

**Email, April 20, from Phil Hamilton to Tony Floor (copies to others)**

Mr. Floor, I am sorry that you feel that we continue to be a problem during the North of Falcon process. The “Bothersome” issue for us is that the tribe’s position continues to be mis-characterized by those in attendance of our regional meetings. Your observer was given an opportunity to sit in this year and evidently could not accurately convey on what actually took place. For you to come out and publically state that we “simply said NO” with out getting the facts accurate is truly “Bothersome”.

For the first time Muckleshoot opposed a selective fishery, a fresh water in the Green on the basis that we are in a conservation situation on a system that is managed for an “integrated stock”, something that you should be full aware of being a former director. “Any” fishery in river will remove potential spawners. The Green is in a situation the next 4 years where we will have to take a conservative approach to insure we meet the escapement. First and foremost, our approach is this, “To preserve and to protect the resource” then, if the resource provides an opportunity to harvest, then we go fish.

We had presented what we felt was a fair proposal to the state that provided an opportunity for the recreation interests, and the tribal fishery would only be conducted based on our in season update, but it was the state who first rejected this and was not until Phil Anderson intervened that we came to resolution that provides both sides an opportunity this year.

I will tell you that you will need to hang on to your hat. If the Green continues in the pattern of the past couple of years, we hope we are wrong, but 2013 the Green could become the driving stock.

There is a big wild card out there. Canadian selective fishery, if this remains uncapped this will need to be monitored closely and will provide the recreation interests an opportunity to sit in the tribal position in terms of our concerns that come with selective fisheries. If you have any further questions or areas of concern, you now know how to contact me.

**Email, April 26, from Tony Floor to Phil Hamilton (copies to others)**

Mr. Hamilton:

Thanks for the opportunity to respond to your April 20th e-mail regarding the issue of selective fishing and the Muckleshoot Tribe's approach to management of the Elliott Bay and Green River chinook salmon fisheries.

In your e-mail, you suggest that the Muckleshoot's position on selective fishing has been "mis-characterized" by sport fishing representatives in the North of Falcon (NOF) process. Therefore, let me take this opportunity to try and express more clearly, our concerns regarding the Muckleshoot Tribe's position in the NOF process.

We have two primary concerns. First, we do not understand your refusal to support scientifically based conservation proposals concerning the impacts of hatchery fish spawning with wild fish in the Green River. Second, we continue to be disappointed that you make no attempt to address the obvious imbalance between tribal and non-tribal harvests. As you are well aware, the Muckleshoot Tribe is harvesting nearly 60% of Green River chinook salmon, which is clearly inconsistent with the outcome of the 1974 Boldt Decision that directed the allocation to be shared equally between tribal and non-tribal fishers—50/50.

As you must be also aware, the Hatchery Scientific Review Group (HSRG), at the request of Congress, completed an independent science review of the impact of hatchery fish on wild fish in Puget Sound, in their report dated March, 2003. They made it crystal clear, that it was critical for the purposes of recovering ESA listed salmon to significantly reduce the number of hatchery fish spawning with wild fish. They recommended that the percentage of hatchery fish on the spawning grounds should not exceed 10%. Phil, as you know from the information presented at this year's NOF process, the forecast was for 15,169 hatchery chinook and 3,646 wild chinook, returning to the Green River incorporating the escapement goal of 5,800 chinook. You appeared to justify this situation by characterizing the management goal for the Green River as an "integrated approach," which we understood you to mean that it should be managed for both hatchery and wild fish. In other words, the excess hatchery fish were not a problem.

We remain confused about what you mean by this as it is clearly inconsistent with the recommendations of the scientists. It also seems to be inconsistent with the requirement of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) which I understand listed the Green River as a Category 1 system, meaning it should be managed for wild fish. You seem to be saying that hatchery fish on the spawning grounds are equally as important as wild fish. If we follow this line of reasoning, then there really is no need to worry about wild fish. We can just take surplus

hatchery fish from the hatchery and put them on the spawning grounds. It makes me question why we are going through all the pain and spending hundreds of millions of dollars to protect wild fish if we can just simply substitute hatchery fish for wild fish.

The HSRG also strongly recommended that selective fishing methods be used to reduce the number of hatchery fish reaching the spawning grounds. The alternative was to reduce the production of hatchery fish. We, as well as the Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), thought it was in the best interest of conservation of wild fish and sustainable fisheries to selectively harvest the hatchery fish before they reach the spawning grounds. By the way, this is exactly the position of Congressman Norm Dicks has consistently taken with regard to hatchery reform since he received the Hatchery Reform Report from the scientists seven years ago. You rejected this position and in turn, rejected the selective fishing proposal put forth by WDFW. Thus, we remain confused about your stated conservation concerns.

If I mis-characterized your position on this matter, please help me understand what you mean by managing the Green River chinook as an “intergrated run.” Actually, now that I think further about it, I guess we in the recreational fishing community should be asking both WDFW and the NMFS this same question.

Currently, as stated earlier, according to WDFW, the Muckleshoot Tribe is harvesting around 60% of the chinook returning to the Green River. This is frustrating to those of us in the sport fishing community because it is clearly inconsistent with the direction dictated by the Boldt Decision, which, to be crystal clear, we support. We continue to believe that the use of selective fishing methods would accomplish two goals: reduce the number of hatchery fish spawning with wild fish and thereby promote the conservation of wild fish allowing sport fishers an opportunity to harvest their fare share of harvestable salmon. Having been in the “fish business” for nearly 35 years, I know that were the shoe on the other foot, the tribes would not sit still for the non-tribal fishers harvesting 60% of the fish. Your rejection of our selective fishing proposal, which would have allowed the harvest of about 1,000 fish in Elliott Bay by sport fishers, even though the tribe will harvest 3,000 to 4,000 fish in the Bay and the Green River, was to say the least, upsetting.

In closing, we in the sport fishing community and related businesses do not understand your management approach. It does not seem to be consistent with the best science and it ignores the Boldt Decision. Hopefully, before the NOF process in 2011, we can come to a better understanding.

Tony Floor  
Director of Fishing Affairs  
NW Marine Trade Association