, and the remaining recoveries were between September 9 and October 6. There doesn't seem to be a lot of tags in the Oregon group that were migrating down to the mouth of the Klamath River. The bigger answer probably comes from California, in the rest of the eighty-some tags.

Barnes: Does Rich have data with him to separate by time the CWT recoveries?

Dixon: No--maybe we can provide that on Tuesday's meeting.

Barnes: We have the distribution of the total recovery in the fall fishery by Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) zone.

Bits: I am concerned that the ledger balance here one way or another. Whether fours or fives, they should be charged to the appropriate year. I have heard three different suggestions from TAT members on how to approach this. One has been noted here; another is by time, (make the break later than normal since the run was late), and the third was to break it out by hatchery. It may be that Trinity fours in the ocean are less likely to winter over as fives than those from Iron Gate. I hope the whole TAT can come to some agreement on the best approach. The danger is if we predict 100,000 fives and only 5,000 showed up. It would look bad if ocean fisheries are charged with a large number of last fall's catch against this year's five-year-olds, and the prediction for five-year-old abundance does not correspond with that charge. That's the situation we are in now. If 1800 of the fish were five year olds, it doesn't make sense that we caught 25% of what is going to be in the ocean this year. If you look at the tag recoveries of '93 brood year fish, which are this year's fours, there are less than 400. There are 43,000 predicted. There were 2,500 '92 brood year fish caught, (this year's fives), expanded from tag recoveries. 7,200 predicted. That difference in the harvest rate, between fish that are all fully vulnerable, doesn't make sense.

Barnes: Mr. Chairman, we don't bring the whole TAT here unless there's a specific task. We used to bring the TAT when we had to change the harvest share almost hourly. For the last two years we haven't had to. We have four members here- 3/4 of the team. We are capable of doing the analysis you're asking for. Mr. Bingham, when does the Salmon Technical Team (STT) get busy with options from Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS)? Will tomorrow morning be free?

Bingham: As soon as the options are brought to the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) on Tuesday, they are given to the STT for collation and assembly to be reviewed by the PFMC Wednesday.

Barnes: Since the STT has prepared the pre-season report, and they had the stock prediction in those numbers, which is a PFMC document, the KFMC could pass it back to the STT which may not be reasonable and the STT will say they can't handle it. Or members of TAT that are here can work on it, and give it to the KFMC on Tuesday, to get at some decision on whether to change the numbers. Whatever comes out of the KFMC will go to the PFMC, which will have the STT analyze it.

McIsaac: I suggest TAT give us a copy of the extra information that we have not seen yet. Rich can look at the dates of recovery between now and Tuesday and if there is a legitimate issue, TAT can discuss it with the STT. As it stands now, TAT is recommending no change.

Bits: [Inaudible]

McIsaac: Have these 2500 been subtracted off?

Dixon: If so, what would the allowable harvest be? The information Jerry handed out doesn't include fall catches except the overall catch. The TAT needs to review accounting for age fives caught in the fall fishery relative to calculating the starting age-five estimate. This is briefly explained in the stock projection report. Age fives caught in fall are subtracted from the estimate of fish still out in the ocean prior to estimating the overwinter survival against the base start population.

McIsaac: It sounds like the five-year-old question will be played out over the next 48 hours.

McCovey: Looking at these data from May to August: were any of these salmon spring chinook? I think a similar table could be developed for that off the CWT's. It would be good for us to look at that information.

Dixon: Are you suggesting some of these were age-five spring chinook?

McCovey: No. I'm talking about fish caught in May. Maybe we can make the table reflect some of the spring fishery.

McIsaac: In Santa Rosa we did talk about maybe coming up with a table of annual spring chinook ocean catches by area using scales.

Bits: We in the ocean fishery assume we don't catch springers, because we don't fish anywhere near the Klamath in May; we're below San Francisco or above Coos Bay, but that might not be right. We need to take a look at that.

Fletcher: Are we getting this analysis now? I'd like that information, but I know Rich is a busy man. I will offer Dave Hillemeier to help.

McIsaac: I thought from Santa Rosa that this was not a deliverable for this week.

Fletcher: This is important, because we're doing spring management plans and this helps us. We need this information for fully responsible harvest management plans.

McIsaac: Now regarding the handling of spring chinook in the fall chinook megatable... Jerry Grover brought this up. Jerry, would you like to rephrase that question?

Grover: I was concerned it was unfinished business. I thought we were going to have a report on the megatable being adjusted for late spring fish showing up last fall.

Fletcher: Spring fish in our fishery showed up late. There was a question about time to the hatcheries, and what happened between the lower river fisheries and the hatcheries.

Barnes: CWT's were recovered late in fisheries, and they were distributed between falls and springs in December. This was resolved. We're comfortable that the numbers in the fall fishery are fall chinook.

McIsaac: To sum up what came out of Santa Rosa: there were tagged fish caught in August with the tags saying spring chinook. People thought the tags might be false. No spring tags were taken, however, during the fall spawning period in the hatchery or the river. So those springs must have made it up to the hatchery before the cut off date. Those springs were then taken off the megatable for fall chinook.

Barnes: There was an interagency meeting where they decided what to do with those late season fish. That took place before megatable was done.

Fletcher: Dave Hillemeier wrote a memo summarizing that. We'll get a copy to Jerry Grover.

McIsaac: Any more Jerry (Barnes)?

Barnes: No.

10. Adjustment for equal outputs from the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model and the Harvest Rate Model (Dixon)

McIsaac: Rich Dixon?

Dixon: I want to address three pages in [Handout G]. On Page 1 there is a Harvest Rate Model (HRM) run of

3/12/96 where shares were allocated tribal/nontribal 50/50. On Page 2 is a Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) run. It should say "1996 PFMC-adopted non-tribal split .15/.85 river/ocean." On Page 3 is another KOHM run that says "1996 April SAS Option 4/9/96".

Page 1 is the HRM we used for the catch, with 50/50 sharing tribal/nontribal. You see the adult ocean harvest is 88,447. If you look at the KOHM run on Page 2, you can see Klamath adult ocean landings are 88,400. So the models did match up last year in the final runs. There was some confusion, because at the end of that last PFMC meeting in April, (see Page 3), the 1996 April SAS Option had Klamath adult ocean landings at 91,400. There was concern that the two models didn't agree, but in the end they actually did. There will be times when they don't, because the two models estimate Klamath harvest differently. The HRM is a very simplistic model. The KOHM is a more sophisticated model that uses exploitation rates for the five base years, scaled to relative stock abundances. TAT would like suggestions from the Council on how to proceed when they do not match.

Fletcher: A letter we wrote to the Council had some suggestions for actions to make them match up. I want to get that to the TAT. It could be used as the first straw man on how to address that.

Barnes: In our last meeting, the TAT agreed it can be done, either using the method outlined in Fletcher's letter or a modification of it. We can find a process to balance the KOHM and the HRM.

11. Preliminary analysis of the harvest allocation proposed by the California In-River Sport Fishing Community (TAT)

McIsaac: In Santa Rosa, we gave a modeling assignment to the TAT to do hindcasting of 1/3 1/3 1/3 non-tribal sharing for the years 1995 and 1992, to represent big and small population years.

Dixon: Look at pages 1 and 2 [Handout H]. Page 1 shows the model run that applies for this year. The allocations to tribal/non-tribal are about 21,600 each. Of the 21,579 non-tribal harvest, 15% (or about 3,200 fish) goes to in-river sport under management for a spawner floor of 35,000. Now for a non-tribal allocation of 1/3 to in-river sport, 1/3 to ocean sport and 1/3 to ocean commercial, see Page 2.

McIsaac: My notes say a non-tribal allocation of 1/3 to in-river sport, 1/3 to the KMZ, 1/3 to outside the KMZ. So San Francisco and Newport would be in the 1/3 outside the KMZ. That's what my notes say, but I understand there was a letter proposing what you describe.

Dixon: Unfortunately, I didn't have time to do the years 1992 and 1995. But on Page 2 you can see what would happen under that scenario. The ocean harvest rate would drop from 12.2% to about 8.6%. In-river sport would get about 6,900 fish and the ocean adult harvest would be 13,800, down from 18,300. The tribal/non-tribal shares would fall from 21,600 each to about 20,700 each.

McIsaac: Does this address the question of 1/3 in KMZ and 1/3 in non-KMZ?

Dixon: No. That would be done with the KOHM.

Cribbs: The proposal was that the allocation be split between the ocean sport/ocean commercial/ in-river. That was the proposal. On Page 2, there is a reduction from 21,580 to 20,683. Why does the Indian harvest rate go down? They should get 50% off the top. How can they have a reduction in their fishery if we aren't impacting their fishery?

Dixon: It's an effect of where the fish are caught. If all the fish were caught in the river, the harvest would substantially drop. I need to review a little more on that.

McIsaac: There are three-year-olds in the ocean that would never make it to the river. It's because of this maturity schedule change that you see this drop.

