



Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission Minutes

Meeting: Thursday, June 5, 2014 – 8:00 a.m.
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Commission Room
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive S.E.
Salem, Oregon 97302

Meeting: Friday, June 6, 2014 - 8:00 am
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Commission Room
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive S.E.
Salem, Oregon 97302

1
2 *Commission minutes are considered draft until approved by the*
3 *Commission at its next meeting.*
4

5 Notice of these meetings had been made by press release of statewide media
6 circulation. Those attending part or all of the meeting included:
7

Bobby Levy, Chair
Michael Finley, Vice-Chair
Bob Webber, Commissioner
Holly Akenson, Commissioner
Gregory J. Wolley, Commissioner
Laura Anderson, Commissioner

Roy Elicker, Director
Curt Melcher, Deputy Director
Steve Sanders, Assistant Attorney General
Teri Kucera, Executive Assistant

8 **MEETING**

9 On Friday, June 6, 2014, Chair Bobby Levy called the Oregon Fish and Wildlife
10 Commission to order at 8:15 a.m.

11
12 **PUBLIC FORUM** – No one signed up for Public Forum.
13

14 **Exhibit H: 2014-2015 COASTAL PELAGIC SPECIES FISHERIES**

15 Troy Buell, State Fisheries Management Program Leader, during a slide presentation
16 discussed the 2014-2015 Coastal Pelagic Species (CPS) Fisheries for the Commission's
17 consideration. He noted a correction in **Attachment 2 – Notice of Proposed**
18 **Rulemaking Hearing, Statement of Need and Economic and Fiscal Impact**
19 **Statement**. He said the Fiscal and Economic Impact Statement contains information on
20 Pacific mackerel harvest limits. Staff has determined that federal processes will not fit
21 staff's timeline for adopting those regulations into state rule at this time, so staff will not
22 ask the Commission to consider anything specific to Pacific mackerel for this exhibit.
23

24 Buell said the federal Fishery Management Plan divides Coastal Pelagic Species into
25 several categories. In Oregon, CPS fisheries primarily target and harvest Pacific Sardine.
26

27 Buell said harvest limits and regulations are recommended by the Pacific Fishery
28 Management Council (PFMC), who shifted from a calendar year fishery (January to
29 December) to a July to June fishery to allow better incorporation of recent data into the
30 stock assessment. The coastwide maximum harvest level from July 2014 through June
31 2015 was set at 23,292 metric tons by PFMC in April 2014. Buell said the federal
32 regulations are not published but the proposed rule did just publish last week and reflects
33 the PFMC recommendations.
34

1 Buell said since 2006, the fishery has been on a downward trend which is reflected in
2 declining harvest levels; the lowest point since 1993. He discussed Harvest Limits (see
3 Allocation slide). A harvest control rule is applied to the output of the stock assessments
4 in terms of stock biomass. In recent years the harvest limit has been fully utilized by the
5 fishery. Buell discussed the adjustment made to the harvest control in this cycle. He said
6 there is a 65% decrease in the allowable harvest from last year to this year.

7
8 Buell discussed the Coastwide maximum harvest guideline. He said the harvest limit is
9 allocated to set-asides for different fishery activities and across three seasons:

- 10 • Industry sponsored aerial survey has been set aside for this summer.
- 11 • Treaty Tribes requested a 4,000 metric set-aside for their fisheries.
- 12 • 19,293 metric tons remain for allocation across three seasonal periods.

13
14 Buell said because of the shift in the Federal Management Cycle the period definitions
15 have changed. Oregon and Washington fisheries primarily occur in Periods 1 and 2, and
16 California fisheries primarily occur in Period 3 and some in Period 2. Each seasonal
17 allocation this year has been reduced by 500 metric tons to account for incidental catch
18 in non-directed fisheries. If there are unused set-asides or any seasonal allocations are
19 unused they can be rolled from period into the next. If the incidental set-aside does not
20 get used or the Tribal set-aside doesn't get used those could be rolled into the other
21 directed fishery allocation. He said there will be no roll over from Period 3 into Period 1
22

23 **Public Testimony:** There was no public testimony.

24
25 *Action: Commissioner Webber moved to approve the staff recommendations for*
26 *the 2014-2015 Coastal Pelagic Species fisheries as proposed in Attachment 3.*
27 *Commissioner Wolley seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously*
28 *by a vote of six.*

29
30 **Exhibit I: 2014 OCEAN SALMON FISHERIES**

31 Chris Kern, Acting Fish Division Deputy Administrator, said the new ocean salmon
32 regulations took effect May 1 for ocean waters (3-200 miles off shore) based on seasons
33 adopted by PFMC on April 9. Temporary rules to allow state water fisheries to begin
34 concurrently with federal rules are in place. Staff will ask the Commission to adopt
35 matching permanent regulations for ocean waters from 0-3 miles off shore in state
36 waters. He discussed the 2014 Forecasts for the North of Falcon and South of Falcon
37 areas:

- 38 • Klamath fall Chinook – 287,000.
- 39 • Sacramento Index fall Chinook – 635,000.
- 40 • Columbia River fall Chinook – 1,600,000.
- 41 • Coho: Columbia River hatchery - 964,000; Oregon Coastal Natural - 231,000.
- 42 • Chetco Terminal area: 2,300 Chinook.
- 43 • Elk Terminal area: 4,800 hatchery Chinook; less than the three year average.

44
45 Kern discussed the Primary Constraints:

- 46 • 41% exploitation rate on Lower Columbia Natural (LCN) tules.

- 1 • 16% harvest rate on Klamath age 4 fall Chinook.
- 2 • 22.5% exploitation rate on LCN wild coho and 30% OCN wild coho.

3
4 Kern referred to Slide 7 – 2014 Ocean Commercial Season and said there are more
5 details in *Attachment 2 – Notice of Proposal Rulemaking Hearing, Statement of Need*
6 *and Economic and Fiscal Impact Statement*. He said in general quotas are in place for:

- 7 • North of Falcon fisheries; they are higher in some cases than last year.
- 8 • No targeted retention of coho South of Falcon in the trawl fishery; it's Chinook
9 focused with some exceptions.
- 10 • Individual quotas by month in the Klamath Management Zone off of Brookings.

