

PUGET SOUND RECREATIONAL FISHERIES ENHANCEMENT OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 28, 2014

MEETING CALLED BY	Dave Knutzen
TYPE OF MEETING	Advisory Group
FACILITATOR	Ryan Lothrop
NOTE TAKER	Colleen Desselle
ATTENDEES	Ryan Lothrop, Colleen Desselle, Dave Croonquist, Don Freeman, Mike Gilchrist, Dave Knutzen, Rich Eltrich, Norman Reinhardt, Erik Anderson, Laurie Peterson, Ron Warren, Clint Muns, David Puki, Dorothy Reinhardt, Matt Parnel, Michael Schmidt, Jorge Villarreal, Mike Rian (conference call), Don Freeman, and Jim Jenkins

Agenda Topics		
DISCUSSION	Introductions	
CONCLUSIONS	Introductions were not necessary since all in attendance were familiar with each other.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

DISCUSSION	Minutes of June 4, 2014 Meeting	
	Motion was made to accept as written and seconded. No opposition.	
CONCLUSIONS	Accepted.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

DISCUSSION	Oversight Committee Membership	
	Dave Puki, Clint Muns, Matt Parnel, David Croonquist, and Rich Eltrich are all retiring from the committee. Dave Knutzen, Ryan Lothrop, Ron Warren, and Laurie Peterson presented awards and thanked all those retiring for their contributions, and thanked those staying on for their commitment to the committee. It was asked if those leaving were leaving because there is a problem with the committee or if there were other reasons. The members leaving are leaving because of personal commitments or interests which are cutting into their ability to devote their attention to the committee.	
CONCLUSIONS	Applicants are being accepted to mid-November. The chair for the new year will meet with the prospective members as well.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Appoint new members	Philip Anderson	December 2014

DISCUSSION	Budget Update – Licensing Discrepancy Follow-Up	
	The Office of Financial Management put \$126,316 too much into the account back in March of 2003 due to an error in the formula, and it had to be withdrawn from the account.	
CONCLUSIONS	It would have been nice to have more notice and to work out how this was to occur. They have thoroughly rechecked the other years, and we have been assured this will not happen again. They have satisfied our questions and concerns about this.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
The money was removed from the account in June 2014.		

DISCUSSION		Current Biennium Expenditure Report	
<p>Ryan explained the expenditures and variances. There is a spending authority issue this year. It was reduced during the last biennium which is causing a negative issue this coming fiscal year so we need to ensure we do not overspend this year so we need to stay on top of this for the next couple months.</p> <p>It was asked how Hoodsport got \$25K in the happy zone. Ron stated that he believed it is more just a timing thing and that staff expenditures have not been coded to the account or that the expenditures have not yet hit the system. Laurie stated that we (Dept.) have to put in a spending plan prior, and there may be variances in the actual expenditures.</p>			
CONCLUSIONS			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ryan will check into the expenditures for Glenwood and ensure that there are no errors. • Clint asked when the survey was completed and the response was last year. He stated that it concerns him that the PSRFE are slipping even though more licenses are being sold. It was stated that one trend that is occurring is the uptake in combination licenses being purchased, and these do not get as much as the salt water licenses. However, we do get some help when freshwater anglers buying combination licenses. It could be worth keeping an eye on what the fishing trends are. • Norm stated that the salmon fishing community is becoming more mobile and go where the fish are. South Sound fish have stopped biting and mid-Puget Sound is becoming the same. • Clint stated that when the anglers fish the Columbia River the money does not come to the PSRFE. How do you overcome the survival issues [for Puget Sound]? Ryan stated that the creel surveys are probably the only way to convey how bad the fisheries really are. • Dave Puki asked about mark selective fisheries and whether they could be reopened as that was popular. Clint stated that there should be some follow-up on Dave Puki's comments and quantify it. Laurie stated that we could look at sampling data. • Norm stated that it is not about fishing, but about catching. A huge concern is what happened at NoF is the way Lake Washington fish were calculated. It came out of nowhere and was shocking. We will continue to hear people say, "why should I fish in Puget Sound because I am not allowed to catch the fish and keep them?" If this trend continues we will see some falling revenue. 			
ACTION ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Review and ensure there is not an error. Wallace is probably another timing issue and will make corrections. We are sitting well in the biennium to date.		Ryan Lothrop	
DISCUSSION		13-15N Budget Status	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking at Diane's revenue sheet, it shows where the June 2013 discrepancy is noted. If you look at the planned revenue was \$193,000 in the actual we saw in our account was \$112,000 if you add the \$126,000, we would have had a really good June. When you look at fiscal year 2014 as a total we were pretty darn close, only \$70,000 behind even with the \$126,000 taken out of the account. Looking at July, August, and September of this year we can see that each month we are a little behind and there could be a few factors such as maybe some may have bought their license earlier this year as the Columbia River was on fire this year, and the ocean and all that or maybe it was our inside fisheries like the coho was not on fire like it has been it could be any number of cases. Frank's handout does have a write up. Fishing revenue for September was about \$200,000 lower than forecast, but at the end of September new customers were up a little, most likely to the extended salmon opportunities most likely to Columbia River and ocean opportunities, but not a lot of detail for Puget Sound. As a whole, for the biennium, we would have been in the positive but that \$126,000 set us back. We are still sitting in fairly good shape. 			
CONCLUSIONS			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This year's projections are based on the survey from last year. Clint stated that a lot of anglers he knows fished the Columbia River and ocean, and did not fish Puget Sound and that is a concern on how it affects the PSRFE. The PSRFE funds are slipping even though we are selling more licenses. Ryan stated that one thing that has been occurring is that the combination license sales are increasing (which do not contribute as much to our funding) versus the purchase of just salt water or freshwater licenses. 			

