SUMMARY MINUTES
Scientific and Statistical Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel
Mt. St. Helens B
8235 NE Airport Way
Portland, OR 97220
503-281-2500

April 5-6, 2013

Call to Order and Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) Administrative Matters

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. on Friday, April 5, 2013. Council Executive Director, Dr. Donald McIsaac briefed the SSC on priority agenda items.

Members in Attendance

Mr. Robert Conrad, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Olympia, WA
Dr. Martin Dorn, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
Dr. Owen Hamel, SSC Chair, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
Dr. Selina Heppell, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR
Dr. Daniel Huppert, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
Mr. Tom Jagielo, Seattle, WA
Ms. Meisha Key, SSC Vice-Chair, California Department of Fish and Game, Santa Cruz, CA
Dr. Peter Lawson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Newport, OR
Dr. Todd Lee, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
Dr. Charles Petrosky, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise, ID
Dr. André Punt, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
Dr. David Sampson, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Newport, OR
Dr. William Satterthwaite, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA
Ms. Cindy Thomson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA

Members Absent

Dr. Vladlena Gertseva, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
Dr. Tien-Shui Tsou, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA

SSC Recusals for the April 2013 Meeting.		
SSC Member	**Issue**	**Reason**
Dr. André Punt	Sardine Harvest Parameters Workshop Report	Dr. Punt's student did the analysis.

Scientific and Statistical Committee Comments to the Council

The following is a compilation of April 2013 SSC reports to the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) in the order they were discussed by the SSC. (Related SSC discussion not included in written comment to the Council is provided in *italicized text*).

D. Groundfish Management

3. Stock Complex Assemblages

Mr. John DeVore and Dr. Jason Cope gave a summary of "Initial Proposal (Proposed Action, Alternatives, and Considerations) for Restructuring Groundfish Stock Complexes" (Agenda Item D.3.a Attachment 1). The report describes a proposed action to restructure the current groundfish stock complexes into groupings that comprise species of more equivalent ecological distributions, of more equivalent vulnerabilities to overfishing, and that are caught together in the fishery. The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) appreciates the efforts of the authors of the report, agrees that restructuring stock complexes is important, and anticipates reviewing a revised document in June.

The SSC focused on methodology for identifying stock complexes that could be restructured and for evaluating the performance of proposed stock complexes.

The SSC supports approaches that group similar stocks on the basis of their productivity and spatial distribution. The distribution data used were not described in sufficient detail to fully evaluate. The SSC recommends developing and presenting explicit measures of the concordance between spatial groupings and the groupings of stocks into stock complexes.

Several potential metrics for evaluating proposed stock complexes were discussed. All proposed metrics depend to some degree on predicting future fishing behavior. It is very difficult to evaluate whether a new stock complex structure will achieve the desired goals without actually implementing changes in an iterative, adaptive-management approach.

The SSC recommends refining the metrics used to evaluate current stock complexes to focus on the ratio of total cumulative catch to total cumulative component overfishing limit (OFL) and the mean difference between total catch and total component OFL. Plots of trends over time in catch relative to component OFL provide a useful graphical summary of potential concerns with current stock complexes.

The SSC also raised concerns about the reliability of species composition data used in retrospective analyses, an issue often encountered in groundfish management. Some stock restructurings may provide benefits by aligning species complexes with market categories, e.g. grenadier and greenlings. However, increasing the number of market categories could create data quality issues, and the SSC recommends this be evaluated more thoroughly in the next version of this analysis.

The current report contains adequate information for the SSC to reiterate its endorsement of reorganizing the present "other fish" stock complex.

5. Consider Barotrauma Device Mortality Rates

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) report on "Proposed discard mortality for cowcod, canary rockfish and yelloweye rockfish released using descending devices in the recreational fishery" (Agenda Item D.5.b) and received a slide presentation by Mr. John Budrick (California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW], GMT). The report condenses and refines information presented to the Council in two previous reports and presents revised values for the mortality of recreationally caught cowcod, canary rockfish and yelloweye rockfish if they were released and returned to depth using descending devices. The GMT report reflects suggestions made in SSC comments to previous reports and resulting from a joint meeting in January of the GMT and SSC Groundfish Subcommittee.

