

PROPOSED AGENDA
Groundfish Management Team

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel
Columbia Ballroom B
8230 NE Airport Way
Portland, Oregon 97220
(503) 281-2500
June 20-21, 1999

SUNDAY, JUNE 20, 1999 - 2 P.M.

A. Call to Order

Chairman

B. Inseason Adjustments

C. Recreational Fishery Data Issues

1. Discussion with Dr. Dave Van Voorhees, Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey

D. Survey of Trawl Gear Usage

E. Rebuilding Plans for Lingcod, Bocaccio, and Pacific Ocean Perch, Including Allocation and Bycatch Reduction

F. Stock Assessment Priorities for 2000

G. Other Issues on Council Agenda, as Time Permits

H. Other

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/09/99

PROPOSED AGENDA
Scientific and Statistical Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel
8235 NE Airport Way
Portland, OR 97220-1398
(503) 281-2500
June 21-22, 1999

In addition to your briefing book, please bring your April Newsletter.

MONDAY, JUNE 21, 1999 - 8:30 A.M.

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

1. Report of the Executive Director
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of the April 1999 minutes

Larry Six

A suggestion for the amount of time each agenda item should take is provided in the agenda. When the agenda is approved, priorities can be set and these times revised. Discussion leaders should determine whether more or less time is required and request an amendment to the agenda as needed.

Committee member work assignments are noted in parentheses at the end of each agenda item. The first name listed is the discussion leader and the second the rapporteur.

4. Open Discussion (30 minutes)

B. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

2. Anchovy Biomass Estimate
(9 a.m., 30 minutes; Francis, Stauffer)

D. Salmon Management

3. Nonretention Mortality in Ocean Salmon Fisheries
(9:30 a.m., 1.5 hours; Conrad, Byrne)

G. Groundfish Management

3. Strategic Planning
(11 a.m., 1 hour; Sylvia, Lawson)

L. Six

LUNCH

Recreational Fishery Information Network Presentation
Dr. Dave Van Voorhees
Economic Fishery Information Network Presentation
Mr. Dave Colpo
1 P.M.

A. SSC Administrative Matters (continued)

5. Review Statements B.2., D.3., G.3.
(2:30 p.m., 30 minutes)

G. Groundfish Management

4. Stock Assessment Priorities for 2000
(3 p.m., 1 hour; Jagielo, Ralston) Cyreis Schmitt
5. Consistency of California Rockfish Size Limits with Groundfish Fishery
Management Plan CDFG
(4 p.m., 1 hour; Hill, Thomson)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
4 P.M.

Members of the public may address the SSC on fishery issues related to agenda items.

A. SSC Administrative Matters (continued)

6. Finalize Statements B.2., D.3., and G.3.
(5 p.m., 30 minutes)

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 1999 - 8 A.M.

A. SSC Administrative Matters (continued)

7. Review Statements G.4. and G.5.
(8 a.m., 1 hour)

G. Groundfish Management (continued)

7. Observer Program
(9 a.m., 2 hours; Stauffer, Conser)
8. Control Date for Potential Limited Access in the Open Access Fishery
(11 a.m., 1 hour; Young, Sylvia)

LUNCH

A. SSC Administrative Matters (continued)

8. Review Statements G.7. and G.8.
(1 p.m., 1 hour)

G. Groundfish Management (continued)

9. Rebuilding Plans for Lingcod, Bocaccio, and Pacific Ocean Perch, Including Allocation and Bycatch Reduction
(2 p.m., 2 hours; Ralston, Francis)

A. SSC Administrative Matters (continued)

9. Review and Finalize All Statements
(4 p.m., 1 hour)

ADJOURN

PFMC
05/25/99

PROPOSED AGENDA
Habitat Steering Group

Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel
Columbia Ballroom D
8235 NE Airport Way
Portland, OR 97220-1398
(503) 281-2500
June 21, 1999

MONDAY, JUNE 21, 1999 - 9 A.M.

