

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES
Groundfish Management Team
Groundfish Allocation Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion Hotel – Convention Center
St. Johns Room
1021 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232
503-235-2100
February 6-9, 2006

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2006

Members Present:

Ms. Susan Ashcraft (chair), California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Merrick Burden (vice-chair), National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Ms. Deborah Aseltine-Neilson, California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Brian Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ms. Michele Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ms. Yvonne de Reynier, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Robert Jones, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Ms. Gway Kirchner, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ms. Becky Renko, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Mark Saelens, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. John Wallace, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center

Others Present:

Ms. Laura Bozzi, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Ms. Eileen Cooney, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration General Counsel
Mr. John DeVore, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Dr. Steve Freese, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Frank Lockhart, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Ms. Heather Mann, West Coast Seafood Processors' Association and Groundfish Allocation
Committee Representative
Ms. Mariam McCall, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration General Counsel
Ms. Caroline Park, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration General Counsel
Mr. Brad Pettinger, Oregon Trawl Commission
Ms. Kate Quigley, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Jim Seger, Pacific Fishery Management Council

A. Call to Order of the Groundfish Management Team

1. Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, etc.

Ms. Ashcraft called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. Ms. Ashcraft noted changes in the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) membership: following this meeting, Debbie Aseltine-Neilson would be temporarily replaced by Ms. Deb Wilson-Vandenberg, who would likely remain on the GMT through June; add her to the GMT email list. Also, Ms. Gway Kirchner will be replaced on the GMT by a new ODFW staffer who has yet to be hired. Ms. Kirchner will remain on the GMT at least through the June meeting. Ms. Becky Renko replaced Carrie Nordeen as the NMFS Northwest Region Representative.

2. Elect Chair and Vice Chair for 2006

Although the GMT had decided that the positions of chair and vice-chair should be 2-year terms, the Council Operating Procedures (COPs) still call for yearly elections. Therefore, as a matter of process, the chair called for additional nominations to the 2 positions. None were proposed, and the GMT unanimously re-elected Susan Ashcraft as chair and Merrick Burden as vice-chair.

Ms. Culver noted that the GMT should look at the COPs and the new, proposed Efficiency and Standards Protocols (ESP) to clarify the roles and duties of the GMT members, as she finds that members sometimes have differing expectations about their responsibilities.

3. Goals and Objectives of this Meeting and Agenda Overview

Mr. DeVore overviewed the GMT meeting agenda as well as the key decisions for the GMT to make during the meeting. These decisions/products included:

- The range of management measure alternatives to prepare for the Groundfish Allocation Committee (GAC), by sector and region.
- A list of key management issues that the GMT would need to analyze.
- A list of potential management measures GMT members want to see analyzed based on their constituency meetings.
- A strategy to meet the March 15 deadline for GMT materials in the April Council meeting briefing book. The key materials are the final harvest specifications, including those for depleted species, which largely defines rebuilding plans. These initial analyses will aid the Council and advisory bodies refine a range of management measure alternatives for analysis. That decision is scheduled to occur at the April Council meeting.

4. Approve Agenda

Ms. Culver asked if Agenda Item B, *Review Updated Impact Analysis Models for 2007-08*, was necessary, particularly for the recreational analyses. She preferred to begin with the final numbers provided by the Groundfish Allocation Committee (GAC) and then structure the management alternatives to meet that limit. Her concern was to prioritize Agenda Item E, *Synopsis of Key Questions and Presentations for the Groundfish Allocation Committee*. Mr. DeVore countered that GMT consensus on the impact projection models needs to occur early in the process so there is no further deliberation on how analyses should be done.

The agenda was revised to allow for an initial drafting of the key questions to the Allocation Committee after lunch on Monday. The agenda was approved following the revision.

B. Review Updated Impact Analysis Models for 2007-08

Mr. DeVore explained that the purpose of this agenda item is for the GMT to agree that they support each of these models, as some are new or have been adjusted.

1. California Recreational Model

Ms. Aseltine-Neilson briefed the GMT on the California recreational impact projection model, summarizing that the model is very similar to the 2005-2006 model but that the base data is different. This model now has only California Recreational Fishery Survey (CRFS) data from 2004-2005. Since 2005 was such an anomaly in its oceanographic patterns – similar to a small El Niño – the model is driven by 60:40 weighting of 2005 to 2004 data. The estimates of historical percent catch by wave are calculated from RecFIN Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistical Survey (MRFSS) data from 1993-1999, as this was the period during which seasons and depths were unconstrained. **It is noted that the origin of the data (MRFSS or CRFS) and how it is used must be made explicit in the EIS.**

The model assumes that all B1 groundfish are discarded dead. The B2 (discarded live) component may be incorporated into the model in its next revision (2009-2010). There is concern that these discard mortalities should be included. Mr. Burden suggested using the open access model designed last year, which included differential mortalities. **Mr. DeVore requested that the California representative provide data on the magnitude of B2 for canary and yelloweye for the March 2006 Council meeting.**

Ms. Ashcraft recommended incorporating the barotrauma-induced discard mortality rates presented at the Western Groundfish Conference into the models. A subgroup was formed to research further details, such as depth information. Mr. Culver noted that this is a similar charge as given to the RecFIN Technical Committee, but this committee would want input from GMT. **The subgroup on barotrauma, which will work together via email, is Ms. Kirchner, Ms. Aseltine-Neilson, and Mr. Culver.**

Ms. Culver was unsure about the model expansion factors, so Ms. Aseltine-Neilson agreed to provide a more explicit written explanation of that element on Tuesday. **The GMT accepted by show of hands the California recreational model as a “relatively reasonable approach”.**

2. Oregon Recreational Model

Ms. Kirchner briefed the GMT on the changes to the Oregon Recreational Model. The model applies 2004 and 2005 salmon fishery data to estimate that fishery’s impacts on the groundfish fishery; 2003 catch temporal data is used to normalize the 2004 and 2005 seasons, accounting for closures; and 5% mortality rates are applied to released fish (B2) in nearshore fisheries to incorporate anticipated hooking mortality. With little discussion, **the GMT accepted by show of hands the Oregon recreational model as a “relatively reasonable approach”.**