Cribbs: I understand that you lose fish that would never come up the river. That is outside of the harvest allocation. If there was a 50% allocation of the fish to the Indians under this year's proposed scenario, the mere fact that you changed the ocean harvest, split between sport and commercial, and allocated 1/3 of the fish to the in-river... Don't you have to prorate that, because you are only dealing with two-thirds of the harvest in the ocean? You are reducing the ocean harvest collectively, and therefore you are not impacting the inriver harvest of those fish that you say are lost to the fishery, because you are not counting them now. Is that true?

Dixon: I must think about this.

Fletcher: I can see how those two are different. I was going to say don't worry about that drop from our perspective. It is a concern to me, but don't let that keep you from discussion of this option.

Bits: Twenty percent of the fish taken in the ocean as threes would have died from over winter natural mortality if not caught. This is the HRM not the KOHM, so it doesn't show the effect on the commercial fishery of this reduction. In-river and ocean sport shares currently are about the same, 15%, and ocean commercial is about 70%. This would cut the commercial share by over 50%. If you cut our allotment in half, we'll have to close all fisheries above Point Reyes even in the best year. The port of Bodega Bay, with the largest landings of any single port, would be lost as a salmon port. And this would give in-river sport a share which historically they haven't been able to catch when there were no quotas.

Cribbs: Regarding the CDFG proceeding with the candidate status of spring-run Sacramento salmon: has the effect of further restrictions been looked at on commercial ocean sport?

Another question: Taking a look at Page 6 of the stock size projections, at least half the time there has been a margin of error of 100,000 fish for three-year-olds. That is a substantial error. A quarter of the time there were less fish than estimated. About 47% of the time it was a substantial underestimate. Do I assume that the data from '85-'88 aren't looked at in your ten year average? Do you have a more sophisticated projection method now, or are you still using the same approach as in the years 1985-1996?

Dixon: Right now we use simple linear regression of age-tuos in the river the year before. It hasn't been precise, but the alternatives haven't been any better. We aren't closed to an alternative method, but use this because it's the best we have.

McIsaac: Regarding the first part of Hal's question, I pass to Mr. Collins and the CDFG seat. Will the Department be advocating further restrictions in the ocean for protection of Sacramento spring chinook in 1997?

Collins: We don't have an answer.

Cribbs: I'm wondering, with the tremendous impact the Sacramento winter run chinook had, and with the numbers of spring run, will this have an impact on the decisions that this Council ought to consider?

Bingham: Regarding jurisdiction: that's the state listing process and might affect California Fish and Game Commission (F&G Commission) jurisdiction. Federal waters aren't affected. This is not a federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) listing. The Sacramento Index dropped from the mid-seventies to 64% after winter run protection last spring, so some protection for spring run might already be in place. The length adjustment has given some protection

Cribbs: The F&G Commission wasn't wanting to list winter run, but then they did and set up draconian protection measures. Political pressures on the F&G Commission are going to have substantial effects on in-river harvest and state water harvest of Sacramento spring run fish.

McIsaac: Rich, I have a question on Page 1. The ocean harvest rate was 12%. Referring to the fives question we talked about earlier, if catch was zero the previous fall, how would that change this 12% ocean harvest rate?

Dixon: It would probably let it come up a little, because it would reduce the ocean landings by that amount.

McIsaac: It might rise to 13% or 14%?

Dixon: Not more than that.

McIsaac: Let's take a short break, then have a public comment period, then develop motions for a range of management options for discussion by the SAS or as a recommendation to the PFMC, as they will be looking at the beginnings of a range of options to move out to the public on Friday.

Break

13. Public comment

McIsaac: Are there any public comments? None seen, we close the comment period, and open up to council discussion.

12. Council discussion

Kirk: This is regarding the letter [Handout O from the February 18, 1997 KFMC meeting] from the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force, which represents resort owners and related industries in the lower Klamath [a group different from the KTF]. I asked folks in Willow and Weaver creeks to come to a meeting to discuss this, and 12 people came. They represented the river from Hoopa to Weaverville, including Trinity County Supervisor Matt Leffler. Two comments were made after showing them the letter with this proposal. First, they were concerned about their credibility with this Council and ocean fishermen, because they didn't know in advance about this proposal and no guides or business owners at the meeting were involved in it. They want me to say today that this proposal didn't come from them; it's from the Klamath Camp area. Second, they asked me whether I thought the ocean recreational fishermen would support any increase above 15%. I said that after the ordeal last year, and after this Council and the counties got behind 15%, I didn't think so. I have two hats because I represent them and the ocean people. I also said I couldn't take this proposal back to the county board of supervisors and support it. These upriver people want me to say they want the in-river share to stay at 15%. Virginia's seat is supposed to represent all those folks, not just those represented in this letter. There is heartburn here, because the entire constituent base isn't behind this.

McIsaac: I have a copy of a letter dated February 24, 1997, signed by Sandy Crockett. Any remarks Paul?

Kirk: The Klamath Fisheries Coalition fishermen met in Brookings at the same time I was meeting with Trinity, Weaverville and Willow Creek fisherman. This letter to Robert Treanor, executive director of the F&G Commission, opposes the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force recommendation for a 3-way split in 1997, when the stock projection is critically low. There is no way the KMZ ports can support this.

Cribbs: First, I think two years ago, the lower river folks especially levied a serious criticism: we don't know what you want ahead of time. Why can't you get your ideas on the table early for discussion? What the river sportsmen want is sufficient fish allotted to sportsmen so that there can be a reasonable season, and year to year

they can know if they can make bookings. Second, when the 3-way recommendation was made, it was thought that with the 50/50 tribal/non-tribal decision it was a good time to open discussion. Third, the information on allocations wasn't available until Santa Rosa. How do you split up those 3500 fish? Forty-four percent go to above Clear Creek, so about 1700 fish go to the lower river. That's a very short season. Those resort owners felt the brunt of this year's storms, and are concerned about staying in business. They need a season or quota that will insure their fishing through Labor Day. They need to be able to respond when people ask if there will be enough fish to make vacation plans. I appreciate the statistical information presented here. I want to open the debate

Bits: In support of Hal's later comments, that sounds the same as what the recreational KMZ people have been saying for 15 years. I hope the Council will help with that.

McIsaac: I ask our tribal representatives regarding the drop in tribal share on pages 1 and 2: what reaction can we expect from you?

Fletcher: I meant to be unclear. There are some issues the non-tribals need to work out: 1) I'm interested in the outcome, 2) where you catch the fish affects how many fish you catch, 3) I don't want to be in the middle of your discussion. We'll comment later when you're done.

McCovey: I think the proposal has merits, and has drawbacks. How it affects us is what happens in the ocean with threes and fours. There are differences in years in the age composition of fish coming in. Some years it gives more opportunities for escapement and for tribal and in-river sport fisheries. I think we do need to take a good look at this. We want to be on the side of the resource. When you work with minimums, that's what you end up with. Things don't always turn out the way you predict, so the tribe prefers to err on the side of conservation.

Fletcher: We too have the need for stability and predictability and are affected by how well resorts do. We feel your pain, and we face some of the same things.

Bingham: We have the next three days to set the sideboards of the discussion and give that to the SAS and TAT. I encourage the user representatives here to have discussions in order to move toward the goal of a stable season, rather than playing hardball with percentages. Perhaps the Harvest Allocation Work Group (HAWG) might host it. By mid-week we could get somewhere if we approach it with good will and use this opportunity.

McIsaac: We had a meeting of the Oregon Salmon User Group in Newport on Wednesday, and discussed a different variation: 1/3 allocation in-river, 1/3 to the KMZ, and 1/3 outside the KMZ. This reduced the harvest overall significantly. So much acrimony last year resulted from the decision to allocate 15%, why start this so soon? Why is the share you are proposing so large, when the in-river sport fishery didn't meet their quota last year? Firm dates on the fishery and no abrupt closures was what we shot for last year in the KMZ, and we took some risk and pruned back the full quota to try that, and it seemed to work. We anticipated a 2.5% Klamath impact in the KMZ, and it came out 1%. There was a firm season within the normal bounds of allocation, and it seemed to work. Secure seasons can be less than 7 days/week. To secure known dates, we cannot get locked into percentages and traditional paradigms.

Cribbs: One issue I would like input on: several years ago we increased the jack harvest in the in-river sport fishery. I think had four or five available to the in-river sport fishery. If we had enhanced sampling to better understand the effect of additional jack harvest, we might be able to use them. Maybe we can talk about this.

Fletcher: We are cautious about that, because you start talking about hook-and-release fisheries and high water temperatures exacerbating mortality rates. We recommended some changes to the F&G Commission, and the

CDFG made some changes. We must be aware of the implications of increased hook-and-release fisheries.

I request that the Council write a letter asking the F&G Commission to adopt similar time lines to the PFMC process. This is the second year in a row of difficulty resolving this issue. It affects our ability to come up with solid harvest management plans when we have that unknown out there.

McIsaac: Let's entertain motions.

