

PSRFE Oversight Committee Minutes, December 8, 2016

Present: Don Freeman, Dave Knutzen, Troy McKelvey, David Puki, Norm Reinhardt, Art Tachell, Ryan Lothrop, Kirt Hughes, Laurie Peterson, Colleen Desselle, Mark Baltzell, Lea Ronne, Chris Nacey

Present via conference call: Steve Chamberlin, Mike Gilchrist, Brett Rosson, Michael Rian, Gregg Williams, Jim Jenkins, Ed Eleazer

Absent: Erik Anderson

Introduction

Review Agenda – reviewed, no changes.

Approve previous meeting’s minutes – Troy McKelvey stated he was at the last meeting and it was not in the minutes. Once that is added minutes are approved.

Fishing Regulations Application

Update – We are working on an application for anglers to use while out in the field. We have a really great map system to look at streams or lakes in your area, and you touch one of them and it will bring up the regulations for that stream or that lake. At this time it is just giving what is valid today. We are looking to change that so you can plan ahead, look at upcoming regulations to see what it will be on certain dates. It went into beta test phase last week and we are asking for feedback from users that can give us new ideas, tell us how features are working or not, tell us what is useful or not. People are going to want to zoom to an area and then filter the results just for that area. This is probably going to have a disclaimer on it stating that this is the best and most up-to-date, but it can only be as up to date as when you last synced it with our data, and our data can only be as up-to-date as when it got entered, but the final say is the law. It is hoped to have all the rules and have immediate updates available. We also would like to be able to have people off-line and to be able to use the application and update it when back in a service area. Mike Gilchrist stated that overall it is positive; the concern is with field usability. No zoom ability for regulations. Chris stated that the best thing is for them to have written feedback. We are hoping to get someone in design to help with colors, fonts, and zooming. We are trying to build android and Apple side-by-side so they are both the same, but we are finding differences. Each should run better because of the specific application for android and IOS application for Smart phones. Also for entering CRC – that is something Chris is hoping for. It is not part of the original scope: buying licenses, entering CRC. ADFG tried having the CRC log-in and there are some advances in that and the processes that can occur. Timeline: went out to public to download prior to April 1. Beta is available now.

Program Update

Sub-committee Report

- Legislative – Gregg sent Dave Puki letter yesterday re: support for the new funding bill – it was well written. **Dave P.** liked that Gregg indicated our funds are not directly derived through the fees and what we do with the hatcheries portion of it. He also read the letter from **Don** re: support for the redevelopment of Lures Landing and Point Whitney – **Ryan** stated that there has been some positive feedback. It will be competitive getting the funding, hopefully one if not both will get the needed funding. **Dave K.** stated that he had a couple minor edits and asked whether to send the letter. **Norm** stated that he has a different opinion about the letter and said if we approve it, we are all saying the recreational community at large feels the same way. They feel that what is in the letter – so far, they have no idea of all the underlying issues and complexity for managing the fisheries for the state - there is very little public support for what is stated in that letter. If we send the letter, the message is that we are going to do it anyway and in that, I am not comfortable with that. They have questions like why am I paying more for less opportunity? Why can't I launch my boat from the ramps we are refurbishing when I have to wade through the commercial activity? They do not see the complexity. I tell them to come to the meetings for a better understanding. They do not want to attend, but want to fish. They don't see where they are getting the opportunity for the money they are putting into it. How do we get them to understand that they need to support the letter? **Art** agreed with this. **Dave P.** stated that they all seem to be getting the same feedback, but we cannot do anything if we do not get the funding. We are more worried about being able to operate. **Don** stated that he had to take exception that people are not listening. They are, but they need to know that if we don't get the funding, what they will lose (indicate the top ten cuts that will take place). If there is no funding, it will fail. **Dave K** said we are showing support, people are upset about the North of Falcon (NoF) process – we need solutions not road blocks. We have faith in Director Unsworth. He is more like us than anyone else has been. DFW is more like us. Will they be successful? Not everywhere, but the need for more funding is there. Norm stated if we want to rewrite the letter as a committee fine, but if as representing the public, it needs more fine-tuning. We need to acknowledge the skepticism of the public. We need to show that we are not representing what the public is feeling, however we need to let the Department know that we are supportive. **Gregg** stated that he wants to put some of that sentiment into the letter, and will add text to address the skepticism of the public. We need to be realistic that not all are onboard with it, but individual members of the committee support this. We would like the letter out tomorrow or early next week, if necessary. Dave K will send some minor edits to Gregg via his phone and Gregg can wordsmith and get it out to the committee early tomorrow (Dec 16). **Steve Chamberlin** – show budget without the new programs and staffing – that may help smooth it out. **Kirt Hughes** stated that the package was developed from what the public wanted from the Wild Futures – outreach, additional enforcement presence, etc. The package absent additional funding means cuts. **Dave P** asked if the Department decided or discussed either a directive or policy shift to more generally prioritize fisheries for the recreational community. **Kirt:** .The policy would come at the direction of

