KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
APRIL 5-6, 1993
MINUTES FOR THE RECORD

Columbia River Red Lion, Portland, OR

Monday, April 6

7:00 PM Meeting convened by Chairman McIsaac with a quorum of members present (Attachment 1).

ADMINISTRATION

1. Members introduced themselves.

2. The agenda (Attachment 2) was reviewed and modified:

   - Discussion between Department of Interior (DOI) and Department of Commerce (DOC) representatives on the letter from Secretary of Interior Babbitt was added after agenda item #3.
   - Discussion of the impact of the fall chinook fishery on spring chinook populations was added to follow the DOI/DOC discussion.
   - The Technical Team may have data relevant to shaping this fall's fisheries. A presentation of this data will be added after agenda item #11.

** Motion to approve the amended agenda (Wilkinson). Seconded.

**** Consensus.

HARVEST MANAGEMENT PLANNING FOR FALL CHINOOK

3. Technical Team description of the PFMC ocean salmon options sent out for public comment in March.

Barnes: This handout (Attachment #3) shows the results of the PFMC options when used with the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model. Note that options 1 and 2 are identical harvest rates. Option 3 was remodeled because it didn't make the Sacramento River escapement goal.

New agenda item: DOI and DOC discussion

DOI: (Shake): The Secretary of Interior signed a letter on March 10 indicating his policy that Klamath tribes are entitled to at least 50% of the total harvest. As a result of this letter, the PFMC put together Option 3 for 50%. There has been

no response to the letter that PFMC sent out. While Secretary Babbitt was in Eureka for the PFMC meeting, he told the press that he was still looking at other options.

Q: If the PFMC were to set a season with a 28% ocean harvest rate, would Interior follow through by splitting this down the middle for a 50:50 split?

A: Yes.

Q: How will ceremonial and subsistence harvest be accounted for in regard to a 50:50 split? How will the harvest impact be determined?

A: I haven't seen the policy on the split, but I would foresee that ceremonial and subsistence fishing are included in the 50%. The harvest impact will be determined using the same methods usually used to determine harvest impact on Klamath stocks.

Q: Can you give us examples of the Indian case law that was reviewed?

A: The three cases were: U.S. v. Washington, U.S. v Oregon, and one case on the Klamath. There have been other cases throughout the country where tribes receive 100% of the harvestable resources.

Council discussion:

Bitts: This Council is intended to seek solutions (allocations) which allow for the survival of all fishing parties and the rebuilding of Klamath stocks. The 50% tribal allocation does not allow us to do that -- it only provides for the destruction of ocean fisheries. If there were case or statute law that clearly entitled tribes to a certain allocation, then this Council wouldn't exist. The position taken by BIA/Interior this year subverts the intent of Congress in establishing this Council by attempting to circumvent the process and removing all incentive for the tribes to participate. The 28% allocation proposed by ocean and states provides more than 2/3 of the identified subsistence need. We are willing to work with the tribes to seek solutions that allow for mutual long-term survival as fishermen (as long as such work is possible).

Masten: It is unfortunate that the tribes have had to make sacrifices in the past after coming here in good faith. In past years, the California troll representative cast the "no" vote. It is unfortunate that the tribes had to forego subsistence and ceremonial needs in the past. We have been here every year looking at ways to address solutions and it hasn't happened.

McCovey: We all need to work together. So far, I haven't seen it happen. Since we have no new agreement, we are back to square one. The tribes have foregone a lot of things. Somewhere along the line we (all of us) are going to have to pay the price to get this fishery back. Better sooner than later.

Bitts: We have an honest difference in opinion about the best way to rebuild the stocks. Commercial fishing interests feel that we need to concentrate on the survival of the juvenile fish, whereas the tribes seem to feel that higher adult returns are needed. The fishermen have been working towards restoring the stocks (e.g., rearing programs funded by the Salmon Stamp Program), but they are beginning to say, "why are we doing this?" because they aren't getting anything back.

Shake: Other groups have also been working towards restoring the stocks (e.g., the Hoopa Tribe has successfully lobbied to get more water released down the Trinity River). Both sides worked hard to get the Klamath Act passed and there is no question that all of us have worked very hard to restore the stocks. The problem comes when we try to decide on the harvest of the fish. From a tribal perspective, they've run out of room to find common ground to provide for harvest. They took the 5 year agreement in good faith but it didn't work. You need to understand that the federal government has a trust responsibility for the Indian people. This is not an easy task.

Bitts: All that we are asking is that we continue to work under this process that was established by Congress, rather than replacing it with management-by-decree.

DOC (Matlock): My sole purpose is to make sure that enough fish are maintained to insure continuation of the species and continuation of the fishery. I want to prevent the fish from being listed. The management of this fishery doesn't belong to only one of us, it belongs to all of us -- until the fish are listed, then it becomes the responsibility of the Department of Commerce. I have been given no direction from DOC since last meeting. The Pacific Council plan has a goal of making sure that the 35,000 spawning escapement is not violated. No one disagrees with this. I hope we focus on proposals for '93 and the long run. Commerce is faced with the letter from Babbitt and we must work within these recommendations until we have a legal opinion. We have to make some judgements at this level. For now, in the absence of any further direction from the Secretaries, we will proceed with Bill and I representing DOI and DOC.

