

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Scientific and Statistical Committee**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
DoubleTree Hotel - Columbia River  
Deschutes Room  
1401 N Hayden Island Drive  
Portland, OR 97217  
(503) 283-2111  
March 5-6, 2001

**In addition to your briefing book, please bring your November 2000 Newsletter.**

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2001 - 8 A.M.

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

1. Report of the Executive Director Don McIsaac
2. Approve Agenda
3. Approve November 2000 SSC Minutes

**A suggestion for the amount of time each agenda item should take is provided. At the time 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 the agenda be amended.**

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. Subcommittee Assignments
5. Open Discussion (1 hour)

CLOSED SESSION  
9 A.M.

6. Confirmation of Chair and of Vice Chair
7. Review Nominations for SSC and Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team

GENERAL SESSION  
10 A.M.

**B. Salmon Management**

2. Review of 2000 Fisheries and Summary of 2001 Stock Abundance Estimates Dell Simmons  
**Council Action:** Discussion  
(10 A.M., 1 hour, Conrad, Lawson)

**D. Groundfish Management**

5. Groundfish Informational Reports  
b. Canary Rockfish Incidental Catch Review Jim Glock, Brian Culver  
**Council Action:** Discussion  
(11 A.M., 1 hour, Jagielo, Byrne)

LUNCH

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

- 5. Groundfish Informational Reports
    - e. Rebuilding Terms of Reference
- Council Action:** Discussion  
(1 P.M., 3 hours, Ralston, Francis)

Steve Ralston

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

- 9. Review and Finalize Statements  
(4 P.M.)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD  
4 P.M.  
Public comments on fishery issues not on the agenda are accepted at this time.

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2001 - 8 A.M.

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

- 3. Future Groundfish Management Process and Schedule
- Council Action:** Consider Ad Hoc Groundfish Management Process Committee Recommendations  
(8 A.M., .5 hours, Conser, Stauffer)
- 4. Implementation of the Groundfish Strategic Plan
- Council Action:** Guidance Regarding Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Groundfish Strategic Plan Implementation Oversight Committee  
(8:30 A.M., .5 hours, Hill, Zhou)

Dan Waldeck

Dan Waldeck

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

- 10. Squid Assessment Methodology Review Workshop  
(9 A.M., 1 hour, Thomson – no report to Council)
- 11. Review and Finalize Statements  
(10 A.M.)

Cindy Thomson, Kevin Hill

ADJOURN

PFMC  
02/19/01

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

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Red Lion Hotel at the Quay  
East River 1  
100 Columbia Street  
Vancouver, WA 98660 Room  
(360) 750-4911  
October 30-31, 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  
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

### **Members Absent**

Dr. Susan Hanna, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR  
Dr. Kevin Hill, California Department of Fish and Game, La Jolla, CA  
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).

### **Salmon**

#### **Results of SSC Methodology Review**

The SSC reviewed two methodologies that are under development: the revised Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) and the Coho Cohort Reconstruction project. Progress is good on both projects, but neither will have a product ready for use in the 2001 season setting process.

Mr. Allen Grover (CDFG), Dr. Lloyd Goldwasser (NMFS), and Mr. Michael Mohr (NMFS) briefed the SSC salmon subcommittee on the progress of the KOHM revision. This team has undertaken a thorough reworking of the input data sets and many of the supporting analyses, as well as the KOHM itself. The ocean

coded-wire tag (CWT) database, which is one of the foundations of the model, was checked for accuracy and consistency. A new, corrected data base was created. The SSC recommends the corrected data base be made available through the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC). In addition, several freshwater CWT data sets that the KOHM team has assembled should be considered for inclusion on the PSMFC system. Using the revised data sets, along with an age composition analysis (marine and in-river) and a size-at-age analysis, the KOHM team produced a new cohort analysis. Remaining work includes a catch-effort analysis, inclusion of Central Valley and Rogue River stocks in the ocean populations, and creation of the harvest model itself. This project appears to be well conceived, carefully executed, and well documented. Progress is slower than expected due, in part, to the large number of interdependent elements in the analysis and the overall scope of the project. The final products, which will include revised Klamath fall chinook data sets and a new harvest model, should be completed in time for review prior to the 2002 management season.

Mr. Jim Packer of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife presented a progress report on the coho cohort analysis and coho FRAM development. This project was initiated in 1994 with the goal to revise the base period used in the coho FRAM model to improve the harvest estimates in mixed stock fisheries. Progress to date includes production of historical exploitation rates and contribution rates for stocks and fisheries from 1986 to 1991. Work to be done includes incorporation of the new data set in the structure of FRAM. There are several challenges that remain. Six years of data need to be condensed into a single base period. The new data set has many more stocks and fisheries than the existing model. Stock size predictions are needed for each included stock. The increased resolution of the new model must be reconciled with the capability of tribes and agencies to predict stock size. The new data set has four time periods (January through June, July, August, September through December) compared with 13 for the existing model. The current system of Terminal Area Management Modules will not work with the new data set. This will necessitate development of new techniques for modeling late-season and terminal area fisheries. The new model structure will permit a functional internet interface, simplifying model distribution and coordination of preseason negotiations. Mr. Packer indicated the final model should be ready for review in the summer of 2001 and for the use in fishery management in 2002. In order to conduct that review the SSC will need thorough documentation of the model and the methods used to develop the new data base.

#### Final Report of the Oregon Coastal Natural Coho Work Group

Mr. Sam Sharr, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), reviewed the final draft report "2000 Review of Amendment 13 to the Pacific Coast Salmon Plan" for the salmon subcommittee of the SSC. This report thoroughly addresses two items previously identified by the SSC and Salmon Technical Team as critical to the review:

An assessment of the current status of the Oregon Coastal Natural (OCN) stock towards rebuilding to full seeding of the spawning grounds, and

A review of the marine survival and parental spawner trigger points in the harvest management matrix.

The SSC encourages the proposed changes to the harvest management matrix, because they are based on a peer-reviewed model, reflect conditions that have been experienced in the 1990s, and provide additional protection to OCN stocks when they are at low levels of abundance. Given the continuing depressed status of OCN stocks, the recommendations to expand the harvest management matrix defined in Amendment 13 to include two new parental spawner categories ("Very Low" and "Critical") and one new marine survival category ("Extremely Low") are warranted. The recommended allowable fishery impacts in the new harvest management matrix are consistent with the historical performance of the fishery and provide escapement levels that are consistent with the goal of full seeding of the spawning grounds. The results from the model are difficult to interpret when parental spawner levels are in the "Critical" category. The SSC stresses that when stocks are in the "Critical" parental spawner category there is no biological justification for allowing harvest.

It is important to note that the risks of extinction used in the 2000 review report do not supercede the previous risk assessment developed for Amendment 13 (Appendix C). Although the extinction risks in the 2000 review were developed with the same model used for the original risk assessment in Amendment 13, they were used

only to address issues pertinent to the 2000 review. The assessment developed for Amendment 13 remains the best assessment of the risk of extinction for OCN populations.

Finally, the SSC supports research that focuses on the underlying assumptions of the model, such as ODFW's life-cycle monitoring project. This research, in addition to analyses currently under way, will provide new information that can be incorporated into future reviews of Amendment 13 and the harvest management matrix. We recommend another review be conducted in 2003.

## **Groundfish**

### Final Harvest Levels for 2001

#### Widow Rockfish

The SSC reviewed Appendix B of the widow rockfish stock assessment, which considers alternative minimum stock size/overfishing thresholds for widow rockfish. The report contrasts the default definition of stock status with the results of a new analysis of spawner-recruit (S/R) data, which had not been reviewed by the Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel.

The stock assessment results indicate the point estimate of spawning output in 1999 is 23.6% of the unfished level, which is below the fishery management plan amendment 11 default minimum stock size threshold (25%). The approximate 95% confidence interval ranges from 16% to 38.6% of the unfished level. The new S/R analysis estimates  $B_{MSY}$  and presents the case that stock status could range from nearly overfished (Ricker model) to healthy (Beverton Holt model).

The SSC finds the results of the new S/R analysis are not adequate to reliably characterize widow rockfish stock status. The S/R data used in the analysis are not sufficiently informative to describe a meaningful stock-recruit relationship, and some of the results of the S/R analysis are not internally consistent with the results of the stock assessment. In particular, it is difficult to reconcile the Beverton Holt model results with the long term decline in spawning biomass and recruitment shown by the stock assessment.

The SSC encourages further S/R work for widow rockfish and other species. It is important to consider a variety of potential S/R relationships, and modeling should provide likelihood profiles of the steepness parameter. It would be useful if the analyses could be presented together with stock assessments to assure internal consistency of the results and to get the maximum benefit from a full STAR Panel review of the work.

While recognizing the uncertainty about the point estimate of stock status, the SSC supports the optimum yield (OY) of 1775 mt recommended by the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) for widow rockfish in 2001, which was derived from an  $F_{65\%}$  harvest rate as modified by the 40-10 policy. Projections indicate this policy will result in rebuilding the widow rockfish stock within a ten-year period.

