

Klamath Fishery Management Council
April 8, 1996
Ramada Inn, South San Francisco
Meeting #45 (Part 1)
Draft Minutes

10 a.m. The meeting was convened by the Department of Interior Representative, Jerry Grover, in Chair McIsaac's absence. Members introduced themselves (Attachment 1).

Background materials (Parker):

- ! At the last meeting, Mike Rode from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) promised that he would let us know what the schedule is for the Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) straying issue review process. He has set May 2 as the date for the public to discuss and provide input on hatchery operations on both the Iron Gate and Trinity River hatcheries. The location will be at the Shasta Trinity National Forest Headquarters in Redding, 2400 Washington Avenue from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.
- ! Mike Belchik, Hydrologist from the Yurok Tribe, told us that he'd let interested people see their efforts for the flow schedule. Please contact Dave Hillemeier from the Yurok Tribe if you are interested in copies.
- ! Rich Dixon said that the stock projection report has been revised and he will be bringing copies to the meetings this week. If you would like a copy, check with Rich when he arrives.
- ! You have received mail copies of the three pieces of correspondence dated March 21 from Dr. McIsaac. One letter was sent to the Shasta Coordinated Resource Management Program (CRMP) and responded to their letter to this Council, and one letter was sent to the Fish and Game (F&G) Commission to let them know that we passed a motion that recommends 7.5% share of the harvestable surplus be allocated to inriver sport fisheries in 1996. This letter noted that there were three abstentions (CDGF, Hoopa and nonHoopa representatives). We haven't heard anything back from the F&G Commission, but LB Boydston is here so maybe we can get an update later. The third letter was to the Pacific Council to recommend that 15% of the nonIndian allocation be provided to the inriver sport fishery in 1996. Again we had three abstentions, CDFG, Hoopa and nonHoopa. One outstanding assignment from the March meeting is that I have not yet prodded the Governor about the Governor's appointments to this Council -- but I will.

ADMINISTRATION

Agenda Item # 1: Review and approve agenda.

Grover: Does anybody want to add, delete or adjust the agenda? Given the information that Tricia has provided, Dale, do you have something that you were going to suggest for the agenda (Attachment 2)?

Webster: Yes, I need some clarification on the recommendation that we made about 50/50 harvest sharing. I need to understand if it is going to be for a long term plan or if it was just for this year.

Boley: On Friday, during Pacific Fishery Management Council discussions on this issue, LB described that we are talking about a long range 50/50 sharing (in the absence of any court interpretations).

Boydston: I believe one of the tribal members asked the Council if this annual 50/50 sharing could be formally adopted (e.g., a plan amendment) or be part of this technical adjustment for a 33-34% escapement goal as an average long term objective and not an annual objective. I don't know that we ever resolved this.

Bitts: There are two separate things being discussed here: 1) How are we going to determine the sharing under the current allocations? 2) Dale's question is there anything going into the Klamath Council's Long Term Plan? As I understand the specific 50/50 allocation is not to go into the Long Range Plan.

Grover: Does that answer your question, Dale?

Webster: Yes. I'd like to discuss this topic more under Agenda Item #7.

Grover: Fine, we'll add these two items. Are we ready to adopt the agenda?

**** Motion**

McCovey: I move to adopt the agenda.

Kirk: Second. I'd like to add that we should also hear from LB on the F&G Commission's actions last Friday.

Grover: We have a motion that is moved and seconded. The changes are accepted by Mr. McCovey.

***** Consensus - amended agenda adopted**

Agenda Item #2: Review of minutes of meetings held March 10 and March 13.

Grover: A packet of minutes was given to each Council member last night. March 5-7 minutes will be mailed to you in a few weeks.

Wilkinson: I would suggest that we hold off adoption of these minutes until we have had the opportunity to read over the technical discussions more thoroughly. The cover letter asks us to respond by May 31 (see Attachment #3).

Grover: Hearing no objections, let's postpone adoption of the minutes.

REPORTS

Agenda Item #3: Status report on the Klamath Project Operation Process (KPOP), recent extension for completion, and opportunities for input to Bureau of Reclamation (BOR).

Penny Howard, BOR, Sacramento: I am the Regional Environmental Officer in the Mid Pacific Region for the BOR. I have been recently asked to get involved with KPOP because some questions have come up about the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. It looks like KPOP had the right kind of public involvement. There has been a lot of public meetings and a tremendous amount of really good participation by

all of the various stake holder groups. Volumes of information were given to the BOR. Staff have been sorting through the information and just recently decided that there is a need to do a NEPA document. The decision to prepare the Environmental Assessment came so late that we just put together a very hurried timeframe. A draft Environmental Assessment was sent to the Department of Interior for review. This internal document generated some very legitimate questions on the parts of other sister agencies. We tried to stick to the schedule, but it was just way too big of a project and way too fast. Right now, we want to slow down, give everybody a chance to catch up and really take the time to evaluate the information that came in. We are currently in the midst of putting together a good plan for where we are going from here. Fortunately, we had a really good water year. A draft advisory for '96 operation is available (Handout #1). We would like any input that you have on this by the end of this week. We will be working this weekend in preparation for some meetings with our Washington office people. Soon we will also decide what our long term plan for developing KPOP will be. We want to understand the issues and then do whatever NEPA documentation is appropriate for the project design. There will be full public involvement in whatever we do. There has been full disclosure and I can guarantee that there will continue to be lots of opportunities for input. Does anybody have any questions?

Agenda Item #4: Discussion:

Wilkinson: Has there been a schedule developed for any future KPOP meetings?

Howard: No, we don't have the schedule finalized yet. I will mail that to you (the full Klamath Council) as soon as it is finalized. [Update: Fish and Wildlife Service staff gave Penny the Klamath Council's names and mailing addresses at the meeting.]

Bits: What is the minimum Upper Klamath elevation called for in the biological opinion on the suckers?

Howard: I am not well versed on that. (**Clarification:** The 1992 biological opinion calls for a surface elevation of 4141.0 March 1 - May 31 or 4139.0 for the rest of the year. The lake elevation is not to be less than 4137.0 [feet above sea level]).

Bits: Do the water supplies to agriculture and the refuges meet the needs of water users?

Howard: We haven't seen all the comments yet so I don't yet have that information. Have you heard anything from the Service, Jerry?

Grover: No, I haven't.

Webster: Do you have any idea of what scientific information was used?

Howard: My understanding is that it used the information from the biological opinion (generated by the Fish and Wildlife Service). I don't know how much of the information received in the past couple of months during the KPOP has been incorporated into this.

