

Minutes
Klamath Fishery Management Council
April 5, 1998
Portland, OR
Meeting # 53

April 5, 1998, Columbia River DoubleTree Hotel, Oregon

2:00 PM

McIsaac: Welcome to the 53rd meeting of the Klamath Fishery Management Council. **Members please introduce yourselves:**

Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Mike Orcutt (for P. McCovey, Sr.)	Hoopla Valley Tribe
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Ron Iverson	Department of the Interior
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopla Indians Residing In The Klamath Conservation Area
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Virginia Bostwick	California In-river Sport Fishing Community
Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Services
L.B. Boydston	California Department of Fish and Game
Nat Bingham	Pacific Fisheries Management Council

Other Speakers:

Scott Barrow	Technical Advisory Team, California Dept. of Fish and Game
Bernice Sullivan	Bureau of Reclamation
Carrie Cook-Tabor	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Rich Comstock	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Don Stevens	Salmon Advisory Sub-panel, Oregon Troller
George Kautsky	Technical Advisory Team, Hoopa Fisheries Dept.
Rich Dixon	California Department of Fish and Game
Dave Hillemeier	Technical Advisory Team, Yurok Fisheries Dept.
Jim Welter	Salmon Advisory Sub-panel, Oregon Recreational Fisher

Agendum 1. Review and approve the agenda.

McIsaac: Are there any changes to the agenda?

Bitts: Last meeting we had a discussion of temperature and dissolved oxygen in the Klamath River in summer. Will we have a discussion of that information?

McIsaac: Where would you like to put it?

Bitts: I just want it to be brief...

McIsaac: Let's put it after item 8.

Boydston: I want to report on the action taken by the California Fish and Game Commission (CFGC) on setting

policy for the Klamath in-river allocation.

McIsaac: We'll put that between items 11 and 12. Let's call it 11B.

Boydston: We have a letter on that we could get copied and distributed.

Barrow: I could give you the letter later.

McIsaac: We'll put that after 3:15 today.

Bingham: I would like to postpone item 6. Staff has had some difficulty locating the letter.

McInnis: We also have a faxed letter here from the Yurok tribe to Jerry Mallet. Will we be addressing that?

McIsaac: Let's put that after or in with item 12. I would add one thing before we recess: arrange further meetings for the week.

Motion to approve the agenda.

Motion passes

Agendum 2. Review handouts.

Silveira: You have or will soon have handouts pertaining to Agenda 3 through 10. You also have information handouts: a final report on the Karuk Tribal Harvest Monitoring Project of 1991 (Handout W), and a letter from NMFS to Interested Parties dated March 23, 1998 regarding recent Endangered Species Act (ESA) activities (Handout H). There is also a letter to the Council from the Coast Indian Community of the Resighini Rancheria regarding a fish allocation request on the Klamath River (Handout M).

McIsaac: As we are having some technical problems with our projector, let's postpone agenda 3 and 4 until those are cleared up.

Agendum 5. Council monitoring needs - budget request to Task Force (TF).

Wilkinson: The Klamath Act calls for the Secretary of Interior to monitor restoration activities. Let's highlight and submit this to the Klamath Task Force (TF) Chair. They need to have a different view of the Council's monitoring needs. This should be a primary budget item for the TF.

Fletcher: The TF needs are prioritized, but the amount of dollars coming is small.

Bits: The Act says monitoring is a federal responsibility.

Fletcher: How about reducing subbasin planning and shifting some money to monitoring?

Wilkinson: I won't touch that, but I do note that the IFIM study is getting out of control. There has been an ideology shift in the TWG leading to less emphasis on monitoring.

Bits: I recall that \$500,000 of Anadromous Fish Act money has been spent through the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) on the Klamath, and \$1.5 million has been spent through the Trinity River Restoration Program on the Trinity. Monitoring needs to be funded from outside the restoration program. If the TF is going to take that on, we must stand down from doing anything else. Other sources of funding have walked away. Bob McAllister says some CDFG-supported monitoring ends this September. We need to put this problem back in

front of the agencies. The TF and we can't do it.

Fletcher: We need to say how much money is needed, and where it should come from. We need to throw out some targets. I think the TF should look at shifting money. There is only a little funding we can work with.

Fletcher: Then let's ask staff to verify monitoring we consider important and see how that measures up against the \$70,000 or whatever that is available. Ron, can the Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) come up with a list of fishery monitoring and associated costs?

Iverson: Yes.

Fletcher: We need to let the TAT review that list, to make sure it is inclusive.

McIsaac: In the course of the week they can do that.

Iverson: Bernice and a group of others are working on identifying monitoring needs.

Sullivan: We are shooting for April on that. We are not done yet.

Fletcher: The BOR needs to tell us what they will fund.

Boydston: I asked our Region I staff to make a request to the TF to fund the creel census. There may be others, (CWT activities and spawner surveys), that we may need to submit requests for. The Trinity is a related issue. I'm not sure where we are on that.

Bits: What would happen to fisheries without this monitoring?

McIsaac: There would be an extreme cost to fisheries or the resource. We need to point that danger out. Let's put this on the agenda for later in the week.

Agendum 3. Presentation on mass marking and selective fisheries in Washington State.

Silveira: I'm pleased to introduce Carrie Cook-Tabor and Rich Comstock of the USFWS, Western Washington Fishery Resource Office. They will be presenting the results of their analysis of selective fisheries as a potential conservation tool in Oregon and Washington.

Cook-Tabor: The concept of selective fisheries is to mass mark all hatchery fish by an adipose fin clip, and operate fisheries that retain only mass marked fish. [Presentation uses overhead graphics, see Handout A]. The problem with using the adipose fin clip is that it is also used to flag fish with CWT's. An alternate method must be used to detect tagged fish: electronic detection.

Bits: Is electronic detection useful for carcass counts?

Cook-Tabor: Yes, but you have to hold the carcass in the air and wave the readings wand with your other hand. It is hard work.

Bits: What is the success of identifying adipose clipped fish before fish are brought on boats?

Cook-Tabor: A fin clip is more visible than a tag. I don't know about the research on that.

Comstock: It's not easy to do.

Cook-Tabor: Is selective fishing a good tool? We used the Proportional Migration Selective Fisheries Model to investigate whether selective fisheries would meet expectations. We analyzed the current proposed fisheries by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), and DFO Canada: selective fisheries for WA/OR/CA sport, OR/CA troll and southern Canada, and non-selective fisheries for WA/OR/CA net, WA troll, all AK, and the rest of Canada..

Bits: In this WDFW and ODFW proposal, there are Oregon/California troll included in these selective fisheries. There would be from California troll since we weren't consulted. Why is Washington troll left out of this proposal?

McIsaac: That's a policy question.

Stevens: Then they should give the presentation.

Comstock: It came from the Washington legislature. They directed the ODFW to do it.

Cook-Tabor: Washington wants non-troll only for non selective fisheries.

Bits: So Washington wants California and Oregon troll to do it, but they don't want to do it.

McIsaac: Let's proceed.

Cook-Tabor: We used the model to evaluate the following perceptions: increased harvest of hatchery fish, increased escapement of wild fish, and greater fishing opportunity. (See Handout A for graphs of results).

Stevens: If the tribes are not on board for marking for selective fisheries, then we don't get the opportunity to catch those fish.

Comstock: Most fish will be marked.

Member of audience: What about the Columbia River?. Will those fish all be marked?

Comstock: The USFWS is advocating marking. The tribes are concerned that they'll be harvesting more wild fish as a result of other fisheries going selective.

Boydston: What will this cost and what will benefits be compared to status quo?

Cook-Tabor: There is a small window of opportunity when it would be worthwhile to have selective fisheries. For Hood Canal wild stocks, the model predicts only a 7% increase in escapement with selective fisheries, because those stocks range up to Canada and areas without selective fisheries. For Oregon Coastal wild stocks, the model predicts a 21% increase in wild stock escapement. But at a high cost.

Bits: We've been considering selective fisheries for inriver catch and mass marking. Is there any way to do a cost benefit analysis on this?

Comstock: Our model could give you changes in mortality to weigh the benefits of having selective fisheries, but not costs in dollars.

McIsaac: Let's take a break.

BREAK

Agendum 7. Letter to the CDFG regarding hatchery marking.

Kautsky: We met with the hatchery about the issue of enumerating the total release of hatchery fish. What has been used is based on an educated guess estimate of mortality factors from incubation to release. There was no debate on the need for enumeration, just on methodologies. It was a good meeting. A letter is not really needed anymore. (Handout B)

Boydston: It was a constructive meeting. I asked the region to write up the methodology that was agreed upon there. We'll ask to have the KFMC cc'd on that letter.

Fletcher: I want to thank L.B. for participating. His presence helped us reach agreement.

Agendum 8. Update on proposed Steelhead listings by NMFS.

McInnis: NMFS concluded a review on 3 additional Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESU's) in California. The Klamath Mountain Province (KMP) ESU wasn't warranted for a listing at this time. There are sufficient programs in place to reduce threats to the continued existence of the species. It will remain a species of concern to us. Also in California, the adjacent ESU from the Northern California coast to the Russian River, was not listed. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) which you have as a handout (Handout C), between NMFS and the State of California, relates to hatchery practices and harvest management for steelhead fisheries, and an accelerated review of the Forest Practices Act by December 15, 1998. Any resultant changes in regulation would be effective by July 1st, 1999. The whole package involves extensive restrictions on recreational harvest of steelhead. The CFGC made those as an emergency action, and will revisit them at their May or June meeting.

McIsaac: Questions?

Wilkinson: L.B. commented on this at our last meeting. Are there any further developments?

Boydston: In the MOA there are a number of time lines. We've identified some critical dates. Mr. Tim Farley, chief of our inland fisheries division, is responsible to meet them. May 1st is the deadline for review of existing and proposed monitoring programs. The area involved goes beyond the Klamath-from the Oregon border to Russian Gulch Creek. That is a collaborative effort. He will be contacting NMFS, the tribes and agencies doing monitoring.

McInnis: The ESU in the Central Valley for steelhead was proposed for listing as threatened. We are working with the CDFG and CFGC to take measures to reduce threats there.

Fletcher: Will the MOA insure that the existing laws are enforced? Will it address minimum flow needs in the Shasta and Scott rivers?

Boydston: No additional funding was specified for enforcement --as overtime or to hire new officers. A review of existing staffing in Regions 1- 3 shows that in these areas there is the highest warden force per capita in the state. One vacancy will be filled in Happy Camp. I don't recall any mention of flows in the MOA.

McInnis: Flows are not addressed explicitly.

Fletcher: My concern is not warden oversight of fishermen, but ongoing Fish and Game violations in the Shasta and Scott basins. How can you meet the needs of the resource when you don't address water issues but focus primarily on fishermen?

Boydston: Regarding the KMP ESU, due to federal involvement in the Klamath area where federal input and control is great, it was felt that listing was not needed. Outside the KMP, we have an issue being effectively dealt with at the Capehorn Dam on the Russian River. In the Eel River Conservation Plan, they are going to increase flows in the river.

Fletcher: We will hold the federal government accountable for those systems?

Iverson: There is a copy of the MOA as a handout (Handout C)

McIsaac: Now we have an inserted agendum on dissolved oxygen and temperature.

Inserted Agendum: Dissolved oxygen and water temperatures in the Klamath River.

Bitts: I would like to point out that while this council's purview is harvestable surplus and its allocation, we have a 9% ocean harvest rate on fall chinook, more often than not lately. The subsistence harvest issue has come up this year for the tribes. Meanwhile the federal government has a tribal trust responsibility and an obligation under the law that created this council to provide adequate water quality for fish. We heard in Eureka that that isn't happening--not only are flows inadequate, but dissolved oxygen occasionally falls to lethal levels for out-migrating fish. The TF's restoration projects and all our management efforts are meaningless in the face of lethal barriers to out-migration of juvenile salmonids. I'm not in a position to do anything about it, but I hope the federal government is.

Fletcher: The TF will have a difficult time dealing with this. The Secretary's obligation regarding the Klamath Act...we'll push the tribal trust responsibility issue as hard as we can with NMFS, USFWS, U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and others. We need to write letters to the Department of Commerce (DOC) and DOI.

Boydston: There has been a call for comments on critical habitat for coho. I asked our staff to provide comments on that issue. The areas above the barrier dams like Iron Gate and Trinity are not regarded as critical habitat. That bothers me, because what happens above the dams is very important to coho productivity.

