





EFH area closures to protect Pacific Coast groundfish habitat - Coastwide.

Senator Betsy Johnson
P.O. Box R
Scappoose, Oregon 97056

Lower Columbia Alliance for Sustainable Fisheries
Bernie Bjork, Grassroots Organizer
36293 Bartoldus Loop
Astoria, Oregon 97103
503-791-0014

RE: Voting No On More Closed to Fishing Marine Reserves.

January 27, 2012

Dear Senator Johnson;

Hope you are well, and that you are rested up for the upcoming February Legislative Session. I am writing to ask you once again to support your local small family ocean going fishing businesses. A full 85% of our local trawl fishermen's traditional fishing grounds have been closed over the last 12 years, and we have two new no-fishing marine reserves at Port Orford and near Depoe Bay. It is premature to suggest evicting fishing from additional areas, whether they are marine reserves or test sites for renewable energy devices, before we know the results from the two new marine reserves. The state has not adopted a long-term budget yet to do even minimal research of the two new reserves to learn if they have any effect at all. Marine reserve advocates are not promoting marine reserves to save any particular species, or conduct any science, because they believe the science is already settled based on marine reserves partial outcomes in other areas, with little relevance to circumstances on the Oregon coast. Any initiative placed before the voters by out of state environmental foundations wanting to close Oregon's ocean would be defeated if coastal legislators would take a high-profile public stand with the majority of their constituents and raise the same points that their constituents have been raising for years and that is; That marine reserves are an inappropriate management tool here and science bears that out, that our fisheries that would be affected by a marine reserve are in good condition, that no problem has been found for marine reserves to correct, and that we cannot afford to lose jobs or finance an unnecessary program of regulation at this time.

I will go through a short list of concerns our local fishermen are dealing with, but first a reminder of who we are and who supports our cause. The Lower Columbia Alliance for Sustainable Fisheries is a grassroots coalition, formed in 2003 to stop the closure of any MORE fishing grounds to our local commercial and sport fishermen. Our membership of over 100 entities is made up of mostly lower Columbia River ocean going commercial and sport fishermen from both sides of the River, and the businesses that cater to the industry. Through the years we have gained the support of all the lower Columbia port districts, and obtained letters of support from the cities of Warrenton and Astoria, and several previous Clatsop County Commissions. Our stance has gained the support of most local and coast wide commercial fishing associations like the Columbia River Crab Fishermens' Association, Fisherman's Marketing Association, Salmon for All, the Western Fishboat Owners Association, and the largest sports fishermen's group in the state, Oregon Anglers, a subsidiary of the national Recreational Fishing Alliance.

These are our concerns:

1. The continual push by environmental foundations and groups to close MORE fishing grounds causes our fishermen to lose confidence in the system. They see the state of Oregon having no money to maintain what they have already, but somehow coming up with the money it takes to

- implement and enforce these unnecessary closed fishing areas. They wonder where the money is coming from, and worry that if the state takes environmental foundation money, CONTROL of the state waters will ultimately end up in the hands of these foundations, regardless of Oregon's attempt to keep an arm's length distance between foundation money and actual research. That alone is a very scary thing to our ocean fishermen.
2. They see the Department of Land Conservation and Development showing up in town, less than a year after a very poorly run Cape Falcon Marine Reserve Process, wanting to close more fishing grounds for test sites for renewable energy devices.
 3. We saw the Port of Coos Bay run a much cleaner marine reserve process than the Cape Falcon process, and coming up with exactly what would have happened up on the North Coast. That result being, "No marine reserve" at Cape Falcon, just like Coos Bay did for Cape Arago.
 4. 'Mitigation' has to be an integral part of allowing any new closed to fishing area. This could be in the form of cash to our displaced fishermen, previously closed areas reopening, more money for fish hatcheries, placement in the ocean of artificial reefs, etc.
 5. 'Sunset Clauses' have to be part of any new closed to fishing area. Preferably 4 to 6 years. If it is shown that the closed to fishing area is doing more good for the community than the displaced fishermen, then they may continue.
 6. We are very fortunate on the coast to have fishing families that will take a chance, go out to sea, and bring back fresh seafood for our restaurants, and fish markets. Our local tourist businesses thrive due to it. Inland counties would love to have this opportunity.
 7. When I was growing up in Astoria, we had a thriving salmon gillnet and troll fleet, and almost the entire Astoria waterfront was working. What was the straw that broke the camel's back, and made up Bumble Bee Seafood's mind that it needed to leave Astoria? Was it the 1972 Marine Mammal Protection Act, or maybe the 1974 Boldt Decision, or their loss of clout with the Oregon state legislature? The same can happen to our trawl and crab fleets.
 8. The huge expense of these new marine reserves, and the jobs lost to them, in a time of real economic turmoil. The researchers who would be working out there already have jobs, financed by taxpayers, so no new jobs would be added. But private sector workers would be left with less opportunity to earn an income to pay the researcher's salaries. More closed fishing areas just cannot be justified.

