

FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR
AMENDMENT 20
TO THE
PACIFIC COAST SALMON FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN:
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PRESEASON SCHEDULE AND
KLAMATH MANAGEMENT ZONE BOUNDARY
(RTID 0648-XA603)

April 2021

Prepared by:
Pacific Fishery Management Council Staff and
West Coast Region National Marine Fisheries Service Staff

Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Background	1
2.1	KMZ Boundary Change.....	1
2.2	Preseason Schedule Change	4
2.3	FMP Language Updates	4
2.4	Purpose and Need.....	5
2.5	Public Involvement.....	5
3.0	Description of Alternatives	5
3.1	Proposed Action: Boundary Change	5
3.1.1	Alternative 1.1 (no-action alternative) – KMZ/FB Status Quo	6
3.1.2	Alternative 1.2 (preferred alternative) – KMZ/FB Boundary Move	6
3.1.3	Alternative 1.3 – KMZ/FB Boundary Move with Conservation Zone.....	6
3.2	Proposed Action: Schedule Change	7
3.2.1	Alternative 2.1 (no-action alternative) – Schedule status quo	7
3.2.2	Alternative 2.2 – Annual effective date May 15	7
3.2.3	Alternative 2.3 (preferred alternative) – Annual effective date May 16.....	8
3.2.4	Alternative 2.4 (preferred alternative) – No transmittal deadline	8
3.2.5	Alternative 2.5 – 24-day transmittal deadline	8
3.3	Proposed Action: Language Updates	8
3.3.1	Alternative 3.1 (no-action alternative) – Language status quo	8
3.3.2	Alternative 3.2 (preferred alternative) – Adopt language changes	8
4.0.	Environmental Impact of Alternatives	8
4.1	ESA-listed Species	9
4.1.1	Affected environment.....	10
4.1.1.1	ESA-listed salmon.....	10
4.1.1.2	ESA-listed marine mammals	13
4.1.2	Environmental Effects	14
4.1.2.1	Short- and long-term impacts/Cumulative Effects of the alternatives on ESA-listed species	16
4.2	Marine Mammals.....	17
4.2.1	Affected Environment.....	17
4.2.2	Environmental Effects.....	17

4.2.2.1	Short- and long-term impacts/Cumulative Effects of the alternatives on marine mammals	18
4.3	Managed Fish Species	18
4.3.1	Affected Environment	18
4.3.2	Environmental Effects	19
4.3.2.1	Short- and long-term impacts/ Cumulative Effects of the alternatives on managed fish stocks	20
4.4	Socioeconomics	21
4.4.1	Affected Environment	21
4.4.2	Environmental Effects	23
4.4.2.1	Short- and long-term impacts/Cumulative effects of the alternatives on socioeconomics	24
5.0	Agencies and Persons Consulted	25
6.0	References	26
Appendix A. Comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment		30
Public Comment Received		30
NMFS' Response		30
Appendix B. Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)		31

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

CCC coho	California Central California Coast coho
Council	Pacific Fishery Management Council, also PFMC
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone (3-200 NM offshore)
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FB	Fort Bragg management area in California
FMP	Fishery Management Plan
KC	California portion of the Klamath Management Zone
KMZ	Klamath Management Zone
KO	Oregon portion of the Klamath Management Zone
KOHM	Klamath Ocean Harvest Model
KRFC	Klamath River fall-run Chinook salmon
lat.	Latitude
MSST	Minimum Stock Size Threshold.
MSY	Maximum sustainable yield
nmi	Nautical miles
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
PFMC	Pacific Fishery Management Council, also Council
SHM	Sacramento Harvest Model
S _{MSY}	Maximum sustainable yield (MSY) spawner abundance. The abundance of adult spawners that is expected, on average, to produce MSY
SONCC coho	Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast coho
Spp	Species
SRFC	Sacramento River Fall-run Chinook salmon
STT	Salmon Technical Team of the PFMC

1.0 Introduction

Ocean salmon fisheries in the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), 3-200 nautical miles (nmi) off the coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California, are managed by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA). Pursuant to the MSA, these salmon fisheries are managed according to the Council's Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery Management Plan (FMP) (PFMC 2016). The FMP is amended periodically to address the changing needs of fishery management.

At its November 2019 meeting, the Council decided to consider developing Amendment 20 to the FMP to address two primary topics: 1) an adjustment to the annual preseason salmon schedule and 2) a modification to the southern boundary of the Klamath Management Zone (KMZ). In addition, the Council identified minor changes to update language in the FMP to include in the proposed amendment.

The Council adopted preliminary alternatives for public comment at its June 2020 meeting and adopted final preferred alternatives for the primary topics at its September 2020 meeting. The Council considered the information developed by the Salmon Technical Team (STT) (O'Farrell and Letvin 2019) and by the Amendment 20 Workgroup (PFMC and NMFS 2020) in making its decision.

This environmental assessment (EA) was prepared using the 1978 Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations. NEPA reviews initiated prior to the effective date of the 2020 CEQ regulations may be conducted using the 1978 version of the regulations. The effective date of the 2020 CEQ NEPA Regulations was September 14, 2020, and reviews begun after this date are required to apply the 2020 regulations unless there is a clear and fundamental conflict with an applicable statute [85 Fed. Reg. at 43372-73 (§§ 1506.13, 1507.3(a))]. This EA began on July 1, 2020, and the agency has decided to proceed under the 1978 regulations. However, the agency has organized the EA consistent with the 2020 regulations and includes analysis consistent with both the 1978 regulations and the 2020 regulations.

2.0 Background

2.1 KMZ Boundary Change

The Council uses management boundaries and zones to manage the ocean salmon harvest consistent with the objectives in the FMP. These boundaries or zones are specified in the annual management measures and may change from year to year. Others remain relatively constant and, as described in section 6.1 of the FMP, changes to these boundaries or zones may require special justification and documentation, the KMZ is one of these relatively constant zones. Since at least 1990, the KMZ has extended from Humbug

Mountain, Oregon, to Horse Mountain, California. The area south of Horse Mountain to Point Arena is the Fort Bragg salmon management area (FB) (Figure 1-1). Representatives of the commercial salmon fishery first proposed moving the boundary line from Horse Mountain (lat. 40°05' N) north to lat. 40°10' N at the Council's March 2016 meeting (Helliwell 2016). This change would make the KMZ boundary consistent with a management boundary in the Council's Pacific Coast Groundfish FMP and would address additional concerns from fishery participants regarding navigational safety and fishery accessibility (Helliwell 2016). The proposal to move the boundary was presented at several Council meetings since 2016 and received support from the Council's Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS).




Figure 1-1. Map of the California Klamath Management Zone (KC) and Fort Bragg (FB) salmon management area showing the current boundary at Horse Mountain and the proposed boundary at lat. 40°10' N (Source: O'Farrell and Letvin 2019).

2.2 Preseason Schedule Change

Chapter 9 of the FMP contains the schedule and procedures for preseason modification of regulations (preseason schedule). The annual preseason schedule extends from March to May. The schedule in the FMP addresses the timing of announcement of meeting dates and locations, Council meetings at which the Council develops its recommended management measures, and availability of the STT's analytical documents (the annual Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) document and the STT's Preseason Reports). The current preseason schedule concludes with the publication of the annual management measures in the Federal Register by NMFS during the first week of May, which corresponds with the traditional May 1 start date for many ocean salmon fisheries. However, it has become increasingly challenging for the Council and NMFS to complete the necessary environmental and economic analyses and regulatory documentation in time for the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) to approve and implement the Council's annual recommendation by May 1.

At its September 2020 meeting, the Council adopted a change to the schedule in the FMP such that NMFS would publish the annual management measures in the Federal Register in mid-May with an anticipated effective date of May 16 (see NMFS 2019). Early May salmon fisheries would be established in the previous year's Federal Register notice of annual management measures and modified as needed through inseason action in the spring, much as has been done for March and April salmon fisheries since at least 1994 (Federal Register Volume 59, Number 85, unknown page number, May 4, 1994, Federal Register document number 94-10722, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-1994-05-04/html/94-10722.htm>).

2.3 FMP Language Updates

In addition, as discussed above, the Council identified several items in the FMP that no longer reflect current information, and therefore recommended the following updates as part of this FMP amendment.

In 2015, NMFS approved changes to the management reference point values for three stocks of salmon managed under the FMP: Southern Oregon coastal Chinook salmon, Grays Harbor fall-run Chinook salmon, and Willapa Bay natural coho (80 FR 19564, April 13, 2015). The reference points included in that action have been used in fishery management since the final rule implementing them was promulgated. However, the text of the FMP includes the prior reference point values that the 2015 reference points superseded. Amendment 20 updates the reference points to represent the correct values.

Other minor housekeeping changes being made in Amendment 20 include: correcting spelling errors, updating document references, and updating language to reflect the merger of NMFS' Northwest and Southwest Regions, which occurred in 2013.

2.4 Purpose and Need

The purpose for the boundary change is to change the boundary between the KMZ and the Fort Bragg management area from lat. 40°05' N (Horse Mountain) to lat. 40°10' N to increase efficiency in fishery management. The purpose of the schedule change is to provide the Council and NMFS with sufficient time to complete the necessary environmental and economic analyses and regulatory documentation in time for the Secretary to approve and implement the Council's annual recommendation by the start date for the bulk of the annual salmon fisheries. The purpose of the language updates is to bring the FMP up to date with current information.

The need for the boundary change is to simplify management of the fishery by aligning the southern boundary of the KMZ with an existing management boundary used in the groundfish fishery and to address navigational safety and fishery accessibility concerns raised by the local commercial ocean salmon fishery participants. The need for the schedule change is to provide increased certainty that the annual management measures will be effective on the date anticipated by the Council, state and tribal fishery managers, and the public. The need for the language updates is to keep the FMP up to date with current information, including terminology, references, and management reference points.