A. Call to Order

Paul Heikkila, Chair

1. Opening Remarks and Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda

B. *Action Items*****

Drafts of all proposed resolutions or written comments for Council approval must be provided to the Council office at least **two weeks prior to the meeting.**

1. Snake River Dam Resolution (60 minutes)

C. Informational Presentations or Updates

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 1. Update on Fishing Gear Research (15 minutes) | Cyreis Schmitt |
| 2. Habitat Steering Group (HSG) Fishing Gear Impact Statement (20 minutes) **Action Item** | Jennifer Bloeser |
| 3. Boccacio/Lingcod/Pacific Ocean Perch Habitat Rebuilding Areas | Allison Bailey |
| 4. Ad-Hoc Marine Reserve Committee Update (20 minutes) | Jim Seger |
| 5. Update on Eel River/Potter Valley (30 minutes) | Larry Week |

E. Updates on Past or Future Committee Actions

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 1. Letter to U.S. Bureau of Reclamation on Klamath Environmental Impact Statement (10 minutes) | Troy Fletcher |
| 2. Letter to U.S. Department of Interior on <i>New Carissa</i> (20 minutes) | Stephen Phillips |
| 3. Update on Mouth of Columbia River Ocean Disposal (20 minutes) | S. Phillips |
| 4. California Bay Delta/Central Valley Project letter to Council of April 30, 1999 (10 minutes) | S. Phillips |

F. HSG Group Briefings

Members of the HSG may provide short informal briefings on pertinent habitat issues not on the agenda.

G. Comments of HSG Members and Public on Issues Not on the Agenda

Those wishing to comment may be asked to signify their intent at the beginning of the comment period to allow a determination of the time available for each person (20 minutes).

H. Items For September 13, 1999 Portland Council Meeting

1. List and describe agenda items and assign persons responsible for arranging presentations (10 minutes). P. Heikkila

I. Report of the HSG to the Council (10 minutes)

P. Heikkila

ADJOURN (4 P.M.)

Note: The Council meeting begins Tuesday at 8 A.M.

PFMC
06/07/99

PROPOSED AGENDA
Groundfish Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel
Columbia Ballroom A
8235 NE Airport Way
Portland, OR 97220-1398
(503) 281-2500
June 21-23, 1999

MONDAY, JUNE 21 - 1 P.M.

A. Call to Order

Don Hansen, Chair

1. Opening Remarks and Introductions
2. Approve Agenda

B. Status Reports

1. Federal Regulations and Activities and Exempted Fishing Permit Applications NMFS
2. Review of Groundfish Priorities, Schedules, and Strategic Plan Jim Glock
3. Report on Fixed Gear Sablefish Industry Meeting Participants
4. Report on Ability to Address Permit Stacking in 1999 Jim Hastie
5. Report on Industry Survey of Buyback Program Peter Leipzig
6. Harvest Policy Review GMT
7. Rockfish Stock Status GMT, Steve Ralston
8. Recreational Fisheries Statistics (RecFIN) Dave VanVorhees
9. Economic Survey/Statistics (EFIN) Dave Colpo

C. Comment on Marine Reserves Committee Reports

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 1999 - 8 A.M.

D. Comment on Groundfish Habitat Areas of Particular Concern

E. Bycatch Issues (Review Survey of Trawl Gear Usage)

Brian Culver

F. Process to Allow Use of Open Access Hook-and-Line Gear by Fixed Gear Limited Entry Permit Holders

Yvonne deReynier

G. Stock Assessment Priorities for 2000

GMT

H. Rockfish Allocation (stock complexes)

I. Consistency of California Rockfish Size Limits with Groundfish Plan

Julie Walker

J. Status of Fisheries and Inseason Adjustments

GMT

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 1999 - 8 A.M.

K. Status of Observer Program Development

J. Glock

L. Control Date for Potential Limited Access in the Open Access Fishery

***M. Rebuilding Plans for Lingcod, Bocaccio and Pacific Ocean Perch,
Including Allocation and Bycatch Reduction***

GMT, J. Walker

N. Review Statements and Complete Any Unfinished Business

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/08/99

DRAFT
SUMMARY MINUTES
Groundfish Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion's Sacramento Inn, Comstock II Room
1401 Arden Way
Sacramento, CA 95815
April 5-7, 1999

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1 p.m. by Chairman, Don Hansen.

