

Klamath Fishery Management Council
Meeting #44: Part One
Red Lion Inn, Jantzen Beach, Portland, Oregon
March 10, 1996
DRAFT MINUTES

The meeting was convened at 2:00 p.m. by Chair McIsaac with a quorum of members present (Attachment #1).

Agenda item #1: Review and approve agenda.

WILKINSON: I would like to recommend deleting Item #3: Report from the Harvest Allocation Work Group (HAWG).

McISAAC: Let's put an agenda item at the end of the day on "consider future activity of the HAWG". The action item is to continue where we left off in Eureka (there was a motion on the table).

Agenda (Attachment #2) approved.

Agenda item #2 Report from the Technical Advisory Team (TAT).

BARNES: I have distributed background information on CPUE data (Handout #1).

1996 Management Season.

Agenda item #4: Other proposed options to achieve Council goal in 1996.

Does anyone here know whether there have been any recommendations from California Fish and Game's Commission?

BOSTWICK: Zeke and I were at the meeting and we both testified during public comment. I didn't hear any recommendations from the commission.

McISAAC: Okay, with that lack of information, what are the wishes of the Council?

GROVER: Is the modified Bitts proposal (March 6, at 8:52 p.m.) the motion that we will take off the table and consider today?

KIRK: That's right. We were waiting until we could have information from the F&G Commission.

BITTS: I would suggest that we bring the motion back as an option to be presented to the Council as one of a series of options to be framed in March. F&G Commission action could be incorporated in the other options.

WILKINSON: Before you put that in the form of a motion, we are still missing 2 critical elements: the inriver recreational number and how all this models out with OCN impacts.

We need to make sure that our report to the Pacific Council tells them that we don't have all the information.

BITTS: We don't know those constraints now, and we may not know the winter run constraints by Friday. We have to do what we can. Maybe at this point in time if we can make some suggestions that could be introduced in the SAS and STT meetings tomorrow, then they could begin some of the modelling.

McINNIS: We need to put something on the table as a recommendation for the STT to get started on an analysis regarding OCN impacts.

BOSTWICK: We did a 10 year evaluation of what our average had been of the total nonIndian harvest. It came out over 14% with a high being 29%, and the low being 3%. I asked the Commission for 15%. I need to hear an option with my range in it.

BITTS: Is the current inriver sport share at 12% of the nonIndian share? What ocean harvest rate would that translate to? If we framed the motion to encompass a riversport share of 12-15%, with corresponding ocean harvest rates, would that be acceptable?

BOSTWICK: Yes.

BOLEY: We need to know what ocean harvest rate would be associated with a 15% inriver sport share of nontribal harvest. We could basically frame the motion in terms of a range of ocean harvest rates stating explicitly that this was encompassing a range of nontribal inriver fishery impacts of 12-15%.

BARNES: We could model this and get the results to you tomorrow.

*****Motion***

BOLEY: This Council needs to forward with these recommendations, as a modelling exercise only, to the Pacific Fishery Management Council: Ocean harvest rates corresponding to harvest of 12-15% of the nontribal share in the inriver nontribal fishery. Also encompass the status quo situation of 17% of ocean harvest to KMZ recreational fisheries and the remainder split evenly north and south between Oregon and California. This recognizes the 15% for inriver recreational would not correspond to a .225 ocean harvest rate. Tribal/nontribal will be 50/50 (Handout #2).

BITTS: Second (on the understanding we don't know OCN and winter nonconstraints).

DISCUSSION

McISAAC: We want to try to get something out for modelling to see if this going to come in at 25% OCN or is it going to come in at 15% OCN. Is this going to come in with any reduction in impacts on winter chinook or is it going to be an increase for winter chinook?

WILKINSON: The only way I could support the motion is if you amended the 17% to the zone recreational for the same sort of latitude you did with the nontribal share of the inriver and list that as 17-19%. If there is an increase in the percentage for the inriver recreational, it is most likely that that would come out of the zone recreational fishery.

BITTS: As I understand the motion, if there were an increase, the percentage of the ocean share would be the same as it has been for the past several years (e.g. 17% to KMZ sport and the balance split between Oregon and California troll). My intention was for it to be taken out of all ocean fisheries proportionally so that their proportions remain the same.

