

PROPOSED AGENDA
Groundfish Management Team

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Crowne Plaza Hotel
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 16 - 21, 2002
Alexandria II Room

SUNDAY, JUNE 16, 2002 - 1 P.M.

A. Call to Order

J. Hastie/B. Culver, Co-Chairs

1. Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, Approve Agenda, etc.
2. Agenda Overview

John DeVore

C. Groundfish Management

2. Stock Assessments for Bocaccio, Canary Rockfish, and Sablefish
3. Rebuilding Analyses for Bocaccio, Canary Rockfish, Yelloweye Rockfish, Widow Rockfish, and Whiting
4. Preliminary Harvest Levels and Other Specifications for 2003
9. Status of Fisheries and Inseason Adjustments

A. MacCall/K. Piner

A. MacCall/K. Piner

GMT

Jim Hastie

NOTE: The Groundfish Management Team will be working with the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) and the Council through the week. Groundfish Management Team members may want to sit in with the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) and GAP for discussions on agenda items of interest. See Ancillary B, GAP Agenda and Ancillary C, SSC Agenda.

MONDAY - FRIDAY, JUNE 17 - 21, 2002

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/05/02

PROPOSED AGENDA
Groundfish Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Crowne Plaza Hotel
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 16 - 20, 2002
Bay View Room

SUNDAY, JUNE 16, 2002 - 1 P.M.

**NOTE: The GAP will convene in the Balboa Room on Sunday only.
After Sunday the GAP will meet in the Bay View Room.**

A. Call to Order

Rod Moore, Chair

1. Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, Approve Agenda, etc.
2. Agenda Overview

John DeVore

C. Groundfish Management

5. Adoption of Draft Rebuilding Plans for Public Review for Pacific Ocean Perch,
Lingcod, Cowcod, Widow Rockfish, and Darkblotched Rockfish
4. Preliminary Harvest Levels and Other Specifications for 2003

John DeVore

GMT

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2002 - 8 A.M.

C. Groundfish Management (continued)

9. Status of Fisheries and Inseason Adjustments
6. Fishery Management Plan Programmatic Supplemental
Environmental Impact Statement (PSEIS)
7. Draft Amendment 17 (Multi-Year) Management
2. Stock Assessments for Bocaccio, Canary Rockfish,
and Sablefish
3. Rebuilding Analyses for Bocaccio, Canary Rockfish,
Yelloweye Rockfish, Widow Rockfish, and Whiting

GMT

Jim Glock
Yvonne de Reynier

A. MacCall/R. Methot/K. Piner/M. Schirripa
A. MacCall/R. Methot/K. Piner
F. Wallace/Helser

E. Habitat Issues

1. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Issues

F. Marine Reserves

1. Review of Proposal for Marine Reserves in State Waters of the
Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS)
2. Update on Other Marine Reserves Processes

Jim Seger

Jim Seger

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 2002 - 8 A.M.

Review Draft Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Statements

C. *Groundfish Management (continued)*

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| 10. Groundfish Stock Assessment Priorities for 2003 | E. Clarke/R. Methot |
| 11. Scoping for Delegation of Nearshore Management Authority | T. Barnes/S. Wertz |
| 8. Proposed Management Measures for 2003 | GMT |

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 2002 - 8 A.M.

Review Draft Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Statements, Complete Unfinished Agenda Items

C. *Groundfish Management (continued)*

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 8. Proposed Management Measures for 2003 | GMT |
|--|-----|

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/05/02

PROPOSED AGENDA
Scientific and Statistical Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Crowne Plaza Hotel
Syracuse Room
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 16 - 18, 2002

SUNDAY, JUNE 16, 2002 - 1 P.M.

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

1. Approve Agenda
2. Approve April 2002 SSC Minutes. Confirm Subcommittee Assignments.

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.

3. Open Discussion

CLOSED SESSION – 1:30 P.M.

4. Review Nominations for SSC and Groundfish Management Team Representatives.

GENERAL SESSION – 2:15 P.M.

F. Marine Reserves

1. Review of Proposal for Marine Reserves in State Waters of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary
(2:30 P.M., 2.5 hours, Dalton, Thomson) *Report due to Council – Thursday morning.* Cindy Thomson

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2002 - 8 A.M.