#### Pacific Ocean Perch

The SSC is concerned the preliminary OY for Pacific Ocean perch (POP) (626 mt) reflects overly optimistic projections of stock rebuilding due to a reliance on potentially untenable stock recruitment assumptions. The new stock assessment indicates an improvement in POP stock status, suggesting that it may be possible to rebuild the stock faster than previously thought, or, alternatively, to obtain higher yields during the period of rebuilding. Until a thorough rebuilding analysis is conducted with the new assessment results, the SSC recommends using the yield projected for 2001, as put forth in the existing rebuilding plan (303 mt) as a lower bound. The SSC further recommends the new stock rebuilding analysis should provide catch projections based on a constant fishing rate and not a constant catch over the rebuilding time period.

#### Whiting

Biomass estimates produced by the new assessment are very close to the values reported by the 1999 assessment. Some errors were identified in the catch tables of the new assessment; however, the SSC was informed that the correct catch values were used in the stock assessment model, so this error does not affect

the assessment results. The SSC recommends the Council should use the 2001 OY (238,000 mt) as put forth in the previous assessment. Assuming an 80% U.S. share, this corresponds to 190,000 mt.

#### Darkblotched Rockfish

The OY range is based on uncertainty in the amount of darkblotched rockfish taken in the foreign rockfish fishery. The SSC understands that data are available which may provide an opportunity to better estimate the species composition of the Russian catch in the early years of the fishery. These data should be evaluated, and, if found reliable, should be incorporated into the next darkblotched stock assessment and other applicable slope rockfish stock assessments.

#### Recreational Fishery Information Network (RecFIN)

The SSC reviewed a report prepared by the RecFIN statistics subcommittee, which evaluated alternative estimators of ocean boat fishing effort and catch in Oregon. The report compared the sampling programs of the NMFS Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) and the Oregon Ocean Boat Survey (OBS). The SSC is impressed with the quality of the report and the level of effort put into examining the properties of two recreational fishery survey datasets. The SSC endorses the subcommittee's recommendations for improvements in both surveys, and concurs with their recommendations to 1) use adjusted OBS estimates during periods when the two surveys overlap, and 2) use stratified MRFSS without the freshwater stratum during other periods. The SSC also recommends that ODFW derive variance estimates to accompany past and future OBS estimates of recreational catch.

#### 2001/2002 Groundfish Management Process and Schedule

The SSC discussed the groundfish management process and schedule for the upcoming year. In recent years, the Council's groundfish process has become increasingly more complex with each management cycle. Growing demands on the system coupled with inherently difficult management decisions have taxed all elements of the Council family. Completion of advisory committee documents and analyses needed to support Council decision making is often delayed until late in the calendar year, leaving little time for reflection and discussion. The problems facing the groundfish management process involve many different issues. The SSC is best suited to address STAR issues and looks forward to working with the rest of the Council family on developing long-term solutions for the overall problem.

The STAR process was developed after long and involved negotiations among the Council's groundfish entities, the SSC, and NMFS to resolve the problem of providing independent and comprehensive review of stock assessments. Over the past few years, the STAR process coupled with SSC review has taken on additional responsibilities with the need to review more complex stock assessment models, additional analyses related to rebuilding plans, and harvest policy rate guidelines. The SSC partnership with the STAR coordinator, Ms. Cyreis Schmitt (NMFS) has generally worked well, but the process is being strained under the weight of increasing demand but few additional resources. Long-term solutions may require rethinking the frequency with which assessments are conducted and the need to formally review all stock assessments, as well as other streamlining measures that bring the demand more in line with available resources.

For the short term, the SSC suggests the following:

As indicated in the June 2000 SSC statement, the SSC Groundfish Subcommittee will develop guidelines on the technical aspects of rebuilding plans, based on the experience with such plans to date. These guidelines will facilitate the process of developing and approving rebuilding plans for overfished stocks.

All members of the SSC Groundfish Subcommittee will attend the August 2001 GMT meeting to discuss the 2001 assessments and STAR Panel reports with the GMT and to identify any important loose ends not adequately covered by the STAR Panel reviews.

All stock assessment analyses, including those commissioned by private groups, must be included in the STAR process, including adherence to all terms of reference and the STAR process schedule. In addition, it is critical that assessment documents be completed following the STAR meeting and incorporated into the Council's annual stock assessment and fishery evaluation (SAFE) document.

## Sablefish Permit Stacking

Mr. Jim Seger briefed the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) on the completed Draft Analysis of Permit Stacking for the Limited Entry Fixed Gear Sablefish Fishery. The revised analysis includes 1) a description of relevant policies and recommendations from the Groundfish Strategic Plan, 2) a description of the fishery, 3) a qualitative analysis of each option, and 4) social and economic impacts.

The results of the analysis are not substantially different from the September draft report. The general conclusion is that, unless the individual quota (IQ) moratorium is lifted, voluntary permit stacking is not likely to increase the duration of the fixed gear sablefish season, alleviate safety concerns and complex management decisions associated with short seasons, or result in significant capacity reduction. In order to achieve capacity reduction, 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 has the following recommendations:

The analysis contains ten key objectives and relates each objective to the appropriate Strategic Plan recommendations, National Standards or Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) objectives. The permit stacking objectives are sometimes contradictory. For instance, while the objective of capacity reduction is consistent with selecting options that encourage permit stacking, other objectives are consistent with options that would discourage stacking. The analysis could be simplified by focusing on a small number of priority objectives. As a related issue, the SSC also notes that some of the goals and objectives of the Groundfish FMP may not be consistent with the Strategic Plan. The SSC recommends the FMP be revised to incorporate Strategic Plan objectives and that FMP objectives be prioritized; this would be useful not just for evaluating permit stacking options but for evaluating options contained in future FMP amendments.

Transitioning to an IQ program is a recommendation of the Groundfish Strategic Plan. The SSC recommends the Council evaluate the permit stacking options in terms of whether they would accommodate a smooth transition to an IQ program. In other words, in considering options pertaining to restrictions on concentration of permits, restrictions on permit ownership, and permit-on-board and U.S. citizenship requirements, it would be helpful to consider whether such provisions are also what the Council would like to see in an IQ program.

Given existing uncertainties regarding whether the various sets of options will encourage permit stacking, the SSC recommends the Council evaluate the program after one year to determine its effectiveness and consider revising options if the program is not meeting key objectives. As part of this evaluation, we recommend that transaction prices as well as permit ownership be tracked over time. Because prices reflect the expectations of permit holders regarding current and future earnings in the fishery, they would be a key indicator of the success of the stacking program.

Many of the objectives and options in the analysis focus on social, economic, and community effects. This emphasis reinforces the need for additional social science expertise within the Council family to evaluate such effects.

### **Council Administrative and Other Matters**

#### Research and Data Needs and Economic Data Plan

Mr. Jim Seger briefed the SSC on the status of two draft documents: Research and Data Needs and West Coast Fisheries Economic Data Plan, both dated October 2000. The current drafts reflect the changes proposed by the SSC at the September meeting. The SSC would like to see one additional minor modification to Research and Data Needs. The first sentence in the third bullet under "Slope Surveys" (page 9) should be reworded as follows: "Establish regular pot or longline surveys for sablefish, conducted at appropriate depths and coordinated and standardized coastwide." Once that change is made, the SSC recommends that both documents be adopted by the Council.

## Coastal Pelagic Species

### Pacific Sardine Harvest Guideline

A summary of the Pacific sardine stock assessment for 2001 was presented to the SSC by Dr. Ray Conser. The SSC finds the assessment and recommendations to be adequate for setting harvest levels at this stage of the fishery. Future assessments may be inadequate for the northern range of the stock if appropriate time series data for the northern areas are not incorporated into the assessment.

The discussion that followed was a good update on the status of Pacific sardines and the assessment methodology, but was not an in-depth peer review. The data sources for sardine are limited to geographic areas off Baja California, Mexico, and the State of California (particularly the area from San Diego to Monterey Bay). A migration model parameterized with historical estimates of sardine migration rates is used to extrapolate the stock assessment to the northern areas of the sardine distribution. With the recent expansion of the sardine population off Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia, there is an urgent need to incorporate fishery-dependent data for northern areas into the stock assessment and to initiate resource surveys to establish a fishery-independent time series for those areas. It will be very important that monitoring be coordinated, consistent, and compatible between northern and southern areas.

In response to an earlier SSC request, the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) has recommended a peer review process for the coastal pelagic species similar to the groundfish STAR process. The CPSMT suggests that full sardine and Pacific mackerel stock assessments and reviews be conducted on a triennial cycle, with a less formal review by the CPSMT and SSC during interim years. Full stock assessment reports would be developed and distributed following each STAR panel review. Details from interim-year assessments could be documented in executive summaries similar to the one produced for this year's sardine assessment. As entirely new assessments are developed, a STAR panel would be convened to review the assessment prior to implementation of results for setting harvest guidelines. The SSC supports the CPSMT's proposal. The SSC Coastal Pelagic Species Subcommittee is willing to work with the CPSMT to develop the terms of reference for a STAR process and guidelines for stock assessment documents. The SSC suggests the first such review be scheduled for 2002, given that a major review of squid assessment methodology is scheduled for 2001. A 2002 CPS review should be scheduled to avoid overlap with the groundfish STAR review process.