WILKINSON: It is most likely that the fish will have to come out of the zone recreational fishery. Historically, the sport fishery in the SOC cell is "unassailable". To give slack in the motion, I would like to see a modelling exercise that encompasses range in the zone recreational fishery.

BITTS: I can't accept that as a friendly amendment, though I understand your first motion. I believe ocean trollers will absorb 83% of any constraint to provide more fish inriver. The 83% includes California's even share of the 83%; all California fisheries south of the zone and any troll fishery that happens in the zone. So it includes the Fort Bragg and Bay Area recreational fisheries. In the past, their Klamath impacts have appeared to be negligible, but they are included in that California share of that half of the nonKMZ sport share. If they are there, they are included.

WILKINSON: I am just suggesting modelling of the 17-19% range.

KIRK: The last paragraph in the Commission letter we just received (Handout #3) is the crux of the whole issue. "It is the expectation that the ocean sport fishery will be provided a full season to the extent possible. That may translate to a reduction of the commercial fishery harvest. Is someone from DFG bringing this Commission information tomorrow sometime during SAS?"

McISAAC: The motion is silent as to where in the ocean there would be any payment of this extra fish to the river. It assigns it the same proportions that have been used in the past. If we were to entertain a later motion that someone could interpret from this last paragraph, (referring to Handout #3) then I could see a motion coming forward that said 15% to the river after a 50/50 split and then some higher number, 19% or more, to the KMZ sport. Some higher number would go to the Oregon component of the remainder and there would be some reduction down below, but the motion that is before us now does not do that as I see it.

BITTS: This motion specifically runs counter to the intent that the Commission expresses in this last paragraph. By spreading the impacts over the entire ocean fishery, rather than taking them all from the commercial fishery. I would not support a motion that did not do that.

BOLEY: I just wanted to remind everyone that California F&G Commission may have authority over the inriver recreational fishery, but they are just like everyone else, they only recommend to the Pacific Fishery Management Council, and ultimately to the Secretary of Commerce, for the ocean fisheries.

McINNIS: There are likely to be additional constraints on the ocean recreational fisheries and commercial fisheries in that southern cell due to the winter chinook. Any increase in inriver recreation should come totally out of KMZ sport or KMZ troll. The motion that we have on the table right now is a good middle of the road course to take.

BOLEY: I do intend to follow with an additional motion that would address some of these concerns.

WILKINSON: Due to the sheer preponderance of evidence, I am persuaded to not object to the motion.

****Friendly amendment**

McISAAC: Give the modelers direction that due to the high Klamath forecast we would like to see the Klamath impacts distributed in a manner to minimize OCN and winter run impacts.

****Friendly amendment not accepted.** BOLEY: We will deal with those concerns in subsequent motions.

BREAK

DISCUSSION OF MOTION (continued)

McISAAC: Does this imply no change in the harvest rate or spawner escapement rate?

PIERCE: I just wanted to point out that, this difference in sport harvest % changes the overall ocean harvest rate. It also has a small effect on tribal fisheries by changing the ocean harvest rate from .225 to .215 that costs the tribes about 1,000 fish.

McISAAC: As I understood the motion, it would make absolutely no difference in the number of the fish to the tribes.

BITTS: Yes, that is my intent.

PIERCE: This cannot be done. The more fish that are harvested collectively in river, the smaller the overall pie is. It is because you are harvesting immature 3 year olds that wouldn't come to the river. A shift to inriver harvest is a shift toward 4 year olds, and a decrease in the total number of harvestable fish.

McISAAC: If we were doing an adult equivalency on all of this, then there would be no difference. On a fish per fish basis, perhaps I could see the entire pie shrinking, for example, if you closed out the ocean in its entirety, there would be a smaller number of fish harvested.

ORCUTT: Aren't we fixing the escapement rate upfront and then applying two different harvest scenarios to that?

BITTS: If Ronnie says that the total harvestable pie would be reduced by 2,000 fish, (1,000 each for tribal and nontribal fisheries) and if this change were to be made, then I see that it is technically possible to get different results from the model even though we started with the same parameters. I am not sure that a difference of 1,000 to 2,000 fish would make much difference in a year that looks as abundant as this year looks. I would be inclined to go for the more equitable slicing of the pie rather than for the absolute maximum number of fish that can be harvested on paper.