14. Council action: develop a range of options for the 1997 management season for discussion with Salmon Advisory Subpanel; assign TAT to analyze technical feasibility of options

Cribbs: Regarding our earlier discussion involving the North-Coast folks: part of the problem is getting information from the F&G Commission. We sent a letter to the F&G Commission asking that they speed up the process by 30-45 days. We support that. The F&G Commission should hold one of its hearings on this issue on the north coast, either Redding or Eureka.

Fletcher: **I make a motion that the chair send a letter asking that F&G Commission activities related to allocation be more friendly to the time line of the KFMC and PFMC.***** If anyone wants to make specific amendments, feel free.

Cribbs: **I suggest it say specifically that there be February and March meetings.*****

McIsaac: **Further discussion indicated the letter call for a meeting held on the north coast.*****

Bitts: **I second.*****

Kirk: Mr. Treanor, executive director of the F&G Commission, stated two weeks ago in Santa Rosa that the reason they changed to the April, May, June scenario is that someone requested that in the past. They have already set and noticed all the dates for this year, in far away places like Alturas and Bridgeport. Mr. Treanor said he would be willing to have a conference call scenario. **Ask them for the conference call mechanism for this year.*****

McIsaac: Troy, my thinking was that the motion was for the next go-round. Was it?

Fletcher: I'm open to anything. The main thing is they need to recognize the discomfort it causes us here.

McIsaac: **The motion is for a letter to the F&G Commission, recommending for future schedules they be consistent with the KFMC and PFMC process, suggest February or March meetings, ask that they consider conference calls for 1997, and future meeting locations on the North Coast. Call the question.**

[Motion passes with members approving and abstaining]***

McIsaac: **Motion: for 1997 that fall chinook be shared 50/50 fish for fish tribal/non-tribal, and the non-tribal sharing be 15% for in-river, 17% for KMZ sport and the balance to other ocean areas, as in 1996.*****

Wilkinson: **I second.*****

Cribbs: **I request we table this motion to give additional time to talk between now and Wednesday.*****

Bits: The trouble with tabling this is that while those discussions would be beneficial, we'll miss the train for developing options for ocean fisheries for 1997, which is the function of the PFMC meeting this week. The SAS must have options to report to the Council Tuesday morning to give to Dr. Henry (of the STT). I think if we came up with something different later during the week it could be accommodated.

Cribbs: Without conferring with Ms. Bostwick, I would have to vote no on that motion at this time. I would hate to see us locked into something without the opportunity for further discussion.

McInnis: You are asking for a modeling of last year's allocation? This isn't departing from past practice, and it would be part of the package. I'm in favor of getting it on the table and moving on.

McIsaac: The intent of the motion was more than just modeling; it was to stabilize the management considerations now while continuing efforts to move toward some of the things Hal brought up. After this I would make a motion that we get to the base of the in-river request, so we can get to their need without shaking up the entire process.

Bits: Usually we come out of the March PFMC meetings with 3 options that have to meet public review. What you have proposed could be one of the 3 options.

McIsaac: This motion doesn't prohibit the other options being different.

Bingham: The PFMC runs on a tight calendar through the week. I urge that we don't veto that option, but allow it to go forward.

Cribbs: I again request to table the motion until additional discussions take place.***

Fletcher : I request a five minute caucus.

McIsaac: Let's take five minutes and then reconvene.

Break

Collins: I second the motion to table the motion.***

McIsaac: Call the question.

[Motion to table passes with members approving and abstaining]***

Cribbs: I make a motion that the Council recommend for consideration by the PFMC as an option that sharing of the non-tribal portion of Klamath fall chinook be allocated 1/3 to the ocean sport fishery, 1/3 to the ocean commercial fishery without location specified, and 1/3 to the in-river recreational fishery.***

McIsaac: I second for discussion.***

Bits: Will this be put through the KOHM to scrutinize its effect on ocean fisheries?

McIsaac: Yes.

McInnis: Clarification: this motion is to recommend to the PFMC, and analyze this scenario. This is to be one option, but not necessarily the only option recommended.

Cribbs: Yes

Wilkinson: **The implications of this motion are great. I move to table this motion.*****

Kirk: **I second to table the motion.*****

McIsaac: Discussion? Call the question.

[Motion to table the motion fails with members approving, opposing, and abstaining]***

Cribbs: I make a motion that this group reconvene on this specific issue alone at 7:00 am tomorrow to allow discussion this evening.

Bits: Don't we still have the other motion on the floor, since the motion to table your motion failed?

McIsaac: We are back to the 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 motion.

Bingham: Call the question.

McIsaac: The question has been called for. The motion of 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 as described by Hal Cribbs.

[Motion fails with members approving, opposing, and abstaining]***

Bingham: **I move to remove the original motion relative to last year's sharing from tabling.*****

Wilkinson: **I second.*****

Grover: This was to recommend that the Council's recommendation to the PFMC would be the same percentages of allocation as last year?

McIsaac: Yes. The original motion was tabled, and there was a motion to bring it back from tabling that was seconded. Discussion on the motion to bring it back?

McInnis: If this motion were brought back on the table, would it be open for amendment?

McIsaac: Yes, I believe.

Bingham: That is correct.

McIsaac: Further discussion? Call the question.

[Motion to remove motion relative to last year's sharing from tabling passes with members approving and abstaining]***

McIsaac: The original motion is before us. Discussion?

Collins: Are we open at this point [inaudible]

Cribbs: I propose an amendment to that motion: that the motion include a second alternative which would be to look at an allocation of 1/3, 1/3, 1/3.***

Bingham: I second for discussion.***

McIsaac: Any discussion?

Grover: The legislation that formed the Klamath River Basin Fishery Restoration Act specifies that the KFMC develop recommendations to the PFMC. Setting two analyses does not constitute a recommendation.

Bingham: Here in March, the PFMC at this stage is looking to develop a range of options. Were this the April meeting, it would be inappropriate. By passing this motion we find out what the real ocean impacts would be. I'm in favor of the motion.

Bits: The Council has often made recommendations to the PFMC that had a range of allocations.

McInnis: Regarding modeling this: we weren't clear about sharing ocean commercial impacts north and south of the California/Oregon border. I would see a 50/50 sharing of those impacts north and south of the KMZ.

McIsaac: Regarding the 1/3 ocean sport: there is the KMZ sport, a strong San Francisco area sport fishery, and north of Humbug mountain. Mr. Cribbs, what is your thinking on that?

Cribbs: One of the proposals I brought forward at Santa Rosa was to try to keep as many fish in the KMZ as possible. In this case, whatever maximizes the ocean sport and ocean commercial troll fisheries.

Wilkinson: Clarification: were Nat and Rod speaking for the amendment to the motion, or the original motion?

Bingham: The amendment. I simply want to get it modeled to see what it does.

Bits: I support the amendment too on that basis.

McInnis: Read my remarks as supporting the full amendment and motion.

McIsaac: I would like to speak against the amendment if it includes the 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 in it. The status quo is now the low end of the range. As distasteful as this is to Oregon, I'm not opposed to seeing it modeled, but we should also consider a lower range as well so people can see the pros and cons of that.

Wilkinson: To make this palatable to me, we need a true range by looking at a lower in-river range.

Kirk: Can we go against who we represent? Coastal people in no way want to go on record as being for this, because we moor our boats and live with the commercial people. At Santa Rosa, I thought we were heading for a compromise between 15% and 18%, not 1/3. I can't be in favor, because I can't see how we can do this.

McCovey: We have to keep our season in mind. We don't have a lot of leeway to go different directions as we would with a big season. We are managing this year for the floor.

Cribbs: I appreciate concern for the floor. If we had statistical information available, we could discuss the

implications. My intent was to take a look at what the implications are and continue discussion before adoption. Regarding the lower figure in a range, it shouldn't just be lower for the in-river, but other fishers too.

McIsaac: A comment against the amendment which now includes maximizing ocean catch. The low harvest rate from managing for the floor could show a zero commercial fishery in the KMZ. It might show a zero sport fishery in the Zone, depending on the size of San Francisco impacts. Oregon wouldn't advocate that.

Cribbs: Yes, zero is not maximizing fisheries dependant on the KMZ. My intent was finding how can we best utilize fish in the ocean to address user groups.

Bits: The language of the proposal is aimed at minimizing the ocean catch, by moving fish in-river, which lowers the total allowable catch for all, and by moving the ocean take towards the KMZ, which lowers the total allowable ocean catch. Those aren't moves that maximize benefits of the ocean share Klamath fish.

Cribbs: To clarify with the allocation of 1/3, 1/3, 1/3: I'm saying to maximize ocean sport and ocean troll fisheries. Not a zero fishery. I keep hearing that there is a multiplier that is out there.

Bingham: What is troubling everybody here is, this raise is too high from last year's compromise and is basically unworkable. We're not moving forward.

McIsaac : Let's come to a conclusion on this amendment to the original motion.