2.5 Public Involvement

On February 9, 2021, NMFS published a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register and solicited public input on the proposed Amendment 20 (86 FR 8750). In the Notice of Availability, NMFS also announced the availability of a draft EA, analyzing the environmental impacts of the proposed actions under Amendment 20, for public review and comment. The public comment period closed April 12, 2021. We received three unique comments on Amendment 20. One of these comments specifically addressed the draft EA. This comment resulted in an update to chapter 4 in the final EA. The full text of the comment, and NMFS' response, can be found in Appendix A to this document.

3.0 Description of Alternatives

3.1 Proposed Action: Boundary Change

The KMZ has been used in managing ocean salmon fisheries since at least 1988, when it was described in the annual management measures as extending from Orford Reef, Oregon, to Horse Mountain (53 FR 16002, May 5, 1998). The KMZ has been included in the FMP since Amendment 14 (effective June 29, 2001) and is currently defined as extending from Humbug Mountain to Horse Mountain. In ocean salmon fishery management, Horse Mountain, at lat. 40°05' N, is the current boundary between the KMZ to the north and FB to the south. A portion of the KMZ, from Humboldt South Jetty (lat. 40°45'53" N) to Horse Mountain, has been closed annually to commercial salmon fishing since at least 1996.

Since 2016, representatives of the commercial salmon fishery have periodically requested that the Council move the KMZ/FB boundary line 5 nmi north, from Horse Mountain (lat. 40°05' N) to lat. 40°10' N. Proponents of the boundary move have cited the following reasons in support of the move: (1) concurrence with an existing management boundary for groundfish for “ease of management and enforcement,” (2) expansion of commercial fishing opportunity north of Point Arena, (3) placing the fishery closer to the port of Eureka, California, with the potential to rebuild fishery infrastructure and market opportunities at that port, and (4) to improve navigational safety for the salmon fleet in the area (Helliwell 2016). Moving the KMZ/FB boundary line 5 nmi north would result in the area between Horse Mountain (lat. 40°05' N) north and lat. 40°10' N, which had been managed as part of the KMZ, to be managed as part of the FB management area. While this area has been part of the Humboldt South Jetty to Horse Mountain portion of the KMZ that has been closed to commercial salmon fishing for many years, it is reasonable to assume that the area from Horse Mountain to lat. 40°10' N would be open to commercial salmon fishing under annual management measures for the FB management area under the proposed action.

Section 6.1 of the FMP identifies a limited number of management boundaries or zones, including the KMZ, for which “changes to these boundaries or zones may require special justification and documentation” (PFMC 2016). Therefore, the Council and NMFS determined that moving the KMZ/FB boundary should be considered through the FMP amendment process. The Council considered the three alternatives described below.

3.1.1 Alternative 1.1 (no-action alternative) – KMZ/FB Status Quo

The FMP currently places the boundary between the KMZ and FB management zone at Horse Mountain (lat. 40°05' N). Under the Status quo Alternative, there would be no change to this boundary in the FMP.

3.1.2 Alternative 1.2 (preferred alternative) – KMZ/FB Boundary Move

Under the KMZ/FB Boundary Move Alternative, the FMP would be amended to move the boundary between the KMZ and FB management zone from Horse Mountain (lat. 40°05' N) to lat. 40°10' N.

3.1.3 Alternative 1.3 – KMZ/FB Boundary Move with Conservation Zone

Under the KMZ Boundary Move with Conservation Zone Alternative, the FMP would be amended to move the boundary between the KMZ and FB management zone from Horse Mountain (lat. 40°05' N) to lat. 40°10' N, as under Alternative 1.2, and establish a conservation zone from lat. 40°05' N five nautical miles north to lat. 40°10' N during years when the *de minimis* provisions of the Klamath River fall-run Chinook (KRFC) salmon control rule are implemented (see section 3.3.6 in PFMC 2016).

3.2 Proposed Action: Schedule Change

The annual preseason schedule for setting annual management measures for ocean salmon fisheries is detailed in Chapter 9 of the FMP. The Council adopts a range of management alternatives at its March meeting and provides for approximately one month to receive public comment on these alternatives. The final suite of annual management measures is adopted at the Council's April meeting and, under the current FMP, NMFS is expected to publish these measures in the Federal Register during the first week of May. A footnote in the FMP states that the intent in scheduling the Council meeting in April is that this should leave sufficient time for the Council's final recommendations to be promulgated into federal regulations by May 1, and the Council has developed the management measures such that the earliest fisheries start on or around May 1.

In recent years it has become increasingly difficult for the Council and NMFS to complete the necessary environmental and economic analyses and regulatory documentation in time for the Secretary to approve and implement the Council's annual recommendation by May 1. In 2019, the final rule that implemented the annual management measures published on May 6, and in 2020, the final rule published on May 8.

The proposed action would change the schedule to assume the annual management measures will be published as a rule in the second or third week of May, rather than the first week of May, and to structure the annual management measures so the earliest fisheries start May 16 instead of May 1. The Council considered three alternatives for the schedule change.

In addition to the schedule change, the Council considered a proposal to include a requirement that the annual management measures recommendation be transmitted to NMFS no fewer than 24 days before the measures were expected to take effect. The Council considered two alternatives for the transmittal deadline.

3.2.1 Alternative 2.1 (no-action alternative) – Schedule status quo

Under the status quo alternative, there would be no change to the preseason schedule in Chapter 9 of the FMP. The expectation would continue to be that NMFS would promulgate the annual management measures through publication in the Federal Register in the first week of May and the effective date would continue to be May 1.

3.2.2 Alternative 2.2 – Annual effective date May 15

Under Alternative 2.2., the preseason schedule in Chapter 9 of the FMP would be changed to anticipate NMFS' promulgation of the annual management measures through publication in the Federal Register in mid-May with an effective date of May 15.

3.2.3 Alternative 2.3 (preferred alternative) – Annual effective date May 16

Under Alternative 2.2., the preseason schedule in Chapter 9 of the FMP would be changed to anticipate NMFS' promulgation of the annual management measures through publication in the Federal Register in mid-May with an effective date of May 16.

3.2.4 Alternative 2.4 (preferred alternative) – No transmittal deadline

Alternative 2.4 would maintain the status quo of no deadline to the schedule in Chapter 9 of the FMP for Council transmittal of the annual management measures recommendation to NMFS.

3.2.5 Alternative 2.5 – 24-day transmittal deadline

Alternative 2.5 would include the addition of a deadline to the schedule in Chapter 9 of the FMP for Council transmittal of the annual management measures recommendation to NMFS that provides 24 days for NMFS to approve and implement the annual management measures.

3.3 Proposed Action: Language Updates

The Council considered a number of proposed language updates to the FMP in a mark-up of the FMP titled “Proposed Housekeeping Changes” (see Council briefing book for September 2020, Agenda Item H.2).¹ These included updating information in the FMP to reflect rulemaking actions that had occurred previously, and updating references to the NMFS Northwest and Southwest Regional Administrators to reflect the 2013 merger into the West Coast Region.

3.3.1 Alternative 3.1 (no-action alternative) – Language status quo

The no-action alternative would not update language in the FMP as suggested in the proposed housekeeping changes document.

3.3.2 Alternative 3.2 (preferred alternative) – Adopt language changes

This alternative would update language in the FMP as suggested in the proposed housekeeping changes document. This was the Council's preferred alternative and includes all suggested changes in the referenced document.

4.0. Environmental Impact of Alternatives

The proposed change to the preseason schedule and updates to language in the FMP are administrative in nature and are not expected to have environmental effects. Therefore, there are no effects of those parts

¹ PPMC September 2020 Briefing Book, Agenda Item H.2, Supplemental Revised Attachment 2, Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery Management Plan: Amendment 20: Proposed Housekeeping Changes. Available: <https://www.ppcouncil.org/documents/2020/09/h-2-supplemental-revised-attachment-2-pacific-coast-salmon-fishery-management-plan-amendment-20-proposed-housekeeping-changes.pdf/> (website accessed December 2, 2020).

of the proposed action to amend the FMP to analyze in this chapter. The environmental impact of the alternatives for the proposed boundary change are analyzed below.

Council-managed salmon fisheries are divided into those that occur north of Cape Falcon, Oregon (U.S./Canada border to Cape Falcon) and south of Cape Falcon (Cape Falcon to U.S./Mexico border). The proposed action is in the area south of Cape Falcon. The analysis area for the proposed action is the KMZ from Humbug Mountain (lat. 42°40'30" N) to Horse Mountain (lat. 40°05' N). The Council manages ocean salmon fisheries in the KMZ in two subareas: the Oregon KMZ (KO) from Humbug Mountain to the Oregon/California border, and the California KMZ (KC) from the Oregon/California border to Horse Mountain. The focus of the proposed action is in the KC management area (see section 8.1 in PFMC and NMFS 2020 for a description of the KC management area).

NMFS determined that the following resources could potentially be affected by the proposed action and are, therefore, the resources that are analyzed in this EA: species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), marine mammals, managed fish species, and socioeconomics. Although the proponents of the boundary change cited positive impact on safety at sea, the Council's Enforcement Consultants testified that the boundary change would not impact safety or freedom of navigation (Enforcement Consultants 2020); therefore, safety at sea is not analyzed in this EA. The proposed action is not likely to result in any large adverse impacts to the environment that could have disproportionately large or adverse effects on members of Environmental Justice communities in the analysis area.

4.1 ESA-listed Species

The Council-managed salmon fisheries affect a number of ESA-listed species. NMFS has consulted under section 7 of the ESA on the impacts of the fisheries on several evolutionarily significant units (ESUs) of salmon (Waples 1991) and one distinct population segment (DPS) of killer whale. The biological opinions resulting from these consultations include any terms and conditions, reasonable and prudent measures (RPMs), and reasonable and prudent alternatives (RPAs) necessary for managing ocean salmon fisheries without jeopardizing the ESA-listed species. See Table 4-1 for a list of biological opinions issued by NMFS on the effects of ocean salmon fisheries on ESA-listed species. Several of these species occur south of Cape Falcon, including eight ESUs of ESA-listed salmon (see Table 4-2). ESA-listed species that are affected by ocean salmon fisheries in the analysis area are discussed below.