### Public Comment

There was no formal public comment.

### Adjournment

The SSC adjourned at approximately 4:30 P.M., Tuesday, October 31, 2000.

PFMC  
02/20/01



## PROPOSED AGENDA Salmon Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
DoubleTree Hotel - Columbia River  
Umatilla Room  
1401 N Hayden Island Drive  
Portland, OR 97217  
(503) 283-2111  
March 5, 2001

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2001 - 8 A.M.<sup>1/</sup>

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

Mark Cedergreen

1. Role Call (Sign Attendance Roster)
2. Selection of Subpanel Officers
3. Review of Agenda

### **Priority Agenda Items for Monday are B, C, and D**

### **B. Review of 2000 Fisheries and Summary of 2001 Stock Abundance Estimates** (Council Agenda Item B.2, Tuesday morning)

The Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS) may wish to establish a time for the Salmon Technical Team (STT) to join the meeting and respond to technical questions regarding the 2000 fisheries and 2001 abundance projections. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) should be able to provide some guidance on requirements for listed species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

### **C. Inseason Management Recommendations for Openings Prior to May 1** (Council Agenda Item B.3, Tuesday, late morning)

The Council will make recommendations for early commercial and recreational openings off Oregon.

### **D. Definition of 2001 Management Options** (Council Agenda Item B.4 on Tuesday afternoon; Item B.7 on Wednesday afternoon; Item F.2 on Thursday afternoon; Item B.9 on Friday afternoon)

The SAS should have its preliminary management options completed in time to allow editing, collation, and copying in the Council Secretariat. Council staff can provide forms and some assistance to help draft the options. Please follow the guidance in Attachment B.4.a (Council briefing book) as much as possible. We would like your final input no later than 10 a.m., Tuesday morning. Please work with the Council staff to coordinate your efforts and forms. Note the SAS must also provide options for the incidental halibut harvest restrictions in the commercial salmon fishery off Washington and Oregon (Council Agenda Item F.2).

Limit options to the least number that adequately cover a realistic range of allowable harvests and meet fishery management plan objectives. Initial definition of the management elements in the options will be completed by the Council at day's end on Tuesday. On Wednesday, the STT will return with the management elements collated into coastwide options for Council approval before beginning a full analysis. Final adoption of the options will occur on Friday.

---

1/ The meeting will continue on Tuesday to complete the SAS agenda and as necessary during the week to advise the Council on the selection of final options on Friday.

Information on any new requirements for stocks listed under the ESA should be available from NMFS at the meeting.

**E. *Habitat Issues*** (Council Agenda Item C, Tuesday afternoon)

The Habitat Steering Group (HSG) will make its recommendations to the Council on Tuesday afternoon. If the SAS has any habitat comments, they may be made through the SAS liaison with the HSG or directly to the Council during the habitat agenda.

**F. *Halibut Landing Restrictions for the 2001 Salmon Troll Fishery*** (Council Agenda Item F.2, Thursday afternoon)

The incidental halibut harvest allocation of 34,046 pounds is about 10,000 pounds greater than the 2000 allocation. The SAS will need to recommend a range of landing restrictions for the troll salmon options to allow utilization of the incidental halibut harvest without undue risk of exceeding the halibut quota.

**G. *Queets Coho Overfishing Status Review*** (Council Agenda Item B.5, Wednesday afternoon)

This is an update on the current stock status and progress made in completing a stock assessment and recommendation to assure the stock is not overfished.

ADJOURN

PFMC  
02/18/01

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Salmon Technical Team**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
DoubleTree Hotel - Columbia River  
Tualatin Room  
1401 N Hayden Island Drive  
Portland, OR 97217  
(503) 283-2111  
March 5-9, 2001

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2001 - 8 A.M.

**A. Call to Order**

Dell Simmons

1. Role Call (Sign Attendance Roster)
2. Review of Agenda

The Salmon Technical Team (STT) has no formal meeting agenda, but meets as necessary throughout the week to complete the development and analysis of the Council's fishery management options and other issues as needed. Anyone desiring to formally address the entire STT should make arrangements to do so through the STT Chair, Mr. Dell Simmons.

**B. Review of 2000 Fisheries and Summary of 2001 Stock Abundance Estimates** (Council Agenda Item B.2, Tuesday morning)

The STT Chair is scheduled to review this topic with (1) the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) at **10 a.m. on Monday** and (2) before the entire Council **Tuesday morning at about 9 a.m.** The STT should be available on Monday morning to answer any questions the Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS) may have with regard to last year's fishery and this year's abundance projections.

**C. Inseason Management Recommendations for Openings Prior to May 1** (Council Agenda Item B.3, Tuesday, late morning to early afternoon)

The Council will make recommendations for early commercial and recreational openings off Oregon.

**D. Definition of 2000 Management Options** (Council Agenda Item B.4 on Tuesday afternoon; Item B.7 on Wednesday afternoon; Item B.9 on Friday afternoon)

**E. Queets Coho Overfishing Status Review** (Council Agenda Item B.5, Wednesday afternoon)

This is an update on the current stock status and progress made by the STT in initiating a stock assessment and recommendations to assure the stock is not overfished.

ADJOURN

PFMC  
02/19/01

# PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2130 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 224  
Portland, Oregon 97201

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
Donald O. McIsaac

CHAIRMAN  
Jim Lone

Telephone: (503) 326-6352  
Fax: (503) 326-6831  
[www.pcouncil.org](http://www.pcouncil.org)

## DRAFT

Mr. Todd Olson, Project Manager  
PacifiCorp  
825 NE Multnomah, Suite 1500  
Portland, OR 97232

### Re: The relicensing of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project

Dear Mr Olson:

This letter is to present concerns the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) has regarding the relicensing of the Klamath Hydroelectric Project (Project) and the FSCD (FSCD) that PacifiCorp has prepared to initiate this effort. The hydroelectric projects of the Klamath River have dramatically affected the range and quality of habitat for Klamath Basin anadromous fish stocks, which has directly affected the livelihood of fishing communities of the West Coast. It is our hope that the relicensing effort will result in the successful restoration of anadromous salmonids to their historic range as well as improvements to habitat of the Klamath River below the projects.

The Council was created by the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act in 1976 with the primary role of developing, monitoring, and revising management plans for fisheries conducted within federal waters off Washington, Oregon and California. Subsequent congressional amendments in 1986, 1990, and in 1996 added emphasis to the Council's role in fishery habitat protection. Amendments in 1996 directed the National Marine Fisheries Service, as well as the regional fishery management councils, to make recommendations regarding federal or state agency activities that may affect the "Essential Fish Habitat" (EFH) of a fishery under its authority. The Act's amendments also mandate threats to EFH be identified, and that conservation and enhancement measures be described that minimize those adverse impacts. The proposed relicensing of the Project by the Federal Energy and Regulatory Commission is a federal action that has an effect upon EFH.

The Project has had direct influence on the condition of anadromous fish stocks in the Klamath Basin, both by extirpating anadromous fish from the basin above Iron Gate Dam and by affecting the habitat of the mainstem Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam. The decline of Klamath River Basin Fisheries resources is of serious concern to the Council. Ocean fisheries along the Pacific Coast from Cape Falcon to south of San Francisco are managed to reduce harvest impacts to Klamath River fall chinook. The Project has a direct influence on the condition of anadromous fish stocks in this Basin and as such greatly affect the economies of Tribal and non-Tribal fishing communities along several hundred miles of the Pacific Coast.

A primary concern regarding the FSCD is the scope of the document is too limited and the potential effects of the Project are understated. For example, the document states (page 5-28) that "The only relevant issue of water quality related to fisheries the Project can control is the amount of water released in the bypass reaches of J.C. Boyle and Copco." Therefore, no studies have been proposed to assess the effects of the Project upon water quality downstream of Iron Gate Dam. The Council is very concerned about the poor water quality of the Klamath River and the subsequent fish

Mr. Olson  
DATE  
Page 2

kills that have occurred downstream of Iron Gate Dam during recent years. We believe that as part of the relicensing effort, PacifiCorp should conduct thorough investigations to determine the effects of the Project upon water quality in the Klamath River, with the goal of developing a strategy for operating the Project that does not degrade Klamath River water quality.

The FSCD does not propose investigations for determining how to best restore anadromous salmonids to their historic range in the Klamath River. Instead, PacifiCorp proposes to convene a Fish Passage Advisory Team, composed of agency, tribal, and interested party representatives to determine the information needed to address fish passage issues as well as to evaluate the role of fish hatchery facilities. However, the effectiveness of this team will be hampered without critical studies to support their efforts. Thus, we believe the failure of the FSCD to specifically identify information needs and associated studies is a serious deficiency of the document. The Council is not opposed to the collaborative approach suggested for the Fish Passage Advisory Team, as long as the Team has meaningful decision-making input regarding the studies to be conducted by PacifiCorp, however this approach precludes us from commenting on studies that PacifiCorp will conduct regarding fish passage alternatives. Therefore, we take this opportunity to urge PacifiCorp to conduct studies to assess a broad range of alternatives for the successful upstream and downstream passage of anadromous salmonids, up to and including decommissioning of dams within the Project. We also believe that a component of this fish passage analysis should include an assessment of the anadromous salmonid habitat available above Iron Gate Dam as well as an exhaustive list of the many projects being conducted (or planned to be conducted) to restore aquatic habitat in the Upper Klamath Basin.