Bingham: I agree. We've raised that issue a lot in public hearings. NMFS responded that they would consider factors affecting critical habitat that originate outside the critical habitat area.

McInnis: Critical habitat is defined by the presence of a listed species. The influence on coho habitat from outside is dealt with separately. There are constraints on federal agencies creating an impact from outside.

Wilkinson: The Water Supply Initiative, and other efforts in the basin, in the long term are the answer. I am optimistic about the water management strategies being discussed.

Fletcher: Those activities are happening due to a big stick. I don't want to see the big stick go away.

McIsaac: Rod, do you have comments on the coho listing and steelhead MOA with regards to water quality improvements?

McInnis: That is part of the MOA; a review of the adequacy of habitat protections will be conducted by July 1st. That will be conducted by state and federal agencies.

Iverson: Would the council like to hear from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) on Klamath water quality issues and trends?

McIsaac: Please explore that for our September meeting.

Agendum 9. Technical Advisory Team report. Review of inriver fisheries harvest data: what was expected and what occurred.

Kautsky: The council directed the team to look at river impacts in 1990-97. See the graph in Handout D summarizing the data. Generally the post season estimate was less than the preseason target. In the two tribal fisheries, the post season harvest exceeded the preseason target in '92 and '91, and in '95 (Hoopa side only). The river recreational harvest exceeded preseason expectations in '91, '95, and '97. In most years, half of the harvest was to be taken below Coon Creek and half above Coon Creek, but we don't have data to show where the overages occurred.

McIsaac: Can you pick that out of the megatable?

Kautsky: I don't think the megatable is comprehensive enough to do that.

Boydston: Friday I signed a letter to the CFGC on this issue, with my recommendation to revisit Trinity River regulations. I didn't bring a copy of that letter. The Trinity River has been a source of recent overages as a result of a fixed 28-day season scenario that is prone to go over with a low run size.

Bostwick: Part of the problem is the regulations. In 1997, upriver stayed at a 2-fish bag limit, while on the lower river we tried to reduce ours to 1 fish a day.

Bits: For 1995, the megatable divides the angler catch into "Klamath River below 101 bridge", "Trinity Basin above Willow Creek", and "balance of the system". Of 6000 fish that were caught, 5000 were caught above the 101 bridge.

Bostwick: On the lower river, the state's all over us like flies on honey. I thought we asked the TAT for a breakdown of that upriver fishery at the last meeting. It isn't counted like the rest of us.

Kautsky: It wasn't on my list.

Boydston: The documentation of the megatable was an assignment.

Kautsky: That was a long term assignment.

Boydston: We can get a short version now.

Barrow: I got swamped with other things. The CDFG folks in Yreka, I believe, are documenting the process.

Bostwick: I thought the upper river numbers were "soft". I would like to know the accuracy of those numbers.

Kirk: When will the CFGC set those regulations?

Boydston: The Klamath River regulations are set by June. The CDFG must get it's recommendations for the Klamath to the Commission by April for discussion at their May meeting, and their final action is set for June.

Kirk: Does your letter say the Commission needs to take action to modify the 28 day season on the Trinity this year?

Boydston: My letter is general, not specific. I will give you the letter this week. You won't hear any specifics until the Commission's May meeting.

McIsaac: So the lower river doesn't seem to be a problem going over? The Upper Klamath outside the Trinity in an unknown quantity, and the special fishery add-ons late in the year near the hatchery won't probably happen this year?

Boydston: Whether they meet the hatchery goal is an issue. Second, they won't have funds to sample it, even if it does take place.

Agendum 10. Review of recommendations to the PFMC made by the KFMC in March.

McIsaac: This item was just a double check to review what transpired at the last meeting. We have been provided with Handout E. Are there any questions?

Kirk: Is it time to discuss the decision of the CFGC?

McIsaac: Let's jump on to item 11A. That will be item 11B.

Agendum 11A. Review of the PFMC's options for public review.

Kirk: After our last meeting I received several faxes from the PFMC staff, and each one had different days for the KMZ. Which page are we on now?

Bingham: I got that same series of faxes myself. Does the Council want me to walk through these options in detail?

McIsaac: How about if you just answer questions.

Bingham: The PFMC's Option 3 is most restrictive and resembles our Option 1 recommendation from our March meeting.

Boydston: Scott Barrow prepared a helpful graphic showing the options. (See Handout F)

Bingham: Thank you L.B.. Looking at Klamath River escapements: Options 1 and 2 have an ocean escapement of 64.1 and 64.3, and Option 3 has 64.5 (thousands). These are intended to meet the 35,000 natural spawner floor. The 64.5 is to meet the tribal minimum. When you look at the Sacramento River escapements, there is a startling difference: Option 1 returns 318.9, Option 2 returns about 300, and Option 3 returns over 500 (thousands). A remarkable spread. In the available ocean harvest south of Horse Mountain, Option 1 has 493.3 for commercial troll, Option 2 has 539.3 and Option 3 has 275 (thousands). Also note that Option 2 has an Oregon/California split of 53%/47% while Options 1 and 3 reflect a 50/50 sharing of Klamath impacts. These options pretty well reflect what was recommended by this council. At the end of the last PFMC meeting there were some faxes floating around that raised some questions. But those were team faxes that were works in progress. The Preseason Report II is the official word. If you have those faxes, file them.

McIsaac: On Friday in San Francisco we left Option 1 with a certain number of days and now in the red book (Preseason Report 11) it is 2 days shorter, and so is Option 2. Option 3 is 6 days shorter. The team went back to balance the books after that as far as escapement. Is that correct?

Rich Dixon: There was a lot of confusion on Friday of the PFMC meeting. It took us a while to sort it out. The team recognizes that. We'll try to avoid that in the future.

McIsaac: The red book is where we are now.

Bingham: L.B.'s handout gives an easy visual portrayal of these options. The dates in it are the same as the red

book. Troll Option 3 is the “hold Oregon harmless” option.

Bitts: I’m confused by the difference in troll options. Between Options 1 and 2, the difference I see is in the August Oregon quota fishery, where Option 2 is almost 4000 fish less, and the April quota fishery is 100 fish less. That’s the only difference I see. I would have thought the shrinking of these fisheries in Option 2 would have produced a greater expansion in California troll, since that represents about 600 Klamath fish.

[Mike Orcutt arrives for Pliny McCovey]

Boydston: For Paul’s information, what I presented to the Commission was Sport Option 2, with the expectation that the final recommendation would be close to that, except for the KMZ-S, for which Option 1 would be closer without the buffer. Option 1 would give KMZ-S a few more days- May 23-June 10, and June 21-July 5, and August 12-September 13. That is my expectation for KMZ-S.

Inserted Agendum 11B. Decision by the CFGC on inriver sport allocation.

Boydston: See the handout (Handout G) letter regarding the Commission’s decision to adopt a policy of an inriver allocation for 1998 of 15% of the non-tribal harvest. This is the status quo. I was at the April 2 meeting (as were Rod McInnis, Bob Fletcher, and Zeke Grader) and presented Handout F. The concepts of weak stock management in ocean fisheries and allocation are very new issues for the Commission. They struggled for over one hour on this. There was a suggestion of a 1 % increase, and they asked me what that would do. I told them that CDFG has no recommendation, but that it would mean very little for inriver sport (a little over 100 fish) and that it would complicate negotiations on the Oregon/California split in ocean troll fisheries. Robert Fletcher said that 1998 would be one of the last years of business as usual, and that ESA listings will force some changes that might lead to more fish inriver.

McInnis: L.B. did a good job of a balanced presentation to the Commission. NMFS did not have a recommendation, so long as escapement and tribal goals are met. I didn’t speak. They had a lot of frustration. Their final act was done more out of frustration than a decision.

Orcutt: Was there any discussion of monitoring fisheries?

Boydston: I was explicit in my presentation that we were coming back to the Commission with inriver regulation recommendations. I did mention to them, as I will in the before mentioned letter to Tim Farley, that we’ve had overages in the fishery that must be dealt with.

Iverson: L.B., can you give examples of those ESA related factors that the Commission thought might lead to greater ocean escapement?

McInnis: NMFS proposed listing several chinook ESU’s (See Handout H). Central Valley spring chinook and fall/late fall chinook, if either are listed, will give ocean fisheries additional restrictions, reducing impacts on Klamath fish. Now we’re trying to target the Sacramento fall run by using Klamath impacts to get at them.

Bingham: Would you explain how Sacramento fall run with a population projection of over a million can be proposed for listing?

McInnis: The reasons given are the intermingling of hatchery and wild stocks and the loss of habitat on the San Joaquin side of the Central Valley. These will be reviewed over the next year with considerable debate.

Bitts: Also, proposed for listing is the coastal fall chinook from Cape Blanco south. What would be the effects of that?

McIsaac: There will also be adjustments in ocean fisheries, but I don't know what. That ESU includes the Klamath River up to the confluence with the Trinity.

Boydston: Spring chinook in the Central Valley are presently a candidate species under the California (ESA). We want to coordinate the conservation plan under the States act with NMFS. I believe spring chinook is the most ominous of the proposed listings as far as ocean constraints and most difficult to defend against listing. This is not an official statement--just me speaking.

McIsaac: On the Columbia River, more fish have been allowed to return to fresh water because of US/Canada negotiations, but because a listed species is there, it has not led to more access to fish by inriver fishers. But on the Klamath not all the species are proposed to be listed. What would be the effects of a listing below Weitchepec on sport and tribal fishing opportunity?

McInnis: If there is a listing, there will have to be actions taken to reduce impacts.

Fletcher: We're worried about the line at Weitchepec. I would like to think the actions we have already taken for coho would extend to late-running chinook.

Bostwick: How can you reduce us more? We're already near zero.

Orcutt: We commented to NMFS that we were dissatisfied with the lumping of chinook races in the Klamath/Trinity system. Is there a follow up or answer to those comments?

McInnis: The comment process included in the pre-proposal stage only allowed co-managers to comment, and the Hoopa Valley Tribe is one of those. Your question should have been responded to in the Federal Register notice. If it wasn't, it will have to be, because that is a major issue.

Fletcher: A lot of our comments at the meeting in Rancho Cordova regarding proposed management units were not responded to. We'll look in the Federal Register notice.

McInnis: The division at Weitchepec between lower and upper Klamath was made on the basis of genetic information, not run timing.

McIsaac: What is the process for expressing any gripes with scientific decisions, now that there is a proposed listing?

McInnis: They should be submitted to Bill Hogarth, the sooner the better.

Bitts: Should we c.c. William Stelle at the Northwest Region?

McInnis: That wouldn't hurt. The Biological Review Teams that made these listing proposals involved both the Northwest and Southwest.

Kirk: A number of Siskiyou County residents went to Sacramento to protest the coho proposed critical habitat designation. The regional reaction in the Klamath river is strong.

McInnis: The people from Siskiyou County that we've heard from have been reacting very strongly to proposed critical habitat for coho depriving them of their property rights. Critical habitat only influences decisions made by federal agencies in conducting their own activities and in issuing permits. On private land, where there is no federal funding or federal permitting involved, there would be no impact at all of critical habitat. There is a strong

concern in Siskiyou County that a federal land grab is going on. There has been a lot of misinformation put out in newspapers and other media in Siskiyou County. It hasn't been helped by some people who have been given the correct information and have chosen not to forward that information. We have targeted for local newspapers in Siskiyou County a letter to the editor that will lay out as best we can what critical habitat is about. That is supposed to be published in those papers this week.

Kirk: The KFMC office is in Yreka, in the middle of the county. Have we received any letters or feedback on this issue?

Iverson: We have received no questions directed at our office as regards the Council. We have heard all the controversy regarding coho critical habitat.

Fletcher: It grieves me to hear that the ESA won't be the tool we thought it would. I saw a flyer that said that NMFS was going to allow no activity within 300 feet of the channel. Is that true?

McInnis: No. That's the kind of misinformation we're talking about, along with others contributed by federal officials. I'm not saying that the listing won't have an impact. The critical habitat won't, but we will limit the take of listed species if we can prove take occurs. Enforcement is the question.

McIsaac: Let's take a break.