Table 4-1. NMFS ESA Biological Opinions regarding Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs) and Distinct Population Segments (DPSs) affected by PFMC Fisheries.

Date	Duration	Species Considered
Salmonid Species		
March 8, 1996	until reinitiated	Snake River spring/summer and fall Chinook Snake River sockeye
April 28, 1999	until reinitiated	S. Oregon/N. California Coast (SONCC) coho Central California Coast (CCC) coho Oregon Coast natural coho
April 28, 2000	until reinitiated	Central Valley Spring-run Chinook California Coastal Chinook
April 27, 2001	until withdrawn	Hood Canal summer-run chum
April 30, 2001	until reinitiated	Upper Willamette River Chinook Columbia River chum Ozette Lake sockeye Upper Columbia River spring-run Chinook Ten listed steelhead DPSs
June 13, 2005	until reinitiated	California Coastal Chinook
April 4, 2015	until reinitiated	Lower Columbia River coho
March 3, 2018	until reinitiated	Sacramento River winter-run Chinook
April 29, 2004	until reinitiated	Puget Sound Chinook
April 26, 2012	until reinitiated	Lower Columbia River Chinook
Non-Salmonid Species		
May 5, 2009	Reinitiated in 2019	Southern Resident Killer Whales

Table 4-2. ESA-listed salmon within the South of Cape Falcon management area.

ESA-listed ESUs	Status
Chinook salmon (<i>O. tshawytscha</i>)	
Sacramento River Winter-run	Endangered
Lower Columbia River	Threatened
Central Valley Spring-run	Threatened
California Coastal	Threatened
Coho salmon (<i>O. kisutch</i>)	
Central California Coastal (CCC)	Endangered
Southern Oregon/Northern California Coastal (SONCC)	Threatened
Oregon Coastal	Threatened
Lower Columbia River	Threatened

4.1.1 Affected environment

4.1.1.1 ESA-listed salmon

Several ESUs of Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) that are ESA-listed as threatened or endangered occur in the ocean in the area south of Cape Falcon, Oregon (Table 4-2). Of the ESA-listed salmon listed in table 4-2, the ESUs that are known to be affected by ocean salmon fisheries in the analysis area are:

California Coastal Chinook, Central California Coast coho (CCC coho), and Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast coho (SONCC coho) (O’Farrell and Letvin 2019). These ESA-listed species can be encountered in salmon fisheries targeting non-ESA-listed salmon stocks such as KRFC. Take of these ESA-listed species in the ocean salmon fishery can occur through incidental harvest (including misidentified harvest) or hooking mortality (including hook-and-release mortality and dropoff mortality) (O’Farrell and Letvin 2019). NMFS has consulted under section 7 of the ESA on the impacts of Council-managed salmon fisheries on these ESA-listed salmon. Meeting the ESA biological opinion requirements for California Coastal Chinook salmon (threatened) and CCC coho salmon (endangered) often constrains ocean salmon fisheries in the KC area.

California Coastal Chinook salmon ESU (threatened)

The California Coastal Chinook salmon ESU includes naturally spawned Chinook salmon originating from rivers and streams south of the Klamath River to, and including, the Russian River (70 FR 37159, June 28, 2005); this distribution overlaps the analysis area, including the Mattole River which flows into the ocean at lat. 40°18' N, and is considered a critical component of the California Coastal Chinook ESU (O’Farrell and Letvin 2019). This ESU has been ESA-listed as threatened since 1999. NMFS’s most recently completed review of this ESU (NMFS 2016) expressed concern about extremely low number of Chinook salmon in most populations in the “North-Central Coast and Central Coast strata” (NMFS 2016) which include most of the key populations in the California Coastal Chinook salmon ESU.

The biological opinion on impacts from the ocean salmon fisheries managed under the FMP on California Coastal Chinook salmon (NMFS 2000) includes an RPA that limits ocean salmon fishery impacts on non-ESA-listed KRFC as a surrogate for ocean salmon fishery impacts on ESA-listed California Coastal Chinook salmon.² These surrogate impacts are used because there is no methodology available to directly measure fishery impacts on the California Coastal Chinook salmon ESU, which has no hatchery component. NMFS has investigated alternative methods for assessing ocean salmon fishery impacts on California Coastal Chinook salmon (e.g., O’Farrell et al. 2012, O’Farrell et al. 2015) including a multi-agency workshop in 2014 (O’Farrell et al. 2015). At the 2014 workshop, Satterthwaite presented a study based on genetic stock identification (GSI) comparing distribution and catch per unit effort (CPUE) data between California Coastal Chinook salmon and KRFC (Satterthwaite et al. 2014). The limited GSI data suggest that California Coastal Chinook salmon and KRFC exhibit similar distributions in spring and early summer, but by August CPUE for California Coastal Chinook salmon increases in the FB area while

² This RPA was revised in 2005 to account for observed performance of the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (McInnes 2005).

KRFC CPUE shifts to the northern portion of California KMZ, near the Klamath River mouth (Satterthwaite et al. 2014). The divergence of these two stocks in late summer may reflect migration of these salmon to their natal streams (O'Farrell et al. 2015). The low sample size of California Coastal Chinook salmon in this study prohibited making strong inference about differences in spatial distributions (Satterthwaite et al. 2014, O'Farrell et al. 2015). The conclusion from the 2014 workshop was that alternative methods of managing ocean salmon fishery impacts on California Coastal Chinook salmon are technically difficult at this time. Lacking a new, reliable methodology, the existing RPA continues to represent the best available science for managing ocean salmon fishery impacts on ESA-listed California Coastal Chinook salmon.

CCC coho (endangered)

The CCC coho ESU includes naturally spawned coho salmon originating from rivers south of Punta Gorda, Humboldt County, California, to, and including, Aptos Creek, as well as such coho salmon originating from tributaries to San Francisco Bay; this distribution overlaps the analysis area. This ESU also includes coho salmon from two hatchery, or artificial propagation, programs: (1) Don Clausen Fish Hatchery Captive Broodstock Program and (2) Southern Coho Salmon Captive Broodstock Program. This ESU was originally ESA-listed as threatened in 1996, but was reclassified to endangered in 2005 (70 FR 37159, June 28, 2005). This ESU is currently considered critically endangered and is one of NMFS' Species in the Spotlight.³

The biological opinion for CCC coho and SONCC coho (NMFS 1999) includes an RPA for CCC coho that prohibits coho-directed fisheries and coho retention in Chinook-directed fisheries off California. This RPA continues a prohibition on coho retention that had been reiterated annually in the Council's recommended management measures since 1994. The purpose of this RPA is to limit salmon fishery impacts on CCC coho. As retention of coho salmon in ocean salmon fisheries is prohibited throughout California, any fishery mortality incurred by coho salmon, including the CCC coho ESU, in the California portion of the analysis area is limited to hook-and-release mortality, dropoff mortality, and misidentified harvest (PFMC and NMFS 2020).

SONCC coho salmon ESU (threatened)

This ESU includes naturally spawned coho salmon originating from coastal streams and rivers between Cape Blanco, Oregon, and Punta Gorda, Humboldt County, California; this distribution overlaps the

³ NMFS launched the "Species in the Spotlight" initiative in 2015 to bring greater attention and marshal resources to save highly at-risk species: <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/topic/endangered-species-conservation#species-in-the-spotlight>.

analysis area. Coho salmon from three hatchery, or artificial propagation, programs are also included in the ESU: (1) Cole Rivers Hatchery Program (ODFW Stock #52), (2) Trinity River Hatchery Program, and (3) Iron Gate Hatchery Program. This ESU has been ESA-listed as threatened since 1997 (70 FR 37159, June 28, 2005).

Retention of coho has not been allowed in California ocean salmon fisheries since 1994. This prohibition was initially implemented through the Council's annual management measures, and in 1999 it was included as an RPA for CCC coho in NMFS' biological opinion (NMFS 1999). As retention of coho salmon in ocean salmon fisheries is prohibited throughout California, any fishery mortality incurred by coho, including SONCC coho, in the California portion of the analysis area is limited to hook-and-release mortality, dropoff mortality, and misidentified harvest (PFMC and NMFS 2020). The biological opinion (NMFS 1999) also includes an RPA that limits the exploitation rate on Rogue/Klamath hatchery coho stocks to 13 percent in Council-managed fisheries, to limit salmon fishery impacts on SONCC coho.

The Council develops annual management measures that are consistent with all applicable biological opinions. Ocean salmon fisheries in the KC management area are frequently constrained to meet conservation requirements for ESA-listed salmon, as detailed in the STT's annual Review of Ocean Salmon Fisheries (SAFE documents); these annual documents are available on the Council's website (<https://www.pcouncil.org/safe-documents-3/>).

4.1.1.2 *ESA-listed marine mammals*

Of the ESA-listed marine mammals that occur in the analysis area, only Southern Resident killer whales (SRKW), a DPS of *Orcinus orca*, are likely to be affected by the ocean salmon fisheries. The "resident" killer whale ecotype is dependent on fish as a prey item; the primary prey for the SRKW DPS is Chinook salmon (SRKW Workgroup 2020). The SRKW DPS occurs regularly throughout the coastal waters of the states of Washington, Oregon, and Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada; individuals are known to travel as far south as central California and as far north as Southeast Alaska (SRKW Workgroup 2020).

Salmon fisheries conducted under the FMP may directly affect SRKW through interactions with vessels and gear, and indirectly affect them by reducing prey availability. The risk assessment report, prepared by the Council's ad hoc workgroup on SRKW/salmon fishery interactions (SRKW Workgroup 2020), presented at the Council's March 2020 meeting, provides the most current information on SRKW and their predator-prey interaction with Pacific salmon. The report can be found online at:

<https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2020/02/e-3-a-srkw-workgroup-report-1-electronic-only.pdf/>.

NMFS completed an ESA consultation on the effects of implementing the Council's 2020 ocean salmon management measures on SRKW and their current and proposed critical habitat. The biological opinion, dated April 29, 2020, considered interactions with vessels and gear, and effects on prey availability (NMFS 2020). The biological opinion concluded that effects from the Council's 2020 salmon fisheries were not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the SRKW DPS or destroy or adversely modify its designated critical or proposed habitat.

