

## **PROPOSED AGENDA Groundfish Management Team**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
Quay Side Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 29 - November 2, 2000

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2000 - 1 P.M.

### **Call to Order**

Jim Hastie, Co-Chair

Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, Approve Agenda, etc.

- C.1 Rebuilding Programs for Cowcod and Canary Rockfish**  
(Council Action: Final Adoption of Rebuilding Plans)
- C.2 Apportionment of Sablefish Discard Estimates for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Apportionment Values for 2001)
- C.3 Final Harvest Levels and Other Specifications for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Final Harvest Levels for 2001)
- C.9 Management Measures for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Final Management Measures for 2001)

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 - 8 A.M.

- C.6 Exempted Fishing Permit Applications**  
(Council Action: Recommendations to NMFS on Research and Other Exempted Fishing Permit Applications)
- C.11 Status of Fisheries and Inseason Adjustments**  
(Council Action: Consider Adjustments to Management Measures)

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2000 - 8 A.M.

(Continue as Necessary)

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2000 - 8 A.M.

(Continue as Necessary)

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2000 - 8 A.M.

(Continue as Necessary)

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/17/00

## **PROPOSED AGENDA**

### **Scientific and Statistical Committee**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
East River I  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 30 - 31, 2000

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 8 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 September 2000 minutes

Don McIsaac

**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 (.5 hours)

#### **CLOSED SESSION**

5. Review Nomination for Salmon Technical Team

#### **OPEN SESSION**

#### **B. Salmon Management**

2. Results of Scientific and Statistical Committee Methodology Review  
**Council Action:** Approve Methodology Changes for 2001  
(8:30 a.m., 1 hour; Zhou, Lawson)
3. Final Report of the Oregon Coastal Natural Coho Work Group  
**Council Action:** Consider Adopting Technical Adjustments to Amendment 13  
(9:30 a.m., 1.5 hours; Byrne, Conrad)

Pete Lawson

Sam Sharr

#### **H. Council Administrative and Other Matters**

3. Research and Data Needs and Economic Data Plan  
**Council Action:** Consider Final Adoption  
(11 a.m., .5 hours; Thomson)

Jim Seger

**A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)**

6. Review Statements B.2 and B.3  
(11:30 a.m., 1 hour)

LUNCH

**C. Groundfish Management**

3. Final Harvest Levels for 2001
- Resolution of Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey and State Catch Estimates (Thomson, Jagielo)
  - Widow Rockfish Supplemental MSY Calculation (Conser, Jagielo)
- Council Action:** Adopt Final Harvest Levels for 2001  
(1:30 p.m., 3 hours)

GMT

Russell Porter

Public Comment Period  
4 p.m

**A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)**

7. Finalize Statements B.2 and B.3; Review Statement H.3  
(4:30 p.m., 1 hour)

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2000

**A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)**

8. Finalize Statements H.3; Review Statement C.3  
(8 a.m., 1 hour)

**E. Coastal Pelagic Species Management**

2. Pacific Sardine Harvest Guideline
- Council Action:** Adopt 2001 Harvest Guideline  
(9 p.m., 1 hour; Stauffer, Francis)

CPSMT

Joint Meeting with Groundfish Management Team and Groundfish Advisory Subpanel

October 31, 2000  
10 a.m. to 12 p.m  
East River II

**A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)**

9. Finalize Statements C.3  
(12 p.m., .5 hours)

LUNCH

**C. Groundfish Management, (continued)**

7. 2001 Groundfish Management Process and Schedule  
• Review of Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Process  
**Council Action:** Adoption of 2001 Groundfish Management Process  
(1:30 p.m., 1 hour; Conser, Ralston)

Jim Glock

8. Sablefish Permit Stacking  
**Council Action:** Consider Final Adoption  
(2:30 p.m., 1 hour; Sylvia, Young)

Jim Seger

**D. Pacific Halibut Management**

1. Estimate of Bycatch in 1999  
(3:30 p.m., 1 hour; Stauffer)

Cyreis Schmitt

**A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)**

10. Review and Finalize Statements E.2, C.7, C.8, and D.1 (if necessary)  
(4:30 p.m., 1 hour)

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/16/00



## **PROPOSED AGENDA**

### **Salmon Technical Team**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
West River I Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 30, 2000

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 - 1 P.M.

[**Note:** The Scientific and Statistical Committee will review salmon methodologies and the Oregon Coastal Natural (OCN) Work Group Report between 8:30 and 11 a.m. in the East River I Room].

#### **A. Call to Order**

Doug Milward

1. Role Call, Chairman's Remarks, Welcome New Member (Sign Attendance Roster)
2. Approval of Agenda

#### **B. Final Check of Salmon Technical Team (STT) Harvest Report (B.1)**

#### **C. Scientific and Statistical Committee Methodology Reviews (B.2)**

- Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM)
- Central Valley Index Abundance Regression
- Coho Cohort Analysis Project

#### **D. Final Report of the OCN Coho Work Group (B.3)**

#### **E. Queets Wild Coho Status (B.4)**

#### **F. Selection of Salmon Option Hearing Sites (B.5)**

#### **G. Council Research and Data Needs—Final Adoption (H.3)**

#### **H. Internal STT Business**

- Completion of Technical Appendix
- Selection of a new Vice Chair
- Refine/develop bycatch estimates for preseason reports
- Confirm assignments for preseason reports and any modifications
- Establish process and schedule for completing Queets coho overfishing report
- Consideration of questions concerning tags used in the chinook Fishery Regulation Assessment Model
- Implementation of data from Makah encounter rate study

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/18/00

**DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES**  
**Scientific and Statistical Committee**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel Sacramento  
Sierra B Room  
1401 Arden Way  
Sacramento, CA 95815  
September 11-13, 2000

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 8 A.M. by Chair Cynthia Thomson. Dr. Don McIsaac, Executive Director, provided some opening comments and noted for the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) the key issues where the Council would look to the SSC for guidance. The first tier items included: G.4, G.5, G.6, G.7, F.1, A.5, I.1; second tier items included: A.6, D.2, E.2, A.7, A.10.

The agenda was approved.

**Members in Attendance**

Mr. Alan Byrne, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Nampa, ID  
Dr. Ramon Conser, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA  
Mr. Robert Conrad, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Olympia, WA  
Dr. Robert Francis, University of Washington, Seattle, WA  
Dr. Susan Hanna, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR  
Dr. Kevin Hill, California Department of Fish and Game, La Jolla, CA  
Mr. Tom Jagielo, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA  
Dr. Peter Lawson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Newport, OR  
Dr. Stephen Ralston, National Marine Fisheries Service, Tiburon, CA  
Dr. Gary Stauffer, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA  
Dr. Gilbert Sylvia, Hatfield Marine Science Center, Newport, OR  
Ms. Cynthia Thomson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA  
Dr. Shijie Zhou, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland, OR  
Dr. Richard Young, Crescent City, CA

**Scientific and Statistical Committee Comments to the Council**

The following text contains SSC comments to the Council. (Related SSC discussion not included in written comment to the Council is provided in italicized text).

**Halibut**

**Status of Bycatch Estimate**

At the June meeting, the SSC raised a number of issues concerning the definition of strata for a new estimator of Pacific halibut bycatch mortality that is being developed by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Northwest Fisheries Science Center. In particular, the definition of latitudinal, depth, and seasonal strata boundaries was discussed, as was the association of halibut with arrowtooth flounder. As a followup to those concerns, the SSC was briefed by Ms. Cyreis Schmitt and Mr. Mark Saelens, who together described the current status of halibut bycatch estimation in Area 2A of the groundfish trawl fishery. In addition, they provided documentation of the rationale behind the use of specific boundaries to categorize the data into homogeneous strata. The SSC was in agreement that sufficient thought had gone into the analysis following their presentation. In particular, Mr. John Wallace provided a written point-by-point

explanation for the various boundary selections that were used. In finalizing the analysis the SSC recommends that care be exercised in conversions between (1) round and net weight, (2) legal and sublegal fish, and (3) pounds to kilograms. The SSC looks forward to examining the final bycatch mortality estimates, which should be available at the November meeting.

## **Salmon Management**

### **Preliminary Report of the Oregon Coastal Natural Coho Work Group**

Mr. Sam Sharr presented a summary of the draft report of the Amendment 13 review. We did not have time to fully assimilate the information presented, but can offer several observations. The new approach is strong, because it is based on a peer-reviewed model and reflects conditions the Council has been facing in recent years. The report presents a major change in the Amendment 13 matrix, extending specification into the low end of both parental spawning escapement and marine survival. The SSC has not examined the analysis and rationale for the exploitation rate values contained in the matrix.

The matrix specifies a critical cutoff of four spawners per mile in a basin. It is appropriate to specify a critical low spawner escapement level, because extinction risks increase rapidly as spawner densities drop. Any basin with escapements in this range will likely have experienced extinctions of local populations. There is no biological justification for inducing fishing mortality on such stocks. However, it is not clear whether the value of four spawners per mile, as suggested in the review document, provides adequate protection. The SSC has requested an analysis of the risk of low levels of incidental fishing mortality when a stock is near the critical level.

Additional review is needed prior to Council action. The SSC would like to continue our review of this report at the October meeting.

## **Research and Data Needs**

The version of draft research and data needs that appears in the briefing book reflects a number of changes suggested by the SSC and other Council advisory bodies before the Council's groundfish strategic plan became available to us. At this meeting the SSC again reviewed the draft research and data needs, largely to ensure that it reflects the recommendations contained in the strategic plan.

Many of the strategic plan recommendations - pertaining, for instance, to capacity reduction, estimation of total removals, frequency of fishery independent surveys, role of industry in data collection, improved stock assessments, evaluation of environmental effects on recruitment and productivity, evaluation and reduction of effects of gear and fishing practices on habitat - were already reflected in the research and data needs. In some cases, specific items have been edited or reprioritized to improve clarity or to make the connection to the strategic plan more explicit. In addition, several new items were added to the draft research and data needs, including a section on marine reserves and an analysis of the extent of overcapacity in the charter boat fleet. Specific SSC recommendations regarding wording changes to research and data needs are described below.

The SSC also updated the draft West Coast Fisheries Economic Data Plan. The document reflects recommendations contained in the strategic plan, with the most notable addition pertaining to evaluation of the socioeconomic effects of marine reserves. The SSC intends to provide additional wording in the document that describes other economics planning and data collection efforts that have been initiated in recent years and the relationship of the economic data plan to these other efforts.

The SSC appreciates the efforts of Mr. Jim Seger in updating the draft research and data needs and the draft economic data plan. Once the proposed changes have been made, the SSC will consider both documents to be ready for public review.

## Recommended Wording Changes to Attachment F.1

Ensure the wording of the high priority recommendations provided in the Executive Summary is consistent with the body of the document.

### All Fishery Management Plans

Page 2 Add "and species" after "geographic" in fourth sentence. Delete "geographic" in fifth sentence. Replace "will" with "may" in sixth sentence.

Economic Data Plan. In second sentence replace "Developing a coordinated effort" with "Continued development of a coordinated effort."

Page 3 Add a section titled "General Analytical Needs". Subsume "Assessment of Enforcement Effectiveness." Add a second item: "Resources under PFMC jurisdiction respond to large shifts in ocean productivity. For instance, growth and recruitment of rockfish, ocean survival of salmon and the relative abundance of coastal pelagics responded to the major North Pacific climate shift in the late 1970s. In addition, year to year patterns in fishery production tend to show similarities across species (FMP) groups. These holistic resource responses need to be assessed and incorporated into the management process."

Page 3 Economic and Social Data Collection and Research. Delete the last bullet.

Page 4 Add a new item under "Analysis" that reads "Analysis to evaluate extent of overcapacity in the charter vessel fleet."

### Groundfish Management Fishery Management Plan

Page 6 First bullet. Rewrite as follows: "Establish a West Coast coordinator to identify and prioritize stock assessment information needs, to track programs that fulfill those needs and to facilitate establishment of new programs to address unmet needs. This coordinator would report status of biological data collection activities to the Council, with emphasis on anticipated deficiencies identified with respect to stock assessment and management needs." Make a similar change to the last paragraph on page 7.

Delete 2nd bullet on electronic monitoring.

Third bullet. Delete "particularly the trawl fleet." Delete 2nd sentence. In the third sentence insert "and reducing" after "estimating" and delete "against accurate observations made by observers." Delete 4th sentence.

Page 10 Slope Surveys. Move the last sentence of the third bullet to the first bullet.

Page 11 Environmental Data Collection. In 1st sentence, replace "Data collection" with "Collect, analyze and synthesize data." In 4th sentence, replace "trawlers" with "vessels".

Page 13 Stock Assessment Modeling. Add a second sentence that reads "Develop new models for species for which fishery-independent data are not available (e.g., nearshore rockfishes)."

### Salmon Management Fishery Management Plan

Page 16 Indicator Stocks. Add a sentence to the end of the paragraph that reads "Escapement goals are needed for Washington and Oregon coastal fall chinook."

Page 17 Non-Catch Fishing Mortality. Add a sentence prior to the last sentence of the paragraph that reads "Special attention needs to be paid to mid- and long-term mortality."

## Coastal Pelagic Fishery Management Plan

Page 22 First bullet. Replace "in northern and southern end of range" with "throughout its range."

### Marine Reserves

Page 26 3rd paragraph. Delete "five".

Add a new first bullet: "Identify type and scale of information needed to conduct stock assessments after establishment of marine reserves and evaluate the feasibility and cost of collecting such information."

Current first bullet. Insert "and structure" after "location".

Subsume the current 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th bullets under an introductory sentence. "Research is needed to understand the biological effects of marine reserves and determine the extent to which ABCs would need to be modified when marine reserves are implemented, over the short and long term."