3. Washington Recreational Model

Mr. Culver explained the use of angler interviews to determine how deep the anglers fish. He also explained that with an effort shift inshore, the catch of canary and yelloweye has not been

reduced, but the mortality of the released fish declined because of the shallower depth. Discussion turned to the problem of anglers misidentifying the species that they catch. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) staff have worked to educate the public by providing species identification information on websites, through brochures, etc. This misidentification may be the cause of outliers in the data, some of which overestimate the catch estimates and some that underestimate catch. There is a particular problem in the over-identification of canary and yelloweye because of the media attention that they have received over the past years. **The GMT members discussed an interest in a future topic: approaches to validate recreational anglers' recorded data. The GMT accepted by show of hands the Washington recreational model as a "relatively reasonable approach".**

4. Limited Entry Trawl Model

Mr. Burden noted that there have been no changes to the Limited Entry (LE) Trawl model since last fall. Since the projected total annual catch for some species, such as canary and darkblotched, tend to be behind, he calibrated these projections by adjusting them up. **Mr. Burden will provide a written description of the LE trawl model for the March 2006 Council meeting.**

A discussion began on the use of new latitudinal breaks to geographically partition the LE trawl fishery, with a goal to more finely match trip limits with regional incidental catch limits. Mr. DeVore voiced concern about the regulatory difficulties of implementing such a management approach. Ms. Ashcraft asked if the current model could incorporate additional latitude breaks. Mr. Burden replied that such a change could not be made in time to include the analysis in the EIS; however, it was unclear whether such analysis would need to be included in the EIS.

Ms. Culver then asked whether it is necessary to structure management measures to support a year-round fishery, even if this is not necessarily the most economically efficient method. The GMT planned to ask the GAC whether or not the season must be started with lower catch limits so as to allow for a year-round fishery. Mr. DeVore suggested analyzing both year-round and less than year-round alternatives. The GMT noted the importance of understanding what defines a year-round fishery. The processor representative for the Groundfish Advisory SubPanel (GAP), **Ms. Heather Mann, volunteered to query processors about their definition of and need for a year-round groundfish fishery by the March 2006 Council meeting. She will provide summary results by area and by species.**

There have been no changes to the whiting model structure over the past year other than updating it with 2005 total catch by species information.

5. Limited Entry and Open Access Fixed Gear Models

Mr. Wallace provided information on the LE and Open Access (OA) fixed gear models. Someone asked why the data is truncated at 50 fm. **Mr. Wallace will find out whether this is because there is no data for depths greater than 50 fm or whether this was a decision in structuring the model and report back.** This should be footnoted in the model documentation to explain the cause. It is noted that this may impact the Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA) designations for the non-trawl commercial fishery.

No changes will be made to the primary sablefish model until next November when an updated observer data report is anticipated.

6. Tribal Model

Mr. Jones first provided background on the tribal fishery. The Makah tribal groundfish fishery is a full retention fishery. There are observers on bottom trawl boats, with an observer rate of 10% in 2004. The midwater trawl fishery averages higher observer rates because of the concern over incidental canary catch. The tribal longline groundfish fishery primarily targets sablefish, where two-thirds of the quota is allocated to each of the tribes, and the remaining one-third is fished in a competitive derby fishery. He assumed that the allocated quota could provide an incentive to high-grade, although there is no evidence of discarding. There are more of the larger sablefish (>3 lbs) in the quota fishery, which may be due to seasonal changes in size or availability of larger fish as well as high-grading. To estimate the maximum mortality resulting from high-grading, he subtracts the difference between the two fisheries and then multiplies by a 20% mortality rate. Mr. Culver suggested that Mr. Jones look at the length distribution of sablefish in tribal catches. These distributions should include a tail end of small sized fish. Mr. Culver also noted that there should be higher observer coverage for a fishery that is full retention but has an incentive to discard. **The GMT accepted by show of hands the tribal model as a “relatively reasonable approach”.**

C. Discussion of the Analytical Approach Used to Decide 2007-2008 Harvest Specifications and Long-Term Rebuilding Plans

1. Overview of Proposed Analyses and Discussion of Rebuilding Alternatives

Mr. DeVore explained the revised approach to preparing analyses for the 2007-2008 harvest specifications and rebuilding plans. The first step in analyzing OY alternatives for depleted species will be the same as in the past, in which OY alternatives will be analyzed for each species to determine the tradeoff in predicted rebuilding periods versus allowable harvest. Additionally, these analyses are intended to highlight the potential impacts to each sector resulting from those harvest limits. This is coined the “horizontal” analysis.

The second step is to arrange OY alternatives for each of the depleted species into suites of rebuilding alternatives. Rebuilding alternatives were developed by mixing and matching OY alternatives for depleted species (Figure 1). The objective of this step is to demonstrate how each species can constrain other fisheries and to make explicit the tradeoffs that result from these varying constraints. The resulting predicted management regime under each of these alternatives should highlight the tradeoffs. It may be informative to vary allocations or other management assumptions when presenting these results. For instance, status quo allocations may be assumed under one model realization and other allocations considered under other realizations. Likewise, structuring a year-round fishing opportunity to the extent possible may be compared to another model realization where a more seasonal structure is presented. These proposed rebuilding alternatives used a truncated range of depleted species OYs to develop a reasonable range for analysis. Non-viable alternatives, such as the zero-harvest alternatives were not used because it was considered important to present realistic outlooks. The contrast between the different “vertical” alternatives is particularly important for the official record in the EIS.

Mr. Burden explained two different options for analyzing the tradeoffs in the vertically integrated OY suites. In order to stay within a lower OY value, cuts can be allocated either proportionately (making cuts to all sectors), or disproportionately (cutting out entire sectors, beginning at the bottom).

Ms. Ashcraft requested that an additional vertically integrated alternative be added to serve as a “status quo” reference point. She suggested an alternative determined by calculating the effective spawning output-per-recruit relative to that in an unfished state (SPR) harvest rate from the November 2005 bycatch scorecard and projecting this harvest rate forward to 2007 to develop “status quo” OYs. Mr. DeVore added this column to Figure 1.