BREAK

Agendum 12. Yurok letter to Jerry Mallet, PFMC Chair

Fletcher: (See Handout I) The Yuroks have some concerns about how the KOHM accounts for recreational impacts in the SOC cell. We want to talk about how to account for those. During the months when the troll fishery is closed, a factor is applied to account for recreational impacts in that month. If troll fishing is allowed for a partial month, recreational impacts are accounted for only on the days when troll fishing is open. We must account for all impacts.

McInnis: The letter refers to redoing the KOHM with separate cells for SOC troll and recreational. Is that what you had in mind?

Fletcher: Yes, by the end of this week. I recognize it is a tough exercise, but I think it's a legal requirement.

McInnis: It's not difficult to do, but how much to do is unclear. What is the magnitude of this accounting problem? Do you have numbers?

Fletcher: It affects 50/50 sharing. Dave, do you have a number?

Hillemeier: In Option 3 there is a 0.2 factor applied in May, July, and August when the troll fishery is shut down.

Boydston: The sport fishery impacts are not thrown away. They are in the model. Those tags are in the post season analysis. When we look at ocean impacts, the recreational are included.

Dixon: The model itself was designed primarily as a commercial fisheries model outside the KMZ. As fisheries became more constrained, recreational factors came into play. All Klamath tag recoveries are in the model for the base period. That includes January 1 to May 31 impacts which go into the May cell, and September 1 to December 31, which go in the fall cell. When there are no commercial fisheries going on, that 0.2 factor is applied. When part is open and part closed in a month we don't separately account for recreational-it is included

with troll. South of Pt. Arena, 7% of impacts are from recreational fisheries.

Bitts: Through 1996, the sport contribution rate was 25% of what the troll rate was.

Fletcher: I appreciate that. Those impacts are considered, but post season?

Boydston: They were rolled into the troll fishery originally. The extra impact was assigned to troll and the sport fishery got off. Then when there was no commercial fishery, they began applying the .2 factor (.2 of what the troll fishery would be if it were open). Post season, all the tags are there.

Fletcher: If they're accounted for post season, that's ok, but shouldn't we account for them pre season?

Boydston: Then you would need to create a new model, and you would have to take the sport impacts out of the troll. Years ago we decided it wasn't worth the complexity.

McIsaac: This is a technical solution. We want our best preseason estimate. I want an assignment to the TAT to see what total Klamath impacts would be, and have them give us a solution by our September meeting.

Bitts: I thought we did use the .2 for the recreational, for the number of days of a partial troll closure. Duncan will correct me if I'm wrong.

Fletcher: That's what we want to have done.

Agendum 13. Public Comment

Welter: I'm Jim Welter from Brookings. The Karuk fishery is a fishery that we should take a look at.

Stevens: My name is Don Stevens. I am the SAS troll representative from Oregon. I'm concerned with the PFMC process. Last year in April there was a letter from Zeke Grader to Mr. Garcia. It reads "It is a long established Pacific Council practice to develop a set of options at its March meeting to establish a range of actions from which it will select a move for its final option of the season". Mr. Grader objected that the process and science used didn't allow time for public comment. My concern is page 10 in Preseason Report 11, Footnote B. Footnote B says these options may not represent a final decision by the Council: "The options presented in this document may not represent a final decision by the Council with regard to the allocation of Klamath River fall chinook between the Oregon and California salmon fisheries. Additional input and information on this issue at the public hearings and the April Council meeting will be considered by the Council in developing its final regulatory recommendations for the 1998 season". This is an end run of the public process. What does this mean? We think you should hear the results of public review before you make a recommendation.

Boydston: I put the footnote in there, because we had to put something together to go out before midnight, Friday, even though what I wanted crafted didn't take place. This is not a circumvention of the process. We have to be able to consider something different, or else there's no point for public review. This is the process.

Stevens: I'll negotiate on Monday, but I will in no way negotiate on Thursday .

Bitts: I felt that at that Friday meeting, we crafted what this Council had asked SAS to do earlier: to see fishing opportunity split 50/50. That happened at the last minute and what came out of that meeting didn't exactly get into the option. That's what I thought L.B.'s footnote was about.

MacLean: I'm Duncan MacLean, California SAS troll representative. I have 3 comments. 1) I think the CFGC took some steps to become more proactive in Klamath fisheries restoration. 2) NMFS should look at

standardizing hatchery practices up and down the coast, to reduce negative impacts to genetic pools and by more productive. Our natural habitat isn't going to increase. Hatcheries can be a barometer of natural conditions, the health of the river. It is not appropriate to use wild fish for this. We never mitigated fully for what we lost when we put those dams in. If we don't have hatcheries there will be no fishing. 3) Regarding the SAS and Option 3: it was to illustrate the drastic effects of that inriver allocation, but we also wanted to meet coho objectives. This was not meant to give anybody. We're at the bottom of the hill.

Bitts: Did you want Rod to address your question about standardizing hatchery practices?

McInnis: This is more than just NMFS. Other agencies have realized there are better ways to operate hatcheries. There was a costly learning curve. Without hatcheries, we won't have fishing, the people, or the infrastructure around to get the science done.

MacLean: NMFS needs to be a vessel of communication.

McInnis: We're doing that work at our Northwest Center.

Agendum 14. Action: develop recommendations for the 1998 management season for presentation to the PFMC; assign TAT to analyze technical feasibility of options.

McIsaac: Are there are motions?

McInnis: How can we make a recommendation without the TAT input on the Yurok letter?

McIsaac: When are we getting together again? We can meet sometime tomorrow.

Bingham: Let's get a sense of where members are feeling on the options. We'll be very busy. The full PFMC council meeting begins tomorrow at 1:00 PM. There is an essential fish habitat hearing in the evening.

Boydston: I would propose an Option A for the Council's consideration. Let me put this out as a straw option.

McIsaac: Would everyone be comfortable with that? Have people talk about what's on their mind, and think about it overnight? Then make formal motions tomorrow?

Boydston: My motion would be to adopt the KMZ sport fishery Option 1; and for all other fisheries, and areas, it would be Option 2, except for the June fishery south of Pedro Pt. and the August Oregon fishery north of Cape Arago, which is subject to California/Oregon negotiations.

Wilkinson: The Coos Bay public hearing testimony was universally for Option 1. That flies in the face of what you're suggesting.

McIsaac: L.B., you're looking at trading off August from Arago to Cape Falcon with the gap in June south of Pedro?

Boydston: That is my aim.

Fletcher: I may make a motion that all ocean impacts be modeled.

Bitts: I concur with L.B., except I want to see better representation of what happens in California when Oregon loses 4000 fish from that August fishery below Arago. I want to be sure those fish show up somewhere in Option 2.

Orcutt: I want clarification on what happened to the conservation buffer for KMZ sport.

McIsaac: L.B.'s motion does not include the 15% buffer that was there the past 2 years. L.B., you said "in all other fisheries and areas, Option 2". That option carries with it some OCN impacts north of Falcon.

Boydston: Whatever we propose will be modified for OCN impacts if it's a constraining factor. Scott and Rich have brought a new analysis of 4 years of southern California charter boat coho observations. It is much lower than what the FRAM coho model assumes. They will bring that to the STT. Depending on what action they take, it may free up OCN's.

McInnis: Winter run may also push Option 2 over the edge. That's another constraint. If the STT looks at OCN's off California, they should also look at the SOC recreational impact at the same time.

Boydston: I think the OCN thing involves changing a number, while the latter is a change in procedure, which I thought we were avoiding.

Fletcher: That's not clear.

Bingham: I thought Troy was asking for a clarification of the model, not a change.

Fletcher: First I want a clarification, then, if appropriate, I want a change.

Bingham: A motion passed in March not to change the model until the season is over. I made that motion.

Fletcher: If there's a legal issue, I don't believe you can fail to account for impacts.

Bits: We need assurance that all Klamath impacts are being accounted for preseason.

Kirk: What constraints are we developing here? We need TAT input on how long this will take.

McIsaac: It's a true or false question. We have from the tech corner that it will be 2 or 3 hours. Certainly a fix would take longer.

Orcutt: Has the TAT provided comments on the options?

McIsaac: The STT worked on that. Their best estimate of impacts is in the red book.

Kautsky: We only looked at two issues, including Troy's. On the first issue, apparently there is no accounting for ocean recreational fishing in the SOC in a month with a partial closure of ocean troll. In a zero troll month, a .2 factor is applied. That .2 factor may be an overcompensation. In a full troll month, it is built in. It's an easy fix, but it might really change the numbers.

Orcutt: Do you have any comments on the use of conservation buffers in the KMZ sport?

Kautsky: No

McIsaac: Let's have TAT assignments. It looks like George just said that Troy's question is false, but the full TAT should have a look at it.

Boydston: In my option after "for all other areas and fisheries it would be Option 2" add "except for June south of

Pedro and August north of Arago, subject to Oregon/California negotiations. “Also have the Fort Bragg sport first fishery extended thru July 5th (versus June 30th) and take a day off between the change in the 26" and 27" size limits.

Wilkinson: Are Oregon and California sport fisheries included under “all other fisheries”?

Boydston: Yes.

McIsaac: Let’s have some TAT assignments.

Fletcher: Are preseason impacts in the ocean recreational fishery accounted for, and if not, how are they and how might they be?

Orcutt: I want more information on a buffer versus non-buffer in the KMZ sport.

Bits: I would like them to find those 4000 fish that were taken from the Oregon quota fishery in August between Option 1 and Option 2. There appear to be no increases in California fisheries nor escapement. The increased escapement in Option 2 is from the conservation buffer in the KMZ.

McIsaac: When do we get together next? (Members discussed meeting times.) So we’ll meet on Monday at noon for 1 hour and then on Monday night at 7:00 PM. We’ll meet Tuesday at noon and Wednesday at noon, and then if needed, Thursday at noon. Let’s recess until noon tomorrow.

RECESS

Monday, April 6th, 12:00 PM

RECONVENE

Members Present:

Don Stevens (for K. Wilkinson)	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Ron Iverson	Department of the Interior
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopa Indians Residing In The Klamath Conservation Area
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Virginia Bostwick	California In-river Sport Fishing Community
Dave Bits	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Services
L.B. Boydston	California Department of Fish and Game
Nat Bingham	Pacific Fisheries Management Council

Other Speakers:

George Kautsky	Technical Advisory Team, Hoopa Fisheries Dept.
Rich Dixon	California Department of Fish and Game
Michael Mohr	Technical Advisory Team, National Marine Fisheries Service

McIsaac: Let’s hear a report from the TAT.

Agendum 15. Report from Technical Advisory Team.

Kautsky: We looked at the SOC recreational fishery in the KOHM. The answer is no, it doesn’t account for all

the impacts. Rich Dixon and Michael Mohr are looking at the magnitude of it and how to fix it. They're looking at SOC CWT's for 1986-1997. The proportion of those tags from the recreational fishery is 10% or less. So the .2 used to estimate recreational impacts in months with no troll in the SOC is a gross overestimate. What do you do between that extreme, and months with just a few days of a troll fishery? We discussed several approaches. We could dissect the fishery into months and sub-cells, or we could apply an aggregate correction factor. Michael Mohr was going to come give an update but he's not here yet.

McInnis: The recreational impact ran from less than 1 to 10% of...?

Barrow: 1 to 10% of the total tags in a cell, within a year.

McInnis: Did the TAT look at whether the recreational fishery catches more Klamath fish when there is no troll? Will you look at that?

Kautsky: No. That would be instructive. Michael Mohr is here.

Mohr: We reviewed CWT recoveries of Klamath chinook in the SOC cell by month, 1986-1997 commercial and recreational. We are giving you a handout on that (Handout J). We've broken it into 3 areas: Bodega Bay (Pt. Arena to Pt. Reyes), the central SOC (Pt. Reyes to Pigeon Pt.), and Monterey and Santa Cruz (Pigeon Pt. To Pt. Sur). In the Bodega area, sport impacts are about .1%; that's nil on Klamath stocks. In the Central Californian area in January through May, compiled in the May month, there was a substantial percentage of impacts from the sport fishery: approximately 36% in the base period. Compare that with 3% in June-August. In the year 1996, it was 54% for May. It was much greater in May than in June through August.

Bits: To address Troy's earlier question about whether troll closures affected recreational harvest rates: you can see in Handout J that in the instance of 1997, the June closure of troll for 3 weeks didn't result in a higher recreational harvest.