Members in Attendance

Barry Cohen
John Crowley
Ken Culver
Jeff Folkema
Tom Ghio
Don Hansen
Marion Larkin
Peter Leipzig

Rod Moore
Dale Myer
Richard Overfield
Jim Ponts
Gary Smith
Kelly Smotherman
Frank Warrens

Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Comments to the Council on April 1999 Agenda Items

MANDATORY OBSERVERS ON AT-SEA PROCESSORS

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) supports NMFS's proposed rule to make observers mandatory on the at-sea whiting processors. The proposed rule will give NMFS more control in observer performance by establishing standards and procedures, and will allow NMFS to certify, suspend, and decertify observers. The at-sea processors have grown to depend upon the observer program. Making a requirement to carry observers is not a burden. The at-sea processors are more than willing to do whatever is necessary to keep the observer program going.

With regard to the coverage requirement, the GAP supports Option 2. This option would make it mandatory for all at-sea processors to carry one observer. The GAP believes one observer will result in essentially 80% coverage over the at-sea whiting fishery. The cooperative (co-op) vessels will continue to voluntarily carry two observers to assure their quotas are not exceeded. Presumably, the tribal processor will also carry two observers. The co-op and tribal sectors represent over 60% of the at-sea whiting harvest and will have 95% to 100% coverage. The motherships harvest 40% of the at-sea quota and will have 45% to 50% coverage with one observer. This should result in 80% coverage overall.

Compared to other fisheries, the at-sea whiting fishery does not have much variability. The co-op vessels will have two observers. This will mitigate the variability of vessel size, timing of the season, and area fished from the co-op vessel. What is left is the variability of the mothership fleet. The catcher vessels fishing for the motherships are of similar size, similar horse power, and tow similar nets over a 16-day fishery. When a mothership changes areas, all its catcher boats also move as a group. Just about all samples should be representative. Variability is not that great.

The at-sea whiting fishery is a well-monitored fishery. Observers have been in place back to the 1980s and joint venture fisheries. An 80% coverage should be sufficient.

DETERMINATION OF TOTAL CATCH

The GAP reviewed the minutes of the Ad-Hoc Total Catch Determination Committee (Committee) and heard from several members of the Committee on the work and discussion which has occurred at previous meetings. The GAP is concerned that the Committee was focusing on how to spend the proposed money in the administration's budget for a West Coast observer plan without much discussion on whether the proposed option achieves the Committees goals and objectives.

The GAP wishes to remind the Council of the need to develop a standardized monitoring and reporting system for groundfish and questions whether either option would move in that direction. Regardless of which sectors we observe, observer coverage should be allocated based on days at sea.

Mark Saelens, Chairman of the Groundfish Management Team (GMT), pointed out he had recently participated in a panel discussion on bycatch at the rockfish forum in Monterey. That panel concluded that the priority for new work should first be conducted to fill data gaps, second to collect data where gaps pose the greatest risk to the stock, and last to fill in data where the species composition of the landed catch is poor or landed catch is not being reported at all.

We believe the Committee should clearly identify the objectives of an observer program and suggest using the above criteria, rather than simply deciding how to spend \$2 million.

STATUS OF CAPACITY ISSUES, INCLUDING TRAWL BUYBACK PROGRAM

Buyback

Steve Freese, from NMFS gave the GAP a presentation on the proposed regulations to implement buyback programs and summarized a letter from Bill Robinson addressing the Council's groundfish trawl buyback proposal.

The GAP would like the Council to provide comments on the proposed regulations, which would improve the regulations not only for the Pacific region, but also, in our opinion, for others around the country considering buyback programs. The proposed regulations would require a fee of two percent to be added to the rate of interest that would be charged by the federal government for programs involving industry funding. This surcharge is levied to offset any loss associated with default on the loan, although the text of the proposed regulation makes it clear the fishery service does not believe there is any risk involved in the loan. A two percent fee would increase in the cost of interest by around one-third. We do not believe this is necessary.