- When the surveys come up with more anglers fishing the Columbia River or ocean rather than in Puget Sound, we are getting less funding. It is not something we can effectively deal with but a bigger agency problem. We can certainly express that to the agency.
- It would be interesting to take a Lloyd's of London policy out and have a million dollar bonus fish, it doesn't cost you anything other than a fishing license and you have to go out there and fish in Puget Sound someplace. Maybe we could get a few people to go out in Puget Sound and maybe get that \$1m fish.
- We all know that fishing has fallen off sharply in Puget Sound. Other than the phone survey how do we qualify how badly it has fallen off the further south you get? The phone survey is about where you fished by license type, but as far as falling off the catch rates, we could look at dockside creels. That would be the only other method.
- The Department really has to get an equitable catch sharing on crab in Area 13, because you are double-whamming with the huge discrepancy with the tribe down there which they have been unable to come to an agreement with and we have no salmon and no crabbing opportunity of any significance.
- Another thing that could be brought up is to get an annual agreement with the tribe on the Elliott Bay fishery where we could get that opened back up with mark-selective or whatever we have got to do. That was a very popular fishery just to allow the boaters and locals to fish there.
- Norm added that it is not about fishing, it is about catching. You are not going to spend large amounts of money to be able to fish if you cannot catch any fish. The less they can catch, the less they will fish. If the anglers are not allowed to catch any fish in Puget Sound, we are going to continue to see a decline.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Quantify what the actual drop-off is and get some realities on the table.		