McInnis: In the current model, if there's no troll fishery in May, what happens to all the January thru April impacts? Are they carried over to June?

Mohr: We assign 20%, (the .2 factor), of the base period troll rate for that month to recreation.

McIsaac: In the Bodega area, for example, the model assumed a commercial impact of Klamath fish, and an additional sport impact, and that ratio would be 80/20. Did that result in an over estimate of Klamath impacts?

Mohr: No, the 80/20 split was only done if there was no troll in the month. If there is a troll fishery, a total impact rate is used that includes the recreational. The 20% we've been using is, I believe, derived from the total landings of chinook, including Sacramento, in the base period and what percentage was landed by the recreational fishery. That's primarily Central Valley fish. On page 3 of the handout in the Monterey and Santa Cruz area about 2% of the total tag recoveries were recreational in 1986 - 90. In 1996 it was 12% approximately, but you can see '96 was exceptionally high compared to other years. To sum up: only in May in the Central California area were recreational tag recoveries consistently above 20% of the total.

Iverson: What is the typical expansion factor used for tags? How much are these numbers blown up?

Dixon: Our desired sampling level is 20%.

Mohr: This is our progress thus far.

McIsaac: To summarize: sport fishery impacts are not fully accounted for when troll is not on the water for a full month. So if troll was only open 15 days, then 20% of that 15 days would be assigned to the recreational fishery, even though the sport fishery might be open 30 days. So the Klamath impacts in months with a partial troll closure could be underestimated. But your data also shows that 20% is sometimes much too high, so we can't tell how these may be canceling each other out.

McInnis: When you have half of the geographic SOC cell open to troll in the month of June, are you adjusting effort for the half of the cell that is closed with respect to Klamath impacts?

Mohr: Yes.

McInnis: Is this a meaningful problem here? The entire SOC is closed to troll only 18 days in June in Option 2.

Mohr: This May situation in the Central area could have some effects. We need to look further into it. This was just a progress report. We have set up the KOHM to break this apart and now we'll run some numbers through it.

McIsaac: You are trying to judge whether to raise the issue of changing the model?

Mohr: Yes.

McInnis: Would you look at changes in the troll impact?

Mohr: If both fisheries were operating the whole month, the total impacts won't change. But this suggests that in that Central area in May when both fisheries are operating only 2/3 of the impacts should be assigned to troll.

McInnis: Will you also review the overall model/cell issues that have been discussed in the past year?

Mohr: Absolutely.

MacLean: You're saying recreational impacts are less than 20%, but May is inflated due to the inclusion of January thru May. Troll only starts in May. Wouldn't it be better to model the recreational fishery on a month by month basis?

Mohr: That should be done when a clear difference between months exists, but that only happens in Central California.

McIsaac: We'll hear an update on this at 7:00 PM. We are all wondering: is this underestimate 100 fish or 600 fish?

Bits: I added up the totals here, and it's about 9,500 total tags, of which less than 300 are recreational. The total recreational share of Klamath landings is on the order of 3%.

Fletcher: Our position is that all impacts must be accounted for pre-season.

McIsaac: Let's hear more from the TAT.

Kautsky: The next question was: what happened to the 3,900 fish taken from the Oregon August quota fisheries between Options 1 and 2? That amounts to about 240 Klamath fish.

Dixon: The August quota fishery in the KMZ troll is 5,300 in Option 1 and 1,400 in Option 2. This includes all stocks here. The numbers of Klamath fish are about 338 for Option 1, 90 for Option 2; that's 240 Klamath fish. The GSI work on the Rogue showed that Klamath impacts were lower than what we were modeling, allowing those target quota fisheries.

Bits: Half of those 250 fish show up in California, in Option 2. What about the other half?

Dixon: We'll look at that.

Kautsky: The last question was the KMZ sport buffer. We passed out a handout in the San Francisco meeting showing an analysis of the KMZ sport fishery and showing the bias in the preseason estimate (Handout K). Look at that handout; the graphs on the right show season totals. In only 2 out of 8 years did the preseason expectation meet the actual catch. In all other years the actual catch was considerably below the preseason expectation. There is a bias toward overestimating preseason impacts for the KMZ sport. In the conservative direction.

McIsaac: It is 1:00 PM. Time to break. We will meet at 7:00 PM.

Bingham: Staff has distributed my letter on monitoring (Handout L). Please look at that before tonight's meeting.

Bostwick: We have received two letters now from Indian rancherias (Handout M) requesting allocation. Someone needs to inform them we are not the body to contact on the allocation process.

McIsaac: We'll put that on our agenda for tonight.

RECESS

Monday, April 6, 7:00 PM.

RECONVENE

Members present:

Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Services
Don Stevens (for K. Wilkinson)	Oregon Commercial Salmon fishing Industry
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Ron Iverson	Department of the Interior
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopa Indians Klamath Conservation Area
Bernie Bohn (for D. McIsaac)	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dave Bits	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
L.B. Boydston	California Department of Fish and Game
Nat Bingham	Pacific Fisheries Management Council

Other Speakers:

Scott Barrow	Technical Advisory Team, California Dept. of Fish and Game
George Kautsky	Technical Advisory Team, Hoopa Fisheries Dept.
Carol Davis	KMZ Coalition, Troller
Michael Mohr	Technical Advisory Team, National Marine Fisheries Service

McInnis: Don McIsaac has other obligations tonight; Bernie Bohn will sit in for him. I will be serving as chair in Dr. McIsaac's absence. We have our agenda for tonight:

- 1) the TAT report on recreational harvest accounting in the KOHM,

- 2) public comment,
- 3) Council action on recommendations to the PFMC or other management agencies,
- 4) Letter to CDFG on monitoring,
- 5) and the letter from the Resighini Rancheria.

We'll start with the TAT report.

Agendum 1. Report from the TAT.

Kautsky: The TAT has adjusted the KOHM and rerun Options 1 and 2 to account for recreational impacts in months of a partial troll closure. The difference between these runs and the unadjusted runs is on the order of 100 fish in Option 1 and 62 in Option 2.

Boydston: I have 3 concerns. 1) the numbers shown yesterday (Handout J) for the SOC sport fishery in May include February-May tags, but in our proposed options, that Central area has a delayed opening in late March; 2) we've implemented a 24" size limit that precludes 2-year-olds from harvest; 3) some of the impacts in Handout J are 2-year-olds that don't contribute toward spawning escapement.

Barrow: I raised that 2-year-old question with the TAT and I think they addressed it.

Bingham: Would this adjustment mean plugging in additional numbers, or would the scaling factors be adjusted in any way? I asked staff to provide a transcript of the motion I made at the last meeting, asking that no changes be made to the KOHM model.

Fletcher: I agree that we took an action, but that was under the assumption that we were estimating all impacts.

McInnis: Nat's concern is not so much with what happens with this council, but with the PFMC. They passed a motion that said they wouldn't change the model back in March.

Bohn: We don't want to have what happened last year with the Snake River fish.

Bingham: Staff will provide the language of that motion.

McInnis: Let's proceed until Mohr and Dixon appear.

Agendum 4. Letter to CDFG regarding monitoring.

McInnis: This letter is to Jacqueline Schafer, dated March 9, 1998.

Bingham: Did you all get this fax to Tim Farley, Inland Fisheries, dated April 3? (Handout N). The bottom paragraph is of interest: "For your information I have asked Region 1 to submit a funding request to the Klamath River Task Force for a middle Klamath River (Coon Creek to Iron Gate Dam) creel survey. The KFMC continues to be concerned about the lack of catch and effort data for the fishery. This is not a new issue, and lack of funding continues to be my answer why we do not collect the data. The Task Force should be an obvious funding source for the project, but monitoring continue to be a low priority with them". This draft letter before you basically asks for funding for a share of monitoring from Jackie Schafer. The TF's mandate is restoration, not monitoring.

Boydston: From the State's perspective, the Klamath Restoration Act was passed on a federal intent, like the ESA. We don't view the State's mandate as having to do the monitoring required for these federal programs. Yet it is perceived as the State's responsibility. We are devoting discretionary funds to this and the sources are declining. It is not fair. This letter should be directed to DOI.

Orcutt: This letter was originally intended to address the issue of monitoring for harvest. Let's stick to that. The Willow Creek weir is a separate issue. All monitoring on the Trinity side is paid for with federal dollars- either Anadromous Fish Act funds, or Bureau of Reclamation funds.

McInnis: To whom do you suggest this letter be addressed?

Orcutt: You could add a variety of people,- Roger Patterson. At the 6 Chairs meeting in Redding, Roger Patterson committed to giving \$250,000 for activities like the Shasta weir and creel censusing.

Bingham: This money from Roger Patterson has become convoluted. I propose that we don't discuss this now, but I agree that we should insert the words "harvest monitoring" in the letter. This is a difficult issue. The Klamath Act calls for a 50% in-kind contribution to match federal expenditures. The State is required to make a substantial contribution.

Bits: If harvest monitoring includes harvest and escapement, then it meets the needs. If escapement monitoring such as carcass counts is not included, then it doesn't meet the needs. See the bold heading at the top of the letter: "Fisheries Harvest Monitoring". What needs to be changed?

Orcutt: There is the weir statement in the 3rd paragraph. The context of the 2nd sentence is incorrect. That Willow Creek weir has never been State funded. It's part of the re-authorization of the Trinity River Restoration Program. If the Willow Creek weir goes in, then escapement will be estimated and recreational harvest estimated above it. The Hoopas will continue with a creel census from the weir down.

Fletcher: How about if we remove the wording in the parentheses in paragraph 3, and ask the TAT to make a list of needs for the TF. The TF only has a half million dollars to spend.

Boydston: This letter says ..."we strongly urge you to reconsider your decision to defund these vital fisheries monitoring programs..." It isn't our decision to defund monitoring. We have no control over that. The funding source is declining. What do you want Jackie Schafer to do?

Fletcher: Cough up some money? The KMP steelhead plan is a recognition by the State that there is need.

Bits: Is it appropriate to also send a letter to Secretary of Interior Babbitt?

Iverson: Appropriate, yes. Are we going to harangue Ms. Schafer and cc Mr. Babbitt, or harangue both?

Bits: They should be separate letters.

Bohn: The data we need runs a lot of decisions, now and in the future. Attention to that needs to be raised, even if you don't get money.

Iverson: I think it would be very appropriate to support efforts to increase Klamath Restoration funding for this purpose. It would be a positive thing.

McInnis: Have Nat and Troy volunteered to work on this?

Bingham: And Mike Orcutt too. We want to make sure the information is correct, and to run it by L.B. also.

Fletcher: How do we drag Oregon into this?

Boydston: It is not the State's responsibility to count every last fish to insure the solicitor's opinion of 50/50 tribal/non-tribal sharing is met. The State of California isn't mandated to do any of this. Jackie should not be receiving this -she should be cc'd.

Fletcher: I think the State is obligated to count the fish harvested as best as it can, as are we.

Bitts: I make a motion that Mr.'s Bingham, Fletcher, and Orcutt draft this letter and possibly draft a second letter to Secretary Babbit on expressing the need for funding for harvest-related monitoring in the Klamath Basin.

Bingham: Second.

Boydston: **I would like to table this motion until we take public comment.**

Bitts: OK.

Iverson: We are distributing a handout (Handout O) on agendum 5 from yesterday's agenda. It is the TF work plan for the current Fiscal Year and the list of monitoring needs from the Coastal California Fish and Wildlife Office in Arcata (CCFWO).

Orcutt: The Hoopa's have been working hard on appropriations, especially of the Trinity program. Appropriations have all gone in for this year. How many here have commented and have had input on those? That also applies to the State legislature. This is frustrating to us.

McInnis: Some of us are precluded from influencing the federal budget.

Orcutt: That is a pat answer.

McInnis: It is the law. Our agencies budget initiatives have recognized the need for monitoring although some of those haven't panned out. You are right; -on-the-ground support is needed.

Bingham: Look at the Handout O on the TF work plan. The TF is doing a lot related to monitoring already- a good share of the job (See FP-01, FP-02, FP-03, FP-05, FP-06). Felice Pace and I have gone to Congress to lobby for an add-on appropriation to the Klamath Act.

Kautsky: The TAT is now ready to give it's report.

Agendum 1. Report from the TAT on recreational harvest accounting in the KOHM.