2. Overview of Proposed Socioeconomic Analyses

Due to the recent 9th Circuit Court ruling on the challenge to the Council’s darkblotched rockfish rebuilding plan, substantial additional socio-economic analysis will be included in the EIS. Dr. Freese explained that the court opinion gives little guidance on what is needed from these economic analyses. Dr. Freese further explained that the court case has changed the metric used to relate changes in fishing regulations to the effects on fishing communities. In the past the Council addressed the *impacts* on communities, whereas now they will need to address the communities’ *needs*. He stressed that federal regulations do not require meeting the needs of the communities, but rather taking those needs into account and providing justification for why a management decision was necessary.

Dr. Freese outlined the array of proposed socioeconomic analyses to be used to assess the needs of west coast fishing communities, allows the Council to take them into account, and then assure that such actions are supported with justification. The elements include economic projections by sector and community, social and economic profiles of communities, developing perspectives on the “needs” of fishing communities (e.g. through reviews of legal documents, historical trends, and a “break-even” analysis), an indicator approach for communities, and an economic trade-off analysis. Someone suggested looking into the MRFSS pressure index, which has been used as a proxy for recreational effort per site, as a data source.

4. Recommendations Regarding Proposed Analyses

Mr. Burden described a proposed method to analyze the economic revenue and distributional impacts associated with the constraints on overfished species’ mortality. He found that for single target sectors, an increase in ex-vessel revenue is linear to an increase in the allowable harvest of a constraining overfished species; whereas, in multiple target fisheries, this relationship is not proportional. Instead, an additional decrease in the allowable harvest of a constraining overfished species becomes increasingly more costly. For the latter situation, his analysis contains an implied goal to maintain the highest ex vessel revenue for the sector. Under this goal, the first target species to be eliminated would be those with a lower price per pound (e.g., arrowtooth flounder in the northern trawl fishery). This goal could be revised based on guidance from the Groundfish Allocation Committee (GAC). Ms. Culver suggested a different goal of providing an equitable distribution of impacts. Mr. Burden stated that he would further specify these analyses, including stratifying the results to the level of community complexes, as long as the GAC found the information useful.

The idea of trading quota among states arose in conversation; it was added to a list of issues to be discussed at a later time.

The GMT began drafting questions to pose to the Allocation Committee. See Agenda Item E for the final list.

D. Proposed 2007-2008 Management Measure Alternatives for Analysis

2. Key Management Issues to Consider for 2007 and 2008

Mr. DeVore included the following list of key management issues to be analyzed for 2007 and 2008:

- Modifying Boundaries in the Cowcod Conservation Areas
- Hotspot/Regional Management
- Selective Fishing Gears
- Fishing Seasons
- Bycatch Implications of Providing Increased Lingcod Fishing Opportunities
- Salmon Bycatch in Groundfish Fisheries
- Other Issues?

These do not all apply to all regions; states need to be specific about where they will propose to use each management measure and how to discuss/analyze these issues in the EIS. The proposed management measures for each state are based on the status quo OYs. If OYs are lowered, analyses may need to be redone to adjust.

Washington representatives provided an analysis of the fisheries impacts for various allocation tradeoffs between states and between sectors. California and Oregon representatives planned to create similar documents for Wednesday's Allocation Committee meeting.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2006 – 8:30 A.M.

GMT Members Present:

Ms. Susan Ashcraft (chair), California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Merrick Burden (vice-chair), National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Ms. Deborah Aseltine-Neilson, California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Brian Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ms. Michele Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Robert Jones, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Ms. Gway Kirchner, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ms. Becky Renko, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Mark Saelens, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. John Wallace, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center

GAC Members Present:

Mr. Don Hansen (chair), Dana Wharf Sportfishing, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Chairman
Mr. Phil Anderson, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Frank Lockhart, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Curt Melcher, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ms. Marija Vojkovich, California Department of Fish and Game

GAC Advisors Present:

Ms. Eileen Cooney, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration General Counsel
Ms. Kathy Fosmark, Open Access Representative
Mr. Pete Leipzig, Fishermen's Marketing Association, Limited Entry Non-Whiting Trawl
Representative
Ms. Heather Mann, West Coast Seafood Processors' Association, Processor Representative

Mr. Dale Myer, Arctic Storm Inc., Limited Entry Whiting Trawl Representative
Mr. Bob Osborn, United Anglers of Southern California, Recreational Representative

Others Present:

Mr. Steve Bodnar, Coos Bay Trawlers' Association and Bandon Submarine Cable Committee
Ms. Laura Bozzi, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Ms. Yvonne de Reynier, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Dr. Patty Burke, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. John DeVore, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Dr. Steve Freese, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Peter Huhtula, Pacific Marine Conservation Council
Mr. Dayna Matthews, National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Law Enforcement
Ms. Mariam McCall, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration General Counsel
Dr. Don McIsaac, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Ms. Caroline Park, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration General Counsel
Mr. Brad Pettinger, Oregon Trawl Commission
Ms. Kate Quigley, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Jim Seger, Pacific Fishery Management Council

A. Call to Order of the Groundfish Management Team (continued)

Ms. Ashcraft called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Legal perspective on the 2007-2008 Specifications and rebuilding plans

Ms. Cooney provided the GMT with background information on the 9th Circuit Court's interpretation of the Magnuson-Stevens Act with respect to rebuilding times, focusing on the language of rebuilding in a time "as short as possible" while taking into account the status and biology of the overfished species and the needs of fishing communities. She stressed that the Council can't look at OYs individually anymore and that the integrated alternatives are needed to demonstrate the leverage the tradeoffs allow for accessing healthy stocks. These different suites of OYs need to show contrast between them. Decisions by the Council can't be justified based on T_{MAX}. Ms. Cooney then stressed that NMFS is under a court order to have the new ABCs and OYs in place by January 1, 2007. She later explained that, for example, a status quo suite of OYs may only pass through a court ruling if a lower suite is analyzed and deemed not possible because of fishing community needs. Someone suggested that such community impacts could be demonstrated with more than ex-vessel revenue and should include other social impacts. Dr. Freese explained how difficult social impacts are to quantify. Ms. Culver voiced her concern that some communities rely on the low value, high volume species and that these are the first to be lost in reducing a constraining stock OY. She noted that it is important to document that the small amount of increase in OY results in a small increase in revenue, but it is critical at a more localized scale.