DISCUSSION | Legislative Budget Package

- The Performance Measure (maintenance of PSRFE funding) on our reduction in spending authority by \$241,000 per biennium, which we are trying to get back, was submitted to OFM with an overview of why we need to spend the money generated. The committee needs the spending authority just to be able to maintain the goals and objectives set forth in our document, highlighting the ones we are focused on. This is a reasonable request. I am in pretty good communication with Ann Larson, she is our liaison between the Leg and the Dept, and we can always come back to this on the subcommittee, but I think one plan of action would be to bring in whoever is the chair next year to chat and schedule things out when she knows what sessions are going on and who is on what committee (elections are coming up). I think we can get a pretty rough timeline rather quickly. The timing is important, especially if we use mass contact, especially with the Puget Sound anglers who we have their voices which we can crank out. Ann stated that whoever is on the chair for the subcommittee can create a list of who the special contacts are by committee and then we can have those distributed to the Enhancement Group to further distribute at their own rate.
- Proposed Commercial and Recreational License Fee Changes – designed to offset our loss due to federal funding. Keeping the message simple. The largest change in fee is commercial which would generate approximately \$1.6 million and then the recreational which \$1 increase in combination per resident or \$2 for temporary and saltwater and freshwater. That would generate \$4.4 million as I recall. Ron Warren stated that this does not take into account the 15% General Fund State (GFS). This is for federal funding shortfalls and this includes assuring that we have the ability to monitor fisheries, continue current hatchery production, and increase our maintenance on hatchery facilities so that we have facilities to operate in the future. It also has a small amount of money in both of the packages that would allow some enhancements on production which we have yet to decide where those are, and we are working on tools to evaluate different hatcheries, and hatchery programs that we can operate that are in line with our agency policies on what fish to raise where and what fisheries those would benefit. There is still a lot of work to do, but until we know the bottom line of lost federal money, we don't exactly know where the GFS cut is, this is just to try to maintain where we are right now. Ryan, for the recreational fee bill, it is \$1 on a combination license, \$5 on non-resident, and then \$2 on all the other licenses. For the commercial fee though, we started off by doubling all of the current total fees. That is still a proposal, although we have been meeting with our commercial

constituents, you all know the Legislative process, you have to have some support by industry to be able to pull something like that off or they are going to pay a fair amount of money more than they are currently. What we heard from our constituents, and we have a meeting with our constituents, the Director, and the Governor the morning of the 30th, and they had asked at the first meeting that we not put a surcharge on everybody, but what they wanted to see was an excise tax increase. The agency heard that, we have made a proposal that we are going to share with commercial folks, we have shared with the Governor's Office, and a segment of the recreational community that we would give up GFS money to receive all the excise taxes from commercial salmon fisheries and we would also then, in turn, raise that excise tax to the amount that we would need to match the original package. So it is still a \$1.1 million per year package that is what the GFS asked because of the commercial fishing and tribal fisheries that are benefitted by the enhancements and the hatchery maintenance. We are just trying to be as diligent as possible in communicating with industry in the hopes that we can achieve some level of support and so we are successful in receiving the increase in fees and excise taxes that we are looking for in order to be able maintain our current level of activities.

- Norm stated that the concern is that it is being put into an excise tax versus a fee for commercial and that he is concerned that it locks the state into, in his mind, supporting commercial over recreational interest because the more excise tax you get, the better off your budget is going to be versus what you get from the recreational community, but I want to segue into the hatcheries. I think some of us have seen the proposals to close hatcheries. Some of those hatcheries that close happen to support production of our committee's fish. Is the Department making plans to move funds from PSRFE when those hatcheries close? Ron stated that we are not that far along and are hoping none of the hatcheries close. The facilities named on the closure list are either in direct support of commercial fisheries or are the least contribution to recreational fisheries, i.e., Minter Creek as any hatchery in Puget Sound right now. We chose those hatcheries specifically to target those GFS activities that support those commercial fisheries or did the least harm to the recreational fisheries when we went through that process. Will we be looking at in the future either continuing the PSRFE programs at those facilities or transferring to nearby facilities? Absolutely.
- Michael asked if there has been a proposal to expand the cost recovery approach that they are trying to apply to McKernan for the chum. Ron stated that those fisheries have not been put into place. Not sure how they would operate yet or where they would come off, chum fisheries in Hood Canal or South Sound; do they come off the top of harvestable or do they come off of state share. We have not had that discussion with anybody. We assume that with the contributions of South Sound and Hood Canal tribes into the operation of McKernan, that there would be some level, whether that would allow us to take an equal proportion from harvestable, we don't know yet, but I know industry is wanting to talk about a cost recovery fishery. Whether that is in their mind of self-imposed landing tax where money comes to the agency or a fishery where a certain number of people go out and fish to a certain level and all that money comes to the agency to operate the facility first, and then the remainder of the share is taken by the different sectors, we don't know yet, but we are willing to pursue that aggressively. If that is where the commercial folks are fishing we can do it and still meet our conservation objectives on other chum stocks and other species, then we want to pursue that where most appropriate.
- Erik R had a question about excise tax versus fees. If you extend those out so many years, or maybe treat it annually, does one have a better rate in terms of increase versus another, for instance is the fee like flatter as you look out into the future whereas the excise tax may grow or increase with whatever, and is one more volatile than the other, and what would that look like? Ron stated that it is really hard to tell right now. When we look at the excise tax right now, there are different rates for pink, chum, and sockeye versus Chinook and coho. It is based on those landings that occur. Our current proposal, I think, increases those both by like 76% to achieve the dollar amounts that we would need. Those fluctuate depending on pink year and non-pink year and Chinook abundances because it is a statewide salmon excise tax, not just Puget Sound centric. We believe that the surcharge was most likely our best foot forward because we tried to bring the excise taxes to the agency in the past and have not had any success in that, but we also know that we need to have some level of support from industry to be successful. One of our main messages is that at almost at every turn recreational folks have stepped to the plate and