11
12 For the 2014 Ocean Sport Season, Kern referred to Attachment 2 and said:

- 13 • North of Falcon quota is better than last year but fishing is slow.
- 14 • South of Falcon has substantial marked coho quota for the summer season
15 starting June 21 this year.
- 16 • Non-marked selective quota for fall fishery in September, south of Humbug.

17
18 Kern discussed three new 2014 Ocean Terminal Fisheries proposals inside state waters:

- 19 1. Tillamook has not been used in recent years because it that area has been open
20 under regular ocean fishing rules for the last few years.
- 21 2. Elk Ocean Terminal Area is in administrative rule now; no changes proposed.
- 22 3. Chetco Ocean Terminal Area. Similar to last year with two proposed changes:
23 1) For Sport changing date by one day: 1 non-adipose daily/10 seasonal
24 aggregate October 1-12.
25 a. For Commercial quota a slight reduction: October 12 – 31 or 600 chinook
26 quota, 20 daily landing limit; 28-inch size limit.

27
28 **Public Testimony:** There was no public testimony.

29
30 Commissioner Webber asked if the commercial fishery on the Chetco was going to be
31 similar to the Elk because the Elk has a landing limitation; they have to land at Port
32 Orford. Do they have to land at Brookings out of the Chetco? Kern said yes they do.

33
34 *Action: Commissioner Anderson moved to approve the 2014 regulations for*
35 *ocean sport and commercial salmon fisheries, and ocean terminal sport and*
36 *commercial fisheries as proposed by staff and as reflected in the draft Oregon*
37 *Administrative Rules shown in Attachment 3. Vice Chair Finley seconded the*
38 *motion and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of six.*

39 40 **Exhibit J: ALSEA BOAT RAMP PROPERTY ACQUISITION REQUEST**

41 Dick Duncan, Realty Specialist, during a slide presentation said the Alsea River supports
42 a very popular fall salmon fishery in this area but access is difficult. The development of
43 a public boat launch facility on the lower Alsea River has been a high priority of ODFW
44 and Lincoln County for a number of years but it has been difficult to find a suitable
45 parcel. This property has 1,800 feet of river frontage and sits on 9.99 acres. The
46 proposed site design was prepared by the Oregon State Marine Board (OSMB).
47 The purchase price is \$330,000. Duncan said sources of funding will include:

- 1 • USFWS Sport Fish Restoration grant: 75% of the appraised value - \$221,250.
- 2 • OSMB Grant - \$73,000.
- 3 • Oregon Wildlife Heritage Foundation (OWHF) - \$35,000.

4
 5 Duncan noted that ODFW will hold title to the property but management and operations
 6 will be the responsibility of the Lincoln County Parks Department. Staff recommends the
 7 Commission approve the acquisition of this property with funding obtained from the
 8 sources just mentioned.

9
 10 **Public Testimony:**

<p>Jim Chambers Newport, Oregon</p>	<p>Jim Chambers, Director for Lincoln County Parks, provided background on the need of the proposed park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for development of facilities not in a flood “way”; it will still be in a flood “plain”. • A deep water parcel surrounded by water that is deeper than 20-feet; will not silt in as bad as privately owned parcels along the Alsea. • Public launches on Alsea are limited to Port of Alsea boat launch and U.S. Forest Service drift boat launches. The rest are private but have shut down. • Parcel is located six miles upriver from the Alsea and allows for easier access to prime fishing grounds. • Navigation between the Port of Alsea to the upland fishing area is limited; there are no channel navigation markers. If you are not familiar with the river you have a chance of running into sandbars. <p>Chambers said without the Commission’s help on this project it will not get down. Lincoln County Park is not contributing to this but has budgeted funds for next year for wetland analysis, archaeological studies, floodplain evaluations, and permits.</p>
<p>Stan Steele Corvallis, Oregon</p>	<p>Stan Steele, Alsea Sportsmen’s Association (ASA), owns a cabin on the Alsea. He said we have the best coastal fall Chinook fishery but access to the river is a problem. Private boat launches closed to the public because of potential lawsuits. Steele said the Alsea has a five mile speedboat limit. If you put in at Port of Waldport it takes hours to get back to the upper tidewater. The site being considered is not actually in upper tidewater but it gives a tremendous cut in the time it takes to get to the best tidewater bobber fishery area. Steele said ASA has worked with Lincoln County, OWHF, and others looking for sites. This site can handle a number of boats. ASA supports ODFW’s efforts and asks the Commission to endorse this purchase.</p>

--	--

1
2 Commissioner Wolley asked if the County awarded ODFW secured funding for the full
3 build out of the site or is that coming from the additional partners? Duncan said staff will
4 apply to USFWS for development grants. Commissioner Wolley asked if the County is
5 assuming liability for the site. Duncan said the County will provide the liability insurance.
6

7 *Action: Commissioner Wolley moved to approve the acquisition of the Alsea*
8 *River Boat Ramp property and direct staff to proceed to escrow closing upon*
9 *completion of the due diligence processes required under Oregon Administrative*
10 *Rules for Land Acquisition and Exchanges. Commissioner Webber seconded the*
11 *motion and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of six.*
12

13 **Exhibit K: COASTAL MULTI-SPECIES CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT**
14 **PLAN**

15 Ed Bowles, Fish Division Administrator, said this is the second step of the Commission
16 process on the Coastal Multi-Species Conservation and Management Plan (the Plan).
17 He said based on the feedback staff received at the informational meeting (in April) there
18 has been little change other than the Siletz deadline compromise.
19

20 Tom Stahl, Conservation and Recovery Program Manager, said the final draft Plan
21 identifies the status and limiting factors for the six species addressed by this plan:

- 22 • Current status of these populations and species is remarkably good.
- 23 • Desired status is to: 1) maintain viability for all the populations that are currently
24 viable and to achieve viability for those that currently are not; and 2) improve the
25 status of all populations to ensure conservation and fishing opportunities into the
26 future.
- 27 • Limiting factors in four management categories:
 - 28 1. Hatchery fish in a few populations but across the board staff is managing the
29 hatchery risk very well in the coastal area.
 - 30 2. Harvest for Chinook and spring Chinook in the ocean and tributaries.
 - 31 3. Other species. Predators (seals, sea lions, cormorants, and non-native fish)
32 require management direction.
 - 33 4. Habitat will have to be dealt with to get us to our desired status.