Further feedback on vertical integration OY tables:

- Someone proposed to create an additional matrix of information to demonstrate the tradeoffs between the proposed alternatives. The matrix could include rows/columns for: (1) areas most impacted by these mortalities, (2) sectors most impacted by these mortalities, and (3) how much healthy stock access is leveraged.
- There was concern that no set of OYs looked like one that the Council would pick – so should one be included that has the Council’s preferred OYs? It is noted that the Council may choose to mix and match from within these sets; so this additional column isn’t needed.
- A suggestion to add in a duplicate table that listed the associated rebuilding times for each of the OYs was considered, but the GMT decided not to add it since a table and figure is already developed to depict the tradeoff between allowable harvests and rebuilding times for each depleted species.
- Someone suggested changing the yelloweye OY from 12 mt to 17 mt in Rebuilding Alternative #2 to see a better contrast for the recreational fishery.

Feedback on “Relative Biological Risk to Overfished Species by Sectors”

The GMT discussed the table that Ms. Culver developed which shows the relative biological risk posed by each subsector to each overfished species. They found the table to be a good way to show the concept, and asked for it to be further developed (e.g., include the relationship of that stock to sectors and communities) and for it to incorporate Mr. Burden’s work on economic tradeoffs between sectors. **This product will be prepared for the March Council meeting by a new subgroup: Mr. Burden, Ms. Culver, Mr. Saelens, Dr. Freese, and Ms. Ashcraft.**

E. Synopsis of Key Questions and Presentations for the Groundfish Allocation Committee

Ms. Culver provided a set of tables that depict the commercial and recreational yelloweye and canary allocation alternatives already decided for analysis. The GMT planned to ask the GAC for additional guidance on other allocation alternatives to be modeled for the 2007-2008 management cycle and whether, if the OYs were decreased, other allocation formulae should be analyzed. It was clarified that short-term catch shares can be decided each year, as long as they are not for the species with fixed allocations in the FMP and in federal regulations (e.g., sablefish and whiting). The FMP does allow a suspension of allocation agreements for any species under rebuilding.

There was a request to clarify an aspect of the recreational fishery harvest guideline specified in federal regulations for 2005-2006. The harvest guidelines were described in the Federal Register notice as cumulative harvest targets, rather than separate harvest guidelines for Oregon/Washington and California. The intent of the Council was to specify separate recreational harvest guidelines for fisheries north and south of the California-Oregon border with automatic state inseason actions to stay within those guidelines. **This needs to be corrected in the regulations by NMFS in order for CDFG to take inseason action (they can only close their fishery independently from a California Fish and Game Commission decision if an OY or a harvest guideline is exceeded inseason).**

Continuing the discussion from Monday, the GMT compiled its list of questions to pose to the Allocation Committee over the remainder of the week:

- 1. What analyses are useful for considering reductions in the take of overfished species?**
 - a. What management goals should be used to guide the analyses?

- i. Prioritization of cuts: cut entire individual sectors or cut proportionally across sectors?
 - ii. Maximize utilization (take the whole OY) or maximize a year round fishery (stretching small OYs)?
 - b. Types of analyses that may be worthwhile to consider:
 - i. Economic return. For example, if the goal is to maximize economic return to the trawl sector, this would eliminate target species with lower price per pound values (e.g., arrowtooth flounder).
 - ii. Possible types of value:
 - 1. Relative value
 - 2. Total ex-vessel value regardless of small vs. larger operations
 - 3. Value or effort in the recreational fishery
 - 4. Value by area and by sector
 - 5. Personal income rather than total ex-vessel revenue across entire fleet.
 - iii. Minimize number of vessels/ports affected.
 - c. Set RCA boundaries to maximize a certain fishery (or fisheries)?
 - d. Consider additional latitudinal lines inside which to set differential trip limits (for lower OY scenarios)? (In other words, what is the priority for this kind of regional management?)

2. Range of 2007-2008 Intersector and Regional Allocation Options to Analyze

- a. Should the GMT analyze alternatives that are not realistic options but simply reflect the extremes? (e.g. 75/25 and 25/75 comm/rec splits for canary and yelloweye)
- b. Are there other catch-sharing ratios between states besides status quo that Washington, Oregon, and California want to consider? Base these on historical catch? Base these on the bycatch scorecard (i.e., based on how much states need to prosecute fisheries)?
- c. GMT needs clarity when an allocation is specified as to whether it is a firm number for the year or whether it is a management goal.
- d. In preseason planning, can the specifications initially be structured to be conservative (will not meet OYs or allocations) with the intent of adjusting management measures inseason to meet these?

3. Can the GMT develop a pre-season structure that doesn't provide for year-round fishery as an alternative?

4. Should the GMT target catch levels that are lower than the OY with the intent of establishing a "buffer" to avoid dramatic inseason corrections? *(Note: from a legal perspective this strategy's logic would have to be carefully documented.)*

5. What canary and widow bycatch caps should be analyzed for the whiting fishery besides status quo?

6. Yelloweye in North: Prioritize curtailing recreational fisheries or increase depth closure of non-trawl RCA?

Groundfish Allocation Committee

F. Call to Order of the Groundfish Allocation Committee and Groundfish Management Team

1. Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, etc.

Mr. Hansen called the meeting to order at 1 p.m. and introductions of the membership and audience were made.

2. Goals and Objectives of this Meeting

Mr. DeVore outlined the goals and objectives for the meeting, particularly:

- For the GAC to become familiar with a revised analytical approach for considering rebuilding plan revisions and 2007-2008 harvest specifications and management measures, so as to prepare the committee for what's ahead in this process.
- For the GAC to develop a range of 2007-2008 groundfish management measures that will then be analyzed in preparation for the Council's decision making at the April meeting.
- For the GAC to provide feedback on what analyses are useful for them and the Council when addressing the range of intersector and regional allocation options.

3. Agenda Overview

Ms. Vojkovich voiced concern about the ordering of agenda items, as she did not want to make allocation decisions based on something other than an analysis. Mr. DeVore replied that the agenda was structured so as to lay out management measure alternatives from the states and then use these with estimated impacts attached to develop the range of allocation options. Another GAC member noted that the agenda sets aside the major topic from the previous meeting, intersector allocations. Mr. DeVore replied that was intentional and that the 2007-2008 specifications and Amendment 16-4 issues were more time-sensitive. Building on Ms. Vojkovich's concern, Mr. Anderson stressed that effort shouldn't be spent trying to separate allocation from management. The agenda was therefore revised to integrate items K and L, beginning with L.1 and L.2. The agenda was approved as amended.