The task of estimating discard mortality rates for these three species is particularly challenging due to the limited number of field studies on the mortality of rockfish released using descending devices. The few studies that include these three particular species provide some data for canary and yelloweye rockfish, but almost no information for cowcod. The mortality estimates developed by the GMT cover four depth bins (0-10 fm, 10-30 fm, 30-50 fm, and >50 fm) and account for three types of mortality: short-term, long-term, and sources not otherwise accounted for.

The information contained in the GMT report is much more clearly presented than in previous versions. The SSC supports the GMT's approach for deriving point estimates of the discard mortality rates by species and depth-bin, with the caveat that the estimates for combined short- and long-term mortality for any of the three species should not decrease with an increase in depth. The mortality estimates for canary rockfish and cowcod taken from depths greater than 50 fm are inconsistent with this principle.

The SSC remains concerned about the lack of information on cowcod. The mortality-by-depth estimates for this species are almost entirely based on proxy species, but the estimates provided in the report do not include an explicit buffer to account for the additional uncertainty due to the use of proxy species. An acoustic tagging study that is currently underway in the southern California bight will provide additional information on the mortality of cowcod released and returned to depth using descending devices. The SSC recommends that the results of this study be examined as soon as possible to evaluate the estimates based on proxy species. Further, the SSC recommends that the Council encourage additional field research to collect information for these three focal species on their mortality after release using descending devices, particularly for capture depths >50 fm.

The SSC notes that the sets of upper confidence limits shown in Table 7 indicate only minor differences in the mortality rates by depth between the different confidence levels (60 percent, 75 percent, 90 percent, and 95 percent). Such small differences imply an implausibly high degree of scientific certainty regarding the mortality rate estimates. The SSC has suggested several methods to the authors of the GMT report for developing more reasonable estimates of the scientific uncertainty. In addition, buffers for bias and scientific uncertainty should be independently delineated.

The SSC was unable to review the supplemental reports from Oregon Department of Fish and

Wildlife and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife regarding implementation of the new mortality rates in the accounting of catch mortality for management. Should the Council decide to use the new discard mortality rates, the SSC would be willing to review how the rates would be applied in the catch accounting for all three states.

Some of the results presented in Tables 5 and 7 of the GMT report are inconsistent with the underlying principle that discard mortality is an increasing function of depth. Pressure change causes the barotrauma that results when a rockfish is brought to the surface, and the pressure change is directly related to the change in depth. It follows that the combined short- and long-term mortality estimates for the >50 fm depth bin, for example, should be at least as large as the combined short- and long-term mortality estimates for the 30-50 fm depth bin. The SSC recommends that the mortality estimates in these tables be revised to be consistent with this underlying principle.

There are several reasons why the confidence limits shown in Table 7 of the GMT report do not seem plausible. First, these confidence limits are based on the assumption that the number of deaths for a particular species-depth category is a binomially distributed random variable, meaning that each individual sampled fish has the same probability of dying. Although this may be possible, it seems very unlikely. If individual fish differ in their probability of dying then the random process is over-dispersed and the binomial confidence limits will be too narrow. The data from the field studies could be analyzed on a shorter time-scale (e.g., by trip rather than pooled across the entire study period) to evaluate whether the probability of mortality is constant and quantify the over-dispersion that may be present. Second, the mortality rates for some species-depth combinations are based on proxy species or are borrowed from other depth-bins, but the estimates in the table ignore these additional sources of uncertainty. Although the available field studies have very limited samples sizes, it should be possible for the GMT to analyze the study results by species and depth to quantify the uncertainty in mortality rates between species and depth-bins and thereby develop appropriate variance adjustments to inflate the confidence limits in Table 7.

6. Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Synthesis Report and Request for Proposals

Drs. Michelle McClure, Waldo Wakefield and Ole Shelton (NWFSC) briefed the SSC regarding the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Synthesis Report. The report provides a useful synthesis of available information regarding groundfish habitat distributions, species-habitat associations, fishing and non-fishing stressors, fishing pressure, and prey species for Pacific groundfish.

The SSC considers the information contained in the Synthesis Report to be sufficient for purposes of initiating a request for proposals (RFP). However, the SSC has two concerns. First, non-fishing stressors are represented by 16 human activities summarized into a single indicator. Given the diversity of these stressors (e.g., pollution, beach use, commercial shipping activity), the SSC recommends that those stressors specifically relevant to groundfish be analyzed individually in the report and not combined. Second, the SSC is unable to comment on the methods underlying the Report, as the Appendices (which provide documentation of these methods) were not available for review until this meeting.

For purposes of evaluating proposals received under the RFP, it may be helpful to consider the

objectives of the Council with regard to essential fish habitat (EFH) and the effectiveness of existing EFH conservation areas in meeting those objectives.

While EFH designation *per se* does not affect fishing activity, it can serve as a basis for future regulatory action. Maps depicting the distribution of catch and ex-vessel value by location and species would be a useful starting point for analyzing the socioeconomic effects of regulatory actions that may occur as a result of changes in EFH designation. While it may not be feasible to develop maps in time for the RFP, it would be useful to have such maps available if and when EFH regulatory actions are considered by the Council.

E. Salmon Management

5. Methodology Review Process and Preliminary Topic Selection for 2013

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) met with the Salmon Technical Team (STT), the Model Evaluation Workgroup (MEW) and Mr. Mike Burner to discuss possible methodology review topics for 2013. The following items were identified for potential SSC review this fall. The lead entity for each work product is identified at the end of the item.

- Review performance of and develop alternatives to the Yaquina River marine survival rate index used in 2013 for the Oregon coastal natural (OCN) coho matrix control rule. (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife [ODFW])
- Evaluate alternative forecast methodologies for the Sacramento fall Chinook index. (STT)
- Develop Conservation Objectives, Annual Catch Limits, and Status Determination Criteria for Willapa Bay coho. (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. [WDFW], STT)
- Develop Lower Columbia natural (LCN) coho matrix control rules. (ODFW, WDFW)
- Develop Conservation Objectives for Southern Oregon coastal Chinook. (ODFW)
- Evaluate bias in coho mark rates in preseason forecasts and postseason estimates in mark-selective coho fisheries north of Cape Falcon. (MEW)
- Incorporate observed encounter rates of sub-legal Chinook into Fishery Regulation Assessment Model (FRAM) for fisheries outside of Puget Sound. (MEW)
- Review the user's manual for the Visual Studio version of FRAM. (MEW)
- Develop improved base period estimates of legal and sub-legal Chinook encounter rates by incorporating more recent information from coded-wire tag and genetic sampling into Chinook FRAM. (MEW)
- Explore incorporating the coho FRAM bias correction methods for mark-selective fisheries into Chinook FRAM. (MEW)

The SSC considers the first two items in this list to be most important for consideration relative to the 2014 salmon management process.

Feasibility of abundance-based management for California Coastal Chinook and Sacramento Winter Run Chinook were subject of a workshop on 8 April after the full SSC had adjourned. Two members of the SSC salmon subcommittee attended the workshop.

Based on information presented at the workshop, which is summarized NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-494 from the March 2013 Briefing Book (Agenda Item C.3.b, Supplemental Attachment 3), there are insufficient data available to implement abundance-based management for California Coastal Chinook at this time. Filling these data gaps should remain a Council priority.