The sequence of events laid out in the time-line of implementation of a buyback program appears to be in series. One event can not occur until the previous event has been completed. The industry must do things before the Council may do things, and all of these steps must be completed prior to NMFS beginning any tasks. We believe that many of these tasks should be conducted in parallel paths so the end product of a buyback program may be implemented much quicker. Allowing for regional differences in proceeding through the required steps would facilitate the process.

Lastly, the procedures for the processors to collect, report, and submit withheld fees from the fishermen are over complicated and differ from the established business practices common on the West Coast. The collection of state and industry fees is common in all three states. The system for handling withholdings from fishermen should be allowed to reflect these established practices. A regional approach should be used here as well.

Individual Transferable Quotas (ITQs)

Throughout the meeting the GAP made comments on the need to move toward the implementation of ITQs for groundfish. The nontrawl sablefish interest raised the issues as an alternative to the three-tiered trip program or permit stacking. Peter Leipzig presented a summary of a trawl meeting held in February that developed a strawman ITQ program (summary attached). The GAP received, but did not endorse, this proposal.

There was no opposition to moving forward with the development of an ITQ program(s) from any sector represented on the GAP. Concern was expressed that the development of program that included trawl

gear may hold back the implementation of a program for nontrawl sablefish. The GAP felt it would be best for each sector to develop programs independent of each other, but on parallel paths. This way, if controversial issues were to arise in one fishery, these issues would not be a detriment to implementation of a system in another sector.

There is also need to look at economic rationalization for all segments of the groundfish user community, including processors, recreational fishers, and open access fishers. The Council needs to make a clear commitment on this issue.

There was disagreement however; on whether in the end, all groundfish ITQ systems should have a goal of becoming integrated into one system. This blending of the systems could occur, or not occur, depending on whether shares for species are gear specific. For example, a gear-specific program would require trawl sablefish shares could only be used with trawl gear. In contrast, if share were not gear specific, sablefish shares could be traded and caught with any gear type.

The GAP would like the Council to give clear guidance on your preferred approach on this issue. We want you to make a decision and tell us which approach to use in developing our systems. We agree to accept your decision.

Control date

Lastly, we reviewed and discussed a proposal from Scott Boley that would establish a control date for new entrants into the open access fishery. Without endorsing any of the details of Mr. Boley's proposal, the GAP requests the Council give notice of your intent to set a control date at your June meeting. The GAP felt that if it were possible to use January 1, 1999, that would be preferable.

PRIMARY FIXED GEAR SABLEFISH FISHERY - LIMITS AND DATES FOR 1999 AND LONGER TERM ISSUES

The GAP examined the developed options for the 1999 fixed gear sablefish primary opening. After consideration of the overhead likelihoods and the variables which would affect season timing, the fixed gear representatives on the GAP agreed on a preference for Option 5 on Attachment G.7.a., with a starting date of August 16, 1999.

Regarding longer term fixed gear sablefish issues, two concepts were explored by the GAP. First, the idea of permit stacking was considered. It was agreed among GAP fixed gear members that permit stacking, if developed, should be kept as simple as possible. The more requirements, restrictions, and complications to a stacking program, the more it will become unwieldy and incompatible with later development of an individual quota program, which was the second possible development explored by the GAP.

It was agreed among fixed gear GAP members that priority should be placed on development of an individual quota program for fixed gear sablefish. The National Research Council has recommended to Congress that the individual quota moratorium be lifted, and a special reference was made to the programs which have previously been developed for West Coast sablefish and red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico. The fixed gear representatives on the GAP feel that now is the time to resume the effort to implement fixed gear individual quotas for sablefish. A committee should be appointed to review the program previously developed, and recommendations should be prepared for an individual quota program so it may be implemented as soon as the moratorium is lifted.

