

## THE GROUND FISH MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON CONSIDERATION OF THE SABLEFISH PERMIT STACKING PROGRAM REVIEW

The Groundfish Management Team (GMT) would like to thank Mr. Jim Seger and Ms. Ariel Jacobs for their presentation on this agenda item. Given the team's workload at this meeting and given that this program review is in its initial planning stage, we kept our discussion and comments brief, with the understanding that future opportunities for input would be available.

One major topic of discussion was the possible scope of the review. That scope could conceivably range widely in both the amount of detail and the number of issues considered, and in turn, the amount of analysis and Council time that it could take. The Council may be concerned with the workload and this review's overlap with the current 2015-2016 and beyond harvest specifications and management measures cycle.

With such program reviews, the first step involves revisiting the stated goals and objectives of the program and evaluating whether they have been met. Completing this step would involve analysis of available information on the fishery performance since the start of the program. We understand there are resources available to help conduct such analysis.

The second step would be to identify whether modifications to the program, including revisions to the goals and objectives, are needed. It is at this step where the Council might consider how much to take on and set priorities and schedules for considering changes to the program. This two-step approach is what we understand as being contemplated in the draft calendar ([Agenda Item G.2.a, Attachment 1](#)). The draft calendar proposes that the preliminary list of changes and improvements to the sablefish permit stacking program be considered in June 2014, which is also when other groundfish management measures are considered for the changes to management measures that occur outside the harvest specifications and management measures process. The GMT thought Section 1.2 of [Agenda Item G.2.a, Attachment 3](#) was a very good start at a list of what the analysis could consider.

On that note, we continue to support moving toward better integration of the various groundfish agenda items for analysis and workload planning. By considering all these items together, priorities can be set with full consideration of the scope of work that the Council, its advisory bodies, and cooperating agencies may be undertaking simultaneously.

Lastly, on the advisory body composition proposed in [Agenda Item G.2.a, Attachment 3](#), some on the GMT recommend including three state seats in addition to or in lieu of one GMT seat. The reason is that the states play a key role in tracking landings and each state's system is different. It may be difficult for one GMT member to adequately represent each state's fish ticket considerations.