The Sacramento Winter Run Chinook jeopardy standard currently includes a harvest control rule adopted by NMFS Southwest Region (SWR) in 2012. The SWR rule, along with a variety of alternative harvest control rules, was presented at the workshop. Components of the model used to evaluate these alternatives have been, or are in the process of being, peer reviewed and published. Choice of a harvest control rule ultimately lies with the Southwest Region. The SSC sees no need for Council review of either California Coastal or Sacramento Winter Run methodologies at this time.

The SSC requires proper documentation and ample review time to make efficient use of the SSC Salmon Subcommittee's time. Materials for review should be submitted at least two weeks prior to the scheduled review meeting. Agencies should be responsible for ensuring that materials submitted to the SSC are technically sound, comprehensive, clearly documented, and identified by author.

H. Ecosystem-Based Management

1. Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP)

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) discussed the public draft copy of the Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP), its initiatives, and scientific products related to ecosystem-based fisheries management. In March, Ms. Yvonne de Reynier of the Ecosystem Plan Development Team provided a summary of report updates and participated in the discussion.

The SSC considers the scientific information presented in the FEP to be the best available science for advising the Council on ecosystem considerations for management. The Plan provides appropriate flexibility for incorporation of ecosystem considerations in stock assessments and harvest control rules. The SSC will continue to evaluate the science used in analyses of ecosystem condition and effects on Fishery Management Plan stocks. Currently, the SSC can assist this effort in four ways:

1) Review the initiatives in Appendix 1 of the FEP, identifying those that are largely science-driven, feasible with existing tools and data, and most likely to improve management. The Ecosystem Plan Development Team has requested SSC input on prioritization of initiatives.
2) Provide feedback on the State of the California Current report document to improve its utility as an advisory document.
3) Review the Ecosystem Considerations sections added to this year's stock assessments for future standardization of the content of these sections.
4) Meet with the Integrated Ecosystem Assessment teams at Northwest Fisheries Science Center and Southwest Fisheries Science Center to discuss Integrated Ecosystem Assessment products and their incorporation into assessments and other Council documents. This is an important step for FEP implementation.

The SSC discussed its role in the evolving applications of ecosystem-based management by the Council. Some review tasks are straightforward, such as evaluation of the data or analyses used to create the California Current report. A more difficult task is to evaluate and advise on the appropriate use of ecosystem-based indicators and proposed thresholds in harvest control rules. This will require the same scrutiny as the methods used in stock assessments. For example, the SSC recently led a review of the environmental parameters used in the harvest control rule for sardine (Agenda Item I.1). Ecosystem considerations for stock assessments should be developed by stock assessment teams and reviewed through the Stock Assessment Review Panel process.
The SSC identified some outdated information in the FEP about models and data used in economic analyses (Section 4). Suggested corrections have been forwarded to Ms. De Reynier and the Ecosystem Plan Development Team. These edits should be incorporated in the final FEP.