[Motion to amend the original motion fails with members approving, opposing and abstaining]***

McIsaac: Back to the original motion.

Bits: I would still like to see the modeling exercise done, because it's part of what Hal requested in Santa Rosa. Can TAT run this unworkable long term allocation through the KOHM to graphically show how unworkable it is?

McIsaac: **That is not part of the motion on the table. The original motion is: for the 1997 management season, that fall chinook be shared 50/50 tribal/non-tribal, and the non-tribal share be allocated using the same allocation as in 1996: 15% to in-river sport fisheries, and within the ocean share, 17% to KMZ sport fisheries and the rest to other fisheries.***** Further discussion? Call the question.

[Motion fails with members approving, opposing and abstaining]***

Cribbs: **I make a motion that we use last year's allocation, using this year's projection, and submit an additional option giving the in-river sport fishery a 20% share, with the ocean split on the same basis as in 1996.*****

[-----]: I second for discussion.***

McIsaac: Discussion?

Kirk: This is an in-river increase from 15% to 20%, and ocean sport is the same, so the 5% comes from the commercial?

Cribbs: The ocean is split 83% to ocean commercial and 17% ocean sport. The purpose of this motion is again to get discussion.

McIsaac: So there is a range, and that one end of the range is 15%, and the other end is 20%, with the extra 5% coming from inside and outside KMZ fisheries.

Kirk: I doubt my constituents, with what the commission put us through last year, will support 20%. I will not support 20%.

[Motion fails with members approving, opposing and abstaining]***

Bits: We still don't have a recommendation. There is a difficult problem facing the Oregon sport fishery, the KMZ sport fishery and the troll fishery. I guess the tribes won't get a commercial fishery this year. There are some things the in-river fishery can do to structure their season, by prioritizing to get Labor Day open, weekends maybe, to maximize their benefits.

Wilkinson: Where we are now?

McIsaac: Every motion proposed has failed.

Fletcher: I have comments regarding Dave's comment. Every year we grapple with how do you spread your effort. We have advocated that other in-river groups equalize impacts on different stocks, etc.

McIsaac: I make a motion that one of the options to the PFMC include a seasonal approach to the KMZ sport fishery.***

Wilkinson: I second.***

Fletcher: As Pliny mentioned, now we're managing for the floor. I want to express our concerns that this year is very different from last. Now that we are at the floor, I want to hear more depth in what you are proposing.

McIsaac: We are in a floor situation, so there will be more scrutiny of Klamath impacts this year. I presume one option will be a quota fishery. Our success last year pruning days from the quota fishery, what we learned about in flux of effort...Fewer days open, a bag limit, and other measures can give us the needed security this year. This motion is made to allow the public to comment not only on a careful quota option, but also a seasonal approach.

Wilkinson: The Klamath Zone Coalition has brought tools to bring to the table to see that a seasonal approach could work. We support this motion, because this marketing approach is a way to achieve security and avoid the gold rush scenario of quotas.

McCovey: As Troy said, we would have heartache with liberalizing ocean seasons. We won't have a commercial fishery this year, but we will have a strong ceremonial fishery which will take place over a month's time. This is our year for ceremonies; there will be a large take that is more important than in other years.

Kirk: I appreciate everyone's honesty. If we don't have this marketing effort up now, at a reduced season, we will lose our momentum. We want people to be guaranteed we will be around. Even in years like five years ago when we had 3,500 fish, if we could just stay alive in the ports we can wait until its better. Communities are interrelated and have to help each other. Even if we have half the days on the water, we want to keep these tools in place.

Fletcher: The over-fishing review that was recently completed spoke to looking at quota fisheries in the KMZ.

We have a problem with our record in the past with under-predicting, and being near to the spawner floor. Anytime you get near the floor, we will start to tell you to be conservative.

Bitts: We aren't in as bad shape as in 1992. There is a chance we could be in the same shape as 1995 going in: similar number of jacks and predictions. It's equally possible the prediction could be wildly off in either direction. Did you say KMZ fisherman are willing to accept a lower take if they can have the security of a season, Paul?

Kirk: Yes, that's where we want to go. It's the only way we can market ourselves and survive. At least we can advertise we are open these weeks, and keep the ports alive.

Bitts: In the sport fishery, does effort fall off if people aren't catching fish?

Kirk: Somewhat.

Bingham: Speaking to the motion on the floor: we have a reauthorized Magnuson Act. The Magnuson Act specifies conservatism. I agree with Troy and Pliny. I can only support the motion if seasonal modeling was conservative rather than designed to hit the spawner floor.

McIsaac: This is not a dangerous fishery. Every year but this year this fishery came under its share. This doesn't specify a buffer--conservative or liberal. It will be worked out this week. The motion calls for it as one of the three options.

We need to wrap it up.

Fletcher: You just have it in one of the three options? Not all three?

McIsaac: Just that it be one of them put out for public review. No endorsement in April is implied.

McCovey: I would like a short caucus.

Break

Fletcher: We are faced with this being the only option, since we didn't agree on the other options. We would be willing to abstain if there were a range of options approved.

Bingham: **I make a motion to table this motion.*****

[-----]: **Second.*****

McIsaac: Discussion? Call the question.

[Motion to table motion passes unanimously]***

Cribbs: **I make a motion that we use last year's allotment with this year's projections, and also tied in with that, we look at one additional jack added to the in-river sport fishery bag limit.*****

Bitts: **I second.*****

McIsaac: Discussion?

Fletcher: We oppose hook and release fishing when water temperatures are high without adequate studies.

McIsaac: Call the question.

[Motion fails with members approving and opposing]***

Cribbs: I make the same motion [that we use last year's (1996) allotment with this year's (1997) projections] with the exclusion of jacks.***

Wilkinson: I second for discussion.***

Kirk: For clarification: do you mean the same allocation in numbers of fish, or percentages?

Cribbs: The same percentages.

McCovey: Call for question.

[Motion passes with members approving and abstaining]***

Kirk: I propose that a range of options be brought back for the Klamath sport fishery, and that one management option be season management, based on last year's season structure as the most optimistic end of the range, using this year's available harvest.***

McIsaac: Is there another end of the range, such as a straight quota, or do you want to leave that open?

Kirk: I would be willing to agree with that.

Bitts: I second. Paul, I ask that you include all the safeguards from last year scaled to this year's stock abundance to provide the same measure of conservatism.***

Wilkinson: For clarification: is this for modeling purposes only?

Kirk: Yes.

McCovey: Last year, did we increase size limits?

Bitts: No, size limits were increased in the sport fishery south of Point Arena to protect winter run, and it was increased in the commercial fishery from 26" to 27" at the beginning of July, up to the California border I believe. I don't think it increased in Oregon.

Fletcher: I need to be better informed on conservation measures. I'll meet with Paul to get more comfort, then I would go for it.

McIsaac: What are the buffers that went in?

Fletcher: I'm wondering about buffers, and also if you agree to a smaller quota percentage-wise, where does that percentage end up? Does it get spread to other fisheries?

Bitts: As I understand, there is no change in allocation, and that there is the understanding that if there were a

quota, it would be smaller this year. I understood that Paul wants a seasonal approach, but with safeguards to keep it from being a blow-out. The same thing as last year, but scaled down.

McIsaac: There is a range here: on one end is a quota, on other end is a seasonal approach. The fishery gets charged with its full share. Leftovers won't go to another fishery. Bag limits and days taken off to make it less likely that you hit the quota. Whatever that buffer turned out to be last year, (I think it was 1/3), will be the low end of the range.

Fletcher: I still need to look at it.

Wilkinson: **I move to table the motion.*****

Bingham: **I second.*****

McIsaac: Discussion? Call the question.

[Motion to table the motion passes unanimously]***

McIsaac: The motion is tabled. To sum up: we have one motion passed that is a request to the F&G Commission regarding timing their meetings to coincide with the February-March time-lines of the KFMC and PFMC, that they consider conference calls, and that those meetings be held in the California North-Coast area. We have one motion under the table. [That one PFMC option include a seasonal approach to KMZ sport. There was also a motion passed that sharing of Klamath fall chinook be allocated in the same percentages as 1996 (50% to tribal fisheries, 50% to non-tribal fisheries, and within this non-tribal share, 15% to in-river sport, 17% to KMZ sport fisheries, and the remainder to other ocean fisheries), using the 1997 stock projection. There was also a motion tabled regarding a range of options for KMZ sport, with one end being season management.]

Our next meeting is Tuesday March 4th from 5:30- 7:00 pm in the Portland room. We must vacate the room promptly at 7:00. We will have few mikes, so we must speak loudly. We also have a meeting Wednesday March 5th, 11:30 am to 1:00 in the Portland room. Caucuses as necessary. Adjourned until Tuesday.

Meeting Recessed.