At its November 2020 meeting, the Council adopted a final preferred alternative for a subsequent amendment to the FMP to include management provisions responsive to the needs of SRKW (if approved, this will be Amendment 21). NMFS is currently consulting on the effects on SRKW of Amendment 21. Amendment 21, if approved, would set a Chinook salmon annual abundance management threshold below which the Council and NMFS would implement specific steps to limit ocean salmon fishery impacts on Chinook salmon in order to increase salmon prey availability for SRKW.⁴ These steps include time and area closures and temporal shifts in fishing. As mentioned above, the annual management measures for Council salmon fisheries are developed to be consistent with all ESA biological opinions.

4.1.2 Environmental Effects

The proposed action (under Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3) would move the boundary between the KMZ and FB management areas, that is used in the annual management measures that govern the fishery, 5 nmi north and would likely result in fishery management changes within that area under the annual management measures. Annual management measures are developed to be consistent with the requirements in NMFS' biological opinions for all affected ESA-listed species (i.e., ESA-listed salmon and SRKW), as described in section 4.1.1.

As mentioned above (section 3.1) part of the analysis area, Humboldt South Jetty (lat. 40°45'53" N) to Horse Mountain, has been closed annually to commercial salmon fishing since at least 1996. The proposed action, under alternatives 1.2 and 1.3, would move the southern boundary of the KMZ 5 nmi north such that this area (between Horse Mountain (lat. 40°05' N) and lat. 40°10' N) would no longer be part of the KMZ and instead would be managed as part of the FB management area and it is reasonable to assume that the commercial fishery will then have access to this area under the annual management measures for the FB area. Lacking any recent commercial fishery data for this area, there is a degree of uncertainty in estimating how the commercial fleet will respond to having access to this area for the first

⁴ For details of the Council's adopted provisions for Amendment 21, see the Council decision document for the November 2020 Council meeting at: <https://www.pcouncil.org/november-2020-decision-summary-document/#Salmon>.

time in decades and how that might, or might not, affect fishery contacts with target and ESA-listed salmon. The STT attempted to gauge the potential fishery effort in this area through discussion with commercial fishery participants, and found that an appreciable fishery effort response to the proposed boundary change would be unlikely (O'Farrell and Letvin 2019).

The No-action Alternative (Alternative 1.1) would not change the KMZ/FB boundary. Therefore, salmon fishery impacts on ESA-listed species would be consistent with impacts in recent years, or less for SRKW if Amendment 21 is approved and implemented. The management area boundaries for the KMZ and FB management areas would remain as they have been for decades.

Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3 would move the KMZ/FB boundary 5 nmi north, expanding the FB management area. The proposed boundary change under Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3, would extend the FB management area to include waters that have been closed to commercial salmon fishing since at least 1996 (see section 3.1). As this area would now be managed as part of the FB management area, it is reasonable to assume the area would be open to commercial salmon fishing, this would create some amount of uncertainty about the effects of opening this area to commercial fishing on the salmon stocks encountered in the fisheries, because there is no recent data on factors such as contact rates and stock distribution. This uncertainty would be ameliorated to some extent by the ongoing monitoring of the fishery, and post-season reporting. Data will be gathered regarding the effects of fishing in the newly opened area, and fishery management would respond to that information in order to be consistent with objectives and harvest control rules.

Expanding the commercial salmon fishery into this previously closed area could result in an uncertain increase in ocean salmon commercial fishery contacts with coho salmon in Chinook-directed fisheries, related to any increase in fishing effort in the area. Although commercial fishers indicate that an appreciable effort response to the boundary change is unlikely, it is possible that the realized effort response to access to an area that has been closed for thirty years could be greater than expected (O'Farrell and Letvin 2019). As described above, retention of coho salmon in ocean salmon fisheries off California is not allowed; therefore, any fishery mortality incurred by coho salmon (including ESA-listed SONCC and CCC coho) between Horse Mountain and lat. 40°10' N would be limited to hook-and-release mortality, dropoff mortality, and misidentified harvest (O'Farrell and Letvin 2019). The STT's report concluded that anticipated changes to total catch are small (O'Farrell and Letvin 2019), which suggests ocean salmon fishery impacts on coho salmon resulting from the boundary change will be small.

As described in section 4.1.1.1, fishery impacts on ESA-listed California Coastal Chinook salmon may diverge from impacts on the surrogate KRFC as summer progresses, resulting in differential fishery

impacts on the two stocks in the KMZ and FB management areas (Satterthwaite et al. 2014). As there is currently no acceptable alternative for estimating impacts on ESA-listed California Coastal Chinook, the existing RPA, which is based on using fishery impacts on KRFC as a surrogate for California Coastal Chinook, represents the best available science at this time for managing ocean salmon fishery impacts on ESA-listed California Coastal Chinook salmon. The uncertainty around fishing effort with the boundary change and the effects on salmon stocks of any changes in fishing effort is added to the uncertainty around the extent to which California Coastal Chinook impacts track with KRFC impacts. However, the proposed action would move only a small area from the KMZ to the FB management area. This area includes 5 nmi of the 41 nmi coastline that has been closed to commercial salmon fishing. Most of the area that has been closed to commercial fishing for decades would remain in the KMZ and, presumably, continue to be closed to commercial salmon fishing.

Alternative 1.3 would, in addition to moving the KMZ/FB boundary, provide for a conservation zone in the expanded FB management area during years when the *de minimis* control rule for KRFC is in effect. This conservation zone could reduce the uncertainty around salmon fishery impacts on ESA-listed salmon in some years, compared with Alternative 1.2.

Regarding effects to SRKW, under any of the alternatives, annual management measures would be developed based on salmon stock forecasts to meet the collective conservation objectives in the FMP and any terms and conditions in NMFS biological opinions. Alternative 1.1 would provide the least amount of uncertainty in terms of salmon fishery impacts on Chinook salmon abundance as prey for SRKW. Alternative 1.2 would introduce some uncertainty in terms of change in fishing effort in the affected area and the resulting impacts to affected salmon stocks; however, the STT expects that any change will be small and, given that this small change would occur in a very limited geographical area, it is reasonable to expect that the proposed action would have no measurable effect on prey availability for SRKW. Alternative 1.3 would provide an additional buffer on salmon fishery impacts, compared with Alternative 1.2, on salmon that are prey for SRKW.

4.1.2.1 Short- and long-term impacts/Cumulative Effects of the alternatives on ESA-listed species

The short-term effects of the No-action Alternative would be somewhat beneficial to ESA-listed salmon species, compared with Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3, because the no-action alternative would not introduce additional uncertainty with respect to fishery impacts on ESA-listed salmon species and the area currently within the KMZ would, presumably, remain closed to commercial salmon fishing. The short-term effects of Alternative 1.2 have the potential to be somewhat adverse, given the uncertainty of commercial salmon fishery impacts on ESA-listed salmon species in the area that would now be open to commercial salmon fishing. The short-term effects of Alternative 1.3 on ESA-listed salmon species would likely be less

adverse than Alternative 1.2, due to the use of a conservation zone in some years. The long-term effects of all alternatives on ESA-listed salmon species are likely to be neither beneficial nor adverse as uncertainty around salmon fishery impacts diminishes through time as information about fishing impacts in the newly opened area is collected and fishery management responds to that information. As described above, the effects of the alternatives on SRKW are not expected to be measurable given the small numbers of salmon and small geographic area affected.

Any effects of the alternatives on ESA-listed species would be not be significant. Ocean salmon fisheries are set each year to establish annual management measures that are consistent with current stock abundance forecasts and which meet ESA-requirements to limit salmon fishery impacts on ESA-listed species through the terms and conditions, RPMs, and RPAs detailed in NMFS' ESA Section 7 biological opinions; this will not change under the action alternatives. The potential effects of any additional uncertainty are limited, as the area affected by the proposed action is small with respect both to the KMZ as a whole and to the area that has been closed to commercial fishing for many years. The STT expects a small response in salmon fishing effort, if any, as a result of the proposed action. Therefore, we expect the impact of the proposed action on ESA-listed species to not be significant.

4.2 Marine Mammals

4.2.1 Affected Environment

A number of non-ESA-listed marine mammal species occur in the analysis area. The non-ESA-listed marine mammal species that are known to interact with ocean salmon fisheries are California sea lion (*Zalophus californianus*) and harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*), both species will feed on salmon, when available, and have been documented preying on hooked salmon in commercial and recreational fisheries (e.g., Weise and Harvey 1999, 2005). Other pinnipeds, including Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*), also occur in the area and may also interact with the ocean salmon fisheries, but there is currently no available information on such interactions. Ocean salmon fisheries employ hook-and-line “troll” gear (net fishing is prohibited in these fisheries by regulation at 50 CFR 660.405(a)(1)) and are classified under NMFS' Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) List of Fisheries as Category III (85 FR 21079, April 16, 2020), indicating there is no record of substantive impacts to marine mammals from these fisheries (MMPA 118(c)(1)). Of the ESA-listed marine mammals that occur in the analysis area, only SRKW are likely to be affected by Council-managed salmon fisheries (see section 4.1, above). SRKW is discussed specifically in section 4.1 as an ESA-listed species.

4.2.2 Environmental Effects

The proposed action (under Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3) would move the boundary between the KMZ and FB management areas 5 nmi north and would likely result in fishery management changes within that

area under the annual management measures. However, the proposed action does not affect how salmon fisheries are conducted with respect to vessel operation and fishing gear and does not remove the prohibition of net fishing that is codified at 50 CFR 660.405(a)(1). Therefore, the proposed action would have no identified impact on marine mammals.

4.2.2.1 Short- and long-term impacts/Cumulative Effects of the alternatives on marine mammals

The short- and long-term effects of all alternatives on marine mammals would be neither beneficial nor adverse as the proposed action will not change how fisheries are conducted.