Todd Lee FEP Comments
March 6, 2013

1. *3.4.2.1 Commercial Fisheries: This seems to exclude the at-sea fisheries. If so, why should they be excluded.*
2. *P 56, para 2: This seems to imply that there isn't any bycatch data or rec data on removals. It may not be in PacFIN, but it does exist.*
3. *P 77, last para: This is a bit confusing. Is this saying that the net value to charter anglers aren't included? Or maybe that this doesn't consider effects in secondary markets? Maybe this doesn't consider charter operator profits? "Does not capture the economic value" is vague.*
4. *3.4.2.3 Recreational Fisheries: This section uses FEUS for WA, TCW Econ for WA, and The Research Group for OR -- why not be consistent and stick with FEUS?*
5. *P 84: The entire section that discusses FEAM should be updated. I don't think FEAM is used any longer, and for sure not for groundfish. IO-PAC, a new model is now used. There is a NOAA Tech Report that describes IO-PAC. It has been updated and expanded since that publication. See Jerry Leonard ant the NWC for more info; he developed the IO-PAC model.*
6. *P 157: Revenues (commercial) and expenditures (recreational) can be bad proxies for net values -- why is this seemingly recommended here? Also "the movement of fish or the fishing experience as commodities within the economy, and resulting expenditures from revenues may be considered largely cumulative effects of an action or of the Council's activities as a whole" is very confusing and perhaps misleading if suggesting that all of these changes should be attributed to Council actions. Is "expenditures from revenues" trying to get at economic impacts / IO model.*
7. *P 158: Recreational values are commonly quantified. Also since the preceding section recommends using expenditures to infer minimum rec values, I find this confusing. It seems to be saying that values can be approximated with expenditures (again, not a good idea), but values aren't easily quantifiable.*
8. *4.4.2 Costs of Participating in Fisheries: The last part here is not correct. There is cost data for a lot of the commercial fisheries. There are dedicated mothership, catcher-processor, LE trawl groundfish, LE fixed gear groundfish, most of the WA, OR and CA state fisheries (esp. shrimp, crab), also some cost data is available for tuna and perhaps other HMS and CPS. There is a NOAA Tech report by Carl Lian for the LE fisheries and Open access groundfish. These collections have expanded since then. All of these surveys are ongoing. There is also the new mandatory Economic Data Collection for*

catch shares. 2009-2011 data have been collected (see the EDC website). It probably won't help much for this report, due to timing, but 5 EDC reports will be completed in April for SSC review.

D. Groundfish Management, continued

7. Trawl Rationalization Trailing Actions – Electronic Monitoring Regulatory Process

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed the Trawl Catch Share Program Electronic Monitoring (EM) Workshop Report (D.7.b, EM Workshop Report), along with documents prepared by the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) including: 1) the results of a pilot EM program in 2012 (D.7.c, PSMFC Report 1), and 2) a plan for EM work to be conducted in 2013 (D.7.c, PSMFC Report 2). Mr. Jim Seger provided an overview of how this research relates to Council objectives and the groundfish trawl share catch program, and Mr. Dave Colpo (PSMFC) was available to answer questions about the EM program.

SSC noted that there was no coverage of non-whiting trawlers in 2012, and the relative performance of the EM system differed between the shoreside and mothership whiting vessels sampled. A clear explanation for the differences was not presented; however, it was noted that the observer data provided in the 2012 report are preliminary. The SSC recommends that when the finalized data are available, the 2012 report results should be re-analyzed and presented in an updated report. The 2013 study will focus on non-whiting trawl, where species identification will be particularly important. One limitation of the cameras is that they cannot, at present, be used to identify rockfish and flatfish discards to species.

Mr. Colpo provided his perspective on the prospects for the work planned in 2013. He noted that, thus far, it has been difficult to recruit trawl vessels to participate in the research program. The SSC notes that, without knowing the number and variety of vessels available for the 2013 research, and a detailed study design, it is not possible to evaluate the likelihood of project success in 2013. For example, a detailed study design should address possible management measures that could be implemented. The SSC also encouraged the collection of information in 2013 that can help to evaluate the costs associated with the program. This could help to evaluate management options that could be proposed in the future.

Review of the 2012 EM sampling results suggests that an ancillary benefit of this research is the opportunity it could provide to examine the performance of at sea observers. Detailed analysis of the videos could yield insights about how the observers operate and some of the particular challenges they face at sea that affect the uncertainty of discard estimates.

I. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

1. Sardine Harvest Parameters Workshop Report

Dr. André Punt presented the report of the Pacific Sardine Harvest Parameters Workshop as well

as subsequent analyses. Mr. Felipe Hurtado-Ferro was present to respond to questions regarding the analysis.

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) endorses the conclusions of the workshop (Agenda Item I.1.b, Attachment 1). This includes the conclusion that there is a relationship between Sea Surface Temperature (SST) and sardine productivity and that it is reasonable to include this relationship in the Harvest Control Rules (HCRs). The best measure of SST for relating to sardine productivity was found to be the annual CalCOFI SST index.