34
35 Stahl said the Plan addresses six species management units (SMUs): Chinook, spring
36 Chinook, chum, winter steelhead, summer steelhead, and coastal cutthroat. He referred
37 to a map that indicated the population viability of these species. The Plan has extensive
38 actions to deal with the following species:

- 39 • Elk River Chinook were not viable.
- 40 • South Umpqua spring Chinook were not viable.
- 41 • Chum is an SMU listed as critical on the Sensitive Species List.
- 42 • Chum in Netarts may not be an historically independent population, and would not
43 be viable if it were.
- 44 • Staff was unable to do analyses of chum in all of their historical locations.

- Winter steelhead and coastal cutthroat are distributed across the planning area (from the Necanicum down to the Elk River); all populations were viable.
- Summer steelhead has native populations in the Siletz and North Umpqua; both are viable.

Stahl discussed the Plan's actions and strategies:

- Addresses limiting factors, conservation and fishing opportunity.
- Increase in production for hatchery fish. New programs for Chinook in the Yaquina and Coos Bay. Some shifts or reduction in hatchery production in certain programs.
- A sliding scale for harvest management is identified. Adjusts harvest lower in years of expected low returns and higher in years of expected higher returns.
- Protective period for early run Chinook to protect less abundant life history of the Chinook populations. Critical thresholds of populations are identified and new opportunity is provided with spring Chinook hatchery programs. Staff proposes harvest of wild winter steelhead in the: 1) East Fork of the Coquille River; 2) Big Elk Creek (Yaquina); and 3) Salmon River. Staff is not proposing wild steelhead harvest in the Umpqua River.
- Predation is recognized and aggressively pursued.
- Habitat strategies in the Plan indicate how to prioritize whole watersheds, types of restoration activities, etc.

Stahl discussed the Hatchery Portfolio. He said about half of the coastal planning area is going to be in wild fish emphasis; the other half is going to have hatchery programs. The total releases of hatchery fish is proposed to increase from 6 million to 6.4 million smolts and pre-smolts and there is a small consolidation in the number of programs.

Stahl said the angling regulations fit into two categories: 1) deferred from previous angling regulation processes; and 2) new angling regulations (see *Attachment 4 – Proposed Angling Regulation Changes*) to implement the Plan. The specific angling regulations that are ready for implementation in 2015 will be presented to the Commission in August during the regular angling regulation agenda item.

Stahl discussed Research, Monitoring and Evaluation during implementation of the Plan.

- Monitoring is adequate to implement the coastal plan. ODFW spends \$3.5 million each year monitoring anadromous salmonids in the coastal planning area. Staff is looking at how these different species are doing; this is world class monitoring in terms of its design and scale of implementation. All species and coho are being monitored. The method, scale, and metrics vary by species based on funding and feasibility.
- The plan calls for a reallocation of some base status and trend monitoring to cover new work lower in the watersheds to get better chum and Chinook information, assess new management actions (e.g., within wild steelhead harvest areas), and to conduct some research into management questions in coordination with the Oregon Hatchery Research Center (OHRC). This will be accomplished by reducing effort on coho spawner surveys (where specific precision levels are not

1 being realized and more realistic precision levels will be set), gaining efficiencies
2 in juvenile monitoring by combining this with habitat monitoring, and possibly
3 adjusting life cycle sites and the work done at them.
4

5 Stahl said the Plan identifies where staff can use additional funding to do more research
6 and monitoring:

- 7 • Fully implement the chum restoration strategy; ODFW developing a budget
8 package to do this.
- 9 • Increase the scope or pace of research.
- 10 • Broadly increase precision for the different species.
- 11 • Support OHRC research in new management strategy techniques for hatchery
12 fish.

13
14 Stahl discussed Implementation of the Plan and said:

- 15 • Most of the actions can be implemented right away with current staff and resource
16 levels
- 17 • Habitat restoration will be coordinated with other entities.
- 18 • Annual reporting on the metrics in the Plan will be completed.
- 19 • Adaptive management will be utilized where needed to ensure staff is meeting the
20 goals of the Plan. He said a full status reassessment is called for in twelve (12)
21 years, which is equivalent to several life cycles of these species and the amount
22 of time needed to start to see a response for these actions.

23
24 Stahl discussed what has changed in the Plan before the Commission today and since
25 their April meeting. This includes:

- 26 • Housekeeping and unifying the way it is written; the term “proposed” has been
27 removed in the Plan.
- 28 • Clarified consistency with the Native Fish Conservation Policy (NFCP), especially
29 with respect to how the biological attributes called for in the policy align with the
30 parameters that staff will be monitoring into the future and how that relates to the
31 Desired Status.
- 32 • Some of the management strategies have been reworded to be consistent with
33 the management strategies in administrative rule; mostly word changes.
- 34 • Revised deadline proposal for Siletz River. Stahl said currently the deadline is at
35 Ojalla Bridge. The intent of the revised proposal is to provide more opportunity up
36 to Illahee Park as well as protect the spawning fish in the river between those two
37 points. Originally staff proposed spawning ground closures in that area but
38 received feedback it is difficult to enforce. Staff is now proposing the Ojalla Bridge
39 deadline August 1 through October 6 and to move it upstream for the later part of
40 the run to Illahee Park after October 7th. Deadline for the spring run will remain at
41 Moonshine Park.

42
43 Bowles said movement of the deadline down to Ojalla Bridge was in response to a low
44 period of Chinook returns, so moving it back up is prudent given that was a response to
45 a low period in the run that is healthy now overall within this Species Management Unit.
46

1 Stahl said the Administrative Rules (see *Attachment 1 – Agenda Item Summary*) are
2 separated into two issues:

- 3 1. New rules for the Coastal Multi-Species Plan were developed using the same
4 approach for other conservation plans the Commission has adopted. It codifies
5 elements required in the NFCP and key elements of the Plan.
- 6 2. Revises the species management and basin plan rules already in place to remove
7 discrepancies between rules in place and direction identified in the Plan.