the Commission, and we have that policy in a number of places, as mentioned, Grays Harbor Policy is out there, and direct sharing allocation among the user groups; the Willapa is the same way; and the Columbia River is going to be discussed on the Commission meeting this Saturday. The NoF Policy is another one of those and beyond just the fisheries there are policies that describe or prescribe to the agency how allocations should work. The legislators also have the ability to direct the activities of the Department. **Brett:** Can the NoF be separated from this request for more money? If there is a difference, can we do it? **Ryan** stated there is intent in some of the information that is out there online to call out certain things this bill would purchase, but the difficult would be in how to separate the two. **Kirt** stated what we have currently is that the information is at a pretty high level, and we need that detail. **Norm** states the policies are being attacked. For my part on this committee and other committees, what will happen if the George Adams hatchery closes because of budget constraints? It will affect areas 12, 7, 9, 5 – every marine area. If we do not get the additional funding this is what will happen: we will be forced to close this program - whether it is a hatchery, warmwater fisheries, cold water fisheries, halibut fisheries, game fish, nongame fish – here is what you are going to give up. There are a lot of folks who do not understand that complexity and we need to get that out there right where it gets their attention. Much discussion on how to get public to get involved: Facebook, Twitter, etc.

- **Dave P.** sent an email to the Legislative aide re support for the Legislative session and that he is willing to attend the training when it becomes available.
 - WDFW Commission Presentation Update – **Dave K** - The Commission presentation went fairly well. Positive feedback. Talked about alternatives. Reminded them we have core e.g., blackmouth, coho barging, fishing application. We have support for agency and program. Excitement that we are doing new things, but we can only do so much without help (harvest type of work, reforms to harvest, building our harvest all that rolled into one; in-season management or removal of in-season management whatever the correct term is, but bottom line is that our blackmouth fisheries that this program started on are dying on the vine because they are not harvest fish due to the impacts in individual areas compared to Puget Sound as a whole) – we need to get Commission/Department help.
 - Hatchery Programs – **Jim** - This year was really complex. It took us six tribes, NOAA, five different adult trapping traps, and facilities to get through this year when we looked at genetic management, disease policy, co-management, and all the pieces and then what actually turned up at the rack depending on the facility we were at.
 - We made our coho programs in south Puget Sound. Took enough eggs to do 150,000 at Hupp if we want to do that. I have not submitted the brood document change form because of all of the brood document change forms that have been done throughout the...and complexity of it. Now we are at a place where we can now discuss it and move forward with it.

- Fall Chinook moved all over south Puget Sound – there shortages in some places and overages elsewhere – it took quite a bit to make it all work. The bottom line is that Voights Creek backfill from Garrison PSRE program – we took every egg we possibly could at Chambers Bay, Voights, and at Tumwater Falls and got about one million eggs on hand now for 850 program. So, we were talking about that 100,000 jumbos in the fall, that is kind of on the edge now and we can discuss that in whatever kind of detail you want. All the programs are in place. The only difference is the slightly older program at Lakewood, and it is not enough to make up that 100,000 jumbos in the fall.
- Spring Chinook – Minter Fall and spring turned up positive with IHN. We took almost 500,000 springer eggs. This year there were a lot of eggs in White River, and they were able to make program and beyond there. We were going to sunset that program in the next 5 years, and those eggs at Minter were going to go...after they were cleared, they were headed to Puyallup. There were enough eggs in the White River watershed to make up for that. Those eggs stayed at Minter and we are slated to take them to Hupp, and we have co-manager approval at this point to do that. NOAA is okay with it as well. We are working on marking issues and funding issues. Just so you know, we had a White River Technical Meeting about a month ago, and at that point the tribes did not object to clipping fish. They were concerned about the fish management side and they are on the hatchery side, but it still had to pass through their harvest management group. The two had not met yet. There may be some conflict. **Dave K** stated that it is his hope that if we do this, we can reap some reward. If they are healthy enough to clip, I recommend they be clipped. My other suggestion is to not call them White River spring Chinook from this point forward – they are Hupp spring Chinook. Potentially we can be discussing this again next year. Protocols are in place to ensure nothing leaves the facility.