McCovey: Is there any type of a contingency plan in the '96 advisory to avoid a crisis if water supply is less than projected this year?

Howard: No, these numbers are based on historical records for 70% exceedence.

McCovey: Is there any process where we can monitor whether or not we are meeting the expected precipitation conditions?

Howard: Do you mean that one of the things that should be included in the advisory is a contingency plan for what happens if we are in one of those 3 out of 10 year conditions? I will take that comment back to the office.

Grover: Do you have a sense of what the time table is?

Howard: Staff up in Klamath Falls are currently looking through and categorizing all of the documentation that has come in. We may hold some technical workshops to work out the details on those issues. If we have only two or three primary issues, it will probably go a little faster than if we have 10 primary issues because of the number of workshops that would be needed. I roughly estimate that we will have some sort of a draft NEPA document out for the winter review.

Grover: What type of NEPA document would it be?

Howard: I don't know yet. It would depend on what comes out of the workshops and what kind of project description we come up with. If we come up with a project description that does not have any real significant impacts for anyone, we can do an environmental assessment or a Finding of No Significant Impact.

McCovey: I think it is really important that the flow needs to assist out-migrating smolts be taken into consideration.

Howard: I believe that Don Reck with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is looking into that issue.

Agenda Item #5: Public comment.

Dave Hillemeir, Biologist with the Yurok Tribe: I just want to point out that we had a really large spawning escapement last year, so in May there are going to be a lot of smolts and I think it is important that they have sufficient flows to successfully out-migrate. The Yurok Tribe hired a consultant to do a flow study. The flow recommendation for May is 2500 cfs. This '96 Water Advisory says that they are going to only release 1700 cfs. That is a substantial 800 cfs difference. I would like to know what that figure is was based on.

Howard: I don't have an answer, but I can certainly look it up and get back to you.

Bitts: Dave, in your view, would it more appropriate to accommodate that need for peak flow in May by adjusting flows from some of the other months, or are we going to have to draw down the lake level in order to pursue that higher flow?

Hillemeir: I am really not qualified to answer that. I know that the Yurok Tribal recommendations is that anything below our recommendations, in any of the months, may harm the species. Species protection fringes on protecting the Tribal Trust responsibility so flows may possibly have to come out of something like agricultural diversions.

Boley: A couple of years ago, we actually had some pulse flows that were designed to move out-migrating salmon through the system. The numbers in the '96 Water Advisory are average cfs over the whole month so it is hard to tell if pulses are included. Are there any plans for this year to have some pulse flows?

Hillemeir: I don't know.

Webster: We think the pulses are unnatural and not a good way to go.

Bitts: This is a little bit distressing. In this good water year, the shape of the hydrograph and the amounts of flow are not being met. What do we have to look forward to if this same scenario occurs in a poor water year? I would certainly hope that in a good water year that water deliveries could be met.

Agenda Item #6: Action: Klamath Council recommendations.

Grover: Is there any action necessary on this item?

Wilkinson: The Task Force will be meeting in a couple of weeks in Klamath Falls to address this same issue. They may have something to pass onto our Council.

Grover: Another issue involved here is a ruling by the Oregon Attorney's General Office on water rights in Oregon. I don't know all of the details, but I know it will be an agenda item for the Task Force.

McCovey: I would recommend that if any of us have any comments to give them to the BOR as part of the KPOP process.

Howard: The address to send your comments to is, 6600 Washburn Way, Klamath Falls, Oregon 97603.

Bitts: This is good information as far as it goes but, I am left without anything to evaluate.

Grover: It is my understanding that the Yurok Tribe provided their numbers to the BOR.

Webster: There is not much difference in the figures. We recommend 2500 cfs in May, 1700 cfs in June. Those are the main differences.

Boley: The question of the timing, or pulses of the flows, might still be up for consideration.

Barnes: I understand the refuge and agricultural water needs are met 100% by the Bureau's water advisory.

Q: Willis Evans: I would like a little information on how you are arriving at the required instream flows for fish life. Is everyone using the same basic IFIM system and if so, how do you get such diverse answers? Are you trying to resolve the instream flows on the basis of other aspects of water demands from other places? Or do you start with the requirements of the fish and then try to make your adjustments afterwards? Can someone give me a brief explanation of how you are attempting to resolve the flows?

McCovey: I will take a stab at it. I think they are considering fish needs first. Other considerations include the endangered species (sucker) and competing interests for agricultural use.

Bitts: I was just going to say that the straight forward answer to the question is no. I don't think that anybody can give you a simple explanation, but I think that Pliny did a pretty good job.

Evans: I think I understand what you are going through. I would like to suggest, why don't you first start out with what the requirements are for the fish resource, try to arrive at some agreement on that, and then try to see if it is possible to obtain those flows. You need to make an honest assessment as to what are the reasons that you are considering when you reduce the flows below those needed for the fish life. I watched the flow determinations going on over the last 25 years on almost all the streams up and down the State. It seems to me that the decisions are mainly on a political or social basis rather than on what the needs of fish are. I think you owe it to the fish resource to at least start out with the fish requirements and then make your adjustments.

Webster: The Yurok Tribe would appreciate you forwarding your comments to Mr. Mike Ryan at the BOR in Klamath Falls.

Bitts: Perhaps the Klamath Council can recommend that pulse flows occur in May.

Grover: Do we want to make a Technical Advisory Team (TAT) assignment to look at pulse flows as an opportunity to operate within this particular scenario?

Boydston: I really think we need to refer this issue to the group that has been formed for this specific topic -- the Task Force. I think the information we received today has been very helpful, but I would be hesitant to move toward making any TAT assignments. I would just ask the Council to just urge the Klamath Task Force to listen carefully to this issue and give it a high priority.

Boley: I agree with LB. It would be proper to identify that we did have exceptionally good spawning escapement in 1995, that we expect to have large numbers of juveniles out-migrating, and this should be considered in the draft 1996 water schedule release plan by BOR.

Grover: This sounds good. We have a liaison between the Council and the Task Force in the form of Keith Wilkinson who sits on both committees. The flows are an item for the Task Force to address at their April 23-24 meeting; Keith will bring forward our concerns at that time.

BREAK

1996 SALMON HARVEST MANAGEMENT

Agenday Item #7: Review Klamath Fishery Management Council (KFMC) recommendations from the March meetings.

[Present: Burnie Bohn, sitting in to represent Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) until Chair McIsaac arrives later this afternoon].