Any effects of the alternatives on marine mammals would be not be significant. The proposed action changes a management boundary, but does not change how ocean salmon fisheries are conducted, e.g. allowable gear-types or vessel operation. Ocean salmon fisheries will continue to be evaluated on an annual basis under section 118 of the MMPA and categorized in terms of level of incidental mortality and serious injury of marine mammals. As stated in section 4.2.1, ocean salmon fisheries off the West Coast states are currently in Category III—i.e. remote likelihood of or no known incidental mortality and serious injury of marine mammals.

4.3 Managed Fish Species

4.3.1 Affected Environment

As described in the EA for 2020 Ocean Salmon Fisheries Management Measures (NMFS and PFMC 2020) ocean salmon fisheries target Chinook and coho salmon and have little impact on non-target species. Therefore, this EA will only analyze impacts to Chinook and coho salmon. Non-salmonid managed fish species are managed under other West Coast fishery management plans and are uncommonly encountered in the salmon fishery; therefore, the proposed action will not have any effect on those managed fish species.

The primary stocks targeted in ocean salmon fisheries in the KC are Sacramento River fall-run Chinook salmon (SRFC) and KRFC. These stocks are harvested in commercial and recreational ocean salmon fisheries. NMFS determined in 2018 that these two Chinook salmon stocks met the criteria for being overfished under the MSA (83 FR 38292, August 6, 2018), based on spawning escapement for the period 2015 – 2017.⁵ The Council adopted rebuilding plans for these stocks in 2019. Annual spawning escapement and fishery impact analyses for these and other salmon stocks managed under the FMP are

⁵ The FMP (PFMC 2016) defines overfished for salmon as the following: a stock will be considered overfished if the three-year geometric mean of annual spawning escapements falls below the minimum stock size threshold (MSST).

available in the Council’s annual Review of Ocean Salmon Fisheries (SAFE document), which are available on the Council’s website (<https://www.pcouncil.org/safe-documents-3/>).

The SRFC stock is the largest contributing stock to ocean salmon fisheries off Oregon and California (O’Farrell et al. 2013), primarily between Cape Falcon and Point Conception, California. Salmon fishery impacts for SRFC are generally higher closer to San Francisco Bay, which connects the Sacramento River to the ocean. Ocean salmon fisheries south of Cape Falcon, including KC, have been constrained to meet conservation requirements for SRFC in four years of the 15-year period 2004-2018 (see the Council’s SAFE and Preseason Reports for the years 2004-2018, available on the Council’s website).

The KRFC stock is primarily contacted in ocean salmon fisheries between Cape Falcon and Point Sur, California. Salmon fishery impacts for KRFC are generally higher closer to the Klamath River mouth. KRFC are typically contacted at a higher rate by the commercial fleet than in the recreational fishery. For these reasons, commercial fisheries in areas closer to the Klamath River mouth (i.e., KO, KC, Central Oregon, and FB management areas) are the most constrained when KRFC abundance is projected to be low. Ocean salmon fisheries south of Cape Falcon, including KC, have been constrained to meet conservation requirements for KRFC in at least five years of the 15-year period 2004-2018, (see the Council’s SAFE and Preseason Reports for the years 2004-2018, available on the Council’s website).

Coho salmon have not been retained in California commercial and recreational ocean salmon fisheries since 1994 (see section 4.1.1.1.). This prohibition was included in an RPA in the biological opinion on the effects of the ocean salmon fisheries on endangered CCC coho, threatened SONCC coho, and threatened Oregon Coast natural coho (NMFS 1999).

4.3.2 Environmental Effects

The proposed action (under Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3) would move the boundary between the KMZ and FB management areas 5 nmi north and would result in fishery management changes within that area under the annual management measures. However, the proposed action does not change the conservation objectives, ACL control rules, and status determination criteria for salmon stocks managed under the FMP. The Council would continue to design annual management measures to keep their impacts within these parameters, and to prevent overfishing and provide optimum yield to the fisheries, as required under the MSA.

To assess the biological impacts of the proposed action, the STT provided a report to the Council in November 2019 (O’Farrell and Letvin 2019). The report focused on the implications of the boundary change to the models used to assess impacts to salmon stocks in the area – mainly KRFC and SRFC.

Information in this section summarizes the findings of the STT report (O’Farrell and Letvin 2019), which is incorporated by reference.

The No-action Alternative (Alternative 1.1) would have no change to the KMZ/FB boundary. Therefore, salmon fishery impacts on managed fish species would be consistent with impacts in recent years. The management area boundaries for the KMZ and FB area would remain as they have been for decades.

Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3 would move the KMZ/FB boundary 5 nmi north, expanding the FB management area. The STT analyzed the likely effects of this change on the outputs from the harvest models used to forecast fishery impacts on KRFC and SRFC: Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) and Sacramento Harvest Model (SHM), respectively. The STT found that there are small anticipated effects on the KOHM and SHM imparted by the proposed management boundary change and those effects are not substantial enough to make it necessary make changes to the existing harvest models under Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3 (O’Farrell and Letvin 2019). The STT report acknowledged that the response of the fishery to boundary change has the potential to result in changes in fishing effort (O’Farrell and Letvin 2019) which, when combined with uncertainty about fish distribution and other parameters in this long unfished area, could create uncertainty regarding fishery impacts on targeted salmon stocks. The STT’s analysis concluded that “potential changes to harvest, harvest rates, and river return projections for KRFC and SRFC resulting from this management line adjustment suggested that effects could be small” (O’Farrell and Letvin 2019).

The STT did not conduct a separate analysis of Alternative 1.3. However, it is reasonable to expect that in years when the proposed conservation zone was not in effect, the effects of Alternative 1.3 on managed fish stocks would be the same as under Alternative 1.2. In years when the conservation zone was in effect, the effects of Alternative 1.3 on managed fish stocks would be more similar to the No-action Alternative.

4.3.2.1 Short- and long-term impacts/ Cumulative Effects of the alternatives on managed fish stocks

The short-term effects of the No-action Alternative would be somewhat beneficial to managed fish stocks, compared with Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3, due to the lack of uncertainty associated with continuing the status quo salmon fishery management in the analysis area. The short-term effects of Alternative 1.2 have the potential to be somewhat adverse, given the uncertainty of commercial salmon fishery impacts on managed fish stocks in the area that would now be open to commercial salmon fishing. The short-term effects of Alternative 1.3 on managed fish stocks would likely be less adverse than Alternative 1.2, due to the use of a conservation zone in some years. The short-term adverse effects of Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3 would likely be minimal as annual management measures are developed to meet the conservation objectives in the FMP on an annual basis. The long-term effects of all alternatives on managed fish

stocks are likely to be neither beneficial nor adverse as uncertainty around salmon fishery impacts diminishes through time through observing the response of the fishery to the boundary change.

Any effects of the alternatives on managed fish species would be not be significant, based on the analysis in the STT report (O'Farrell and Letvin 2019), as described above. The STT concluded that the boundary change could lead to small effort shifts but that these did not warrant any changes to model inputs for predicting the effects of the fisheries on target stocks. Ocean salmon fisheries are set each year through a separate action to establish annual management measures that are consistent with current stock abundance forecasts and which meet management criteria specified in the FMP for each managed salmon stock (e.g., conservation objectives, harvest control rules, annual catch limits, etc.). Analytical models used in forecasting salmon stock abundance and predicting salmon fishery impacts are updated annually and re-evaluated as necessary to provide the best scientific information available for managing salmon fisheries. Therefore, any inaccuracy in the model predictions used to manage ocean salmon fisheries resulting from the boundary change would be expected to decrease through time as response of the fishery to the boundary change is observed. The STT also noted that the boundary change could result in some additional uncertainty about the incidental effects of the fisheries on coho and ESA-listed California Coastal Chinook salmon, but concluded that any effects would likely be small.

4.4 Socioeconomics

4.4.1 Affected Environment

Information on the economic impacts of the ocean salmon fishery is provided in the Council's annual Review of Ocean Salmon Fisheries (SAFE documents), which are available on the Council's website (<https://www.pcouncil.org/safe-documents-3/>). The Amendment 20 Workgroup's document (PFMC and NMFS 2020) includes a socioeconomic analysis of the proposed action in section 9.2 of that document; that analysis is incorporated by reference into this EA and is summarized as follows.

The proposed movement of the management line alone is not likely to result in a noticeable increase or decrease in total commercial or recreational effort. At the same time, the commercial stakeholders' interest in this boundary change indicates that industry expects some benefit. Under the action alternatives (Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3), this benefit could accrue through direct reduction of operating costs and/or increases in revenue or reduction in costs through a higher CPUE. Operating costs might be directly reduced in two ways. First, industry has indicated that when they are fishing along the current management line, the course they need to take to reverse direction is sometimes problematic from a safety perspective. Making the turn in a safe manner may require more time and fuel under the current management regime. Second, if there are vessels fishing in the area that leave from ports in Humboldt Bay, the 5 nmi northward move in the management line would reduce the travel distance, thereby

reducing the one-way travel time by 40 minutes and saving about 4 gallons of fuel for each vessel. After taking into account differences for steaming under load compared to steaming empty, this savings may be more than doubled for vessels that leave from and deliver back to Humboldt Bay. Efficiency may also be increased if there are times when the CPUE is higher in the newly opened area, reducing costs for a given amount of fish caught.

Salmon vessels most likely to be affected by the proposed action are those with landings in the Fort Bragg port area. Given that the primary economic impact of the action alternatives is expected to be on fishing costs rather than total catch or exvessel revenues, it is unlikely that fish buyers would be substantially affected by a move of the management line.

With respect to the recreational fishery, movement of the management line 5 nmi north would expand the extent of the FB management area by approximately 7 percent. Regarding angler trips for which an enlarged FB area might make a difference, that difference would likely relate to the quality of the trip, e.g., if there are times that higher angler success rates occur in areas north of the current management line. There are no substantial recreational launch points between the current management line at Horse Mountain and lat. 40° 10' N. Therefore, there do not appear to be opportunities for recreational vessels to substantially reduce travel time or distance.