8
9 Stahl noted *Revised Attachment 6 – Amendment to Rules for Coastal Multi-Species*
10 *Conservation and Management Plan* and said the administrative rules number changed.
11 The original Attachment 6 (see Attachment 6 – Draft Modifications to Existing Basin Plan
12 Oregon Administrative Rules) did not have that number change. Staff also clarified that
13 coho are not part of the Plan because coho already have a conservation plan in place.
14

15 Stahl said the Staff Recommended Motion approves the Plan and adopts the rules for
16 the plan as noted in the packet, although adoption of the rule revisions for Species
17 Management and Basin Plans is found in revised Attachment 6.
18

19 Jim Owens, the Facilitator, presented his overarching observations.

- 20 1. Process was intentionally different than the historic approach of developing
21 conservation management plans in a chapter-by-chapter multi-year process. Staff
22 did its work upfront, defining current and desired status and coming up with a
23 preliminary set of management strategies and actions to which four stakeholder
24 teams and the public could respond. This approach helped shorten the process.
- 25 2. This was a very successful public process that brought together a variety of
26 disparate interests to wrestle with challenging policy decisions in a collaborative
27 process. It gave the public in local communities, approximately 650 people, the
28 opportunity to participate in the public meetings.

29
30 Chair Levy thanked staff for clarifying that there is no proposed harvest of wild steelhead
31 on the Umpqua River.
32
33

Public Testimony:

Bruce Bertrand Coos Bay, Oregon	Bruce Bertrand, President of South Coast Anglers (SCA) STEP Association, expressed their concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Disagree with reduction of 50,000 Chinook on Elk River. Need to study first and then make appropriate decisions, an approach in line with the new research projects adopted in May 2014 by OHRC.• If this project is successful, do not reduce the hatchery Chinook. SCA believes science takes time and should be the primary basis for any decision. Make the Elk River a laboratory for scientific research with OHRC and make changes in the future based on that research.• SCA asks the Commission to consider that in some areas competition for food may be a real problem between hatchery and wild fish.
------------------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stray rates may be a legitimate concern on some rivers. We put more hatchery fish in our area. The survey on the Coos River this year at the fish weir and trap and spawning grounds showed that 800 salmon were observed; the stray rate was 2%. It could have been less because some of the salmon that died by the fish weir were counted as strays; you have to count them above that point. This is a large sample and a very small stray rate on the Coos system. We think that is very important and our number one goal is the proliferation of wild fish. <p>Bertrand said it is their position with the reservations he just expressed that they lend their support to the draft 2014 Plan.</p>
<p>Peter Tronquet Medford, Oregon</p>	<p>Peter Tronquet, Native Fish Society (NFS), North Umpqua Foundation, Steamboaters, spoke to several concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proportion of hatchery fish on spawning grounds (the PHOS rate) has moved away from science standards around hatcheries and release points; sometimes it exceeds 30%, 60%, or 90% stray rates. If that is the way to approach that okay, but that should not be codified as the goal. Through monitoring efforts, shoot for a target of 10% or less. We are going to be happy with 30% or 60% around hatcheries. • Tronquet serves on the OHRC Board. Some of their research may improve homing fidelity so you have less stray. We may be able to improve hatchery fish to bite better so we take more hatchery fish out of the system to reduce PHOS rates. If they're high now, ODFW has a lot of latitude that works to the detriment of wild fish recovery. • A total of 171 million fish are released into the Columbia River every year. The Commission is charged with being true to the Native Fish Conservation (NFC) policy. We need to make sure that the life cycle of wild salmon and steelhead does not start and end in a hatchery so the NFC policy really means something. • He asked the Commission to give their full support to the agency's monitoring budget when it comes before them.
<p>Guido Rahr Portland, Oregon</p>	<p>Guido Rahr, President of Wild Salmon Center (WSC), spoke to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall this Plan is an important contribution to the protection of wild fish on the Oregon coast, especially through the Wild Fish Management Zone designations. • WSC completed an economic analysis; 40% of the economic impact from the fisheries comes from the wild

	<p>fish - \$32 million per year for coastal economies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is going to happen in the hatchery emphasis areas, especially with the concept of straying? The Nestucca, Trask, and Elk have been sites of big investments in habitat protection and restoration. We need to be careful that we don't fill those habitats with hatchery strays and undermine that habitat protection. Need to monitor the impacts of stray rates on those rivers and through adaptive management ensure we are not damaging those important systems. • WSC asks the Commission to adopt the Plan. • Important for the Plan and Oregon coast to have an independent scientific review of its hatchery system through the Hatchery Science Review Group to make sure we have the best management practices on hatcheries and are doing everything we can to reduce impacts. • If we don't allocate money to monitor the impact of the hatchery programs on the rivers, we won't know if we are succeeding with this Plan. WSC encourages Director Elicker to allocate funding to monitor the impacts in places like the Nestucca, the Elk, and others. • Use adaptive management to make any changes needed to bring these systems to best management practices and to reduce the impact on wild fish. • WSC hopes ODFW will promote these wild fish zones through branding and signage to make these designations durable.
--	---

1
2 Vice Chair Finley asked Bertrand if his group would be willing to be involved in a
3 volunteer monitoring program. Bruce Bertrand said yes, we would be very much involved
4 – that is how we get things done.
5

<p>Joe Ferguson Springfield, Oregon</p>	<p>Joe Ferguson, Stakeholder for Umpqua Stratum, distributed a handout, <i>Umpqua River Winter Steelhead Biological Assessment (ODFW, 2003 – Page 21)</i>, and expressed his concerns specifically to the Umpqua River:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of firm data on total run size. The 2003 biological assessment by ODFW estimated a run size that averaged 28,000 fish. He said there is far fewer fish on the mainstem and mainstem tributaries (see highlighted language on page one of handout). There is not sufficient habitat to produce those numbers of fish. Neither ODFW nor BLM can identify the high quality rearing habitat that is producing these numbers of fish. 2. Pending federal legislation would transfer jurisdiction of timber harvest on O&C lands to the state. If there is a
--	---