Senator, our LCAFSF wishes that you would support your local fishing families, in this extremely import issue. We also wish the best for you personally.

Truly;

Bernie Bjork
Grassroots Coordinator, Lower Columbia
Alliance for Sustainable Fisheries

cc. Gov. Kitzhaber, The Coastal Caucus, Oregon State Legislators, Mayor Mark Kujala of Warrenton, Clatsop County Com. Chair Dirk Rohne, Tim Josi, Port of Garibaldi, Port of Astoria, Port of Ilwaco, Port of Chinook, Port of Newport, Port of Coos Bay, Steve Bodnar, John Griffith, F.A.C.T, Com. Kelly Barnett, Linda Buell, Nils Stolpe, John Holloway, Michael Desmond.

Coos Bay Trawlers' Association, Inc.

PO Box 5050

63422 Kingfisher Dr.

Coos Bay, OR 97420

Phone (541)888-8012

E-mail: c.trawl@yahoo.com

A Non-Profit Organization Since 1997

2/1/2012

Dear Legislators,

Coos Bay Trawlers' Association, Inc. is one of the oldest trawl associations in the state and we write today to express our concern about the upcoming Marine Reserve Bill (Draft Bill LC 149).

We would like to remind you that the trawl sector's fishing grounds have been reduced to about 20% of the EEZ. Almost all of the reductions were brought about by proactive representatives of the trawl industry who approached the Pacific Fisheries Management Council with solutions the council needed to fend off lawsuits filed against them by environmental groups. At that time we had no idea the state would be swayed by those same lawsuit filers to close state waters to establish marine reserves. Most of the areas that the state settled on to create these sites were proposed by those same environmentalists. In Coos Bay, for the second round of discussions after OPAC rejected the Cape Arago/Seven Devils proposals, the Port selected a very fair but broad committee made up completely of all local residents. The outcome was no marine reserve at Cape Arago. Port of Coos Bay Commissioners had the final say and though the meeting was well attended by the citizens of the state, locals were out numbered by at least 3 to 1 by citizens from Portland, Corvallis, Salem, Eugene and Roseburg, the commissioners still chose to go with the recommendation of the committee they had approved to work on this issue.

We would like to remind you that the trawl sector came forward when management realized that they had been over-optimistically managing our fisheries and several species may have been over harvested. The trawl sector initiated a buy-back program to reduce the fleet and those left will be paying the buy-back loan off for the rest of our lives. Still without the historic level of landings supporting our industry and our communities we knew we had to do something about the discard issues. The fleet had to discard more and more fish as management ratcheted down the harvest. So we pressed PFMC to allow us to design a rationalization program which again cut our catch, our time on the water and has caused us to manage our catch with accountability. That program was launched in January 2011.

Our fishermen, their representatives and our fishing communities know that the lack of information (data) about our fisheries creates uncertainties and when there is uncertainty management has to manage conservatively and the more we don't know the more

conservatively they have to manage. Marine reserves were introduced to counter-balance our lack of knowledge of the ocean and the things that live in/on it. A marine reserve is just another band-aid to cover up the fact that we still lack adequate data to manage our fisheries. Our concern is a single issue that I will dramatize below. But the truth is that no marine reserve will increase our knowledge applicable to fishery management. Marine reserves were introduced by the environmental groups as an insurance policy against bad management. But we feel we need to fix the problem and not just stick another band-aid over it. The real problem has been the **lack of adequate funding** for over 20-plus years to accomplish what the Magnuson-Stevens Act laid out for our nation and unless that changes we will always be plagued by the lack of knowledge.

1. The state has been in a financial squeeze for a number of years and has **reduced state budgets** and spending every budget cycle for over a decade. ODF&W's budget has taken reductive hits every time there has been a state budget reduction. ODF&W managers and personnel have been frustrated by the **lack of funding** to carryout even the most mundane science research and data collection activities. These shortfalls in their budget has caused a decrease in abundance, habitat and bottom studies and has had to even use outside "environmental groups" to accomplish the simplest ocean floor mapping for the Territorial Sea Plan revisions. Whale Cove/Boiler Bay has not been studied in depth since it was designated a closed area over 25 years ago because of the **lack of funding**. The **lack of adequate funding** has made ODF&W open to manipulation by outside influences who dangle a purse and say "no strings attached" as long as you do this with the money (they don't stipulate exactly how to spend the money – "no strings" – as long as it is spent on marine reserve, spatial planning, essential fish habitat, or community fishing associations).