Legal Guidance Regarding Rebuilding Plan Revisions

(For further detail, see the summary of the Legal Perspective briefing during the 2/7 morning GMT meeting.)

Ms. Cooney provided a background on the impact of the 9th Circuit Court decision on the rebuilding plan and 2007-2008 specifications/Amendment 16-4 process. The Court based its decision on the basic language in the Magnuson-Stevens Act, rather than the NMFS National Standard 1 guidelines for establishing a rebuilding plan if the stock's rebuilding time is greater than 10 years. The Court focused on the language "as short as possible," rejecting NMFS' formulaic approach in the guidelines. Furthermore, taking the biology of the stocks and the impacts on communities into account can no longer be done implicitly.

She highlighted that, due to these changes, the rebuilding plan and 2007-2008 specifications/Amendment 16-4 process would be a very different one than in past years. For example, at its November meeting the Council specified a range of OYs; these can still be used,

but they need to be related to each other and supported by an integrated analysis. Proposed suites of OYs have been drafted by the GMT.

G. Overview of Goals and Objectives of the Groundfish Fishery Management Plan and the Groundfish Strategic Plan

1. Goals and Objectives of the Groundfish Fishery Management Plan

Mr. DeVore reviewed the three management goals of the Groundfish FMP; Conservation, Economics, and Utilization; and the series of objectives associated with each goal. For further information, refer to the FMP available at:

<http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/gffmp/fmpthru17.pdf>

The Committee questioned the meaning of developing management measures that affected users “equitably”. This does not imply “equally,” but there is no formula for understanding how to operationalize the objective. Mr. Lockhart stressed that equitability will be a key consideration in the upcoming decision-making.

Someone asked if these goals and/or objectives could be revised. Ms. de Reynier clarified that they are revised as necessary when an amendment is approved by NMFS so that they remain consistent with the FMP. The last revision to the FMP occurred with the adoption of Amendment 18.

2. Goals and Objectives of the Groundfish Strategic Plan

Mr. DeVore then reviewed the goals and objectives in the Groundfish Strategic Plan, a non-binding policy document finalized in October 2000. For further information, refer to the document available at: <http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/gfother/stratplan.pdf>

H. Overview of the Purpose and Need for Action

1. Considering Amendment 16-4 Rebuilding Plan Revisions

Mr. DeVore briefed the GAC on a proposed new strategy for analyzing and considering revisions to rebuilding plans and harvest specifications. He explained that the first step is to analyze individual OY alternatives for each depleted species individually. He displayed graphs that demonstrate the tradeoff between allowable harvest and the predicted duration of rebuilding. Species with a small slope value show a small increase in rebuilding time results with a relatively larger increase in OY, and vice versa. The analysis will also address how each species’ OY might impact associated fisheries. The second step is to develop integrated suites of OYs (Table 1). Mr. DeVore showed seven of these rebuilding alternatives to the GAC, noting that they were developed to reflect the species’ co-occurrences and strategically constructed to demonstrate the tradeoffs in relaxing different constraints independently. These sets of rebuilding alternatives include one that is “status quo,” which had been added during the GMT meeting; it represents the current level of impacts from the November 2005 bycatch scorecard projected ahead to 2007.

Mr. Anderson proposed reducing the number of alternatives to analyze, while still maintaining an appropriate range. Mr. DeVore proposed reducing the POP and cowcod OYs in Alternative #6 (the most constraining rebuilding alternative). Mr. Lockhart expressed concern about the Council mixing and matching OYs within the rebuilding alternatives, because he wants to assure that the EIS contains adequate analysis with enough contrast with the preferred alternative.

A discussion on the recreational/commercial splits for canary clarified that selectivity is now assumed to be equal across gears, and so shifting the splits will not change the OY. This policy change allows for inseason allocation adjustments.

I. The Recommended Analytical Approach for Considering Rebuilding Plan Revisions and 2007-2008 Harvest Specifications and Management Measures

Dr. Freese briefed the GAC on the variety of analyses the socio-economic team is undertaking with respect to the needs of fishing communities. (*See the summary of Dr. Freese's briefing from the GMT meeting 2/6*).

In discussion, someone noted that the analyses are based on data from the past, but future projections are much more constraining. How can these future scenarios be incorporated? Dr. Freese replied that he and his team will rely on the GMT and others to put the data into its current context. Someone else suggested that the socio-economic team look into the studies by California Sea Grant and the Ecotrust study of Moss Landing.

Mr. Burden then briefed the GAC on his proposed method to analyze the economic revenue and distribution impacts associated with the constraints on overfished species mortality. (*See the summary of Mr. Burden's briefing from the GMT meeting 2/6*). When prompted for feedback on the proposed analyses, Mr. Myer expressed interest in seeing an analysis that stratified shoreside whiting trawlers and the at-sea fleet.

The chair adjourned the meeting for the day.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2006 – 8:30 A.M.

GMT Members Present:

Ms. Susan Ashcraft (chair), California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Merrick Burden (vice-chair), National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Brian Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ms. Michele Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Robert Jones, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Ms. Gway Kirchner, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ms. Becky Renko, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Mark Saelens, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. John Wallace, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center

GAC Members Present:

Mr. Don Hansen (chair), Dana Wharf Sportfishing, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Chairman
Mr. Phil Anderson, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Mr. Frank Lockhart, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region

Mr. Curt Melcher, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Ms. Marija Vojkovich, California Department of Fish and Game

GAC Advisors Present:

Ms. Eileen Cooney, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration General Counsel

Ms. Kathy Fosmark, Open Access Representative

Mr. Pete Leipzig, Fishermen's Marketing Association, Limited Entry Non-Whiting Trawl Representative

Ms. Heather Mann, West Coast Seafood Processors' Association, Processor Representative

Mr. Dale Myer, Arctic Storm Inc., Limited Entry Whiting Trawl Representative

Mr. Bob Osborn, United Anglers of Southern California, Recreational Representative

Others Present:

Mr. Steve Bodnar, Coos Bay Trawlers' Association and Bandon Submarine Cable Committee

Ms. Laura Bozzi, Pacific Fishery Management Council

Ms. Yvonne de Reynier, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region

Dr. Patty Burke, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Mr. Mark Cedergreen, Washington Charter Association

Mr. John DeVore, Pacific Fishery Management Council

Dr. Steve Freese, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region

Mr. Steve Joner, Makah Tribe

Mr. Chris Kubiak, Morro Bay Commercial Fishermen's Organization

Ms. Mariam McCall, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration General Counsel

Dr. Don McIsaac, Pacific Fishery Management Council

Ms. Caroline Park, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration General Counsel

Mr. Brad Pettinger, Oregon Trawl Commission

Ms. Kate Quigley, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region

F. Call to Order of the Groundfish Allocation Committee and Groundfish Management Team (continued)

The chair called the meeting to order at 8:45 a.m.