As the Fish Passage Advisory Team evaluates the role of fish hatchery facilities in the Klamath River, it is important to consider that Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) does not mitigate for all the habitat lost from the Project, nor does it mitigate for all the races of chinook that have been extirpated above Iron Gate Dam. IGH currently only mitigates for habitat that was lost between Iron Gate Dam and Copco 2 Dam. IGH does not mitigate for the habitat lost above Copco, including tributaries such as the Williamson and Sprague Rivers, which once supported healthy populations of spring-run chinook. IGH produces no spring-run chinook. We also think it is imperative for this Team to evaluate the success of IGH at meeting its mitigation goals for all species, as well as to assess the effects of the hatchery upon natural Klamath Basin fish populations, and the ability to monitor these effects by marking sufficient numbers of hatchery production.

In summary, the Council request PacifiCorp to conduct studies that will adequately assess the effects of the Project upon anadromous salmonids in the Klamath River as well as to assess a range of alternatives that will result in the successful restoration of anadromous salmonids to the Upper Klamath Basin.

Sincerely,

**DRAFT**

Jim Lone  
Chairman

DOM:rdh

c: FERC

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

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
DoubleTree Hotel - Columbia River  
Nehalem Room  
1401 N Hayden Island Drive  
Portland, OR 97217  
(503) 283-2111  
March 5, 2001

MONDAY, March 5, 2001 - 9 A.M.

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

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

**B. Review of November Council Actions/Directions** (9:15 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.) Chuck Tracy, PFMC

**C. HSG Administrative Matters** (9:30 a.m. - 10 a.m.) HSG

1. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

**D. Review of Council Agenda** (10 a.m. - 10:20 a.m.) HSG

1. Identification of Habitat-Related Issues on Council Agenda

**E. Action Items** (10:20 a.m.-11 a.m.):

1. Review/Comment on Artificial Reef Plan (20 min.) HSG
2. Letter regarding PacifiCorp Klamath Federal Energy Regulation Commission (FERC) Relicensing (20 min.) Dave Hillemeier, Yurok Tribe  
(See Attachment 1, Proposed Draft letter)

**F. Informational Presentations or Updates** (11 a.m.-12:20 p.m.)

1. Columbia River Hydrology - Biological Opinion (50 min.) Ed Bowles, ODFW,  
NMFS NWFS Representative
2. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Lawsuit Briefing (30 min.) Eileen Cooney, NOAA Council

**Lunch** (12:20 p.m. - 1:20 p.m.)

**F. Informational Presentations or Updates** (continued) (1:20 p.m. - 2:50 p.m.)

3. NMFS Consultation on Oil and Gas Pipeline National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits (30 min.) Mark Helvey, NMFS
4. Klamath Flow Issue/FERC Relicensing/U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Operation Plan Environmental Impact Statement (10 min.) Michael Rode, CDFG
5. Update on San Francisco Airport Expansion (10 min.) Mark Helvey, NMFS
6. Update on Kelp Management Plan (10 min.) Bob Lea, CDFG
7. Lower Willamette Superfund Assessment (10 min.) Paul Engelmeyer, National Audubon Society
8. Queets EFH Overfishing Outline Review (10 min.) Michele Robinson, WDFW
9. Update on Marine Protected Areas from AAAS/ Communication Partnership for Science and the Sea Meeting (10 min.) Fran Recht, PSMFC

**G. Public Comment Period** (2:50 p.m.)

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

**Break** (3:05 p.m.)

**H. EFH/Magnuson-Stevens Act Review** (3:20 p.m. - 4:20 p.m.)

HSG

1. Review EFH Consultation (20 min.)
2. Discuss HSG Roles (20 min.)
3. Coordination with NMFS (20 min.)

**I. HSG Member Briefings** (4:20 p.m.-4:40 p.m.)

HSG

**J. June Meeting Agenda** (San Francisco) (4:40 p.m. - 5 p.m.)

HSG

**K. Report to Council/Comment on Council Agenda** (5 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.)

HSG

ADJOURN (5:30 p.m.)

PFMC  
02/21/01

**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Ad Hoc Groundfish Strategic Plan**  
**Implementation Oversight Committee**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Double Tree Hotel - Columbia River  
Nestucca Room  
1401 N Hayden Island Drive  
Portland, OR 97217  
(503) 283-2111  
March 5, 2001

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2001 - 10 A.M.

**A. Call to Order**

Dave Hansen

**B. Introductions**

**C. Meeting Purpose and Approval of Agenda**

**D. Subcommittee Reports**

1. Implementation Cost Estimates
2. Marine Reserves
3. Open Access to Limited Entry / Nearshore Management
4. Buyback Program Status

Don McIsaac  
Don McIsaac  
LB Boydston  
Ralph Brown

**E. Draft Report to Council**

Committee

**F. Other Business**

ADJOURN

PFMC  
02/20/01



**SUMMARY MINUTES**  
**Ad Hoc Groundfish Strategic Plan**  
**Implementation Oversight Committee**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission  
Large Conference Room  
45 SE 82<sup>nd</sup> Drive, Suite 100  
Gladstone, OR 97027  
January 10 - 11, 2001

**Call to Order**

The Strategic Plan Implementation Oversight Committee (SPOC) meeting was called to order by Dr. David Hanson, Chair. Mr. Jim Lone, Council Chair, provided introductory remarks, noting reducing capacity in the groundfish fishery was a principal objective of his tenure as Chair. He emphasized implementation of the Strategic Plan as fundamental to this objective and the long-term goal of a viable, sustainable fishery.

After introductions, Dr. Hanson outlined the meeting goals, which entailed prioritization of Strategic Plan issues and initiating implementation development teams. An overarching goal is to ensure the Strategic Plan works for all stakeholders and ensures resource conservation. Public input to the implementation process will be critical to its success.

The agenda was reviewed and approved. Time for a brief presentation by Mr. Brock Bernstein, National Fisheries Conservation Center (NFCC) and a review of legal matters by Ms. Eileen Cooney, General Counsel, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) were added.

Mr. Dan Waldeck reviewed meeting materials for the Committee.

**Members in Attendance**

Mr. Phil Anderson, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Mr. LB Boydston, California Department of Fish and Game  
Mr. Ralph Brown, Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Mr. Jim Caito, Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Dr. David Hanson, Chair, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission  
Mr. Bill Robinson, National Marine Fisheries Service

**Others in Attendance**

Mr. Brock Bernstein, National Fisheries Conservation Center  
Mr. Steve Bodnar, Coos Bay Trawler's Association  
Ms. Eileen Cooney, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration - General Counsel  
Dr. John Coon, staff, Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Mr. Brian Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Mr. Joe Easley, Oregon Trawl Commission  
Mr. Bob Eaton, Pacific Marine Conservation Council  
Mr. Doug Fricke, Washington Troller's Association  
Dr. Rod Fujita, Environmental Defense  
Mr. Jim Glock, staff, Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Mr. Jim Golden, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, designee for Mr. Burnell Bohn  
Dr. Jim Hastie, National Marine Fisheries Service  
Mr. Rob Jones, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission  
Cmdr. Ted Lindstrom, US Coast Guard

Mr. Jim Lone, Chair, Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Dr. Donald McIsaac, Executive Director, Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Mr. Jim Seger, staff, Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Ms. Cyreis Schmitt, National Marine Fisheries Service  
Mr. Chuck Tracy, staff, Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Mr. Dan Waldeck, staff, Pacific Fishery Management Council

## **Meeting Summary**

### General Discussion

Dr. McIsaac discussed Council budget and staff workload. Given the level funded budget and no change in workload priorities, he stressed staff will be able assist at a limited level, e.g., tracking strategic plan consistency relevant to briefing book situation papers, acting as an information base, staffing meetings of the SPOC. Dr. McIsaac provided a table outlining staff workload to illustrate his point. Significant activity implementing the Strategic Plan would displace other current workload priorities assigned by the Council. Creation of workload to implement the Plan would need to be balanced by commensurate deletions from current staff workload. He suggested performing a workload management check each time a new implementation task is considered, e.g., (1) what is current workload?, (2) how much time will the new task take?, (3) how does the task fit into the context of existing priorities?

An opportunity was provided for public comment. Mr. Eaton stated the Council needs to identify the amount of money needed to implement the plan and where the money would come from (internal or external sources). He suggested the Council needs to define priorities, where public funds should come from, where private funds should come from; this will help others in lobbying Congress on the Council's behalf. Mr. Easley noted the tremendous amount of work it will require to implement the plan.

A general discussion followed about how to proceed with the meeting.

It was suggested that in setting priorities, the SPOC needs to consider what projects will provide the most benefit in relation to their cost; the focus should be on projects that provide the most gain. It was also noted that it will be important to identify where a task or priority will lead, and how it fits with other Plan initiatives. For example, marine reserves may be a harder sell if they are prioritized ahead of capacity reduction, whereas, capacity reduction first may facilitate marine reserves as a second priority.