Grover: The handout that was presented to the Pacific Council at its meeting on March 10, showed our two recommendations (Handout #2). This has now been turned into a document called the Proposed 1996 Ocean Salmon Harvest Management Options for Public Review (Handout #3). The issue that was brought up by Mr. Webster on whether we intended to amend the plan to show 50/50 sharing, was what the Council had agreed

to in the latest iteration of a much amended allocation addendum. We agreed to use "legally defined tribal fishing rights on an annual basis." This statement doesn't clearly define the 50/50 sharing issue, but it refers to Policy 7.2 on page A-12 in the Long Term Plan.

Webster: I would like to have Ronnie explain this issue to the group.

Ronnie Pierce: The tribes are not trying to embed the 50/50 language into the Long Term Plan. We want to firm up the process so that fixed percent shares are determined annually rather than having a set long term average using fixed harvest rates. We made this motion to the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) the other day. I don't feel that they clearly understood that this would be a process that would be put in place as status quo. What we are trying to do is avoid the shift in methodology every other year. Our intent at the Harvest Allocation Work Group (HAWG) meeting was to come to agreement on harvest management then amend to the Klamath Council's Long Term Plan allocation section. This is the methodology that we have agreed we should use. I don't recall that we had formalized it. When it comes to the PFMC Thursday, they will be discussing whether it should be an amendment to the Fisheries Management Plan (FMP) or whether it should be a technical adjustment. Today, it looks like it can be a technical adjustment. How loose of a technical adjustment is it going to be? One that gets changed practically every year? We need to know from the record, is this method now part of the Klamath Council's Long Term Plan or was this just a recommendation to the PFMC for this year?

Grover: My recollection is that this Council presented this information as part of the HAWG report as a proposed amendment to the Long Term Plan. Since then it has been modified and amended numerous times.

Wilkinson: Correct, Mr. Chairman. My recollection says that it was never acted upon as an amendment by the Council. Therefore it is considered, at least in my view, as a technical adjustment for this year.

Bitts: It was my understanding that the Council adopted that language at the Eureka meeting in March. Before it becomes an addendum to the Long Term Plan, we need to find out from the PFMC whether that can be done with a technical adjustment. We are still waiting for that clarification from the PFMC.

Pierce: We want to adopt this methodology for basing allocations on annual percent shares into the KFMC Long Term Plan. The Klamath Council should first specifically ask PFMC if this can be a long term technical adjustment.

Boley: We have asked the PFMC that question, we are now waiting for the answer.

McInnis: I don't know that we really have to wait for the PFMC to make a call on this. If we are all in agreement that we are going to use the method that we settled on at the last meeting, then I don't see that there is any reason not to adopt it for amendment to our Long Term Plan. If it doesn't mesh perfectly with what the PFMC has in their Fishery Management Plan (FMP), then we ought to make our change -- then ask the PFMC to make their change on Thursday as part of their amendment to the FMP.

The history on this issue goes like this: In the document dated March 13, 1996, the Klamath Council described how we plan to arrive at our annual 50/50 sharing. Then we told the PFMC this is going to require that there be some annual deviation in the spawning escapement rate because of the different sizes of cohorts

that are moving through the fishery (i.e., instead of having a spawning escapement rate between 33% and 34% for brood, we are going to be looking at a 2% greater deviation in spawning escapements, so it would probably be about 31-36%. The PFMC right now has a spawning escapement goal of 33-34% and in order for a recommendation to come out of the PFMC for 1996 fisheries, it has to meet that 33-34% goal. There are two ways to deal with that. One is to amend the FMP (a year long process) and the other is to ask the Salmon Technical Team (STT) of the PFMC to look at what is being proposed to determine if indeed that isn't a change to the FMP escapement goal but rather a technical adjustment to how it is described in the FMP. If the STT says it is a technical adjustment, then we can use that adjusted explanation of the goal immediately rather than to have to either wait a year to have an adjusted goal or to have to ask the Department of Commerce to implement the '96 season by an emergency rule rather than by the regular way of doing business within the framework. The way that I see this is that it is only a one year issue and this was a one year fix. If it isn't a technical adjustment, we have got a problem for this year. This body doesn't have to wait for the PFMC in order to make an adjustment to its own Long Term Plan. If we agree to change to our own Long Term Plan on the agenda today, then we don't have to wait to hear from the PFMC. That could create some problems with the PFMC, but it would also put this organization where it belongs in the leadership of making a recommendation to the PFMC. The PFMC should come into sync with the Long Term Plan that is devised by this Council.

Wilkinson: I agree. If they agree that this is a one year technical adjustment, then we are in fine shape. A problem might arise if they declare it to be a plan amendment to the FMP, because it wouldn't be very useful for us to make a technical adjustment that they are not going to accept.

McInnis: I thought we had agreement that we ought to start the process of amending the Long Term Plan for the Klamath Council. I don't anticipate any major objection from the PFMC process.

Pierce: The tribe is still concerned about: 1) The language that Keith is using, "one year technical adjustment" and 2) We see the need for a plan amendment.

Boydston: I am going to suggest that we move off this issue. Annual 50/50 sharing has been explained to us as the way we are going to do business under the Solicitor's opinion. I don't see that this Council has to do anything unless the Federal Government decides there is going to be some other sharing arrangement. We have asked the PFMC to ask the STT, "is it consistent with the existing FMP"? We asked the PFMC once and we got a response that, no, it doesn't look like it is consistent. I would suggest that Department of Interior and NMFS undertake resolving this issue. It is not our Council responsibility to amend these documents.

Grover: We have provided two options that came out of this Council to the PFMC. We are committed to following the HAWG process.

Agenda Item #8: Develop additional recommendations for '96 salmon harvest management.

LB, do you have an update on what the F&G Commission has decided?

Boydston: The F&G Commission met April 5 to agree to publish notice of intent to amend DFG's Klamath River fishing regulations. They also discussed the allocation of Klamath River fall chinook to the inriver sport fishery. I apprised them that three options had been developed by the Pacific Council. These options allocate between 6% and 9% of the available harvest to the inriver sport fishery (consistent with the letter that the

Commission had forwarded to the Council). According to the rule making schedule, they don't make a decision on the number of fish that they are going to manage for inriver until June. The F&G Commission will be recommending to the PFMC that they assume an allocation of 9% to the inriver sport fishery (i.e. make the most conservative assumption about what the F&G Commission will decide in June). There is a possibility of having some kind of a trigger in our ocean regulations that in the event the F&G Commission adopts a lower figure, the ocean fisheries could be adjusted at that time. The F&G Commission acknowledged that the recommendation from this group was a 7.5% level. Legally, the F&G Commission does not make a final decision until June on the river sport fishing regulations.