McISAAC: Ronnie, I think what you said at the end did make pretty good sense, but let me ask you to elaborate on it to make sure that I did understand it. You figure out how many are going to mature and that

gets you the adult run to the river. One could split that 50/50. By going fish for fish, we don't do that. So could you explain again why this is related to something other than adult equivalency?

PIERCE: The maturity rate on 3 year olds is (37%). If we were going to base everything on just what would come into the river, if there were no ocean fishing at all, we would be dividing out 37% of the 3 year olds and 98% of the 4 year olds which is a much smaller pie than what we have to divide out if ocean fisheries harvest 4 year olds and 3 year olds which are mature and 3 year olds which are immature. The greater share of the total pie that comes and is harvested in river, the smaller the size of the pie gets.

McISAAC: Call for the question.

BITTS: Aye	BOLEY: Yes
BOSTWICK: Yes	McINNIS: Yes
GROVER: Yes	KIRK: Yes
ORCUTT: Abstain	WEBSTER: Abstain
WILKINSON: Yes	McISAAC: Chair votes yes.

*****Motion passes.* (BOYDSTUN: Absent)

** *Motion*

BOLEY: The Klamath Council recommends that the Pacific Council model an option for full utilization of the harvestable fish that originate from the Klamath system (recognizing that we have severe constraints in 1996, Oregon coastal natural coho salmon, and recognizing that we have to make reductions in 1996 on Sacramento winter run impacts). We recognize that the initial modelling exercise may not result in fisheries that are optimized nor consistent with the constraints necessary to reduce coho winter run impacts. Other options, other than the ones modelled here, may be necessary but among nontribal fisheries, the shares to respective areas and times will be designed to optimize total fisheries. If the ocean fisheries are constrained so that we are not able to take either an 85% or an 88% share of the total nontribal harvest within the ocean area, then additional harvest opportunities would be made available to inriver nontribal fisheries as the next priority. In other words, first we optimize ocean fisheries within whatever option or direction we get, secondly if we cannot harvest all the Klamath fish there, we put those in river for the nontribal fisheries. If the nontribal fishery cannot harvest that surplus, then that surplus will be made available to tribal fisheries.

WILKINSON: Second.

DISCUSSION

BOLEY: Yes. Within the nontribal share, we are going to have to have flexibility. Given the history of spawning escapement when we have projected large stock size, I am not comfortable with putting additional spawners onto the grounds for 1996. I would much rather see those fish harvested and fully utilized even if it means over and above 33%.

***Friendly amendment*

BITTS: Any accommodation made for harvesting surplus fish is for this year only and that this issue be approached on an ad hoc year to year basis.

BOLEY: Okay.

Q: (McISAAC): Did you mean full utilization without getting into monthly time strata?

A: (BOLEY): Within the fisheries, north and south of the KMZ zone, you would want to reduce impacts of OCN coho and reduce the impacts on winter run Sacramento chinook to the extent possible. After these impacts are examined, you would arrange your fisheries in times and areas to keep those impacts as low as possible. If those impacts were not still acceptable and you had to reduce further and that resulted in unharvested Klamath fish, then those fish might be available in the KMZ fisheries. If those fisheries had impacts that were still unacceptable and you weren't able to harvest all those fish there, then they would be put into the inriver fisheries. If the inriver fishery had too many fish to catch and everybody boycotted Virginia's establishment, then fish would be available for tribal fishers to harvest.

WILKINSON: Call for the question.

BITTS: Aye	BOLEY: Aye
BOSTWICK: Aye	McINNIS: Yes
GROVER: Yes	KIRK: Yes
ORCUTT: Yes	WEBSTER: Yes
WILKINSON: Yes	McISAAC: Chair votes yes.

**** *Motion passes.*

In season adjustment

BITTS: I glanced through the material that Jerry Barnes handed out on the CPUE (Handout #1) and it looks like we would need to have a test fishery as a dry run. I wonder whether we might be able to compose some sort of a test fishery as a trial with no management consequences for this year and see how it checks out.