Page 27 Stock Assessment Models. After the last sentence, add "As part of the evaluation of marine reserves relative to the status quo, the types and scale of information needed to conduct stock assessments after establishment of reserves should be identified and the feasibility and cost of collecting such information should be analyzed."

Page 27 Social and Economic Data Needs. In second sentence, replace "are not recorded on a fine enough scale to be useful in modeling" with "are needed on a fine enough scale to model". Replace 3rd and 4th sentences with "Information is also needed on the extent of displacement of fishing activity from the reserve and the extent to which effort is diverted to other fisheries."

Page 29 Recreational Harvester and Site Specific Demand. In first sentence, replace "the changes in CPUE (if CPUE predictions could be made)" with "site-specific closures".

Offsite Nonconsumptive Values. Change "bequeathal" to "bequest." Delete 3rd sentence.

Add "Other Marine Related Industries. Inventory and assess dependence of businesses supporting commercial and recreational fisheries as well as other ocean based activities (e.g., ecotourism.)"

## Groundfish Management

### Rebuilding Programs for Canary Rockfish and Cowcod

#### Canary Rockfish

Dr. Richard Methot, NMFS, presented the results of the rebuilding analysis for canary rockfish to the SSC. The analysis addressed all SSC comments that were given to the author at the June meeting. The rebuilding analysis was based on the northern stock assessment. Rebuilding analyses were presented for the two scenarios used during the stock assessment to explain the low incidence of older females compared to older males. The rebuilding analyses were developed by resampling the recruits per spawner (R/S) from various time eras. The SSC agrees with this approach.

The results of the rebuilding analyses are very sensitive to the strength of the 1996 to 1998 year classes. The R/S for these three years were the highest recorded; however, there is uncertainty associated with these values, because they are based solely on the 1998 triennial survey. Until these strong recruitments can be confirmed by the 2001 triennial survey, the SSC agrees with the results obtained by resampling R/S values from the preferred model approved by the Stock Assessment and Review (STAR) Panel. In the northern area, the median time to rebuild, in the absence of fishing, exceeded 60 years for both scenarios. The time to rebuild ranged from 81 to 132 years when an annual catch of 13 to 40 mt was added.

## Cowcod

Mr. Tom Barnes, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), presented the results of the cowcod rebuilding analysis to the SSC. The analysis addressed most of the SSC comments that were given to the author at the June meeting. The rebuilding analysis was based on a surplus production model. The median time to rebuild, in the absence of fishing, ranged from 42 years when initial biomass was set at 11% of virgin biomass to 81 years if initial biomass was 4% of virgin biomass. When annual catches of 2.5 mt to 6.4 mt were added, the median time to rebuild ranged from 92 years to 277 years. It will be difficult to achieve catch targets in this range. The SSC is supportive of proposals outlined by CDFG (Exhibit G.4, Attachment 2) to reduce cowcod catch rates.

A delay difference model was used for the cowcod assessment. This model predicts a longer time to rebuild the stock compared to the surplus production model. The SSC would have preferred that the authors use the model approved by the STAR Panel; however, the difference in allowable catch levels during rebuilding would probably be negligible.

## New Stock Assessments for Lingcod and Pacific Ocean Perch

The SSC met with Mr. Jim Glock to discuss new stock assessments for lingcod, Pacific Ocean perch (POP), and widow rockfish. Lingcod and POP have been separated out for discussion, because each is managed under recently-adopted rebuilding plans, and this is the first time new assessments have been prepared for these species since the overfishing declaration. The new widow rockfish assessment indicates the biomass is at or below 25% of  $B_0$ , so the potential for an overfishing declaration exists for this species as well.

The SSC held a lengthy discussion regarding timing of new stock assessment results for rebuilding species, particularly with respect to updating current rebuilding plans and applying changes for the upcoming management season. For example, rebuilding plans for lingcod and POP have just been approved by NMFS, immediately followed by new stock assessment results for each species. The Sustainable Fisheries Act (SFA) requires re-evaluation of rebuilding plans every two years, but the groundfish fishery management plan (FMP) states that stocks will be managed based on the best available information. This leaves the Council with two options, (1) re-establish rebuilding plans according to the new benchmarks each time new data are available, or (2) carry forward current rebuilding plans as approved, applying the new information in the next review period. The SSC favors the second option.

The SSC has the following specific comments regarding the new stock assessment results:

Widow Rockfish – Although there is a fair amount of uncertainty in the preferred model estimate of widow rockfish biomass, there is a 70% probability that current biomass is less than 25% of  $B_0$ . The Groundfish Management Team (GMT) is currently developing preliminary optimum yields (OYs) based on this estimate and the assumption the stock will be declared overfished. In addition, the current assessment indicates year class strengths have been weak in recent years. The current 40-10 policy will likely be sufficient to rebuild widow rockfish within the next 10 years, and supplemental analysis, provided as an appendix in the stock assessment report, but not reviewed by the Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel, suggests widow rockfish biomass may be somewhat greater and not in an overfished condition. The SSC's groundfish subcommittee will review the supplemental analysis prior to the October Council meeting.

Pacific Ocean perch – The previous POP rebuilding analysis estimated 20 to 30 years to rebuild the stocks. The latest analysis indicates a much shorter rebuilding time on the order of 10 years. The data used in the new rebuilding analysis are based on the new assessment, in which  $B_{MSY}$  was estimated from parameters in the model. There are many confounding factors associated with simultaneous estimation of steepness of the stock-recruitment relationship and survey catchability. This confounding and other technical issues affect the reliability of the  $B_{MSY}$  estimate, which subsequently impacts the rebuilding plan. The SSC does not recommend superceding the currently approved rebuilding plan with the new analysis. The new analysis has not yet been reviewed, but should be considered for the process in 2001.

Lingcod – The lingcod stock is still considered to be in an overfished state, but the most recent assessment results indicate the stock has started to rebuild. The stock assessment authors did not develop a modified rebuilding plan based on the latest results. The SSC recommends continued implementation of the recently approved rebuilding plan.

#### Preliminary Harvest Levels and Other Specifications for 2001

Dr. Richard Methot of the NFMS, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, discussed the report *A Preliminary Analysis of Discarding in the 1995-1999 West Coast Groundfish Fishery* with the SSC. An update of discard levels is needed as the data supporting the current estimates are 15 years old, and the current procedure for estimating discard as a fraction of the total catch of a target species is no longer applicable to today's fishery. The report uses a new model to analyze data from the Enhanced Data Collection Project (EDCP) for the Dover sole, thornyhead, sablefish (DTS) bottom trawl fishery during the 1995-1999 fishing seasons and proposes a new model for estimating DTS discards based on trip limits. The model has two important features, (1) it can be used to estimate discards from current fishery data, and (2) it can be used to predict discards for a given set of proposed trip limits.

The SSC finds the approach used to estimate discards in the DTS trawl fishery very promising. It has the potential to provide better estimates of discards than current procedures and explicitly accounts for changes in trip limits. The SSC recommends future work with the model examine the following:

1. Length frequency information from the data used to develop the model, to determine if there is evidence of high-grading and whether discards are having a significant impact on recruits to the population.
2. Associated economic data that may influence discard behavior in the fishery.
3. A tow-by-tow analysis of the data.
4. Availability of existing log book data (beyond the EDCP data) to support model development.

Although the SSC recognizes the preliminary nature of the current model, it does represent the best available science. Therefore, the SSC recommends using the proposed method for estimating discards in the DTS trawl fishery during the 2001 season. Because of the early stage of development of this model, future improvements to the model may result in changes to the DTS discard estimates and the estimation procedures. Furthermore, the proposed model is dynamic, and discard rate estimates may change annually. The SSC encourages further development of this model.

The restrictive 2000 and 2001 catch levels for many of the OY groundfish stocks will continue to create problems with bycatch in other fisheries and will adversely impact the collection of fishery-dependent data. Additional management efforts will need to be undertaken by the state agencies to reduce the bycatch in shrimp and prawn trawl fisheries and recreational fisheries to keep the catches below OY levels. In addition, fishers may become reluctant to land any catch of rockfish stocks with OY levels of just a few 100 tons to ensure landings do not exceed OY. This will likely contribute to additional unaccounted discards for rockfish stocks. The port sampling opportunity to collect biological data from commercial or recreational catches will then be jeopardized. Information on fish size and age composition is important to our efforts to evaluate the magnitude of incoming year classes and to track stock rebuilding. The lack of sufficient port samples will place more emphasis on the data from the coast-wide shelf and slope surveys.

The SSC reviewed with Dr. Jim Hastie, Chair of the Groundfish Management Team (GMT), the preliminary OY levels for a number of the stocks, particularly those judged to be overfished or near overfishing levels. The new harvest rate policy, and 40-10 reductions are being implemented as 2001 point estimates or as the lower bound of a range. Comments on OY levels for selected stocks are:

Canary rockfish – SSC supports the OY levels based on the preferred model of the Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel which reduced the estimates of recent recruitment levels by 50%. These result in OY ranges of 13 mt to 40 mt for the northern area. The extremely low harvests levels will severely impact shelf fisheries.

Pacific Ocean perch (POP) – With respect to the OY levels for Pacific Ocean perch there is confusion over the existing rebuilding plan, given the results of the new assessment which concluded that current biomass is above 50% of  $B_{MSY}$ . The new rebuilding analysis provided in the briefing book has not been reviewed, and the SSC cannot endorse its use in setting the 2001 OY level. We recommended to the GMT they develop a range using last year's OY (294 mt) and a yield obtained using the current harvest policy ( $F_{50\%}$  with the [40-10] reduction) applied to the most recent biomass estimate. This recommendation should be in place until the status of the POP rebuilding plan is resolved. Given the sophistication and complexity of the new models being used to assess rebuilding and to derive biological reference points, the current review process is being stretched beyond its capability to provide the in-depth evaluations required to make informed, valid, and pertinent judgments to resolve conflicting model outcomes similar to those for the POP assessment.

Widow rockfish – The updated assessment concluded the current biomass for the widow rockfish stock has a 70% probability of being less than 25% of  $B_0$ , which indicates an overfished stock. However an existing analysis, which has not been reviewed or approved by the Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel or SSC, concludes a rebuilding plan for widow rockfish may not be required. If this is the case, the harvest rate would be based on the (40-10) policy. Prior to Council adopting OYs in October, the SSC will review the overfished status report appended to the assessment document and will provide advice on OY at that time.

Darkblotched rockfish – The OY range is based on uncertainty in the amount of darkblotched taken in the foreign rockfish fishery and initial rebuilding projections by the Stock Assessment Team (STAT) that assume the stock will be declared overfished. SSC recommends further analysis be undertaken to resolve the uncertainty of species composition in the foreign fishery. Until there is some resolution to this issue, SSC can offer no advice on any particular point estimate.

Lingcod – The lower value of the OY range is based on the existing rebuilding projections and the upper value is based on the new assessment results. The best available information is from the new assessment.

#### Sablefish Permit Stacking Concept

Mr. Jim Seger briefed the SSC on the Draft Analysis of Permit Stacking for the Limited Entry Fixed Gear Sablefish Fishery.

The analysis includes a placeholder in Section 1.3.3 for a discussion of the relationship between the permit stacking proposal and the goals and recommendations of the Groundfish Strategic Plan, should the plan be adopted by the Council. This is a good example of how groundfish plan amendments should be routinely related to the strategic plan. The document also contains placeholders for other portions of the analysis that have not yet been completed, including Section 2.0 (description of fishery) and portions of Section 3.3.x (safety, windfall profits, etc.). The analysis, however, was sufficiently complete to allow the SSC to evaluate the essential elements of the voluntary stacking proposal.

The SSC concurs with the following conclusions from the analysis: unless the individual quota (IQ) moratorium is lifted, voluntary permit stacking per se is not likely to increase the duration of the fixed gear sablefish season, alleviate the safety concerns and complex management decisions associated with short seasons, or result in significant capacity reduction. In order to accomplish those things, voluntary stacking will need to be followed by a properly designed IQ system (an uncertain prospect at this time, given the moratorium) or some other stringent capacity reduction mechanism. The SSC is concerned about the limited benefits that would accrue from voluntary stacking if the IQ moratorium is not lifted. However, we also realize that it is up to the Council to decide whether that risk is acceptable.

The SSC has several suggestions for clarifying and simplifying the analysis:

Section 1.3 includes nine objectives. Prioritization or elimination of some objectives may help to simplify the analysis.

Section 1.5 describes three possible future scenarios regarding the IQ moratorium: (1) moratorium expires/no new requirements constraining creation of IQS, (2) moratorium expires/some new

requirements constraining creation of IQS, (3) continuation of moratorium. The SSC recommends that scenario (2) be eliminated from consideration. While it is a plausible scenario, it is not specific enough to be very useful for the analysis.

Provisions 1-9 should be distinguished in terms of whether they pertain to design features of a stacking program that the Council must decide in advance, or outcomes that are contingent on whether voluntary stacking is followed by an IQ program. For instance, the two fishing duration options presented under provision 5 (extended season vs. modified derby) represent alternative outcomes. Similarly, the two options under provision 9 (open vs. close the daily-trip-limit fishery during the primary fixed gear sablefish fishery) also represent alternative outcomes.

## **Coastal Pelagic Species**

### **Amendment 9: Bycatch, Squid Maximum Sustainable Yield, Tribal Fishing Rights**

The SSC reviewed the calculation of squid maximum sustainable yield (MSY) contained in amendment 9 to the coastal pelagic species fishery management plan. The approach extrapolates historic California landings to the entire West Coast based on percentages of area fished and the coastwide distribution of squid in trawl samples. We are concerned about the accuracy of this approach. On the one hand, the extrapolation method used for California may overestimate the amount of squid, because it assumes occasionally fished areas are as productive as heavily fished areas. On the other hand, this method may underestimate the amount of squid, because it assumes that no squid occurs in areas where no fishing occurs. We also do not know how well the incidental catch of squid in various trawl surveys represents the actual distribution of squid coastwide. Because of the uncertainties surrounding these extrapolations and our ongoing concern regarding the appropriateness of defining MSY for this species, we cannot recommend an MSY value at this time.