Movement of the management line 5 nmi to the north would increase fishing area for vessels in the FB area during times when the FB area is open for recreational fishing but the KC area closed (i.e., non-overlapping days). The potential effect of this movement in the line can be considered in the context of past seasons and effort patterns. Since only those trips taken in the vicinity of the northern management line would likely be affected by the new opportunity, the number of trips potentially benefitting would likely have been substantially less than 20 to 28 percent.

For recreational vessels fishing in the KC area during times when the FB area is closed and the KC area is open, movement of the management line 5 nmi to the north might decrease the fishing area for these vessels. However, the affected area is distant and relatively isolated from recreational launch points in the KC area, such as Humboldt Bay. While movement of the line 5 nmi to the north may diminish recreational fishing opportunity in the KC area in months when the KC area is open but the FB area is closed, recreational vessels launching from ports such as Shelter Cove would still be able to transit the additional 5 nmi north to participate in the KC area fishery.

Whatever economic benefits that are provided under Alternative 1.2 might not occur under Alternative 1.3 in years in which the option to close the 5 nmi area as a conservation zone is exercised due to low KRFC abundance. Alternative 1.3 would therefore likely function like the no-action alternative

(Alternative 1.1) in those low abundance years since the KC area would likely be closed to commercial fishing. However, while this may be true for the commercial fishery, it is not necessarily true for the recreational fishery which has much lower contact rates for KRFC than the commercial fishery, allowing the sport fishery often to still occur in years of low KRFC abundance.

4.4.2 Environmental Effects

The proposed action (under Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3) would move the boundary between the KMZ and FB management areas 5 nmi north and would result in fishery management changes within that area under the annual management measures. The proposed action, in and of itself, does not have an identifiable economic impact, but could lead to economic impacts from the annual management measures that incorporate and account for the boundary change.

The socioeconomic analysis (section 9.2 in PFMC and NMFS 2020) found that, overall, impacts of the action alternatives (Alternatives 1.2 and 1.3), relative to the No-action Alternative, are not expected to affect the fishery to an extent or in a manner that it will be noticeable in the data and are not possible to estimate quantitatively due to the lack of information about stock composition and expected effort in the 5 nmi area that would be moved from being managed as part of the KC to the FB area. The report includes a qualitative analysis of: future fishing opportunities related to changing stock impacts, effects on commercial profits and CPUE, and effects on the recreational effort and experience.

The socioeconomic analysis suggests that the action alternatives might provide economic benefit from reduced operating costs, including fuel costs and improved CPUE. Alignment of the salmon and groundfish management lines at lat. 40°10' N may provide an operational benefit to the fishery. Table 4-3, taken from the Workgroup's report (PFMC and NMFS), summarizes the qualitative effects of the alternatives on the socioeconomic environment.

Table 4-3. Summary of socioeconomic impacts.

Potential Impact Areas	Alternative 1.1	Alternative 1.2	Alternative 1.3
Long Term Harvest Opportunity	Similar to baseline	Minimal chance of adverse impacts to stocks (not likely to be irretrievable, as fishery management could be responsive to any adverse impacts). Adverse impacts to stocks might result in reduced opportunity in future years.	Lower risk of adverse impacts than Alternative 2
Commercial Fishery		Possibility of some reduction in operating costs and opportunity to fish at a higher CPUE. ^{a/} Regulatory simplification by using same management line for groundfish and salmon.	Benefits anticipated under Alternative 2 would not occur in years that the 5 nmi conservation zone is closed.
Recreational Fishery		Possibility of some opportunity to fish at a higher angler success rate. ^{a/} Regulatory simplification by using same management line for groundfish and salmon.	Benefits anticipated under Alternative 2 would not occur in years that the 5 nmi conservation zone is closed.

a/ The size of the Fort Bragg area fishing grounds would be increased by about 6 percent at the northern end. If a hotspot were to appear just north of the current boundary extending to the north, the proposed change would provide harvesters with increased opportunity to fish in that hotspot with the attendant socio-economic benefits associated with higher CPUE.

4.4.2.1 Short- and long-term impacts/Cumulative effects of the alternatives on socioeconomics

The short- and long-term effects of the No-action Alternative would be similar to recent years, as there would be no change in fishery management areas and no anticipated change in how commercial and recreational fishery participants conduct their fishing activities. Alternative 1.2 would likely result in somewhat positive economic effects, in the short- and long-term, over Alternatives 1.1 and 1.3, due to the potential for reduced operating cost and increased CPUE. In years when the conservation zone is in effect, Alternative 1.3 would have short-term negative economic impact compared to Alternative 1.2 and neutral impact to Alternative 1.1.

Any effects of the alternatives on socioeconomics would be not be significant. The proposed action changes a management boundary, but does not implement ocean salmon fisheries. Ocean salmon fisheries are set each year through a separate action to establish annual management measures that are consistent with current stock abundance forecasts and which meet FMP and ESA-requirements to manage ocean salmon fishery impacts on salmon stocks. Socioeconomic impacts, therefore, are more strongly affected by salmon abundance than by the geography of management boundaries.

5.0 Agencies and Persons Consulted

The proposed action was considered at three Council meetings (November, 2019, June 2020, and September 2020). The Council includes representatives from:

- State of California
- State of Idaho
- State of Oregon
- State of Washington
- Tribal representative
- Alaska Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- National Marine Fisheries Service
- Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
- U.S. Coast Guard
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Department of State

The following organizations were consulted and/or participated in preparation of supporting documents:

- PFMC Salmon Technical Team
- PFM Scientific and Statistical Committee
- PFMC Salmon Advisory Subpanel

6.0 References

- Enforcement Consultants. 2020. Enforcement Consultants Report on Amendment 20: Annual Management Schedule And Boundary Change. Advisory Body Report submitted to the Pacific Fishery Management Council, June 2020 (Agenda Item E.3.a). Available at <https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2020/06/e-3-a-supplemental-ec-report-1.pdf/> (website accessed November 20, 2020).
- Helliwell, D. 2016. Proposal to move the northern boundary of Fort Bragg management area five miles north from latitude 40°05' N to latitude 40°10' N. Public comment submitted to the Pacific Fishery Management Council, March 2016 (Agenda Item E.4.c Supplemental Public Comment). Available at https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2016/03/e4c_supplemental_public_comment.pdf/ (website accessed October 29, 2020).
- McInnis, R. 2005. Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation on the Effects of Ocean Salmon Fisheries on California Coastal Chinook Salmon: Performance of the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model in 2004 and Implementation of the Reasonable and Prudent Alternative of the April 28, 2000, Biological Opinion. Memo to the Record from Rodney R. McInnis, Regional Administrator, NMFS Southwest Region, dated June 13, 2005. 14 p.
- NMFS. 1999. Endangered Species Act- Section 7 Consultation Supplemental Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement. The Pacific Coast Salmon Plan and Amendment 13 to the Plan. NMFS Protected Resources Division. April 28, 1999.
- NMFS. 2000. Endangered Species Act- Reinitiated Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion. Effects of the Pacific Coast Salmon Plan on California Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook, and California Coastal Chinook Salmon. NMFS Protected Resources Division. April 28, 2000.
- NMFS. 2019. Proposal for Refinement of the Pacific Fishery Management Council's Salmon Preseason Schedule. PFMC Briefing Book for September 2019. NMFS West Coast Region. Available at <https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2019/09/agenda-item-f-4-a-nmfs-report-1.pdf/> (website accessed November 4, 2020).
- NMFS. 2020. Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7(a)(2) Biological Opinion and Conference Opinion: Consultation on Implementation of the Pacific Fishery Management Council Salmon Fishery Management Plan in 2020 for Southern Resident Killer Whales and their Current and

Proposed Critical Habitat. NMFS West Coast Region. April 29, 2020. NMFS Consultation Number: WCRO-2019-04040. 149 p.

NMFS and PFMC. 2020. Final Environmental Assessment for 2020 Ocean Salmon Fisheries Management Measures. NMFS West Coast Region and the Pacific Fishery Management Council. 314 p. Available at <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/west-coast/laws-and-policies/west-coast-salmon-harvest-nepa-documents> (website accessed November 12, 2020).

O'Farrell, M. and A. Letvin. 2019. Potential implications of moving the California Klamath Management Zone/Fort Bragg salmon fishery management line from Horse Mountain north to latitude 40°10'. PFMC Briefing Book for November 2019. Available at <https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2019/10/agenda-item-e-2-attachment-1-potential-implications-of-moving-the-california-klamath-management-zone-fort-bragg-salmon-fishery-management-line-from-horse-mountain-north-to-latitude-40-10.pdf/> (website accessed October 29, 2020).

O'Farrell, M.R., W.H. Satterthwaite, and B.C. Spence. 2012. California Coastal Chinook salmon: Status, data, and feasibility of alternative fishery management measures. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-494, 34 pages. Available at <https://swfsc-publications.fisheries.noaa.gov/publications/TM/SWFSC/NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-494.pdf> (website accessed December 3, 2020).

O'Farrell, M., M. Mohr, M. Palmer-Zwahlen, and A. Grover. 2013. The Sacramento Index (SI). U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-512, 41 pages. Available at <https://swfsc-publications.fisheries.noaa.gov/publications/TM/SWFSC/NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-512.pdf> (website accessed November 6, 2020).

O'Farrell, M., S. Allen-Moran, K. Atkinson, P. Dygert, S. Gallagher, A. Grover, B. Kormos, M. Lacy, E. Larson, M. Mohr, S. Ricker, W. Satterthwaite, and B. Spence. 2015. California Coastal Chinook salmon fishery management: Future prospects. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-542, 20 pages. Available at <https://swfsc-publications.fisheries.noaa.gov/publications/TM/SWFSC/NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-542.pdf> (website accessed December 3, 2020).