There is an immediate need for conservation, especially rebuilding overfished species; implementation of the plan needs to be in balance with other groundfish priorities. Therefore, it was suggested that rebuilding plans should be the first priority, as there are seven overfished stocks and no approved rebuilding plans. It was agreed all components of groundfish fishery management need to be considered – rebuilding plans, annual management, other groundfish tasks, strategic plan implementation.

Ms. Cooney provided an update on litigation issues. She noted that National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance for Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) had been successfully challenged and a new NEPA analysis for groundfish EFH would need to be completed. She also noted the high risk of litigation on rebuilding plans, both Amendment 12 and the individual rebuilding plans.

The committee discussed delegation of nearshore fisheries to the states. It was suggested that it would be easier for state fish and game commissions to manage nearshore fisheries. Three options were proposed: remove species from the groundfish FMP; or leave species in the FMP, but delegate (or defer) management to states. For California, there are approximately 20 species that could fall under a Nearshore Fishery Management Plan (FMP). Currently, California is developing a Nearshore FMP. It was noted that consistency among state and federal regulations would be a critical issue. Ms. Cooney noted that where fish are captured

is critical to who has management authority. In order to determine whether to, and the best way to transfer management authority to the states, you must look at the location of the fishing of different species, e.g., species only caught within 3 miles; caught within 3 miles, but some outside 3 miles in federal waters; or mostly caught in federal waters. Delegation of nearshore management could also have spill-over effects on the groundfish limited entry fishery or the new "B" permit fishery that could be established under the strategic plan recommendations. That is, if species are removed from the groundfish FMP, it could negatively affect limited entry permit holders.

It was noted that state nearshore management will still require some Council involvement, and, therefore, still place a burden on staff workload. It could also result in increasingly complex management, especially if state limited entry and federal limited entry programs are developed. There is also the likelihood that, when catching fish under a nearshore FMP, federally managed species will also be caught, which would require coordination between state and federal activities, that would vary depending on the amount of interaction.

#### Priority Setting

The SPOC then discussed the various elements of the Plan and developed a list of priority issues. Four themes were highlighted as high priority:

- Capacity Reduction
- Harvest Policy
- Marine Reserves
- Science

Within each theme the SPOC identified and prioritized various issues. A detailed list is provided below.

Specific to the harvest policy recommendations in the Plan, it was noted that these provisions will, generally, be, implemented through the annual groundfish fishery management process. It was stressed that strong consideration needs to be given to recommendation 2.a under Harvest Policy in the Plan, i.e., "...close fishery when OY is reached... ."

Specific to capacity reduction, consideration will need to be given to the details of reducing capacity( i.e., what sectors, how will it be accomplished?), particularly the details of converting the open access fishery to limited entry. How would state limited entry fit with federal limited entry, would both be necessary? Coordination will be critical.

It was also noted that gear modifications have improved resource conservation. Therefore, in implementing the Plan, the SPOC should look to incentives and other passive measures (rather than regulations).

An overarching concern will always be ensuring conservation and stock rebuilding while allowing harvest of healthier stocks.

Groundfish Fishery Strategic Plan Implementation Oversight Committee – Recommended List of Priorities

Item (section in Strategic Plan)	Staffing Cost (states/NMFS/Council/tribal)	\$ cost	Rank	Development Team Needed
Buyback – all gears (C. 3.g)	med/med/low <sup>5/</sup>	very high	1.a <sup>7/</sup>	yes
Trawl permit stacking (A.3.e) <sup>1/</sup>	low - high		1.b <sup>7/</sup>	yes
Observers -- develop full program (A.5) <sup>2/</sup>	med/high/low	high	2	no <sup>8/</sup>
Review and improve groundfish management process (C.8)	low/low/low	low	3	no <sup>8/</sup>
Fixed gear permit stacking -- sablefish (A.3.d) <sup>1/</sup>	low/high/med		4	no <sup>8/</sup>
Open access limited entry (A., C. 3.a,b,c)	high/high/high	high	5	yes
Allocation*	high/high/high	high	6*	yes
Marine reserves (A.6.) <sup>3/</sup>	high/high/high/yes	high	7	yes
Nearshore rockfish delegation (A.1.d)	high/med/med/yes	high	8	yes
Implement harvest policy recommendations (A.2.a-e)	low/low/low	low	9	no <sup>8/</sup>
Fixed gear spp endorsements & stacking -- non-sablefish	high/high/high	high	10	yes
Explore regulations to (1) reduce bycatch and (2) access allocations	med/med/med	high	11	yes
Explore regulatory incentives (regs/gear) to minimize impacts on habitat	high/high/high	high	11	yes
Implement Strategic Plan science recommendations (B. 1-11) <sup>4/</sup>	high/high/high	very high		
Implement Strategic Plan Council process recommendations (C. 1-7) <sup>4/</sup>				
*Elements of Allocation Category	Rank w/in 6			
"A" v "B" v "C" v Sport permits (overfished species)	6.a			
Sport v Commercial	6.b			
Limited entry trawl v Fixed gear (rockfish, lingcod)	6.c			
"B" v "C" permits (selected species)	Part of 5 above <sup>6/</sup>			

1/ As first step toward IFQ  
 2/ \$2.25 million -- federal base funding (annual). "Full" means a comprehensive program with an adequate annual budget  
 3/ Tool within the larger context of the Strategic Plan. Adopted as a tool, but no use of the tool scheduled.  
 4/ Critical element, not accorded rank -- overrides other topics. Include comment to this effect in introduction.  
 5/ Currently, industry lobbying for. Near-term low workload NMFS/Council. If Congress authorizes, NMFS/Council workload will be large.  
 6/ Allocation will occur as part of O/A to L/E  
 7/ Priority may change depending on Congressional action.  
 8/ Program in place, under development, or under review -- no development team needed.

*Thursday, January 11, 2001*

The list of priorities developed on the previous day was reviewed.

It was agreed to form a small subcommittee to develop rough cost estimates for the items in the priority list. It was stressed the cost estimates should be simple, noting who would bear the cost and who would do the majority of the work. This is necessary to provide a realistic view of the level of funding required to fully implement the Strategic Plan. The estimates would represent additional funding needed (above the Council budget) to accomplish implementation of the Plan. It was agreed the draft cost estimates would be reviewed by the SPOC prior to the March Council meeting. The subcommittee is comprised of Dr. McIsaac, Mr. Robinson, and Mr. Golden; and will meet February 14, 2001.

#### Discussion of the List of Priorities

##### **Buyback and Trawl Permit Stacking**

Without Congressional help, a buyback program is unlikely, the Council and/or the industry does not have the means to do it. West Coast industry representatives are actively lobbying Congress for a buyback program. However, if, by the June Council meeting, signs are that Congress will not adopt legislation for a West Coast buyback program, the SPOC agreed that trawl permit stacking should become a high priority.

The rationale for first emphasizing buyback as the preferred means for reducing capacity in the trawl fleet was because a large reduction is needed to rationalize the fleet and industry supports a buyback program. Until there is an indication that Congress will not support a buyback program, trawl permit stacking will be less desirable from the perspective of the industry.

Allocation could also be a critical issue. For example, if buyback is for all sectors of the industry then allocation might be less of an issue, whereas, if buyback is only for trawl, then allocation might be critical. This would also be true for trawl permit stacking.

Finally, it was emphasized that developing a trawl permit stacking program will require an extensive analysis. This must be factored into the workload equation (in balance with other workload), as both the analysis and implementation of trawl permit stacking will be quite intensive.

##### **Observers**

A partial program will be implemented by mid-2001. However, there is a strong need for a comprehensive program, which will require secure, long-term funding, i.e., annual commitment in the NMFS budget. The groundfish fishery is extremely diverse, and the current level of funding provides for only a limited program (covering only a small portion of the fleet).

It was noted that pursuing observer funds should be done in the context of other strategic plan initiatives. For example, the groundfish fishery only generates about \$50 million per year, it may be hard to justify spending large amounts of money for a small net gain. If the fleet were rationalized (made smaller), it would require a smaller program to cover the entire fleet. Moreover, with a rationalized fleet it may be possible to move to a system where the industry funds management.

##### **Management Process**

A comprehensive review of the groundfish management process is underway, the SPOC will need the results

of this review before taking action to implement the management process recommendations in the Strategic Plan. The Groundfish Management Process Committee will report to the Council in March, with the aim of initiating action for review at the April Council meeting. The goal is to implement an improved process for the 2002/2003 cycle, with phase-in of certain parts as soon as possible.

### **Fixed Gear Permit Stacking**

It was reported that Council staff is completing the analytical work for the FMP amendment (or regulatory amendment depending on NOAA-GC determination). NMFS will draft the regulations, which could be quite complex when all the permit stacking provisions are factored in.

As it will be difficult to complete all of the above (analyses, Council review, regulations) in time for implementation in fall 2001, it may be necessary to phase-in certain aspects. One possibility is to implement in 2001 the extended fishing season and stacking permits (i.e., the basic objectives). The more complicated issues, e.g., ownership, owner-onboard, will require substantial analysis and a longer regulatory process under the Paperwork Reduction Act, and may need to be implemented later. The SPOC noted partitioning the analysis and review could, ultimately, create more workload (i.e., doing things twice); but there was general agreement that we should move forward.