Reconvened: March 4, 1997, 5:30 pm

Members present: Nat Bingham, Dave Bitts, L. B. Boydston, Troy Fletcher, Ron Iverson (for Jerry Grover), Paul Kirk, Pliny McCovey, Donald McIsaac, Rod McInnis, Keith Wilkinson

Other speakers: Scott Boley, Carol Davis, Rich Dixon, Andy Eagan, George Kautsky, Ron Metheny

McIsaac: To budget our limited time let's focus on three topics: TAT reports, including the resolution of the age five anomaly; recommendations to the Pacific Council, including our tabled motion from Sunday; and discussion of the letter from Blair Hart of Shasta Valley.

Boydston: I will introduce items on two additional subjects. First, the need to agree on how to calculate the 17% share for the KMZ Sport Fishery, this came up today in the Pacific Council. Second, I would like to see a recommendation to the Pacific Council on sharing of age four harvest north and south of the KMZ.

Iverson: I had a note from last session that we would get a memo from Dave Hillemeier on the 1996 spring

chinook planning.

Fletcher: We said we would get that to you later on.

16. Reports from TAT: Resolution of age-five anomaly, Adjustment of KOHM to meet sharing and spawner floor constraints

George Kautsky: Our first subject is the five-year-old anomaly. Some items of interest for the '92 brood year: first, most of the post-September-1 CWT recoveries (64% from Oregon and 70% from California) came from late running fall chinook stocks in the Lower Klamath and the Trinity Basins. These are traditionally recognized as late runs, implying that those tagged fish may have been heading to spawn in the fall of 1996 rather than over-wintering and spawning this coming year, as we have assumed. Second, note that fall chinook were generally late arriving in 1996. Third, by October the numbers of lower Klamath CWT's recovered by ocean fisheries dropped off. If the four-year-olds were over-wintering in the ocean, where did they go? Another issue that came up on Sunday was that one CWT returned from the Coos Bay fishery was expanded about 800 fold. Actually, it was two tags. This was partly due to the low sampling rate in the Coos Bay area ports. By expanding the time window over which tags were grouped to the entire month of September, we cut that expansion factor down. Before the April meeting we will adjust the estimate of five-year-olds projected for the 1997 season.

Bits: I am glad to learn that CWT's are being recovered from those lower river runs and there is something to explain it. Will your adjustments to five year abundance be minor?

Kautsky: We will adjust the 7200 projection of five-year-olds by subtracting a smaller number of five-year-olds from the fall of 1996, after 80% winter survival. Your observation about the recovery of the lower stocks is true. About 190,000 CWT's were applied to the 1992 brood from Lower Klamath and Trinity tributaries, including various rearing projects.

Bits: Are these of naturally produced fish?

Kautsky: Some naturally, some from the rearing facility at Supply Creek.

McIsaac: When do these lower river fish spawn? Is it after the September 1 biological clock of Trinity and Iron Gate fish?

Kautsky: Late spawning is hard to observe, because of turbidity. It probably peaks in November and December. I have seen spawning in January at Hoopa.

McIsaac: Will there be no TAT action on this matter this week that could affect the PFMC options? If there are changes, they won't be made until April?

Kautsky: That is correct.

Wilkinson: George, can you present your recommendations prior to the Eureka Public Hearing on April 1?

Kautsky: Don't think so. This could be an extensive problem for TAT to grapple with, which could affect our cohort reconstruction.

Wilkinson: It could affect people's decisions on which options to support.

Kautsky: Rich (Dixon) is here, so we can move on to the harvest rate model.

Dixon: See the KOHM run dated March 2, 1997, (9:31 pm) [Handout I]. This run scales the 1996 season to the projected 1997 abundance to achieve a 12.2% harvest rate, with adjustment to meet the 17% KMZ sport allocation.

McIsaac: Let's square away the 17%. Is this 17% of the ocean allocation or the non-tribal share.

Dixon: 17% of the ocean.

Boley: See Pages 1-15 of the PFMC Review of 1996 Fisheries. It says the ocean allocation of Klamath chinook is split 83/17.

McInnis: Does this projection meet the 50/50 share requirements? Tribal/Non-tribal?

Dixon: No. Essentially it is just equally decreasing all the factors in the exploitation rate change matrix to achieve that 12.2%.

McInnis: What is the purpose of this then?

Dixon: To estimate the number of fish the KMZ sport was looking at.

McInnis: Have you done this without achieving one of the major constraints? Do you need to whittle this down some more?

Dixon: Yes. Note the discrepancy between this model output and that of the HRM dated February 12, 1997, (3:05 pm) [Handout H, Page 1]. This KOHM output shows Ocean Harvest of 21,200 while the HRM shows 18,340. This KOHM is almost 3000 higher. The TAT needs your guidance on how to reconcile these models by whittling something down.

Fletcher: The non-tribal harvesters need to resolve the modeling assumptions right now on your harvest shares, so the public is commenting on realistic projected seasons. This is inconsistent with the law.

McInnis: I see that the March 2nd run [Handout I, Page 1] also misses the natural spawner floor by nearly a thousand fish.

McIsaac: This is the dueling model problem discussed at the last meeting. I thought Rich said this wasn't going to be a problem.

Dixon: If I said that, I misspoke. There are several constraining stocks to deal with, including winter chinook and coho and several dueling models. My thought was to adjust the KOHM to meet the 50/50 requirements once the season options have been shaped to meet the other constraints.

Boydston: The modeling discrepancy situation arises from the fact that there are different proportions of age threes and fours in different parts of the ocean range, so differing season structures leads to differing impacts on threes and fours. This is where we ended up last year. The USFWS HRM assumes an equal distribution of threes and fours throughout the range. This makes it difficult to square the KOHM and the HRM. One solution would be to achieve the 50/50 sharing through an iterative process using the KOHM.

Fletcher: The TAT has this assignment. Their information must be responsive to the legal mandates. I suggest

modeling of ocean harvest be conservative.

Bits: Let's recognize this model run is a preliminary version only. It needs work, and is not going outside the Council process. This is the way we learn.

McIsaac: We faced the same problem last year then we advised the TAT to assume 50/50 sharing, a 17/83 sharing of the ocean harvest, equity north and south of the KMZ and to consider coho constraints. I would advise the TAT to continue the iterative process.

Boydston: That can be done using the KOHM, but will we be constrained by the HRM? The KOHM will give you 50/50 and a 35,000 spawner floor. We need to agree now-will we use the HRM or the KOHM?

McIsaac: I presume the TAT will default to what was acceptable last year. We don't have time to debate this now.

Kautsky: As Rich said, the balancing of the models should come at the end of the iterative process, after accounting for winter run protection, etc., but we must be careful not to heighten people's expectations along the way. Last year the STT had an uphill battle, because we started with high expectations of harvest. We would like to know what balancing of the KOHM and HRM you want from us.

Fletcher: The TAT should review what's the best model to use. We don't want the same discrepancy that came out at the end last year, with the tribal share being less than 50%.

Inserted agenda: Response from the Shasta River CRMP

McIsaac: Sunday we received a letter from Blair Hart on the situation in the Shasta River. We've had time to review it. Discussion?

Fletcher: In light of the most recent letter, I would like to keep working until the April meeting to respond to all of his letters. In our response, we will mention that we will go up and talk to them.

Bits: I will be going to Yreka March 13, but I cannot meet with them in April.

Fletcher: April was when I will draft the letters. I'm looking at May or June for a meeting.

McIsaac: We should be looking very closely at a fishery effect here. They make an interesting point about the odd ratio of threes to fours in the 1992 brood in the Shasta River, Bogus Creek and near the Iron Gate Hatchery. Any ideas on this other than harvest impacts? If there are fishery effects here, in the river or the ocean, I think this Council should make corrective recommendations to the various management entities.

Boydston: There is more here than just a selective harvest of fours. Note that there were fewer three-year-olds in the Shasta in 1996 than the 1995 jack count (695-the highest since 1986) indicated. I think environmental factors such as temperature precluding their entrance should be considered.

Wilkinson: I prefer that we work on a response at the Klamath Symposium in Yreka in March, for a more timely response prior to establishing the 1997 season.

Fletcher: I would like us to take the time to analyze environmental factors such as thermal barriers. The UC Davis data on temperature is cause for concern.

Wilkinson: I'm not suggesting we have all the answers, but it behooves us to begin an open discussion soon. Since most of us will be at Yreka for the Symposium, I suggest we work on the issue then with the CRMP.

Bingham: I concur with Troy. Let's gather all the evidence we can, and not rush into convenient judgements that our constituents might like to see.

Wilkinson: Okay, let's make this the first of many sessions with the upper river folks.

Fletcher: I agree and will participate.

McIsaac: I would like to set up an analysis process, including a commitment of technical staff to do the analysis, to produce something firm to send a signal we are taking the issue seriously. For example, if there is temperature and flow data at Iron Gate or any tributary, I would like someone to commit their staff to summarize it. Troy, can you summarize the coded wire tag recoveries from the net fishery? L.B., can you summarize the sport tag recoveries?

Fletcher: I will.

Boydston: Yes. We can also pull together environmental information: for example, the USGS station on the Shasta River. Bob McAllister can assemble that information.