	<p>large amount of suitable rearing habitat on the mainstem and tributaries this is an opportunity to partner with BLM to find where that high quality habitat is on these O&C lands.</p> <p>3. The North and South Umpqua basins are heavily dependent on snow pack for their summer flows. He referred to page 2 of his handout, "<i>Crater Lake's yearly snowfall declines</i>", and said snowpack in the High Cascades is down 100-inches over the last 50 years. Page 3 of his handout is from the final draft CMP on anticipated negative impacts from climate change. Staff adjusted their abundance figures upwards which do nothing to address the problem if you have declining habitat and numbers.</p> <p>Ferguson proposed that abundance numbers in the Umpqua Basin be adjusted and enough data gathered to get a realistic appraisal of the total population size for the winter steelhead run in the Umpqua Basin. His handout includes a listing of the total run size in the North Umpqua since 1946; the lowest number in the last 60 years is 3,700 fish. He asked to see recognition of the value of the North Umpqua; those numbers increased or indication that if there is any long term decline that action will be taken before it gets down to a ridiculously low level.</p>
<p>Stan Steele Corvallis, Oregon</p>	<p>Stan Steele, member of Alsea Sportsmen's Association, said having a wild fish or a hatchery fish is what this all about – those opportunities to protect and enjoy. He thanked Director Elicker, Ed Bowles, and staff for moving on with the goal to making our family unit stronger and protecting what we care about as a core; CMP does that. He said we need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endorsement of this Plan to allow our professionals to manage with our input. • Make sure it is adequately funded through legislative actions and through, maybe, fee increases. <p>Steele said all of this is what is going to make this mechanism work and adaptable to what fisheries are in the future and what our grandchildren need. Coming together and allowing science to lead us and understanding that science is part of an overall management plan.</p>
<p>Bob Spellbrink Siletz, Oregon</p>	<p>Bob Spellbrink lives and fishes on the Siletz River. He said he supports the management Plan and requests the Commission's support as well. He has been self-employed his entire life and he understands the need for a good plan. Regarding the Siletz deadline he was glad of the</p>

	<p>compromise to allow fall Chinook fishing above Ojalla Bridge, which allows a balance between conservation and opportunity.</p>
<p>Greg Haller Portland, Oregon</p>	<p>Greg Haller, Conservation Director for Pacific Rivers Council (PRC), said the CMP process is an opportunity for PRC to fulfill its mission in the best remaining and iconic rivers in western Oregon. Highlights of his testimony:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciates ODFW's efforts to strike a balance between meeting the conservation needs of wild fish and providing opportunities to harvest fish. The Plan did not go far enough in identifying and creating the conservation requirements for wild fish. • PRC supports the Wild Fish Emphasis Areas (WFEA) concept but they were not chosen in a way that provides any meaning beyond just the creation of a zone. Wild fish need wild rivers and habitat and not zones, and need to be free from hatchery influences. Because of a lack of quantity and quality of data there is much we do not know about the impacts hatchery fish are having on wild runs. • PRC supports the elimination of steelhead hatchbox programs which is an important conservation gain. • Sliding scale harvest regulations are a good start, however there should be an option for no harvest of wild fish in extremely low return years. • PRC appreciates that ODFW eliminated the initial proposal to harvest wild steelhead on the Umpqua River. • PRC would like to see the elimination of harvest of wild Chinook on the mainstem Umpqua below the confluence of the South Umpqua to protect the early arriving Chinook destined for the south. He said these fish have been identified as an independent, nonviable population, primarily based upon habitat being severely degraded in that river. • Monitoring is key – think about getting that data, funding the needs for it, and building the Plan from there.
<p>Grant Scheele N/A</p>	<p>Grant Scheele, a guide, expressed his support of the CMP. He said there was a lot of work on the Plan and on the Siletz River fall Chinook deadline. In the end neither side was happy, which means we met in the middle.</p>
<p>Brad Halvorsen Hillsboro, Oregon</p>	<p>Brad Halvorsen spoke on behalf of the Board of Directors for the Association of Northwest Steelheaders (ANWS) and distributed written testimony. He said they commend ODFW for its transparency in this policy planning, the vetting with</p>

	<p>stakeholders, and the review process and modifications to the original draft. Halvorsen said that ANWS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endorses the CMP being presented but supports a wider policy discussion leading to future refinements in the Plan. • Favors the proposed sliding scale harvest based on predicted abundance. • Supports the proposed Pilot Implementation Plan to channel resources and actions to those populations most in peril. But it is imperative those actions in the two basins selected are monitored for efficacy and extrapolated to other basins. • Disturbed by a lack of baseline data to formulate the Plan. It is not demonstrated that the effects of coastal hatchery programs have been analytically assessed. • Urges a stronger commitment to monitoring and data collection. • Applauds involving OHRC, but hopes a focus will be to better understand the impact of hatchery fish on wild fish abundance and productivity. • Constituents voiced unease of reducing quality angling experiences due to shifting hatchery plants from basin to basin, and the overcrowding that will cause. It should not be construed that increased production necessarily equates to increased opportunity. • Strongly advocates for the deferral of increased wild coastal winter steelhead retention, even moderately increased take. All stakeholder groups are working to blend increased conservation of wild populations with adequate harvest opportunity. He said this action undermines that objective.
<p>Tom Wolf Hillsboro, Oregon</p>	<p>Tom Wolf, Oregon Council of Trout Unlimited (TU), said Alan Moore, from their national staff sat on the North Coast Advisory Committee. Wolf spoke on behalf of Moore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointed that the harvest of wild steelhead and stray rates were not dealt with enough. • Gratitude that ODFW and Ed Bowles met with TU's national staff to meet some of our concerns. • Regret that chum salmon and cutthroat trout were not addressed enough in this Plan. They feel that ODFW is not doing enough to look at the decline of sea runs in particular and some resident populations. • Nobody is happy completely with this Plan so it must be a good plan; pragmatically let's move forward. • TU supports the adoption of the CMP. • TU hopes that ODFW will look at the chum population and