### **Open Access to Limited Entry**

This has the potential of being a highly contentious issue, and may require consideration of the net benefit to the fishery as a whole versus the cost to individuals in the open access fishery.

It was agreed that a group would develop a scoping document to outline what needs to be done, this will include consideration of delegation or deferral of nearshore management to states. The group will also explore linkages with other Strategic Plan issues, e.g., allocation, delegation of nearshore management, etc. The states will take the lead on developing the scoping document. In addition, the document will include definitions of "B" and "C" categories and the fleet involved, and consideration of the importance to coastal communities. It was suggested that they use outside mediation/facilitation (e.g., the Environmental Conflict Resolution Institute) to aid in development of an implementation strategy.

The possible schedule is to be included as part of scoping document. The document will be reviewed by SPOC at their March meeting.

### **Allocation**

The issue of allocation is strongly entwined with many other strategic plan issues, and may be necessary before implementation of other components of the Strategic Plan. Currently, allocation is an annual necessity as part of routine fishery management, especially for overfished species. May not be able to improve from current process until after GMPC review.

### **Marine Reserves**

Implementation will require substantial funding (in excess of Council budget), especially for developing siting criteria. It will also require substantial public participation, which will add to the overall cost. Therefore, the issue will require substantial commitment of new funds. *The SPOC recommends continuing with Phase II, under the aegis of strategic plan implementation, to begin with establishing an Implementation Development Team assigned the sole task of developing a complete proposal (with the Council as lead authority): a proposed process and proposed budget.* The SPOC also recommends the proposal include outside assistance, in the form of non-governmental organization funding and/or facilitation services of NFCC. Opportunities with the Pacific Ocean Conservation Network should also be pursued.

### **Nearshore Rockfish**

It was agreed that this would be included as part of scoping document for conversion of Open Access to Limited Entry (discussed above).

### **Implement Harvest Policy Recommendations**

Implementing the recommendations in the Strategic Plan will require development and adoption of management policies for closing fisheries when OY is reached. It will be necessary to distinguish between closure of a single fishery that harvests the stock and closure of all fishing for the stock. *The SPOC recommends the Council initiate discussion of this topic in April 2001.*

### **Fixed Gear Species Endorsements/Stacking (non-sablefish)**

It was suggested that this issue could be taken up in conjunction with the Open Access to Limited Entry work.

### **Explore Regulations – to Reduce Bycatch / for Access Allocations**

“Access allocation” refers to, for example, management measures that solve the problem of not harvesting the allowable sablefish OY year after year. Recently the trawl fleet has not been able to harvest its entire allocation because of protections for thornyheads. Therefore, there is a desire to allow the trawl fleet to possibly access sablefish with a different gear that does not affect the restricted species.

*The SPOC recommends the development of a work plan (in the near future).* It was suggested that this work could be supported/funded with disaster relief money (or other outside funding source).

*The SPOC recommends an industry group be formed to develop ideas related to access allocation, especially sablefish – possibly including: Mr. Steve Bodnar, Mr. Marion Larkin, Mr. Joe Easley.*

No due date was discussed for this work plan.

### **Explore Regulatory Incentives (regulations/gear) to Minimize Impacts on Habitat**

*Similarly, the SPOC recommends development of a work plan in the near future.* The SPOC recommends incorporation of this issue into the Council’s Research and Data Needs document with a high priority.

No due date was discussed for this work plan.

### **Implementation Development Teams**

The SPOC discussed the need for development teams for each of the issues identified on the Priority List. Generally, most issues will require development teams; several issues are either completed or in progress, and, thus, development teams will not be required. At this meeting, the SPOC approved the formation of two Implementation Development Teams (marine reserves and allocation) and a subgroup to develop cost estimates.

### **Marine Reserves**

Development Team: Mr. Jim Seger (staff), Ms. Jennifer Bloeser, Mr. Dave Fox, Dr. Rod Fujita, Mr. Mark Helvey, Ms. Michele Robinson, Mr. Bob Lee, Mr. Barry Cohen, Mr. John Crowley, Mr. Kelley Smotherman, Mr. Mark Cedergreen, Ms. Fran Recht. Also, the SPOC asked that Mr. Brock Bernstein and Ms. Suzanne Iudicello (NFCC) be invited to participate in a facilitation role.

For the time being, the team was tasked only with developing a detailed proposal – based on the proposal submitted by the Pacific Ocean Conservation Network. The proposal would be for a project to address remaining marine reserve recommendations contained in the Strategic Plan. The detailed proposal would address the complete process to implement marine reserves as described in Strategic Plan, consistent with the objectives already adopted by the Council.

The Team will meet February 13, 2001, Portland, OR

### **Allocation**

*The SPOC recommends use of the current Ad-Hoc Allocation Committee to develop further recommendations at his point.*

The SPOC anticipates adding to the prior allocation committee process industry representatives at some point in the future to deal with allocation issues directly related to implementation of the Strategic Plan.

*As a first step, the SPOC recommends the Allocation Committee develop allocation priorities relative to implementing the strategic initiatives in the Plan.*

### Next Meeting

The SPOC will meet Monday, March 5, 2001 in Portland, Oregon.

### Other Topics Discussed

#### **IFQ**

It was noted that the Council will eventually need a committee to scope out an IFQ program.

#### **National Fisheries Conservation Center (NFCC)**

Mr. Brock Bernstein from the NFCC presented information about his organization and the facilitation role they could play in implementation of the Plan. For example, with marine reserves, they could build bridges behind the scenes; facilitate public processes/meetings toward agreement. Also could provide dispute resolution. He noted their role would not be to set up meetings or an organizational structure, rather they would act as facilitators.



**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Ad-Hoc Groundfish Strategic Plan**  
**Implementation Oversight Committee**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission  
45 SE 82nd Drive, Suite 100  
Gladstone, Oregon 97027  
(503) 650-5400  
January 10-11, 2001

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2001 – 10 A.M.

- |  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| <b>A. <i>Introductory Remarks</i></b>                              | Jim Lone           |
| <b>B. <i>Meeting Purpose and Approval of Agenda</i></b>            | Dave Hansen, chair |
| <b>C. <i>Review of Meeting Materials</i></b>                       | Dan Waldeck        |
| <b>D. <i>Funding and Staffing Capabilities</i></b>                 | Don McIsaac        |
| <b>E. <i>Public Comment</i></b>                                    |                    |
| <b>F. <i>Review of Legal Matters</i></b>                           | Eileen Cooney      |
| <b>G. <i>National Fisheries Conservation Center</i></b>            | Brock Bernstein    |
| <b>H. <i>Prioritization of Implementation Efforts</i></b>          | SPOC               |
| <b>I. <i>Establishment of Implementation Development Teams</i></b> | SPOC               |

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 2001 – 8 A.M.

- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <b>J. <i>Public Comment</i></b>                 |             |
| <b>K. <i>Schedule of Near Future Events</i></b> | Dave Hansen |
| <b>L. <i>Next Meeting Agenda</i></b>            | Dave Hansen |

ADJOURN

PFMC  
01/10/01



**PROPOSED AGENDA**  
**Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanel**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Double Tree Hotel - Columbia River  
Nehalem Room  
1401 N Hayden Island Drive  
Portland, OR 97217  
(503) 283-2111  
March 6-7, 2001

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2001 - 10:30 A.M.

**A. Call to Order**

Bob Fletcher, Chair

**B. Introductions**

**C. Approval of Agenda**

**D. Approval of Summary of January 8-10, 2001 Meeting**

**E. Reports of Recent Activities**

1. International Activities
2. Domestic Activities

Svein Fougner  
Svein Fougner

**F. Highly Migratory Species Plan Development Team (HMSPDT) Summary of Draft Fishery Management Plan (FMP)**

HMSPDT

**G. Advisor Comments on FMP**

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 2001 - 8 A.M.

**H. Continue Advisor Comments on FMP**

**I. Plan Development and Meeting Schedule**

**J. Report to the Council**

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2001 - 8 A.M.

**K. Attend Council Session on Highly Migratory Species**

ADJOURN

PFMC  
02/20/01

DRAFT #2  
(Revisions to first draft in **bold**)

Meeting Summary  
Highly Migratory Species Plan Development Team and Advisory Subpanel  
Pacific Fishery Management Council  
La Jolla, CA  
January 8-11, 2001

The HMS Team and Subpanel met jointly January 8-10, and the Team continued meeting on January 11. The primary purpose of the joint meeting was to review the first draft of the management options and analyses for each HMS fishery.