Fortunately, research being conducted on squid life history, abundance, and distribution in California is expected to provide significant new information within the next year. We recommend that the SSC work with NMFS and California Department of Fish and Game to organize a stock assessment workshop next year to integrate the ongoing squid research in California into the Council's management plan. This workshop should also address how the concept of MSY relates to a species that is short lived and whose abundance/availability is largely environmentally determined.

For near term management purposes, the SSC discussed the known characteristics of the squid fishery with members of the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team. We made three observations about the fishery. First, it has taken place in the same areas near Monterey and in Southern California for decades. Second, catch is dramatically reduced by the occurrence of El Niños, but catches rebound rapidly from very low levels. Third, significant spawning activity takes place in areas that are not fished. Given these characteristics, we believe the resource will not be adversely affected by a delay in setting MSY until after the recommended workshop is completed.

## **Public Comment**

There was no formal public comment.

## **Adjournment**

The SSC adjourned at approximately 3:30 P.M., Wednesday, September 13, 2000.

PFMC  
10/16/2000

**DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES**  
**Groundfish Advisory Subpanel**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion's Sacramento Inn  
Sierra A Room  
1401 Arden Way  
Sacramento, CA 95815  
(916) 922-8041  
September 10 -13, 2000

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 1 p.m. by Mr. Rod Moore, Chairman.

**Members in Attendance**

~~Mr. Wayne Butler~~  
Mr. Barry Cohen  
Mr. Tom Ghio  
Mr. John Crowley  
Mr. Marion Larkin  
Mr. Peter Leipzig  
Mr. Rod Moore

Mr. Dale Myer  
Dr. Mark Powell  
Mr. Jim Potts  
Mr. Gary Smith  
Mr. Kelly Smotherman  
Mr. Frank Warrens

**Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Comments to the Council on September 2000 Agenda Items**

**MARINE RESERVES PHASE I CONSIDERATIONS**

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) re-affirms the statement made in June that marine reserves should be available to the Council as a tool for fisheries management. More extensive comments will be provided under agenda item B.2.

**MARINE RESERVES PHASE II CONSIDERATIONS**

The GAP had an extensive discussion on how, where, and why marine reserves should be used, the extent of knowledge regarding marine reserves and their benefits, and the costs reserves may impose on fishermen, processors, and local communities. The GAP agreed the Council needs to examine the number and extent of areas not being actively fished for various reasons in order to determine whether they meet - in whole or in part - any Council goals on establishing marine reserves. Several GAP members emphasized the effect that establishing reserves will have on participants in the fisheries, including seafood processors, and pointed out the cumulative impact of reserve establishment, changes in harvest policy, and reductions in allowable harvest will be devastating to participants in the fisheries. GAP members pointed out the restrictions on harvest of shelf species are already creating de facto marine reserves in continental shelf areas.

A majority of the GAP believes - prior to establishing marine reserves - a capacity reduction and an individual quota program must be put in place in order to reduce economic disruption. The Council should take whatever actions are appropriate to obtain funding for a capacity reduction program.

A minority of the GAP agrees capacity reduction is important, but these programs should be coordinated with establishment of marine reserves in order to avoid delaying the benefits to fisheries and habitat that accrue from having reserves.

## CHANGES TO ADVISORY BODIES

The GAP discussed changes in the Council's Operating Procedures relating to the GAP and makes the following recommendations:

1. The GAP agrees with the recommendation that GAP terms be extended to three years, beginning January 2001. The GAP views this as a cost saving measure.
2. The GAP recommends the number of meetings which a GAP member can miss should be limited to two per year. Missing two meetings will be cause for dismissal.
3. The GAP recommends a member be allowed to be replaced with an alternate once each year upon prior notification of the Council Chair, and the alternate be compensated for his/her expenses.
4. The Council should make clear to applicants for advisory bodies what their responsibilities are including the number of meetings they will be required to attend.

The majority of the GAP discussed GAP composition and recommends no changes be made at this time. A minority requested greater representation from the open access sector.

## GROUND FISH STRATEGIC PLAN

The GAP received an update on the strategic plan from Ms. Debra Nudelman. After considerable discussion among GAP members and members of the public, the GAP arrived at the following recommendations.

The GAP believes the Council should move ahead with the strategic plan even though there is no consensus on implementation measures. However, this recommendation is made based on the assumption the plan is just that: a plan, which by definition is flexible and can and will be changed to meet drastically changing circumstances in the fisheries.

In regard to implementation, the GAP disagrees strongly with recommendation #2 in the proposed implementation process (page 14 of Exhibit G.2, Attachment 1 - Executive Summary). The GAP believes it is imperative any implementation committee include significant representation of the Council's advisory bodies and affected users. The GAP believes implementation is too serious a task to be left up to those with no direct stake in the welfare of the fishery.

Finally, the GAP observes that trying to decide where to go should require an analysis of where you are. There have been significant changes in law, policy, economics, fishery status, environmental conditions, and management systems in the past few years. The Council should not jump into a new management process without first fully examining the results of these changes.

## REBUILDING PROGRAMS FOR CANARY ROCKFISH AND COWCOD

The GAP met jointly with the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) to review rebuilding plans for cowcod and canary rockfish. The GAP also was briefed by staff of the California Department of Fish and Game on regulatory proposals which the department intends to make to the Council at this meeting. This report comments briefly on the rebuilding plans and more extensively on the proposed California management measures. The GAP notes it will be increasingly important to monitor discards in all sectors of the fishery.

Canary Rockfish - The options available for rebuilding are dependent on assumptions about recent recruitment. Projections based on the 1998 triennial trawl survey indicate a more optimistic view of canary stocks, which could lead to a higher optimum yield (OY) for 2001 than projections not using the 1998 survey point. In either case, the results of the 2001 triennial trawl survey will provide additional information to determine whether or not an optimistic approach is justified.

The Council needs to be aware of the trade-off involved: if the optimistic approach is used now and the 2001 survey confirms this projection, then substantial pain can be avoided. If the 2001 survey shows canary at a low level, then additional restrictions will need to be put in place in 2002.

On the other hand, if the pessimistic approach is used now, restrictions will begin immediately. If the 2001 survey confirms the optimistic approach, the fisheries will have endured this pain unnecessarily. If the 2001 survey confirms the pessimistic approach, then the Council will have acted properly.

**Cowcod** - The GAP agrees with the GMT decision to recommend the medium biomass estimate as the basis for rebuilding cowcod. However, the GAP has concerns on how rebuilding progress - both for this species and in general - will be monitored, especially if management measures call for zero retention of a species.

## NEW STOCK ASSESSMENTS FOR LINGCOD AND PACIFIC OCEAN PERCH

The GAP met jointly with the GMT to review new stock assessments for lingcod and Pacific Ocean perch (POP) and their relationship to rebuilding plans for these species. The GAP offers the following comments.

**Lingcod** - The GAP believes the 2001 acceptable biological catch (ABC) and optimum yield (OY) for lingcod should reflect the new stock assessment, as this will represent the best scientific information available. Further, the results of the new stock assessment should be used to update the existing rebuilding plan for this species.

**Pacific ocean perch** -The GAP notes the new stock assessment shows POP stocks are above the "overfished" level and in fact, probably should not have been designated as "overfished." The GAP recommends this be reported to NMFS, and the Council obtain clarification on what action is necessary when a species grows above the "overfished" level. At the same time, the GAP recognizes the need to manage conservatively while stock increases continue.

## PRELIMINARY 2001 HARVEST LEVELS AND SPECIFICATIONS

The GAP reviewed the preliminary GMT acceptable biological catch (ABC) recommendations as presented in Exhibit G.6, Attachment 1, and offers the following recommendations. Except as noted, the GAP recommend the Council adopt the proposed ABC and optimum yield (OY) levels and ranges contained in the document.

**Lingcod** - The GAP recommends adopting the high end of the OY range. This number reflects the new stock assessment prepared this year.

**Pacific Ocean perch (POP)** - The GAP urges the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) to resolve the issue of the level of POP and other rockfish in historic foreign catches. Two Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panels suggested different and potentially conflicting approaches on this issue, which has a bearing on proposed ABCs.

**Widow rockfish** - The GAP recommends adoption of the high end of the OY range, which reflects application of the new harvest policy and management based on the Council's 40-10 control rule.

**Canary rockfish** - As noted in its comments on the canary rockfish rebuilding plan, the Council needs to decide on how to balance optimistic and pessimistic projections with the upcoming triennial trawl survey.

**Longspine thornyheads** - The GAP recommends adoption of the upper end of the OY range, consistent with the Council's previously stated policy of not applying the new harvest policy rates to species which have not had a new stock assessment and which are not considered at risk.

**Darkblotched rockfish** - As noted above in relation to POP, the SSC needs to resolve the issue of composition of historic foreign catch, as this has major bearing on the status of this species.

**Dover sole** - The GAP recommends adoption of the high end of the OY range. Two years ago, the Council selected the low end of an assessment range as a precautionary measure, even though Dover stocks were projected to increase. The low end of the OY range shown here represents application of the new harvest

policy, even though no new stock assessment has been completed, and stocks are not at risk. This double precautionary approach carries conservative fisheries management to the extreme and should be rejected.

**English sole, petrale sole, arrowtooth flounder, and other flatfish** - In all cases, the GAP recommends adoption of the high end of the OY range, as the low end represents application of the new harvest policy to stocks that are not at risk and that have not been subject to a new assessments.

#### SABLEFISH PERMIT STACKING CONCEPT

The GAP reviewed the draft analysis of permit stacking (Exhibit G.7, Attachment 1) and provides the following comments on the options proposed. In most cases, GAP comments on these options are not unanimous; majority and minority views are indicated where appropriate. The GAP comments follow the outline of provisions listed in the draft analysis.

##### Provision 1: Basic Stacking

A majority of the GAP believes that the Council should not proceed further with a permit stacking system if the individual transferable quota (ITQ) moratorium continues; if the moratorium expires, then stacking should be considered as outlined below. A minority of the GAP disagreed, believing the Council should proceed with a stacking option regardless of the status of the ITQ moratorium.

##### Provision 2: Base Permit and Gear Usage

The consensus of the GAP is that option 2b (using any gear allowed by stacked permits, length endorsement applies) is the preferred option.

##### Provision 3: Limits on Stacking

The majority of the GAP believes limits are desirable, but the limits should be based on poundage, not on the number of permits. They suggest ownership be limited to the equivalent of 5% of the fixed gear allowable catch, although current ownership of permits/endorsements in a greater amount should be "grandfathered". They request the Council establish a control date as soon as possible to signal the potential cut off of "grandfather" rights. A minority of the GAP believes - if permit stacking is considered a free market system - ownership should not be artificially constrained, and thus opposes limits on ownership.

##### Provision 4: Combination of Stacked Permits

After considerable debate in which majority/minority opinions changed several times, the majority of the GAP supported option 4a (allowing permits to be unstacked) as the preferred option, suggesting this will provide greater economic benefits and to allow new entrants an opportunity to buy into the fishery. A minority of the GAP supported option 4c as the preferred option, pointing out this option will provide capacity reduction (a goal of the Council) and still provide economic benefits through trade of endorsements. All parties suggested the Council consider breaking tier endorsements into smaller pieces in order to allow more flexibility in stacking.

##### Provision 5: Fishery duration

While the GAP recognizes the limitations imposed on the Council if the ITQ moratorium remains in effect, the GAP prefers the fishery be of a longer duration, and an ITQ system be developed.

##### Provision 6: At-Sea Processing

A majority of the GAP chose option 6a as the preferred option, with the proviso that it be modified to allow freezing at sea by any vessel that had frozen at least 2000 pounds of sablefish in any of the years 1998, 1999, or 2000. The GAP recognizes some investment in freezer capacity has already been made and this should not be precluded. A minority of the GAP supported option 6b, suggesting this is not a fisheries management issue and thus should not be regulated.

##### Provision 7: Owner on Board

A majority of the GAP supports option 7b (status quo) as the preferred option, suggesting the current system works well and has not led to outside corporate ownership of the fishery. A minority of the GAP supports a modification of option 7a, requiring the owner to be on board only in the case of "2nd generation"

ownership; establishing an emergency exemption in the case of death, injury, or other unavoidable circumstances; and - in the case of corporations or partnerships - requiring only one member of the corporation or partnership be on board.

Provision 8: Non-sablefish cumulative limit stacking

The GAP agreed that this issue needs further discussion and analysis before judgement can be rendered.

Provision 9: Vessels without sablefish endorsements

The consensus of the GAP is that option 9b [no limitation on the daily trip limit fishery] should be the preferred option.

## PERMIT TRANSFER REGULATIONS

The GAP discussed the issue of limited entry permit transfer regulations. The GAP supports initiating a regulatory amendment to modify permit transfer regulations as follows:

1. Permits may be transferred once in any calendar year.
2. The transfer will take effect on the first day of the cumulative limit period following the date of transfer.

## PROPOSED MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR 2001

The GAP had an extensive discussion on proposed groundfish management measures for 2001, including those proposed by the Council's Ad Hoc Allocation Committee and options developed by the GAP.

Since the Allocation Committee options primarily involved reductions in fishing time, the GAP first reviewed this general issue. The GAP - as it has in the past - strongly opposes "time off the water" options.

