Summary Review of
Prohibited Species Catch Limits below 200,000 chum salmon

## What led to the preparation of the NMFS supplement?

- NEPA - reasonable range of alternatives

- Public comments at October 2023 Council Meeting

- Question: do the impacts at a 200,000 chum PSC limit reflect impacts at lower limits, such that an examination of lower limits would be unnecessary for NEPA compliance?


## What is in Appendix 1?

- Alternative 2 - limits on overall chum salmon
- PSC limits reviewed in Appendix 1
- 0; 50,000, 100,000, 150,000, and 200,000 chum
- Quantitative analysis of impacts on pollock harvest and chum PSC
- Qualitative description of impacts on communities


## Data and methods

- Data - NMFS Catch Accounting; AKFIN (prices)
- Identify each sector's chum PSC apportionment under pro rata (75\% 3-year avg.; 25\% AFA)

| Pro rata allocation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Sector | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 k}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 k}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 0 k}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 k}$ |  |
| CDQ | 7.1 | 0 | 3550 | 7100 | 10650 | 14200 |  |
| CP | 25.4 | 0 | 12700 | 25400 | 38100 | 50800 |  |
| Inshore | 58.4 | 0 | 29200 | 58400 | 87600 | 116800 |  |
| Mothership | 9.1 | 0 | 4550 | 9100 | 13650 | 18200 |  |

Appendix 1: Table A-1

## Data and methods

For each year between 2011 and 2022, NMFS identified the day each sector would have met its PSC apportionment

Then calculated:
-total pollock (metric tons) subsequently caught -total chum salmon (\# of salmon) subsequently caught

For forgone pollock:
-Calculated gross ex-vessel value
-Calculated first wholesale value

## Methods: CP Example

150,00 PSC limit: 38,100 Apportionment exceeded on DAY 295

Saturday, October 22, 2011

| $\frac{\text { Day }}{290}$ | Chum (\# fish) |  | Pollock (mt) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 290 | 35,278 |  | 238,035 |
| 291 | 35,409 |  | 239,057 |
| 292 | 35,423 |  | 240,039 |
| 293 | 35,460 |  | 241,066 |
| 294 | 35,491 |  | 241,642 |
| 295 | 40,336 |  | 242,750 |
| 296 | 43,213 |  | 243,281 |
| 297 | 43,409 |  | 243,657 |
| 298 | 43,424 |  | 243,993 |
| 299 | 43,982 |  | 244,968 |
| TOTAL | 44,299 |  | 250,219 |

Pollock forgone $=7,379 \mathrm{mt}$ Avoid chum - 3,963 fish

## Results: potential forgone pollock (Pro rata apportionment)

| Calcuated using Pro-rata sector apportionment |  | Sum of Forgone B Season Pollock (mt) | Reduction as \% of B Season | Mean Annual Forgone <br> B Season <br> Pollock (mt) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| If a 0 chum PSC limit had been in place 2011-2022: | Total | 8,715,783 | 100\% | 726,315 |
|  | CDQ | 877,006 | 99\% | 73,084 |
|  | CP | 3,119,072 | 100\% | 259,923 |
|  | Mothership | 783,052 | 99\% | 65,254 |
|  | Inshore | 3,936,653 | 100\% | 328,054 |
| If a 50,000 chum PSC limit had been in place 2011-2022: | Total | 4,648,109 | 53\% | 447,228 |
|  | CDQ | 319,649 | 36\% | 35,517 |
|  | CP | 1,598,394 | 51\% | 159,839 |
|  | Mothership | 405,279 | 51\% | 40,528 |
|  | Inshore | 2,324,786 | 59\% | 211,344 |
| If a 100,000 chum PSC limit had been in place 2011-2022: | Total | 3,657,087 | 42\% | 368,553 |
|  | CDQ | 241,706 | 27\% | 40,284 |
|  | CP | 1,236,108 | 40\% | 123,611 |
|  | Mothership | 323,832 | 41\% | 35,981 |
|  | Inshore | 1,855,441 | 47\% | 168,676 |
| If a 150,000 chum PSC limit had been in place 2011-2022: | Total | 2,894,255 | 33\% | 300,045 |
|  | CDQ | 213,554 | 24\% | 42,711 |
|  | CP | 955,942 | 31\% | 95,594 |
|  | Mothership | 244,723 | 31\% | 27,191 |
|  | Inshore | 1,480,037 | 38\% | 134,549 |
| If a 200,000 chum PSC limit had been in place 2011-2022: | Total | 2,068,764 | 24\% | 252,293 |
|  | CDQ | 184,178 | 21\% | 36,836 |
|  | CP | 848,644 | 27\% | 106,081 |
|  | Mothership | 134,939 | 17\% | 19,277 |
|  | Inshore | 901,003 | 23\% | 90,100 |
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## Results: potential chum salmon avoided (Pro rata apportionment)