Team members present:

David Au, NMFS, La Jolla, CA  
Norm Bartoo, NMFS, La Jolla, CA  
Steve Crooke, CDFG, Long Beach, CA  
Sam Herrick, NMFS, La Jolla, CA  
Jean McCrae, ODFW, Newport, OR  
Michele Robinson, WDFW, Montesano, WA  
Susan Smith, NMFS, La Jolla, CA  
Dale Squires, NMFS, La Jolla, CA

Advisory Subpanel members present:

Jock Albright, recreational at-large, Costa Mesa, CA  
Tom Raftican for Michael L. Domeier, private recreational, Oceanside, CA  
Pete Dupuy, commercial at-large, Tarzana, CA  
Robert Fletcher, charter boat, San Diego, CA  
Douglas Fricke, commercial at-large, Hoquiam, WA  
Wayne Heikkila, commercial troll, Eureka, CA  
Chuck Janisse, commercial gillnet, Ventura, CA  
Marciel, Klenk, public at-large, Napa, CA  
Steve Lassley, commercial at-large, Spring Valley, CA  
Anthony Vuoso, southern processor, San Pedro, CA  
Kate Wing, conservation, San Francisco, CA

Others attending one or more days:

Don Hansen, Council member, Dana Point, CA  
Larry Six, consultant, Portland, OR  
LCDR Dave Hoover, USCG, Seattle, WA  
August Felando, San Diego, CA  
Donna Dealy, NMFS, La Jolla, CA  
Tim Hobbs, National Coalition for Marine Conservation  
David Wilmot, Ocean Wildlife Campaign, Islip, NY  
John La Grange, American Fisherman's Research Foundation  
Russell Nelson, The Billfish Foundation  
Bob Osborn, United Anglers of Southern California  
Mike Hurt, Recreational Fishing Alliance  
Richard Neal, NMFS, La Jolla, CA  
Mike McGettigan, Sea Watch, Inc.  
Jim Morgan, NMFS, Long Beach, CA  
Svein Fougner, NMFS, Long Beach, CA  
Peter Flournoy, AFRF, San Diego, CA  
Rebecca Lent, NMFS, Long Beach, CA  
Marty Golden, NMFS, Long Beach, CA  
Dick Stone, RFA, Southport, NC  
Jim Cook, Hawaii Longline Association  
Reuven Ronald Walder, Turtle Island Restoration Network, Forest Knolls, CA  
Paul Dalzell, WPFMC, Honolulu, HI  
John Hunter, NMFS, La Jolla, CA  
Rich Hamilton, Marlin Club of San Diego, TBF, RFA, UASC, IGFA  
Steve Fosmark, F/V Seealder  
Wayne Moody, Western Fishboat Owners' Association  
Kevin Kelly, WPFMC, Honolulu, HI  
Steve Joner, Makah Tribe

Joint Team/Subpanel Meeting, January 8-10

### Elections of Officers

The HMS Advisory Subpanel elected Robert Fletcher and Wayne Heikkila as chair and vice-chair, respectively, for the year 2001.

The Plan Development Team re-elected Dale Squires and Steve Crooke as co-chairs for the year 2001.

## Background

Dale Squires summarized the scoping document and the reasons for developing a fishery management plan.

Michele Robinson presented a first draft list of problems and issues for FMP chapter 6. Michele requested input on chapter 6 by January 31. Rebecca Lent suggested that this chapter include public comments from the scoping sessions. Susan Smith recommended that research and data needs be included in this chapter, and Wayne Heikkila recommended adding the US/Canada albacore issue.

David Au summarized policy recommendations for managing HMS fisheries, which is section 1.7 in the FMP partial draft dated 12/15/2000. This section describes a precautionary management approach. Advisors offered a number of comments. Bob Fletcher noted that the U.S. cannot unilaterally control growth of fisheries. Chuck Janisse felt the draft went too far in discouraging utilization of waste. Wayne Heikkila suggested that waste be defined in the FMP. Kate Wing liked the precautionary approach, but recommended that the tools not be limited to the four listed. Chuck Janisse noted that Article 6 of the MHLC agreement defines the application of the precautionary approach.

## Draft Paper on Management Options and Analysis

The Team and Subpanel reviewed the first draft of chapter 8.0, Analysis of Impacts of HMS Regulatory Options. The document is generally structured on a fishery-by-fishery basis. Discussion began with the longline fishery.

Longline Fisheries: There are options for conventional longline gear inside the EEZ, cable longline gear inside the EEZ, and conventional longline gear outside the EEZ. After much discussion, it was agreed that the options for conventional longline gear within the EEZ should be restructured as follows:

1. Status quo
2. No longlining in EEZ
3. Longlining subject to restrictions
  - a. Limited entry
  - b. Time/area closures
  - c. Gear restrictions, size, deployment, hook type, etc.
  - d. Dupuy-Janisse proposal
  - e. Others - VMS, observers, etc.
4. **Research program to evaluate longlines**
  - a. **Research program with formal experimental design (Kate Wing proposal)**
  - b. **Commercial experimental fishing (EFP)**
  - c. **Combination of a and b**

There was considerable discussion about Kate Wing's proposal that longline gear be evaluated using a research program with a formal experimental design, as opposed to a traditional exempted fishing permit (EFP) fishery, before authorizing a fishery. There was no consensus on this proposal. It was agreed that both options should be included.

Chuck Janisse stated that some of the statements and conclusions in the analysis are not supported. There needs to be much more detail included in the analysis. The Team agreed.

It was agreed that a third option should be added for longlining outside the EEZ, which would be to adopt selected portions of the Hawaii longline regulations, including, but not limited to, VMS, logbooks, and observers.

Private Boat Recreational Fishery: Tom Raftican (representing Michael Domeier) recommended that the Team include a history of this fishery and describe the distinct recreational fishing communities for tuna, marlin and shark. He also suggested that if recreational limits are going to be considered (e.g., bag limits), then limits for the commercial fisheries also need to be considered. Chuck Janisse supported the addition of data collection requirements for sport fisheries. Bob Fletcher spoke against the option of a federal recreational fishery permit; if a permit is required for data purposes, a vessel permit would be preferable to an individual license. The Team agreed to modify the option to require a vessel permit.

The option for catch and release of striped marlin will be a formal program to encourage release but will not require release. Steve Crooke distributed additional language for the analysis on this catch-and-release program.

Charter Boats: Bob Fletcher noted that harvest of HMS accounts for the majority of the revenue for the charter boat fleet in southern California. Tom Raftican suggested addition of the history of the charter fishery to this section. The Team agreed to add an option for a federal bag limit, which may or may not be consistent coastwide. The Team will add information on the Washington and Oregon charter fisheries. Bob Fletcher questioned the necessity of a federal charter boat license. He urged that angling surveys be conducted to collect data. Marciel Klenk suggested a federal HMS stamp be required. There was agreement to combine the options applying to anglers in the private boat and charter boat fisheries, but the analysis will differentiate between private and charter fisheries.

---

The Advisory Subpanel met during lunch recess on January 9 to discuss some process and procedural issues of concern. Doug Fricke was disappointed that the agenda did not include an opportunity to review the partial draft FMP dated 12/15/2000 which was distributed prior to the meeting. He also asked the Team to eliminate opinions from the analysis, stick to the facts, and don't be afraid to admit

that they don't know effects. Chuck Janisse stated that the draft analysis was very sketchy and skeletal at this point and he hoped that we would see a more "fleshed out" version next time. He further noted that the Team made some inappropriate conclusive statements in the analysis. This probably is a reflection of time constraints. Wayne Heikkila said that the troll fishery analysis contained assumptions throughout which are not supported.

Marciel Klenk stated that the discussion on net economic benefit did not capture consumer concerns about the availability of domestic vs. foreign product. Wayne Heikkila raised concerns about the delay in conducting the cost and earnings surveys and the possible need to delay the plan development process. Tom Raftican was concerned about the "holes" in the recreational data and history of the fishery. Tom also noted that Michael Domeier was concerned about the short notice of meetings and lack of time to review the draft FMP. Kate Wing was concerned about requesting an additional formal delay in the process. Wayne Heikkila moved that the Subpanel recommend that the Council delay presentation of the first draft of the FMP until the June meeting. Opinions for and against delay were presented. There didn't appear to be any objection to the presentation of an incomplete draft FMP at the March meeting, as long as there was no formal adoption of the FMP. The Subpanel should point out the gaps and problems with the draft and request sufficient time to develop a complete package. Wayne Heikkila withdrew the motion.

Doug Fricke moved to suggest that the Team analyze and comment only with verifiable information and refrain from using information that cannot be substantiated. The Team should use substantiated information or state that information is not available. The vote was 7 in favor and 4 against.

Several members of the Subpanel suggested that the Team send e-mail attachments in WordPerfect and 'rich text file' formats, so that all members can read the attachments.

---

**Drift Gillnet Fishery: Because of the fact that the U.S. share of Pacific HMS harvest is so small,** Chuck Janisse questioned the conclusion that option 3 would increase non-consumptive benefits (existence value) due to a reduction in swordfish and possibly shark landings, as well as turtle mortality. The Team agreed to add language noting that any such benefits may be short term in duration and may be consumed elsewhere due to the highly migratory nature of the stocks. David Hoover suggested that any enforcement costs might be mitigated by instituting a requirement for VMS. Chuck Janisse summarized the FISH document entitled "Review and Discussion of Regulatory Alternatives relating to the DGN Fishery for Shark and Swordfish." **Chuck believes that the DGN fishery options need to be defined as regulatory packages (a management unit) containing a specific suite of management measures that is linked to one of the 3 basic management authority options. For example, one option could be the suite of DGN permit measures under federal authority as recommended by FISH.** There was substantial discussion of how to present the various DGN options. The group decided on the following options:



1. A federal limited entry fishery in the Pacific coast EEZ with time/area closures off Washington and other area/season/gear restrictions as per current state practices, the federal Take Reduction Plan and pending closures to protect turtles mandated by the biological opinion.
2. A federal limited entry fishery coastwide in the Pacific coast EEZ with area/season/gear restrictions as per current state practices, the federal TRP restrictions and the pending closures imposed by the biological opinion.
3. A federal limited entry fishery in the Pacific coast EEZ with time/area closures off Washington, subject to federal regulations.
4. A federal limited entry fishery coastwide in the Pacific coast EEZ subject to federal regulations.