helped us out in times of need to support their portions of fee increases and we need to bring the commercial folks along and get them to pay their proportion of fees that it cost us to monitor and put those fisheries on as well as maintain facilities or operate facilities like the recs have. We have been being very consistent in the message to the commercial industry in those meetings and we hope that continues, but we also know we need their support, so that is why we opted to go with the excise. That way those folks that try to hang onto their licenses and only fish four or five weekends out of a season make less than a \$1,000 on their license every year versus those who are really fishing for a livelihood and are making \$60,000 or \$70,000 in one particular fishery, those people would pay more because of the excise tax. The industry wanted it to be if you use it more, you pay more. Erik asked if this is an either/or, or is it both? Right now it is both. We are still flexible as long as we can achieve that level of contribution from the commercial fishery sector in the fee increases whether it is a surcharge or an excise tax or something else that may come up in other meetings. As long as it is legal and we can be assured that the money comes to the state into the Wildlife account to where we can access it, be transparent, and show how we use it like we have in the Columbia River endorsement. Maybe a committee of commercial folks overseeing some of the things we use it for, we are willing to do whatever we have to do to get a higher level of contribution by that sector.

CONCLUSIONS

- Jim Scott believes the PM will go through successfully. Schedule some time in December with Ann as we might know who is in office and who might be replacing who.
- Ryan stated that the 15% cut was requested by the Governor’s office for all agencies in the state, and from talking to Ann, sometime in December the Governor will take his selection on the 15% cut and that is when the subcommittee can react on that. So there are three different potentially legislative actions going on that the subcommittee can get involved with any level they prefer. It also benefits to communicate with Ann and I on some information probably within the next few days I will provide as soon as it is signed off we will have a fact sheet on the feed bill that you can all have and distribute to start that process.

ACTION ITEMS

PERSON RESPONSIBLE

DEADLINE

Communicate as diligently as possible with commercial fishers to maintain our current level of activities.

WDFW

DISCUSSION

Goals, Objectives, and Tasks

The 5-year data is set. Updated with latest CWT evaluation data provided (2004-2009). The 2009 yearling data is very preliminary. Compared to what we saw in June, this actually improved with current CWT data. Puget Sound sport cost is year-round. Going to the winter aspect, is just looking at winter only. That excluded the Minter Creek yearlings as we had only one data set with no recovery, but it is preliminary data. This is what we are funding at this time. Minter does only have a 1-year data set and that could be why it is so good.