The committee to be appointed for review and further development of a program should be the same as, or very similar to, the previous individual quota committee. Special effort should be taken to include all types of individuals who will be included in or affected by this particular program. Any future program should be built upon the program previously developed and should accommodate changes in the management of the fishery since the moratorium was implemented; such as the implementation of the three-tier allocation regime, which would solve the most contentious issue of individual quota development.

It is also recommended the Council revise the groundfish workload priorities so a sablefish individual quota program could be developed for the year 2000 season pending a moratorium end.

INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS, INCLUDING POSSIBLE EMERGENCY ACTION FOR BOCACCIO

The GAP met with the GMT to discuss inseason fishery adjustments and makes the following recommendations:

Dover Sole - Effective in the fishing period starting April 1, 1999, increase the cumulative limit to 25,000 pounds. As of June 1, 1999, return to the currently scheduled cumulative limit of 20,000 pounds.

Sablefish - Effective in the fishing period starting April 1, 1999, increase the cumulative limit to 12,000 pounds. As of June 1, 1999, return to the currently scheduled cumulative limit of 10,000 pounds.

The GAP believes an opportunity will exist to harvest Dover sole and sablefish with minimum bycatch of other species during this early period, and thus, recommends the short-term increases.

Sebastes North - Effective June 1, 1999 through September 30, 1999, increase the cumulative limit to 30,000 pounds for each cumulative period.

Yellowtail - Effective June 1, 1999 through September 30, 1999, increase the monthly cumulative limit to 16,000 pounds for each cumulative period.

Canary - In the northern area, effective June 1, 1999 through September 30, 1999, increase the cumulative limit to 14,000 pounds for each cumulative period. For the southern area, maintain existing regulations specifying that canary harvest cannot exceed southern Sebastes limits.

Sebastes South - Effective June 1, 1999 through September 30, 1999, decrease the cumulative limit to 3,500 pounds for each cumulative period.

Widow Rockfish - Effective June 1, 1999 through September 30, 1999, decrease the cumulative limit to 11,000 pounds for each cumulative period.

For B Platoon vessels, the changes recommended should be made for the appropriate corresponding time periods.

These recommendations are made in light of the uncertainty in tracking harvests and projecting attainment of the optimum yield (OY) under the new cumulative system developed this year. The GAP expects the GMT to further review harvest attainment at their June meetings and will work with the GMT at the June Council meeting to make any further necessary adjustments.

The GAP discussed with Council staff and the GMT the procedures involved in having an inter-Council meeting phone conference for inseason adjustments. The GAP believes the teleconference will be unnecessary for May if the recommended cumulative limit changes are put in place for the time periods shown.

The GAP held a lengthy discussion on the request for emergency action on bocaccio rockfish, involving GMT members and the conservation representative on the GAP. After considering the requested actions, noting the information available, and taking into account management actions which have previously been put in place to conserve bocaccio, the GAP has the following recommendations for Council action:

1. Reduce the Southern Sebastes trip limit as noted above
2. Initiate a comprehensive education effort about the need to avoid bocaccio, involving the Council newsletter, the commercial industry, and the recreational community.
3. Consider any recommendations forthcoming from the GMT on reductions in California setnet catches and open access limits on bocaccio and southern Sebastes.
4. Request the State of California to take appropriate actions on gear use and modification in State-managed fisheries which are suspected to have a high bocaccio bycatch.

The GAP noted that no surveys have been conducted south of Point Conception for many years. Given changing ocean conditions and the fact that the reduction in bocaccio biomass cannot be accounted for

solely by harvest, the GAP believes that a south of Point Conception survey should be re-initiated as soon as possible.

The GAP did not recommend reducing the chilipepper OY as a way of conserving bocaccio. Information presented by Mary Yoklavich and Mark Wilkins during the joint session on Monday and information presented to the GAP by the GMT did not show any clear linkage between chilipepper harvest and bocaccio harvest. Further, catches to date of chilipepper and bocaccio show that far less of these species is being harvested than would be allowed under the existing OY. Finally, the GAP noted the less flexible procedures involved in taking emergency action and suggested that any future reduction during the 1999 season could best be handled through inseason adjustment of trip limits. The GAP agreed to review catches and make inseason adjustment recommendations again at the June meeting, when more information would be available.