The GAP recommends the Council adopt the following season structure options for public review:

1. Status quo.
2. Divide the season into two cumulative limit periods.
3. Treat the entire year as one cumulative limit period.
4. As a sub-option to status quo for trawl limited entry vessels, require vessels to declare which cumulative limit choices they will make, based on fishing strategy. The GAP intends to recommend differential limit choices which reflect the diversity of the fishery.

Members of the GAP note the management structure used in 2000 involving gear, species, and area restrictions have already accomplished removing vessels from the water during extensive periods of the year. Several GAP members related their own experiences and those of others regarding an observed reduction in fishing effort coast wide and among all gear types.

An analysis of 2000 effort, including logbooks, landings, and other data, will be important prior to making major changes in the management structure. Moving to a formal "time off the water" system will result in several problems that will only exacerbate the economic difficulties faced by the industry. The ability to employ crews both on vessels and in processing plants will be significantly reduced. Vessels will be unable to access those species which are not subject to trip limits, and which comprise an important economic component of the fishery. At the same time, the data available suggests a formal "time off the water" system will result in only slightly increased trip limits.

The GAP is concerned the Council seems eager to once again change the management system without looking at the disruptions that will occur to vessels, processing plants, and long-term business planning. No analysis has yet been conducted of the 2000 management system to see if it is working, which the GAP believes it is. For these reasons, the GAP strongly recommends maintaining the current system as the preferred option.

The GAP is aware Washington and Oregon will propose options for the 2001 recreational lingcod and rockfish fisheries. The GAP recommends the Council adopt the options for public review.

Finally, the GAP reiterates its support for individual quotas as a preferred management option at such time as the Council is able to establish a quota system for all sectors.

#### California Management Proposals

The GAP used Exhibit G.10.b - Supplemental CDFG Report as the basis for its comments.

1. Movement of the southern rockfish/lingcod management line - The GAP opposes moving the line from Lopez Point to Point Conception. Location of the line has no biological impact, but will affect recreational effort and create an economic impact on recreational fishing operations.
2. Rockfish and lingcod closure periods - The GAP suggests the proposed November - February closure in the southern management zone be changed to a December - March closure. This will allow recreational charter operations to take advantage of the Thanksgiving holiday period.
3. Rockfish bag limit - The GAP suggests establishing a combined rockfish and lingcod bag limit of 10 fish, not to exceed the legal limits for individual species.
4. Prohibition on fishing for and retention of certain species - The GAP has no objections to this proposal if sanddabs are not included. The GAP notes the language describing "commercial and recreational fisheries" should be re-worded to be track proposal number 2.
5. Reduction of bocaccio bag limit - The GAP supports reducing the bag limit for bocaccio to two fish.
6. Reduction of number of hooks used in angling - The GAP supports reducing the number of hooks used to two.
7. Season closure for lingcod, cabezon, and greenling - The GAP believes this proposal needs significant clarification before it is considered. For example, does the closure apply to all trawl gear or only exempted trawl gear? How does this closure relate to the proposed closure in option #2, which applies only to fixed gear? How would a prohibition on "fishing" for three particular species be defined and enforced? The GAP recommends the language on "commercial" be modified to track the language in proposal number 2; it is the GAP's understanding this is the intent of the proposal.
8. Lingcod bag limit - The GAP supports maintaining the two-fish bag limit, but achieving conservation through an increase in the minimum size to 28 inches.
9. Increase in cabezon size limit - The GAP supports increasing the minimum size of cabezon to 16 inches.
10. Transport provisions - The GAP believes transportation allowances through restricted areas should be made available for both recreational and commercial vessels.
11. Prohibition of cowcod retention - The GAP suggests allowing one cowcod to be retained per boat, unless a zero retention option provides sufficient conservation savings to avoid the need for the closures proposed in option 12.
12. Area closures - The GAP recognizes the proposed closures support the conservation of species other than cowcod. However, the GAP has concerns about the enforceability of this proposal, especially sub-option 2. Further, some members of the GAP note this proposal creates a de facto marine reserve without the benefit of public discussion and analysis envisioned by the Council - and supported by the GAP - under the Council's marine reserve policy.

## STATUS OF FISHERIES AND INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS

The GAP met jointly with the GMT to discuss inseason adjustments and offers the following consensus recommendations. Except as noted, the adjustments are to be made for the cumulative period beginning September 1, 2000.

### Limited Entry Trawl

1. For minor slope rockfish in the south, increase the limit to 20,000 pounds per two-month cumulative period through the remainder of 2000.
2. For yellowtail rockfish using midwater trawl gear, maintain a 30,000 pound limit per two-month cumulative period through the remainder of 2000.
3. For yellowtail rockfish taken incidentally by vessels using small footrope gear while harvesting flatfish and arrowtooth flounder, maintain through the remainder of 2000 the regulations currently in effect, except the total amount of yellowtail per trip taken in association with arrowtooth flounder and/or other flatfish may not exceed 2,500 pounds. This change to go into effect beginning November 1, 2000.
4. The limit for other flatfish taken using large footrope trawl gear will be increased to 1,000 pounds per trip. This change to go into effect beginning November 1, 2000.
5. The cumulative limit for arrowtooth flounder will be increased to 20,000 pounds per trip. This change to go into effect beginning November 1, 2000.
6. For the cumulative period beginning September 1, 2000, the cumulative limit for sablefish will be increased to 12,000 pounds. For the months of November and December, 2000 the monthly limit for sablefish will be increased to 6,000 pounds.
7. The limit on taking sablefish under 22 inches in length is repealed for the remainder of 2000.

### Limited Entry Fixed Gear

1. The cumulative limit for nearshore minor rockfish in the north will be increased to 10,000 pounds per two-month cumulative period for the remainder of 2000, with no more than 4,000 pounds being species other than black or blue rockfish.
2. The cumulative limit for nearshore minor rockfish in the south will be increased to 6,000 pounds per two-month cumulative period for the remainder of 2000.
3. The cumulative limit for minor slope rockfish in the south will be increased to 20,000 pounds per two-month cumulative period for the remainder of 2000.
4. For the daily-trip-limit fishery north of 36°, vessels may take 400 pounds per day, with a cumulative limit of 8,000 pounds per two-month period; or 1,000 pounds per week with a cumulative limit of 8,000 pounds per two-month period. Vessels may not apply both the daily and weekly limits within the same week.
5. For the remainder of 2000, the prohibition on taking sablefish less than 22 inches in length is repealed.

### Open Access

1. The limit for minor slope rockfish in the south will be increased to 3,000 pounds per two-month period for the remainder of 2000.
2. The limit for minor nearshore rockfish in the south will be increased to 4,000 pounds per two month period for the remainder of 2000.
3. The limit for minor near shore rockfish in the north will be increased to 6,000 pounds per two-month period for the remainder of 2000, with no more than 2,000 pounds being species other than black or blue rockfish.
4. Vessels operating in the daily-trip-limit sablefish fishery north of 36° may take 300 pounds of sablefish per day or 1,200 pounds of sablefish per week with no cumulative limit for the remainder of 2000. Vessels may not apply both the daily and weekly limits within the same week.

PFMC  
10/16/00



## **PROPOSED AGENDA Groundfish Advisory Subpanel**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
East River II Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 30 - November 1, 2000

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 - 10:30 A.M.

### **Call to Order**

Rod Moore, Chair

Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, Approve Agenda, etc.

- C.1 Rebuilding Programs for Cowcod and Canary Rockfish**  
(Council Action: Final Adoption of Rebuilding Plans)
- C.2 Apportionment of Sablefish Discard Estimates for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Apportionment Values for 2001)
- C.3 Final Harvest Levels and Other Specifications for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Final Harvest Levels for 2001)
- C.9 Management Measures for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Final Management Measures for 2001)

Jim Glock

GMT

GMT

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2000 - 8 A.M.

- C.5 Update on American Fisheries Act Measures**  
(Council Action: Discussion)
- C.6 Exempted Fishing Permit Applications**  
(Council Action: Recommendations to NMFS on Research and Other Exempted Fishing Permit Applications)

Dan Waldeck

NMFS

**Joint Meeting with Groundfish Management Team and Scientific and Statistical Committee  
2001 Groundfish Management Process and Schedule**

**Tuesday, October 31, 2000  
10 a.m. - 12 p.m**

- C.7 2001 Groundfish Management Process and Schedule**  
(Council Action: Adoption of 2001 Groundfish Management Process)
- C.8 Sablefish Permit Stacking**  
(Council Action: Consider Final Adoption of Sablefish Permit Stacking Plan Amendment)

Jim Seger

**C.10 Permit Transfer Regulatory Amendment**  
(Council Action: Adopt Regulatory Amendment)

NMFS

**C.11 Status of Fisheries and Inseason Adjustments**  
(Council Action: Consider Adjustments in Management Measures)

GMT

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2000 - 8 A.M.

Review Draft Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Statements, Complete Unfinished Agenda Items

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2000 - 8 A.M.

(Continue as Necessary)

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/17/00

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Salmon Advisory Subpanel**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
West River II Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 30, 2000

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 - 1 P.M.

[**Note:** The Scientific and Statistical Committee will review salmon methodologies and the Oregon Coastal Natural (OCN) Work Group Report between 8:30 and 11 a.m. in the East River I Room]

**A. Call to Order**

Mark Cedergreen

1. Role Call and Chairman's Remarks (Sign Attendance Roster)
2. Approval of Agenda

**B. Scientific and Statistical Committee Methodology Reviews (B.2)**

- Klamath Ocean Harvest Model
- Central Valley Index Abundance Regression
- Coho Cohort Analysis Project

**C. Final Report of the OCN Coho Work Group (B.3)**

**D. Queets Wild Coho Status (B.4)**

**E. Selection of Salmon Option Hearing Sites (B.5)**

**F. Council Research and Data Needs—Final Adoption (H.3)**

**G. Habitat Issues (F.1)**

**H. Other**

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/18/00

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Budget Committee**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
After Deck Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, WA 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 30, 2000

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 - 2 P.M.

***A. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda***

Jim Harp, Chair

***B. Legislative Update***

Dave Hanson

***C. Executive Director Report***

Donald McIsaac

1. Status of 2000 Expenditures and Year End Projection
2. Status of 2001 Grant Submission
3. Schedule of Budget Committee Meetings for 2001

***D. Status of Groundfish Strategic Plan Facilitation Contract***

Dave Hanson

***E. Other***

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/26/00

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Enforcement Consultants**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
After Deck Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 31, 2000

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2000 - 5:30 P.M.

**A. Introductions**

**B. Pacific Halibut**

1. Comments on Season Problems
2. Annual Regulations

**C. Groundfish**

1. Management Measures for 2001
2. Inseason Adjustments

**D. Salmon**

**E. Public Comment**

**F. Miscellaneous Items - Group Discussion**

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/06/00

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Habitat Steering Group**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
East River 1 Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver WA 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
November 1, 2000

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2000 - 9 A.M.

**A. Call to Order** (9 a.m.)

1. Opening Remarks and Introductions
2. Approval of Habitat Steering Group (HSG) Agenda

Michele Robinson, Chair

**B. Review Of September Council Actions/Directions** (9:15 a.m.-9:30 a.m.) Fran Recht, PSMFC staff

**C. HSG Administrative Matters** (9:30 a.m.-9:50 a.m.)

HSG

1. Duties of HSG Members, HSG Chair

**D. Review of Council Agenda** (9:50 a.m.-10 a.m.)

HSG

1. Identification of Habitat Related Issues on Council Agenda

**E. Future Action Item** (10 a.m.-10:30 a.m.)

1. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) review by HSG for Queets Wild Coho Status Report

HSG

**F. Informational Presentation** (10:30 a.m.-11 a.m.)

1. Columbia River Superfund Issue (30 min.) Environmental Protection Agency representative

**G. Updates** (11 a.m.-12:15 p.m.)

Nora Berwick, NMFS

1. Salmon Plan EFH Implementation (20 min)
2. Update on Technical Guidance for Salmon EFH (15 min.)
3. Habitat Approach (Implementing Section 7 for Salmon Endangered Species Act [ESA]) (20 min.)
4. Federal Columbia River Project System Biological Opinion (20 min.)

Nora Berwick, NMFS

**Lunch** (12:15 p.m.-1:15 p.m.)

**H. Informational Presentations** (1:15 p.m.-2:45 p.m.)

1. Presentation--Marine Reserve Work of Communication Partnership for Science and the Sea (COMPASS)/  
National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis (NCEAS)  
2. Marine Reserve Video from U.K.

George Leonard, COMPASS  
Heather Leslie, NCEAS

**I. Updates (2:45 p.m.-4:45 p.m.)**

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. EFH Guideline/Magnuson Act Review (30 min.)   | HSG                  |
| 2. Puget Sound Groundfish ESA Listing (10 min.)  | Cyreis Schmitt, NMFS |
| 3. Fishing Gear Impacts Work (10 min.)   | Cyreis Schmitt, NMFS |
| 4. Update on Habitat Areas of Particular Concern Work (10 min.)  | Cyreis Schmitt, NMFS |
| 5. Klamath Flow Issue/Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing/<br>U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Operation Plan<br>Environmental Impact Statement (20 min.) | Michael Rode, CDFG   |
| 6. Update on San Francisco Airport Expansion (15 min.)   | Mark Helvey, NMFS    |
| 7. Kelp Management Plan Updates (10 min)   | Bob Lea, CDFG        |

**J. Public Comment Period (4:45 p.m.)**

Public

Comments of members of the public on issues not on the agenda.

**K. HSG Member Briefings (5 p.m.-5:15 p.m.)**

**L. March Meeting Agenda (Portland) (5:15 p.m.-5:30 p.m.)**

HSG

**M. Report to the Council (5:30 p.m.-6 p.m.)**

HSG

(A written report will be ready for review by HSG members, Thursday morning).

ADJOURN (6 p.m.)

PFMC  
10//17/00

## **PROPOSED AGENDA Groundfish Management Team**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
Quay Side Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 29 - November 2, 2000

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2000 - 1 P.M.