McIsaac: Dr. Iverson, what information can your staff or the BOR provide?

Iverson: We can provide information that is contained in the Klamath Resource Information System. The Shasta folks should have most of this already.

Fletcher: Historic information on levels of production in that basin would also be useful. So long as we are going at it, spring chinook, coho, and steelhead too.

McIsaac: I will provide information on the affects on water temperature on fish passage and survival in the Columbia River. We've seen when water temperatures exceed 73 degrees, dam counts at Bonneville drop from 7,000/day to nearly zero. In the Snake River, when water temperatures exceeded 75 degrees, a 50% loss of fish between dams was documented during certain weeks.

18. Public Comment

McIsaac: I open up to public comment.

Metheny: I'm Ron Metheny, Oregon Coast Charter Boat Association. We thank this Council and the Tribal representatives for helping establish a season last year that was extremely beneficial to the Brookings area. We would like a season like last year.

Eagan: I'm Andy Eagan, Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District Manager. I am aghast at the lack of inland land owner participation in this harvest management process. Troy, historic information and data on Shasta River coho and steelhead is slim. I found Dave Webb's data compelling. We will be happy to provide anything we can.

Wilkinson: Andy, can you comment on the trade off between taking time to get full data, and the need to show our interest back to your community?

Eagan: The sooner the better. Dave Webb is well-prepared on this issue. We have environmental information from the UC Davis study.

Fletcher: Can you provide your analysis to us? It will help us to review it in order to evaluate the arguments in the letter we received. The letter points the arrow at us, and that's okay; we need to be able to examine ourselves. But we might direct similar hard questions at land and water management in the Shasta Valley. Taking a hard look at each other will help us come to an understanding.

Eagan: I agree. We will be happy to provide the information to you. We want to find out what happened to our salmon run. It doesn't need to be done in a confrontational manner.

Davis: I'm Carol Davis, a commercial fisher from Brookings: I represent the Port of Brookings Harbor and the Brookings Fisherman's Marketing Association. We would like to see a harvest share for trollers in the KMZ.

McIsaac: Further public comment? End public comment.

19. Develop a range of options for the 1997 management season, for presentation to the PFMC

Boydston: **I move that this Council support a 35,000 fish natural escapement floor.*****

Bingham: **I second*****

McIsaac: Discussion?

Boydston: My rationale is that some other floor level might be proposed as a target such as the 38,000 spawner floor once adopted by the Commerce Department, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

McIsaac: From the Oregon perspective, I support the motion. In 1997 we are not facing the multiple weak broods that provided a rationale for the higher floor. Also the draft TAT report on the spawner floor tends to support the lower number.

Wilkinson: Call for question.

[Motion passes, with members approving and abstaining]***

Wilkinson: **I make a motion to remove from the table the motion for seasonal management that was tabled March 2.*****

[-----]: Second.***

[Motion passes unanimously]***

McIsaac: Paul Kirk's motion, seconded by Dave Bitts, included a range of options for the KMZ sport fishery, with last year's seasonal approach at one end of the range and straight quota management at the other. Discussion?

Fletcher: I would support it if it had language expressing a conservative approach in structuring the seasonal management option.

Wilkinson: See the Salmon Advisory Sub-Panel options (Handout J); these appear conservative. If there is

further amendment beyond this, perhaps you should verbalize it.

McIsaac: The motion calls for a season like last year, which had several conservative elements such as days lost. Is that the kind of thing you are looking for?

Fletcher: The stumbling block is the significant difference between Indian and non-Indian shares. I am concerned about the shortcomings of the KOHM model runs.

McCovey: The catch-per-unit effort study we did--is there a safety net like that being proposed?

Bingham: It appears we need the modeling problem rectified before we can move ahead on this. Question for the TAT: Could we have a KOHM reflecting a 35,000 floor and 50/50 harvest sharing done by Wednesday noon?

Dixon: The limiting factor is for the STT to get clarification from the PFMC on some questions that Ken Henry has.

Boydston: Rich, does the PFMC report (Review of 1996 Ocean Salmon Fisheries) display KMZ catches over time? It would give us a historical perspective on the KMZ sport fishery.

Dixon: Yes. See A-20.

Boydston: I suggest you look at the kind of season structure that produced those catches.

Bits: I don't think this exercise will give a good idea of the numbers.

McIsaac: Consider our recommendation on this matter from last year. The KMZ projected catch shrank as we move through the season shaping process. Would those numbers from last year quantify the issue for you Troy?

Fletcher: The options that have already been modeled would have to be reeled back to meet the 50/50 sharing and the 35,000 fish floor.

Bingham: **I move to table the motion to tomorrow noon.*****

McIsaac: Further discussion? Call the question.

[Motion to table the motion passes unanimously]***

Kirk: Clarification: did Rich Dixon say that Dr. Henry will go to the Council early tomorrow morning, so they will bring us some results tomorrow at noon?

Dixon: Yes.

Boydston: **I move to clarify that the 17% KMZ sport share is 17% of the ocean share, and that it comes off the top of the initial allocation.*****

McIsaac: This motion is to allocate the 17% KMZ sport share presumably before we talk about 50/50 sharing and such.

[------]: I second.***

McIsaac: Discussion?

Boydston: I think this is the way it has been done in the past. There are fall impacts that must be accounted for. My rationale is to set aside the number for the KMZ sport, and then take the post-September 1 chinook impacts from the respective commercial fisheries north and south of the KMZ.

Bitts: I support the motion if you take the post-September-1 sport impacts off its share in the same way.

Boydston: **I accept that amendment. Any KMZ sport fishery impacts post September 1 are to be taken from the 17%.*****

Wilkinson: Call for question.

[Motion passes, with members approving and abstaining]***

Boydston: I would ask for a motion from the commercial salmon fishery representatives on a target for 50/50 north/south sharing between California and Oregon of age four impacts. Just a target, not absolute, because the process will shift it.

Wilkinson: I would propose to prepare that for action tomorrow.

Bitts: I agree. We have divided the impacts equally until last year when Coho constraints were a factor.

McIsaac: We'll put this on the agenda for tomorrow. I support a flexible sharing target, noting that over the past five years, for both three- and four-year-olds, it wasn't as close as we would like.

Wilkinson: Is there direction from the chair on meeting with the Shasta CRMP?

McIsaac: We will take that up tomorrow at 11:30 am.

Meeting recessed at 7:00 pm, March 4, 1997.

March 5, 1997 11:30 am, Klamath Council reconvenes.

Members present: Nat Bingham, Dave Bitts, L. B. Boydston, Rob Collins (for L. B. Boydston), Hal Cribbs (for Virginia Bostwick), Troy Fletcher, Ron Iverson (for Jerry Grover), Paul Kirk, Pliny McCovey, Donald McIsaac, Rod McInnis, Keith Wilkinson

Other speakers: Lucy Bott, Rich Dixon, George Kautsky, Dave Hillemeier, Mike Orcutt, Jim Welter

McIsaac: Nat Bingham and Rod McInnis are absent, but we expect them later. Our agenda will focus on: 1) New technical information and TAT assignments; 2) recommendations to PFMC.

Bitts: There is an issue that has surfaced in the PFMC: the effect of the increased troll size limit on the vulnerability of Klamath age threes.

McIsaac: I presumed this had been modeled, but we will add it to #2, the TAT assignments.

20. Reports from and assignments to TAT

McIsaac: Last night when we recessed, we were expecting a new KOHM model run today. We also have received a Dave Hillemeier memo summarizing a spring chinook discussion in December 1996. Dave?

Hillemeier: This gives an overview of why it was decided the spring chinook CWTs recovered late last year were probably spring chinook, not mis-tagged fall chinook (Handout K). It discusses the ramifications of that for allocation.

Kautsky: Rich Dixon will deliver a new KOHM run achieving 50/50 tribal/non-tribal sharing, 17/83 ocean sharing, and balancing 50/50 north and south of the KMZ. I caution you it will differ from the HRM in total volume of harvest. It has to do with the proportion of threes and fours in various areas affected by ocean season structure. The HRM gives us a first cut estimation of total harvest after achieving our escapement and sharing goals, but it assumes a uniform distribution of age threes and fours across the ocean.

Bits: Regarding the model discrepancy: Troy and I discussed this and agreed we want to be working from the same page of numbers.

Fletcher: I would still like to see the TAT complete its assignment to recommend to this group how to handle that question by April, but for this week I will be satisfied if the 50/50 sharing and escapement are met.

McIsaac: Which model does not presume equal distribution of threes and fours?

Kautsky: The KOHM. It attempts to give a more accurate picture. The HRM spreads the fish uniformly across the ocean-not a realistic scenario.

McIsaac: Are people comfortable with using the KOHM as the only sheet to look at? Troy?

Fletcher: Yes, for now, as long as the goals are clearly met and the TAT will get back to us with a solid recommendation.

Bits: If Rod were here, I'm sure he would agree that the 50/50 must be clear; the 35,000 floor must be clear. I think whatever the allocation is, you must be working from the same page.