BOLEY: When you talk about ocean impacts on Klamath chinook, you are talking about a three legged stool built on the expected stock strengths of the Klamath River, Central Valley, and Rogue River. I am really more concerned about projected errors in the Central Valley and Rogue River legs of the stool. If we are going to do inseason adjustments, we might also think about doing some GSI sampling work in May fisheries, and use that information to adjust the quota and Rogue predictions, and to adjust the Evota ocean fisheries. We should have a rational basis for adjusting the model.

BITTS: This is an excellent idea. I can hear objections some from those who aren't fans of GSI, but it seems worthwhile to get better results.

BOLEY: Fisheries managed on time and area constraints for a specific harvest rate wouldn't be adjusted. It wouldn't make a lot of difference. It would make some difference in modelling but it wouldn't make a lot of difference on those fisheries. It is going to make the most difference in the ocean on your quota fisheries. The major weakness in our present system is that our predictors are not very good and the people that pay the bill

are the quota fisheries and that includes all of the tribal fisheries. The only way to get away from that is either get better predictors, develop some sort of a verification system to adjust your predictors inseason, or to go to some time and area type management scenarios for all the fisheries.

McISAAC: My understanding is this Council has not passed any motions that would recommend any ocean inseason updates for this year; just a review by the TAT. Regarding the size of the run, note that at the 22% ocean harvest rate, this will result in the Klamath River fall chinook run being larger than all 5 stocks that enter the Columbia River. It is a curious situation to see the Klamath so big and its neighbors the Rogue and CVI, both be down.

BOLEY: We do know more about the Klamath River than any of the other systems. The Columbia River is quite a long way away from the Klamath and the fish generally migrate into a whole different set of ocean conditions. I am not as bothered by the parallels between a poor Columbia River scenario and a good Klamath River scenario, but I am really bothered by a poor Rogue prediction and a good Klamath River prediction.

KIRK: Could the specific motions brought to the table and passed be made available by the staff sometime early tomorrow so we can track these issues as they go forward to the SAS?

McISAAC: I'll work with staff and try to accommodate that request (Handout #4).

ORCUTT: Does anyone know when we will get the information from the Fish and Game Commission?

BOSTWICK: I think LB will come with a response.

WILKINSON: Are we going to do something about those option ranges as they begin to be generated in the SAS as far as making a recommendation on them?

McISAAC: In past years, there have been impromptu meetings. Dr. Iverson, do we have some leeway to ask the Council to hang around for a couple of days for more meetings after we see the options?

IVERSON: Yes, we can continue the meeting by posting signs in the hotel lobby's that specify when and where we'll be meeting.

GROVER: We also left leeway in the Federal Register notices announcing that the meetings would convene at the set times then continue at the call of the Chair.

McISAAC: Scott, with your knowledge of the PFMC agenda this week, when would the best time for this Council to meet be?

BOLEY: Wednesday. Before the Council sends the STT back to refine the options is when we will have had an initial read out on where the OCN impacts are, they will have had some initial modelling on winter chinook and an announcement by NMFS prior to then as to some direction and there will be some indication of whether the CDFG Commission did anything.

WILKINSON: It appears to me that on under salmon management on Wednesday, we need to meet and produce something between items 3 and 4 just prior to the charge from the Pacific Council to the STT.

McISAAC: We will recess today and will post notice in the lobbys for a time and place to reconvene on Wednesday.

Public comment

McISAAC: Is there anyone here today who would be interested in testifying? No response, so we will close the public comment period.

Action: Develop a range of options for the 1996 management season

Q: (BARNES): Do you want the first motion modelled with a range of options from .215 to .225?

A: Yes.

BARNES: Dr. Iverson said that his staff will be responsible for getting the results of the harvest rate modelling exercise distributed tomorrow afternoon.

New agenda item: Future assignments to the HAWG.

ORCUTT: The assignment list includes: opening the ports, supplementation, mass marking, target fisheries, hatchery surplus could refine the language on full utilization, and review the TAT assignment to have a commercial fishery on species other than fall chinook.

BOLEY: The HAWG could also look into some rough calculations of what fiscal impacts a testing program might have. These kinds of ideas would be best fleshed out if you had a specific proposal in writing for the group to review before the HAWG meeting.