The workshop report outlined a Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) (simulation analysis of alternative harvest control rules [HCRs]). All but one of the sensitivity analyses identified at the workshop have now been completed. Fourteen illustrative "harvest policy variants" were evaluated.

Performance metrics reported in the MSE include average catch, average population size, the probability of catch being below 50,000 mt, the probability of age 1+ biomass being above 400,000 mt. However, the mean and median catch values in Table 5 (Agenda Item I.1.b, Attachment 2) are calculated using only years with positive catches and thus do not represent mean catch across years, especially for those scenarios that result in zero catches in a large proportion of years, such as harvest policy variants 5 and 10. Also, the underlying model of climate variability focuses on decadal changes but does not represent annual variation due to ENSO events. Ignoring El Niño Southern Oscillation events results in an even lower simulated average recruitment during cold regimes.

The analyses use the biomass at the beginning of the fishing season to set harvest levels rather than biomass 6 months earlier. This is the preferred approach, and the SSC recommends that the biomass at the start of the fishing season be used for harvest specification.

The MSE approach presented is adequate to determine whether and how to change the HCRs. The SSC recommends that HCRs include a SST relationship, whereas the current overfishing limit control rule does not. The analysis could be updated and extended based upon Council guidance on performance measures and on alternative SST metrics (annual or average across years), harvest policies and sensitivity scenarios.

This MSE presented to the SSC is focused on the stock and the fishery, but not on spatial or forage issues. If there is a desire to explicitly include ecosystem measures, then a much more complicated process of creating an ecosystem MSE would be necessary. However, further development of existing (or new) ecosystem models is needed before such an MSE would be feasible.

2. Shifting Sardine Season Start Date

Kerry Griffin briefed the Scientific and Statistical Committee regarding the proposal to shift the sardine fishery start date from January 1 to July 1. We have highlighted our support for this change in the past, based upon the time it provides for completion of the Stock Assessment Team's estimate of stock size.

In transitioning to a new start date, the Council would need to determine a means of setting catch

for the first six months of the intermediate year.

B. Administrative Matters

4. Legislative Matters

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) considered issues which could be addressed during the upcoming reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. It identified the following issues (in no particular order) which relate to the provision of scientific management advice, Council fisheries, and Council decision-making:

- The discontinuity of current control rules between rebuilding and non-rebuilding stocks is problematic due to the scientific uncertainty inherent in stock assessment. Establishing continuous control rules across the minimum stock size threshold (MSST) would limit large changes in regulation due to minor variations in assessment results.
- The rule that defines the maximum time for overfished stocks to rebuild, T_{MAX}, is discontinuous at 10 years. It should be replaced by a rule that is not discontinuous, such as "T_{MAX} is the larger of 10 years or the sum of T_{MIN} and one mean generation time."
- Guidance should be developed on how results from new assessments should be used to change fishing mortality rates for overfished and rebuilding stocks and target times to rebuild to B_{MSY} (Rebuilding Revision Rules).
- The mixed stock exemption should be made operational, and guidelines provided for the biological and economic analyses needed for justifying its application.
- "Overfished" and "overfishing" are currently defined to be the same in the Act. The definitions of these terms should be changed to reflect actual practice when applying status determination criteria. "Overfished" is related to population size relative to the Minimum Stock Size Threshold (MSST) and "overfishing" is related to exploitation rate relative to the Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold.
- Information which would normally be considered confidential should be made available to those tasked with reviewing analyses which use that information, and which will form the basis for Council decision-making.
- The term "Ecosystem Component" should be defined more clearly.
- The term "overfished" gives the impression that a stock is below the MSST because of excessive fishing. This is often not the case, so the term "overfished" should be replaced by one such as "depleted."
- Allowance should be made for fishers to be compensated with quota for research conducted in support of fisheries management.