Shake: I hope that anyone seated at this table would aim at meeting at least the 35,000 escapement minimum. If this Council were to arrive at a recommendation, then it could be forwarded to the Secretary.

New Agenda Item: Fall chinook fishery impacts on spring chinook

Q: Did the Technical Team model the impacts on Klamath River spring chinook for Option One and Two? Are spring chinook impacts modeled in any fisheries?

A: The impact of ocean or river fisheries has not been modeled or predicted by the team. Impacts have been estimated in the past (based on average hatchery survival) but we found that this methodology was faulty, so the spring chinook impacts are not used to set ocean or river seasons. We will discuss the impacts and the abundance levels more tomorrow -- agenda item 7 (Baracco).

Q: If we want to develop a spring chinook recommendation tomorrow, will it fit with the Pacific Council's agenda?

A: Procedurally, it could be appropriate -- if we had an objective in the fishery management plan for Klamath spring chinook.

Age class composition information will be presented by the Technical Team tomorrow.

4. Council discussion on harvest options.

- The Yurok tribe is not willing to look at an option that does not provide for at least 50% harvest for the tribes.
- As a representative of the Hoopa Tribe, I've only been allowed to agree to 50% of the harvest this year.
- We have sacrificed over the years too -- I've been fishing in this area since '47 with 25-26 years of charter boat fishing records. My records also show that rebounds in the salmon population can occur after these types of low number years.
- The Oregon industry is willing to meet to resolve proportionality.
- If you compare in-river harvest for Options 1 and 2 with Option 3 (Attachment 3) there is a difference of 10,800 fish -- the tribal portion (80%) provides 8,640 fish. Let's try to find a way to compromise.
- At the Task Force meeting last week, the Task Force decided to write a letter to this Council asking that the spawning escapement floor be met in any harvest options that are recommended.

5. Public comment on harvest options.

Nat Bingham: Read story about "Chinook Salmon" by Salmon "Sam" Shook (salmon troller) and read the Tsimshian Tradition called "Salmon Woman and Raven" (Attachments 4 and 5). Common sense says that it is coincidence that the salmon returned in great abundance when we came to agreement, and declined when we failed to reach agreement.

Tom Robinson: I've listened to tribal people speaking from their heart lately and I respect their ability to do that. Right now people all up and down the coast are working together to resolve differences -- we need this group to resolve their differences.

6. Action: Council recommendations for fall chinook harvest to:

a. Salmon Advisory Subpanel and states.

** Motion (Boydstun): The non-tribal entities could provide a few more fish into the Indian fishery to help reach middle ground in regard to the 8,700 fish difference that currently exists. This could be a one year agreement to split the difference and compromise. In-river sport would give 2,100 fish, ocean users would give up 2,100 fish (exact number to be determined by the Salmon Advisory Subpanel) which gives 4,200 fish that could be put into in-river net fishery. Seconded (Warrens).

Discussion:

- Trollers are interested in this concept because we think it might offer a way out of the impasse. I support forwarding this to the Technical Team.

- From a Pacific Council perspective, this motion would make life more bearable -- it may even do something beyond a temporary measure, because it sets the table for a cooperative effort and follows through on the habitat issues that are the foundation of the problem. I support the motion.

- If the tribes are going to move off the 50% share this year, is there any thing else that is going to be offered? We want to be guaranteed something.

- The in-river sport fishery will be the hardest hit by this measure, but if we are able to reach compromise then it could be worthwhile.

- Maybe we could offer an amendment to the motion that the Klamath Council forwards this motion (without quantifying the shares) to the PFMC.

Q: Is there any willingness to model a 50:50 compromise with no sport fishing?

A: No.

Q: Could we model this and meet at lunch time tomorrow?

A: Yes. [KRFRO staff will post an announcement of the meeting room location.]

Masten: It is difficult for the tribes to consider this option because it doesn't meet our subsistence and ceremonial needs in a year when other groups make economic gain.

Technical Team Assignment

Action: (Boydstun) Let's ask the Technical Team to look at providing for a river harvest of 20,600 (of which tribal is 17,400 and sport is 3,200). The questions that we need answered are: a) What would this mean to the ocean fisheries in terms of the actual harvest rate (with a 35,000 natural spawning escapement floor)? and full harvest rate (with and without floor). b) What would this mean in terms of ocean fishery structure? c) What percent Indian and non-Indian share would this in-river fishing level produce? Note: This potential option is for this year only.

** Motion to table motion ((under 6.a) pending the outcome of this suggested modeling by the team). Seconded.

**** Consensus.

Recessed at 10:30 pm.

April 6, 1993
12:15 pm

Meeting called to order by Chairman McIsaac.

