

SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON  
ADOPTION OF DRAFT REBUILDING PLANS FOR PUBLIC REVIEW FOR PACIFIC OCEAN PERCH,  
LINGCOD, COWCOD, WIDOW ROCKFISH, AND DARKBLOTCHED ROCKFISH

Mr. Jim Seger briefly reviewed the draft document, "Process and Standards for Rebuilding Plans, Part A" (Exhibit C.5, Attachment 2) for the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) and highlighted sections that he considered important for the SSC to review.

The SSC would like to make the following observations:

Amendment Issue 1: Form and Required Elements of Species Rebuilding Plans - As emphasized in the SSC's March 2002 and April 2002 statements, the Council should expect numeric details of rebuilding plans (e.g.,  $B_{MSY}$  in metric tons) to change over time – whether due to improved estimates of these parameters from updated stock assessments or due to technical errors that were not discovered in the previous stock assessment review. The use of hard numbers in the rebuilding amendment should be minimized in order to avoid the need to repeatedly amend the fishery management plan (FMP) with each stock assessment cycle. A case in point is the updated sablefish assessment conducted this year which resulted in a profound change to estimated biomass.

Amendment Issue 3: Mandated Revisions of Harvest Strategy - Option 3b under Adequacy of Progress (Standard Based on Negative Deviations) is not a sound scientific approach and should not be considered. This approach is biased, because it only considers stock projections below the rebuilding level and will result in a change in the probability of recovery. However, the SSC recommends an option be considered that re-estimates the target rebuilding exploitation rate while keeping  $T_{MAX}$  and the probability of recovery constant from the previous rebuilding analysis.

The SSC recognizes the importance of this amendment and the long-term impact it will have on future groundfish management. Given the amount of material necessary to review and the time constraints for the current meeting, a thorough review of the draft document and associated species rebuilding plans was not possible at this meeting. If requested by the Council, the Groundfish Subcommittee of the SSC would conduct a more detailed review of the documents and provide comments to the amendment authors before the September meeting.

PFMC  
06/19/02