5. Review Wednesday Agenda and Outcomes From Yesterday

Ms. Culver made a proposal to change elements of the rebuilding alternatives. After much discussion, the rebuilding alternatives shown in Chapter 1 were developed. Someone noted that these alternatives do not include alternatives of recreational/commercial allocations. Mr. DeVore recommended that the analysis of these alternatives include suboptions depicting different recreational/commercial allocation scenarios. Someone suggested that the analysis should include the foregone values to fisheries because of restrictions on healthy stocks due to co-occurrence. The GAC gave the GMT leeway to adjust OY values in the rebuilding alternatives if necessary to best fit the management objective as described.

J. Key Management Issues to Consider for 2007 and 2008

Mr. DeVore explained the list of key management issues included in the agenda (listed below) were to indicate a comprehensive list of issues to be analyzed in addition to status quo measures, (status quo measures will automatically be analyzed). He wanted to compile a complete list rather than discuss how these issues should be analyzed. He noted that the term “hotspot” should not be used, and that the new name as used in the FMP, Groundfish Fishing Area, should replace it.

1. Modifying Boundaries in the Cowcod Conservation Areas
2. Hotspot/Regional Management
3. Selective Fishing Gears
4. Fishing Seasons
5. Bycatch Implications of Providing Increased Lingcod Fishing Opportunities
6. Salmon Bycatch in Groundfish Fisheries
7. Other Issues?

When prompted for additions to the list of management issues, Mr. Anderson noted that treaty/non-treaty allocation should be highlighted because of the additional reductions in OYs among the alternatives. Mr. DeVore said that this would be added to the list of key management issues in Chapter 1 of the EIS.

L. Determine the Range of Intersector and Regional Allocation Options to Analyze for 2007-2008 Groundfish Fisheries

Mr. DeVore displayed the commercial/recreational allocations currently in place and asked the GAC to discuss whether any changes were needed. He then explained that the 2005-2006 allocation splits between states would be reanalyzed in the 2007-2008 specifications EIS as the status quo alternative. **Mr. Hansen requested to have the allocations displayed as percentages of the OY.** Ms. Vojkovich, who originally requested the addition of 25:75 and 75:25 commercial:recreational allocation alternatives for canary and yelloweye, did not want to see these alternatives fully analyzed. **These alternatives for canary and yelloweye were moved to the “considered but eliminated from further analysis” section of the EIS.**

Mr. Anderson requested analyses for canary and yelloweye for what actually was taken by the fisheries (as percentages for each state), rather than what was allocated preseason. For example, the Washington/Oregon recreational allocation was changed in November from 8.5mt to 9.4mt (4.0 mt for Oregon + 5.1 mt for Washington + 0.3 mt as a buffer against uncertainty). Ms. Vojkovich was not supportive of this, explaining that it is because California is severely constrained that the fishermen cannot reach their allocated caps. Ms. Vojkovich then noted that Mr. Anderson’s proposal would shift the allocation approach from using generic splits (e.g. 40/60 or 50/50) to one that uses the bycatch scorecard as a means of determining the allocation split percentages. Someone commented that in using the bycatch scorecard to make allocation decisions, those that have higher bycatch are rewarded rather than rewarding those that have avoided the depleted stocks. Mr. Anderson clarified that his proposal would maintain the status quo splits but would eliminate the residual. **Mr. Anderson’s proposal of the additional alternative was approved for analysis.**

K. Determine the Range of 2007-2008 Groundfish Management Measures for Initial Analysis

1. California Management Alternatives

The California delegation provided a handout listing the core alternatives that will be analyzed, in addition to status quo. They hoped to have 2005 catch data by late February to come prepared for the March Council meeting.

No major new ideas for management measures came from stakeholder meetings or from the California Groundfish Taskforce; however, there is an interest in accessing more of the stocks that have been recently assessed and are considered healthy.

Mr. DeVore suggested the proposed new coordinates for the Cowcod Conservation Area should be included in the April briefing book.

2. Oregon Management Alternatives

The Oregon delegation provided a handout with a list of management alternatives compiled from their public meetings and from Oregon's advisory group. These preliminary measures are standard measures. It is noted that that "hotspot closures" should be renamed as Rockfish Conservation Areas.

3. Washington Recreational Management Alternatives

The Washington delegation provided a table that lays out different management alternatives in their primary fishing areas with related impacts for depleted species. These alternatives had not yet been vetted by the public.

4. Limited Entry Trawl Management Alternatives

Mr. Burden briefed the GAC on the whiting trawl model and provided information for different OY alternatives with respect to sector allocations, associated ex-vessel revenues, and the estimated impacts on depleted stocks.

The group discussed the coastwide ocean salmon conservation zones specified last year for the whiting fishery to reduce salmon bycatch. Mr. Burden replied that these zones were the result of an emergency action in 2005 and will be analyzed as a status quo action.

Mr. Myer mentioned that there are some whiting trawl sectors interested in sector-specific caps for certain overfished species. He suggested allocating these caps proportional to the sector whiting allocations. This alternative needs to be analyzed before the April meeting. He suggested the whiting industry should propose this alternative to the Council at the March meeting.

Mr. Burden then presented some strawman non-whiting trawl alternatives. The alternatives were constructed to analyze regional management of petrale sole, a reduction in the sablefish OY, an increase in the Dover sole OY, and other ranging options for 2007-2008. He noted that the effect of changing the trawl bimonthly limit regulations to allow only one type of trawl gear to be used in a landing period (with the associated gear-specific limits) has not yet been analyzed. Once this is taken into account, there would be lower petrale sole and canary rockfish catches.