The technical team distributed a handout (Attachment 6) showing the Harvest rate model results with inriver fishing level set at 20,600 adults.

Council members had a long discussion on various potential amendments that could be made to the motion. The discussion included the following points:

Discussion:

Q: If we are only making up 2,100 fish why does the harvest rate drop from .28 to .21?

A: Baracco: Season shaping causes the harvest rate to change drastically.

o In the spirit of cooperation and desire for agreement and understanding, the in-river sport fishery could give 600 fish to the ocean users (for one year only). This would change the ocean harvest rate to .22 or .23.

o Oregon trollers want alternatives to motion, e.g. supplemental enhancement with goal of 50:50.

o The 50% tribal share is inevitable. If the tribes have to take less than that this year, then we will aim for payback in future years.

o If the Klamath Council puts in a recommendation to the Pacific Council it will make a big difference to the Department of Commerce. If a Klamath Council recommendation is not made, then others will decide the Klamath harvest.

o NOAA general counsel concurs that the Klamath Council should put in a recommendation to the Pacific Council (Eileen Cooney).

Q: Is there a chance that DOC could respond to Babbitt's letter this week?

A: Yes.

o Secretary of Interior Babbitt is interested in finding a solution to this harvest allocation problem. The President and his Cabinet are interested in fish restoration on a coastwide basis. Discussion on this topic was initiated during the Forest Summit last week.

o The Oregon troll industry will support the amended motion.

Break for caucus.

McIsaac: The time is now for consensus -- at least on forwarding the model run.

Tabled motion (under 6.a) brought back to Council.

**** Consensus.

** Amend motion (Bostwick):

A) Increase overall harvest rate to 22% by transferring 600 fish from river sport fishery to ocean harvest. Seconded (Wilkinson).

B) Spawning escapement deficit accounting forwarded to Pacific Council (technical analysis done by Sept (accelerated technical assignment)).

C) Increase tribal catch by 1,000.

In considering amendments A, B, and C, the following comments were made:

o C should be forwarded along with B.

o We should take a range to the Council.

o Supports A, B, but not C.

o Supporting motion on emergency basis only.

o B should not be an amendment. It should be separate.

o In favor of a compromise, the amendment should include B.

o We are only 1,000 fish apart. It's ok to have a proportionate reduction in KMZ sport.

o Pacific Council has 50/50 split (their Option 3). If we can adopt this ranging to Option 3 then we give PFMC something to look at.

o Let's forward both options for modeling and consideration.

** Amend motion: Two proposals should be forwarded to the STT for modeling: i) CDFG proposal including 600 fish from in-river sport to ocean and ii) DOI proposal (17,400 to tribes, 3,200 to

the river sport fishery, 27,300 ocean). This amendment would not include any parameters and it does not include the Hoopa proposal for putting deficit accounting into place in '93.

Wilkinson: .12 -.22 or .23 is not something I can support.

Motion to amend withdrawn.

** Amend motion: Include deficit accounting.
"Yes" votes: Shake.
"No" votes: Walters, Warrens, Wilkinson, Bostwick, Bitts, Boydstun, McCovey, Masten.
Abstain: Matlock.

Motion to amend fails.

** Amend motion: Add CDFG's proposal of 600 and include a .21-.22 ocean harvest rate. Seconded.

"Yes" votes: Walters, Warrens, Wilkinson, Bostwick, Bitts, Boydstun.
"No" votes: Masten.
Abstain: Matlock.

Motion to amend fails.

** Amend motion (Matlock): Ask PFMC to shape seasons ~~consider a range~~ around these 2 options: A) Tribal harvest of 17,400, inriver sport harvest of 2,600, ocean harvest determined by 35,000 escapement and B) 18,400 tribal, 3,200 in-river sport, and an ocean harvest that provides for 35,000 escapement. The PFMC would also be asked to include an assessment of the Hoopa Valley Tribes proposal for deficit accounting for investigation (fast-tracked). Seconded.

"Yes" votes: Shake, Walters, Warrens, Wilkinson, Bostwick, Bitts, Matlock, Boydstun, McCovey.
"No" votes: none.
Abstain: Masten.

**** Consensus.

Recessed at 1:30 pm.

April 6, 1993

7:10 pm Meeting called to order by Chairman Don McIsaac.

Alternates: Scott Boley for Frank Warrens and Mike Orcutt for Pliny McCovey.

Recess called (until a quorum was present). Reconvened at 7:20.

The most recent consensus decision was re-read.

- The Council asked that the wording be changed to "shape seasons around those two options" in order to tell the Yuroks what the effects of those options would be.

- PFMC has already received the correct message so we don't need to spend time discussing it.

- The danger for tribal interests is that once there is a range, then that is the only thing on the table.

- The tribes want to look at how these options shape out.

- The Yurok chairman had a discussion with Secretary Babbitt this afternoon, the Secretary said he is holding firm with his 50% recommendation, although he will respect whatever decision the tribe makes.