The GAP also did not recommend reducing the California recreational bag limit since information provided by California GMT members was unclear on the effect on any savings of bocaccio.

A minority of the GAP disagreed with the recommendations not to reduce the chilipepper OY by emergency action and not to reduce the California recreational bag limit, suggesting that such reductions would be precautionary measures that would help conserve bocaccio.

REBUILDING PLANS FOR LINGCOD, BOCACCIO, AND PACIFIC OCEAN PERCH, INCLUDING ALLOCATION AND BYCATCH REDUCTION

The GAP is confused and concerned that with so little time available to develop rebuilding plans for bocaccio, lingcod, and Pacific Ocean perch that uncertainty exists on whom actually is taking the lead on the rebuilding plans. We believe it makes the most sense for stock assessment authors to assume this role and conduct the necessary calculations to establish rebuilding scenarios.

We believe given the time available, a STAR Panel approach will not be permitted. Therefore, the Scientific and Statistical Committee, GMT and GAP should be involved in the development of the plans and their final review. The assessment authors should be made available to explain their work.

The GAP would like technical guidance, whether it be from STAR-type panels or the SSC and the GMT. The GAP would like to have the opportunity to select among the options developed by these technical teams.

LANDING OF "OVERAGES"

The GAP reviewed the summary and report provided by the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (Attachment G.11.b.). The GAP recommends the Council adopt the program as presented and have it go into effect for the year 2000.

COMMENTS TO THE AD HOC MARINE RESERVE COMMITTEE

The GAP reviewed the report presented by the Ad Hoc Marine Reserve Committee in March and made the following general comments:

1. The GAP believes it extremely important that any siting decisions for marine reserves be made with the full involvement of all of those in fisheries that would be affected by reserve establishment.
2. One criterion of reserve establishment is that a reserve should have the least negative economic impact possible on all users.
3. The purposes for establishing reserves should be clearly defined.
4. Before establishing a reserve, sufficient baseline data should be collected to determine what is being protected and what is being measured.
5. Reserves, once established, should be monitored to ensure they are meeting the purposes for which they are established.

6. We need to look at the relationship of reserves to rebuilding goals. Is establishing a reserve a viable means of assisting rebuilding? Does establishing a reserve to aid in rebuilding reduce the need to take other actions which more directly affect harvest?
7. What is the effect of establishing a reserve on resources in areas outside the reserve, including any effects related to effort increases?
8. In establishing a reserve, a means of dis-establishing the reserve needs to be included.

PFMC
06/02/99

PROPOSED AGENDA
Ad-Hoc Salmon Mortality Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel
Columbia Ballroom C
8235 NE Airport Way
Portland, OR 97220-1398
(503) 281-2500
June 21, 1999

MONDAY, JUNE 21, 1999 - 1 P.M.

A. Call to Order

LB Boydston

1. Chairman's Remarks
2. Review of Agenda

B. Progress Reports on the Review and Technical Evaluation
of Recent Nonretention Mortality Studies

D. McNair, P. Lawson, and R. Kope

Mr. Doug McNair has completed a summary of recent hooking mortality studies as an initial step in the effort to improve nonretention mortality estimates in Council fisheries (previously mailed to committee members). He will review his report with the committee. The next step is a technical evaluation of the recent studies led by Drs. Pete Lawson and Robert Kope. The intent of this effort is to relate and standardize the results of the various studies for easier comparison as well as providing guidance in reviewing current creel census information and in collecting future data from which to estimate nonretention mortality in Council fisheries (see #1 of the November meeting minutes, attached).

C. Development of Ocean Fishery Profiles and Encounter Rate Information

LB Boydston

Using the technical evaluation of recent hooking mortality studies as a guide, committee members will need to have their respective agencies begin developing standardized ocean fishery profiles and encounter rate information (see #2 and #3 of the November meeting minutes). A meeting will likely be needed to coordinate this action in the near future. Committee members should identify the pertinent ocean sampling personnel to be involved in the current effort and meeting, as well as future budget and personnel needs.

