Southern Coho Management Plan

Developed pursuant to 1999 PSC Agreement

---

Conservation-Based

---

Objectives

1. Constrain exploitation rates (ERs) for key natural management units
   - MSH while preserving genetic & ecological diversity
2. Improve prospects for sustaining healthy fisheries
3. Regimes responsive to resource status and new information
4. Predictable basis for management planning
5. Objective monitoring, evaluation, & revision
Key Management Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canadian Management Units</th>
<th>U.S. Inside Management Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior Fraser (including Thompson)</td>
<td>Skagit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Fraser</td>
<td>Stillaguamish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait of Georgia Mainland</td>
<td>Snohomish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait of Georgia Vancouver Island</td>
<td>Hood Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strait of Juan de Fuca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Outside Management Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quileute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three Status Levels

- Low (≤ 20% ER)
- Moderate (> 20% and ≤ 40% ER)
- Abundant (>40% ER)

Targets determined by producing Party

Principle 1

- For MUs in low status
  - Both Parties shape fisheries to minimize impacts
  - Producing Party expected to bear a greater share of the conservation responsibility
  - Intercepting Party not required to reduce its ER impact below 10%
Principle 2

- For MUs in *moderate* status
  - Producing Party should receive the majority of the allowable ER
- For MUs in *abundant* status
  - Producing Party should receive greater majority of the allowable ER

Principle 3

- Neither Party should be unduly prevented from accessing its own stocks to achieve its fishery objectives or harvesting other allocations agreed under the PST

ER Caps For Intercepting Fisheries

- Canadian on U.S. Inside MUs
- Canadian on U.S. Outside MUs
- U.S. on Canadian MUs
Normal & Composite ER Caps on U.S. MUs

- Accommodate Canadian concerns over disparate nature of MUs proposed by Canada and the U.S.
- Composite rules apply if only 1 MU is in Low or Moderate Status
  - Inside & Outside MUs Treated Separately
  - Canada required to respond, but not to full extent
- Normal rules apply if more than 1 MU is in Low or Moderate status

---

Canadian ER Caps on U.S. Inside MUs

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal Low</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Low</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Moderate</td>
<td>0.124 + 0.13 x ER</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Moderate</td>
<td>0.134 + 0.13 x ER</td>
<td>0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundant</td>
<td>0.084 + 0.28 x ER</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundant 0.40 x Total ER ≤ 0.60</td>
<td>0.024 + 0.38 x ER</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundant 0.60 x Total ER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Prioritized Bilateral Review of MU Target ERs

- Skagit
  - Target ER at Moderate Status = 0.35
- Stillaguamish
  - Target ER at Abundant Status = 0.55
- Lower Fraser
- Interior Fraser
Canadian ER Caps on U.S. Outside MUs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ER Caps 1</th>
<th>ER Caps 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal Low</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Low</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Moderate</td>
<td>.024 + .38 x ER</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Moderate</td>
<td>.054 + .33 x ER</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundant</td>
<td>.024 + .38 x ER</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. ER Caps on Canadian MUs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ER Caps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundant</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ER Caps are Maximums

- Apply to each MU individually
- All fishery impacts
- Intercepting Party may take less
- Producing Party may take unused portion provided that the cumulative ER limit established is not exceeded

Parties may request

- Reductions or increases from general ER Caps
Preseason Planning

- Each Party provides status of MUs and target ERs
- Exchange factors expected to govern fishery plans – manager-to-manager discussions
- Provide pre-season plans

Obligations for PFMC

- Constrain exploitation rates by all U.S. fisheries on Canadian MUs within allowable caps.
- Constrain total ERs on each U.S. MU so as not to exceed the established limit

U.S. Obligation for Canadian MUs

Total Allowable Exploitation Rate for MU

U.S. Interception Cap for MU

• 10% for Low
• 12% for Moderate
• 15% for Abundant
U.S. and PFMC Obligations for U.S. MUs

- Total Allowable Exploitation Rate for MU
- Anticipated Canadian ER on MU

U.S. Exploitation Rate Cap for MU

Bilateral Tools

- Commitment to develop bilateral regional planning tools and protocols in time for 2004 season.

Regimes to Evolve

- Adapt to new information and development of bilateral tools
- Development and implementation oversight by Southern Panel
2005 Review
- Evaluate performance
- ER Targets – address issues unresolved by bilateral technical review

Process Steps
- Consideration by National Sections
- Consideration by PSC
- Consideration by Parties

Decision to be Made

OR