C. Groundfish Management

2. Stock Assessments for Bocaccio, Canary Rockfish, and Sablefish
(8 A.M., 1.5 hours, Ralston, Francis) *Report due to Council – Tuesday morning.* STAR Panel Chairs
3. Rebuilding Analyses for Bocaccio, Canary Rockfish, Yelloweye Rockfish, Widow Rockfish, and Whiting
(9:30 A.M., 2 hours, Punt, Allee) *Report due to Council – Tuesday afternoon.* John DeVore

A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)

5. Review Statements
(11:30 P.M.)

LUNCH

C. Groundfish Management, (continued)

4. Preliminary Harvest Levels and Other Specifications for 2003 Jim Hastie
(1:30 P.M., 2.5 hours, Allee, Dorn) *Report due to Council – Tuesday afternoon.*

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

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

A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)

6. Review Statements
(4 P.M.)

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 2002 - 8 A.M.

A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)

7. Review Statements
(8 A.M.)

C. Groundfish Management, (continued)

7. Draft Amendment 17 (Multi-Year) Management Yvonne de Reynier
(9:30 A.M., 1 hour, Thomson, Byrne) *Report due to Council – Wednesday afternoon.*
5. Adoption of Draft Rebuilding Plans for Public Review for Pacific Ocean Perch,
Lingcod, Cowcod, Widow Rockfish, and Darkblotched Rockfish Jim Seger
(10:30 A.M., 1 hour, Hill, Lawson) *Report due to Council – Wednesday morning.*
8. Proposed Management Measures for 2003
(11:30 A.M., 1 hour) *Information only, no report to Council.*

LUNCH

C. Groundfish Management, (continued)

10. Groundfish Stock Assessment Priorities for 2003 E. Clarke / R. Methot
(1:30 P.M., 1 hour, Byrne, Zhou) *Report due to Council – Thursday afternoon.*
11. Scoping for Delegation of Nearshore Management Authority T. Barnes / S. Wertz
(2:30 P.M., 1 hour, Zhou, Dalton) *Report due to Council – Friday morning.*

G. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

3. Pacific Mackerel Stock Assessment and Harvest Guideline
(3:30 P.M., 1 hour, Francis, Punt) *Report due to Council – Friday morning.*

Kevin Hill

A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)

8. Review Statements
(4:30 P.M.)

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/05/02

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES
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
April 8-9, 2002

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8 A.M. by Chair Tom Jagielo. After discussing the need to be flexible on the timing of certain items, the SSC approved the agenda. After corrections to the table of subcommittee assignments, the March 2002 meeting summary was approved.

Members in Attendance

Dr. Brian Allee, Northwest Power Planning Council, Portland, OR
Mr. Robert Conrad, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Olympia, WA
Dr. Ramon Conser, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA
Dr. Michael Dalton, California State University, Monterey Bay, CA
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, Santa Cruz, CA
Dr. Andre' Punt, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
Dr. Gary Stauffer, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
Ms. Cynthia Thomson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA
Dr. Shijie Zhou, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland, OR

Members Absent

Mr. Alan Byrne, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Nampa, ID
Dr. Robert Francis, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

Open Discussion

During open discussion the SSC thanked Dr. Stauffer for his leadership and years of service on the SSC.

SSC Administrative Matters

A brief closed session was held to review and discuss a nomination to the NMFS-Alaska Fisheries Science Center seat on the SSC.

Scientific and Statistical Committee Comments to the Council

The following text contains SSC comments to the Council.

Salmon

Identification of Stocks Not Meeting Escapement Goals for Three Consecutive Years (Agendum B.2)

Mr. Dell Simmons from the Salmon Technical Team (STT) reviewed the chinook and coho natural spawner escapement estimates for the SSC. Most stocks met their escapement goals in 2001 and most

are predicted to achieve their goals in 2002.

The following three stocks did not achieve their escapement goals in each of the past three years:

Upper Columbia River Summer Chinook
Grays Harbor Fall Chinook
Queets River Spring/Summer Chinook

Exploitation rates of Council managed fisheries on these stocks were less than 5% in the base period. Therefore, these stocks are exceptions under the overfishing criterion of Amendment 14.

Although these stocks are considered exceptions under Amendment 14, the SSC is concerned that these stocks have failed to meet their stated goals. The SSC recommends the cause for these failures be documented and reported by the co-managers to the Council.