D. Assignments and Other Issues

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/08/99

MINUTES AND REPORT
Ad-hoc Salmon Nonretention Mortality Committee
Pacific Fishery Management Council
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission Conference Room
45SE 82nd Drive, Suite 100
Gladstone, OR 97027-2522
December 9, 1998

Mr. LB Boydston, committee chair, called the meeting to order at 11 a.m. The following committee members were in attendance:

LB Boydston, chair	Phil Anderson
Stuart Ellis (for Jim Harp)	Randy Fisher (for Dave Hanson)
Rod Kaiser (for Burnie Bohn)	Bill Robinson
Tim Roth	John Coon (Council staff)

Other attendees were:

Les and Francis Clark	Mike Crewson	Paul Engelmeyer
Robert Kope	Pete Lawson	Doug Milward
Jim Olson	Hans Radtke	Gerald Reinholdt
Dell Simmons	Don Stevens	Roger Thomas

The purpose of the meeting was to develop recommendations for actions to accurately assess the incidence and mortality of salmon caught and released in Council ocean salmon fisheries, to maintain the Council's ability to use the best science in assessment of nonretention fishery impacts over the long-term, and to explore ways to minimize nonretention mortality. The recommendations developed by the committee revolve around answering four questions:

- (1) Are the hook-and-release mortality rates currently used in Council ocean salmon fisheries correct (the best science available)? If not, what rates should be used?
- (2) What changes in fishing gear could be made to reduce hook-and-release mortality?
- (3) What studies are needed to determine more accurate hook-and-release mortality rates (i.e., studies with regard to direct estimation of hook-and-release mortality, encounter rates, fishery profiles, etc.)?
- (4) What additional studies or management tools are needed to assure the Council can accurately assess impacts of selective fisheries for marked hatchery fish (e.g., changes in impact modeling)?

The committee's recommendations, which follow below, are aimed at making comprehensive improvements in Council management of nonretention mortalities and do not propose specific hook-and-release mortality rate changes for the 1999 ocean salmon season. The recommendations incorporate actions which have resulted from the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) Hooking Mortality Workshop on December 8, 1998. In line with the approach at that workshop, the committee stresses the need for and benefits of close coordination among all fishery management entities, including those of Canada, to address the issues of nonretention fishery impacts. The committee's specific recommendations follow:

1. **Combined Literature and Technical Review of Existing Research** - To begin addressing the first question (above), a thorough literature review and technical evaluation of the hook-and-release mortality research pertinent to ocean salmon fisheries should be completed in the next few months. The review should result in a summary which, to the degree possible, relates and standardizes the results of the various studies for easy comparison (i.e., establishes a protocol for comparing current and future studies, including the standardization of terms for short- and long-term mortality, relevant fishing gear descriptions and categories, hook wound locations and relevance, etc.), and makes recommendations for any needed future research.

The PSMFC has agreed to coordinate a literature and technical review of the current hook-and-release mortality research along the lines recommended above. The committee recommends that the technical review include the U.S. and Canadian researchers from the hook-and-release mortality workshop and also include Dr. Robert Kope (Salmon Technical Team chair), Dr. Pete Lawson (Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC)) and Dr. Robert Conrad (Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission and SSC). The PSMFC has indicated that a meeting of the review group is likely to occur in January 1999. The committee urges the review group to have a product completed by no later than early June 1999 to afford review at or prior to the June Council meeting (June 21-25, 1999).