Kautsky: We can't present you with the model that will satisfy all your needs, but we can define the limitations of both. The HRM is still out there on people's hard disks, and they will still be running it to generate thumbnail sketches, here and in April.

McIsaac: Okay, let's focus on the KOHM for the balance of the week. While we await Rich Dixon, let's go on.

19. (cont.) Develop a Range of Options for th 1997 Management Season, for Presentation to the PFMC

Fletcher: I am concerned about the hooking mortality and size limit discussions I heard Dr. Henry raised at PFMC. There needs to be a thorough review of these proposed modifications by the STT and the TAT before these are implemented.

McIsaac: George, please have the TAT look at the material the STT is reviewing. I understand we do not have a precise figure for hooking mortality and the STT is reticent to offer one. The PFMC will have to make its best judgement.

Collins: We are in the final throes of revising hooking mortality estimates and believe the STT will use the new

figures in their modeling, with the understanding that we will go on to put them through the review process.

Bits: Will the CDFG also recommend regulations away from the more damaging gear types?

Collins: We probably will recommend circle hooks.

McIsaac: For the record, Nat Bingham and Rod McInnis have just joined us. We have just asked TAT to look at size limit changes and hooking mortality. Are there other TAT assignments?

Fletcher: I want them to be sure as they address the five-year-old issues that they insure the fish caught after September 1 are charged to the right fishery.

Cribbs: I would ask the TAT to look at optimizing in-river recreational angling opportunities using the 15% share that has been proposed.

McIsaac: Sunday we talked about ways to stabilize the in-river fishery, so it is not abruptly cut off by quotas, such as adjusting the days of the week for a seasonal type approach. Is that your meaning?

Cribbs: Yes. I would like the TAT to provide information on the options and implications so the in-river fishery constituents can select the management they want.

Kautsky: It will take a lot of reference material to examine that. Based on old baseline data in the past, the state used a guideline for the fishery above Coon Creek Falls. It was open for 28 days after one-half of the quota had been harvested below Coon Creek. That assumption was never validated. In fact, in the past two or three years, the 28 day structure hasn't been used. We need the assistance of the State to provide the CDFG data supporting this. I am not aware of intensive creel surveys on the Klamath side, but that information is available on the Trinity side using reward tags.

Cribbs: I know changes are required for this type of management, but we can't make a decision unless we know the financial and political implications.

McInnis: As a longer term assignment I would like the TAT to respond to Ken Henry's comments on Tuesday on over-prediction of Klamath age fours by the current model.

McIsaac: So the assignment is to come up with a correction factor or a better method?

McInnis: For consideration for the 1998 season, we would need such a recommendation by the Fall 1997 PFMC meeting.

Kautsky: The STT raised this issue last year. We reviewed it, and Mike Preager wrote it up.

McIsaac: That addressed the STT's recommendation for an alternative predictor. Rod is asking for some new ideas.

McInnis: Ken Henry seems to think the predictor basing ocean fours on ocean threes is viable and preferable to the presently used predictor.

Kautsky: That approach just recapitulates our database; we don't support it. It adds a little bit of variability to the regression, but you are basically just putting 80% survival on the threes to fours. That is why it produces a nice r^2 . We would like to look again at the partitioned cohort method.

McInnis: Make sure the results of your analysis of this method gets to the STT.

Bits: Regarding our discussion of the impacts of the 27" troll size limit: should the TAT take that on?

McIsaac: They are assigned to view the STT material and provide a second opinion when we get back together in April.

Boydston: Note that the KOHM has been reviewed by the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC), but it would be good to have another review. In our discussion of the dueling models, I said that the KOHM will meet the desired 50/50 / 35,000 parameters.

McIsaac: L.B., your arguments were so persuasive that in your absence we agreed to use the KOHM for the balance of this week.

McIsaac: We are still waiting for the Rich Dixon report, meanwhile we will take public comment.

Added agenda: Public comment

Welter: I'm Jim Welter, Brookings. Regarding the lack of fish in Shasta River: we had a major concern a few years ago about the Karuk harvest. Are the Karuk still fishing the same way?

McCovey: They have a State gill net fishery.

Boydston: They are fishing under State permit in their traditional fishing area.

Orcutt: I'm Mike Orcutt, Hoopa Valley Tribe. How would the in-river sport fishery be affected by listings of coho on April 25th and steelhead in August? We had talked about marking steelhead at Trinity River hatchery.

McInnis: I can't answer directly. If steelhead are listed as threatened, take would still be allowed. NMFS and CDFG would probably regulate take at a safe level.

Fletcher: How would you characterize allowable take? Is that incidental take, or hook-and-release fisheries? Compare this to the Sacramento winter chinook situation.

McInnis: The Sacramento River chinook salmon fishery is closed by the CDFG when winter chinook are present. There is still a trout fishery. Law enforcement has made cases against people who bring salmon aboard their boats. Hook and release of salmon in the Sacramento River is not prosecuted. For steelhead, enforcement would be far more complex. There are questions of hatchery and natural stocks.

Fletcher: That speaks to what Mike was saying: the need of marking of salmon and steelhead. Maybe we should offer a motion like we did at the KTF meeting. Nat, can you help with the language?

Bingham: I move to encourage the CDFG to consider marking steelhead, chinook and coho from Trinity River Hatchery and Iron Gate Hatchery as a way of addressing the endangered species problem with in-river fisheries. The operative word here is "encourage" not "mandate."****

McIsaac: Before we have a second, the chair requests a hold on this until after public comment is closed.

Cribbs: The F&G Commission can adjust regulations to accommodate unforeseen circumstances such as listings. We agree hatchery fish should be marked. We are concerned that in some areas, no take of both hatchery and natural stocks has been proposed.

Bott: I'm Lucy Bott, Curry County, Oregon. I am encouraged that this group would encourage the State of California in marking fish. Residents in our area of the ESU are disappointed in Governor Wilson's lack of effort on this issue. The State of Oregon asked for a six month extension hoping California would come on board. We have done a lot of work in our county. Mr. McIsaac, will NMFS bring money to help areas affected by listings? Proponents of listing have said this, but Will Stelle of NMFS told us you will not.

McInnis: It is unlikely that listing will lead to much more funding. NMFS is spending about all it can on salmon issues. We are spending more on consultations and habitat conservation planning, but we don't have much for restoration work. Mr. Stelle is a lot closer to the source of dollars than I am.

McIsaac: Further public comment? Seeing none, let's move back to agendum 19: PFMC recommendations.

19. (cont.) Develop a Range of Options for th 1997 Management Season, for Presentation to the PFMC

Bingham: I had a motion on the floor. This motion was made relative to river fisheries only. I don't think we are ready for selective ocean fisheries.

Boydston: I support the motion, we just need funds.

Bits: I agree selection can benefit river fisheries. My only concern is that if marking is extended to chinook, that we keep our database consistent in our assessment of impacts from different rivers in the ocean fisheries.

Fletcher: We also need to keep existing marking practices in place.

Cribbs: We might urge the F&G Commission to amend its policies relative to marking hatchery fish. This gives more impetus to the budget process.

Bingham: **I amend "and the F&G Commission" to my motion.*****

McIsaac: Call the question.

[Motion passes with members approving and abstaining]***

Wilkinson: **I move to affirm that the north/south sharing have a target of 50/50 of Klamath impacts outside of the KMZ recreational fishery.*****

McIsaac: **The Chair will step away from the chair to second.*****

Boydston: Would you amend the motion to say this applies to age four fish, as in the past?

Wilkinson: I want to hear discussion before amending.

McInnis: Would you be looking for a 50/50 split, Oregon and California, for KMZ troll as well? Within the Zone?

Wilkinson: I characterize it as a target.

McIsaac: Would the Oregon portion of any KMZ troll fishery be included in the Oregon share of the 50/50 target and the California portion of the KMZ troll fishery be included in the California part of the 50/50 target?

Wilkinson: Yes.

McIsaac: I assume a target is something for the technical people to strive for, but is not strictly binding?

Wilkinson: Yes.

Boydston: Regarding my proposed amendment: a target harvest rate on four-year-olds will be modeled with equal impacts north and south of the Oregon border after KMZ sport is subtracted. If we bring in three-year-olds, it becomes more difficult to balance. **I suggest an amendment to clarify that the equally shared harvest rate applies to fours.*****

Wilkinson: **I accept that friendly amendment.*****

McIsaac: Out of the past six years, Oregon was short of its 50% share in four years. In those years it ranged from 80/20 to 90/10. So I favor the motion as a target. Call for question.

[Motion passes, with members approving and abstaining.]***

McIsaac: Rich Dixon is here with a new KOHM model run.

20. Reports from and assignments to TAT

Dixon: Please refer to [Handout K], and also what was handed out yesterday with the 21,200 adult ocean landings [Handout I]. I made an attempt this morning to try to achieve what was requested: the 17% in the Zone sport, bringing the adult ocean harvest landings to agree with the HRM (about 18,300 fish) and achieve 35,000 natural spawners. I got approximately two of those. It is a very difficult process. In trying to achieve them we are down to 10.5% for harvest rate.

