## Review of salmon fisheries analyses

## NOAA FISHERIES



## OVERVIEW OF SRKW ANALYSIS

We evaluate potential effects from reduced prey availability (short-term and long-term) from an action based on best available scientific information.

Short-term (annual) effects analysis:

1) Estimate percent reduction in Chinook available (inland and coastal waters)
2) Chinook available (in kcal) is compared to metabolic needs Long-term (over the period of the action) effects analysis:
3) Assess the likelihood for localized depletions and long-term implications for SRKW survival and recovery
4) Assess impacts on salmon recovery and survival
5) Consider conservation objectives for individual stocks (listed and non-listed Chinook) that aid in the recovery and survival of SRKWs

## PREY REDUCTIONS FROM FISHERIES

| Fisheries | Region | October-April | May-June | July-September |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Canadian | Coastal | $0.0 \%-1.7 \%$ | $0.5 \%-4.9 \%$ | $2.4 \%-19.0 \%$ |
|  | Inland | $0.1 \%-2.9 \%$ | $1.3 \%-8.4 \%$ | $7.2 \%-31.0 \%$ |
| Total U.S. |  |  |  |  |
|  | Coastal | $0.6 \%-2.7 \%$ | $2.9 \%-13.4 \%$ | $8.3 \%-30.2 \%$ |
|  | Inland | $0.7 \%-4.3 \%$ | $2.5 \%-8.6 \%$ | $7.7 \%-22.6 \%$ |


| SEAK | Coastal | $0.1 \%-1.3 \%$ | $0.8 \%-3.9 \%$ | $2.5 \%-15.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Inland | $0.1 \%-0.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%-1.5 \%$ | $1.2 \%-2.8 \%$ |
| PFMC | Coastal | $0.0 \%-2.2 \%$ | $0.6 \%-11.9 \%$ | $1.7 \%-26.2 \%$ |
|  | Inland | $0.0 \%-0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%-2.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%-4.3 \%$ |
| Puget Sound | Coastal | $0.0 \%-0.6 \%$ | $0.1 \%-1.0 \%$ | $0.3 \%-2.7 \%$ |
|  | Inland | $0.4 \%-3.8 \%$ | $0.5 \%-5.9 \%$ | $4.0 \%-17.7 \%$ |

Supporting Doc: 2019 Puget Sound fisheries biological opinion

## GENERAL ADVERSE AFFECTS TO SRKW

- Fisheries cause meaningful reductions in prey availability
- Not all fish caught would have been consumed by whales
- Reductions are highest in summer months
- Small reductions can lead to:
- Reduced fitness
- Increased foraging effort
- Less energy acquired
- Less socialization


## PERCENT REDUCTIONS AND ABUNDANCE

| Year | Region | Oct - <br> April | May - <br> June | July - Sept |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1999 | Inland | 0.1\% | 0.4\% | 1.0\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.5\% | 1.4\% | 5.0\% |
| 2000 | Inland | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 2.0\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.5\% | 1.1\% | 4.0\% |
| 2001 | Inland | 0.2\% | 0.6\% | 1.2\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.2\% | 0.6\% | 2.4\% |
| 2002 | Inland | 0.2\% | 0.5\% | 1.6\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.2\% | 0.6\% | 3.9\% |
| 2003 | Inland | 0.2\% | 0.5\% | 1.4\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 4.3\% |
| 2004 | Inland | 0.3\% | 0.7\% | 1.8\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.5\% | 1.3\% | 5.9\% |
| 2005 | Inland | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 2.1\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.6\% | 1.7\% | 7.1\% |
| 2006 | Inland | 0.3\% | 0.7\% | 1.7\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.6\% | 1.5\% | 6.4\% |
| 2007 | Inland | 0.3\% | 0.9\% | 2.3\% |
|  | Coastal | 1.1\% | 3.5\% | 12.9\% |
| 2008 | Inland | 0.1\% | 0.6\% | 1.5\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.4\% | 1.6\% | 5.2\% |
| 2009 | Inland | 0.3\% | 1.0\% | 2.5\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.5\% | 2.0\% | 7.9\% |
| 2010 | Inland | 0.3\% | 0.7\% | 1.4\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.5\% | 1.1\% | 4.3\% |
| 2011 | Inland | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 2.2\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.9\% | 2.1\% | 7.4\% |
| 2012 | Inland | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.9\% |
|  | Coastal | 0.8\% | 1.8\% | 6.5\% |