Wilkinson: I don't understand how the F&G Commission's recommendation would change the option process. Could you explain that?

Boydston: In order to apply the F&G Commission's recommendation to Federal waters, the potential changes would have to be acknowledged pre-season in the regulations. I don't know if we have ever done that in the PFMC. Under Option IV you have the 9% (28,800) inriver harvest rate. Page 13 of PFMC's Proposed '96 Ocean Management Options (Handout #3) show a recreational quota of 28,800. I understand that figure is not inclusive of the September fishery but I understand that the Options I, II and III are inclusive of the September fishery. Notice that Option IV on page 12 does not have a quota. In answer to your question, if the F&G Commission adopted the 7.5% inriver recreational level under Option IV, there would be no change because there is no quota anyway. If they were to adopt some other option, then there would be a change.

Bitts: Are you proposing that the reduction in harvest from 7.5% to 9% come out of the Klamath Management Zone (KMZ) sport quota? Wouldn't 80% of the reduction in the ocean allocation come from outside the KMZ?

Boydston: If the PFMC adopts Option I, it could have an effect on the KMZ sport quota. THE PFMC options impose no Klamath constraint south of Pt Arena, so F&G Commission action should have no effect there.

Bitts: I disagree -- and ocean harvests would be constrained north to Coos Bay.

Boydston: We would have to examine those fisheries that are being constrained because of Klamath impacts (e.g., fisheries in the Coos Bay and Newport areas).

Bitts: In your opinion, is it likely that an action of this sort by the Pacific Council would influence the decision made by the F&G Commission in June? Would they be more likely to go with the 9% instead of the 7.5% if the Pacific Council had already come out with a season based on 9%?

Boydston: I really cannot answer that question. I don't know what they would do.

Bitts: It seems to me that the inriver sport fishery is about to be given its traditional historical share of the catch (expressed as a percentage of the inriver run), while ocean fisheries are being constrained to 1/3 of their historical share (by the allocation of 50% to the tribes). I think the sport fishery is being held harmless at the expense of other nontribal fisheries. There is a fundamental inequity taking place here. I will not support any motion from this Council recommending an 18% share to the inriver sport fishery.

Bohn: Dr. McIsaac's letter to the PFMC reflects the 15% option. LB has indicated that the F&G Commission will not take any action until June, but they may plan on recommending the 18% level. Do you just want to keep it as a range? Can you influence in any way what might happen in June?

Boydston: This is a decision that is outside the purview of the Magnuson Act -- just like the Buoy Ten fishery. It is decided by the states and then the ocean fisheries are adjusted accordingly by the PFMC.

Boley: I think that this Council and the Pacific Council will be faced with taking one of two possible routes this week: define ocean fisheries around the 15% rate (previously recommended by this Council to the PFMC) or make provision for a decision by the F&G Commission of an 18% recommendation to the inriver sport fishery.

Bohn: The March 21 letter shows only the 15% option.

Grover: That point is also made in our draft minutes. LB Boydston abstained from that motion. I believe he knew that the Commission was going to have a meeting. We do have a motion to the Pacific Council; for a single point of 15% inriver harvest. Are there any further recommendations? Let's continue after lunch.

Boydston: I apologize, but I have a conflict at 1 o'clock. There is a discussion on winter run chinook in the Habitat Committee. I will find a staff member to sit in as my alternate to keep me informed of what is taking place here.

Wilkinson: I suggest a delayed reconvening of this Council to accommodate this habitat meeting. Perhaps Dr. McIsaac can arrive at this later time too.

Grover: Seeing no objections, the Council stands recessed until 3 o'clock.

LUNCH

RECONVENE

PRESENT: McIsaac, Dan Viele (for McInnis) and all other Council members.

Agenda Item #12: Technical Advisory Team assignments.

Barnes: The TAT is continuing work on the stock recruit relationship, the prediction methodology for spring chinook, and the STT analysis for new forecast methods for 4 year olds. There is a new handout from Dixon showing a revised ocean stock projection. He used the 12% in river allocation scenario to revise the report.

Agenda Item #9: Council discussion (continued).

Boydston: I would like to consider a motion relative to management of the KMZ sport fishery. The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) had public hearings in Eureka where we received a considerable amount of testimony. On the California side, the public was overwhelmingly in favor of Option IV, seasonal management. There was some excellent discussion and comments from the audience relative to the divisiveness of Options II and III. This is truly an issue for the Klamath Council to work on prior to it getting onto the Pacific Council floor tomorrow. If the State of Oregon supports dividing the quota between the two states, it is going to be a very messy meeting. Our suggestion is to go forward with seasonal management and defuse the

whole issue. Paul Kirk and I have discussed starting off with a very conservative season structure and establishing a harvest guideline (i.e., the target toward which we would be adjusting the days per week so as to hit or fall below that target level of fish) of June 24. On June 24, we could ask the TAT to adjust the days per week so that we hit that target number based on their assessment of the way the landings are going. We would guarantee the fishery would operate at least 4 days per week in the whole season. This is the concept I would like this Council to support.

Q: Wilkinson: When would you propose that this season start? When would you propose that the block closure be placed? For how long?

A: Boydston: It would basically be Option IV.

Bitts: If this element of Option IV is selected, will it call for the selection of other elements from Option IV elsewhere in the package?

Boydston: No, it would only apply to the KMZ sport fishery.

Bitts: My feeling is that the seasonal approach has a lot of merit.

McIsaac: The State of Oregon held a meeting on March 24 in Seaside. We have received an unprecedented amount of mail on this issue (i.e., the tally as of this morning was 340 letters from southern Oregon). All the correspondence is in favor of split quotas. We briefed our Commission about this issue. The guidance that they gave us was that a seasonal approach would lock in the same kind of a season that we hope for. What are the risks of a full seasonal approach? One of the benefits of the seasonal approach is not being tied to a number generated by some forecasts that may or may not be accurate. A seasonal approach with a quota or a seasonal approach with fixed days off would start to lose all the benefits. If we look back since quotas have been in effect in the KMZ sport fishery, do we have Klamath impacts left on the table? When we were talking about this in Portland, I believe there were 4 years where we used a quota in the KMZ sport fishery. During those 4 years either the target number of Klamath fish or the Klamath harvest rate was never achieved. Perhaps Jerry Barnes and the Technical Team could look into this to see if that perception is accurate. If it is, it would lend some security to my concerns that a seasonal approach could possibly run up a 70,000 fish catch.