McISAAC: The HAWG will get together and talk about these items at the direction of the Chair. So, Keith, could you ask people during the course of the next couple of days to get a date for another meeting?

Let's recess with an expectation of getting back together sometime during the week, most likely Wednesday morning.

RECESSED

PARTICIPANTS
Klamath River Fishery Management Council
March 10, 1996
Portland, Oregon

Klamath River Fishery Management Council members present:

Dave Bitts	California Commerical 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:

Sandie Crockett
Ronnie Pierce
George Kautsky
Mike Orcutt
Dave Hillemeier
Ron Iverson
Patricia Parker
Judy McDaniel
Darla Eastman

Representing:

Sandie's Marine, KMZ Fishery Coalition
Yorok Tribe
Hoopa Valley Tribe
Hoopa Valley Tribe
Yurok Tribe
Klamath River Fish and Wildlife Office
Klamath River Fish and Wildlife Office
Klamath River Fish and Wildlife Office
Klamath River Fish and Wildlife Office

HANDOUTS
Klamath River Fishery Management Council
March 10, 1996
Portland, Oregon

HANDOUTS

- #1 - Background reports on in-season adjustments from Jerry Barnes
- #2 - Information pertaining to Scott Boley's motion
- #3 - Letter from the Fish and Game Commission, March 1996 (aka Attachment B.2.c. to PFMC agenda)
- #4 - Draft - Klamath Council recommendations to the Pacific Council

Klamath Fishery Management Council
Meeting #44: Part Two
Red Lion Inn--Jantzen Beach, Portland, Oregon
March 13, 1996
DRAFT MINUTES

The meeting was re-convened at 11:30 a.m. by Chair McIsaac. All members were present with the exception of Scott Boley and LB Boydstun (Attachment #1).

McISAAC: Our main charge here is to give some advice to Pacific Council, to CDFG, or to tribal managers. The floor is open with regard to any 1996 business.

Agenda

- #1: public comment
- #2: technical updates
- #3: '96 fishing season recommendations,
- #4: the FMP adjustment issue,
- #5: HAWG issues,
- #6: resolution of the draft letter to Mr. Hart.

Agenda item #1: Public Comment.

BOB JONES, Brookings, Oregon, Klamath Coalition: The Klamath Coalition's charter was drafted and designed to represent all fisheries in the zone (e.g. ocean sport, commercial troll, and inriver sport). Our goal is to work and share together. If there is going to be shifting of fish from one group in the zone to another group in the zone, then I would like to have some consideration given to possibly realigning the allocation process. I think public perception is that inriver sport is going to have a higher Klamath quota and Klamath impact than ocean sport is. Mr. Kirk will bring our recommendation to re-align harvest sharing forward to the Council.

WILKINSON: The north and south share of the harvestable surplus would be shared equally, north and south of the zone.

MIKE ORCUTT, Hoopa Tribe: Any fishery that could impact spring chinook should first be looked at by the HAWG.

RONNIE PIERCE: Regarding the new 4 year old predictor being considered by the STT. Should that come back to the TAT?

McISAAC: It should be a TAT assignment.

BITTS: As I understand that issue, the question is whether the reduction in ocean harvest rates would have an effect on the accuracy of the regression of 4s on 3s and that might be the case if the reduction in ocean harvest on age 3s were changing the rate at which age 3s enter the river. I wonder if there might be any evidence that the Teams could look at to see if that appears to be happening (e.g. size or maturity rate changes).

McISAAC: The STT says they are not in favor of changing the forecast for this year. The prediction would stand for this year.

SANDY CROCKETT, Crescent City, California, Vice Chair, KMZ Fishery Coalition: I just want to point out on the recreational options under #3a (Handout #1). that the business owners and the fishermen of Crescent City are in complete opposition to this option. If you are doing any studies, I would like to see what the coho ratio were on the data that they presented to you from '74-'90. They give a total fish count but not a breakdown on coho and king.

Public comment closed.

McISAAC: Scott Boley and LB Boydstun are now in attendance.

Agenda item #2: Technical updates.