Matlock: DOC cannot, in the absence of the legal opinion that DOI is preparing, agree to something that has not been legally analyzed. I would have to vote against any such proposal.

** Motion (Shake): Assign the Harvest Allocation Work Group to discuss the March 10 letter from DOI. This discussion would be in concert with other resource priorities (i.e. deficit accounting). The Harvest Allocation Work Group will come back to the Council with recommendations prior to next meeting. Seconded (Matlock).

Discussion:

- This would demonstrate to the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior that we have taken seriously the discussions that have gone on today and yesterday. It would also send a message back to the Secretaries that we are willing to work hard to resolve this issue.

- The purpose would be to maintain user group and tribal sharing while maintaining viable communities along the coast.

- This action would demonstrate to others that this group is willing to sit down and come to agreement on this issue. We have had a five year agreement, a long range planning process that is hung up on this issue. Things have changed... in reality we have to look at where we are now.
- At last weeks forest conference we heard that we can't do things the way we used to. We have to demonstrate that we want to be part of the solution.

- I can't deviate from DOI's position as laid out in the March 10 letter (Shake).

**** Consensus.

Action: Harvest Allocation Work Group members need to get back to me with possible dates for meeting prior to the October Council meeting (Wilkinson).

This Council needs to inform the Secretaries that these discussions are taking place.

HARVEST MANAGEMENT PLANNING FOR SPRING CHINOOK

7. Spring chinook report (Polos).
Here is an un-official Technical Team (TT) report (i.e. it has not yet been reviewed by the full TT) (Attachment 7). I put this together and I think it provides valuable information to the Council. (Note "pm" on the handout refers to "production matrix.")

I did not get the assignment of determining run timing, but the peak run at the lower section of river appears to occur in mid-May and June. When the water is high like it is now, it is hard to keep the net in the water. Therefore, we may need to change our sample collection time.

The third column of Table 1 shows the natural escapement of 1,363 spring chinook in '91. Table 4 shows the number of hatchery fish that spawn naturally -- 483 in '91. You can compare Tables 1 and 4 to determine the "true" number of natural spawners (1363 - 483 = 880).

Note that the hatchery numbers were arrived at by using a production multiplier based on the number of tags recovered.

The population projection (Table 2) is based on hatchery fish. The total projection is 6,100 fish. The box at the bottom of the page looks at cohort reconstruction.

Spring chinook are counted during the summer using direct observation. Prior to '90 only index reach sections were

counted, but since then counts of the entire river have been completed.

The TT does not develop an ocean impact model like the KOHM for spring chinook.

Jack West, the Fisheries Staff Officer for the Klamath National Forest, has developed a recovery strategy for spring chinook in the Salmon River.

Action: The Klamath National Forest's Spring Chinook Recovery Strategy should be sent to all Council members. (This document was mailed to the Council on 4/15/93.)

8. Plans for spring chinook harvest

a. Hoopa Tribe (McCovey) We are focusing our efforts on an Integrated Resource Management Plan to ascertain the composition of our catch. We are trying to avoid targeting South Fork Trinity River stocks. In addition to this effort, we have submitted proposals to do scale analysis because we want to gather information to build a database. The 6,000 spring chinook that are available for harvest this year are more than in the past, so we will base harvest around that. The tribe is very supportive of the flow study that is underway by the Trinity River Task Force.

The Hoopa Tribe is working to collect information to assist in managing the fisheries. Run timing information will be used to target hatchery fish. George Kautsky is working with Joe Polos to put together reliable predictor methodology. The Hoopa Tribe is taking actions to protect spring chinook.

Walters: What is the opportunity for people from Humboldt Bay to help on the flow study?

Orcutt: There is not any actual work that we need you to do, but we welcome your support for this study.

b. Yurok Tribe (Masten) Our tribe is still planning to fish under Title 25 in the Code of Federal Regulations (basically, 7 days/wk, except Sunday 9-5). We will continue to monitor harvest to continue to improve management. The tribe plans to hire 3 biologists and a hydrologist. The tribe will manage the Yurok resource zone and take over monitoring of all fisheries done by the Yurok Tribe. In the past, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service office in Arcata monitored the Yurok resource zone.

The Yurok Tribe is not directly managing for spring chinook, but we are making recommendations for the May ocean fishery which impacts spring chinook.

Q: I didn't hear any specific numbers mentioned by either Mike or Sue, does that mean management of the fisheries will be on a seasonal basis?
A: Hoopa Tribe: Harvest this year will be similar to the harvest in past years.
A: Yurok Tribe: Our take will probably be about what it was last year. The high flows may prevent us from having a fishing opportunity.

Orcutt: The Task Force has funded a study to have tribal members tag green sturgeon. This shows that there is a cooperative effort between our tribe and the Fish and Wildlife Service. Data on green sturgeon will be collected during the spring salmon fishery.

c. California Dept of Fish and Game: The Fish and Game Commission will provide the same regulations as in the past -- fishing will be allowed on the main stem Klamath and Trinity, but the Salmon River and South Fork tributaries will be closed. On the mainstem, anglers will only be permitted to take 1 salmon that is 22 inches or longer.