- Larger percent reductions have occurred during low abundance years for SEAK and PS fisheries
- Low abundance (red)- currently defined as in the lower quartile of abundance from the retrospective time period (1992-2016)
- High abundance (green)- currently defined as in the upper quartile of abundance from the retrospective time period.
- Large and small percent reductions are also defined by quartiles from the retrospective time period.

Table 97 from 2019 SEAK biological opinion

## PROPOSED ADAPTIVE FRAMEWORK- STEPS

## One potential option for Puget Sound fisheries:

Step 1: Determine the status of coastal and inland Chinook salmon available (age 3-5) for the current year.

| Year | Coastal Abundance (Oct-Apr) | Coastal <br> Abundance <br> (May-Jun) | Coastal Abundance (Jul-Sep) | Average <br> Annual <br> Coastal Status | Inland Abundance (Oct-Apr) | Inland <br> Abundance <br> (May-Jun) | Inland Abundance (Jul-Sep) | Average Annual Inland Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1992 | 2,862,985 | 2,220,470 | 1,509,575 |  | 1,394,351 | 1,060,086 | 661,454 |  |
| 1993 | 2,893,827 | 2,202,796 | 1,483,178 |  | 1,339,251 | 1,008,063 | 638,889 |  |
| 1994 | 2,408,951 | 1,834,209 | 1,243,798 |  | 975,288 | 778,215 | 551,986 |  |
| 1995 | 3,143,793 | 2,285,553 | 1,674,744 |  | 1,120,863 | 887,298 | 681,558 |  |
| 1996 | 3,018,600 | 2,309,238 | 1,892,149 |  | 1,146,147 | 905,827 | 727,970 |  |
| 1997 | 3,180,586 | 2,398,535 | 1,798,128 |  | 1,626,509 | 1,293,554 | 1,041,159 |  |
| 1998 | 2,550,340 | 1,971,712 | 1,507,002 |  | 1,172,196 | 968,020 | 809,934 |  |
| 1999 | 2,788,484 | 2,137,650 | 1,708,222 |  | 1,530,733 | 1,223,325 | 1,006,912 |  |
| 2000 | 2,650,053 | 1,976,851 | 1,521,163 |  | 966,151 | 780,017 | 625,191 |  |
| 2001 | 4,688,872 | 3,591,790 | 2,970,863 |  | 1,604,738 | 1,281,885 | 1,050,996 |  |
| 2002 | 5,994,944 | 4,480,548 | 3,588,177 |  | 1,517,945 | 1,181,288 | 957,996 |  |
| 2003 | 5,576,250 | 4,171,145 | 3,205,132 |  | 1,501,007 | 1,192,968 | 992,452 |  |
| 2004 | 5,349,674 | 3,956,154 | 2,947,776 |  | 1,438,896 | 1,149,770 | 942,139 |  |
| 2005 | 4,062,468 | 3,091,662 | 2,264,645 |  | 1,301,340 | 1,027,538 | 836,261 |  |
| 2006 | 3,220,203 | 2,508,872 | 1,986,398 |  | 1,543,815 | 1,233,540 | 1,005,946 |  |
| 2007 | 1,872,745 | 1,404,617 | 995,379 |  | 1,247,776 | 978,026 | 777,531 |  |
| 2008 | 2,350,539 | 1,860,050 | 1,553,566 |  | 1,377,905 | 1,099,790 | 900,820 |  |
| 2009 | 2,177,107 | 1,717,367 | 1,411,802 |  | 982,477 | 781,875 | 632,811 |  |
| 2010 | 3,951,373 | 3,046,002 | 2,586,060 |  | 1,903,663 | 1,507,342 | 1,277,062 |  |
| 2011 | 3,391,716 | 2,620,680 | 2,130,340 |  | 1,363,226 | 1,079,141 | 873,050 |  |
| 2012 | 3,721,516 | 2,846,697 | 2,269,610 |  | 1,135,447 | 891,370 | 706,180 |  |
| 2013 | 6,579,960 | 5,130,900 | 4,401,289 |  | 1,561,246 | 1,238,347 | 1,038,614 |  |
| 2014 | 4,592,020 | 3,537,011 | 2,752,652 |  | 1,379,833 | 1,080,051 | 871,014 |  |
| 2015 | 5,708,243 | 4,444,177 | 3,792,791 |  | 1,320,178 | 1,045,470 | 855,228 |  |
| 2016 | 3,261,658 | 2,563,426 | 2,066,722 |  | 1,250,954 | 987,595 | 811,040 |  |
| Lower Quartile | 2,788,484 | 2,137,650 | 1,521,163 |  | 1,172,196 | 968,020 | 706,180 |  |
| Median | 3,220,203 | 2,508,872 | 1,986,398 |  | 1,363,226 | 1,060,086 | 855,228 |  |
| Upper Quartile | 4,592,020 | 3,537,011 | 2,752,652 |  | 1,517,945 | 1,192,968 | 992,452 |  |