KAUTSKY: These model runs (dated 3/6/96, 8:52 p.m.; 3/11/96, 7:05 p.m.; and 3/12/96, 9:39 a.m.) (Handout #2) were generated with this year's new methodology where we look at the equilibrium harvest rate model, pluck out the types of harvest rates which produce 50/50 sharing between tribal and nontribal sectors, identify an escapement for natural spawners, the harvest rates to hold that escapement constant, then deliver a 50/50 tribal and nontribal sharing of harvest for the given year. The first sheet shows the 12% nontribal share for the inriver recreational fishery which is probably the same one we have seen before. The last page in this bundle shows the nontribal share allocated to the inriver recreational fishery representing 15% of that share. You can see that the respective harvest for tribal and nontribal fisheries is decreased perhaps by about 200 fish in this new model run. I also note that the adult natural escapement decreases by about the same magnitude. Because of the age structure, you are going to be affecting the natural escapement (which includes 3s and 4s) a little differently because of the vulnerability in the recreational fishery versus that which may have been experienced in the ocean fishery.

Q: (McISAAC): We should view these runs as preliminary. You say that you fixed the escapement, but then the escapement varies. Why is this?

A: (KAUTSKY): The escapement is varying because you increased the ocean escapement to provide more access to the inriver recreational fishery. Then when you adjust the nontribal recreational harvest in the river to be 15% rather than what we have been doing which was 12%, you get a slight variation in natural spawning escapement.

Agenda item #3: Recommendations for 1996 options.

**** Motion**

BITTS: Recommend to the management entities a 7.5% inriver sport fishing share.

WILKINSON: Second.

DISCUSSION

BITTS: Sunday, we voted to forward 2 recommendations to the PFMC. One for 6% and the other for 7.5% of nontribal harvest for inriver sport. Three years ago when there were very few Klamath fish, the inriver sport fishery gave a portion of its share to the ocean troll fishery. While that portion was quite small, it opened up more opportunity for the ocean fishery, so it was very significant. This year is about as wealthy as ocean fisheries are going to get in terms of Klamath share under the current allocation framework and I think it would be appropriate to give something back

McISAAC: If this motion passes, it would go to California Fish and Game Commission as well as PFMC. Is that the intent? Right now the 3 options on the table are a 6, a 7.5 and a 9% in-river sport fishing share.

BITTS: That is the intent.

BOYDSTUN: It would be hard for me to vote in favor of this motion as far as the State of California is concerned. We take policy direction from the Commission, we don't give it. I would urge that individually your organizations let the Commission know what your wishes are.

BOLEY: Would you be precluded from abstaining from this motion, thereby not compromising the CDFG?

BOYDSTUN: Yes, I will abstain.

*****Consensus**

KIRK: Bob Jones's suggestion is that the inriver receive 15% and the ocean recreation receive 15% to give a perception of equity. The balance to the north and south would be 35% each. This would result in us receiving 15% instead of 14.5% under the 21.5 option II. We would not share in the changing of a 12% to 15% amount of available fish. I have some concern with that because I don't want to automatically shift gears from the Commission's letter (Handout #3) that, as I read it, leaves open the issue of who will share in the change other than inriver quota.

BOLEY: I did not understand anything to be attached to this motion other than just designating that 7.5% of the total Klamath harvest or 15% of the nontribal harvest would be this Council's recommendation for the inriver sport share. I think the motion was silent regarding any other allocations.

McISAAC: Yes, the motion was silent. I'd speak in favor of the motion for the following reasons. When the Solicitor's opinion became something that this Council recommended allocation shares on, we fell back to normal shares amongst all of the various nonIndian groups. It is my understanding that this 15% share was the normal share for the inriver sport fishery. It had corresponded roughly to the 80/20 split that was in the agreement before.

In 1993, the inriver fishery gave up some fish that went from 15% down to 12% so a 15% would represent nonIndian status quo up to the point of the Solicitor's opinion. Secondly, our 3/10/96 motion #2 on "surplus" harvestable fish could give more than a 15% share to the inriver sport fishery. This is a cooperative, community approach.

WILKINSON: Call for the question.

McISAAC: Question has been called for on the motion that was made by Dave Bitts and seconded by Keith Wilkinson.