- Its no secret that a lot of folks are concerned about the spring chinook run in the Klamath basin. In some cases, petitions for threatened/endangered listing are pending. Shouldn't we be talking about what we should do differently to prevent National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) from having to list spring chinook?

- We should work more pro-actively on changing things we can control, like the harvest of spring chinook, to prevent getting in a real fix.

10. Public comment

Nat Bingham: PCFFA has commented on timber harvest plans on the South Fork of the Trinity River because we are concerned about the spring chinook living there. We have been contacted by the Sierra Club legal defense workgroup and we have met with them to suggest activities to prevent listing. We looked at what Jack West was doing on the Salmon River and felt it was proactive. We feel that there is a missing link on the South Fork Trinity River side. At the Forest Summit, timber interests on the South Fork expressed interest to help. Groups are currently holding petitions to list species and waiting to see if we can get something done. We encourage this Council's efforts to protect stocks. We understand that Klamath Forest Alliance may petition next year.

Q: Do you have any specific recommendations on what we might do?

A: Efforts like what the Hoopa Tribe has done (e.g. targeting hatchery stocks) and small scale bioenhancement (e.g. Horse Linto Creek) are efforts in the right direction. We tried to initiate some small scale bioenhancement on the Salmon River, but agency problems prevented it from happening. Time is running out.

11. Action: Council recommendations to managers on proposed spring chinook fisheries.

** Motion (Wilkinson): Establish a workgroup to summarize activities underway for spring chinook in the Klamath Watershed. Membership will include representatives from both the Task Force and Klamath Council. Seconded (Bitts).

Discussion:

- This group will review many issues surrounding the spring chinook fishery issue including ocean impacts. It will make the job easier for NMFS to have all the data in one place.

- Since this group is charged with making recommendations on harvest allocation, I'm not sure that we are the appropriate ones to collect information on spring chinook. Task Force members could more quickly answer these questions.

- We need to have better communication between groups regarding harvest, habitat, data, etc. Its time to get proactive.

- The Task Force could describe what they are doing for spring chinook and the Klamath Council could describe what is being done to target the hatchery component.

Questions and assignments that we would ask/give this group will be:
1) What is the catch of spring chinook in the Klamath River?
2) Compile information on what is being done, or what has already been done to study/restore this species.
3) How would we respond if there was a listing?
4) What opportunities for recovery for stressed populations of spring chinook exist?
5) Where are the ocean harvest impacts on spring chinook?

*** Consensus.

A tired and weary Council postponed deciding on the membership of this workgroup until the next Council meeting. The FWS-Arcata office will draft a more detailed list of tasks for this group to present at the next Council meeting.

New Agenda Item: Report from the Technical Team regarding data on spring chinook that is relevant to shaping the fall chinook fishery.

Postponed until the next meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

12. Approve minutes of the March 6-7 meeting in Burlingame.
Postponed until next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

13. Nominations to serve on the PFMC's "overfishing" review group (PFMC Agenda item B.6.a)
Jim Walters will be recommended as one of the participants.

14. Assignments to the Technical Team
Further assignments were postponed until after the next meeting.

15. Identification of date, time, location and agenda items for next meetings

The next meeting will be held during the first week in October in Hoopa, CA.

There is a possibility of having a joint meeting with the Task Force since they meet in Hoopa during that same week. The harvest allocation workgroup will call a meeting sometime before the full Council meets in October.

Attachment 1

KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL:

Mr Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Ms Virginia R. Bostwick	Klamath In-River Sport Fishery
Ms Susan M. Masten	Non-Hoopa Indians Residing in the Klamath Conservation Area
Dr Gary Matlock	National Marine Fisheries
Mr. Pliny McCovey, Sr	Hoopa Valley Tribal Council
Dr Donald McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr L.B. Boydstun	California Department of Fish and Game
Mr Bill Shake	U.S. Department of the Interior
Mr Jim Walters	California Offshore Sport Fishery
Mr Frank Warrens	Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry

Attendees:
Phil Bentivegna, Salmon Advisory Subpanel/Calif. Charter
Nat Bingham
Steven Brown, Oregon Troller
Ken & Virginia Byrtus, Klamath Management Zone Coalition
Eileen Cooney, NOAA/OCNW
Russ Crabtree, Port of Brookings
Judy Cunningham, KMZ Fisheries Coalition
Rick Fielitz, BIA
Ed Gray, Port of Brookings Harbor
Bruce Halstead, CCFRO
Robert Jones, Klamath Management Zone Coalition
George Kautsky, Hoopa Valley Tribe
Mike Maahs
Duncan Maclean, Salmon Advisory Subpanel/Calif. Troll
Ginger Phalen, CCFRO
Tom Robinson, Oregon Salmon Commission
John Rohleder, Oregon Fish forever Inc.
Fred Schutt, Klamath Management Zone Coalition
Fred Sears, Morro Bay Commercial Fishermen
Fred Stutzman, Klamath Management Zone Coalition
Dana Viele, NMFS-SWR
John Vogler, Fishermen's Marketing Association of Bodega Bay
Jared Williams, Salmon Trollers Marketing Association of Fort Bragg
Desma Williams, BIA