Mohr: Do you want the bottom line, or do you want me to describe the methods we have used to reach our conclusion.

McInnis: Please give us the method first.

Mohr: Please see the handout on revised Option 1(Handout P). See the last page with the line running across it. The top tables show the number of days open by area and month for the commercial and recreational fisheries. Those numbers are converted to a proportion of the month open (the second set of tables). In the May cell for the recreational, March, April, and May impacts are lumped together. There are no sport Klamath impacts found in February. In May they were on the water 3/4 of the time, and in June, July, and August, 100% of the time. The first middle table shows the month-specific proportion of the total SOC impacts. It is the same across the months. That number has been used for years to reflect the percentage of SOC total impacts in each area. For

example, 17% of impacts occur in Pt. San Pedro to Pigeon Point. The second middle table shows the recreational proportion of SOC impacts(derived from CWT recoveries-Handout J). For example Pt. Arena to Pt. Reyes is .1%. (CWT recoveries were recorded within Pt. Reyes to Pigeon Point, so Pt. Reyes to Pt. San Pedro, and Pt. San Pedro to Pigeon Point are shown as the same numbers). These proportions are all below the 20% we've been using, except for May in Reyes to Pedro and Pedro to Pigeon. Pt. San Pedro to Pigeon Point in May is 36.3%, so under full fishing in May, in Pedro to Pigeon, 17% of total SOC impacts occur, and 36.3% of those are recreational. So (.17 x.363) or about 1/9 of the total impacts are due to sport in that area. The two bottom tables of uncorrected scalars are derived as follows:For the recreational, for each cell and month:(the proportion of the month open for recreational) * (the proportion of total SOC impacts) * (recreational proportion of SOC impacts).For the commercial, for each cell and month:(the proportion of the month open for commercial) * (the proportion of total SOC impacts) * (1 minus the recreational proportion of SOC impacts). The uncorrected scalars are summed across the areas by month. Then we apply the correction factors for effort-shift for the different months. These correction factors have a long history. They are not applied to recreational. The corrected commercial scalar and the recreational scalar for each month are added together and entered into the KOHM as the SOC exploitation rate scalars. In the remainder of Handout P, we've given you the original KOHM run of Option 1, and then a revised run using the SOC exploitation rate scalars calculated as I've just described. You can see them entered in the exploitation matrix at the top of the page. If you compare the Klamath Adult Ocean Landings in these two model runs, you'll see the revised run changes little. It increase the landings by 61 fish, (or if we use rounded numbers, by 100 fish). The second handout (Handout Q) shows the same analysis for Option 2. We found a difference of roughly the same amount.

Boydston. In Option 1, recreational opens beginning in late March, which is later than the base. Did you revisit the CWT's? Are tags recovered in February and March discounted here?

Mohr: There are no tag recoveries in February. March, April, and May are included, and the closure in March is accounted for by the "proportion of month open" number.

Boydston: How did you treat the 2 year olds?

Mohr: We took out the 2's, it didn't change the results.

Bits: It looks like there is a difference in escapement. Now there is an escapement of about 100 less than Option 1. That puts us about 115 fish below the floor.

Boydston: We've always rounded to 100 fish, so would this make no difference?

McInnis: Because of 50/50 sharing, if this is showing more to ocean landings, in reality those fish are matched by the same number going to the river. We're under the floor, so we have to reduce ocean harvest.

Bohn: The KMZ sport number changes by about 100 between Option 1 and revised Option 1.

Mohr: That's all stocks. In the Klamath landings, I only see a difference of 10.

Fletcher: Thank you Mike and Rich. We will make sure the model gets revised in 1999. We won't push it this year, but it is an issue.

Boydston: To remind you, the 27" limit will probably reduce this number.

McInnis: There is no motion for a change? Thanks to the TAT [applause] Let's move to the next item on the agenda.

Agendum 5. Letters from the Resighini and Trinidad Rancherias regarding separate allocations.

McInnis: Virginia raised the question of whom to address this to. I don't know.

Iverson: The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) in Sacramento? Troy and Mike can correct me.

McInnis: Are they part of the tribal or the non-tribal share?

Fletcher: The solicitor's opinion specifically applies to the Hoopa Valley and Yurok tribes. Our position is that if the PFMC or the KFMC want to allocate fish to them, they should take it from the Non-tribal allocation.

Boydston: This extends to the Karuks also. They come under the State of California's authority as far as fishing regulations and gear restrictions. Their catches are part of the non-tribal entitlement. When non-tribal fisheries reach their quotas, they must close also. A special exception is made for gear at Ishi Pishi Falls for the Karuk's dip net fishery.

McInnis: Is there a question on their status of these groups?

[Member of audience]: They're federally recognized.

Boydston: They can ask the CFGC for special consideration. If they want more, they can ask the DOI.

McInnis: Can staff draft a letter on this? L.B. can help with the language.

Agendum 2. Public Comment

Davis: I'm Carol Davis, a commercial troller from Brookings. I represent Brookings Harbor and the Klamath Coalition. I want to ask Dave Bitts, how many days in May did you fish?

Bitts: This last May I fished 22 days.

Davis: How many days do you usually fish in May?

Bitts: I usually fish between 6-15 days.

Davis: And how many days did you fish in August?

Bitts: Not many.

Davis: My community has asked for a token fishery. Every time the commercial fishery gets hit, they take it from the KMZ. In Option 1, we get 2200 fish in August. In Option 2, we get 1400. Any day that Dave Bitts takes off, he takes it off our Southern Oregon communities.

Bitts: I don't follow your logic. The Klamath impacts are not based on the expectation that people fish every day.

Davis: You want more days in June instead of closures, and that's why we're losing fish.

McInnis: You brought up an issue that the PFMC is addressing.

Davis: Our communities deserve a token fishery in May and August. The public deserves to have fish to buy.

Bingham: I recognize your pain. Ft. Bragg doesn't have much time either. Trying to find a balance between accessing Sacramento stocks and the community values that you represent that have a high cost in economic value. It is not an easy decision. In Ft. Bragg in 1992 we had 300 active salmon boats; now we have 15. I will consider what you are saying this week.

Bitts: I agree with you on the value of a token fishery. We just disagree on an appropriate size.

McInnis: Close public comment. Do we need to reconvene? We don't know what will occur tomorrow.

Bitts: We need to vote on a motion that was tabled. Also I thought there might be another motion for a recommendation. **The tabled motion I made was that a committee of Troy Fletcher, Mike Orcutt, and Nat Bingham re-draft a letter to Director Schafer on monitoring funding and perhaps draft a new letter to Secretary Babbit on the same topic.**

Bingham: I seconded it

McInnis: Call for the question.

Motion passes, Boydston abstains

Agendum 3. Develop additional recommendations to the PFMC or other agencies for 1998 management.

McInnis: Are there any council motions for recommendations to the PFMC?

Kirk: We began the process of a straw motion. If we don't follow through we won't have anything for the PFMC.

McInnis: What is the pleasure of the council? L.B.?

Boydston: I made an Option A, a straw motion. Since then there has been a lot of discussion. **I will offer a new motion: to adopt PFMC Option 1 for the area south of Cape Falcon with the following exceptions:**

- 1) use Option 2 for the sport fishery south of Horse Mountain,**
- 2) the June commercial fishery south of Pedro and the August fishery north of Cape Arago be subject to negotiations of the SAS;**
- 3) that the Ft. Bragg sport fishery continue to July 5, instead of June 30th.**

Kirk: I second.

Bitts: **I offer a friendly amendment.**

To provide for an experimental fishery between Pt. Reyes and Ft. Ross in July, inside 6 miles only, 30 fish per day, a 3000 fish quota, all fish taken in that fishery to be landed in that area, to be concurrent with the maximum attainable level of GSI sampling of fish taken, and Klamath cost to be borne by other sectors of the California commercial fisheries, probably either Pt. Reyes-Pt. San Pedro or South of Pt. San Pedro.

Boydston: **I accept the friendly amendment.**

Kirk: I accept

Stevens: Oregon and California SAS worked on this today, but we thought we were working off of Option 2 not Option 1, so all that was wasted. Would the Pt. Reyes to Ft. Ross be a “new fishery”? I support a new fishery, but I won’t support anything that takes fish away from Oregon in August, and gives them to California to be used to support a new fishery.

Bingham: L.B.’s motion left the door open for negotiations.

Bits: We think the Klamath impacts associated with this would be about 60 fish.

McInnis: The test fishery would be modeled at the full impact for that cell?

Bits: Yes.

McInnis: And what is the purpose?

Bits: We think Klamath impacts are lower inside and below this Bodega Bay area, and we want to find out. It would be similar to what Oregon did in an area of their fishery.

McInnis: L.B., how does your motion relate to the recreational fishery counting in the SOC? Are there more periods when troll will be closed and recreational open?

Boydston: There will be the same or less commercial closures.

Fletcher: Extending the Ft. Bragg fishery-what impacts on Klamath fish will that have?

Boydston: There is a Klamath impact model for recreation in Ft. Bragg. There would be a Klamath impact. Whatever overages were found would lead to probable reductions later this week.

Fletcher: I don’t want to vote until I see that modeled.

Bits: Ft. Bragg recreational is modeled at 3% of the base period. 3% for 5 days isn’t much.

Bohn: This test fishery will be somewhat like what we did at the Rogue. The problem at the Rogue experimental fishery is that it took 3 years to get the GSI results.

McInnis: This will be modeled at full impact this year.

Orcutt: What accepted procedures for GSI will be used? Will they be the same as the Oregon experimental fishery?

McInnis: NMFS is committed to support this effort using the same people from our Northwest Science Center that did the Oregon experimental fishery. It is not a one year effort. It is a multi- year test.

Stevens: Regarding L.B.’s motion and negotiations: the line north of Cape Arago. We want to move that line to Humbug.

Bits: The motion doesn’t quite cover all the possibilities.

McInnis: One or more members have reservations on moving forward until this is modeled. I would like to table this. Let L.B. get together with the tech team and have them model the motion.

Boydston: Now I think there a couple of problems with this. I think the commercial fishermen will push for a blend between #1 and #2. **I want to withdraw the motion.**

Kirk: I agree.

McInnis: What are the wishes of the council regarding reconvening? [Members discuss meeting times]. We will reconvene at noon tomorrow. We now stand recessed.

RECESS

Tuesday, April 7, 12:30

RECONVENE

Members present:

Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Services
Don Stevens (for K. Wilkinson)	Oregon Commercial Salmon fishing Industry
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Ron Iverson	Department of the Interior
Mike Orcutt (for P. McCovey)	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopa Indians Residing in the Klamath Conservation Area
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
L.B. Boydston	California Department of Fish and Game
Nat Bingham	Pacific Fisheries Management Council

Other Speakers:

George Kautsky	Technical Advisory Team, Hoopa Fisheries Dept.
Rich Dixon	California Department of Fish and Game

McIsaac: The KFMC comment period to the PFMC has passed, but if we had a motion, we could try to get it to the PFMC before they pass something to the STT for analysis.

Fletcher: We can't vote on any motions until we have the team review.

Bitts: We're at a stage where we can recommend to send something to the team for analysis,.

Fletcher: OK, we could support sending something to the team.

McInnis: You are referring to the STT as the team?

Fletcher: Yes.

McIsaac: Is there time to put us on the agenda before the STT assignment?

Bingham: I think the chair would be open to that.

McInnis: I informed the PFMC, while I was presenting the KFMC comments, that we may be back.

Kirk: We usually have given our recommendation along with the SAS recommendations. What does Troy want modeled in addition to the SAS?

Fletcher: I don't know. We've never had a consensus recommendation before. I won't make a recommendation to the PFMC without an analysis of impacts and tribal share effects.

Boydston: I hoped we would support sending the SAS recommendation to the STT, and then make comments on the SAS analysis.

Fletcher: I have no problem sending something to the team.

Kirk: We either support the modeling exercise and comment after, or we make no comment. We need to say we support the SAS operation for modeling.

Boydston: Can we say we are cautiously optimistic with the SAS modeling exercise?

McIsaac: There are 2 blanks in the SAS option. I want to put some numbers in there and then the Oregon seat will be happy.

Boydston: There is a harvest sharing formula in there of 56/44. That will drive those quotas. We have a couple of numbers ready.