PFMC. 2016. Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery Management Plan for Commercial and Recreational Salmon Fisheries off the Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California as Amended through Amendment

19. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, OR. 91 p. Available at <https://www.pcouncil.org/fishery-management-plan-and-amendments-3/> (website accessed October 29, 2020).
- PFMC and NMFS. 2020. Analytical document organized as a preliminary draft Environmental Assessment with updated range of alternatives for Amendment 20 of the Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery Management Plan: Proposed Change to the preseason schedule and to the Klamath Management Zone Boundary. PFMC Briefing Book for September 2020. Available at <https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2020/08/h-2-attachment-1-analytical-document-organized-as-a-preliminary-draft-environmental-assessment-with-updated-range-of-alternatives-for-amendment-20-of-the-pacific-coast-salmon-fishery-management-plan.pdf/> (website accessed October 29, 2020).
- Satterthwaite WH, Mohr M, O'Farrell MR, Anderson EC, Banks MA, Bates SJ, Bellinger MR, Borgerson LA, Crandall ED, Garza JC, Kormos BJ, Lawson PW, and Palmer-Zwahlen ML. 2014. Use of genetic stock identification data for comparison of the ocean spatial distribution, size at age, and fishery exposure of an untagged stock and its indicator: California Coastal versus Klamath River Chinook salmon. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 143:117-133.
- SRKW Workgroup. 2020. Pacific Fishery Management Council Salmon Fishery Management Plan Impacts to Southern Resident Killer Whales: Final Draft Risk Assessment. PFMC Briefing Book for March 2020. Available at <https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2020/02/e-3-a-srkw-workgroup-report-1-electronic-only.pdf/> (website accessed November 6, 2020).
- Waples, R. S. 1991. Definition of “species” under the Endangered Species Act: Application to Pacific salmon. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, F/NWC-94, 29 p.
- Weise, M.J. and J.T. Harvey. 1999. Food habits of California sea lions (*Zalophus californicus*) and their impact on salmonid fisheries in Monterey Bay, California. Report submitted to Fishermen’s Alliance of California. Moss Landing Marine Laboratories (MLML) Technical Publication No. 99-01, 39 p. Available online at: <http://islandora.mlml.calstate.edu/islandora/object/islandora%3A2382/datastream/OBJ/view> (website accessed November 5, 2020).
- Weise, M.J. and J.T. Harvey. 2005. Impact of the California sea lion (*Zalophus californicus*) on salmon fisheries in Monterey Bay, California. *Fish. Bull.* . 103:685–696. Available online at:

<https://spo.nmfs.noaa.gov/content/impact-california-sea-lion-zalophus-californianus-salmon-fisheries-monterey-bay-california> (website accessed December 22, 2020).

Appendix A. Comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment

NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) published a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register for Amendment 20 to the Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery Management Plan (FMP); the notice included a request for comments on the draft environmental assessment (EA) (86 FR 8750, February 9, 2021). The public comment period on this notice was 60 days, as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act. We received three unique comments on this action. One of these comments specifically addressed the draft EA, this comment is included below.

Public Comment Received

Hello, we are three Natural Resource Management majors from Grand Valley State University and we are currently taking a course on Natural Resource Policy. We are very passionate about the environment and wanted to address your Environmental Assessment for the Salmon FMP Amendment. We believe that alternative 1.3 is the best option for your proposed actions.

Alternative 1.3 provides a conservation area that helps reduce uncertainty around salmon fishery impacts. We think this is important because alternative 1.2 has no recent data on contact rates and stock distribution which would create uncertainty with the area being open for commercial fishing. The area has ESA-listed species, so reducing any uncertainty about the effects on these species is crucial. That being said, the research done suggests that moving the management boundary will not have significant effects on the ESA-listed species and they expect limited uncertainty because of how small the area is. Additionally, the report says that the STT expects a small response in salmon fishing effort in this area, but we are curious how this information is known.

Overall this Environmental Assessment does a good job taking a hard look at the environmental impacts of all the alternatives suggested. They examined the biophysical impacts and the economic impacts in depth. The only thing missing is the social and cultural impacts, such as environmental justice. The movement of this boundary should not have significant environmental or economic consequences, because as suggested in this Environmental Assessment, this is a proposal to move a boundary, not to change how the fisheries are conducted.

NMFS' Response

NMFS appreciates the interest in Amendment 20 and the commenter's thoughtful support of Alternative 1.3. The Pacific Fishery Management Council adopted Alternative 1.2 and recommended it to NMFS for approval by the Secretary of Commerce. As noted by the commenter, the draft EA did not include a section on Environmental Justice. This was not included in the draft EA because NMFS found there was no Environmental Justice impact to analyze. We have added a statement to this effect in chapter 4 of the final EA.

Appendix B. Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Background

Proposed Action:

The proposed action is to amend the Pacific Fishery Management Council's (Council) Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery Management Plan (FMP) to change the boundary between the Klamath Management zone (KMZ) and the Fort Bragg management area (FB), modify the preseason schedule, and update out-of-date language in the FMP. Amendment 20 to the FMP comprises these actions. Details can be found in the Environmental Assessment (EA).

This FONSI and EA were prepared using the 1978 Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations. NEPA reviews initiated prior to the effective date of the 2020 CEQ regulations may be conducted using the 1978 version of the regulations. The effective date of the 2020 CEQ NEPA Regulations was September 14, 2020. This review began on July 1, 2020, and the agency has decided to proceed under the 1978 regulations. However, the agency has organized the EA consistent with the 2020 regulations and includes analysis consistent with both the 1978 regulations, and the 2020 regulations.

Alternatives Evaluated in the Environmental Assessment:

KMZ Boundary Change Alternatives

Alternative 1.1 (no-action alternative) – KMZ/FB Status Quo

The FMP currently places the boundary between the KMZ and FB management zone at Horse Mountain (lat. 40°05' N). Under the Status quo Alternative, there would be no change to this boundary in the FMP.

Alternative 1.2 (preferred alternative) – KMZ/FB Boundary Move

Under the KMZ/FB Boundary Move Alternative, the FMP would be amended to move the boundary between the KMZ and FB management zone from Horse Mountain (lat. 40°05' N) to lat. 40°10' N.

Alternative 1.3 – KMZ/FB Boundary Move with Conservation Zone

Under the KMZ Boundary Move with Conservation Zone Alternative, the FMP would be amended to move the boundary between the KMZ and FB management zone from Horse Mountain (lat. 40°05' N) to lat. 40°10' N, as under Alternative 1.2, and establish a conservation zone from lat. 40°05' N five nautical miles north to lat. 40°10' N during years when the *de minimis* provisions of the Klamath River fall-run Chinook (KRFC) salmon control rule are implemented (see section 3.3.6 in PFMC 2016).



Schedule Change Alternatives

Alternative 2.1 (no-action alternative) – Schedule status quo

Under the status quo alternative, there would be no change to the preseason schedule in Chapter 9 of the FMP. The expectation would continue to be that NMFS would promulgate the annual management measures through publication in the Federal Register in the first week of May and the effective date would continue to be May 1.

Alternative 2.2 – Annual effective date May 15

Under Alternative 2.2., the preseason schedule in Chapter 9 of the FMP would be changed to anticipate NMFS' promulgation of the annual management measures through publication in the Federal Register in mid-May with an effective date of May 15.

Alternative 2.3 (preferred alternative) – Annual effective date May 16

Under Alternative 2.2., the preseason schedule in Chapter 9 of the FMP would be changed to anticipate NMFS' promulgation of the annual management measures through publication in the Federal Register in mid-May with an effective date of May 16.

Alternative 2.4 (preferred alternative) – No transmittal deadline

Alternative 2.4 would maintain the status quo of no deadline to the schedule in Chapter 9 of the FMP for Council transmittal of the annual management measures recommendation to NMFS.

Alternative 2.5 – 24-day transmittal deadline

Alternative 2.5 would include the addition of a deadline to the schedule in Chapter 9 of the FMP for Council transmittal of the annual management measures recommendation to NMFS that provides 24 days for NMFS to approve, and implement the annual management measures.

Language Updates Alternatives

Alternative 3.1 (no-action alternative) – Language status quo

The no-action alternative would not update language in the FMP as suggested in the proposed housekeeping changes document.

Alternative 3.2 (preferred alternative) – Adopt language changes

This alternative would update language in the FMP as suggested in the proposed housekeeping changes document. This was the Council's preferred alternative, and includes all suggested changes in the referenced document.

Selected Alternatives:

Alternative 1.2. KMZ Boundary move to lat. 40°10' N.

Alternative 2.3. Schedule change with annual effective date of May 16.

Alternative 2.4. No transmittal deadline.

Alternative 3.2. Adopt language changes.

Related Consultations:

There are no consultations specific to the proposed action; however, there are several Endangered Species Act (ESA) section 7 consultations on the ocean salmon fisheries impacts on ESA-listed evolutionarily significant units (ESUs) of salmon and one on an ESA-listed distinct population segment (DPS) of marine mammal, the Southern Resident killer whale DPS (SRKW). Table 4-1 below, reproduced from the EA, provides a list of the current applicable ESA section 7 biological opinions relative to ESA-listed species.

Table 4-1. NMFS ESA Biological Opinions regarding Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs) and Distinct Population Segments (DPSs) affected by PFMC Fisheries.

Date	Duration	Species Considered
Salmonid Species		
March 8, 1996	until reinitiated	Snake River spring/summer and fall Chinook Snake River sockeye
April 28, 1999	until reinitiated	S. Oregon/N. California Coast (SONCC) coho Central California Coast (CCC) coho Oregon Coast natural coho
April 28, 2000	until reinitiated	Central Valley Spring-run Chinook California Coastal Chinook
April 27, 2001	until withdrawn	Hood Canal summer-run chum
April 30, 2001	until reinitiated	Upper Willamette River Chinook Columbia River chum Ozette Lake sockeye Upper Columbia River spring-run Chinook Ten listed steelhead DPSs
June 13, 2005	until reinitiated	California Coastal Chinook
April 4, 2015	until reinitiated	Lower Columbia River coho
March 3, 2018	until reinitiated	Sacramento River winter-run Chinook
April 29, 2004	until reinitiated	Puget Sound Chinook
April 26, 2012	until reinitiated	Lower Columbia River Chinook
Non-Salmonid Species		
May 5, 2009	Reinitiated in 2019	Southern Resident Killer Whale (SRKW)

As stated in section 4.1.1.2 of the EA, NMFS completed a consultation on the effects of implementing the Council’s 2020 ocean salmon management measures on SRKW and their current and proposed critical habitat. The biological opinion, dated April 29, 2020, considered interactions with vessels and gear, and effects on prey availability (NMFS 2020). The biological opinion concluded that effects from the Council’s 2020 salmon fisheries were not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the SRKW DPS, or destroy or adversely modify its designated critical or proposed habitat.