FINAL AGENDA
Klamath Fishery Management Council
Meeting of April 5-6, 1993
Red Lion Inn - Columbia River, Portland, OR

Monday, April 5

7:00 pm Convene meeting

ADMINISTRATION

1. Introduce members.
2. Review and approve agenda.

7:30 pm HARVEST MANAGEMENT PLANNING FOR FALL CHINOOK

3. Technical Team description of the PFMC ocean salmon options sent out for public comment in March
4. Council discussion of harvest options.

8:00 pm 5. Public comment on harvest options.

8:30 pm 6. Action: Council recommendations for fall chinook harvest to:
   a. Salmon Advisory Subpanel and states.
   b. In-river managers.

9:00 pm Adjourn

Tuesday, April 6

7:00 pm Convene meeting

HARVEST MANAGEMENT PLANNING FOR SPRING CHINOOK

7. Spring chinook report (Technical Advisory Team - Polos).
8. Plans for spring chinook harvest.
   a. Hoopa Tribe.
   b. Yurok Tribe.
   b. California Department of Fish and Game.
9. Council discussion.

8:00 pm 10. Public Comment

11. Action: Council recommendations to managers on proposed spring chinook fisheries.

OLD BUSINESS

12. Approve minutes of the March 6-7 meeting in Burlingame.

NEW BUSINESS

13. Nominations to serve on the PFMC's "overfishing" review group (PFMC Agenda item B.6.a)
14. Assignments to Technical Team
15. Identification of date, time, location and agenda items for next meetings.

9:00 pm Adjourn

Harvest and escapement of Klamath fall chinook for PFMC options of March 1993 from the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model

KLAMATH LANDINGS	OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3
Cape Falcon - Humbug Mt.	15,300	15,300	6,500
Humbug - Horse Mt. (KMZ)	5,300	6,600	800
Calif. south of Horse Mt.	19,100	18,100	8,900
Total (Age 3,4,&5)	39,700	40,000	16,200
TOTAL ESCAPEMENT	47,400	47,300	48,200
NATURAL ESCAPEMENT	35,100	35,000	35,700
IN-RIVER HARVEST	16,400	16,400	27,200
AGE 4 HARVEST RATE	28 %	28 %	12 %

Chinook Salmon

Chinook Salmon, fighting the
current of Big Salmon Creek, a female, waiting at the nest
swimming in and out of the current
thrashing the gravel, with her tail
leaping, twisting, dodging sticks
flashing the brilliance of SALMON.

flash! here comes the male, moving
his fins like knives, slicing through the water.
he nosed the female and swam into the current with her.
Flashing her brilliances, she dug the nest as carefully
as any shoemaker.

They met.

Then, as the spawning ended, the male, weak with dying, started washing down the current, fighting as hard as he could, fighting harder, harder, harder, that one last final push. But alas, all the strength of a 26 inch dying salmon couldn't take the swollen waters of Big Salmon Creek.

He floated down the current with his fins still waving, waving, like a beautiful drowned maiden's hair.

The female, mating with a new male, lept into the air, shaking her scales as they shone, like a crystal coat of mail. Our eyes met and she said with her eyes

"I am a SALMON
A FREE
FREE
SALMON.

I am going to die and float down the creek to my mother
the sea
so are all of us
someday. //

Salmon Shook -- 1972

Salmon Woman and Raven

One day Raven drifted in his canoe through thick fog that had covered the world for weeks. Raven was hungry and depressed. No fish showed itself to him. Suddenly fog cleared over the bow of the canoe and there stood Bright Cloud Salmon Woman altogether as beautiful as Raven was ragged and thin. Right away Raven asked her to marry him, and who could resist Raven? Bright Cloud Salmon Woman stayed with Raven and made salmon run plentifully up the river by his lodge. Her eyes shone with love for him and he grew fat and handsome. Soon their storehouses were filled with dry fish and there was no need to feel hunger. They wanted for nothing but Raven grew bored and surly. Bright Cloud Salmon Woman tried to comfort him by giving him everything and making life easy in the lodge. Finally, in a fit of anger, Raven broke a salmon spine comb that caught in a tangle as Bright Cloud Salmon Woman was combing his hair. He threw the broken spine across the floor and cursed it, and Bright Cloud Salmon Woman stood up. "Come my tribe," she said, "it is time for us to go back." She walked back into the water and every dried fish--even the smallest bone--came alive once again and followed her. Raven realized his mistake at once, but no matter how he pleaded and danced around he was soon left alone again, and he began to feel very hungry.