Budget

- Status – we are tracking on par – 98% of our projected. Current expenditures – fish health, shuffling of who was operating that budget, go to FY17, it balances out. They will zero out. Hatchery Utility Support – Dept. /OFM have increased in authority. Utility cost has gone up so it allowed us to have \$10,000 more. Will use to balance out. Tracking well across the board. Garrison Springs – we are still obligated to this. Top of reverse side – where we are to date. We are unable to transfer the funding we had allocated for Barging Coho. The tribe absorbed the cost. We acknowledged that we owe them the funding. We have three options: 1) we cut them a \$7,000 check for this and next year; 2) we use the funding for enhancing the project (study); or 3) use it for another project. Do a study on how barging affects the fish – put some in a barge and move around for a certain period of time, and put back in with original group. Compare.
 - BN 16-18 World Wide Conference – the difficulty with the conference is that we will not have new information/analyses. That said, new project people are curious about. Can we

send a member to the conference? How much will be covered? What is our justification? Hold to have PSRE \$3,600 for the conference.

- BN 15-17 Remaining Projects

- Sport Shows – Two shows coming up. Seattle is more expensive. Puyallup – we want to be in the fishing building. David P – the partnership with Licensing was good. Will we have enough manpower? If their booth for their message, we can provide a nominal fee toward it. Is there overlap? Puyallup is from Jan 25-28, Seattle from Jan 27-Feb 4, so a 2-day overlap. Have TV or laptop at shows to present how to fish for whichever species. Yes on shows. Norm stated he would go to Puyallup because that is where people like me go. Can talk about fisheries, where, how, etc. Be prepared to talk about why the Department has a request for a fee increase. Only go if they can put us in the right area at the show. Volunteer at the Seattle show with licensing.
- Outreach – Fish Pink \$10,000. If we decide to do that we need to kickoff this at the shows. Still in a place holder. Subcommittee shall report. There are a lot of logistics to put together, i.e., capture pink in the Sound, tag, release (where?). Trout derby took a lot of planning, and although there are differences from trout, we will not want to reinvent the wheel. We need to be sure that we are going to have the season. Will need to know harvest rate, exploitation rate. Hold farther north? Ryan thought it should be more interior Puget Sound. How many (%) per prizes you have? Fewer tags worth more? We need to check with derby to get our options. Get smaller prizes to get less chance of cheating? Sub-committee to work on this. Some discussion on whether we “do the talk” in having a pink fishery where prizes can be won, could be a fail if there are no pinks to fish. We just want to get excitement on fishing for them, even if we have to do gear restrictions.
- Rockfish - For rockfish we have \$3,000 available for descending devices, key chains with IDs, etc. PSA is giving away Seaqualizers. Big bang for the buck is the Shelton. Everyone will have to have one to bottomfish. Steve will talk with PSA about their overstock and Ryan will talk with Dayv Lowry.
- Hatchery Reform – Benefit to PSRFE and the Department. We have a fishery problem, not a hatchery problem. Need to remove barriers to opportunity. Independent scientific panel “utilizing hatcheries, how can we increase sport fishing opportunity by facility scoring?” We have to narrow it to a certain area because \$25K does not get very much. Look at facilities to increase our recommendation is to look at X, Y, or Z hatchery. Talked to HSRG. They could answer in short period of time, will answer at end of January as to what makes sense. They cannot do PS as a whole, so asked for mid-Sound (Areas 5-13), but will focus on 10-13. Will help Department work with Legislators to give them credibility. It could come back that they are wasting money at a hatchery. Facilities have been reviewed, recommendations made, changes have occurred. Cutting hatcheries is probably not going to happen. In PS only looked at hatcheries, not harvest – then they looked a harvest and made recommendations. HSRG will use along with other

funds to get more answers. \$25,000 will give leveraging. There are models that they will plug in and analyze. Federal government did this previously with about \$14 million for the west coast. Done because ESA was hitting our Chinook in PS and there was a lot of hatchery bashing. David Puki moved that the committee allocate \$25,000 to HRSB for research into the harvest management in regards to the hatcheries in central to south Puget Sound. Seconded. No opposition. You can let Eric Kinne know and I will let Lee know and the two of them can figure out what truly happens.

BN 17-19 Budget Development

- Outlook
 - Program/Project Prioritization
 - Next Steps – We need to review to see where we are with our Goals and Objectives. We need a meeting in early to mid-January. Pink committee needs to meet prior to next meeting. How about a Fish Pink sticker like the Fish Washington stickers?
-

Wrap-Up

- Q&A
- Date/Location for Next Meeting - TBD