5. Limited Entry and Open Access Fixed Gear Management Alternatives

Mr. DeVore explained the GMT uses a simple model for Limited Entry and Open Access fixed gears and that there is not much new information to provide to the GAC at this point. The model uses depth-stratified, species-specific retention rates determined from the West Coast Groundfish Observer Program (WCGOP) and discard mortality rates from the literature to estimate total mortality impacts by depth in nearshore fisheries. He also noted the data were limited and very sparse for California waters south of Ft. Bragg.

Discard rates from the WCGOP are used to model impacts in the limited entry primary sablefish fishery and the daily trip limit fishery. He recommended following the management measures proposed by the GAP in November as a guide to formulating an alternative. He recommended the proposed pattern of the fishery was more informative than the recommended trip limits by period. He highlighted the proposed measure of closing the second period of the year south of Cape Mendocino.

The GAP also recommended analysis of alternative seaward lines of the non-trawl RCA that west of the current depth line. The GAC also requested the GMT analyze 125 fm and 150 fm line options as a means of reducing yelloweye impacts.

Public Comment: Proposal from Environmental Defense and Chris Kubiak (Morro Bay trawl fisherman)

Mr. Kubiak spoke to the GAC about a proposal that Morro Bay fishermen are formulating with the assistance of Environmental Defense. The community is interested in creating a collective of fishermen to share an allocation of groundfish, as the fishermen in Morro Bay currently don't have access to healthy stocks in their region. The GAC was generally supportive of the proposal, but they had numerous questions about the allocation process as well as the consequent management details. Mr. Burden mentioned that gear switching, which is part of the Morro Bay proposal, has already been analyzed in the EFH EIS and the concept of small group allocations are allowed through Amendment 18. Mr. Anderson mentioned this proposal fit better with the trawl IFQ initiative and recommended the analysis occur in that process, not the 2007-2008 management process. The GAC agreed.

6. Tribal Management Alternatives

Mr. Jones explained the new proposed tribal management alternatives for a dogfish fishery, which will be implemented in 2006, and an arrowtooth flounder bottom trawl fishery with the primary objective to test gear. Mr. Anderson noted that if the depleted species' OYs decrease, the tribes planned to still fish as usual and so would take a higher percentage. Mr. Jones replied that that would be an issue to take up with the individual tribes, although he surmised that they might voluntarily decrease their take under such a circumstance. This issue highlighted Mr. Anderson's earlier concern that treaty and non-treaty fisheries may require allocations for additional species.

M. Requests for Immediate Analyses to the Groundfish Management Team

Ms. Ashcraft read the GMT's list of questions they had prepared to pose to the GAC. (Refer to the list in the minutes from the GMT meeting.) GAC guidance is listed below each major topic:

1- Regional allocation considerations:

- The Groundfish FMP gives guidance that impacts should be spread across sectors and regions.
- Regional allocations should be a low priority in Council decision-making. However, there is interest in seeing the analysis for such regional management, if possible.

2- Regional priorities and goals: finer resolution using other latitudinal lines?

- Analysis and management should be kept as simple as possible. There is no support among the GAC for such an option.
- Mr. DeVore recommended postponing this as a possibility for later analyses since there is insufficient time to change the impact models and the added complexity to fishery management is an added workload in an already burdensome process.

3- Organizing trip limits to allow for year-round opportunities:

- The chair reminded the GAC that this has been tried in the past and that it was not successful.
- Ms. Mann confirmed that she will compile a summary of what processors recommend for a year-round fishery would be for each species.
- Proposed alternative for GMT analysis: year-round slope fisheries while allowing only seasonal shelf fishery opportunities, if necessary.

4- What analyses for depleted species are useful?

- Equitably share impacts across all sectors, based on FMP objectives.
- If there's a situation in which equitable sharing of impact is at odds with rebuilding in the fastest time possible, then proportionality by sector should be prioritized and then proportionality by region, with a review of the result to look for aberrations.

5- Other guidance:

- Proposed analysis: analyze an alternative that highlights the reduction of bycatch in different fisheries and rewards those sectors that have already reduced bycatch.

Ms. Culver requested flexibility for the GMT to perform their analyses using GAC guidance and the indicated range of options, but the GMT could reduce the amount of analysis, if necessary. The GMT would bring these analyses to the GAP at the April Council meeting. The GAC agreed to that flexibility is needed given the tight timelines.

There was some concern about the perception the GMT or GAC might be setting policies in this process. Mr. Anderson assured folks that is only the purview of the Council. Mr. DeVore explained the Council delegated the task of developing alternatives for analysis to the GAC, but final decisions will only be made by the Council.

Ms. de Reynier encouraged creating analyses that create simple descriptions/scenarios, rather than exhaustive quantitative analysis to portray community impacts. She likened the approach to telling a compelling story using data, trends, and facts. This kind of depiction would be more easily understood by a judge in a court case.

There was discussion about the difficulty of the Council adopting final OYs in April. Due to the requirements for developing the EIS, the public notice and comment periods, and with the increased attention to analyses under the court order, the Council is discouraged from postponing this action until June. The court has also mandated final implementation of rebuilding plans no later than January 1, 2007.

The GAC completed their necessary business and therefore canceled their planned February 9 meeting. The chair adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2006 – 8:30 A.M.

GMT Members Present:

Ms. Susan Ashcraft (chair), California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Merrick Burden (vice-chair), National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Brian Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ms. Michele Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Robert Jones, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Ms. Gway Kirchner, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ms. Becky Renko, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Mark Saelens, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. John Wallace, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center

Others Present:

Ms. Laura Bozzi, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. John DeVore, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Ms. Yvonne de Reynier, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Dr. Steve Freese, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Ms. Heather Mann, West Coast Seafood Processors' Association and Groundfish Allocation Committee Representative
Ms. Mariam McCall, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration General Counsel
Mr. Brad Pettinger, Oregon Trawl Commission
Ms. Kate Quigley, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region

Ms. Ashcraft called the GMT meeting to order at 8:50 a.m.