### **Call to Order**

Jim Hastie, Co-Chair

Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, Approve Agenda, etc.

- C.1 Rebuilding Programs for Cowcod and Canary Rockfish**  
(Council Action: Final Adoption of Rebuilding Plans)
- C.2 Apportionment of Sablefish Discard Estimates for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Apportionment Values for 2001)
- C.3 Final Harvest Levels and Other Specifications for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Final Harvest Levels for 2001)
- C.9 Management Measures for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Final Management Measures for 2001)

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 - 8 A.M.

- C.6 Exempted Fishing Permit Applications**  
(Council Action: Recommendations to NMFS on Research and Other Exempted Fishing Permit Applications)
- C.11 Status of Fisheries and Inseason Adjustments**  
(Council Action: Consider Adjustments to Management Measures)

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2000 - 8 A.M.

(Continue as Necessary)

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2000 - 8 A.M.

(Continue as Necessary)

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2000 - 8 A.M.

(Continue as Necessary)

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/17/00

## **PROPOSED AGENDA**

### **Scientific and Statistical Committee**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
East River I  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 30 - 31, 2000

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 8 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 September 2000 minutes

Don McIsaac

**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 (.5 hours)

#### **CLOSED SESSION**

5. Review Nomination for Salmon Technical Team

#### **OPEN SESSION**

#### **B. Salmon Management**

2. Results of Scientific and Statistical Committee Methodology Review  
**Council Action:** Approve Methodology Changes for 2001  
(8:30 a.m., 1 hour; Zhou, Lawson)
3. Final Report of the Oregon Coastal Natural Coho Work Group  
**Council Action:** Consider Adopting Technical Adjustments to Amendment 13  
(9:30 a.m., 1.5 hours; Byrne, Conrad)

Pete Lawson

Sam Sharr

#### **H. Council Administrative and Other Matters**

3. Research and Data Needs and Economic Data Plan  
**Council Action:** Consider Final Adoption  
(11 a.m., .5 hours; Thomson)

Jim Seger

**A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)**

6. Review Statements B.2 and B.3  
(11:30 a.m., 1 hour)

LUNCH

**C. Groundfish Management**

3. Final Harvest Levels for 2001
- Resolution of Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey and State Catch Estimates (Thomson, Jagielo)
  - Widow Rockfish Supplemental MSY Calculation (Conser, Jagielo)

GMT

Russell Porter

**Council Action:** Adopt Final Harvest Levels for 2001  
(1:30 p.m., 3 hours)

Public Comment Period  
4 p.m

**A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)**

7. Finalize Statements B.2 and B.3; Review Statement H.3  
(4:30 p.m., 1 hour)

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2000

**A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)**

8. Finalize Statements H.3; Review Statement C.3  
(8 a.m., 1 hour)

**E. Coastal Pelagic Species Management**

2. Pacific Sardine Harvest Guideline
- Council Action:** Adopt 2001 Harvest Guideline  
(9 p.m., 1 hour; Stauffer, Francis)

CPSMT

Joint Meeting with Groundfish Management Team and Groundfish Advisory Subpanel

October 31, 2000  
10 a.m. to 12 p.m  
East River II

**A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)**

9. Finalize Statements C.3  
(12 p.m., .5 hours)

LUNCH

**C. Groundfish Management, (continued)**

7. 2001 Groundfish Management Process and Schedule  
• Review of Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Process  
**Council Action:** Adoption of 2001 Groundfish Management Process  
(1:30 p.m., 1 hour; Conser, Ralston)

Jim Glock

8. Sablefish Permit Stacking  
**Council Action:** Consider Final Adoption  
(2:30 p.m., 1 hour; Sylvia, Young)

Jim Seger

**D. Pacific Halibut Management**

1. Estimate of Bycatch in 1999  
(3:30 p.m., 1 hour; Stauffer)

Cyreis Schmitt

**A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)**

10. Review and Finalize Statements E.2, C.7, C.8, and D.1 (if necessary)  
(4:30 p.m., 1 hour)

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/16/00



## **PROPOSED AGENDA**

### **Salmon Technical Team**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
West River I Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 30, 2000

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 - 1 P.M.

[**Note:** The Scientific and Statistical Committee will review salmon methodologies and the Oregon Coastal Natural (OCN) Work Group Report between 8:30 and 11 a.m. in the East River I Room].

#### **A. Call to Order**

Doug Milward

1. Role Call, Chairman's Remarks, Welcome New Member (Sign Attendance Roster)
2. Approval of Agenda

#### **B. Final Check of Salmon Technical Team (STT) Harvest Report (B.1)**

#### **C. Scientific and Statistical Committee Methodology Reviews (B.2)**

- Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM)
- Central Valley Index Abundance Regression
- Coho Cohort Analysis Project

#### **D. Final Report of the OCN Coho Work Group (B.3)**

#### **E. Queets Wild Coho Status (B.4)**

#### **F. Selection of Salmon Option Hearing Sites (B.5)**

#### **G. Council Research and Data Needs—Final Adoption (H.3)**

#### **H. Internal STT Business**

- Completion of Technical Appendix
- Selection of a new Vice Chair
- Refine/develop bycatch estimates for preseason reports
- Confirm assignments for preseason reports and any modifications
- Establish process and schedule for completing Queets coho overfishing report
- Consideration of questions concerning tags used in the chinook Fishery Regulation Assessment Model
- Implementation of data from Makah encounter rate study

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/18/00

**DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES**  
**Scientific and Statistical Committee**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel Sacramento  
Sierra B Room  
1401 Arden Way  
Sacramento, CA 95815  
September 11-13, 2000

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 8 A.M. by Chair Cynthia Thomson. Dr. Don McIsaac, Executive Director, provided some opening comments and noted for the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) the key issues where the Council would look to the SSC for guidance. The first tier items included: G.4, G.5, G.6, G.7, F.1, A.5, I.1; second tier items included: A.6, D.2, E.2, A.7, A.10.

The agenda was approved.

**Members in Attendance**

Mr. Alan Byrne, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Nampa, ID  
Dr. Ramon Conser, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA  
Mr. Robert Conrad, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Olympia, WA  
Dr. Robert Francis, University of Washington, Seattle, WA  
Dr. Susan Hanna, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR  
Dr. Kevin Hill, California Department of Fish and Game, La Jolla, CA  
Mr. Tom Jagielo, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA  
Dr. Peter Lawson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Newport, OR  
Dr. Stephen Ralston, National Marine Fisheries Service, Tiburon, CA  
Dr. Gary Stauffer, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA  
Dr. Gilbert Sylvia, Hatfield Marine Science Center, Newport, OR  
Ms. Cynthia Thomson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA  
Dr. Shijie Zhou, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland, OR  
Dr. Richard Young, Crescent City, CA

**Scientific and Statistical Committee Comments to the Council**

The following text contains SSC comments to the Council. (Related SSC discussion not included in written comment to the Council is provided in italicized text).

**Halibut**

**Status of Bycatch Estimate**

At the June meeting, the SSC raised a number of issues concerning the definition of strata for a new estimator of Pacific halibut bycatch mortality that is being developed by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Northwest Fisheries Science Center. In particular, the definition of latitudinal, depth, and seasonal strata boundaries was discussed, as was the association of halibut with arrowtooth flounder. As a followup to those concerns, the SSC was briefed by Ms. Cyreis Schmitt and Mr. Mark Saelens, who together described the current status of halibut bycatch estimation in Area 2A of the groundfish trawl fishery. In addition, they provided documentation of the rationale behind the use of specific boundaries to categorize the data into homogeneous strata. The SSC was in agreement that sufficient thought had gone into the analysis following their presentation. In particular, Mr. John Wallace provided a written point-by-point

explanation for the various boundary selections that were used. In finalizing the analysis the SSC recommends that care be exercised in conversions between (1) round and net weight, (2) legal and sublegal fish, and (3) pounds to kilograms. The SSC looks forward to examining the final bycatch mortality estimates, which should be available at the November meeting.

## **Salmon Management**

### **Preliminary Report of the Oregon Coastal Natural Coho Work Group**

Mr. Sam Sharr presented a summary of the draft report of the Amendment 13 review. We did not have time to fully assimilate the information presented, but can offer several observations. The new approach is strong, because it is based on a peer-reviewed model and reflects conditions the Council has been facing in recent years. The report presents a major change in the Amendment 13 matrix, extending specification into the low end of both parental spawning escapement and marine survival. The SSC has not examined the analysis and rationale for the exploitation rate values contained in the matrix.

The matrix specifies a critical cutoff of four spawners per mile in a basin. It is appropriate to specify a critical low spawner escapement level, because extinction risks increase rapidly as spawner densities drop. Any basin with escapements in this range will likely have experienced extinctions of local populations. There is no biological justification for inducing fishing mortality on such stocks. However, it is not clear whether the value of four spawners per mile, as suggested in the review document, provides adequate protection. The SSC has requested an analysis of the risk of low levels of incidental fishing mortality when a stock is near the critical level.

Additional review is needed prior to Council action. The SSC would like to continue our review of this report at the October meeting.

## **Research and Data Needs**

The version of draft research and data needs that appears in the briefing book reflects a number of changes suggested by the SSC and other Council advisory bodies before the Council's groundfish strategic plan became available to us. At this meeting the SSC again reviewed the draft research and data needs, largely to ensure that it reflects the recommendations contained in the strategic plan.

Many of the strategic plan recommendations - pertaining, for instance, to capacity reduction, estimation of total removals, frequency of fishery independent surveys, role of industry in data collection, improved stock assessments, evaluation of environmental effects on recruitment and productivity, evaluation and reduction of effects of gear and fishing practices on habitat - were already reflected in the research and data needs. In some cases, specific items have been edited or reprioritized to improve clarity or to make the connection to the strategic plan more explicit. In addition, several new items were added to the draft research and data needs, including a section on marine reserves and an analysis of the extent of overcapacity in the charter boat fleet. Specific SSC recommendations regarding wording changes to research and data needs are described below.

The SSC also updated the draft West Coast Fisheries Economic Data Plan. The document reflects recommendations contained in the strategic plan, with the most notable addition pertaining to evaluation of the socioeconomic effects of marine reserves. The SSC intends to provide additional wording in the document that describes other economics planning and data collection efforts that have been initiated in recent years and the relationship of the economic data plan to these other efforts.

The SSC appreciates the efforts of Mr. Jim Seger in updating the draft research and data needs and the draft economic data plan. Once the proposed changes have been made, the SSC will consider both documents to be ready for public review.

## Recommended Wording Changes to Attachment F.1

Ensure the wording of the high priority recommendations provided in the Executive Summary is consistent with the body of the document.

### All Fishery Management Plans

Page 2 Add "and species" after "geographic" in fourth sentence. Delete "geographic" in fifth sentence. Replace "will" with "may" in sixth sentence.

Economic Data Plan. In second sentence replace "Developing a coordinated effort" with "Continued development of a coordinated effort."

Page 3 Add a section titled "General Analytical Needs". Subsume "Assessment of Enforcement Effectiveness." Add a second item: "Resources under PFMC jurisdiction respond to large shifts in ocean productivity. For instance, growth and recruitment of rockfish, ocean survival of salmon and the relative abundance of coastal pelagics responded to the major North Pacific climate shift in the late 1970s. In addition, year to year patterns in fishery production tend to show similarities across species (FMP) groups. These holistic resource responses need to be assessed and incorporated into the management process."

Page 3 Economic and Social Data Collection and Research. Delete the last bullet.

Page 4 Add a new item under "Analysis" that reads "Analysis to evaluate extent of overcapacity in the charter vessel fleet."

### Groundfish Management Fishery Management Plan

Page 6 First bullet. Rewrite as follows: "Establish a West Coast coordinator to identify and prioritize stock assessment information needs, to track programs that fulfill those needs and to facilitate establishment of new programs to address unmet needs. This coordinator would report status of biological data collection activities to the Council, with emphasis on anticipated deficiencies identified with respect to stock assessment and management needs." Make a similar change to the last paragraph on page 7.

Delete 2nd bullet on electronic monitoring.

Third bullet. Delete "particularly the trawl fleet." Delete 2nd sentence. In the third sentence insert "and reducing" after "estimating" and delete "against accurate observations made by observers." Delete 4th sentence.

Page 10 Slope Surveys. Move the last sentence of the third bullet to the first bullet.

Page 11 Environmental Data Collection. In 1st sentence, replace "Data collection" with "Collect, analyze and synthesize data." In 4th sentence, replace "trawlers" with "vessels".

Page 13 Stock Assessment Modeling. Add a second sentence that reads "Develop new models for species for which fishery-independent data are not available (e.g., nearshore rockfishes)."

### Salmon Management Fishery Management Plan

Page 16 Indicator Stocks. Add a sentence to the end of the paragraph that reads "Escapement goals are needed for Washington and Oregon coastal fall chinook."

Page 17 Non-Catch Fishing Mortality. Add a sentence prior to the last sentence of the paragraph that reads "Special attention needs to be paid to mid- and long-term mortality."

## Coastal Pelagic Fishery Management Plan

Page 22 First bullet. Replace "in northern and southern end of range" with "throughout its range."

### Marine Reserves

Page 26 3rd paragraph. Delete "five".

Add a new first bullet: "Identify type and scale of information needed to conduct stock assessments after establishment of marine reserves and evaluate the feasibility and cost of collecting such information."

Current first bullet. Insert "and structure" after "location".

Subsume the current 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th bullets under an introductory sentence. "Research is needed to understand the biological effects of marine reserves and determine the extent to which ABCs would need to be modified when marine reserves are implemented, over the short and long term."

