

SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON MAGNUSON-STEVENSON
ACT REAUTHORIZATION IMPLEMENTATION

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) discussed issues pertaining to Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA) reauthorization implementation as they relate to the role of the SSC in the Council process. The SSC also discussed particular issues regarding the implementation of annual catch limits (ACLs) and accountability measures (AMs).

The SSC's March 2007 report to the Council on this topic is still relevant. As such, it is attached to this report.

From the SSC's point of view, the stocks currently managed under Council FMPs that have biologically-based control rules governing harvest (e.g., the principal groundfish stocks and sardine) may already have sufficient precautionary characteristics to meet the reauthorized MSA requirements, such as ACLs, AMs and buffers. However, many Council stocks are managed through control rules that are not biologically based (e.g., minor rockfish species). While it may be desirable to manage all species with control rules, the large number of stocks involved and the data-poor nature of the assessments make this impractical for all stocks. Furthermore, salmon are generally managed for escapement, rather than using explicit catch accounting control rules. Managing for spawning biomass is generally appropriate, and is arguably closer to the management goal.

Even with substantial additional funding, it is unlikely explicit catch accounting control rules can be developed for all stocks managed under Council FMPs. The SSC suggests it may be prudent for NMFS to fully consider these factors when creating the National Standards needed to implement the reauthorized MSA.

PFMC
04/03/07

SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON REVIEW AND PLANNING
FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW REQUIREMENTS RESULTING FROM
REAUTHORIZATION OF THE MAGNUSON-STEVENSON ACT

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) discussed new provisions of the 2006 Magnuson-Stevens Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act (MSRA) as they relate to the role of the SSC in the Council process. The SSC has a number of questions regarding these provisions:

Provision: “The Council shall establish annual catch limits for each managed fishery that may not exceed the fishing level recommendations of its SSC” (MSA 302(h)(6), p. 51)

The Pacific Council has maintained a clear distinction between scientific analysis and advice and policy decisions, with the SSC taking the lead on the science. With regard to coastal pelagic and groundfish catch limits, the SSC’s role has been to review the harvest control rule and the stock assessments that are fed into the control rule. The Council’s role has been to establish annual catch limits, which (for groundfish) involves taking into consideration the decision table showing harvest levels associated with high, medium, and low levels of risk to the stock. While not mandated by the SSC, it has generally been Council practice not to exceed the risk-neutral level of harvest indicated by the control rule.

If the “fishing level recommendations” that the SSC is expected to provide under the MSRA are intended to be numeric catch limits, this will be a major deviation from Council practice, as it will require the SSC to make policy decisions. This raises several issues: (1) Is the SSC supposed to establish catch limits strictly on the basis of biological considerations? If so, this will be tantamount to an implicit policy decision to disregard ecosystem and socioeconomic issues in setting catch limits. (2) What types of information would the SSC be required to consider in establishing catch limits? For instance, would the SSC consider results of a regulatory analysis and take input from advisory bodies and the public? If so, then what is the role of the Council with regard to setting catch limits? If not, does this leave the Council and NOAA Fisheries Service vulnerable to claims of procedural violations under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Magnuson Act?

Provision: “The SSC shall provide recommendations for acceptable biological catch, preventing overfishing, maximum sustainable yield and achieving rebuilding targets, and reports on stock status and health, bycatch, habitat status, socioeconomic impacts of management measures, sustainability of fishing practices (MSA 302(g), pp 49-50).

Clarification is needed with regard to SSC responsibilities entailed by this provision. For instance, does this responsibility pertain to all species (including salmon and highly migratory species)? In terms of “preventing overfishing” and “achieving rebuilding targets”, is the SSC supposed to set numeric bycatch levels associated with rebuilding? If

so, then the same issues raised above with regard to the SSC setting of catch limits would apply here as well.

Does the requirement that the SSC “provide” reports on stock and habitat status, bycatch, socioeconomic impacts of management measures and the like mean the SSC will “produce” these reports. If so, given the Council’s practice of separating analysis from review, who will review the SSC’s production of these reports?

The SSC also discussed pending efforts by NOAA Fisheries Service to integrate NEPA requirements with fishery regulatory requirements in such a way as to streamline the management process. Given that rationale for the biennial groundfish management and assessment cycle was the cumbersome nature of the regulatory process, would such streamlining reduce the time lag between groundfish management actions and the stock assessments on which they are based?

PFMC
03/06/07