



Susan Bishop - NOAA Federal <susan.bishop@noaa.gov>

---

## RE: Area 7 Performance Adjustment

1 message

---

**Dufault, Aaron M (DFW)** <Aaron.Dufault@dfw.wa.gov>

Sat, Apr 7, 2018 at 12:02 PM

To: "Dapp, Derek R (DFW)" <Derek.Dapp@dfw.wa.gov>, Susan Bishop - NOAA Federal <susan.bishop@noaa.gov>

Cc: Chris Phinney <Chris.Phinney@puyalluptribe.com>, Jason Schaffler <Jason.Schaffler@muckleshoot.nsn.us>, "Chris James (cjames@nwifc.org)" <cjames@nwifc.org>

Hey Susan,

To add to what Derek just wrote, I wanted to reiterate what's in the harvest performance report regarding Sport fisheries in Areas 9 and 10 which contributed the greatest to NT marine area sport fisheries.

After accounting for post-season ER differences arising from the age-2 recruit scalars, marine sport fisheries still significantly exceed pre-season ER's in some years. As noted above, the greatest contributors to this annual exceedance are areas 9 and 10 (but also include 5, 6, 7, and 11). Much of the overage can be attributed to poor forecast performance. From 2011-14, post season UM abundances were ≈54% of their preseason forecast using total UM abundances, leading to marine area sport fisheries in many years having higher post season ER's even when fisheries performed well below preseason expectations (e.g. 2011 and 2012 in marine area 9 sport fishery).

Marine area sport fisheries that contributed to ER overages on Puyallup UM chinook in areas 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11, had a variety of season structures and management guidelines. For the years being assessed, all of these fisheries were mark-selective with the exception of area 5 in the winter (converted to MSF in 2014-15 season) and area 7 in the summer. Fisheries that were intensively creeled, such as area 9 and 10, were managed with in-season triggers while others like area 6 in the summer were managed as a total season. Since 2014, WDFW has increased the number of mark-selective fisheries that utilize in-season triggers to ensure fisheries do not exceed pre-season modeled encounters. Area 7 is one area that exceeded preseason ER's in 2013 and 2014 and since that time, effort in this fishery has increased. WDFW acknowledges the increasing trend in effort in this fishery and is taking active steps in 2018 preseason planning to address this issue. In 2011 and 2013 area 13 sport impacts exceeded preseason expectations, which are likely due to increased effort during Pink salmon return years. Since the time period used in this assessment, the increased catches in area 13 have been incorporated into our preseason modeling.

If there's any additional information on this topic you need, please let me know.

a

Aaron Dufault

Salmon Policy Analyst

[aaron.dufault@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:aaron.dufault@dfw.wa.gov)

Office: (360) 902-2791

Cell: (360) 584-6195

---

**From:** Dapp, Derek R (DFW)  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 07, 2018 11:55 AM  
**To:** Susan Bishop - NOAA Federal <[susan.bishop@noaa.gov](mailto:susan.bishop@noaa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Dufault, Aaron M (DFW) <[Aaron.Dufault@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:Aaron.Dufault@dfw.wa.gov)>; Chris Phinney <[Chris.Phinney@PuyallupTribe.com](mailto:Chris.Phinney@PuyallupTribe.com)>; Jason Schaffler <[Jason.Schaffler@muckleshoot.nsn.us](mailto:Jason.Schaffler@muckleshoot.nsn.us)>  
**Subject:** Area 7 Performance Adjustment

Hi Susan,

Attached you'll find the benefit to using the 2018 performance adjustment. I was a bit surprised to see that with the adjustment we're still underestimating Puyallup ERs by 0.1%. I can do a bit more digging into it to confirm my thoughts, but I think it may have to do with old methods used to derive scalars (perhaps also some of the forecasting issues as described for Areas 9 and 10 in the report). The error associated with this is difficult to measure as we have an updated sheet to derive scalars (as of last year), but if using new base period post-season runs with the new method of developing pre-season scalars, modeled catch exceeds actual catch in 2011-2014. There is a caveat to consider if analyzed in this way – this analysis examines at post-season runs rather than pre-season and more variability (due to uncertain forecasts) is expected in pre-season.

We can not analyze the new scalar method fully with the old base period pre-season runs, as scalars have changed (a scalar of 1 in the old base period will produce an entirely different catch than a scalar of 1 in the new base period).

Derek