Methodology Review Process for 2002 (Agendum B.3)

The SSC met with Mr. Dell Simmons of the STT to identify and prioritize potential methodology review issues for 2002. Mr. Simmons presented a list of eight items which the STT is scoping for possible review:

1. Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) Effort Estimates for Ft. Bragg Area: A review of the KOHM effort submodel is needed to examine commercial fishing effort estimates, which are apparently high and unrealistic for the Ft. Bragg cell. The SSC will not have time to address this matter for the current management season, but will place priority on reviewing the problem during 2002.
2. Coho Impact Model (CIM) for California: Coho encounters modeled for California are not scaled to Oregon Production Index coho abundance as they are for fisheries north of the Klamath Management Zone.
3. Oregon Coastal Natural (OCN) Coho Prediction Methodology: The OCN coho prediction methodology has performed poorly in the past several years. The SSC views this item as important, but not one which may be easily addressed in short order. OCN predictor modifications should not take priority over other more pressing matters.
4. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) Management Plan for Lower Columbia River Coho: ODFW is developing a fishery management plan for Lower Columbia River (LCR) coho and has requested SSC review of the document. ODFW's LCR Recovery Plan includes an exploitation rate matrix which may constrain Council-managed ocean fisheries. The SSC will review the plan, including the exploitation rate matrix, when materials are made available.
5. Fishery Regulation Assessment Model (FRAM) Models for Mark-Selective Fisheries: The chinook FRAM has reportedly been modified by Mr. Jim Packer to accommodate mark-selective fisheries using methodologies similar to that of the coho FRAM. In addition to modeling harvest impacts, effects of mark-selective fisheries on the coast-wide coded-wire tag database are of concern. The SSC places high priority on this review.
6. Columbia River Fall Chinook Abundance Predictors: The current Columbia River fall chinook predictor is based on inriver run size. A more useful predictor for the purpose of fishery modeling would account for ocean abundance. The SSC will review an ocean abundance predictor for these stocks if the appropriate material is provided.
7. Coho FRAM Terminal Fisheries: The coho FRAM may need to be revised in the way it handles terminal fisheries in the final time step.
8. Protocol for Boundary Changes: The STT raised a concern that there is no standard methodology for evaluating impacts of changing management boundaries for salmon stocks. At this point, it is unclear whether this is a technical issue for further consideration by the SSC.

In March 2002, the SSC recommended formation of Model Evaluation Subgroups for both the coho and

chinook FRAM models. The Model Evaluation Subgroups would serve to increase the number of people who understand the models, validate and document the current models, review changes to the models, conduct postseason evaluations, conduct sensitivity analyses to model inputs, and implement methods to quantify uncertainty of model predictions. For example, the subgroups could serve to address FRAM models for mark selective fisheries (Item 5) and coho FRAM terminal fisheries (Item 7) for the 2002 review.

The SSC requires good documentation and ample review time to make efficient use of the SSC Salmon Subcommittee's time. Agencies should be responsible for ensuring materials submitted to the SSC are technically sound, comprehensive, clearly documented, and identified by author. Materials must be received at the Council office at least three weeks prior to the review meetings, which are tentatively scheduled for October 2002.

Marine Reserves

Review Process for Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary and Update on Other Marine Reserves Processes (Agendum D.1)

Mr. Jim Seger briefed the SSC on the current status of marine reserves at the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary. The State of California is developing a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document and is requesting the Council form a committee to review the document. The committee, consisting of Council members and members of Council advisory committees (including the SSC), would meet on April 29 and perhaps again in May. The exact charge of the committee is not yet defined.

If the purpose of the proposed review committee is to evaluate the scientific content of the CEQA document, the SSC requests that its Marine Reserves Subcommittee have the opportunity to conduct a full review of the document. If the Council agrees with this suggestion, the SSC requests it be provided with state guidelines for how such documents should be reviewed. Given the Council's public meeting requirements and the expected length of the CEQA document, the SSC notes that a technical review would take significant time to complete and could not be accomplished by April 29.

If the purpose of the review committee is to determine consistency with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and with Council fishery management plans, the SSC suggests that one of its members attend to observe the review committee's April 29 meeting and report back to the SSC. Scheduling conflicts with other meetings will make it impossible for the SSC economists and most of the SSC groundfish biologists to participate in the April 29 meeting. However, the SSC would ensure that at least one of its members would be available to participate.

The SSC understands it is the state's prerogative to make decisions about marine reserves in state waters, and the CEQA document may not be fully reviewed in the Council process. However, it is important to note that Council consideration of the CEQA document is not a substitute for full review of the National Environmental Policy Act analysis regarding effects of reserves in federal waters once that becomes available.