At its November 2020 meeting, the Council adopted a final preferred alternative for a subsequent amendment to the FMP to include management provisions responsive to the needs of SRKW (if approved, this will be Amendment 21). NMFS is currently consulting on the effects on SRKW of Amendment 21. Amendment 21, if approved, would set a Chinook salmon annual abundance management threshold below which the Council and NMFS would implement specific steps to limit ocean salmon fishery impacts on Chinook salmon in order to increase salmon prey availability for SRKW.¹ These steps include time and area closures and temporal shifts in fishing. NMFS is currently consulting on the effects of authorization of the fishery through approval of the FMP, including Amendment 21, and implementing regulations on SRKW, and expects to complete this consultation prior to the effective date of the 2021 management measures. As mentioned above, the annual management measures for Council salmon fisheries are developed to be consistent with all ESA biological opinions.

Significance Review

The CEQ Regulations state that the determination of significance using an analysis of effects requires examination of both context and intensity, and lists ten criteria for intensity (40 C.F.R. § 1508.27 (1978)). In addition, the Companion Manual for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Administrative Order 216-6A provides sixteen criteria, the same ten as the CEQ Regulations, and six additional, for determining whether the impacts of a proposed action are significant. Each criterion is discussed below with respect to the proposed action, and considered individually as well as in combination with the others.

1. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to cause both beneficial and adverse impacts that overall may result in a significant effect, even if the effect will be beneficial?

The proposed action is not expected to cause impacts that would result in a significant effect. The change to the boundary of the KMZ is expected to have a beneficial socioeconomic impact on the fishery, but the effect is not expected to be significant. The change to the boundary of the KMZ is not expected to have a significant effect on ESA-listed species, marine mammals, or managed fish species. Fishery management measures are set annually under a separate action and are designed to meet conservation and management goals in the FMP, and limit impacts on ESA-listed species consistent with the ESA section 7 biological opinions that are in place. The proposed action will not change any of these conservation and management goals.

¹ For details of the Council's adopted provisions for Amendment 21, see the Council decision document for the November 2020 Council meeting at: <https://www.pccouncil.org/november-2020-decision-summary-document/#Salmon>.

2. *Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to significantly affect public health or safety?*

No, there are no effects on public health or safety from the proposed action. As described in chapter 4 of the EA, the Council's Enforcement Consultants advisory body, which includes the U.S. Coast Guard, testified to the Council that the boundary change would not impact safety or freedom of navigation.

3. *Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to result in significant impacts to unique characteristics of the geographic area, such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas?*

No, the proposed action has no physical or ground disturbing action. The proposed action implements a schedule change for setting annual management measures, a management boundary change, and language updates to the FMP.

4. *Are the proposed action's effects on the quality of the human environment likely to be highly controversial?*

No, the proposed action is not likely to be highly controversial. The proposed action was developed through a series of public meetings, and with the involvement of stakeholders and co-managers. NMFS has received three public comments during the public comment period; one of these comments specifically addressed the draft EA. The comments all expressed concern about potential fishery impacts from the KMZ boundary change. The environmental assessment for this action described the uncertainty associated with changing a long-standing management boundary, but concluded that the area affected (i.e., five nautical miles of coastline) was small compared with the overall size of the KMZ and the neighboring FB management area, and NMFS does not anticipate a substantial change in fishery impacts resulting from this change. See question #5, below.

5. *Are the proposed action's effects on the human environment likely to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks?*

No, the proposed action's effects are not likely to be highly uncertain as they were analyzed using well-documented methodologies. As described in chapter 4 of the EA, the Council's Salmon Technical Team (STT) has reviewed the KMZ boundary change and concluded that the boundary change could lead to small effort shifts, but that these did not warrant any changes to model inputs for predicting the effects of the fisheries on targeted stocks. Further, any inaccuracy in the model predictions used to manage ocean salmon fisheries resulting from the boundary change would be expected to decrease through time as response of the fishery to the boundary change is observed. Analytical models used in forecasting salmon stock abundance and predicting salmon fishery impacts are updated annually and re-evaluated as necessary to provide the best scientific information available for managing salmon fisheries. The STT also noted that the boundary change could result in some additional uncertainty about the incidental effects

of the fisheries on coho and ESA-listed California Coastal Chinook salmon, but concluded that any effects would likely be small. Therefore, although there is a degree of uncertainty regarding the effects on the human environment, that uncertainty is expected to be small.

6. *Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration?*

No, the proposed actions in this EA are unique to the specific circumstances, as described in the EA. There is no expectation that these proposed actions establish a precedent.

7. *Is the proposed action related to other actions that when considered together will have individually insignificant but cumulatively, both long term and short term, significant impacts?*

No, the proposed action will inform the regulatory setting of annual management measures for ocean salmon fisheries, which will not have a significant cumulative impact, including both long term and short-term effects. These annual management measures are analyzed in a separate NEPA document. The annual management measures are developed to meet the cumulative conservation objectives, other requirements for all Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA)-managed salmon stocks on the West Coast, and comply with allowable impacts on ESA-listed species.

8. *Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources?*

No, the proposed action has no physical or ground disturbing action. The proposed action modifies the preseason schedule for setting annual management measures, and changes a management boundary used in those annual management measures.

9. *Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to have a significant impact on endangered or threatened species, or their critical habitat as defined under the Endangered Species Act of 1973?*

No, annual management measures for ocean salmon fisheries are developed to be consistent with biological opinions on the impact of the ocean salmon fisheries on ESA-listed species (see **Related Consultations**, above).

10. *Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to threaten a violation of Federal, state, or local law or requirements imposed for environmental protection?*

No, the proposed action was prepared with consideration of MSA, NEPA, and other applicable laws.

11. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to significantly adversely affect stocks of marine mammals as defined in the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA)?

No, the proposed action will not have any significant impacts on marine mammals. The proposed action changes a management boundary, but does not change how ocean salmon fisheries are conducted, e.g., allowable gear-types or vessel operation. Ocean salmon fisheries will continue to be evaluated on an annual basis under section 118 of the MMPA, and categorized in terms of level of incidental mortality and serious injury of marine mammals. As stated in section 4.2.1 of the EA, ocean salmon fisheries off the West Coast states are currently in Category III—i.e. remote likelihood of or no known incidental mortality and serious injury of marine mammals.

12. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to significantly adversely affect managed fish species?

No, as described in section 4.3 of the EA, ocean salmon fisheries target Chinook and coho salmon and have little impact on non-target species. Non-salmonid managed fish species are managed under other West Coast fishery management plans, and are uncommonly encountered in the salmon fishery; therefore, the proposed action will not have any effect on those managed fish species. The proposed action implements a schedule change and changes a management boundary but does not change how ocean salmon fisheries are conducted. Ocean salmon fisheries are managed on an annual basis through annual management measures, and impacts on managed salmonid species from annual management measures for ocean salmon fisheries are analyzed annually in a separate NEPA document. These fisheries are developed to be consistent with the conservation and management objectives in the FMP, which are, in turn, developed to be consistent with the National Standards in the MSA, including criteria for optimal yield and sustainability.

13. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to significantly adversely affect essential fish habitat as defined under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act?

No, there are no adverse effects to essential fish habitat (EFH) from the proposed action. The proposed action implements a schedule change for setting annual management measures and a management boundary change. The most recent EFH consultation on ocean salmon fisheries (NMFS Consultation Number: WCR-2017-8012) concluded that these fisheries do not have an adverse effect on EFH. There are no habitat disturbing activities in the proposed action. Ocean salmon fisheries target adult salmon, which are not considered prey for any of the remaining species managed under the other three Pacific coast FMPs.

14. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to significantly adversely affect vulnerable marine or coastal ecosystems, including but not limited to, deep coral ecosystems?

No, the proposed action will not adversely affect vulnerable marine or coastal ecosystems. The proposed action implements a schedule change for setting annual management measures and a management boundary change. Management measures for ocean salmon fisheries that will be affected by the proposed action are developed annually and are analyzed in a separate NEPA document. Ocean salmon fisheries utilize hook-and-line gear that does not contact the substrate. Ocean salmon fisheries are designed to harvest adult salmon that are excess to the escapement required for spawning and hatchery needs. Annual management measures are designed to meet the conservation and management requirements of the FMP, and any ESA requirements.

15. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to significantly adversely affect biodiversity or ecosystem functioning (e.g., benthic productivity, predator-prey relationships, etc.)?


No, the proposed action will not adversely affect biodiversity or ecosystem functioning. The proposed action implements schedule changes for setting annual management measures, and a management boundary change. Management measures for ocean salmon fisheries that will be affected by the proposed action are developed annually and are analyzed in a separate NEPA document. Ocean salmon fisheries utilize hook-and-line gear that does not contact the substrate. Ocean salmon fisheries are designed to harvest adult salmon that are excess to the escapement required for spawning and hatchery needs. Annual management measures are designed to meet the conservation and management requirements of the FMP, and any ESA requirements.

16. Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to result in the introduction or spread of a nonindigenous species?

No, the proposed action does not affect the introduction or spread of nonindigenous species. The West Coast states have regulations in place for vessel inspections to address this issue; this action does not change these measures or affect the likelihood of the introduction or spread of these species.

Determination

In view of the information presented in this document and the analysis contained in the supporting Environmental Assessment prepared for Amendment 20 to the Pacific Coast Salmon FMP, it is hereby determined that Amendment 20 will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment as described above, and in the supporting Environmental Assessment. In addition, all beneficial and adverse impacts of the proposed action have been addressed to reach the conclusion of no significant impacts. Accordingly, preparation of an environmental impact statement for this action is not necessary.



Barry A. Thom
Regional Administrator
West Coast Region
National Marine Fisheries Service

April 20, 2021
Date