# Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fish Program Columbia River Recreational Advisory Group July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018

WDFW Ridgefield Office- 5525 S 11<sup>th</sup> St, Ridgefield WA 98642

#### **Attendance**:

**CRRAG Members:** 

Harry Barber, Clinton Winn, Randy Woolsey, Mark Heirigs, Ken Beer, Lance Beckman, Pete Boone

WDFW Staff:

Cindy LeFleur, Ryan Lothrop, Myrtice Dobler (note taker)

Public:

Larry Cassidy, Don Kinsey

## **Purpose of meeting:**

Advisory Group/Public Comprehensive Review of Columbia River Basin Salmon Management Policy C-3620 (2013-17)

#### Meeting Agenda:

- В		
Time	Topic	
4:00- 4:15	Introductions/ Agenda/ Review update and timeline	
4:15- 4:45	Economics	
4:45-5:15	Allocation	
5:15-6:00	Alternative Gear	
6:00- 6:15	Concurrency	
6:15-6:30	Selective Fisheries	
6:30- 6:45	Q1 Supplemental: Conservation Benefits	
6:45- 7:00	Wrap-up / What's next	

## **Meeting Notes**:

## Introductions/Agenda/Review

Ryan quickly summarized where we are and what the process is (details in handouts). He highlighted the next Fish Committee meeting that is open to the public.

• August 9<sup>th</sup> in Olympia at Double Tree Hilton in Olympia at 4pm.

#### **Economics**

There was a discussion on the use of angler trips in comparison of commercial ex-vessel values. This is a measure used in the policy. It was requested to add a narrative on the value of angler trips and noted that it would be nice to know the impact of sport anglers (WA and OR) on the economy.

Question on how WDFW arrives at the estimated angler trips; more information will be provided to the advisory group. The main ways are:

- ODFW flies the river twice a week and counts boats and bank anglers
- There are samplers on both sides of the river, 7 days/week at beaches and boat ramps
- Put those 2 together = catch and angler estimates
- Staff provided a PPT to the group on this topic after the meeting

#### Question 2- Economic Enhancements

- Concern was expressed about showing how the poor run size has effected angler trips.
- It was suggested to show angler trips per fish, instead of just per run size
- In regards to tables 2D through F it was noted that a value is placed on the number caught and the amount received (per fish), it would be useful to know what those expected and actual values were.
- It seems that both recreational and commercial indicate a declining number compared to what was modeled.

#### Question 15- Enhancements to Select Area fisheries

After a quick summary by Cindy and a note that we plan to add futuristic numbers, due to Mitchell Act Biop, the advisory group highlighted the following items:

- They would like to see a table, by year, of the commercial and sport catch totals in select areas and main stem (whole river to McNary)
- A listing of all the select areas, with amount of fish released by species and harvested with description of the purpose of select areas

It was noted by a member of the public that on SAFE areas Bonneville Power spends \$2.8 million compared to \$2.3 million return. They questioned the soundness of the investment – that is paid by rate payers.

#### Question 20- Opportunities, transition phase

• There was a discussion on lack of URB, this fishery did not occur during the policy.

## Question 21- Opportunities, long term

• The advisory group had a discussion on how the poor upcoming run size will be disastrous, and there were questions on how it would be reflected. We are expecting to go from 15% to 8.25% harvest rate and so you would expect to cut the numbers in half.

#### Question 37- Economic expectations (similar to Q2)

There were discussion on the tables in question 37, several notes were:

- Need to show these in terms in some kind of percentage change- show trend
- For Table 37E provide a totals row, perhaps by chinook, Coho (for each section).
- In Table 37G that shows effect of policy while neutralizing run size. It was asked to make notes of factors effecting sport fishery- weather, catch rates, run timing, water temperature and flow.

For the economic section, it was noted that this needs to be distilled into five or six lines. Staff agreed that we are missing the narrative in this section, and we plan to have a separate document to summarize the whole review information at a high level.

#### **Allocation**

This section has not really changed since the group went over it in March. Staff plan to reformat the document for ease of reading.

#### Question 30- Spring Chinook Allocation

- There was discussion on catch balancing and ESA impacts, and how they work.
- The advisory group did not like that the table only shows the percent used, and not actual sharing between fisheries.
- They would also like to see the ESA impacts and what actually happened.

#### Question 31- Spring Chinook Buffer

- The question was did the buffer succeed? Yes, we did not exceed impacts.
- This is because of catch balancing.
- There was further discussion on catch balancing.

## Question 32- Spring Chinook Allocation, Sport

- There was further discussion on why catch balancing is applied to the whole river.
- The advisory group noted that the data in table 32A are skewed by 2017 and if you take that out it would change average. It has been suggested to run the data without the 2017 information to give a clearer picture.

#### Question 34- Summer Chinook Allocation, above PRD

- The advisory group recommended staff describe what a summer chinook season looks like, angler days/days open.
- There was also a discussion on allocation in relation to the Colville fishery.

#### Question 35- Summer Chinook Allocation, below PRD

- There was discussion on the original response to this question; ultimately, staff ran out of time to put this together.
- Discussion on the allocations, if we reached the 70-30 split, and looking at how much of the allocations were used.

#### **Alternative Gear**

Concern was expressed of having non-selective gill nets in the main stem. There was also discussion about seine net studies and the actual fisheries in 2014.

#### Question 12- Alternative Gear Development

- There was a discussion on the challenges of seines- the cost, increase need for staff, and economic viability.
- The advisors brought up the difference between spring/summer/fall seasons.

• It was asked how the Colville tribe make seines so effective- there was talk on stock and rates, as well as location.

## **Question 19- Alternative Gear Progress**

 Advisory group members felt that this section was missing by-catch (spring chinook tangle nets, summer chinook gillnets) and sturgeon. Staff pointed out that it all should be in commercial.

#### Concurrency

Cindy summarized the document; there was little discussion.

#### **Selective Fisheries**

The document was summarized by staff.

- The group discussed how mark-selective can be challenging- missing marking, strong wild population.
- Several of the advisory group members felt that the effect of gillnets on steelhead was misrepresented. They also expressed concern over missing steelhead mortalities, which would affect the fishery.

#### Q1 Supplemental

We did add to this, suggest read through it-policy is not a conservation policy

- Missing elimination of by-catch, major conservation consideration and should be in there.
  - By-catch of some fisheries are provided in their appropriate section (i.e., commercial).

#### **Other Comments**

Due to the dense content, it was suggested staff meet individually with commission members not particularly oriented in fishing

There's no mention of impacts of sea lions- have heard impacts can be higher than allocation

• It is not in these sections, but is under management section in question 5 on predation.

#### **Action Items:**

#### WDFW Staff:

• Update Policy Review document with input from CRRAG.

#### CRRAG:

- Review of meeting minutes.
- If you have additional comments- please send to us.

## **Next Meeting:**

Date: July 18, 2018	Time: 1:00-3:30pm	Location: Benton PUD	
This is not an official advisory group meeting, but an opportunity for public on the eastside to			
review the Columbia River Basin Salmon Management Policy C-3620			
Time	Topic		
1:00- 1:15	Introductions/ Agenda/ Review update and timeline		
1:15- 2:30	Review Category A (completed) responses		
2:30- 3:15	Review Category B (incomplete) responses		
3:15- 3:30	Wrap- up/ What's next		