

**WDFW and Tribal 2001 Management Objectives**  
**for Puget Sound Chinook and Coho**  
**March 6, 2001**

Amendment 14 to the Pacific Coast Salmon Plan recognizes and allows for annual management targets to be established for Puget Sound chinook and coho salmon pursuant to rules and procedures established under U.S. v. Washington. It further recognized that WDFW and the effected tribes were in the process of establishing new objectives for coho salmon based on stepped exploitation rates, which would replace the currently defined management objectives. It also recognized that for Puget Sound chinook salmon, which are listed as a threatened species under the ESA, additional conservation objectives would be provided by NMFS, WDFW and the tribes.

As provided for in Amendment 14, WDFW and the effected tribes have now established, pursuant to their obligations and authorities under U.S. v. Washington, revised management objectives for Puget Sound chinook and coho salmon for the 2001 season. These new management objectives will be provided to the Salmon Technical Team for their analysis during this regulation setting cycle (see attached tables).

For Puget Sound coho salmon these goals are based on stepped exploitation rates based on defined breakpoints in expected spawning escapement, and are designed to be implemented using the modeling tools that the PFMC currently uses for preseason planning.

For Puget Sound chinook salmon the new goals are based on exploitation rates that will facilitate recovery, and are part of a comprehensive chinook management plan being developed by WDFW and the tribes. The harvest components of the plan were developed under U.S. v. Washington, but were also developed in close coordination with NMFS to ensure adequate consideration of ESA requirements. NMFS has recently proposed a finding that this plan meets the requirements of the ESA, under limit #6 of their recently implemented 4(d) rule for the Puget Sound chinook ESU. That finding is expected to be made final by May 1.

2001 Comprehensive Coho management guidelines for Puget Sound region primary natural coho management units

	Strait of Juan de Fuca	Hood Canal	Skagit	Stillaguamish	Snohomish
Critical abundance US exploitation rate	0.10	0.10	0.12	0.10	0.10
Critical/Low spawning escapement breakpoint	7,000	10,000	16,000	6,100	31,000
Low abundance exploitation rate	0.40	0.40	0.30	0.35	0.40
Low/Normal spawning escapement breakpoint	11,000	14,350	25,000	10,000	50,000
Normal exploitation rate	0.60	0.65	0.60	0.50	0.60

1.1.1 Table 6- Natural Chinook Management Units and Associated Objectives

Natural Chinook Management Units	Recovery Exploitation Rate Ceiling <sup>1</sup>	Low Abundance Threshold <sup>2</sup>
Western Strait Hoko	10% SUS ER <sup>3</sup>	500 spawners
Elwha River	10% SUS ER <sup>3</sup>	1,000 spawners
Dungeness	10% SUS ER <sup>3</sup>	500 spawners
Mid-Hood Canal	15% SUS ER <sup>3</sup> Terminal – 750 spawners	400 spawners (n)
Skokomish	15% pre-terminal SUS ER Terminal – 3,150 aggregate / 1200 natural spawners	1,300 aggregate / 800 natural spawners
Nooksack Early North Fork South Fork	The co-managers and NMFS are developing a RER assessment for this stock <sup>4</sup>	1,000 spawners (n) 1,000 spawners (n)
Skagit Spring Chinook	42% Total ER	576 spawners (n)
Skagit Summer/Fall Chinook	52% Total ER	4,800 spawners (n)
Stillaguamish Summer/Fall	25% Total ER	500 spawners (n)
Snohomish Summer/Fall	32% Total ER	2,000 spawners (n)
Lake Washington Chinook Cedar River Index	15% pre-terminal SUS ER Terminal – 1,200 spawners	200 spawners (n)
Green River Chinook	15% pre-terminal SUS ER Terminal – 5,800 spawners	1,800 spawners
White River Spring Chinook	17% Total ER	200 spawners
Puyallup River Chinook	50% Total ER	500 spawners
Nisqually River Chinook	1,100 spawners	500 spawners

(n) – low abundance measures as natural origin recruits

- 1) Interim management ceiling during recovery phase expressed in FRAM values.
- 2) Level of forecasted spawning abundance that triggers additional management action as defined in Step 5 of the Application Section. Thresholds are set with consideration to stock-specific characteristics and genetic viability concerns (See Appendix A for details by management unit).
- 3) FRAM exploitation rate measured as total exploitation rate in southern U.S. fisheries. This objective represents the average exploitation rate by southern United States fisheries during 1992-1996 determined from run reconstruction.
- 4) In the interim, management guidance will be derived from Appendix C application.