BITTS: Aye
BOSTWICK: Aye
McINNIS: Aye
KIRK: Aye
WEBSTER: Abstain
McISAAC: Chair votes yes.

BOLEY: Aye
BOYDSTUN: Abstain.
GROVER: Aye
McCOVEY: Abstain
WILKINSON: Yes.

*****Motion passes* Absentations: CDFG, Hoopa Valley Tribe and Yurok Tribe.

McISAAC: Are there any other motions before the Council?

***Motion*

BOYDSTUN: I support the objective of seasonal management of the KMZ sport fishery, consistent with PFMC option 3. Use the allocations to determine the harvest rate used for seasonal management of the KMZ sport fishery (As called for in option 3).

BITTS: Second.

Discussion

KIRK: As I said before, we are concerned about gaining credibility for marketing our fish. A season structure, such as the motion, would go a long way to providing us with the opportunity to market. We don't know at this time what the quota is, how we can spread that quota, or how to take into consideration impacts. It is up in the air as to exactly what that season would actually pencil out to be. I can support LB's motion because it is going to finally put back on the table some answers to this year's quota, we can expect to be able to market effectively to people out of the area. I just think it is a very positive step for recreational fisheries, I support the motion.

BOLEY: I would support the motion too. It does a better job for the recreational fishery of assuring people that when they make plans that they can fulfill those plans and actually have some opportunity to fish.

BITTS: I have to echo the comments so far. I think this is an excellent idea. I only wish that we had the technical basis in front of us to offer a similar proposal for the inriver fisheries.

McISAAC: Is your motion to support the objective of seasonal management consistent with option 3?

BOYDSTUN: To support the concept of seasonal management -- not the specifics of option 3, we establish what the harvest rate objective is and then the seasons are modeled based on assumptions of expected catch. We are going to be talking about 17% of what may be a 20% ocean harvest rate. That is very simplistic, probably only 3.5 to 4 percentage points. Remember that there was a Pacific Council discussion to move part of this option to option 2 (i.e. only in California would it be 6 fish in 7 days. In Oregon, it would be 4 fish in 7 days).

WILKINSON: I support the motion.

BREAK

McCOVEY: I can't support this motion because we haven't had time to really study it.

McISAAC: In expressing support for this objective, do you think we could make a single recommendation that this should be the situation or do we just express some support and investigate what it means is to recommend that one of the 3 options that goes out at the end of the week be a seasonal approach? Did you mean 1 of 3 options, or recommending a single option, or what?

BOYDSTUN: My intent was for this Council to vote in favor of the concept of seasonal management consistent. As contained in option 3 (option 3 will still be finalized by the PFMC later this week).

BOLEY: Seasonal structure will achieve conservation objectives better than a quota would.

KIRK: When I review options 1, 2, and 3, I see a downward progression in the amount of fish and the time available to fish. We really want to see as much time on the water as possible so that we can revitalize our coastal recreational fisheries. We are willing to go through a modeling exercise to begin the process of finally getting back to some guarantees on the water. We need to be conservative to maintain time on the water. Our call is to come here and try to present the public's best interest in putting 3 options on the table. Then the public is going to tell you very clearly what it is that they want.

McISAAC: I wonder if the maker and the second would agree to rephrase the motion to: #1, suggest the kind of intensified modeling that has been suggested here and #2, recommend that the tribes could come and testify when it is appropriate.

*****Action***

BOYDSTUN: I withdraw the motion. We will get the modeling done, regardless.

BITTS: As the seconder, I agree. Pliny's point is cogent that he has got to have some time to look at this. I think we should revisit this at a later time.

McISAAC: Are there any other motions relative to fishing seasons before the Council?

*****Motion***

BOYDSTUN: The catches in any emergency openers near the Iron Gate and Trinity hatcheries will be taken off the table with regard to preseason allocation counting or postseason accounting of 50/50 sharing.

BOSTWICK: Second.

DISCUSSION

McCOVEY: Would that include the tribal fishery also? Could there be traditional tribal dip net fishery?

BOYDSTUN: This would be an all citizen fishery in the close vicinity of the hatchery. Any provisions for special fishing would have to go through the F&G Commission.