McIsaac: The Oregon F&W Commission is concerned about this same issue.

Kirk: Within the Trinidad community (as well as many of the port communities), we are concerned that, considering how we have worked in the last 4 years to try to structure a season that would open and close with a limited amount of fish (e.g., around 10,000 fish per year for 4 years), we have never been able to achieve equity. At the present time when a larger number of fish are available to harvest, people living near Humboldt County ports have expectations of being able to craft a better opportunity to get out and get fish. We want to target 30,000 fish instead of an average of 10,000 fish over 4 years. We want time on the water to access those fish and an option that allows people to go south to Eureka or north to ports in Oregon to make sure that with 30,000 fish, everybody gets an equitable share of the fish, no matter what day of the week. I would like to see an opportunity in the days-of-the-week structure to add weekends and/or add days to whatever the original proposal is. We need to have a Saturday/Sunday opening for people that want to fish on the weekend. We should have at least a 5 day per week start. I would prefer to see a Thursday through Monday

fishery beginning on May 25. This way both of the groups that fish those stocks can do that on a holiday weekend. I hope that we can encompass this within Option IV. I understand that there is complexity with the six fish in 7 days and the four fish in 7 days aspects of the season structure, but I would like to hear a little bit more from Oregon on what they do. I understand that our punch cards in California are already printed, but, on the other hand, I really think that we need to go with 5 days fishing. During those 5 days we could have a fish a day bag limit. LB, would your intention on Option IV be to reduce down to 4 days to get two more weeks or to increase the number of days?

Boydston: My expectation is that you would then go to 7 days per week. It is all going to depend on early season catches. If they don't catch many, it will likely go to 7 days.

McIsaac: I understand what you are trying to do is go give security for a season that everyone can count on, but since a harvest guideline of 29,000 fish is set, it lays out boundaries that are somewhat like a quota.

Boydston: This type of season structure addresses tribal and other fishery managers concerns. It is a mechanism to slow the fishing down in case harvest is occurring too fast.

Boley: A number of years ago, we had kind of a red light/green light approach where we projected catch during the season and during different points during the season. Our idea was that if we were going to be over or under those numbers then we would make some adjustment in the days of fishing allowed to be open.

Boydston: I would propose one midseason checkpoint for the rest of the year.

Bitts: There is already a substantial catch reducer here (i.e., 1 fish per day). I was envisioning that the checkpoint could go either way. If you started with 5 days per week and the season is productive, you might cut it back to 4, otherwise, you might expand it to 6 or 7 days at the checkpoint.

Boydston: The only reason I talked about starting off at 5 days was to better ensure that Brookings has an opportunity to harvest fish later and catch up (since their fishing is later). I am very flexible on the number of days/week. I just want to see a checkpoint in midseason to determine our path for the rest of the season.

McCovey: I have to have some assurance that the season won't get away from us (i.e., we don't want to harvest a substantial number over our target).

Kirk: Whatever is established, the ports in Humboldt County need to have a very good chance of having equitable opportunity. At my port we fished the last 4 years at 25% of the traditional effort. When the season is open, it is not wide open (even though there are a lot of fish that are typically caught the last week of June and the first week of July in the last 4 years).

Bitts: The two remaining salmon charter boat skippers in the Port of Eureka did not renew their licenses this year. I expect this will have some effect on the rate of catch out of the Port of Eureka, because not only do these guys catch fish, but they attract a crowd that also caught fish.

Boley: I can support a seasonal approach for most fisheries because it does a better job of meeting people's expectations and it benefits the fishery. The quota method has some drawbacks. Maybe we could by narrow

the range of options (from the present three down to two). We could finetune the seasonal approach and then develop another option that was a nonseasonal quota approach.

McIsaac: I would encourage us to keep this option of a seasonal approach on the table as long as possible. Pliny's remark about needing some assurances that the season won't get away from us is a legitimate concern. One of the assurances is that during the past 5 years, the KMZ sport harvest rate has never been achieved on a quota basis. In all the years except last year, the Klamath number was not achieved because of the Rogue and the California stock projection problems. Last year, the Klamath number was exceeded but the harvest rate was not because there were so many more Klamath fish out there. The 85/15 ocean/inriver nontribal allocation gets us back to the historic norm, but 82/18 gets into new ground. The shaky predictors (Rogue forecasts and Central Valley Index forecasts) are part of the problem. I suggest a seasonal approach with an inseason check on effort as an alternative to stock size predictors.

Kirk: Is there a possibility of moving the season to the middle of July?

McIsaac: Fishing at the end of July might be a possibility to make the seasonal approach more attractive. On the other hand, Oregon Coastal Natural (OCN) impacts are 2.0 for Options II & III and 1.7 under Option IV. I don't want to raise the OCN impacts.

Boley: Yes, we would be very concerned about increasing the coho impacts by going to the middle of July. Last year, even with low OCN abundance, 2 coho were caught, and released, for every chinook. That is a very distasteful way to conduct fisheries.

McCovey: These options need to be explored (e.g., the 9%, and the Oregon/California sharing). We have got to decide which way we are going to go.

McIsaac: Are there any other motions that we want to talk about before public comment? At our meeting in Portland, we had tabled one issue relative to excess fish returning to IGH. We had talked about taking excess fish out of allocation. Is it now appropriate to discuss that issue.

Boydston: Department of Fish and Game is having a meeting on April 16 with managers from Regions I and II. We will discuss these hatchery surplus issues and perhaps establish a trigger for the Trinity River similar to what is in place for the Klamath River (i.e., after the hatchery intake is met, the sport fishery reopens). I also plan to pursue the possibility of some special tribal fisheries, and/or the sale of excess hatchery fish. I have asked for a legal opinion on selling hatchery fish since these are mitigation hatcheries.

Bitts: LB, have you looked into donation of these fish to correctional institutions or charities?

Boydston: At Coleman National Fish Hatchery last year, the processor came in and processed fish and then gave the product to State correctional institutions. The processor gave part of the proceeds back to the hatchery.

Grover: The Coleman National Fish Hatchery manager and staff were glad to be able to use these disposal methods for handling excess fish.

McCovey: The Klamath Tribe traditionally harvested salmon prior to Iron Gate Dam blocking their passage. They expressed an interest in being able to access some of the surplus fish. If we can have extreme terminal area "clean up" fisheries that involve both the sport and the tribes then our attempt to preseason manage for 50/50 might come closer to reality. It seems like a reasonable proposal to take these fish out of the allocation because they would be a late season surprise as opposed to a preseason planned situation.