2. **Ocean Fishery Profiles** - Based on the standard protocols to be developed by the PSMFC review group, the state and tribal fishery management entities should (through their harvest sampling personnel) develop standardized profiles of the current and recent ocean fisheries with regard to fishing methods (trolling, mooching, etc.), gear descriptions (hook sizes, number and layout; baits, etc.) and other pertinent baseline information. Such information can be used to assess the differences in various fisheries which may be likely to create differences in hook-and-release mortality rates and/or identify areas of needed research or special management consideration. This information should be developed by early June 1999 to afford committee review. Once established, the committee believes it would also be important to update the information periodically to document and respond to any major changes. This effort addresses questions #1 through #3, above.
3. **Encounter Rate Estimation** - With regard to encounter rate estimates, pertinent representatives of the state and tribal fishery management entities, with assistance from National Marine Fisheries Service (perhaps in the form of a biometrician), should meet in February 1999 (meeting to be coordinated by PSMFC). The purpose of the meeting would be to summarize and review existing encounter rate information and plan future coordinated and standardized data collection through on-the-water observers and test fisheries, including personnel and budget needs to conduct an ongoing coastwide encounter rate estimation program in the commercial and sport salmon fisheries. This effort addresses questions #1 and #3 above.
4. **Standardized Record of Nonretention Mortality Impacts** - The STT should maintain a clear record of nonretention mortality projections and postseason estimates in its preseason reports (including hook-and-release mortality rates or changes thereof and methods of estimating encounter rates). This record is necessary to meet requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.
5. **Selective Fisheries** - The states, tribes and Council technical advisors should maintain or improve coordination among the management entities with regard to developing other studies or model changes which can accurately assess the impacts of selective fisheries for marked hatchery fish. This effort addresses question #4, above.
6. **Changes in Fishing Gear to Reduce Hook-and-Release Mortality (Question #2)** - Following the assessment, standardization and summarization of existing research and data under the first three recommendations (above), the Council should consider a mechanism for coordinating the development of specific recommendations for fishing gear changes and/or test fisheries to assess such changes. Reconvening this committee may be appropriate to develop guidance in this effort.

The committee instructed Council staff to keep it apprised of any draft products resulting from the actions outlined above and to plan on a second committee meeting to review the products of the PSMFC review group during the June Council meeting. If beneficial, the committee may also consider meeting at the March Council meeting.

Mr. Boydston adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

PFMC
01/13/99

ANCILLARY F.
June 1999

PROPOSED AGENDA
Budget Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel
Cascade Room A
8235 NE Airport Way
Portland, OR 97220-1398
(503) 281-2500
June 21, 1999

MONDAY, JUNE 21, 1999 - 3 P.M.

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| A. <i>Call to Order and Approval of Agenda</i> | Jim Harp, Chair |
| B. <i>Report of Expenditures Through May 1999</i> | John Rhoton |
| C. <i>Budget Projection for 1999</i> | J. Rhoton |
| D. <i>Status of Appropriations for 2000</i> | Dave Hanson |
| E. <i>Status of Meeting Sites for 2001 through 2002</i> | J. Rhoton |
| F. <i>Other</i> | |

ADJOURN

PFMC
05/21/99

PROPOSED AGENDA
Enforcement Consultants

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel
Cascade Room A
8235 NE Airport Way
Portland, OR 97220-1398
(503) 281-2500
June 22, 1999

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 1999 - 5:30 P.M.

A. Introductions

B. Enforcement Comments - Agenda Items

1. Coastal Pelagic Species - Anchovy Quotas for 1999-2000
2. Highly Migratory Species Management
3. Salmon - Non-Retention Mortality
4. Marine Reserves
5. Habitat Issues
6. Groundfish Management
 - a. Status of Federal Regulations
 - b. Status Reports
 1. Permit Stacking
 2. Experimental Setnet Landings as Qualification for Sablefish Tier Assignment
 3. Industry Survey of Buyback Program
 4. Use of Open Access Hook-&-Line Gear by Fixed Gear Limited Entry Permit Holders
 5. Bycatch Issues
 - c. Strategic Planning
 - d. Stock Assessment Priorities for 2000
 - e. Consistency of California Rockfish Size Limits with Groundfish Plan
 - f. Inseason Adjustments
 - g. Observer Program
 - h. Control Date for Potential Limited Access in the Open Access Fishery
 - i. Rebuilding Plans and Bycatch Reduction

C. Industry and Interested Party Comments

D. Public Comments

E. Schedule for Additional Meetings

F. Miscellaneous Items - Group Discussion

ADJOURN

PFMC
05/21/99