CONCLUSIONS

Dave K stated that he assumed we spend \$42,000 is just a portion of what it cost to raise 1.4 million fish, and similarly at other hatcheries. Is there a way to tease out what we are really paying or is this what it really cost to raise the fish? Ron stated that we went through some pretty major reductions going into the 2009-11 biennium and we notified the tribes of production cut. We also evaluated what PSRFE was funding at the time, and we were feeling the urgency to buy-back fish that contributed to the recreational fishers in deep South Sound, i.e., Minter and Voights Creek. One of the highest surviving fish that this group was excited about was Garrison. We were just trying to buy back our reductions – as an agency when you look at reductions spread across geographically, you are trying to keep as many boots on the ground as possible. You are trying to take cuts where other systems make the cut less offensive to the co-managers and the fishers. No FTEs associated with either of the two, Voights Creek or Minter Creek cuts. When PSRFE came along and stated they were interested in these programs and we were all thinking what to do, we took the offer to buy back the fish. Basically fish food, mass marking, and any wire that might be in them. It was not proportionate to the facility, it wasn’t any of the infrastructures, and it wasn’t any of the maintenance. It was food and mass marking – buy that back, we got our fish back. In the case of Garrison that came from some of that infrastructure costs because there weren’t any bodies to operate or conduct the work at that facility. That came at the cost of staff time where the other two

production lots do not cover any staff time. PSRFE is just riding the coattails of the state program whether it is Wildlife fund or Dingell-Johnson feed contracts, all those things that help those other programs at those other facilities, but it is just feed and mass-marking at all of those except Garrison where we had to buy back staffing because we were going to lose them.

Clint – PSRFE wants to make sure it is clear that our intent was to piggyback on the projects, not to fully fund them. Ron – only thing I think is missing from the Minter/Voights and maybe Rich is headed this direction, I am not sure, but everybody understands the differences in the operations at the facilities and most of the facilities other than Garrison that are on this list are pump facilities. Garrison is gravity-fed so the operational cost is lower. The only thing I would see on top of feed and marking is for us to try to estimate the additional pounds to try to recuperate some of the power costs. Those are the three biggest costs that we have other than staff. PSRFE needs to pay for food, clipping, and power to get the job done. There may be a few possible things built into that such as chemicals or something like that, but going from the ground up for the PSRFE, that was what it did. Now there were some facilities that did not do that, ever. Wallace comes to mind. It would be nice to try to really look at what [the cost per fish] should be and what would that really cost for that many fish. There are some facilities like Garrison where that has to be the cost, because absent that program that facility is closed. Clint stated this fund started back-filling agency shortfalls which prompted that second piece of legislation that stated that that shall not happen, and yet with luck and blessing we are continuing down that path. I hope that the history of this program is appreciated that we did not start out as a backstop for the agency's budget woes, but it started out as a way to enhance recreational fishing opportunity to add to what was already happening, and now what you have already pointed out we have a hatchery that would not exist without PSRFE.

Rich stated that the climate of the legislature has changed over the years as to what they will and will not support. A lot of the hatcheries where PSRE monies are were originally commercial fisheries hatcheries or mitigation hatcheries. They are not, as you see in this new legislative approach, they are not really going to use GFS to support those facilities. How do you keep those facilities going so you do have some recreational fishing opportunities? Also, for the Minter Creek yearlings, I think they are doing it differently now. I think they are raising them at Hupp Springs. Is that correct? those early years of that 120,000 were really, really bad because there were some disease issues trying to raise them at Minter, so if you don't see survival of those groups, there is a reason for it. Ron stated that if we do see that lack of survival, to bear with it and wait to see what the survival looks like with a good summer rearing and release and see what they do. We have got to give it some time.

Ryan - One of my tasks, and what we'll be presenting to the Fish and Wildlife Commission would be to evaluate all the programs, Puget Sound-wide, not just PSRFE money, so at some point you will see this for everything we have out there that we are currently running, the CWT data available to work with. I will probably be calling up all the hatchery managers figure out costs to add a program.