Groundfish

Groundfish Fishery Management Plan Environmental Impact Statements (Agendum E.6)

The SSC was briefed by Mr. Jim Glock and Mr. Steve Copps, who provided an update on progress towards completing the groundfish Programmatic Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (PSEIS) and the Essential Fish Habitat Environmental Impact Statement (EFH EIS). While there will be significant overlap between the two documents, they have been placed on separate completion schedules because of legal considerations. A range of PSEIS alternatives for analysis is expected to be available at the June Council meeting. At this time, however, there were no specific issues for the SSC to consider.

The PSEIS will establish the basic policies, goals, and objectives of groundfish management into the future and, as a consequence, the recently completed Groundfish Strategic Plan should prove useful in

developing the range of options, as well as selecting a preferred option from the range of alternatives analyzed. While the PSEIS will not alter the fishery management plan, a subsequent amendment may redefine the goals of groundfish management, consistent with the groundfish strategic plan.

Rebuilding Plans (Agendum E.7)

Mr. John DeVore briefed the SSC on the planning and progress toward rebuilding amendments to the groundfish fishery management plan (FMP). The expectation is that rebuilding plans for cowcod, darkblotched rockfish, lingcod, Pacific ocean perch, and widow rockfish will be incorporated in the first rebuilding FMP amendment scheduled for Council adoption in September 2002. A second rebuilding amendment – scheduled for Council adoption in November 2002 – will include bocaccio, canary, and yelloweye rockfish.

As highlighted in the SSC's March 2002 statement, the Council should expect numeric details of rebuilding plans (e.g., B_{MSY} in metric tons) to change over time – whether due to improved estimates of these parameters from updated stock assessments or due to technical errors that were not caught in the previous stock assessment review. The use of hard numbers in the rebuilding amendment should be minimized in order to avoid the need to repeatedly amend the FMP with each stock assessment cycle. Instead, formulae and algorithms should be specified whenever possible (e.g., $B_{MSY} = 0.4 B_0$), and Stock Assessment Team (STAT) teams should be asked to identify and explore assessment models that will be more robust with respect to the numeric values that do need to be specified. The terms of reference for STAT teams and Stock Assessment Review Panels should be modified accordingly.

Further, it is important to distinguish between the biological and policy parameters that collectively govern the rebuilding process. Virgin biomass (B_0), biomass target for rebuilding (B_{MSY}), and minimum rebuilding time (T_{min}) are examples of biological parameters; while the target rebuilding time (T_{target}) and the probability of achieving the rebuilding goal (B_{MSY}) within T_{target} years are examples of policy parameters. While it should be possible to specify numerically some or all of the policy parameters, only the formulae and algorithms for biological parameters should be specified in FMP amendments.

Groundfish Stock Assessment Review Process (Agendum E.8)

The SSC and Dr. Rick Methot, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, discussed (1) the groundfish Stock Assessment Review (STAR) process for 2001 and 2002, (2) the Terms of Reference for Expedited Stock Assessment Updates to be used in 2002, and (3) the possibility of a future workshop to address issues related to the uncertainty of estimating initial stock abundance and rebuilding parameters.

1. STAR Process in 2001 and 2002

Typically, the STAR process is reviewed at the November Council meeting of each year. However, that review did not take place in 2001, and instead an informal review was conducted by way of a phone conference in December 2001. The phone conference included some SSC participation, but the SSC never formally approved the review. Consequently, stock assessment teams used the draft Terms of Reference during 2001 and 2002. Ideally, the assignment of STAR panels, scheduling of reviews, and all other related procedural matters for the following year should be made available by the November Council meeting.

2. Terms of Reference for Expedited Stock Assessment Updates

A final version of the draft Terms of Reference for Expedited Stock Assessment Updates (revised version of Exhibit E.8.c) has been approved by the SSC and is ready for Council review. More generally, the SSC suggests that consideration for expedited review be a formal part of the STAR planning process. The timeframe for expedited review of sablefish for this year will be limited. The SSC Groundfish Subcommittee expects to receive the draft sablefish assessment on May 1, have a conference call on May 6, and complete work by May 10th. This sequence of events will allow the expedited review to be available to the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) in time for their meeting on May 13. The phone conference schedule will likely need to be published in the *Federal Register* twenty-three working days

prior to the conference call.

3. Workshop on Stock Abundance and Rebuilding Parameters

Dr. Methot informed the SSC about ongoing national (and international) efforts to define overfishing and characterize stocks in an overfished condition. The set of issues involved is complex and much broader than West Coast groundfish. The SSC agrees that such a formal workshop for Council staff and advisors is worthwhile. The SSC recommends the decision to proceed with this workshop be revisited in November 2002.