Many of our school districts have shortened the school week to four days. Police services have been reduced to skeleton crews. Senior services have been reduced in nearly every county in the state. Unemployment has been overly high for five or more years and Oregonians are still going through foreclosure proceedings. Food stamp programs are maxed out and the Oregon Health plan has reached capacity and is turning away the needy leaving the poor with no choice but to assume high level of personal debt or avoid health care altogether putting their lives on shorten futures. The turn-a-round time for many of these major issues is slower than an Oregon slug and solutions are as direct as the slug's path. As long as there is even one Oregon child that goes to bed hungry we should not be spending one penny on marine reserves or other frivolous pipe dreams. As long as there is one Oregon child suffering a homeless life with little hope of happiness and health we need to resist the out of state influences of the rich, powerful environmental groups.

2. The intellectual debate on the necessity of marine reserves has been clouded by big money and poor examples of fishing activities **presumed** to be conducted on the west coast of the United States. Because of the **lack of financial** support provided by our state government, ODF&W has not had the budget to educate the state's citizens about the true condition of fisheries and the management process. If ODF&W had appropriate budgets for the last 20 years our citizens would know the current conditions of the Oregon territorial sea and would not be so gullible of outside influence. However, that is not the

case. ODF&W has failed to live up to its educational mission because of budget shortfalls and **the lack of knowledge** about our ocean has undermined their confidence to stand up with the truth about our ocean. Furthermore, because the marine reserve movement was started as a "TOP DOWN" process, ODF&W has not had the freedom to speak the truth about the state of the ocean because "their boss", the governor and his staff, were in bed with outside "big money" enviros who were making big promises of lots of jobs and financial incentives if marine reserves were established in Oregon territorial sea.

3. Because of **inadequate budgets** over the years, the state of Oregon has created an atmosphere where our industry experts are demonized by the big environmental industry. Fishermen and their representatives who attend every PFMC meeting, who are on committees that help construct the fishing regulations, who help gather the data used to create the regulations, who make their boats available so scientists can conduct research, who help to ground-truth fishery facts and separate out the fiction, who are out on the ocean more than anyone else, who's parents have also fished and have shared the stories over time of ocean conditions, their combined knowledge is trumped by environmental groups with big pockets and unchecked influence. We haven't just showed up at the table and started making demand for change because we have been agents of change ever since when we first helped to establish the EEZ. Now the new-comers point their prissy fingers at us crying we are the culprits of the demise of the ocean. **UNDER FUNDING THROUGHOUT THE ERA OF THE MAGNUSON-STEVEN ACT FROM ALL LEVELS IS THE REAL VILIAN OF THE LOW KNOWLEDGE THRESHOLD OF OUR FISHERIES** and marine reserves is not a penance the enviros should be allowed to dole out to the fishing industry to pay for long-time budget constraints.

4. Past conflicts with ocean users and want-to-bes was best settled through dialogue and sometimes mitigation. Our own association went head to head with AT&T and came to a working agreement about the Bandon Cables. Today the state can be proud to have helped that mitigation process as Bandon Submarine Cable Council celebrates its thirteenth anniversary. Oregon Fishermen's Cable Committee in Astoria is another example of successful partnerships created by fishermen with BIG corporations. The marine reserve issue was not approached the same way but if it were we would have had more willing fishermen stepping up as they did in Depoe Bay and Port Orford.

We acknowledge the fact that the train has left the station and perhaps we are not on board but we cannot join you for the ride because it is a train to nowhere. Marine reserves are not going to fix any problem and many of us refuse to stick our heads in the sand and pretend that everything is going to be okay. **If we do not fix the ODF&W budget they will never have enough money to do the scientific work that needs to be done.** If we don't fix their budget we will continue to apply band-aids instead of increasing our knowledge. Ignorance is not bliss!

I sincerely thank you,

Steve Bodnar, Executive Director

April 1, 2011

House Committee on
Energy, Environment and Water
Oregon State Capitol
900 Court Street N.E., Room 347
Salem, Oregon 97301

Re: House Bill 2009

The Port of Astoria Board of Commissioners supports the Lower Columbia Alliance for Sustainable Fisheries position opposing House Bill 2009. Together with the Lower Columbia Alliance, commercial fishermen, crabbers, area sport fishermen and others in the State of Oregon we do not believe the amendments are reflecting representation of the actual stakeholders in this process. The Bill, if passed, will eliminate nearly all of the commercial crab grounds off Cape Falcon, Cascade Head and Cape Perpetua as well as eliminating some very productive fishing grounds from the few fishing areas left.