| Calcuated using Pro-rata sector apportionment |  | Sum of B Season Chum | Reduction as \% of B Season | Sum of Estimated WAK Chum Avoided (\#) | Mean Annual Estimated WAK Chum Avoided (\#) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| If a 0 chum PSC limit had been in place 2011-2022: | Total | 3,364,568 | 100\% | 591,159 | 49,263 |
|  | CDQ | 227,068 | 100\% | 45,431 | 3,786 |
|  | CP | 960,180 | 100\% | 121,138 | 10,095 |
|  | Mothership | 279,813 | 100\% | 51,858 | 4,322 |
|  | Inshore | 1,897,507 | 100\% | 372,731 | 31,061 |
| If a 50,000 chum PSC limit had been in place 2011-2022: | Total |  | 81\% | 472,310 | 39,359 |
|  | $\mathrm{CDQ}$ | $187,146$ | 82\% | 38,082 | 3,174 |
|  | CP | 812,087 | 84\% | 101,532 | 8,461 |
|  | Mothership | 223,404 | 80\% | 41,084 | 3,424 |
|  | Inshore | 1,520,175 | 80\% | 291,612 | 24,301 |
| If a 100,000 chum PSC limit had been in place 2011-2022: | Total | 2,207,747 | 66\% | 371,311 | 30,943 |
|  | CDQ | 153,552 | 67\% | 31,904 | 2,659 |
|  | CP | 677,563 | 70\% | 84,814 | 7,068 |
|  | Mothership | 176,180 | 63\% | 32,373 | 2,698 |
|  | Inshore | 1,200,452 | 63\% | 222,220 | 18,518 |
| If a 150,000 chum PSC limit had been in place 2011-2022: | Total | 1,710,185 | 51\% | 277,658 | 23,138 |
|  | CDQ | 139,922 | 61\% | 29,103 | 2,425 |
|  | CP | 547,270 | 57\% | 69,140 | 5,762 |
|  | Mothership | 138,456 | 49\% | 25,548 | 2,129 |
|  | Inshore | 884,537 | 47\% | 153,866 | 12,822 |
| If a 200,000 chum PSC limit had been in place 2011-2022: | Total | 1,203,504 | 40\% | 186,339 | 15,528 |
|  | CDQ | 114,078 | 50\% | 24,081 | 2,007 |
|  | $\mathrm{CP}$ | 417,007 | 43\% | 54,518 | 4,543 |
|  | Mothership | 99,887 | 36\% | 18,818 | 1,568 |
|  | Inshore | 572,532 | 30\% | 88,922 | 7,410 |
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## Inter-annual variability <br> (2011-2022)



Appendix 1: Figure A-1

## What was not included?

- analysis of avoidance costs
- analysis of potential fishing changes
- comprehensive analysis of economic impacts
- benefits of avoided chum salmon
- ecosystem impacts
- PSC tradeoffs (e.g., 6.2.6 of DEIS)
- stakeholder input
- other?


## Questions?

Doug Shaftel, NOAA NMFS, Fishery Management Specialist doug.shaftel@noaa.gov

