

Scoping Session  
Amendment 16-3 to the Groundfish Fishery Management Plan:  
Rebuilding Plans for Bocaccio, Cowcod, Widow Rockfish, and Yelloweye Rockfish  
Hilton Hotel - San Diego Del Mar  
Boardroom 1100  
15575 Jimmy Durante Blvd.  
Del Mar, CA 92014  
(858) 792-5200  
November 2, 2003

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2003 - 3 P.M.-5 PM

Attendance:

Commercial fishing	1
Recreational fishing	5
Government agency	1
Conservation org.	1
Other	2
Total	10

Comments

- In the past, a  $F_{20\%}$  harvest rate was used, which was reviewed, and worked well; but the unexpected shift in environmental regime, combined with continued management at this rate, is what caused overfishing problems.
- The environmental impact statement (EIS) should discuss and recognize the controversy surrounding stock assessment results.
- Ideally the Council should develop a programmatic ecosystem EIS. In this EIS, the cumulative effects analysis bring in other factors in a similar way. Such an analysis would include evaluation of coastal impacts such as development and pollution. Definitely recognize outcomes of bycatch Programmatic EIS and essential fish habitat EIS and how they might affect rebuilding.
- Considering habitat is especially important in rebuilding overfished species.
- Look at social values from a range of maximizing amount of cheap fish extracted to not having any fishing and relying only on non-consumptive values of the resource.
- In the scoping information document the discussion of fishing communities is inaccurate in stating that there are alternatives to recreational groundfish. Because recreational fishers show

a strong preference for a particular type of fish (e.g., groundfish versus salmon) they will not necessarily switch if fishing opportunity on one type is eliminated. Also, there may be restrictions on other stocks that limit fishing. This affects both private and commercial passenger fishing vessels.

- There are people that “live and die by the rockfish” and will not be replaced. People focus on a particular group of fish by preference.
- There needs to be a strong monitoring component in the rebuilding plans. If the Council commits to rebuilding plans, they should also commit to making them work.
- How will rebuilding plans take into account that catch rates will increase as the stock increases?
- As stocks increase, the harvest increases will occur outside of the Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA). Retention of overfished species caught in areas outside the RCA should be allowed in the future. This is the spillover effect in action. The fish inside the RCA will continue to be protected.
- As stocks increase there is tradeoff in terms of management measures. Either the size of RCAs can be reduced, or retention of overfished species should be allowed.
- There has to be a provision in the rebuilding plan that, as an overfished stock gets above a certain level, they can be caught and retained.
- Scientists and fishermen should work collaboratively to do research to develop better methods for bycatch reduction.
- The EIS should look at the historical aspect of how these stocks came to be overfished. Can we learn anything from these rebuilding plans to determine better ways to manage the fishery?
- An analysis should be done of the effect of making the RCA a permanent marine protected area. The analysis should evaluate how to approach management in this way.
- At the least, there should be a discussion in the EIS about different management policies. For example, evaluate full retention or how catches should be treated to reduce bycatch.

PFMC  
11/06/03