TSIMSHIAN TRADITION
STORY BY CONNIE MARTIN
ETHNOGRAPHIC TEXT BY FRANZ BOAZ

4/6/93

TO: Klamath Fishery Management Council
FROM: Klamath River Technical Advisory Team

SUBJECT: Harvest rate model results with inriver fishing level set at 20,600 adults.

Harvest rate and 1993 harvest level determinations based on the Council's assignment to the Team are as follows:

1993 Ocean Harvest Rate =	0.21
1993 River Harvest Rate =	0.44
Long Term Ocean Harvest Rate=	0.27
Long Term River Harvest Rate=	0.63
Tribal Harvest Level=	17,400 adults
Non-tribal Harvest Level=	32,500 adults
Tribal Harvest Share=	35%
Non-tribal Harvest Share=	65%

4/5/93

TO: Klamath River Fishery Management Council
FROM: Klamath River Technical Advisory Team

SUBJECT: Trinity River Hatchery spring chinook cohort reconstruction report.

The Trinity River Hatchery spring chinook cohort reconstruction report is not ready to be presented to the Council. It still needs to undergo further review by the KRTAT. Attached are the data sets that were requested by the Council. Keep in mind that these data are preliminary and are not yet a product of the entire tech team.

Table 1. Inriver harvest and escapement estimates of Klamath Basin adult spring chinook and estimated number of adult spring chinook of hatchery origin.

Table 2. 1992 inriver TRH spring chinook CWT recoveries and 1993 ocean stock size projection.

Note: Preseason ocean stock size estimates for 1982-1991 are presented for comparison to 1993 projection. All data was derived from the TRH spring chinook cohort reconstruction.

Table 3. TRH spring chinook inriver age composition by return year and release type, 1982-1991.

Note: Yearling-plus (Y+) 1982-1991 average age composition is not calculated because this release practice was discontinued in the early 80's.

Table 4. Harvest and escapement of Trinity River Hatchery spring chinook, 1982-1991.

TABLE 1.

Inriver harvest and escapement estimates of Klamath Basin adult spring chinook and estimated number of adult spring chinook of hatchery orgin from the cohort reconstruction.

Year	Salmon River	Lower Trinity Tribs	Natural Escpmnt J.C.*	Escapement Hatchery	Escapement Subtotal	Sport Above J.C.	Harvest Yurok	Harvest Hoopa	Harvest Subtotal	Total **	Spring Chinook of Hatchery Orgin *** #	Spring Chinook of Hatchery Orgin *** %
78	2	40	14,384	3,680	18,106	752	N/A	N/A	752	18,858		N/A
79	19	301	5,008	1,658	6,986	1,298	N/A	N/A	1,298	8,284		N/A
80	256	74	1,614	547	2,491	140	N/A	N/A	140	2,631		N/A
81	285	N/A	3,362	2,405	6,052	2,146	1,717	1,090	4,953	11,005		N/A
82	585	169	3,868	1,226	5,848	637	2,440	715	3,792	9,640	4,830	50
83	6	39	N/A	930	975	N/A	510	75	585	1,560	1,350	N/A
84	18	52	1,354	736	2,160	375	247	380	1,002	3,162	1,869	59
85	453	329	4,897	2,645	8,324	736	1,074	1,000	2,810	11,134	5,727	51
86	791	183	13,371	7,083	21,428	2,949	692	2,022	5,663	27,091	16,568	61
87	614	153	29,083	8,466	38,316	8,467	1,646	4,146	14,259	52,575	36,595	70
88	1,039	332	39,329	13,905	54,605	8,738	2,926	2,727	14,391	68,996	50,518	73
89	287	18	19,581	5,506	25,392	2,152	4,775	1,978	8,905	34,297	21,503	63
90	148	218	2,975	2,411	5,752	796	1,413	865	3,074	8,826	4,837	55
91	190	66	1,363	685	2,304	333	287	263	883	3,187	1,058	33
92	330		1,090	1,435	2,855	119	396	329	844	3,699	1,561	42

* spawning escapement above Junction City weir (includes hatchery fish spawning in natural areas)

** includes escapement data from Lower Trinity and Salmon River (data for some years is incomplete)

*** hatchery contribution of spring chinook to inriver run from cohort reconstruction

KRTAT 4/5/93

Preliminary data, subject to revision. 4/5/93

TABLE 2.

1992 inriver TRH spring chinook CWT recoveries and 1993 ocean stock size projection.