## PROPOSED ADAPTIVE FRAMEWORK- STEPS

One potential option for Puget Sound fisheries:
Step 1: Determine the status of coastal and inland Chinook salmon available (age 3-5) for the current year.

Step 2: Determine the annual SRKW status.
Step 3. Assign a weighted mortality proportion to each fishery.

WEIGHT
Fishery $X=0$
Fishery $Y=1$
Fishery $Z=0.3$

HARVEST
MORTALITY
Fishery $X=100$
Fishery $Y=50$
Fishery $Z=1,000$

WEIGHTED
MORTALITY
Fishery $X=0$
Fishery $Y=50$
Fishery $Z=300$

## PROPOSED ADAPTIVE FRAMEWORK- STEPS

## One potential option for Puget Sound fisheries:

Step 1: Determine the status of coastal and inland Chinook salmon available (age 3-5) for the current year.

Step 2: Determine the annual SRKW status.
Step 3. Assign a weighted mortality proportion to each fishery.
Step 4. Determine the annual threshold for the weighted mortality proportion and assign Tier category.

Step 5: Compare the weighted mortality proportion threshold from step 4 to the current pre-season estimate of the weighted mortality proportion from step 3 above and make necessary fishery adjustments if exceedance occurs.

## SUMMARY OF 2019 PFMC SALMON FISHERIES

- Evaluated the abundance and \% reductions available and compared the composition of 2019 in terms of priority scores
- Evaluated the contribution of priority Chinook stocks in Council area Chinook salmon harvest retrospectively and compared this with 2019 alternatives


RunYear
Note: 'Non-Model Stock' includes Klamath River Fall and Central Valley Winter, in addition to all other stocks identified as having no model representation in Table 1 of Supplemental STT Report 2 to Agenda Item D.8.a of the March 2019 PFMC Meeting

Priority.Chinook.Stock.Group
$\square$ Central Valley Fall

Fraser Spring \& Fraser Summer

Lower Columbia Fall
Lower Columbia Spring
Middle \& Upper Columbia Summer Non-Priority North \& Central Oregon Coast Fall
Northern Puget Sound Fall
Northern Puget Sound Spring
Southern Puget Sound Fall
Southern Puget Sound Spring
Strait of Georgia Fall
Upper Columbia/Snake Fall \& Middle Columbia Fall
Upper Willamette Spring
Washington Coast Fall
Non-Model Stock

See Supporting Doc:

## SUMMARY OF 2020+ PFMC SALMON FISHERIES

Pieces of an assessment:

1. Season and location of prey reduction
2. Percent reduction in prey available
3. Analysis of effects to listed and non-listed Chinook salmon in the action area (area where distribution of SRKWs and Chinook overlap)
4. Understanding of impacts to priority prey stocks under good and poor status conditions of both SRKWs and Chinook.