Agenda Item #10: Public comment.

Judy Cunningham, Port of Eureka, United Anglers: Recreational ocean anglers in Eureka are giving up our harvest time on the water. Even if we got all 6 or 7 days in July, we are still giving up most of July, and half of August. The Port of Eureka is a tough port (because it doesn't have a reef for bottom fishing), so if the salmon season is restricted, you have to drive your boat quite a ways north or south to other ports. The Eureka port facility has been vacated because people are taking their boats and their business elsewhere. The seasonal approach is the only way to go. Let's also do what we can do to satisfy the people in southern Oregon. I would like the season to be 7 days a week, or at least 5 days in the beginning and then hopefully increase that to 7 days. The Port of Eureka is opposed to a split quota. We'd like to see a seasonal approach to salmon management. We understand the constraints and we are willing to work along with those for the OCN coho. We understand that there has to be a harvest guideline in place. We would just like a guarantee that we have set dates for an opener, a closure, and a number of days that we can go fishing so that the people can arrange their days off to go out of Humboldt Bay and do some salmon fishing.

Sandy Crockett, Tackle Store Owner representing Crescent City Harbor District, Troll & Recreational Fishery: I've been asked to express concern and disappointment that, in these times of increased Klamath River chinook stocks we are looking at only approximately 30,000 for the recreational fishery. The Crescent City Harbor District would like to acknowledge their support for two options in the '96 ocean salmon management plan.

- ! The Harbor District supports Option IV of the recreational management interest in the KMZ. This option will allow sport fishermen to plan their trips to our coast without the probability of suddenly closing the season. We need to have a seasonal management program where I can tell them within certain guidelines, if you are here these dates, you can go fishing.
- ! The Board does not support the proposed recreational option of splitting a KMZ sport fishery quota between Oregon and California. This is an option that is divisive among our communities and will not benefit the continued cooperation of the KMZ coalition.
- ! The Harbor District also supports the troll fishery option that will allow a short commercial salmon fishery from the California Oregon border to north of the Klamath River. We have not been allowed a commercial salmon fishery off our coast for some years. It is time for "fishery pay back" to our local fishermen during this time of increased Klamath chinook stocks. Crescent City used to have five charter boats, last year we had one, this year we might not have any. New proposed docks have also been put aside because there is no need for them.

Boydston: Sandy, at the Eureka hearing, you talked about the Crescent City and Brookings fishermen intermingling. Do they fish some of the same areas? How do you keep the quotas straight?

Crockett: California people can buy an out of state Oregon license and fish Oregon waters. If a fisherman goes to Oregon and catches a fish but brings the boat back into Crescent City, then which state counts that fish? I can see nothing but enforcement nightmares. The Coast Guard is also apprehensive.

Bitts: What is the effect of the one fish bag limit on your business? Do you think one fish instead of two fish bag limit would keep people from coming to fish in Crescent City?

Crockett: The bag limit doesn't seem to prevent people from coming to Crescent City to fish. We have a bigger problem with anglers being unhappy because of the quotas. People are happy with one fish because they feel they are going to be able to fish 5-6 days a week. That is not a problem.

Bitts: I understand that the F&G Commission made the sport limit of 24" effective today. What kind of effect is that going to have on your operations?

Crockett: Fishermen from Crescent City are going to be unhappy with the 24" limit. I can foresee some of my people going to Brookings where the size limit remains at 20".

Boydston: The 24" is an emergency rule that will last through April. On May 1, when the regulations go into effect, there may be size differentials along the California coast (depending on the winter run chinook analysis).

Bob Jones, Port of Brookings: There are 3 issues that I would like to talk to you about: 1) Season management. Season management is the ideal (e.g., no fish counting, no season shut down, no red flags, no green flags, no target numbers, etc.). 2) The Oregon south coast ocean salmon fishermen endorse a split quota. 3) I would invite each of you Council members to look at the Preseason One Report and see who the real Klamath users are. Maybe, you could put your energies into monitoring those fisheries, thereby giving the zone sport fishery a little opportunity that it has not had in the past.

Boydston: I have not been in favor of the split quota concept. California members are not in favor of it. The last 2 years of distribution of catch has upset the Southern Oregon group.

Jones: Since 1986, when the Klamath Zone was formed, there has been a downward spiral in the KMZ sport catch until it got to the bottom of the spiral in '94 and '95.

Boydston: Ever since the major commercial salmon fishery was taken out of Eureka, there has been a major allocation shift away from California. If you want to go back and look at the old sharing, before '86, let's throw the commercial numbers in for consideration, too.

Jones: I am only a sport fishing representative, so I cannot talk commercial.

Boydston: One of the things that has happened under the Klamath Management Zone is that, the fish that used to be taken in the commercial fishery suddenly became available to sport fishing. The sport fishery has never been so good since Klamath Management has come along. For that reason, we are concerned about those fisheries getting out of hand. I am trying to offer an option that will allow for seasonal management to keep the fishery from getting out of control. Dividing up the fish between the two states is just going to cause bad feelings between our states. We have worked with Oregon on coho issues in good faith. I would like to

continue that good faith working arrangement. My main objective is I just don't want to see us divide up the union within this KMZ group. If the quota is split it just increases the chances of one group reaching their quota and the other group not.

Q: Bitts: Bob, I think we pretty well know that last year, every fishery that was managed by quota was shut off too soon because of the error in prediction. Are you confident that if you get a quota, whether it is a subquota or a quota for the whole zone that the same thing won't happen again?

A: Jones: No. I'm also no more confident that if we start catching fish, our days of the week won't be ratcheted down (through red flag/green flag for target numbers) to become a zero fishery as well.

Q: Boley: I thought the whole purpose of this was to guarantee that a zero fishery did not occur before the stated close of the season?

A: Jones: I hope that's true. All I'm reading here is the days we will be shut down as we reach the Klamath impact rate. There is no verbiage saying we could keep fishing for more days.

Q: Boley: If you develop specific mechanisms to keep the fishery from being shut down too soon, then what would happen? This is still a federal fishery management plan. We still have to follow the rules.

Jones: I view true season management as the best option. At the end of the year, we will tally up and find out what our impacts are.