Ron stated that from a competitive cost analysis we have already done so much through our JLARC work to know and understand what our costs are at facilities, and we are poised to get this work done in a comprehensive way to where we can look at it, make some comparisons, we are also working with Hatchery Scientific Review Group (HSRG) to develop some tools both in Puget Sound (they have done a roll-up model in the Columbia River and now we are having them develop one for Willapa Bay to be able to look at those comparative shifts in production so if you moved production from one facility to another: a) and most importantly, could you continue to achieve our Commission guidance, so Hatchery Fishery Reform Policy (broodstock management)?, and b) what kind of contributions would it make for a different facility and what would that cost be and to see where our bigger bang for the buck is. We need to offer a production where it is going to give us meaningful fishing opportunities that we know we can sustain. This is just one tool that could really make a big benefit in that step. Dave K stated that it would be interesting to add some other columns to this, maybe not always have it, but at least have the data available e.g., what is being caught in the freshwater; what is being caught commercially; what is being caught by the tribal fishers so then you can really look at this and get a good feel for what we are really paying for. The other thing I was going to ask is what can we do with this information to get to our next step? What can we do to take it to that next step?

Schmidt – We discontinued our coho program at Glenwood this year for the very reason of considering 200,000 Chinook. It is not going to happen this year, but we are going to start discussion on that. We are looking for funding, not with you guys, but mostly with tribes because they have a certain amount of catch up there as well, but with additional capacity we are trying to get to exactly what you guys are talking about.

Ryan – First part? Yes, I can add the comparisons. The second part - that is one of our goals. Planned to have the Performance Measures report by 2022 – this can be expedited. Ron stated to broaden the field of view. Ask those facilities that have these programs to write a paragraph on what PSRFE funds are what we are funding for them. Need to ensure what we are paying for at each facility. Puki - If you look at the other factors you can get a much broader picture, you can see what you are paying for and who else is catching those fish?

Ron - when you see baseline comparisons such as these you can see that we have been really successful at achieving Jobs Now and Jobs Now 2, i.e., our capital budget these last few years and getting to be able to make those infrastructure changes that improve early conditions that are such a critical component of what we do and can, and have shown in the past, increased survivals for our fish that we are rearing. It is not just the feeds and the attention paid by staff, sometimes it is the vessel being reared and I can't wait to see some of those changes occur. When I say that, to think of more secure, possibly better flow through for Soos Creek and getting that facility rebuilt with the capital money that is headed that way, the ponds at Hupp Springs although with the water there whether that will make a difference from the earthen pond, but holistically at least we are no longer just having to flush our entire operation out into Minter Creek. We actually expend more staff time to keep the ponds clean, but it is still an improvement of our operation and total environmental compliance so it is a benefit to all of us.

Clint – The whole idea is to expand what the actual cost is –a broader context is needed. These fish are contributing in many, many ways. That \$736 fish does not accurately portray contributions of the production. Dave stated that based on we would also need commercial/tribal outside Puget Sound, but within Washington and then outside Washington altogether so basically Canada, Alaska, etc. What is being caught in Areas 1-5 for these fish? Clint - Is it possible to quantify the dilution effects on ESA impacts, certainly that is an impact. Ron stated with the huge production shifts and miniscule impacts that it has on a particular fishery, it is so hard to see and measure. I do not know if we have a reliable, accurate way of doing that. I am excited to see what HSRG may be looking at for a production shift and what their thought process is. I haven't seen any of their work yet, but I know they are working on it and for Willapa as well, and I am excited to see if it lends us any assistance. Laurie stated that she was not sure if modelers can do that, but will check.

Norm asked if the Dept were to close a production facility, what happens to the property. Ron said that it depends on what the contract stipulates. Sometimes leave it and see if we can back to it. It is now at the point where nothing is left due to theft. The Nisqually tribe is interested in obtaining it. Other partnerships, and may have other groups, that operate on private/public operations. It is hard to determine which is cost-effective. An industry may want to fund the operations or another entity may take it and allow Dept staff to continue until they leave or retire. WFC has asked if they could support the most recent facility scheduled to close.

Broodstock Status

Michael Schmidt – we did release our 500,000 in late May...our release goals and we have had close enough returns this year to meet broodstock of 600,000, and then again we are talking about to increase about 200,000 to production, a 800,000 egg take so a 750 or 740 release.

JV – Our release was good. We collected the 2014 brood without a problem.