SSC Subcommittee Assignments, April 2013

Salmon	Groundfish	Coastal Pelagic Species	Highly Migratory Species	Economic	Ecosystem-Based Management
Robert Conrad	**Vlada Gertseva**	**André Punt**	**Selina Heppell**	**Cindy Thomson**	**Martin Dorn**
Owen Hamel	Martin Dorn	Owen Hamel	Robert Conrad	Vlada Gertseva	Vlada Gertseva
Meisha Key	Owen Hamel	Selina Heppell	André Punt	Dan Huppert	Selina Heppell
Pete Lawson	Tom Jagielo	Dan Huppert		Todd Lee	Pete Lawson
Charlie Petrosky	Meisha Key	Tom Jagielo		André Punt	Todd Lee
Will Satterthwaite	André Punt	Meisha Key		David Sampson	André Punt
	David Sampson				Will Satterthwaite
	Tien-Shui Tsou				Cindy Thomson
					Tien-Shui Tsou

Bold denotes Subcommittee Chairperson

DRAFT Tentative Council and SSC Meeting Dates for 2013

Council Meeting Dates	Location	Likely SSC Mtg Dates	Major Topics
March 6-11, 2013 Advisory Bodies may begin Tue, March 5 Council Session begins Wed, March 6	Hotel Murano 1320 Broadway Plaza Tacoma, WA 98402 Phone: 1-888-862-3255	Two Day SSC Session **Wed, March 6 – Thur, March 7**	Final CPS EFP Groundfish Am24 FPA Policy for Data-Mod. Stock SDC Salmon Review/Pre I 5 yr Research Plan
April 6-11, 2013 Advisory Bodies may begin Fri, Apr 5 Council Session begins Sat, Apr 6	Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel 8235 NE Airport Way Portland, OR 97220 Phone: 503-281-2500	Two Day SSC Session **Fri, April 5 – Sat, April 6**	Rockfish Barotrauma Mitigation Groundfish EFH Salmon EFH FPA
June 20-25, 2013 Advisory Bodies may begin Wed, June 19 Council Session begins Thurs, June 20	Hyatt Regency Orange County 11999 Harbor Blvd. Garden Grove, CA 92840 Phone: 714-750-1234	Two Day SSC Session **Wed, June 20 – Thurs, June21**	Mackerel HG & Mgt. Measures Review 2013 GF Stock Assess. Final Groundfish Stock Complexes Final 2015 and Beyond Spex Process Unmanaged Forage Fish Protection
September 12-17, 2013 Advisory Bodies may begin Wed, Sept 11 Council Session begins Thurs, Sept 12	The Riverside Hotel – Boise 2900 Chinden Blvd Boise, ID 83714 Phone: 208-343-1871	Two Day SSC Session **Wed, Sept 11 – Thurs Sept 12**	Review 2013 GF Stock Assess. Plan Science Improvements Salmon Meth. Topic Select Halibut Bycatch Estimate
November 1-6, 2013 Advisory Bodies may begin Thurs, Oct 31 Council Session begins Fri, Nov 1	Hilton Orange County/Costa Mesa 3050 Bristol Street Costa Mesa, CA 92626 Phone: 714-540-7000	Two Day SSC Session **Thurs, Oct 31 – Fri, Nov 1**	Review 2013 GF Stock Assess. (if needed) & Reb. Analyses Salmon Methodology Rev Pacific Sardine Assess. Fishery Ecosystem Plan

SSC Meeting Dates and Durations are tentative and are subject to change in response to Council meeting dates and agendas, workload, etc.