The Port of Astoria, in 2007, approved Resolution 2007-31 regarding the establishment of marine reserves in Oregon. We do not believe HB 2009 amendments reflect the criteria we recommended and approved in the resolution. (Attached)

We urge the legislators to oppose House Bill 2009 introduced by Oregon's Coastal Caucus.

Sincerely,



Floyd Holcom, President

Port of Astoria Commission

Attachment



National Environmental Trust to Join The Pew Charitable Trusts Environment Group

Contact: Justin Kenney, 215-575-4816, Brandon MacGillis, 202-887-8800

Washington, D.C. - 05/15/2007 - The Pew Charitable Trusts and the National Environmental Trust (NET) announced today that they have reached agreement in principle to merge the staff and operations of NET and Pew's Environment Program. The consolidated team, to be called the Pew Environment Group, will have a domestic and international staff of more than 80 and estimated annual operating revenue of approximately \$70 million, making it one of the nation's largest environmental scientific and advocacy organizations. The Environment Group will have an initial presence across the United States as well as in Canada, Europe, Australia, the Western Pacific, Indian Ocean and Latin America. Pew and NET set a target date of December 2007 to finalize the agreement and begin their joint operations.

"Our environmental efforts have delivered major successes over the past 20 years, but threats to the global environment have grown exponentially," Rebecca W. Rimel, president of The Pew Charitable Trusts, said today. "To better respond to the problems of global warming and the world's rapidly deteriorating marine and terrestrial systems, we have been making major adjustments to our work, and this is one step in that process. We are delighted that the experienced and talented staff of the National Environmental Trust has agreed to join with us to address the critical environmental challenges we face," she said.

Pew's Environment Program works to advance environmental policy by supporting top-level scientific research; building, assisting and coordinating broad coalitions of organizations representing diverse constituencies concerned about environmental protection in the United States and abroad; and making strategic investments in strengthening the capacity of environmental groups to achieve shared policy goals. The staff is composed of scientists, attorneys, public policy experts and campaign professionals.

NET, founded 13 years ago, has built an experienced staff of public policy and campaign professionals that has played a central role in both U.S. environmental policy debates and international treaty negotiations. The organization has domestic operations in 18 states and a Washington-based staff specializing in media and communications, government relations and field organizing. It hosts a number of coalitions made up of environmental organizations working on issues ranging from protecting U.S. national forests to international fisheries conservation.

Dr. Joshua S. Reichert, who has directed Pew's Environment Program since 1990, will serve as managing director of the Pew Environment Group. Philip E. Clapp, NET's president since its founding in 1994, will become the deputy managing director, overseeing day-to-day operations, policy development and strategic planning with Dr. Reichert. Thomas A. Wathen, NET executive vice president and general counsel, will become deputy director, and will be joined in that capacity by Kathleen A. Welch, currently deputy director of Pew's Environment Program.

The Pew Environment Group will combine science, policy, campaign and advocacy expertise to reduce the scope and severity of three major global environmental problems:

- dramatic changes to the Earth's climate caused by the increasing concentration of greenhouse gases in the planet's atmosphere;
- the erosion of large wilderness ecosystems that contain a great part of the world's remaining biodiversity; and
- the destruction of the world's oceans, with a particular emphasis on global fisheries.

"Combining our staffs and operations represents an enormous opportunity to increase our collective impact on the world's most challenging environmental problems," Mr. Clapp said. "Our two organizations work largely in the same fields of environmental protection, and have complementary policy and advocacy skills. All of us believe that the next decade will be critical on virtually every issue on which we work – global warming, marine protection, and conservation of the world's remaining wilderness areas. The Pew Environment Group will work with and assist other organizations in the United States and elsewhere in the world, providing both expertise and resources that will make all of our efforts more successful. This merger will better equip us and others to protect the world's natural heritage in the years ahead."

"We have reached a critical moment in our history with the natural world," said Dr. Reichert. "For years, scientists have been warning of the potentially devastating impacts of human activity on the land, the Earth's atmosphere and the sea. The good news is there is a growing sense of urgency that has gripped the public, and governments throughout the world are waking up to the problems we face. We have a rather narrow window of time to address these problems and a corresponding opportunity to reverse course and begin to more sensibly manage our relationship with nature. This merger will make us more effective at serving the public's strong interest in protecting the environment, and will help us to improve the collective ability of organizations in this country and abroad to better address global problems that no single organization can successfully tackle on its own."

View a [video](#) about the NET/Pew Environment Group merger on the E&ETV Web site.

ASSOCIATED GRANT:
National Environmental Trust