It was agreed that there are 3 basic management authority options which apply to all fisheries, and which are described in the FISH paper: 1) delegate or defer to state management, 2) adopt federal authority, or 3) a mixture of 1 and 2. These options will be described near the beginning of the section on management alternatives.

Hook-and-Line Fishery: Doug Fricke recommended that the analysis be revised to reflect that a portion of the catch is sold directly to the public, and while the amount is relatively small, this is an important part of the income of some fishers. Wayne Heikkila noted the fishery extends as far as 160E, and this issue of access to bait for the live-bait fishery needs to be addressed. August Felando suggested that the pole-and-line fishery should be added to this section. Doug Fricke took exception to the assumption that the fishery will increase under open access. This is not happening under the status quo. The analysis should be revised to state that we don't know what will happen to effort under continued open access. The problem of increase in Canadian effort in U.S. waters needs to be addressed, also. Bob Fletcher thinks that we should expect increases in effort in this fishery under open access, given the drastic reductions in other fisheries. Doug Fricke suggested that the Team clearly distinguish between predictions and statements of fact. He said that regarding the effects on ESA listed species, the analysis should state that there are no documented impacts.

There was discussion of the extent of authority of this FMP, particularly regarding vessels fishing on the high seas. This needs to be clarified in the FMP. Larry Six will work with Beth Mitchell to draft some language for review.

Tom Raftican noted that gear switching can be a problem, particularly when longlines are involved. Michele Robinson said the intent is to provide an option that would allow switching from one hook-and-line gear to another hook-and-line gear. The switching option will be revised.

Coastal Purse Seine Fishery: August Felando recommended the analysis be expanded to add historical data on coastal seiners to encompass all of the fisheries they pursue. Kate Wing said that there needs

to be reporting of live fish transshipments by U.S. vessels. She also suggested adding an option for limited entry in the bluefin tuna purse seine fishery. There was no consensus on this recommendation. Chuck Janisse suggested that the two seine fisheries be changed from “coastal” and “distant water” to “mixed species” and “HMS.”

Distant Water Purse Seine Fishery: It was agreed that the coastal and distant water seine fisheries from now on should be labeled “small” ( $\leq 400t$ ) and “large” ( $>400t$ ), respectively. August Felando suggested using IATTC weekly catch report data for the most recent information on this fishery.

There were questions and discussion about the involvement of the Council and this FMP in implementing the Pacific Tuna Conventions Act and the legislation that will implement the MHLA agreement in the U.S. This applies to all HMS fisheries, not just seine fisheries. It was noted that the Pacific Council could be involved in resolving any domestic allocation issues which arise from implementing regulations adopted by international bodies. The option of supporting U.S. obligations under laws and treaties does not belong in the purse seine section, nor is this an option; it’s a requirement. This needs to be discussed in a separate section.

Evaluation Factors: The Team agreed to add 2 new evaluation factors to the original list of 11 factors: 12) meeting objectives of the FMP and 13) consistency with international obligations.

Shark Conservation: Pete Dupuy suggested that this section address whether or not an alternative fishery would reduce the catch of sharks. Chuck Janisse recommended that option 6 include a requirement for de-hooking devices. Finning options need to be added that include the language adopted by the Subpanel (4 fins per carcass/ 5% of wt.) and an option requiring fish to be landed whole. Pete Dupuy stated that requiring fish to be landed whole will create a lot of waste. Doug Fricke suggested adding language to describe the differences in stock composition along the west coast and the reasons for this. Marciel Klenk argued for inclusion of quality aspects relative to finning regulations. August Felando asked how can the analysis be done when you don’t know the sport catch of sharks? Data are lacking in this analysis. The Team agreed to add citations or reference other sections. Option 4 precludes the development of target commercial fisheries for sharks, but there may need to be a special provision for a blue shark fishery, since this stock is abundant. Option 6 would require release of juvenile and large adult sharks, but for safety reasons it may not be possible to release live sharks caught in drift gillnets, so there may be no benefit to this regulation.

Protected and Prohibited Species: Subpanel and Team members agreed that the FMP needs to include documentation on interactions with protected species.

**While white sharks are prohibited species in California, apparently they may be landed and sold under certain circumstances. The FMP should close this “loophole.”**

Bycatch

Steve Crooke distributed a new section on options to minimize bycatch in HMS fisheries. The group agreed that the current knowledge of bycatch in each fishery needs to be documented in the FMP. Performance standards recommended in option 1 need to be defined. For the drift gillnet fishery, options to minimize bycatch should include time as well as area closures, effort reduction, and establishment of markets for underutilized bycatch species. For the troll fishery, area closures to minimize bycatch may not be practical. For the longline fishery, reporting options should include logbooks and observers inside and outside the EEZ. Options for minimizing bycatch should include reducing soak time, establishing markets and gear changes. In the charter boat fishery, reporting options should include a mandatory logbook coastwide.

#### Plan Development Team Meeting, January 11

Kate Wing summarized and explained the policy statement distributed by the Ocean Wildlife Campaign date January 8, 2001.

The Team developed the following permit options:

1. One unified permit for fishing; state delivery permits
2. Federal endorsement of state licenses
3. Free record-keeping permit (like IPHC)
4. HMS permit in addition

The Team discussed various options for a point-of-concern framework (to enable quick management action in response to a resource crisis) which were compiled and distributed by Michele Robinson. The options include the CPS FMP language, a modification of the CPS FMP language by David Au, and an option drafted by Kate Wing. The discussion raised a number of questions. Who raises a point of concern and how is it raised? How much detail and criteria are needed? Kate Wing felt that the process should require a response by the Council to a point of concern (not necessarily a management action). The process should not burden the Team. Michele Robinson stated concerns about deadlines which the Team would have trouble meeting. Kate will re-draft the language for review at the February Team meeting.

The Team adopted a revised FMP outline, which includes new chapters to document interactions with protected species as well as bycatch in HMS fisheries, and combines chapters 6, 7 and 8 in one chapter addressing management under the FMP. Larry Six will revise the outline and send it to Team members and Advisors.

New drafting assignments were made. Michele Robinson will draft new section 8.5.1, Management Authority Options and Arguments for Federal Management. Permit options will be included here. Steve Crooke will draft new chapters 5.0, Bycatch of Fish in HMS Fisheries, and 6.0, Interactions of

HMS Fishing Gears with Protected Species. Michele Robinson will revise new chapter 7.0 (formerly 5.0), Current Management, and will include a description of current monitoring and data collection programs. Jean McCrae will draft a description of legal gear under the FMP (in section 8.5.5) and will draft section 8.7, Research and Data Needed for Management. Larry Six will draft revisions to the FMP to explain the jurisdiction of the FMP inside and outside of the EEZ of the west coast.

The Team meets February 5-9, 2001, in the large conference room at the Southwest Fisheries Science Center in La Jolla. Dale Squires is drafting the agenda. A tentative schedule was approved by the Team as follows:

- Mon., Feb. 5: Distribute and review new documents from 8:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. Review chapters 5 (bycatch) and 6 (protected species) for the remainder of the day.
- Tues., Feb. 6: Review revised chapter 8 (management).
- Wed., Feb. 7: Review revised chapter 8.
- Thurs., Feb. 8: Review other new sections from 8:00 a.m. to noon. After lunch adjourn to draft revisions to FMP.
- Fri., Feb. 9: Continue drafting revisions from 8:00 a.m. until noon. After lunch reconvene to review revisions.

Susan Smith presented a list of all species caught by HMS gears. Team members suggested some minor modifications to the list. Susan will draft language for inclusion in chapter 3.

The Team identified current monitoring programs and research needs for each HMS fishery which will be documented in the FMP by Michele Robinson and Jean McCrae.



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

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
DoubleTree Hotel - Columbia River  
Umpqua Room  
1401 N Hayden Island Drive  
Portland, OR 97217  
(503) 283-2111  
March 6, 2001

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2000 - 5:30 P.M.

**A. Introductions**

**B. New Business/Issues**

**C. Enforcement Comments - Agenda Items**

1. Salmon Management
  - a. Review of 2000 Fisheries and Summary of 2001 Stock Abundance Estimates
  - b. Adopt 2001 Options for Public Review-Salmon
2. Coastal Pelagic Species Management
  - a. Report on California Meetings
3. Status of Regulations for Groundfish
  - a. Permit Stacking

David Hoover, USCG

**D. Industry and Interested Party Comments**

**E. Public Comment**

**F. Miscellaneous Items - Group Discussion**

ADJOURN

PFMC  
02/12/01