Proposed Workshops and SSC Subcommittee Meetings for 2013

Tentative – Depended on funding, dates subject to change

☐ – Prep. Work Underway, Scheduled to Occur; ▭ – Status of Supporting Analyses Uncertain, Remains a Priority;

▨ – Setbacks exist, Questionable; ■ – Funding or Prep. Not Avail, likely to be canceled or postponed

	Workshop/Meeting	Potential Dates	Sponsor/ Tentative Location	SSC Reps.	Additional Reviewers	AB Reps.	Council Staff
1	Pacific Sardine Harvest Parameters Workshop	Feb 5-8	Council La Jolla	CPS Subcm	?	CPSMT/ CPSAS	Griffin
2	Review of Methods to Develop Groundfish Abundance Indices for Data-Moderate Assessments	March 5	Council Tacoma	GF Subcm	None	GMT GAP	DeVore
3	Groundfish Nearshore and Non-Nearshore Model Reviews	March 8	Council Tacoma	GF/Econ Subcms	None	GMT Reps	DeVore, Dahl
4	IOPAC and EDM Model Reviews	April 8	Council Portland	Econ Subcm	None	?	DeVore, Dahl
5	Data-Moderate STAR Panel	April 22-26	Council Santa Cruz	Dorn, Punt, Heppell	CIE: TBD	GMT GAP	DeVore
6	Petrale/Darkblotched STAR Panel	May 13-17	Council Seattle	Tsou	2 CIE & 1 additional reviewer	GMT GAP	DeVore
7	Groundfish Bocaccio Update and Catch Reports Review	June 18	Council Garden Grove	GF Subcm	None	GMT GAP	DeVore

Proposed Workshops and SSC Subcommittee Meetings for 2013

Tentative – Depended on funding, dates subject to change

▭ – Prep. Work Underway, Scheduled to Occur; ▬ – Status of Supporting Analyses Uncertain, Remains a Priority;

▨ – Setbacks exist, Questionable; ■ – Funding or Prep. Not Avail, likely to be canceled or postponed

	Workshop/Meeting	Potential Dates	Sponsor/ Tentative Location	SSC Reps.	Additional Reviewers	AB Reps.	Council Staff
8	Integrated Ecosystem Assessment – Annual Report and App. to Stock Assessments	June 2013?	NWFSC/ SWFSC TBD	EBM Subcm	?	EPDT EAS	Burner
9	Rougheye/Aurora STAR Panel	July 8-12	Council Seattle	Sampson	2 CIE & John Field	GMT GAP	DeVore
10	Thornyheads STAR Panel	July 22-26	Council Seattle	TBD	2 CIE & 1 additional reviewer	GMT GAP	DeVore
11	Cowcod/Sanddabs STAR Panel	August 5-9	Council Santa Cruz	Gertseva	2 CIE & 1 additional reviewer	GMT GAP	DeVore
12	Mop-up STAR Panel	Sept 23-27	Council ?	GF Subcm	None	GMT GAP	DeVore
13	Salmon Methodology Review	Oct	Council	Salmon Subcm	None	STT SAS	Burner
14	Pacific Sardine Update Review	Oct	Council	CPS Subcm	None	CPSMT CPSAS	Griffin

Proposed Workshops and SSC Subcommittee Meetings for 2013

Tentative – Depended on funding, dates subject to change

☐ – Prep. Work Underway, Scheduled to Occur; ▭ – Status of Supporting Analyses Uncertain, Remains a Priority;

▨ – Setbacks exist, Questionable; ■ – Funding or Prep. Not Avail, likely to be canceled or postponed

	Workshop/Meeting	Potential Dates	Sponsor/ Tentative Location	SSC Reps.	Additional Reviewers	AB Reps.	Council Staff
15	Reference Points (Bzero) Workshop II	?	Council Portland	GF Subcm	CIE/External 1-3:	GMT GAP	DeVore
16	Groundfish Historic Catch Reconstructions	?	Council Meetings - Wrkshp	2-3 TBD	None	GMT GAP	DeVore
17	Assessing Socioeconomic Impacts in Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management	?	NWFSC Seattle?	Econ and EBM Subcms?	?	EPDT IEA	Burner
18	Transboundary Groundfish Stocks	?	Council	2 TBD?	?	GMT GAP	DeVore