Page 27 Stock Assessment Models. After the last sentence, add "As part of the evaluation of marine reserves relative to the status quo, the types and scale of information needed to conduct stock assessments after establishment of reserves should be identified and the feasibility and cost of collecting such information should be analyzed."

Page 27 Social and Economic Data Needs. In second sentence, replace "are not recorded on a fine enough scale to be useful in modeling" with "are needed on a fine enough scale to model". Replace 3rd and 4th sentences with "Information is also needed on the extent of displacement of fishing activity from the reserve and the extent to which effort is diverted to other fisheries."

Page 29 Recreational Harvester and Site Specific Demand. In first sentence, replace "the changes in CPUE (if CPUE predictions could be made)" with "site-specific closures".

Offsite Nonconsumptive Values. Change "bequeathal" to "bequest." Delete 3rd sentence.

Add "Other Marine Related Industries. Inventory and assess dependence of businesses supporting commercial and recreational fisheries as well as other ocean based activities (e.g., ecotourism.)"

## Groundfish Management

### Rebuilding Programs for Canary Rockfish and Cowcod

#### Canary Rockfish

Dr. Richard Methot, NMFS, presented the results of the rebuilding analysis for canary rockfish to the SSC. The analysis addressed all SSC comments that were given to the author at the June meeting. The rebuilding analysis was based on the northern stock assessment. Rebuilding analyses were presented for the two scenarios used during the stock assessment to explain the low incidence of older females compared to older males. The rebuilding analyses were developed by resampling the recruits per spawner (R/S) from various time eras. The SSC agrees with this approach.

The results of the rebuilding analyses are very sensitive to the strength of the 1996 to 1998 year classes. The R/S for these three years were the highest recorded; however, there is uncertainty associated with these values, because they are based solely on the 1998 triennial survey. Until these strong recruitments can be confirmed by the 2001 triennial survey, the SSC agrees with the results obtained by resampling R/S values from the preferred model approved by the Stock Assessment and Review (STAR) Panel. In the northern area, the median time to rebuild, in the absence of fishing, exceeded 60 years for both scenarios. The time to rebuild ranged from 81 to 132 years when an annual catch of 13 to 40 mt was added.

## Cowcod

Mr. Tom Barnes, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), presented the results of the cowcod rebuilding analysis to the SSC. The analysis addressed most of the SSC comments that were given to the author at the June meeting. The rebuilding analysis was based on a surplus production model. The median time to rebuild, in the absence of fishing, ranged from 42 years when initial biomass was set at 11% of virgin biomass to 81 years if initial biomass was 4% of virgin biomass. When annual catches of 2.5 mt to 6.4 mt were added, the median time to rebuild ranged from 92 years to 277 years. It will be difficult to achieve catch targets in this range. The SSC is supportive of proposals outlined by CDFG (Exhibit G.4, Attachment 2) to reduce cowcod catch rates.

A delay difference model was used for the cowcod assessment. This model predicts a longer time to rebuild the stock compared to the surplus production model. The SSC would have preferred that the authors use the model approved by the STAR Panel; however, the difference in allowable catch levels during rebuilding would probably be negligible.

## New Stock Assessments for Lingcod and Pacific Ocean Perch

The SSC met with Mr. Jim Glock to discuss new stock assessments for lingcod, Pacific Ocean perch (POP), and widow rockfish. Lingcod and POP have been separated out for discussion, because each is managed under recently-adopted rebuilding plans, and this is the first time new assessments have been prepared for these species since the overfishing declaration. The new widow rockfish assessment indicates the biomass is at or below 25% of  $B_0$ , so the potential for an overfishing declaration exists for this species as well.

The SSC held a lengthy discussion regarding timing of new stock assessment results for rebuilding species, particularly with respect to updating current rebuilding plans and applying changes for the upcoming management season. For example, rebuilding plans for lingcod and POP have just been approved by NMFS, immediately followed by new stock assessment results for each species. The Sustainable Fisheries Act (SFA) requires re-evaluation of rebuilding plans every two years, but the groundfish fishery management plan (FMP) states that stocks will be managed based on the best available information. This leaves the Council with two options, (1) re-establish rebuilding plans according to the new benchmarks each time new data are available, or (2) carry forward current rebuilding plans as approved, applying the new information in the next review period. The SSC favors the second option.

The SSC has the following specific comments regarding the new stock assessment results:

Widow Rockfish – Although there is a fair amount of uncertainty in the preferred model estimate of widow rockfish biomass, there is a 70% probability that current biomass is less than 25% of  $B_0$ . The Groundfish Management Team (GMT) is currently developing preliminary optimum yields (OYs) based on this estimate and the assumption the stock will be declared overfished. In addition, the current assessment indicates year class strengths have been weak in recent years. The current 40-10 policy will likely be sufficient to rebuild widow rockfish within the next 10 years, and supplemental analysis, provided as an appendix in the stock assessment report, but not reviewed by the Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel, suggests widow rockfish biomass may be somewhat greater and not in an overfished condition. The SSC's groundfish subcommittee will review the supplemental analysis prior to the October Council meeting.

Pacific Ocean perch – The previous POP rebuilding analysis estimated 20 to 30 years to rebuild the stocks. The latest analysis indicates a much shorter rebuilding time on the order of 10 years. The data used in the new rebuilding analysis are based on the new assessment, in which  $B_{MSY}$  was estimated from parameters in the model. There are many confounding factors associated with simultaneous estimation of steepness of the stock-recruitment relationship and survey catchability. This confounding and other technical issues affect the reliability of the  $B_{MSY}$  estimate, which subsequently impacts the rebuilding plan. The SSC does not recommend superceding the currently approved rebuilding plan with the new analysis. The new analysis has not yet been reviewed, but should be considered for the process in 2001.

Lingcod – The lingcod stock is still considered to be in an overfished state, but the most recent assessment results indicate the stock has started to rebuild. The stock assessment authors did not develop a modified rebuilding plan based on the latest results. The SSC recommends continued implementation of the recently approved rebuilding plan.

#### Preliminary Harvest Levels and Other Specifications for 2001

Dr. Richard Methot of the NFMS, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, discussed the report *A Preliminary Analysis of Discarding in the 1995-1999 West Coast Groundfish Fishery* with the SSC. An update of discard levels is needed as the data supporting the current estimates are 15 years old, and the current procedure for estimating discard as a fraction of the total catch of a target species is no longer applicable to today's fishery. The report uses a new model to analyze data from the Enhanced Data Collection Project (EDCP) for the Dover sole, thornyhead, sablefish (DTS) bottom trawl fishery during the 1995-1999 fishing seasons and proposes a new model for estimating DTS discards based on trip limits. The model has two important features, (1) it can be used to estimate discards from current fishery data, and (2) it can be used to predict discards for a given set of proposed trip limits.

The SSC finds the approach used to estimate discards in the DTS trawl fishery very promising. It has the potential to provide better estimates of discards than current procedures and explicitly accounts for changes in trip limits. The SSC recommends future work with the model examine the following:

1. Length frequency information from the data used to develop the model, to determine if there is evidence of high-grading and whether discards are having a significant impact on recruits to the population.
2. Associated economic data that may influence discard behavior in the fishery.
3. A tow-by-tow analysis of the data.
4. Availability of existing log book data (beyond the EDCP data) to support model development.

Although the SSC recognizes the preliminary nature of the current model, it does represent the best available science. Therefore, the SSC recommends using the proposed method for estimating discards in the DTS trawl fishery during the 2001 season. Because of the early stage of development of this model, future improvements to the model may result in changes to the DTS discard estimates and the estimation procedures. Furthermore, the proposed model is dynamic, and discard rate estimates may change annually. The SSC encourages further development of this model.

The restrictive 2000 and 2001 catch levels for many of the OY groundfish stocks will continue to create problems with bycatch in other fisheries and will adversely impact the collection of fishery-dependent data. Additional management efforts will need to be undertaken by the state agencies to reduce the bycatch in shrimp and prawn trawl fisheries and recreational fisheries to keep the catches below OY levels. In addition, fishers may become reluctant to land any catch of rockfish stocks with OY levels of just a few 100 tons to ensure landings do not exceed OY. This will likely contribute to additional unaccounted discards for rockfish stocks. The port sampling opportunity to collect biological data from commercial or recreational catches will then be jeopardized. Information on fish size and age composition is important to our efforts to evaluate the magnitude of incoming year classes and to track stock rebuilding. The lack of sufficient port samples will place more emphasis on the data from the coast-wide shelf and slope surveys.

The SSC reviewed with Dr. Jim Hastie, Chair of the Groundfish Management Team (GMT), the preliminary OY levels for a number of the stocks, particularly those judged to be overfished or near overfishing levels. The new harvest rate policy, and 40-10 reductions are being implemented as 2001 point estimates or as the lower bound of a range. Comments on OY levels for selected stocks are:

Canary rockfish – SSC supports the OY levels based on the preferred model of the Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel which reduced the estimates of recent recruitment levels by 50%. These result in OY ranges of 13 mt to 40 mt for the northern area. The extremely low harvests levels will severely impact shelf fisheries.

Pacific Ocean perch (POP) – With respect to the OY levels for Pacific Ocean perch there is confusion over the existing rebuilding plan, given the results of the new assessment which concluded that current biomass is above 50% of  $B_{MSY}$ . The new rebuilding analysis provided in the briefing book has not been reviewed, and the SSC cannot endorse its use in setting the 2001 OY level. We recommended to the GMT they develop a range using last year's OY (294 mt) and a yield obtained using the current harvest policy ( $F_{50\%}$  with the [40-10] reduction) applied to the most recent biomass estimate. This recommendation should be in place until the status of the POP rebuilding plan is resolved. Given the sophistication and complexity of the new models being used to assess rebuilding and to derive biological reference points, the current review process is being stretched beyond its capability to provide the in-depth evaluations required to make informed, valid, and pertinent judgments to resolve conflicting model outcomes similar to those for the POP assessment.

Widow rockfish – The updated assessment concluded the current biomass for the widow rockfish stock has a 70% probability of being less than 25% of  $B_0$ , which indicates an overfished stock. However an existing analysis, which has not been reviewed or approved by the Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel or SSC, concludes a rebuilding plan for widow rockfish may not be required. If this is the case, the harvest rate would be based on the (40-10) policy. Prior to Council adopting OYs in October, the SSC will review the overfished status report appended to the assessment document and will provide advice on OY at that time.

Darkblotched rockfish – The OY range is based on uncertainty in the amount of darkblotched taken in the foreign rockfish fishery and initial rebuilding projections by the Stock Assessment Team (STAT) that assume the stock will be declared overfished. SSC recommends further analysis be undertaken to resolve the uncertainty of species composition in the foreign fishery. Until there is some resolution to this issue, SSC can offer no advice on any particular point estimate.

Lingcod – The lower value of the OY range is based on the existing rebuilding projections and the upper value is based on the new assessment results. The best available information is from the new assessment.

#### Sablefish Permit Stacking Concept

Mr. Jim Seger briefed the SSC on the Draft Analysis of Permit Stacking for the Limited Entry Fixed Gear Sablefish Fishery.

The analysis includes a placeholder in Section 1.3.3 for a discussion of the relationship between the permit stacking proposal and the goals and recommendations of the Groundfish Strategic Plan, should the plan be adopted by the Council. This is a good example of how groundfish plan amendments should be routinely related to the strategic plan. The document also contains placeholders for other portions of the analysis that have not yet been completed, including Section 2.0 (description of fishery) and portions of Section 3.3.x (safety, windfall profits, etc.). The analysis, however, was sufficiently complete to allow the SSC to evaluate the essential elements of the voluntary stacking proposal.

The SSC concurs with the following conclusions from the analysis: unless the individual quota (IQ) moratorium is lifted, voluntary permit stacking per se is not likely to increase the duration of the fixed gear sablefish season, alleviate the safety concerns and complex management decisions associated with short seasons, or result in significant capacity reduction. In order to accomplish those things, voluntary stacking will need to be followed by a properly designed IQ system (an uncertain prospect at this time, given the moratorium) or some other stringent capacity reduction mechanism. The SSC is concerned about the limited benefits that would accrue from voluntary stacking if the IQ moratorium is not lifted. However, we also realize that it is up to the Council to decide whether that risk is acceptable.

The SSC has several suggestions for clarifying and simplifying the analysis:

Section 1.3 includes nine objectives. Prioritization or elimination of some objectives may help to simplify the analysis.

Section 1.5 describes three possible future scenarios regarding the IQ moratorium: (1) moratorium expires/no new requirements constraining creation of IQS, (2) moratorium expires/some new

requirements constraining creation of IQS, (3) continuation of moratorium. The SSC recommends that scenario (2) be eliminated from consideration. While it is a plausible scenario, it is not specific enough to be very useful for the analysis.

Provisions 1-9 should be distinguished in terms of whether they pertain to design features of a stacking program that the Council must decide in advance, or outcomes that are contingent on whether voluntary stacking is followed by an IQ program. For instance, the two fishing duration options presented under provision 5 (extended season vs. modified derby) represent alternative outcomes. Similarly, the two options under provision 9 (open vs. close the daily-trip-limit fishery during the primary fixed gear sablefish fishery) also represent alternative outcomes.

## **Coastal Pelagic Species**

### **Amendment 9: Bycatch, Squid Maximum Sustainable Yield, Tribal Fishing Rights**

The SSC reviewed the calculation of squid maximum sustainable yield (MSY) contained in amendment 9 to the coastal pelagic species fishery management plan. The approach extrapolates historic California landings to the entire West Coast based on percentages of area fished and the coastwide distribution of squid in trawl samples. We are concerned about the accuracy of this approach. On the one hand, the extrapolation method used for California may overestimate the amount of squid, because it assumes occasionally fished areas are as productive as heavily fished areas. On the other hand, this method may underestimate the amount of squid, because it assumes that no squid occurs in areas where no fishing occurs. We also do not know how well the incidental catch of squid in various trawl surveys represents the actual distribution of squid coastwide. Because of the uncertainties surrounding these extrapolations and our ongoing concern regarding the appropriateness of defining MSY for this species, we cannot recommend an MSY value at this time.