When reviewing the outcomes from the GAC meeting, it was noted that the GMT did not clarify with the GAC what recommendations were provided to them during the meeting. The GMT therefore constructed the following list:

Recommendations from the GAC to the GMT:

1. Final rebuilding alternatives for analysis.
2. Treaty/ non-treaty allocation issues to be highlighted in the EIS.
3. Allocation alternatives:
 - a. Include a 52:48 recreational:commercial allocation alternative for yelloweye.
 - b. Do not include the 75:25 or 25:75 allocation alternatives for canary and yelloweye.

4. Analyze additional seaward non-trawl RCA lines north of 40°10' N latitude: 125 fm, 150 fm, and 200 fm lines, especially under low yelloweye OY alternatives.
5. Make sure that the management options are arranged in an easy to understand order.
6. Analyze coastwide and regional management strategies, as well as the regional differences based on the biology and distribution of the species.
7. GMT has latitude to identify a range of suboptions in the analysis of rebuilding alternatives.
8. Analyze a trawl alternative with seasonal shelf opportunities coupled with year-round slope opportunities. GMT should schedule a joint meeting with the GAP to gain feedback on the threshold at which fishing is no longer profitable.
9. Analyze what a year round fishery means by looking at the differences in definition for this between processors (using the Heather Mann survey) and between different sectors.
10. Assure equity in how the different vessels and ports are impacted. Analyze proportional impacts by sector and address implications by region.
11. Do not analyze additional latitudinal management lines for commercial fisheries.
12. GMT will analyze bycatch impacts for the full range of whiting OY alternatives.
13. Qualitatively assess measures different sectors have taken to reduce bycatch to highlight successful strategies.
14. Demonstrate the human side of the impacts of reducing fishing opportunities to translate the analysis into something more easily understood by the courts.
15. Provide the needed analyses of harvest alternatives to allow the Council to adopt as many OYs as possible in April, although some may be postponed, if necessary, until June. However, the analyses must be completed by the June briefing book deadline (May 24) and must include all the contrasting alternatives.
16. It is important to analyze regional impacts of management alternatives; such impacts may differ depending on the relative value of a fishery to a region, what mitigation measures (e.g. bycatch reduction efforts) are in place, or the biological attributes of a species (e.g. survival rate), etc.
17. If new policies are embedded in or result from any analysis, then these should be highlighted to the Council for ultimate decision-making.
18. Inseason issues should be considered a lower priority now due to time constraints.

T. Tasks for Groundfish Management Team Members Regarding Amendment 16-4 and 2007-2008 Harvest Specifications and Management Measures Analyses

March 15 is the April briefing book deadline and all submissions must be “camera ready.” This includes the critical socioeconomic analyses needed to understand rebuilding tradeoffs. The Council will also need to decide a formal and refined range of management measure alternatives for analysis. Therefore, comprehensive analysis of viable alternatives needs to be included in the April briefing book.

Mr. DeVore constructed a list of prioritized tasks with assignments and corresponding deadlines for each GMT member.

The GMT discussed the format for analyses and clarified the suboptions for analyzing rebuilding alternatives.

Other discussion points:

- The GMT requested to a joint meeting with the GAP for a day or more during its April 17-21 meeting in Portland. Mr. DeVore said he would broach that request with Dr. McIsaac. The GMT discussed the seriousness of the need to reduce OYs and the need to prepare constituencies (particularly the GAP) for the upcoming decisions.
- The GMT discussed the possible use of "buffers". An idea was put forth to use the retrospective difference between projected impacts in past bycatch scorecards and actual total catches for determining an uncertainty "buffer" for managing fisheries to stay within specified OYs. NOAA General Counsel considered this an appropriate approach to further investigate.
- Ms. de Reynier suggested the GMT brainstorm and organize data delivery for the heavy load of analyses needed for the EIS.
- Ms. Renko noted the extensive discussions of species' co-occurrence in the EFH EIS.
- The GMT needs to fully document total catch projections for the open access sector in the bycatch scorecard.

U. Planning for the March 2006 Council Meeting

Planning the March 2006 Groundfish Management Team Agenda

The GMT reviewed a draft agenda for their March meeting. Ms. Ashcraft recommended planning a meeting with the CDFG time management consultant. Some noted that such a meeting during the Council meeting would add to the stress level. However, there may not be another opportunity before the consultant's contract expires in June; therefore, the meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, March 8 at 3:30 p.m.

V. Scheduling Future Groundfish Management Team Meetings

Following the March Council meeting, the GMT plans to meet according to the following schedule:

- April 2-7 (during the Council meeting) in Sacramento, beginning at 1 p.m. on the 2nd.
- April 17-21 in Portland, beginning at 1 p.m. on the 17th. This will be a working meeting for developing the 2007-2008 specifications EIS. The GMT recommended inviting the GAP to attend on Tuesday, April 18.
- June 11-16 (during the Council meeting) in Foster City, beginning at 1 p.m. on June 11.
- September 11-15 (during the Council meeting; venue to be determined), beginning at 8 a.m. September 11. The GMT decided not to meet during the summer to prepare for the September Council meeting.
- Tentative: October 10-13 in Seattle starting at 1 p.m. on the 10th to prepare for the November Council meeting.
- November 13-17 (during the Council meeting) in Del Mar, California starting at 8 a.m. on the 13th.

The chair adjourned the GMT meeting at 3:40pm Thursday.

Table 1. Amendment 16-4 rebuilding alternatives developed by the Groundfish Allocation Committee.

Stock	Association	"Status Quo" Reb. Alt. a/	2007-2008 OYs (mt)				
			Reb. Alt. 1	Reb. Alt. 2	Reb. Alt. 3	Reb. Alt. 4	Reb. Alt. 5
Yelloweye Canary	Northern Shelf	27 44	21 24	17 44	21 68	12 24	12 24
Cowcod b/ Bocaccio	Southern Shelf	8 149	8 149	18 218	22 424	14 315	4 40
Darkblotche d POP	Northern Slope	229 87	330 405	229 87	472 749	472 405	130 44
Widow	Midwater	329	456	329	917	329	120

a/ The species' OYs described in the "status quo" rebuilding alternative are determined by calculating the effective SPR harvest rate from the November 2005 bycatch scorecard and projecting this harvest rate forward to 2007.

b/ OY alternatives for Conception and Monterey areas combined.