BITTS: To be consistent with the principles we endorsed earlier of for full utilization of harvestable surplus, I would have to support any provision that would allow for the taking of excess hatchery fish at the hatchery. If that involved the tribes going before the F&G Commission to get the approval for a dip net, or other type of fishery, I would support including that.

McCOVEY: I don't think the tribes should have to go before the Commission to utilize their fishing rights.

BOYDSTUN: One of the consequences of managing for natural stocks is the potential for surpluses for hatchery fish. We can consider mass marking or selected marking for the future. This motion is a short term solution. I can offer to go before the Commission for the tribes if they would like me to. We realize there is a need to share these fish and we will go the extra mile to try to figure out how to do it between the tribal and nontribal fishers.

McISAAC: Since this fishery scenario will not develop between now and April. Let's table this motion and give people some time to think about it.

****Action**

Motion tabled with concurrence of maker (Boydston) and seconder (Bostwick). Boydston offers to work with the tribes to develop the concept.

Agenda Item #4: FMP Adjustment.

McINNIS: The proposed technical adjustment to the FMP spawning escapement goal for Klamath fall chinook is in the 3 page handout that was provided yesterday (Handout #4). We were asking whether this was a technical adjustment to the spawning escapement goal or if this would require a full blown plan amendment. The STT's initial reaction was it appears we are still targeting the 33-34%, so it looks like it is probably a technical adjustment to the FMP. They expressed some concern that we did not indicate how big a deviation we expected from year to year. They are also concerned that we don't indicate why we are adjusting the annual harvest rates. In one of our earlier drafts, when we said the brood year escapement rate will fluctuate annually, we had specified that it would fluctuate annually to meet the allocation goals. I think that is something we need to put back in there. What we need to do is explain that the we are going to set the spawning escapement goal and then we are going to set allocations.

BOLEY: If we clean this language up, it can be a technical adjustment.

BOYDSTUN: The degree of fluctuation is heavily dependent on what assumptions and what recruitment numbers were put in the models.

McINNIS: The actual sentence would read, "the KFMC analysis shows that this slight deviation from the stated escapement goal, 33-34% per brood *would be plus or minus 2 percentage points.*"

McISAAC: Are you suggesting this will solicit a reaction from the Council where otherwise, there might not be one?

McINNIS: I anticipate that we are going to get a reaction from the STT with their minor concerns. I don't know if we want to be ready to respond, or if we can wait until the April meeting of the Pacific Council to give a response.

McISAAC: Any further discussion?

WILKINSON: Rod, are you offering this as a motion?

McINNIS: I offer this as information. I haven't seen the analysis that says plus or minus 2 percentage points.

McISAAC: Some of us have seen that. I don't think anything Rod has said here is in conflict with any of the discussions at the time this was made. The analysis that we looked at did show plus or minus 2% and the procedure that is described there is what we intended. If there are no objections, if I am asked questions, I would respond in the same manner that Rod has just suggested for clarity.

No objections.

Agenda Item #5: HAWG Assignments.

McISAAC: We've heard about the four issues that will be considered, if there are no others, we will go with those four.

WILKINSON: I would ask the Hoopa Tribe to prepare any documentation they might have on spring chinook prior to the April meeting so we could attempt to review it there.

Agenda Item #6: Resolution of draft letter to Mr. Hart.

McISAAC: Between now and the end of the week, give me any edits you have on the draft (Handout #5) and I will work with the staff to finish it this letter next week.

GROVER: I support that we should be writing to Mr. Hart a letter.

ADJOURNED

HANDOUTS
Klamath Fishery Management Council
Meeting #44: Part Two
Red Lion Inn--Jantzen Beach, Portland, Oregon
March 13, 1996

HANDOUTS

#1 - Draft troll and ocean sport options, 7pp.

#2 - Model runs: 3/6/96, 8:52 p.m.; 3/11/96, 7:05 p.m.; and 3/12/96, 9:39 a.m.

#3 - March 11, 1996, Fish and Game Commission letter to PFMC.

#4 - Proposed technical adjustment to the FMP spawning escapement goal for Klamath fall chinook.

#5 - Draft letter to Mr. Blair Hart (Shasta CRMP) from the KFMC, dated March 13, 1996.