Fortunately, research being conducted on squid life history, abundance, and distribution in California is expected to provide significant new information within the next year. We recommend that the SSC work with NMFS and California Department of Fish and Game to organize a stock assessment workshop next year to integrate the ongoing squid research in California into the Council's management plan. This workshop should also address how the concept of MSY relates to a species that is short lived and whose abundance/availability is largely environmentally determined.

For near term management purposes, the SSC discussed the known characteristics of the squid fishery with members of the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team. We made three observations about the fishery. First, it has taken place in the same areas near Monterey and in Southern California for decades. Second, catch is dramatically reduced by the occurrence of El Niños, but catches rebound rapidly from very low levels. Third, significant spawning activity takes place in areas that are not fished. Given these characteristics, we believe the resource will not be adversely affected by a delay in setting MSY until after the recommended workshop is completed.

### **Public Comment**

There was no formal public comment.

### **Adjournment**

The SSC adjourned at approximately 3:30 P.M., Wednesday, September 13, 2000.

PFMC  
10/16/2000

**DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES**  
**Groundfish Advisory Subpanel**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion's Sacramento Inn  
Sierra A Room  
1401 Arden Way  
Sacramento, CA 95815  
(916) 922-8041  
September 10 -13, 2000

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 1 p.m. by Mr. Rod Moore, Chairman.

**Members in Attendance**

~~Mr. Wayne Butler~~  
Mr. Barry Cohen  
Mr. Tom Ghio  
Mr. John Crowley  
Mr. Marion Larkin  
Mr. Peter Leipzig  
Mr. Rod Moore

Mr. Dale Myer  
Dr. Mark Powell  
Mr. Jim Potts  
Mr. Gary Smith  
Mr. Kelly Smotherman  
Mr. Frank Warrens

**Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Comments to the Council on September 2000 Agenda Items**

**MARINE RESERVES PHASE I CONSIDERATIONS**

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) re-affirms the statement made in June that marine reserves should be available to the Council as a tool for fisheries management. More extensive comments will be provided under agenda item B.2.

**MARINE RESERVES PHASE II CONSIDERATIONS**

The GAP had an extensive discussion on how, where, and why marine reserves should be used, the extent of knowledge regarding marine reserves and their benefits, and the costs reserves may impose on fishermen, processors, and local communities. The GAP agreed the Council needs to examine the number and extent of areas not being actively fished for various reasons in order to determine whether they meet - in whole or in part - any Council goals on establishing marine reserves. Several GAP members emphasized the effect that establishing reserves will have on participants in the fisheries, including seafood processors, and pointed out the cumulative impact of reserve establishment, changes in harvest policy, and reductions in allowable harvest will be devastating to participants in the fisheries. GAP members pointed out the restrictions on harvest of shelf species are already creating de facto marine reserves in continental shelf areas.

A majority of the GAP believes - prior to establishing marine reserves - a capacity reduction and an individual quota program must be put in place in order to reduce economic disruption. The Council should take whatever actions are appropriate to obtain funding for a capacity reduction program.

A minority of the GAP agrees capacity reduction is important, but these programs should be coordinated with establishment of marine reserves in order to avoid delaying the benefits to fisheries and habitat that accrue from having reserves.

## CHANGES TO ADVISORY BODIES

The GAP discussed changes in the Council's Operating Procedures relating to the GAP and makes the following recommendations:

1. The GAP agrees with the recommendation that GAP terms be extended to three years, beginning January 2001. The GAP views this as a cost saving measure.
2. The GAP recommends the number of meetings which a GAP member can miss should be limited to two per year. Missing two meetings will be cause for dismissal.
3. The GAP recommends a member be allowed to be replaced with an alternate once each year upon prior notification of the Council Chair, and the alternate be compensated for his/her expenses.
4. The Council should make clear to applicants for advisory bodies what their responsibilities are including the number of meetings they will be required to attend.

The majority of the GAP discussed GAP composition and recommends no changes be made at this time. A minority requested greater representation from the open access sector.

## GROUND FISH STRATEGIC PLAN

The GAP received an update on the strategic plan from Ms. Debra Nudelman. After considerable discussion among GAP members and members of the public, the GAP arrived at the following recommendations.

The GAP believes the Council should move ahead with the strategic plan even though there is no consensus on implementation measures. However, this recommendation is made based on the assumption the plan is just that: a plan, which by definition is flexible and can and will be changed to meet drastically changing circumstances in the fisheries.

In regard to implementation, the GAP disagrees strongly with recommendation #2 in the proposed implementation process (page 14 of Exhibit G.2, Attachment 1 - Executive Summary). The GAP believes it is imperative any implementation committee include significant representation of the Council's advisory bodies and affected users. The GAP believes implementation is too serious a task to be left up to those with no direct stake in the welfare of the fishery.

Finally, the GAP observes that trying to decide where to go should require an analysis of where you are. There have been significant changes in law, policy, economics, fishery status, environmental conditions, and management systems in the past few years. The Council should not jump into a new management process without first fully examining the results of these changes.

## REBUILDING PROGRAMS FOR CANARY ROCKFISH AND COWCOD

The GAP met jointly with the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) to review rebuilding plans for cowcod and canary rockfish. The GAP also was briefed by staff of the California Department of Fish and Game on regulatory proposals which the department intends to make to the Council at this meeting. This report comments briefly on the rebuilding plans and more extensively on the proposed California management measures. The GAP notes it will be increasingly important to monitor discards in all sectors of the fishery.

Canary Rockfish - The options available for rebuilding are dependent on assumptions about recent recruitment. Projections based on the 1998 triennial trawl survey indicate a more optimistic view of canary stocks, which could lead to a higher optimum yield (OY) for 2001 than projections not using the 1998 survey point. In either case, the results of the 2001 triennial trawl survey will provide additional information to determine whether or not an optimistic approach is justified.

The Council needs to be aware of the trade-off involved: if the optimistic approach is used now and the 2001 survey confirms this projection, then substantial pain can be avoided. If the 2001 survey shows canary at a low level, then additional restrictions will need to be put in place in 2002.

On the other hand, if the pessimistic approach is used now, restrictions will begin immediately. If the 2001 survey confirms the optimistic approach, the fisheries will have endured this pain unnecessarily. If the 2001 survey confirms the pessimistic approach, then the Council will have acted properly.

**Cowcod** - The GAP agrees with the GMT decision to recommend the medium biomass estimate as the basis for rebuilding cowcod. However, the GAP has concerns on how rebuilding progress - both for this species and in general - will be monitored, especially if management measures call for zero retention of a species.

## NEW STOCK ASSESSMENTS FOR LINGCOD AND PACIFIC OCEAN PERCH

The GAP met jointly with the GMT to review new stock assessments for lingcod and Pacific Ocean perch (POP) and their relationship to rebuilding plans for these species. The GAP offers the following comments.

**Lingcod** - The GAP believes the 2001 acceptable biological catch (ABC) and optimum yield (OY) for lingcod should reflect the new stock assessment, as this will represent the best scientific information available. Further, the results of the new stock assessment should be used to update the existing rebuilding plan for this species.

**Pacific ocean perch** -The GAP notes the new stock assessment shows POP stocks are above the "overfished" level and in fact, probably should not have been designated as "overfished." The GAP recommends this be reported to NMFS, and the Council obtain clarification on what action is necessary when a species grows above the "overfished" level. At the same time, the GAP recognizes the need to manage conservatively while stock increases continue.

## PRELIMINARY 2001 HARVEST LEVELS AND SPECIFICATIONS

The GAP reviewed the preliminary GMT acceptable biological catch (ABC) recommendations as presented in Exhibit G.6, Attachment 1, and offers the following recommendations. Except as noted, the GAP recommend the Council adopt the proposed ABC and optimum yield (OY) levels and ranges contained in the document.

**Lingcod** - The GAP recommends adopting the high end of the OY range. This number reflects the new stock assessment prepared this year.

**Pacific Ocean perch (POP)** - The GAP urges the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) to resolve the issue of the level of POP and other rockfish in historic foreign catches. Two Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panels suggested different and potentially conflicting approaches on this issue, which has a bearing on proposed ABCs.

**Widow rockfish** - The GAP recommends adoption of the high end of the OY range, which reflects application of the new harvest policy and management based on the Council's 40-10 control rule.

**Canary rockfish** - As noted in its comments on the canary rockfish rebuilding plan, the Council needs to decide on how to balance optimistic and pessimistic projections with the upcoming triennial trawl survey.

**Longspine thornyheads** - The GAP recommends adoption of the upper end of the OY range, consistent with the Council's previously stated policy of not applying the new harvest policy rates to species which have not had a new stock assessment and which are not considered at risk.

**Darkblotched rockfish** - As noted above in relation to POP, the SSC needs to resolve the issue of composition of historic foreign catch, as this has major bearing on the status of this species.

**Dover sole** - The GAP recommends adoption of the high end of the OY range. Two years ago, the Council selected the low end of an assessment range as a precautionary measure, even though Dover stocks were projected to increase. The low end of the OY range shown here represents application of the new harvest

policy, even though no new stock assessment has been completed, and stocks are not at risk. This double precautionary approach carries conservative fisheries management to the extreme and should be rejected.

**English sole, petrale sole, arrowtooth flounder, and other flatfish** - In all cases, the GAP recommends adoption of the high end of the OY range, as the low end represents application of the new harvest policy to stocks that are not at risk and that have not been subject to a new assessments.

#### SABLEFISH PERMIT STACKING CONCEPT

The GAP reviewed the draft analysis of permit stacking (Exhibit G.7, Attachment 1) and provides the following comments on the options proposed. In most cases, GAP comments on these options are not unanimous; majority and minority views are indicated where appropriate. The GAP comments follow the outline of provisions listed in the draft analysis.

##### Provision 1: Basic Stacking

A majority of the GAP believes that the Council should not proceed further with a permit stacking system if the individual transferable quota (ITQ) moratorium continues; if the moratorium expires, then stacking should be considered as outlined below. A minority of the GAP disagreed, believing the Council should proceed with a stacking option regardless of the status of the ITQ moratorium.

##### Provision 2: Base Permit and Gear Usage

The consensus of the GAP is that option 2b (using any gear allowed by stacked permits, length endorsement applies) is the preferred option.

##### Provision 3: Limits on Stacking

The majority of the GAP believes limits are desirable, but the limits should be based on poundage, not on the number of permits. They suggest ownership be limited to the equivalent of 5% of the fixed gear allowable catch, although current ownership of permits/endorsements in a greater amount should be "grandfathered". They request the Council establish a control date as soon as possible to signal the potential cut off of "grandfather" rights. A minority of the GAP believes - if permit stacking is considered a free market system - ownership should not be artificially constrained, and thus opposes limits on ownership.

##### Provision 4: Combination of Stacked Permits

After considerable debate in which majority/minority opinions changed several times, the majority of the GAP supported option 4a (allowing permits to be unstacked) as the preferred option, suggesting this will provide greater economic benefits and to allow new entrants an opportunity to buy into the fishery. A minority of the GAP supported option 4c as the preferred option, pointing out this option will provide capacity reduction (a goal of the Council) and still provide economic benefits through trade of endorsements. All parties suggested the Council consider breaking tier endorsements into smaller pieces in order to allow more flexibility in stacking.

##### Provision 5: Fishery duration

While the GAP recognizes the limitations imposed on the Council if the ITQ moratorium remains in effect, the GAP prefers the fishery be of a longer duration, and an ITQ system be developed.

##### Provision 6: At-Sea Processing

A majority of the GAP chose option 6a as the preferred option, with the proviso that it be modified to allow freezing at sea by any vessel that had frozen at least 2000 pounds of sablefish in any of the years 1998, 1999, or 2000. The GAP recognizes some investment in freezer capacity has already been made and this should not be precluded. A minority of the GAP supported option 6b, suggesting this is not a fisheries management issue and thus should not be regulated.

##### Provision 7: Owner on Board

A majority of the GAP supports option 7b (status quo) as the preferred option, suggesting the current system works well and has not led to outside corporate ownership of the fishery. A minority of the GAP supports a modification of option 7a, requiring the owner to be on board only in the case of "2nd generation"

ownership; establishing an emergency exemption in the case of death, injury, or other unavoidable circumstances; and - in the case of corporations or partnerships - requiring only one member of the corporation or partnership be on board.

**Provision 8: Non-sablefish cumulative limit stacking**

The GAP agreed that this issue needs further discussion and analysis before judgement can be rendered.

**Provision 9: Vessels without sablefish endorsements**

The consensus of the GAP is that option 9b [no limitation on the daily trip limit fishery] should be the preferred option.

## **PERMIT TRANSFER REGULATIONS**

The GAP discussed the issue of limited entry permit transfer regulations. The GAP supports initiating a regulatory amendment to modify permit transfer regulations as follows:

1. Permits may be transferred once in any calendar year.
2. The transfer will take effect on the first day of the cumulative limit period following the date of transfer.

## **PROPOSED MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR 2001**

The GAP had an extensive discussion on proposed groundfish management measures for 2001, including those proposed by the Council's Ad Hoc Allocation Committee and options developed by the GAP.

Since the Allocation Committee options primarily involved reductions in fishing time, the GAP first reviewed this general issue. The GAP - as it has in the past - strongly opposes "time off the water" options.

The GAP recommends the Council adopt the following season structure options for public review:

1. Status quo.
2. Divide the season into two cumulative limit periods.
3. Treat the entire year as one cumulative limit period.
4. As a sub-option to status quo for trawl limited entry vessels, require vessels to declare which cumulative limit choices they will make, based on fishing strategy. The GAP intends to recommend differential limit choices which reflect the diversity of the fishery.