	<p>are encouraged that Stahl mentioned they are going to have a plan for chum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hope that staff moves forward with plans to protect cutthroat trout. • They hope there is money allotted in the budget planning to provide funds for research and monitoring.
<p>Thomas Oliver Tillamook, Oregon</p>	<p>Thomas Oliver, member of F.A.C.T, said he is a member of the fishermen’s advisory to Tillamook County and past chairman of Coalition for Anadromous Salmon and Steelhead habitat. He said Bowles had a sentence “Habitat is important but not a priority.” Salmon have been destroyed by the habitat mainly, not management. We have an Oregon Forest Practices Act and should have a salmon practices act to give salmon and steelhead equal water rights, logging rights, mining rights, cattle rights and they can make political contributions and they won’t be endangered. He read from a paper from a federal forestry employee: “unless the value of salmonid resource is recognized it will be difficult to defend the watersheds in which salmonids mature against the damaging results of logging, mining, industry, and industrial and urban development”. Oliver said salmon always lose in that case. We have put so many people out of work in Oregon and Washington for the lack of salmon resources itself. Oliver asked how come we are not working on the habitat more. He said this landowner permission is just one way to hide behind not getting things done from the industries that are causing the harm.</p>
<p>Jim Myron Canby, Oregon</p>	<p>Jim Myron, Native Fish Society (NFS), spoke to two issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He agrees with Tronquet that going from a 10% maximum stray rate to a rate 30% or 90% is a huge differential. You need to adequately monitor the population levels and status of wild fish in the hatchery emphasis areas. Staff needs to follow through with changes when it appears the wild fish are being adversely impacted. Under adaptive management staff needs to quickly respond by reducing hatchery plants in areas having an adverse impact. 2. A stock transfer policy that guides the transfer of Chinook in coastal watersheds will be eliminated with the adoption of this Plan; there is no replacement for having a stock transfer policy. This is a huge omission. Staff should draft an additional rule amendment that would reinstate some form of a stock transfer policy. Myron said if not addressed in this process then the likely outcome is we will be asking the Legislature to take up this issue and see if they can provide some guidance to ODFW.

<p>Steve Evans Eugene, Oregon</p>	<p>Steve Evans, Steamboaters, said he wanted to emphasize the importance of maintaining the policy of no kill on the Umpqua. Also, he wants more study done on the threat of global warming on fish runs.</p>
<p>Jim Andras Talent, Oregon</p>	<p>Jim Andras, NFS, is a professional fishing guide who spends about 100 days on the Rogue River alone. The vast majority of his clientele (90%) come from California. He said often rivers close to his clients' home have been impacted by hatchery programs to where wild fish returns have diminished greatly. It is troubling to hear about increasing hatchery releases into Oregon rivers and the harvest of wild steelhead on any river throughout the state. He has been a guide for 20 years and has noticed every year increased pressure on these fish. He said the take of any wild fish will have an impact on the overall health of the river systems in this state. He asked the Commission to think about the value of wild fish and to protect wild fish.</p>
<p>Brian Sohl Ashland, Oregon</p>	<p>Brian Sohl, on WaterWatch Board, a river steward for North Umpqua for NFS, and advisor to Fly Water Travel, said these vibrant runs of wild protected fish from harvest are worth a lot of money to local communities and to residents in British Columbia and Montana. Flywater Travel supports the no kill of wild fish on the Umpqua. Sohl personally supports the concept of no kill of wild fish throughout the CMP. It is important to protect the treasure we have on the North Umpqua in light of the uncertainties with climate change and changing ocean conditions. He supports the statements of Peter Tronquet, Guido Rahr, Tom Wolf, and Joe Ferguson.</p>
<p>Mark Stangeland Bend, Oregon</p>	<p>Mark Stangeland, NFS and fishing guide and a river steward for the North Umpqua, urged the Commission to approve the CMP with no amendment to allow harvest. The fish on the Umpqua are a national treasure. The days of harvest on wild fish are over and we need to, as a whole, accept this. The mindset must be changed – catch and release is the only way to achieve a sustainable fishery on the entire Umpqua system. Stangeland submitted to the Commission an online petition with over 2,000 signatures on wild fish and the entire Umpqua system. This reinforces the overwhelming support of a no harvest position. He urged the Commission to accept the CMP as it stands with no future amendments, additions, or other clauses that would allow harvest of wild fish.</p>
<p>Averi Willow</p>	<p>Averi Willow, Steamboaters, said she is against the harvest</p>

<p>Idleyld Park, Oregon</p>	<p>of wild steelhead on the Umpqua system, although that is not going to be added or amended at this time. She supports Joe Ferguson's question of accurate numbers of fish in the Umpqua system that have spawned, and people thinking there is an abundance of this fish to harvest. She supports a sufficient budget in the CMP that would provide funding for strong monitoring of all that happens with the wild fish.</p>
<p>Bruce Howell Grants Pass, Oregon</p>	<p>Bruce Howell, an angler and native Oregonian, came prepared to talk about the kill policy on the Umpqua. He spoke on behalf of wild fish, specifically wild steelhead, and said he has been involved with habitat projects since the late 1960's with the Rogue Fly Fishers. There is a difference between the wild fish and the hatchery fish: one is for put and take and the other is to preserve a gene pool that is important for the future of the fishery. He said we need to stop killing the wild steelhead and preserve them for the future. Howell complemented the committees who worked on this plan.</p>
<p>Lou Verdugo Corvallis, Oregon</p>	<p>Lou Verdugo spoke on behalf of the owners of the Caddis Fly Shop where he works. Wild fish are good for business, particularly on the North Umpqua. They have clients from all over who fish there. The Umpqua is a very unique fishery. The public outcry on the kill of steelhead was incredible. Verguo, an angler and trout guide, said passion is free but meaningful data is not. The budget to come before the Commission is going to be very important; the monitoring budget is crucial. He urged the Commission to take a good look at that budget, and said what doesn't get measured does not get done. Lastly, he heard the sea run cutthroat were not part of this study. He said a study was done on that fish in 1994. He asked the Commission to take a look at that when it was appropriate.</p>
<p>Scott Amerman Monmouth, Oregon</p>	<p>Scott Amerman, Siletz Watershed Council and CCA Pacific Northwest, supports the CMP. He noted that staff took the time to meet with them. He feels the Siletz deadline should be moved higher up but he supports the compromise that was made. He fishes on the Siletz. Anytime they see someone fishing areas where fish are spawning they talk to those individuals; some were never educated about it. He said having the river open will help them to police it.</p>
<p>Joe Rohleder Waldport, Oregon</p>	<p>Joe Rohleder, member of Mid-Coast stratum team, said it is important that a monitoring plan become part of this Plan. It is more than just counting how many fish were caught and</p>

