



**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

Canadian Management Units

- Interior Fraser (Including Thompson)
- Lower Fraser
- Strait of Georgia Mainland
- Strait of Georgia Vancouver Island

U.S. Inside Management Units

- Skagit
- Stillaguamish
- Snohomish
- Hood Canal
- Strait of Juan de Fuca

U.S. Outside Management Units

- Quilleyute
- Hoh
- Queets
- Grays Harbor


Three Status Levels

- Low ($\leq 20\%$ ER)
- Moderate ($> 20\%$ and $\leq 40\%$ 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

50% Share Pt

Normal Low	0.11	None
Composite Low	0.13	None
Normal Moderate	$.124 + .13 \times ER$.335
Composite Moderate	$.134 + .13 \times ER$.362
Abundant $0.40 < \text{Total ER} \leq 0.60$	$.084 + .28 \times ER$	All
Abundant $0.60 < \text{Total ER}$	$.024 + .38 \times ER$	All



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

50% Share Pt

Normal Low	0.10	0.20
Composite Low	0.12	None
Normal Moderate	$.024 + .38 \times ER$.283
Composite Moderate	$.054 + .33 \times ER$.312
Abundant	$.024 + .38 \times ER$	All

U.S. ER Caps on Canadian MUs

Low	0.10
Moderate	0.12
Abundant	0.15

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