McIsaac: Bob, with regard to the concern for security, if we went with a seasonal approach, then we need some security to prevent it from becoming a runaway fishery. The earlier mechanism that was discussed was to start with less than 7 days a week and somehow guarantee that it not shrink any more than that. Do you have any ideas for a mechanism to prevent the season ending up with an 80,000 fish catch? Do you think the closure in the middle of the summer is sufficient to protect against that?

Jones: We are still willing to limit the number of days we fished during the week, limit the number of fish we catch during certain time periods, and have a one fish a day bag limit. These are all techniques to control harvest before it gets out of control.

Jim Welter, Oregon South Coast Fishermen from the Port of Brookings Harbor: We have got to be able to market the opportunity to fish. July and August are when the Klamath chinook are coming down into the Klamath River and the OCN coho are going north. If we had a split quota, this would give us an opportunity to target fish and not impact the OCN coho. I hope you have a lot of fun this Fall when excess fish will be coming back to the hatchery and you have to worry about getting rid of them.

Q: Boley: In the previous few years, the KMZ has been allocated a certain number of Klamath fish. This year, the same process has been occurring, but it is complicated by the unusual, unprecedented fact of Klamath stocks being the strongest stock in the ocean (i.e., both the Sacramento and the Rogue stocks are weaker). Do you think that you are actually going to catch the number of Klamath fish that the zone had been allocated?

Welter: We probably will, if you include KMZ troll fishery. Last year, less than 3,000 Klamath fish were actually caught in the Klamath Zone by the sport fishermen.

Art Huschler, Port of Brookings Harbor Fishery Committee & South Coast Fishermen, Inc.: I have an additional 39 letters for ODFW showing that Oregon people support the split quota. We do not want any fish that rightfully belong to California. We just want our share. We also want to have season management under a split quota. We don't like the inequities between California and Oregon regulations (e.g., California allows the use of multiple rods). By arranging a split quota where we (the Port of Brookings Harbor), could manage our own fish, monitor the fish being taken, work along with ODFW, regulate the number of fish we catch during the week and regulate the number of days upon the water then we could prevent people arriving here only to find out the season is closed. The Port of Brookings met last Friday and agreed by consensus that: 1) If there is not an equitable solution reached, then Oregon will pull out of the Klamath Coalition, and 2) In regards to the sharing of fish, why can't the recreational fishers trade fish in the same manner that commercial people have done? Why can't we continue working together? We had our meeting between California and Oregon and we agreed that we could not resolve it at our level because it was too close to home. We said we will let ODFW and to CDFG resolve this issue.

Boley: The way we arrived at a sport fishery in the KMZ was in part because of the Coalition. The power of having a united voice for California and Oregon communities shouldn't be disregarded.

Huschely: Our charter specifies that the Coalition represents the inriver fishery, troll fishery and the ocean sport fishery. Now, there seems to be confusion about our role because of other entities' actions.

Mike Orcutt: I have four comments:

- ! The Yurok Tribe has always been supportive of KMZ troll or recreational fisheries. I would express caution in our dealings with the F&G Commission; they are not that attuned to our concerns.
- ! Regarding hatchery fish, who sets the policy on hatchery management in the State of California? It certainly doesn't appear that the Commission does, yet it appears that although the hatcheries are paid for by mitigation dollars (from revenues generated from the sale of water) that the F&G Commission is operating the hatchery in that regard. How do the tribes, and KFMC, fit into hatchery management?
- ! Now, on the equity issue. At the meeting in Santa Rosa the tribes took a lot of heat about the possibility of undocumented harvest. Yet, in 1995, we caught only 15% -- not 50% -- of the chinook harvest.
- ! Regarding the issue of whiting bycatch. Apparently there were large Klamath impacts and I wondered if this Council gives any input to the PFMC?

Wilkinson: Regarding whiting bycatch, there doesn't seem to be a whole lot of incentive to involve the salmon people in what is going on in with the PFMC's subgroup. I share your concern.

Jim Welter: Regarding the Pacific whiting fishery, 17,000 salmon were caught in it this last year.

Bitts: Mike, in terms of the severe difference in what transpired from what was planned before the season for meeting the 50% sharing you are correct, there was inequity. Inequity will happen any time there are more fish than predicted pre-season. If you want to make the 50%, figure out another way to manage your fishery that doesn't rely on a quota that is based on a prediction that, last year, was off by a factor of 400%. The Long Term Plan developed by this Council calls for efforts by the tribes to develop nonquota management methods for their fisheries. That hasn't happened.

Ronnie Pierce: Regarding the 1994 PFMC Klamath River Fall Chinook Review Team Report, the major recommendation was "that the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model should be used to establish quotas in fisheries between Point Arena, California and the Port of Florence, Oregon rather than simple time and area fishing seasons", so you may want to take that into consideration when you say quotas can't be done together. Quotas can be done together.

Mike Maahs: I wanted to request that the Council address the issue of any potential changes in the ocean size limits and how that affects allocations on Klamath fish?

McIsaac: There had been some discussion of it a year or so ago when the question of fish for fish accounting versus adult equivalencies came up. Perhaps we'll ask the TAT to look into this.

McIsaac: Now that public comment is finished, let's recess for about 10 minutes. When we come back, we can consider whether we want to meet later this evening or whether we want to set another time for a meeting during the course of the week. I am still very optimistic that all the groups can get together and that concerns over the seasonal situation can be satisfied in all arenas with assurances to the tribe and with assurances to all the fishing groups. I would hope that there is some resolution out there.

RECESS

Agenda Item #9: Council discussion (continued)

Bitts: Scott, what is the Pacific Council's salmon schedule this year? When is our last chance to get our comments to them?

Boley: If this Klamath Council wants to be in the lead and give direction to the PFMC on the shape of the two options, then now is the time to do it. If you wait until after PFMC acts tomorrow you are behind the curve as far as impacting the process.

McIsaac: So what we have here is a trade off. The prime opportunity would be to conclude business here tonight, but we don't have the technical information in front of us -- I also don't know if we have the caucus time to get a motion passed. If we wait until Wednesday there would still be some opportunity to impact a final decision. My feeling is that we are not at a point tonight to be as productive as a more reasoned approach later. Another issue is still: A possible motion on the extreme terminal area fishery opportunities.

Agenda Item #11: Action: Recommendation for 1996 salmon harvest management.

Boydston: With regard to the KMZ sport fishery issue, I don't know that there is too much hope for this Council to narrow it down to a single recommendation. We could easily come out with two recommendations, but that is not going to help the Pacific Council at all. The only way that this issue can be resolved is if the

Klamath Coalition people agree on it. Otherwise, I don't think we should spend much more time than we have on that issue.