McIsaac: Why did it go from 12% down to 10.5%? Was it that we have got to make the 35,000?

Dixon: All these things. It is just very difficult to try to modify the upper matrix and to try to emulate the results of the HRM. Actually, I probably need a little more time.

McIsaac: Questions of Rich on the model run dated March 5, 1997, 12:10 PM [Handout K]?

Bits: Rich, do you have the number for the in-river sport?

Dixon: It should be 3,200. It's included in in-river harvest impacts. I believe that was the number.

Bits: On first glance, it appears that there is some imbalance here in terms of the 50/50 in favor of tribal fisheries.

Dixon: Are you comparing the ocean with the in-river?

Bits: I could be wrong, but it looks like it doesn't quite come out.

Boydston: This is going to be a balancing act all this week going into April. The most important objective here is to meet the spawner floor. We can give the STT an approximate number at this point in terms of in-river escapement. After we get the season structure, we will try to get the 50/50 balance.

Bingham: We need to keep a focus on the side of conservatism for the spawner floor throughout this process.

McIsaac: Would it be very difficult to modify the display of this spreadsheet, so that in this middle section (where it says "1997 with 1996 season") there could be a line that has in-river tribal and nontribal?

Dixon: I can certainly change those. You want the numbers showing the in-river 50/50? The KOHM does not calculate the river number. It comes directly from the HRM.

McIsaac: It might be difficult, but if you added a display of total nontribal and total tribal, it might ease people's minds.

Dixon: I want to remind all of you; don't put a lot of faith in these numbers. It is a very dynamic model and anything pushing one place is going to affect something else.

McInnis: The Klamath in-river harvest impacts on this KOHM run--that is a fixed number?

Dixon: Right. It is from the HRM.

McInnis: So in adjusting to meet the spawning escapement goal in this run, the only flexibility that you used was reducing the ocean impact?

Dixon: That's exactly right.

McInnis: In another iteration, can you reduce the river impact and try to get the tribal/nontribal to balance?

Dixon: If we go back to the HRM and do it there, and then come back into the KOHM.

McInnis: Which is where we were last year and the year before ...

Dixon: Yes. And for example, the in-river sport would go up, which has to be adjusted and fed back into the model. That number would certainly change spawning potential, spawning escapement, or any of the other factors in the river.

McIsaac: Further questions of Rich? Rich, is this all for us for right now?

Dixon: For your information I have provided a copy of what we call the calibration run [Handout L] where full fishing would be going on. It shows the different contribution rates of the Klamath age-threes and age-fours. It gives an idea of what is involved when we start moving things around.

McIsaac: Further discussion from the Council on other topics?

19. (cont.) Develop a Range of Options for th 1997 Management Season, for Presentation to the PFMC

Wilkinson: I move to endorse seasonal treatment on all KMZ recreational options for 1997.***

Kirk: Second.***

McIsaac: Discussion?

Bitts: Isn't this the motion that was tabled?

Wilkinson: My intent is to offer this in place of the tabled motion from yesterday.

Bingham: Point of order: after a meeting is adjourned, tabled motions die after a period of time.

Boydston: I support the motion as a concept only, but I would need the numbers before I could endorse a specific season.

Fletcher: **I would offer a friendly amendment to add a conservation buffer like last year. The conservation buffer should consist of modeling the KMZ sport fishery to target approximately 85% of the Klamath zone impacts.*****

Wilkinson: **I accept the amendment.*****

McIsaac: So, the motion is to conceptually endorse a seasonal approach with a conservation buffer of 85% of the Klamath impact.

Bitts: Clarification: the buffer stays in the Zone sport share, and nobody else tries to grab it?

Wilkinson: Yes.

McInnis: Does the motion call for each PFMC option to include a seasonal approach only for KMZ sport?

Wilkinson: Yes; this is the request of the KMZ Coalition.

McCovey: I would prefer a range of options from quota to seasonal.

Wilkinson: The range is now in two separate options being modeled by the STT, and those were structured differently to provide different benefits and impacts.

Cribbs: This is specifically ocean sport recreational harvest?

Wilkinson: KMZ recreational harvest.

Fletcher: I request a two-minute caucus.

McIsaac: They will run us out of the room at 1:00. We have only 10 minutes left. Two-minute caucus.

Break

McInnis: As the motion is currently presented, I would oppose it as being too restrictive as far as soliciting public participation in the PFMC process.

Wilkinson: I would accept an amendment to limit the motion to supporting seasonal management on the two options now under review. That is two seasonal options with conservation buffers.

Fletcher: I ask to make the third option a quota option.

Wilkinson: The option packages are still open. All this week anybody can come in with a quota option to put on the table.

McInnis: Keith's amended language will take care of my objection. I intend the third option will be a quota option.

Wilkinson: **As Rod has suggested under friendly amendment, the motion would now read: the KFMC endorse a seasonal management treatment on the two KMZ recreational options for 1997.*****

Fletcher: Of course, that includes the language that I mentioned earlier with my friendly amendment for an 85% buffer.

Wilkinson: Yes.

McCovey: I am not comfortable with the 85% buffer, because the overall amount of fish are lower this year than last year.

Wilkinson: Troy?

Fletcher: I am open to any amendment to my amendment.

McIsaac: We are getting very close to our time limit here. Pliny, this particular fishery is not a powerful fishery. It amounts to 7% of the harvest pie. It is not explosive in nature when confined like this.

McCovey: I appreciate those comments. I know that this fishery isn't dynamic, and I am not trying to pick on it. I just think the quota option should be part of the package.

Kirk: Pliny, if there was an option for a quota as part of the three, then you would accept the 85% cushion?

McCovey: Yes, but I would like further information.

McIsaac: I think we have run out of time here. We are scheduled to adjourn.

Wilkinson: I am not prepared to offer another option without consultation with lots of folks.

McIsaac: Any final comments?

Bitts: The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife has submitted a paper pointing out that the KMZ sport fishery has caught only slightly over half of its preseason target in terms of Klamath impacts for the past six years.

McIsaac: I am looking either for someone to call the question or to table the motion.

Bingham: Call the question.

[Motion passes with members approving and abstaining]***

McIsaac: We are adjourned until April.

Meeting Adjourned 1:00 pm, March 5, 1997.

PARTICIPANTS
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
MARCH 2, 4, 5, 1997
PORTLAND, OREGON

Attachment #1

Members:

Donald McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jerry Grover	Department of Interior
(alternate for Grover: Ron Iverson)	
Nat Bingham	Pacific Fisheries Management Council
David Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Virginia Bostwick	California In-River Sport Fishing Community
(alternate for Bostwick: Hal Cribbs)	
LB Boydston	California Department of Fish and Game
(alternate for Boydston: Rob Collins)	
Troy Fletcher	Yurok Tribe
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Service
Pliny McCovey	Hoop Valley Tribe
(alternate for McCovey: Mike Orcutt)	
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry

Other Attendees:

Jerry Barnes	USFS, Chair KFMC TAT
Scott Boley	KFMC TAT
Lucy Bott	Resident, Curry County, Oregon
Carol Davis	Port of Brookings, Brookings Fisherman's Marketing Association, Commercial Troller
Rich Dixon	CDFG, KFMC TAT
Andy Eagan	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
Dave Hillemeier	Yurok Tribe, KFMC TAT
George Kautsky	Hoop Valley Tribe, KFMC TAT
Ron Metheny	Oregon Coast Charter Boat Association
Dave Webb	Shasta River CRMP
Jim Welter	Port of Brookings

HANDOUTS
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
MARCH 2, 4, & 5, 1997
PORTLAND, OREGON

Attachment #2

HANDOUT A	Letter from Blair Hart, President, Shasta River CRMP, dated February 26, 1997
HANDOUT B	Ocean Stock Size Projections and Appropriate Harvest Levels for Klamath River Fall Chinook, 1997 Season (February 24, 1997)
HANDOUT C	Revised Page 8 of Ocean Stock Size Projections and Appropriate Harvest Levels for Klamath River Fall Chinook, 1997 Season
HANDOUT D	Klamath Fall Chinook Population Parameters
HANDOUT E	1996 Ocean Landings
HANDOUT F	Memorandum from Rich Dixon, CDFG: Calibration of the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) for 1997
HANDOUT G	Harvest Model Results (3 pages)
HANDOUT H	Harvest Rate Model Results (2 pages)
HANDOUT I	Klamath Ocean Harvest Model Run, 3/2/97, (1997 with 1996 Season)
HANDOUT J	Proposed Initial Salmon Management Options for 1997 Non-Indian Fisheries (SAS Report B.3)
HANDOUT K	Klamath Ocean Harvest Model Run, 3/5/97
HANDOUT L	Klamath Ocean Harvest Model Run, 3/2/97, (Calibration Run)