Croonquist – We talked about the number of fish that are caught, how many fish came back to the hatchery that got past the fishermen, survived the trek, and how does that potentially play into the production costs? They should be counted as returns to the production which may reduce the cost per fish if included. Ryan stated what we are currently doing with our metric is just total fish recovered divided by our total cost of that program, so we would have to split out that cost. This only fish that was caught.

Knutzen – I want to know how many are caught, and not those that returned.

Jenkins – This does not include our hatchery rack returns and our egg takes, but this is our first year that we have put together a hatchery on the ground spreadsheet for you. We could add how many eggs we took and where the eggs went, etc. Do you want this? Yes. Sometimes it is not as clear when looking at the spreadsheet, but you can certainly ask questions.

Ryan – I provided preliminary survey results. I am thinking about doing it based by where licenses are sold by county or where residency was by county based upon what licenses were sold. We did actually receive response from all but two counties in the state of Washington. This kind of lays out the basic summaries of the more important questions to determine what they understand about our program and who filled out the survey. #24. How did you find out about this survey? Sport Show had a poor response. We have boat shows or we can get advisors to go, but the coordinator fund is in the red and that is how we paid for it this year. The survey was filled out online only. I have been going to JBLM to recruit new anglers, to get people to buy their licenses earlier on that are stationed here, and just look at the preliminary for even years, there is a good pulse on vendors on base for license sales, saltwater combination and that is free, except for staff time, to go there once a month and who knows how that is going to play out down the road through networks in taking family and kids out. I think that is a positive, almost free way to get our word out. In March I will present to Commission JBLM numbers in finer detail, what we have accomplished this year, and what our next steps are.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

DISCUSSION | Sub-Committees

Alternative Funding – Don Freeman, Mike Rian. Don - I am on another committee which has been using alternative funding. We are a 501C fee, so we have legal standing there and we have been collecting money to provide feed. We are contributing money to DNA testing. Not a lot, but a couple thousand dollars here and there. Working with agency 4-5 years and growing. They know what it is for and where it is going. I would be willing to stay on the board there for another year to get this going. What we have is a starter program have a 501C fee – start with a program like (off the top of my head) descenders for rockfish next year. They will contribute the money, we write a check, and we will have a starting point to go from and then I will see if this thing grows a bit, we are going to need, we are a small group, but if this thing starts getting bigger we would have a template to hand over to somebody like PSA. Could start a chapter for this. We do not have to invest or create anything. It works. If that is the direction we want to go with. Is there some interest? Puki asked if it would be possible to have something like a blackmouth derby. Yes, we could find something that works for everybody. Activities would be coordinated between them and PSRFE. Don stated he had a mechanism to make it happen now. Matt stated that he is willing to be a point to help with alternate funding and to feel free to contact him.

Hatchery Evaluation – Met about a month ago. Discussed objectives and goals of hatchery evaluation feeds. A lot of work. What can we do to help the agency? What is our role? How to support the Dept with strategy; diverse background. Start with evaluation report. Until that is finalized, hard to answer some of the questions such as getting the most bang-for-the-buck, hatchery – moving forward. Knutzen stated that he could see that you are moving forward. Once we get more columns here we can discuss further.

Legislative – on hold until Ann [Larson] gets more direction on where we can help out. Spending authority thing is one of the issues there. Puki – I think we are going to be part of the initiatives package for this year, and then the one I will look into is the Governor’s initiative to cut the budget 15% across the board. Be prepared for Legislative things coming up and see what we can do.

CONCLUSIONS

Committees to revisit who is on with the new regime. Where the Department is targeting and what we can do to help. Need to know Ann’s agenda. Enhance recreational fishing – where to address our efforts. Access – how to encourage more public access. Ron stated this was a great seed to plant. Also Commissioners and local elected; counties looking for enhanced boat ramps around the state. Contact

others in how you can support e.g., boat launch, surf boarding, etc.		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Prepare for Legislative items coming up and let the Department know what we can do to help.		
DISCUSSION	Next Meeting	
CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Doodle Poll members for a meeting in January 2015.	Ryan Lothrop	
OBSERVERS		
RESOURCE PERSONS	Colleen Desselle and Ryan Lothrop	
SPECIAL NOTES		