	<p>how many fish spawn. It has to go through the whole life history, what comes out of the gravel, where fish go, etc. There is an opportunity here to look at a broad part of the coast and manage five species of fish that are important to us that live there. He hopes the Commission can find some place in the 2015-2017 budget to pay for the monitoring.</p>
<p>Scott Howell Medford, Oregon</p>	<p>Scott Howell, fishing guide on Umpqua system, said every one of his clients catch and release the Umpqua wild steelhead. He believes all his clients are in full support of the catch and release regulation in place. He discussed reasons to continue the current no harvest regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased pressure is growing exponentially. Anglers are too good and effective at catching them. • A lot of the data Oregon uses for its management policies is flawed. He asked the Commission to question their state biologists whether they truly believe the population distribution studies they currently use to extrapolate run sizes are good. Howell said they are not. As a guide, late in the season none of them are fishing on the main Umpqua. If half of the run was utilizing that part of the Umpqua to spawn, they would all be down there and not fishing in the upper section of the river. • It's the guides that have created the growing local travel industry based around the catch and release of the Umpqua's wild winter steelhead. • Howell is frustrated that the state still defines angling opportunity as the killing of a fish. We need to redefine what we call angler opportunity.
<p>Gary Lewis Roseburg, Oregon</p>	<p>Gary Lewis, angler/guide on the Umpqua and Elk for 35 years, supported Howell's comments on the Umpqua and wild fish policy. Lewis said staff wants to reduce the hatchery fish on the Elk River so there will be more wild fish to spawn in the river. Currently you can kill 10 fish on the Elk and Sixes. He fishes the Elk 90 days per year and could kill 70 wild fish himself, but 90% of his fishermen are fly fishers and will not kill a wild fish. If you catch 5 fall Chinook salmon on the Sixes, 2-3 of them will be strays from the Elk. If you reduce that hatchery plan on the Elk you reduce the catch chances on the Sixes. He asked to change the laws so they could not kill any wild salmon on the Elk and Sixes Rivers.</p>
<p>Casey Malepsy Roseburg, Oregon</p>	<p>Casey Malepsy, angler/guide, came to speak about harvest of wild steelhead on the Umpqua. He disagrees with keeping wild steelhead. He said the economic value is better in releasing the fish. The other guides would also tell</p>

	<p>you that is accurate. Malepsy believes that hatchery programs play a big part in fishing along the West Coast and have supplemented fish for over 100 years. He does not believe that getting rid of the hatchery programs is necessary. He said we need to decide if we are going to eat fish anymore. If we don't eat fish anymore then do away with the hatchery programs and catch and release all the wild fish. If we do eat fish, we need hatchery programs to be done correctly to co-exist with the wild fish.</p>
<p>James Wright Lyons, Oregon</p>	<p>James Wright, Salmon for Oregon (SFO), spoke to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SFO supports the Commission allowing OFW to transfer stock between basins for restoration possibilities for the future. • Regarding the proposed spring Chinook pilot projects in Yaquina and Coos Bay, terminal fisheries should be a dynamic part of our future for providing new fisheries and economies to coastal communities while protecting natural fish in critical in-river habitat. These terminal fisheries will not interact with natural fish due to close monitoring. • ODFW is placing these two spring Chinook projects in lower estuary quick release acclimation pens in the systems where no spring Chinook existed. They will be closely studied and monitored to make sure there is no interaction with similar species. Wright encouraged the Commission to get a clear picture of what is happening in our fishery by including genetic testing and monitoring. • SFO has a volunteer to assist with the monitoring process. • SFO is meeting with legislators. There is bipartisan support for these projects. SFO expects private business and Tribal interaction as well for these efforts. • SFO encourages adoption of this plan.
<p>Brian McLachlan Portland, Oregon</p>	<p>Brian McLachlan is a newcomer to Oregon, having spent 50 years in the Puget Sound. He appreciates the attempt with this Plan to be proactive while the runs are still healthy and to develop measures to keep them that way. He said this Plan had reasonable compromises made to protect the wild populations while allowing fishing opportunities through harvest and hatchery fish. He supports the Plan but it could have been better. He does not believe that ODFW's methodology to assess the condition of steelhead is scientifically credible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ODFW employed a framework developed by scientists at NMFS that uses specific parameters to judge the condition of the resource. Abundance and productivity

	<p>are the two most important elements. For 17 of 19 steelhead populations no abundance or productivity data is factored into the viability score; it erodes the credibility of that viability analysis.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Spatial structure and diversity measures have incomplete data. There is no genetic research and no complete data on life history characteristics so they used substitutes. 3. There is no meaningful evaluation of the impact of hatchery fish. <p>He said there are serious defects in the way ODFW assessed the resource and paints an unreasonable rosy picture when the Executive Summary states the populations are in remarkably good condition.</p>
--	---

1
2 Vice Chair Finley said Jim Myron testified that the stock transfer policy was potentially
3 eliminated. Was it eliminated and why? We heard support from one of the last speakers
4 that we should maintain the stock transfer policy.
5

6 Bowles referred to the Native Fish Conservation Policy (NFCP) and Hatchery Fish
7 Management Policy (HFMP) and said how to go about brood stock managements and
8 transfers related to those hatchery programs was not ignored; that is directly taken care
9 of within a section in the HFMP dealing with broodstock management. That guides how
10 we do transfers on the coast relative to fish on the backs of these hatchery fish
11 programs. It considers whether it is a harvest oriented hatchery program or a
12 conservation hatchery program and speaks to making sure it is consistent with the
13 conservation needs of the individual watersheds using the best available population.
14