Tag Code	Brood Year	P.M.	Expanded Recoveries Tribal	Sport	Natural	Hatchery
066147	87	13.7	5	0	2	2
066148	88	6.2	18	4	51	40
066149	88	10.7	4	1	13	10
065639	89	3.4	2	4	52	41
0601040102	89	9.3	0	0	3	3
065640	90	6.3	0	0	3	3
065636	90	6.3	0	0	1	1
0601040103	90	1.0	1	6	36	25
Total			30	15	161	125

Tag Code	Brood Year	P.M.	Expanded Recoveries * P.M. Tribal	Sport	Natural	Hatchery	Total
066147	87	13.7	68	0	27	27	123
066148	88	6.2	111	25	314	246	696
066149	88	10.7	43	11	139	107	299
065639	89	3.4	7	14	177	139	337
0601040102	89	9.3	0	0	28	28	56
065640	90	6.3	0	0	19	19	38
065636	90	6.3	0	0	6	6	13
0601040103	90	1.0	1	6	37	26	71
Total			230	55	748	599	1631

	Expanded Recoveries * P.M. Tribal	Sport	Natural	Hatchery	Total
Age 2	1	6	63	51	121
Age 3	7	14	205	167	392
Age 4	154	35	453	353	995
Age 5	68	0	27	27	123
Total	230	55	748	599	1631

Estimated 1993 ocean stock size of TRH spring chinook

Age 3 =	4,472
Age 4 =	1,603
Age 5 =	24
Total =	6,100

Preseason ocean stock size estimates from cohort reconstruction.

1982	9,300	1987	66,900
1983	2,700	1988	94,900
1984	7,800	1989	34,000
1985	10,000	1990	6,900
1986	44,300		

Preliminary data, subject to revision. 4/5/93

3. Spring Chinook in river age composition and percent at age by return year and release type

Return Year	Rel. Type	Age 2	Age 3	Age 4	Age 5	Percent at age 2	Percent at age 3	Percent at age 4	Percent at age 5
1982	F	0	1644	347	N/A	0%	83%	17%	N/A
	Y	215	597	1305	N/A	10%	28%	62%	N/A
	Y+	0	93	998	N/A	0%	9%	91%	N/A
	Total	215	2334	2650	N/A	4%	45%	51%	N/A
1983	F	362	0	201	8	63%	0%	35%	1%
	Y	110	557	460	31	9%	48%	40%	3%
	Y+	0	0	101	11	0%	0%	90%	10%
	Total	472	557	762	50	26%	30%	41%	3%
1984	F	26	611	0	2	4%	96%	0%	0%
	Y	89	1103	163	2	7%	81%	12%	0%
	Y+	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	115	1714	163	4	6%	86%	8%	0%
1985	F	0	287	1213	0	0%	19%	81%	0%
	Y	1169	1485	2808	46	21%	27%	51%	1%
	Y+	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	1169	1772	4021	46	17%	25%	57%	1%
1986	F	0	0	444	0	0%	0%	100%	0%
	Y	4490	15220	1069	43	22%	73%	5%	0%
	Y+	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	4490	15220	1513	43	21%	72%	7%	0%
1987	F	5028	0	0	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Y	1093	23928	13113	17	3%	63%	34%	0%
	Y+	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	6121	23928	13113	18	14%	55%	30%	0%
1988	F	45	24076	0	0	0%	100%	0%	0%
	Y	414	18591	8176	64	2%	68%	30%	0%
	Y+	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	459	42667	8176	64	1%	83%	16%	0%
1989	F	757	384	5043	0	12%	6%	82%	0%
	Y	0	6281	10190	54	0%	38%	62%	0%
	Y+	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	757	6665	15233	54	3%	29%	67%	0%
1990	F	278	1681	97	122	13%	77%	4%	6%
	Y	0	0	2901	120	0%	0%	96%	4%
	Y+	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	278	1681	2998	242	5%	32%	58%	5%
1991	F	0	345	504	0	0%	41%	59%	0%
	Y	55	157	0	69	20%	56%	0%	25%
	Y+	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	55	502	504	69	5%	44%	45%	6%
1982-1991 Average	F					19%	42%	38%	1%
	Y					9%	48%	39%	3%
	Y+								
	Total					10%	50%	38%	1%

Preliminary data, subject to revision. 4/5/93

TABLE 4.

Harvest and escapement of TRH spring chinook, 1982 – 1991.
(upper table includes all age classes, lower table includes only adults)

Return Year	Ocean	Tribal	Inriver Sport	Natural Esc	Hatchery Esc
82	3,149	1,626	389	1,816	1,213
83	1,055	191	172	754	703
84	403	73	294	796	821
85	1,711	1,188	508	2,199	2,996
86	6,953	1,956	1,906	13,323	3,867
87	14,585	4,795	2,496	27,781	7,627
88	18,943	3,775	2,952	31,085	13,154
89	6,628	4,965	141	13,191	3,963
90	1,190	914	67	1,876	2,258
91	258	183	0	483	392

Return Year	Ocean	Tribal	Inriver Sport	Natural Esc	Hatchery Esc
82	3,138	1,626	350	1,696	1,158
83	964	191	148	458	553
84	403	73	281	771	744
85	1,653	1,169	364	1,684	2,510
86	6,919	1,905	1,820	9,599	3,244
87	14,285	4,622	2,445	23,314	6,214
88	18,866	3,660	2,938	31,032	12,888
89	6,628	4,965	141	12,517	3,880
90	1,190	914	67	1,673	2,183
91	258	183	0	483	392

Preliminary data, subject to revision. 4/5/93