Members of the GAP note the management structure used in 2000 involving gear, species, and area restrictions have already accomplished removing vessels from the water during extensive periods of the year. Several GAP members related their own experiences and those of others regarding an observed reduction in fishing effort coast wide and among all gear types.

An analysis of 2000 effort, including logbooks, landings, and other data, will be important prior to making major changes in the management structure. Moving to a formal "time off the water" system will result in several problems that will only exacerbate the economic difficulties faced by the industry. The ability to employ crews both on vessels and in processing plants will be significantly reduced. Vessels will be unable to access those species which are not subject to trip limits, and which comprise an important economic component of the fishery. At the same time, the data available suggests a formal "time off the water" system will result in only slightly increased trip limits.

The GAP is concerned the Council seems eager to once again change the management system without looking at the disruptions that will occur to vessels, processing plants, and long-term business planning. No analysis has yet been conducted of the 2000 management system to see if it is working, which the GAP believes it is. For these reasons, the GAP strongly recommends maintaining the current system as the preferred option.

The GAP is aware Washington and Oregon will propose options for the 2001 recreational lingcod and rockfish fisheries. The GAP recommends the Council adopt the options for public review.

Finally, the GAP reiterates its support for individual quotas as a preferred management option at such time as the Council is able to establish a quota system for all sectors.

#### California Management Proposals

The GAP used Exhibit G.10.b - Supplemental CDFG Report as the basis for its comments.

1. Movement of the southern rockfish/lingcod management line - The GAP opposes moving the line from Lopez Point to Point Conception. Location of the line has no biological impact, but will affect recreational effort and create an economic impact on recreational fishing operations.
2. Rockfish and lingcod closure periods - The GAP suggests the proposed November - February closure in the southern management zone be changed to a December - March closure. This will allow recreational charter operations to take advantage of the Thanksgiving holiday period.
3. Rockfish bag limit - The GAP suggests establishing a combined rockfish and lingcod bag limit of 10 fish, not to exceed the legal limits for individual species.
4. Prohibition on fishing for and retention of certain species - The GAP has no objections to this proposal if sanddabs are not included. The GAP notes the language describing "commercial and recreational fisheries" should be re-worded to be track proposal number 2.
5. Reduction of bocaccio bag limit - The GAP supports reducing the bag limit for bocaccio to two fish.
6. Reduction of number of hooks used in angling - The GAP supports reducing the number of hooks used to two.
7. Season closure for lingcod, cabezon, and greenling - The GAP believes this proposal needs significant clarification before it is considered. For example, does the closure apply to all trawl gear or only exempted trawl gear? How does this closure relate to the proposed closure in option #2, which applies only to fixed gear? How would a prohibition on "fishing" for three particular species be defined and enforced? The GAP recommends the language on "commercial" be modified to track the language in proposal number 2; it is the GAP's understanding this is the intent of the proposal.
8. Lingcod bag limit - The GAP supports maintaining the two-fish bag limit, but achieving conservation through an increase in the minimum size to 28 inches.
9. Increase in cabezon size limit - The GAP supports increasing the minimum size of cabezon to 16 inches.
10. Transport provisions - The GAP believes transportation allowances through restricted areas should be made available for both recreational and commercial vessels.
11. Prohibition of cowcod retention - The GAP suggests allowing one cowcod to be retained per boat, unless a zero retention option provides sufficient conservation savings to avoid the need for the closures proposed in option 12.
12. Area closures - The GAP recognizes the proposed closures support the conservation of species other than cowcod. However, the GAP has concerns about the enforceability of this proposal, especially sub-option 2. Further, some members of the GAP note this proposal creates a de facto marine reserve without the benefit of public discussion and analysis envisioned by the Council - and supported by the GAP - under the Council's marine reserve policy.

## STATUS OF FISHERIES AND INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS

The GAP met jointly with the GMT to discuss inseason adjustments and offers the following consensus recommendations. Except as noted, the adjustments are to be made for the cumulative period beginning September 1, 2000.

### Limited Entry Trawl

1. For minor slope rockfish in the south, increase the limit to 20,000 pounds per two-month cumulative period through the remainder of 2000.
2. For yellowtail rockfish using midwater trawl gear, maintain a 30,000 pound limit per two-month cumulative period through the remainder of 2000.
3. For yellowtail rockfish taken incidentally by vessels using small footrope gear while harvesting flatfish and arrowtooth flounder, maintain through the remainder of 2000 the regulations currently in effect, except the total amount of yellowtail per trip taken in association with arrowtooth flounder and/or other flatfish may not exceed 2,500 pounds. This change to go into effect beginning November 1, 2000.
4. The limit for other flatfish taken using large footrope trawl gear will be increased to 1,000 pounds per trip. This change to go into effect beginning November 1, 2000.
5. The cumulative limit for arrowtooth flounder will be increased to 20,000 pounds per trip. This change to go into effect beginning November 1, 2000.
6. For the cumulative period beginning September 1, 2000, the cumulative limit for sablefish will be increased to 12,000 pounds. For the months of November and December, 2000 the monthly limit for sablefish will be increased to 6,000 pounds.
7. The limit on taking sablefish under 22 inches in length is repealed for the remainder of 2000.

### Limited Entry Fixed Gear

1. The cumulative limit for nearshore minor rockfish in the north will be increased to 10,000 pounds per two-month cumulative period for the remainder of 2000, with no more than 4,000 pounds being species other than black or blue rockfish.
2. The cumulative limit for nearshore minor rockfish in the south will be increased to 6,000 pounds per two-month cumulative period for the remainder of 2000.
3. The cumulative limit for minor slope rockfish in the south will be increased to 20,000 pounds per two-month cumulative period for the remainder of 2000.
4. For the daily-trip-limit fishery north of 36°, vessels may take 400 pounds per day, with a cumulative limit of 8,000 pounds per two-month period; or 1,000 pounds per week with a cumulative limit of 8,000 pounds per two-month period. Vessels may not apply both the daily and weekly limits within the same week.
5. For the remainder of 2000, the prohibition on taking sablefish less than 22 inches in length is repealed.

### Open Access

1. The limit for minor slope rockfish in the south will be increased to 3,000 pounds per two-month period for the remainder of 2000.
2. The limit for minor nearshore rockfish in the south will be increased to 4,000 pounds per two month period for the remainder of 2000.
3. The limit for minor near shore rockfish in the north will be increased to 6,000 pounds per two-month period for the remainder of 2000, with no more than 2,000 pounds being species other than black or blue rockfish.
4. Vessels operating in the daily-trip-limit sablefish fishery north of 36° may take 300 pounds of sablefish per day or 1,200 pounds of sablefish per week with no cumulative limit for the remainder of 2000. Vessels may not apply both the daily and weekly limits within the same week.

PFMC  
10/16/00



## **PROPOSED AGENDA Groundfish Advisory Subpanel**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
East River II Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 30 - November 1, 2000

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 - 10:30 A.M.

### **Call to Order**

Rod Moore, Chair

Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, Approve Agenda, etc.

- C.1 Rebuilding Programs for Cowcod and Canary Rockfish**  
(Council Action: Final Adoption of Rebuilding Plans)
- C.2 Apportionment of Sablefish Discard Estimates for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Apportionment Values for 2001)
- C.3 Final Harvest Levels and Other Specifications for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Final Harvest Levels for 2001)
- C.9 Management Measures for 2001**  
(Council Action: Adopt Final Management Measures for 2001)

Jim Glock

GMT

GMT

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2000 - 8 A.M.

- C.5 Update on American Fisheries Act Measures**  
(Council Action: Discussion)
- C.6 Exempted Fishing Permit Applications**  
(Council Action: Recommendations to NMFS on Research and Other Exempted Fishing Permit Applications)

Dan Waldeck

NMFS

**Joint Meeting with Groundfish Management Team and Scientific and Statistical Committee  
2001 Groundfish Management Process and Schedule**

**Tuesday, October 31, 2000  
10 a.m. - 12 p.m**

- C.7 2001 Groundfish Management Process and Schedule**  
(Council Action: Adoption of 2001 Groundfish Management Process)
- C.8 Sablefish Permit Stacking**  
(Council Action: Consider Final Adoption of Sablefish Permit Stacking Plan Amendment)

Jim Seger

**C.10 Permit Transfer Regulatory Amendment**  
(Council Action: Adopt Regulatory Amendment)

NMFS

**C.11 Status of Fisheries and Inseason Adjustments**  
(Council Action: Consider Adjustments in Management Measures)

GMT

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2000 - 8 A.M.

Review Draft Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Statements, Complete Unfinished Agenda Items

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2000 - 8 A.M.

(Continue as Necessary)

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/17/00

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Salmon Advisory Subpanel**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
West River II Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 30, 2000

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 - 1 P.M.

[**Note:** The Scientific and Statistical Committee will review salmon methodologies and the Oregon Coastal Natural (OCN) Work Group Report between 8:30 and 11 a.m. in the East River I Room]

**A. Call to Order**

Mark Cedergreen

1. Role Call and Chairman's Remarks (Sign Attendance Roster)
2. Approval of Agenda

**B. Scientific and Statistical Committee Methodology Reviews (B.2)**

- Klamath Ocean Harvest Model
- Central Valley Index Abundance Regression
- Coho Cohort Analysis Project

**C. Final Report of the OCN Coho Work Group (B.3)**

**D. Queets Wild Coho Status (B.4)**

**E. Selection of Salmon Option Hearing Sites (B.5)**

**F. Council Research and Data Needs—Final Adoption (H.3)**

**G. Habitat Issues (F.1)**

**H. Other**

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/18/00

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Budget Committee**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
After Deck Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, WA 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 30, 2000

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 - 2 P.M.

***A. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda***

Jim Harp, Chair

***B. Legislative Update***

Dave Hanson

***C. Executive Director Report***

Donald McIsaac

1. Status of 2000 Expenditures and Year End Projection
2. Status of 2001 Grant Submission
3. Schedule of Budget Committee Meetings for 2001

***D. Status of Groundfish Strategic Plan Facilitation Contract***

Dave Hanson

***E. Other***

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/26/00

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Enforcement Consultants**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
After Deck Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
October 31, 2000

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2000 - 5:30 P.M.

**A. Introductions**

**B. Pacific Halibut**

1. Comments on Season Problems
2. Annual Regulations

**C. Groundfish**

1. Management Measures for 2001
2. Inseason Adjustments

**D. Salmon**

**E. Public Comment**

**F. Miscellaneous Items - Group Discussion**

ADJOURN

PFMC  
10/06/00

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Habitat Steering Group**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
East River 1 Room  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver WA 98660  
(360) 694-8341  
November 1, 2000

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2000 - 9 A.M.

**A. Call to Order** (9 a.m.)

1. Opening Remarks and Introductions
2. Approval of Habitat Steering Group (HSG) Agenda

Michele Robinson, Chair

**B. Review Of September Council Actions/Directions** (9:15 a.m.-9:30 a.m.) Fran Recht, PSMFC staff

**C. HSG Administrative Matters** (9:30 a.m.-9:50 a.m.)

HSG

1. Duties of HSG Members, HSG Chair

**D. Review of Council Agenda** (9:50 a.m.-10 a.m.)

HSG

1. Identification of Habitat Related Issues on Council Agenda

**E. Future Action Item** (10 a.m.-10:30 a.m.)

1. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) review by HSG for Queets Wild Coho Status Report

HSG

**F. Informational Presentation** (10:30 a.m.-11 a.m.)

1. Columbia River Superfund Issue (30 min.) Environmental Protection Agency representative

**G. Updates** (11 a.m.-12:15 p.m.)

Nora Berwick, NMFS

1. Salmon Plan EFH Implementation (20 min)
2. Update on Technical Guidance for Salmon EFH (15 min.)
3. Habitat Approach (Implementing Section 7 for Salmon Endangered Species Act [ESA]) (20 min.)
4. Federal Columbia River Project System Biological Opinion (20 min.)

Nora Berwick, NMFS

**Lunch** (12:15 p.m.-1:15 p.m.)

**H. Informational Presentations** (1:15 p.m.-2:45 p.m.)

1. Presentation--Marine Reserve Work of Communication Partnership for Science and the Sea (COMPASS)/  
National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis (NCEAS)  
2. Marine Reserve Video from U.K.

George Leonard, COMPASS  
Heather Leslie, NCEAS

**I. Updates (2:45 p.m.-4:45 p.m.)**

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. EFH Guideline/Magnuson Act Review (30 min.)   | HSG                  |
| 2. Puget Sound Groundfish ESA Listing (10 min.)  | Cyreis Schmitt, NMFS |
| 3. Fishing Gear Impacts Work (10 min.)   | Cyreis Schmitt, NMFS |
| 4. Update on Habitat Areas of Particular Concern Work (10 min.)  | Cyreis Schmitt, NMFS |
| 5. Klamath Flow Issue/Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing/<br>U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Operation Plan<br>Environmental Impact Statement (20 min.) | Michael Rode, CDFG   |
| 6. Update on San Francisco Airport Expansion (15 min.)   | Mark Helvey, NMFS    |
| 7. Kelp Management Plan Updates (10 min)   | Bob Lea, CDFG        |

**J. Public Comment Period (4:45 p.m.)**

Public

Comments of members of the public on issues not on the agenda.

**K. HSG Member Briefings (5 p.m.-5:15 p.m.)**

**L. March Meeting Agenda (Portland) (5:15 p.m.-5:30 p.m.)**

HSG

**M. Report to the Council (5:30 p.m.-6 p.m.)**

HSG

(A written report will be ready for review by HSG members, Thursday morning).

ADJOURN (6 p.m.)

PFMC  
10//17/00