15 Bowles clarified that the existing policy that is being removed as part of the coastal
16 Chinook plan was specific to Chinook and was specific to moving those to where you
17 have independent populations.
18

19 Vice Chair Finley said we heard from Peter Tronquet and Myron concerns about the
20 stray rate ranging up to 30% and that 10% should be established as a goal for ODFW.
21 Do you support a goal of up to 30%? Clarify the 10% goal.
22

23 Bowles said the Native Fish Society referenced that this is potentially in violation of the
24 NFCP but that is not correct. The 10% guideline is an interim guideline set up in the
25 NFCP to manage towards until you develop a conservation plan. The stray rate issues
26 within those conservation plans are not prescribed within the policy because the NFCP
27 encourages a portfolio approach to managing risk that recognizes in some areas you
28 might be accepting higher risks for hatchery programs, balanced across the species
29 management unit and watersheds. That is why a “one size fits all” stray rate was not
30 prescribed in the NFCP. This plan represents that portfolio where we have explicit WFEA
31 where there is very little tolerance for risks associated with hatchery programs. Within

1 areas with hatchery fish, staff has looked at that on a case by case basis. In those areas
2 with a strong importance of wild fish, staff has maintained a stray rate that is
3 conservation-based.
4

5 Vice Chair Finley said he still does not understand why a 10% goal was not used
6 everywhere. Bowles said staff wanted to make sure that the objectives and goals we
7 established are realistic given the balancing we are trying to obtain. Goals put in rule
8 need to be bound by clear expectations, monitoring, and accountability. Staff wanted to
9 make these realistic from that standpoint. There is also potential for litigation if you are
10 not meeting those.
11

12 Vice Chair Finley said there was some expectation in the fishing community that there
13 would be a “do not exceed 30%” stray rate. Bowles said yes, as an expectation. On the
14 Elk River we are currently at 60% to 70%. Kevin Goodson said that is at a population-
15 wide level. We recognize that we can still meet that while in some places you may have
16 higher than 30%. That is why we have that 60% to 90% allowance near hatchery
17 locations, so we don’t open ourselves up to people saying we need to make reductions.
18

19 Vice Chair Finley asked if there was a way to increase the volunteer aspect of the
20 monitoring programs. Bowles said we do a lot of volunteer work now on the propagation
21 programs and habitat restoration and education. We use volunteers through watershed
22 councils and others via a training program.
23

24 Commissioner Webber asked if there are criteria for when we would consider stock
25 transfers. Bowles said within the coastal planning framework, if the Commission adopts
26 this Plan, it would require staff to come back to the Commission if we were to do any
27 stock transfers out of a basin beyond what is already identified in the Plan.
28

29 Commissioner Wolley suggested the following to staff:

- 30 • The impact of stock transfers between basins should be closely monitored;
31 specifically, genetic studies are very important.
- 32 • Pay close attention to comments about climate change and consider those as you
33 move forward, e.g., the change in snow melt and water temperature.
- 34 • Through your partnerships with the U.S. Forest Service, Oregon Department of
35 Forestry, and BLM, pay attention to the land management activities that occur in
36 our watersheds that impact water quality and the fish.
- 37 • Listen to the fishing guides who are some of the best anecdotal monitors that we
38 have out there in terms of monitoring our fish populations.
39

40 Commissioner Anderson asked, how do we communicate what we have done to the
41 outside world? She sees a benefit of legislatively and federally attracting more dollars to
42 the department to do these things. Bowles said one of the best opportunities we have
43 as a result of this Plan is to send the message that Oregon is different. We cherish and
44 value our wild populations and hatchery programs run through best management
45 practices. Both of those are unique to the nation and both contribute to the local
46 economic health of the coastal communities. He said that will be the next part of this

1 Plan, in addition to beginning the technical implementation with stakeholders. He would
2 appreciate her thoughts on this.

3
4 Commissioner Anderson said she would be happy to be part of the efforts with other
5 stakeholders moving forward on a communication strategy.

6
7 Chair Levy said some people brought up the issue of hatchery reviews and making sure
8 that our hatcheries meet the correct requirements. What are your plans for that?

9
10 Bowles said staff uses the NFCP, HFMP, and the Fish Health Management Policy as a
11 guideline. All three were scientifically reviewed by the Independent Multi-Disciplinary
12 Science Team (IMST). Because of the listing of coho on the coast our hatchery
13 programs are federally reviewed through Hatchery Genetic Management Plans. This
14 Plan has been reviewed by the IMST but it is not specific to the hatchery practices. As
15 part of implementing this Plan, the next stage is to complete hatchery program
16 management plans for all of our programs on the coast.

17
18 Chair Levy said those plans will be reviewed by the hatchery science review panel?
19 Bowles said when those are done perhaps would be the appropriate time to do an
20 independent review if the Commission desired it, as opposed to doing it now.

21 Chair Levy said when staff completes the hatchery management plans maybe at that
22 time they could have further review by IMST. Bowles said we already have those plans
23 through the HGMPs but they will be modified as appropriate for this Plan and turned into
24 the Hatchery Program Management plans.

25
26 Goodson said staff is working with OHRC to make sure our hatcheries are using best
27 management practices and how we can do a better job with our programs, have less of
28 an impact on wild populations, and provide more opportunity at the same time. Chair
29 Levy said is this referenced in the Plan? Bowles said the OHRC piece is explicitly in
30 there although the OHRC Board just recently completed a priority list.

31
32 *Action: Vice Chair Finley moved to approve the Coastal Multi-Species*
33 *Conservation and Management Plan, adopt the Oregon Administrative Rule for*
34 *the Coastal Multi-Species Conservation and Management Plan as proposed by*
35 *staff in Attachment 5, and adopt revisions to existing Oregon Administrative Rules*
36 *for Species Management and Basin Plans as proposed by staff in the Revised*
37 *Attachment 6. Commissioner Webber seconded the motion and the motion*
38 *passed unanimously by a vote of six.*

39
40 **ADJOURN**

41
42 Chair Levy adjourned the Commission meeting at 12:30 p.m.