McIsaac: This Council has not spent a lot of time on the KMZ sport fishery issue. When the PFMC gets both of those on the table, they would probably prefer that there had been a lot more attempt at a resolution here than in front of their table.

Bitts: I agree, with your statement. I realize that the positions are fairly hardened on the two sides of the Zone Coalition but I do think that discussion at this Council is our best hope for getting a resolution.

McIsaac: I would work with the TAT so that they could get to their exercise early and be the journeyman between proposals and see if there cannot be something that can be put together. I am optimistic that we can find a proposal that will work better than the polarization that we have got now. Would you like to meet tomorrow evening or Wednesday around noon?

Boley: Probably Wednesday would be better.

McIsaac: Let's get together on Wednesday at noon in this room. We also have some other agenda items: Assignments to the HAWG, whiting bycatch, and those two potential harvest management motions that were alluded to earlier today.

Wilkinson: Scott will be unable to meet with us on Wednesday, yet he has an issue that he has referred to from time to time. How would you want to deal with that, Scott?

Boley: I would at least like to put the issue of continuing our troll target fishery off the mouth of the Rogue River on the table here tonight. We need to decide whether or not we continue to pursue target fisheries or whether we abandon those as a viable tactic. The handout (Handout #4) titled "Issues for 1996, April PFMC Salmon", describes the composition of catch in the Rogue target fishery. I wouldn't ask that this Council pass a recommendation on this technical issue, but I would like this Council to recognize and either affirm or not affirm that we wish to pursue target fisheries to try to avoid Klamath chinook. People in the Zone and Gold Beach are saying that if they are not going to get credit for having these target fisheries, and demonstrating you have a clean fishery, and if you are going to be charged at the full rate, why don't we just open up the whole area and spread the economic benefits out amongst all the ports? If we are going to continue to pursue target fisheries, then the only way we can do that is to have those fisheries at a realistic contribution rate.

Bitts: I would just like to speak in support of the concept. The Long Term Plan also says that we will pursue target fisheries. If this fishery has, appears to have shown a success in avoiding Klamath stocks, it should certainly get credit for that.

Agenda Item #14: New assignments to the Technical Advisory Team

McIsaac: Does our Technical Team have the capacity to look into this issue?

Wilkinson: One of the aggravating things to me is that our request to have this looked into keeps being postponed.

McIsaac: Has the STT made a recommendation on this issue yet?

Boley: This issue is still open. The question amongst the people who participate in these fisheries is, “are we ever going to get any credit”?

McIsaac: Speaking from the ODFW perspective, I would be very disappointed if we did not have a 3rd year of testing to build an extremely convincing data set. I think the issue is whether or not we encourage our Team or the STT to compare the contribution rates, have a discussion, and make a technical recommendation. Or, perhaps if the GSI information can be used to modify the old coded wire tag information.

Boydston: I know the Rogue River test fishery goes back for many years. The efficacy here of whether it is in fact a target Rogue fishery goes beyond whether it just avoids Klamath; does it in fact target on Rogue River? I would like to see that question answered.

Boley: It is a good question. The 1995 data did indicate that in the GSI information, there was a lot of Sacramento fish.

McIsaac: Scott, are you interested in the Council making a direct assignment to the Team or are you interested in a motion?

Boley: Getting a compilation of what information we do have on contribution rates in the KMZ (e.g., what is the statistical validity of the samples from the 80's and look at the information from tags recovered in our test fisheries). This information would probably be useful to the STT, this Council and the Pacific Council altogether.

McIsaac: Is that information available?

Dixon: It is probably recorded in some of the Pacific Council documents (e.g., Postseason Analysis, or the Preseason Reports).

Boydston: Yes, the Preseason One should have some of that information..

McIsaac: We could ask our TAT to look into this tomorrow morning and see what they can do I will also carry this request to the Oregon seat on the Pacific Council so that we could make a similar request to the STT. Hopefully, we can at least force a recognition that this is indeed an issue. Let's recess until Wednesday.

McIsaac: Any further business of the Council this evening then? Let's expect to meet again on Wednesday at noon here.

RECESSED

Klamath Fishery Management Council
 April 8 and 10, 1996
 Ramada Inn, South San Francisco

Klamath River Fishery Management Council members present:

Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Scott Boley	Pacific Fishery Management Council
Virginia Bostwick	Klamath In-River Sport Fishery
Don McIsaac	Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Pliny McCovey	Hoopa Valley Tribal Council
Jerry Grover	U.S. Department of Interior
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Service
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commerical Salmon Fishing Industry
Dale Webster	Non-Hoopa Indians Residing in the Klamath
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
LB Boydston	California Department of Fish and Game

Attendees:

Judy Cunningham
 Sandie Crockett
 Virginia Byrtus
 Ken Byrtus
 Carol Davis
 Stan Griffin
 Ron Lethia
 Art Huschler
 Jim Welter
 Bob Jones
 Mike Orcutt
 Ronnie Pierce
 Dave Hillimeier
 Mike Belchik
 Richard Dixon
 Penny Howard
 Jerry Barnes
 Willis Evans
 Burnie Bohn
 Dan Beally
 Mike Maahs
 Richard Dixon
 Patricia Parker
 Ron Iverson
 Darla Eastman
 Judy McDaniel

Representing:

Port of Eureka, California
 Crescent City Harbor District, Troll & Recreational Fishery
 Port of Brookings Harbor, Oregon
 Port of Brookings Harbor, Oregon
 Port of Brookings Harbor, Oregon
 SAS
 SAS-Oregon
 Port of Brookings Harbor Fishery Committee & South Coast Fishermen, Inc.
 Oregon South Coast Fishermen from the Port of Brookings Harbor
 SAS-Oregon
 Hoopa Valley Tribe
 Yurok Tribe
 Yurok Tribe
 Yurok Tribe
 California Department of Fish and Game
 Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento
 Six Rivers National Forest

 Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
 National Marine Fisheries Service
 Technical Advisory Team
 California Department of Fish and Game
 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Documents Pertinent to these Minutes

Attachment #1	People present
Attachment #2	Agenda
Attachment #3	Corrections
Handout #1	Draft Klamath Project 1996 Water Operations (Agendum #3)
Handout #2	Klamath Council recommendations to the Pacific Council (March 10)
Handout #3	Proposed 1996 Ocean Salmon Harvest Management Options for Public Review (PFMC)
Handout #4	Issues for 1996 April PFMC salmon (Boley)