Bits: I suggest we ask the team to look at opening the Gulf of Farralones on July 6th versus July 1st to "pay" for the Bodega test fishery for Klamath impacts.

McIsaac: If this does go out as a recommended Option for analysis, I would feel better with 3600 for the Humbug border and 1400 for the Rogue terminal.

Stevens: There is an oversight in the options we presented at SAS. We have some additional closures: on page 1, Cape Falcon to Humbug Mtn: The NOR would be closed 3 days, August 29-31, and the Coos Bay Cell would be closed 5 days, August-27-31st.

McIsaac: Is there a possible motion to recommend the SAS recommendation with a few changes for analysis?

Orcutt: We have concerns: 1) the KMZ sport non-use of the conservation buffer, 2) spring chinook and tags in the early season fishery, and 3) we haven't heard any firm commitments on inriver monitoring.

Bits: There is an implicit buffer in the KMZ sport. They are expected to take 60% of their preseason estimation, based on recent years. That's a free gift to escapement.

Boydston: The STT addressed the buffer issue in March. Without the buffer there is still a conservative estimate according to the performance in past years.

Fletcher: I understand that it's that way. If the cell is corrected for that bias, then our comfort will go away.

McIsaac: I remember it as a 40% bias, including the 15%. Is that right George? Without the buffer it would be 25%.

Kautsky: The percentage of bias was .4. That is 40%. That's for age 3's and 4's, in the conservative direction. The model hasn't been corrected.

McIsaac: We're talking about supporting the SAS recommendation with some changes and the SAS has no buffer in the KMZ sport.

Orcutt: A footnote would address our concern.

McIsaac: **To summarize, the changes to the SAS recommendation would be:**

- 1) for Cape Falcon to Humbug Mt. troll fishery, insert "except that it be closed August 29-31 from Falcon to Humbug, and August 27-29 from Florence to Humbug
- 2) insert in blanks on that same page 3600 and 1400 as chinook quotas;
- 3) delete "no study impacts are included in the analysis";
- 4) on page 2, replace July 1 with July 6 for Pt. Reyes to Pt. San Pedro
- 5) on page 6, for Ft. Bragg sport, change June 30 to July 5.

Boydston: **I move to recommend to the PFMC that the STT go forward with analyzing the SAS recommendation with changes recommended by this Council.**

Orcutt: **A friendly amendment: I suggest the language for a footnote "a buffer will not be used in the KMZ sport 1998 season with the understanding that the buffer is implicit in the KOHM".**

Kirk: **I would like to have that read "in the KOHM as it exists today".**

McInnis: Can we add that, Mike?

Orcutt: OK. And I want to put in language saying that we reserve the opportunity to add an explicit buffer in 1999.

Kirk: I won't agree to that last language.

Fletcher: I want something that says that a thorough review of the KOHM will be done.

Bingham: There was a lot of success in the modeling workshop that we had last year. I would like to see us schedule a meeting of the KFMC after the new model is done to go through a dry run of the model.

Orcutt: We reserve the right to scrutinize all the cells in the model.

McIsaac: Should we make that a separate motion?

Orcutt: OK

McIsaac: **Have the friendly amendments been accepted?**

Boydston: **Yes.**

McIsaac: I call for the question.

Motion passes, Orcutt abstains

Orcutt: **I would like to make a motion for a footnote saying the KFMC reserves the opportunity to**

scrutinize and make appropriate recommendations on the new KOHM in 1999 and, the KFMC intends to schedule a Klamath impact modeling workshop for a variety of interests.

Boydston: Then that announces that the KOHM will be done.

Fletcher: Rich Dixon, could we have it ready by August?

Dixon: I can't commit to that without Michael Mohr. A lot has been done, but some difficult issues have held it up.

Fletcher: The PFMC needs it by September, right?

Boydston: It has to come to us by August. Let's word this as a goal, holding a workshop in August.

McInnis: NMFS staff is committed to getting it done in time, but problems will continue to come up.

Kirk: The STT will continue to develop it with NMFS, not our TAT. We should support this process in this motion, and that we want to have a workshop so we can understand it.

McInnis: It will be revised by NMFS, CDFG, and the TAT. We should tell the PFMC of our interest.

McIsaac: Our TAT should take the lead on this.

Bingham: **I make a friendly amendment to the motion that the workshop include a simulation run.**

Orcutt: **I accept.**

Stevens: I support a workshop, but I ask that it coincide with the PFMC meeting in the fall.

Bingham: This council could sponsor the travel expenses for key players. I'm not enthusiastic about coinciding it with the PFMC, as it would be too busy.

McIsaac: Call for the question.

Motion passes unanimously

Orcutt: We will probably be developing a management plan for spring chinook, looking at any economic opportunities.

Fletcher: Let's ask the TAT for any prediction for spring chinook abundance. I request that the TAT give us that information ASAP.

Orcutt: I hope to light a fire under them.

Kautsky: What is the assignment? In San Francisco in March we said we would come up with that in October. The tribes have been working on a prediction methodology. The TAT hasn't looked at that yet.

McIsaac: Is there some intent to do this before Friday, or in October?

Orcutt: I just want to make it a priority.

McIsaac: Please come up with a written assignment tomorrow.

Iverson: I have an assignment for the TAT this week. On April 27 the USFWS will meet with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Biological Resources Division to talk about research priorities. Can they spend time brain storming on fishery management research efforts they might like the USGS to contribute to? At the Seattle National Fishery Research Center, Dr. Reg Reisenbechler did his Ph.D. work in the Klamath. Maybe we could hook up in with them on Dr. Mike Prager's work on natural productivity of chinook stocks. Please give me some bullets on this.

Fletcher: When you meet on this, please invite the tribes and the State.

Iverson: OK, I will convey the message.

McIsaac: Further business? Let's recess until noon tomorrow.

RECESS

Wednesday, April 8th, 12:20 PM

RECONVENE

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Services
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Ron Iverson	Department of the Interior
Mike Orcutt (for P. McCovey)	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopa Indians Residing in the Klamath Conservation Area
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry

Other Speakers:

Scott Barrow	Technical Advisory Team, California Dept. of Fish and Game
George Kautsky	Technical Advisory Team, Hoopa Fisheries Dept.
Mike Burner	Technical Advisory Team, Oregon Dept. Of Fish and Wildlife
Dan Viele	National Marine Fisheries Service
Don Stevens	Salmon Advisory Sub-panel Oregon Troller

McIsaac: Nat and L.B. are still in the PFMC meeting. I had staff prepare an agenda for today and for the rest of the week (Handout R). Let's look at the agenda. Are there are additions?

Orcutt: I would like an item on the Trinity reauthorization.

McIsaac: Let's insert that as item 9a. While we wait for L.B. and Nat, let's first address item 10, our agenda for our October, 1998 meeting, and our 1999 meeting schedule. Let's first discuss the 1999 meeting schedule.

Agendum 10. Plan agenda for October 1998 meeting; discuss 1999 meeting schedule.

Wilkinson: Why are we having a meeting in Hiouchi? That's a detached facility, and because of it being a National Park Service facility, it closes at lunch time. Why can't we meet at Crescent City or Brookings?

Iverson: I don't know how Hiouchi was chosen. I assumed it was requested by a member.

McIsaac: How about Crescent City?

Fletcher: If I can find facilities, can we meet in Klamath?

McIsaac: Let's set another meeting in 1999 in Klamath.

Bits: My favorite location is Yreka for the fall when we can have a tour of the Iron Gate hatchery.

Fletcher: We need to meet in Klamath or Weitchepoc in 1999. What is the PFMC schedule?

McIsaac: The PFMC will meet on March 8-12 in Portland, and April 5-9 in Sacramento. We also need a spring and fall meeting. Troy, why don't you choose a spring location, and Dave choose one for fall.

Fletcher: Let's meet in Klamath in the spring of 1999.

[Boydston and Bingham arrive]

McIsaac: OK, do we have a date for our spring meeting?

McInnis: We must consider the salmon informational meeting put on by the CDFG.

McIsaac: We'll meet Wednesday, February 24 thru Friday, February 26 in Klamath; March 7-11 at PFMC in Portland, at the Columbia River DoubleTree; and on April 4- 8, at the Sacramento Red Lion.

Bits: When will we have the workshop on the KOHM?

McIsaac: It needs to be before November.

Fletcher: How about September 1998?

McInnis: Is this going to be an additional meeting or part of our fall meeting?

Bits: It should be an additional meeting and I suggest the Santa Rosa area.

McIsaac: We talked about having this be a broad invitation. It should be a convenient location for all interested parties.

Fletcher: We can ask the PFMC to send the SAS representatives.

Wilkinson: We need to be more centrally located and nearer an airport than Santa Rosa.

Kautsky: The SCC wants to give their final blessing to the KOHM on November 6. Do you want to learn the model before it's done?

McIsaac: We want a fixed model but we want to be able to challenge it.

Wilkinson: Then September would be better.

Bingham: We want to be able to actually run it in a hands on demonstration,.

McIsaac: The PFMC is meeting in Sacramento, during September 14-18. We could meet during the evenings earlier in the week. Let's meet September 15 and 16. Staff please try to find a room in the Red Lion Inn. Dave would you like to suggest a location for fall 1999.

Bitts: I suggest that we meet in 1999, the 2nd week in October in Yreka.

McIsaac: So we'll meet in October on the 13,14,15, Wednesday - Friday in Yreka, including a tour of the hatchery. We'll meet in 1998 in Crescent City on October 7,8,9, Wednesday-Friday. What is the status of the PFMC process?

Bingham: I think they'll get to salmon late this afternoon. Things have been dragging.

McIsaac: We're on the agenda. Should we finish today?

McInnis: Yes, we should finish today.

McIsaac: Let's move to item #1.

Agendum 1. Report from TAT on the analysis of options.

Kautsky: I defer to Scott Barrow for this discussion.

Barrow: The model run worked yesterday. We had to reduce 1 day in the Pt. San Pedro to Pt. Sur troll fishery so it opened on June 16 instead of 15. We added 1 day in the Humbug to Horse Mt. KMZ sport to meet the 17% allocation, so it opens August 11 instead of August 12. Winter run and OCN impacts look good, the tribal share meets 12,000, the escapement turns out to be exactly 35,000. The overall age 4 harvest rate was 9.1% (See Handout S). The STT will address OCN's this afternoon.

McIsaac: Questions?

Bitts: Did you say this passes the winter run test?

Barrow: Yes, but we had to tweak it a bit.

Viele: The STT identified bias in the model in the identification of legal and sub legal contacts. The STT recommends a correction which results in more sub-legals. With this correction, winter run escapement has relatively increased 31%, which meets NMFS criteria.

Bitts: I'm puzzled about OCN's. The sheet (Handout T) passed out shows an overall rate of 11.9% for all fisheries, but Scott said there would be a reduction to 11% north of Falcon.

Barrow: South of Falcon it was near 10%, but north of Falcon it was about 13%. There were some adjustments.

McIsaac: I brought Handout T. This shows Option 1B from Tuesday has a total OCN impact of 11.89%. The Oregon perspective on the range we would vote for on Friday is that we want to get as close to 11% as possible. The team has elected not to use the charter boat data from southern California, which would have lowered the number without the use of that data. We would be looking for more protection.

Boydston: Are you holding us hostage?

McIsaac: If the council voted for this Option B we can't come forward with a yes.

Iverson: What information would change this?

McIsaac: If the data from Southern California were used, it would make a dramatic difference.

Barrow: We had to use the base period data because we had no other data from outlying areas.

Boydston: This shows a lower impact than the base period showed.

Stevens: I agree if we have data we should use it.

Boydston: Regarding this calculation for southern California, were mooching versus trolling contact rates for coho factored in here?

Barrow: Not in this number. In the STT analysis, it was 73% for mooching, 27% for trolling.

McInnis: Is this a contact rate or a mortality?

Fletcher: This is the information prepared by the STT?

McIsaac: Yes.

Bits: Scott, is the State information on encounter rates applied to the mooching/trolling percentage to get this?

Barrow: No. It was applied to the STT's analysis for the PFMC. Our charter boat vessels are broken by troll and mooch. Because the OCN isn't set up for troll and mooch, they had to adjust those numbers by percentages. They used the number for mooch times 37% and the number for troll times 27%. Then they combined those to get a natural impact from what we've seen from our charter boats. For areas without information, they added the base period, leading to this number that is about 30% lower.

