

Jim Harp

COMMENTS ON PSC CONSIDERATIONS

I would note for the Council that all of the alternatives the Council adopted at the March meeting comply with our PSC obligation to limit impacts on interior Fraser/Thompson coho. An analysis of our compliance with the PSC chinook requirements has not yet occurred. NMFS staff will be attempting to get that analysis completed by the end of this week.

In the future, the impacts on chinook salmon of Council regulations should be explicitly stated in terms that are directly relevant to compliance with requirements of the Council's Framework Plan, ESA jeopardy standards, and PSC obligations. For example, the relationship between the Council's management objectives and ESA jeopardy standards for many Puget Sound chinook stocks are expressed in terms of Recovery Exploitation Rates (RER) while the obligations of the United States under the 1999 Pacific Salmon Treaty Agreement are expressed in terms of Individual Stock Based Management Indices. The relationship between these two measures of impacts is not clear. The Council should instruct the STT to provide impacts in metrics that relate directly to domestic and international management constraints, starting with the 2004 season.