McInnis: Is there any information on the impact on Klamath and Rogue coho?

Barrow: No there are no data. We only had San Francisco.

Boydston: The team used hooking mortality rates for mooching and hooking mortality rates for trolling, and that's one reason this number goes up compared to the past. But the STT is still using baseline contacts. We are mixing new data with old.

Bingham: We have to put this in context with what we heard from charter boat owners who said they hadn't seen one coho all season.

Barrow: But the review shows 100 fish caught per month, which I assume is from the skiffs.

McIsaac: Regarding the Oregon hostage-taking: if this proposal passes, the Oregon seat would vote no above Falcon. The Klamath portion is all fine with the Oregon seat. Any motion would need a footnote to avoid contradicting the Oregon position.

Bits: The motion recommends this season shape. If it is made contingent on reductions of OCN impacts to 11%, then the whole matrix would need to be redone.

McIsaac: The only place it can change is inriver. All freed up Klamath river impacts from OCN reductions would go to the river.

Boydston: If all OCN impacts were reduced north of Falcon to 11%, would you endorse south of Falcon?

McIsaac: Yes.

Fletcher: Would you please repeat that?

McIsaac: If there is OCN protection from ocean fisheries, it will save Klamath fish and repurcuss to other cells in the model. The only OCN fix that goes along with this motion is to send any saved Klamath impacts to the river.

McIsaac: Let's move to Agendum 4.

Agendum 4. Public Comment.

McIsaac: Is there public comment? Seeing none, let's go then to Agendum 5.

Agendum 5. Develop additional recommendations for the 1998 management season for presentation to the PFMC.

McIsaac: Are there motions?

Boydston: **I move to adopt the modified SAS recommendation as it affects Klamath fall chinook.**

Kirk: I second.

McIsaac: We need more clarity as to what "as it affects Klamath fall chinook" means.

McInnis: My understanding is that if winter chinook, Snake River chinook, or OCN's adjustments come up, then those can be done, and this isn't final.

Orcutt: I still see no assurance for funds for monitoring in the inriver fishery. There are also Klamath coho. At NMFS request, the Tribes had to do a biological fishery management plan. Only the inriver recreational fishery didn't do a biological assessment. Our data showed that the impact on coho from our fishery was less than what coho were taken in river by the recreational fishery.

McIsaac: **I make a friendly amendment: "with the contingency that alterations may be necessary to achieve goals for OCN, Snake River Fall Chinook, or winter chinook".**

Boydston: **I'm agreeable, with the addition "in which case the KFMC may reconsider."**

Kirk: When would the reconsidering be? 1999? I'll agree.

Fletcher: I want to add Klamath/Rogue coho to that. Now our recommendation doesn't stand for much. I want certainty with the tribal/nontribal share. If the number of fish coming in river goes up, I want access to those.

Boydston: **Add "with the tribal share being at least 12,000".**

Fletcher: "And that additional fish inriver are shared 50/50."

Bits: Any changes made would be for less ocean take. What if we recommend any extra fish from ocean share

foregone went to escapement?

Bingham: I support that concept.

Boydston: I hear what you are saying: I'm not sure how we effect that. Once fish leave the ocean they're not in the purview of the KFMC.

Bingham: That's not true L.B..

Iverson: I agree.

McInnis: We make recommendations to the CFGC. We're at the floor. We're not here to recommend about OCN's. We should make our recommendation clean. Our arena is Klamath chinook. The reality is that the PFMC is responsible for balancing all of these, and we can say if there are any savings from adjustments, pass them along to escapement.

Fletcher: I request a caucus.

Boydston: **I withdraw my motion.** Regarding the letter to Jacqueline Schafer, I request that it be addressed also to Mr. Greer, Mr. Patterson, CFGC, Yurok Tribe, and Hoopa Tribe, that it be edited to be generic to all.

McIsaac: Let's take a 10 minute break.

BREAK

McInnis: **I move to recommend to the PFMC the option that was put forward by the advisors to the PFMC, as modified by our earlier comments and analyzed and put forth to us today, and make that recommendation with respect to Klamath fall chinook. And that we recognize there are other constraints that need to be addressed, and if that addressing those constraints results in a savings of Klamath impacts in the ocean, that those impacts be passed to spawning escapement, provided also that the tribal share be at least 50/50 and 12,000 fish.**

Fletcher: I second.

Bits: I support that, except the California SAS thinks it no longer represents what the SAS put forward.

McIsaac: How?

Bits: Changes were made in the distribution of fish, including changes between commercial and recreational, which weren't contemplated in the SAS option, resulting in benefits which Oregon conferred to California being lost and not returned to Oregon.

Orcutt: I have uncertainty with statements made by the State of California. There are no firm commitments: a lot of scenarios are possible. How can you tell the difference when a change is made, when fisheries are not even monitored?

Stevens: Oregon gave up time and fish to give California troll some opportunity. Then there was a problem, an adjustment was made to California, things were fouled up, and then the only beneficiary was the KMZ sport.

McIsaac: To the TAT: there seems to be trouble with too many model runs. Maybe people's fears are

unfounded. Maybe those other model runs were wrong. Does this model run represent the seasons recommended by the SAS and with the Klamath Council's recommendation?

Barrow: Yes. We modeled it as specified, but then we didn't meet the 17% share KMZ sport, so we added a day in August. Then we didn't meet escapement, so we took a day off troll.

Bits: There's a domino effect from a minor change.

Barrow: You described a change in August where everyone lost fish. What did you mean?

Stevens: We were making changes on STT computers but the model was not calibrated for August.

Burner: In the STT room, I was working on Option 2, not on the SAS recommendation. Option 2 didn't have August. To say that the SAS recommendation was modeled and then changed for August later is incorrect.

Bits: This just happened. Let's put our SAS advisors and team members in a room to work it out.

McInnis: **I withdraw the motion.**

Fletcher: **I make a motion that there be 50/50 tribal sharing in regard to Klamath impacts, and that the tribal share be at least 12,000 fish for 1998.**

Bits: I second for discussion. We've seen runs that meet those criteria and meet escapement but it may not be possible. Little changes change other things.

Fletcher: I want to provide some certainty.

Bits: Oceans may be reduced from what is represented in this handout. **I make a friendly amendment that if other constraints reduce the non tribal share to less than 12,000 fish, that ocean fisheries commit that reduction to escapement.**

Fletcher: I agree. We want to make sure that the CFGC doesn't use those fish to give them to the inriver recreational allocation instead.

McIsaac: Is there an intent to label this 12,000 a minimum subsistence and ceremonial need?

Fletcher: We have stated in many places that we maintain 12,000 to be our minimum emergency subsistence need. The point of this is not to establish that. We already have.

Stevens: This model run also had the addition of 6 days in the sport fishery, Horse Mtn. to Pt. Arena, as well as the test fishery in Bodega Bay. Those had to come out of California. Maybe that's what tweaked this.

McIsaac: Maybe this model run is just fine. I'm not comfortable recommending just the one piece of the package.

Fletcher: We often only forward one part of an option., i.e., the buffer for the KMZ sport. We've always said that 12,000 was our minimum need, but there's no minimum need language in this motion.

Orcutt: The minimum need is defined by the tribe. I need clarification. Why are we locked into only meeting today? What if the SAS and TAT go into a room to work this out?

Bingham: The chair of the PFMC should hear the STT report in 15 minutes. You may want to go hear it.

McIsaac: When will the PFMC move on to salmon?

Bingham: They have a lot more work on ground fish to do.

Kirk: We have to get clarity from the TAT. We're disintegrating.

McIsaac: Those here who have seats on the PFMC can ask questions in that forum regarding the numbers in the STT's model run.

Fletcher: **I would withdraw the motion if we could reconvene later.**

McIsaac: We will reconvene when the other council goes back to ground fish. Let's break to hear the presentation of the STT's analysis of options to the PFMC.

RECESS

4:00 PM

RECONVENE

Members Present:

Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Services
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Ron Iverson	Department of the Interior
Mike Orcutt (for P. McCovey)	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopa Indians Residing in the Klamath Conservation Area
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry

Other Speakers:

Rich Dixon	California Department of Fish and Game
Michael Mohr	Technical Advisory Team National Marine Fisheries Service
Mike Burner	Technical Advisory Team Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Duncan MacLean	California SAS Troll representative

McIsaac: Let's continue with Agendum 5.

Agendum 5. Develop additional recommendations for the 1998 management season for presentation to the PFMC (continued).

Fletcher: **I withdraw my motion, since I believe some issues were addressed by the STT presentation.**

McIsaac: Before the break there were concerns that the KOHM model run in our Handout S labeled 11/29 was not the same as the KFMC's recommended season sent to the STT. Bernie asked that question of Dr. Morishima (STT chair), and Dr. Morishima's answer was yes, it was the same.

Bits: It does those things with the 12,000. There is an implicit buffer in the KMZ sport of about 600 Klamath fish. I was concerned about the two transfers of Klamath shares from the California troll to the California recreational fisheries. These are minor, I hope. First, L.B. suggested extending the sport in Ft. Bragg through July 5th. We suggest we take the necessary Klamath fish from the Ft. Bragg sport fishery in June. That is my suggestion. Second, I thought these changes we were making between California and Oregon were neutral as to the KMZ sport share of 17%. I want to speak to the TAT regarding that because it now appears they were not.

McIsaac: Rich, can you explain why 17% was satisfied in the previous version, but now one more day was added to the KMZ sport?

Dixon: We did all the modeling recommended here but came up with less than 17% in the Klamath ocean share in the KMZ sport.

Bits: Is it fair to say that all changes outside KMZ sport were not value neutral?

Dixon: Yes. We have the number show up in the model. It is not on the printout you have as a handout. That number changes with each iteration. Then we try to get closer to the number that is 17% by changing a day.

Mohr: That number is a target, that is 17% of nontribal Klamath harvest.

Fletcher: You mean 17% of the nontribal ocean harvest?

Mohr: Yes.

Bits: What were the consequences elsewhere of that change?

Burner: It would effect all other numbers.

Mohr: When was the extra day given in August?

Barrow: When we added an extra in August, escapement wasn't met. So I took a day out of June in the California troll, and the escapement was met.

McInnis: One day in the KMZ sport in August equals about 200 fish. 200 Klamath chinook in escapement? Sounds like a lot of fish.

Barrow: Yes.

Burner: When we put in the recommendation from the KFMC into the model, it didn't meet the escapement floor, largely due to adding August in the SOC. That was before the KMZ sport was given a day. We took the day out of the SOC in June, and that met the floor. But the KMZ-S wasn't quite at 17%; that's when their day was put in. If you took that day away again, it wouldn't make you meet the floor by itself.

Bits: It sounds like as close as we can get.

Orcutt: When this option was presented, the motion footnote we recommended was lost regarding the KMZ sport recreational fishery. I want to see that added back. See page 5 of Preseason Report II.

McIsaac: Regarding the OCN percentage: Oregon wanted 11%. There was a discussion of the lack of credit for 4 spreads in the KMZ troll dropping it down by .4%. We heard discussion of the quality of estimates in the San

Francisco area. NMFS stated it was a generous impact estimate by about 1 percent. So Oregon is satisfied with OCN's south of Falcon and will accept a north of Falcon package with a selective fishery off the mouth of the Columbia.

Bits: My strong commendations to the TAT and STT.

McIsaac: Is there a motion?

Wilkinson: **I move that we endorse the SAS options described in the publications STT Report E.2 dated April 8, 1998, (Handout U) from Cape Falcon to Pt. Sur troll and recreational fisheries.**

Kirk: I concur with Mike Orcutt, supplemental comment E.1 be included, the footnote. We need to ask the PFMC what happened to it.

McInnis: **I make a friendly amendment expressing our understanding that the package meets 50/50 sharing and the spawner floor.**

Fletcher: **And the 12,000.** Under projects and assumptions, there is an editorial change that should be made. "Federally recognized tribes" should be replaced with "the Hoopa and Yurok tribes".

McIsaac: I understand that was going to be changed.

Bits: I want to propose the additional cost in Klamath fish in Ft. Bragg, in July, be borne by Ft. Bragg by a June closure. I also thought we had agreed in California commercial to pay for the test Bodega fishery by closure in the Gulf of the Farallones for the first 5 days in July, but is that consensus is weak, I would like to instead pay for it with another day of closure in June below Pedro.

Wilkinson: Troy and Rod's friendly amendments are redundant. They are already in the option document. Dave's amendment is tech team tweaking and I don't want to load them on this motion.

McIsaac: Would Dave's changes work? I address this to the tech team.

Dixon: I can't say without modeling it.

McIsaac: This might not account for another day.

Fletcher: I want Rod's and my amendments, because if changes are made those things will change.

McIsaac: I sympathize with Keith, but I would be more comfortable with the 35,000 floor stated in the motion. It is not on the option.

Wilkinson: I would add the 35,000.

McIsaac: Regarding Mike Orcutt and Paul Kirk's concern for the footnote. The footnotes in the document are modeling criteria or physical guides. I think the PFMC accepted it and considered it but doesn't put that kind of stuff in the document.

Orcutt: If you look at the notes on page 5, it's not on there. It was a motion that passed.

Bits: I see here on page 5, in the Humbug Mtn. To Horse Mtn section, that they included the 1st sentence of our

footnote but not the 2nd sentence. **I make a friendly amendment to seek to add the 2nd sentence of our footnote and an additional amendment that any changes in this package not change the balances that this package was designed to achieve.**

Wilkinson: Troy would you restate your friendly amendment?

Fletcher: To include a 50/50 tribal/nontribal sharing and a tribal harvest that is at least 12,000. Because earlier I didn't hear L.B. being supportive of sharing extra fish if they go to the river.

McIsaac: So to summarize the friendly amendments. 1st our understanding is that this package meets the 35,000 escapement floor, 50/50 tribal/nontribal sharing, and at least 12,000 fish to the Hoopa and Yurok tribes in the river; 2) that the footnote on page 5 referring to the buffer in the KMZ be worded as per the KFMC recommendation of April 7; and 3) any changes to the package not upset the balance the package was designed to achieve.

Wilkinson: **I accept Mike's amendment** but not Dave's. Those decisions are up to the TAT. **Troy's amendment I would accept as Don McIsaac stated it, but not as Troy stated it.** I don't want the language codifying the 12,000 number.

Bits: I don't want to hand cuff the TAT but I want to hand cuff the fisherman.

Wilkinson: Rich do you think this is constraining?

Dixon: No.

Wilkinson: **Then I will accept Dave's friendly amendment.**

Fletcher: There isn't any mention of subsistence harvest in my amendment. Now I won't approve anything without it. What if CDFG gives inriver additional escapement?

McIsaac: That probably won't happen now that OCN's aren't an issue.

Kirk: For clarification, are you talking about just this year?

Fletcher: Just this hour. The things I've asked for don't compromise the SAS modeling exercise.

Kirk: It is difficult to approve something like this. Remember this is a first time consensus for us. Remember this is just for this year and there is something for all of us in here, even if we don't like everything in it..

Orcutt: I want to clarify that the Footnote on page 5 will be replaced with the Footnote 1 from Supplemental Report E.1. I share Troy's concern with the CFGC....

McIsaac: We can make another motion later.

Fletcher: The amendment I recommend mentions nothing about the minimum subsistence harvest.

McIsaac: To summarize, we are on the verge of a single consensus option recommendation that speaks to our credit. **The motion is that the KFMC endorse the SAS options as described in Supplemental attachment E.2 for the area Cape Falcon to Sur, troll and sport fisheries, with the understanding that this document for 1998 meets the 35,000 escapement floor, 50/50 tribal/nontribal sharing, and at least**

12,000 fish to the Hoopa and Yurok tribes in the river; 2) that the footnote on page 5 referring to the buffer in the KMZ be worded as per the KFMC recommendation of April 7; and 3) any changes to the package not upset the balance the package was designed to achieve.

Wilkinson: **I accept.**

McIsaac: Call the question.

Motion passes, no abstentions

Applause

McIsaac: Before we adjourn, we need to make a recommendation on the TF budget.

Wilkinson: I believe we can handle this administratively. Troy and I can carry this Council's concern to the TF.

McIsaac: Can the Council meet later to address this, and other issues, after we present our recommendation to the PFMC?

BREAK

Agendum 7. Outstanding letters.

McIsaac: Let's address the letter to Jacqueline Schafer. Before he left, L.B. made comments and edits. Let's have Nat, Troy, and Mike coordinate with Ron Iverson on getting this letter finalized. We have the Trinity reauthorization on the agenda.

Orcutt: I had hoped to address this when Bernice Sullivan was here.

Kirk: Maybe we can revisit this later.

Agendum 8. Budget recommendation to the Task Force.

McIsaac: Let's move to the TF budget. We have Handout O. We wanted to see monitoring projects that may lose funding, and other projects that would be desirable, and compare that with the priorities reflected in the TF work plan. Bernice, in her role as coordinator, is willing to spend time on pursuing funding, if we can tell her exactly what to do.

Orcutt: Bob McAllister presented those CDFG projects at risk of losing funding at the 6 Chairs meeting in January. Nat was going to speak to the legislature to target state funds. The BOR is going to try to reprogram funds from their Klamath Falls office to go to the TF \$250,000. George, who has worked on the monitoring committee on the Trinity, and Bernice, and others were going to be meeting to give guidance on the use of those funds for monitoring.

Wilkinson: It was my understanding that there was still going to be a gap.

Iverson: This would be a reprogramming of FY 98 money, but it will come late in the year.

Orcutt: The reprogramming must be approved by Congress. Any letters or inquiries from us would be timely.

Fletcher: **I move to make a recommendation to the TF that they devote additional funds to Category 3,**

(monitoring and research), and that the funds should be taken from Category 2, (subbasin planning).

Bitts: I second.

Fletcher: The CRMP's are pretty successful at bringing in funding. The Yuroks have been able to use that Category 2 funding also. That investment has paid off, but I'd like to see them go out on their own.

Wilkinson: There's about \$500,000 in Category 2 including administrative costs. I would want to know that the CRMP's would be able to get funds elsewhere--they are valuable entities.

Fletcher: We need to make hard choices. There will be more money in the State's proposal to the TF for monitoring than the amount the CRMP's get.

McIsaac: What was the \$70,000 you referred to earlier?

Fletcher: That was left over in Category 3.

Orcutt: This motion is a short-term solution. The long term solution is to get Congressional appropriations. We need to collaborate on lobbying for this, with the cooperation of the agencies.

Wilkinson: I endorse this motion. They need to understand we have minimum monitoring needs that must be met.

McIsaac: Do we have that list of projects that Bob McAllister said were going to fall away? I wanted to get specific as to what the minimum is we need by law. This list (Handout O) doesn't do that.

Wilkinson: The KFMC has no representation on the TWG, so we always find ourselves on the low end of the priority list.

Fletcher: My representative is the TWG Chair. The problem is not the ranking. It is that CDFG has not submitted their shortfalls as proposals to the TF. Last year they did submit one for \$70,000 or \$100,000 for a spawner survey, but that didn't get funded because of the high cost. This year they'll submit proposals for a creel census, probably CWT's, and Bogus Creek. There won't be enough money, even if they are appropriately ranked. If we identify Category 2 as a target source of funds, it will get the attention of the TF.

Wilkinson: I endorse that principle.

Orcutt: There is a similar problem with priorities on the Trinity, even with 6 times as much money.

McIsaac: I presume this would require a letter.

Bitts: Call for the question, please.

Motion Passes...Orcutt and Iverson abstain

McIsaac: Ron, would you talk to Bernice about the idea of a subcommittee to work on this issue?

Agendum 9. Assignments to TAT, other assignments.

Fletcher: I have a written assignment on spring chinook for the TAT as requested yesterday (Handout V).

Agendum 9a. Trinity River Restoration Program reauthorization.

Orcutt: I have a short recap on the Trinity program reauthorization: Congressman Riggs held a hearing on October 16, in Eureka, where the feeling was to go ahead with reauthorization. On February 2, the Trinity River Task Force agreed on legislative language. DOI is responding. The budget has been raised \$3 million annually. Riggs has endorsed that. Both Riggs and Miller have written the administration asking for clarification. The Hoopa Valley Tribe feels that reauthorization legislation is not needed because there is ample authority under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) to continue the program. Any input to your representatives on your views would be valuable.

Bits: Have any members of the TF opposed the reauthorization?

Orcutt: There was one no vote. We abstained, as well as the State.

McIsaac: More comments? Meeting adjourned.

ADJOURN

HANDOUTS
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
April 5-8, 1998
Portland, Oregon
Meeting #53

Attachment #1

(Handouts are listed in the order they were introduced)

April 5, 1998

- | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--|
| Agendum 3 | Handout A. | Selective Fisheries A Conservation Tool?
Overhead presentation by Carrie Cook-Tabor. |
| Agendum 7 | Handout B. | Draft letter to Tim Farley from the KFMC, dated March 10, 1998. |
| Agendum 8 | Handout C. | Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the State of
California and NFMS. |
| Agendum 9 | Handout D. | TAT analysis of preseason allocation vs. post season harvest for
inriver fisheries. |
| Agendum 10 | Handout E. | KFMC recommendation statement to the PFMC dated March 10,
1998. |
| Agendum 11A | Handout F. | Graphical depiction of seasons under 3 options for public review. |
| Agendum 11B | Handout G. | Letter from Robert Treanor to Jerry Mallet dated April 3, 1998. |
| Agendum 11B | Handout H. | Letter from Garth Griffin, NMFS, concerning actions taken by
NMFS regarding proposed listing of salmon and steelhead, dated
March 23, 1998. |
| Agendum 12 | Handout I. | Letter from Troy Fletcher, Yurok Tribe, to Jerry Mallet, dated
March 29, 1998. |

April 6, 1998

- | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| Agendum 15 | Handout J. | Klamath tag recoveries expanded for sampling, commercial and
recreational, in the SOC 1986-97. |
| Agendum 15 | Handout K. | TAT analysis of pre-season prediction vs. post season harvest for
KMZ-S fishery. |
| Agendum 4 | Handout N. | Memo from L.B. Boydston to Tim Farley, dated April 3, 1998. |
| Agendum 4 | Handout O. | List of monitoring needs from USFWS, and Task Force work plan. |
| Agendum 1 | Handout P. | TAT analysis of accounting of recreational fishing in the SOC cell,
Option 1. |

Agendum 1	Handout Q.	TAT analysis of accounting of recreational fishing in the SOC cell, Option 2.
<u>April 8, 1998</u>	Handout R.	Agenda for balance of meeting days.
Agendum 1	Handout S.	Klamath Ocean Harvest Model Run, 4/8/98, 11:29 am.
Agendum 1	Handout T.	Oregon Coastal Natural Stock numbers under Option Tuesday 1B.
Agendum 5	Handout U.	Supplemental STT report E.2, April 1998. Collation of Preliminary Options for Managing Ocean Salmon Fisheries off the coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California in 1998.
Agendum 9	Handout V.	Written assignment to the TAT from Troy Fletcher.
Informational	Handout W.	Final Report Karuk Tribal Harvest Monitoring Project, 1991.

PARTICIPANTS

KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

April 5-8, 1998

Portland, Oregon

Meeting #53

Attachment #2

Members:

Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Service.
Mike Orcutt(for P. McCovey, Sr)	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Ron Iverson	Department of the Interior.
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopa Indians residing in the Klamath Conservation Area
L.B. Boydston	California Department of Fish and Game.
Virginia Bostwick	California In-river Sport Fishing Community
Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Nat Bingham	Pacific Fisheries Management Council

Other Speakers:

Jennifer Silveira	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Bernice Sullivan	Bureau of Reclamation
Dave Hillemeier	Tech Advisory Team, Yurok Fisheries Dept.
George Kautsky	Tech Advisory Team, Hoopa Fisheries Dept.
Duncan MacLean	California SAS Troll representative
Michael Mohr	Technical Advisory Team, National Marine Fisheries Service
Scott Barrow	Technical Advisory Team, California Dept. Of Fish and Game
Rich Dixon	Technical Advisory Team, California Dept. Of Fish and Game
Jim Welter	Port of Brookings
Carrie Cook-Tabor	US Fish and Wild life Service
Rich Comstock	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Don Stevens	Salmon Advisory Sub-panel, Oregon Troller
Dan Viele	National Marine Fisheries Service
Mike Burner	Technical Advisory Team, Oregon Dept. Of Fish and Wildlife