Terms of Reference for Expedited Stock Assessment Updates

While the ordinary STAR process is designed to provide a general framework for obtaining a comprehensive, independent review of a stock assessment, in other situations a less rigorous review of assessment results is desirable. This is especially true in situations where a "model" has already been critically examined and the objective is to simply update the model by incorporating the most recent data. In this context a model refers not only to the population dynamics model per se, but to the particular data sources that are used as inputs to the model, the statistical framework for fitting the data, and the analytical treatment of model outputs used in providing management advice, including reference points, the allowable biological catch (ABC) and optimum yield (OY). When this type of situation occurs, it is an inefficient use of scarce personnel resources to assemble a 6 person panel for a whole week to evaluate an accepted modeling framework. These terms of reference establish a procedure that can accommodate an abbreviated form of review for stock assessment models that fall into this latter category. However, it is recognized that what in theory may seem to be a simple update, may in practice result in a situation that is impossible to resolve in an abbreviated process. In these cases, it may not be possible to update the assessment – rather the assessment may need to be revised in the next full assessment review cycle.

Qualification

The (SSC) will determine when a stock assessment qualifies for an expedited update under these terms of reference. To qualify, a stock assessment must carry forward its fundamental structure from a model that was previously reviewed and endorsed by a full STAR panel. In practice this means similarity in: (a) the particular sources of data used, (b) the analytical methods used to summarize data prior to input to the model, (c) the software used in programming the assessment, (d) the assumptions and structure of the population dynamics model underlying the stock assessment, (e) the statistical framework for fitting the model to the data and determining goodness of fit, (f) the weighting of the various data components, and (g) the analytical treatment of model outputs in determining management reference points, including F_{MSY} , B_{MSY} , and B_0 . It is the SSC's intention to employ an expedited stock assessment update in situations where no significant change in these seven factors has occurred, other than extending time series of data elements within particular data components used by the model, e.g., adding information from a recently completed survey with an update of landings. In practice there will always be valid reasons for altering a model, as defined in this broad context, although, in the interests of stability, such changes should be resisted when possible. Instead, significant alterations should be addressed in the next subsequent full assessment and review. In principle, an expedited update is reserved for stock assessments that maintain fidelity to an accepted modeling framework, but the SSC does not wish to prescribe in advance what particular changes may or may not be implemented. Such a determination will need to be made on a case by case basis.

Composition of the Review Panel

The groundfish subcommittee of the SSC will conduct the review of an expedited stock assessment update. A review panel chairman will be designated by the chairman of the groundfish subcommittee from among its membership and it will be the panel chairman's responsibility to insure the review is

completed properly and that a written report of the proceedings is produced. Other members of the subcommittee will participate in the review to the extent possible, i.e., input from all members will not be required to finalize a report. At a minimum, one member of the SSC's groundfish subcommittee will be needed to conduct a review (i.e., the panel chairman). In addition, the groundfish management team (GMT) and the groundfish advisory panel (GAP) will designate one person each to participate in the review, although the GMT and GAP panelists will serve in an advisory capacity only.

Review Format

Typically, a physical meeting will not be required to complete an expedited review of an updated stock assessment. Rather, materials can be distributed electronically. Stock Assessment Review Team and panel representatives will largely be expected to interact by email and telephone. A conference call will be held to facilitate public participation in the review.

The review process will be as follows. Initially, the STAT team that is preparing the stock assessment update will distribute to the review panelists a document that summarizes the team's findings. In addition, Council staff will provide panelists with a copy of the last stock assessment reviewed under the full STAR process, as well as the previous STAR panel report. Each panelist will carefully review the materials provided. A conference call will be arranged by the panel chairman, which will provide an opportunity to discuss and clarify issues arising during the review, as well as provide for public participation. Notice of the conference call and a list of public listening stations will be published in the *Federal Register* (generally, 23 days in advance of the conference call) and a *Meeting Notice* will be distributed (generally, 14 days in advance). A dialogue will ensue among the panelists and the STAT team over a period of time that generally should not exceed one week. Upon completion of the interactive phase of the review, the panel chairman may, if necessary, convene a second conference call to reach a consensus among panel members and will draft a report of the panel's findings regarding the updated assessment. The whole process should be scheduled to occur within a two week period and the STAT team and panelists should be prepared to complete their work within that time frame. It will be the chairman's responsibility to insure that the review is completed in a timely manner.

STAT Team Deliverables

It is the STAT team's responsibility to provide a description of the updated stock assessment to the panel at the beginning of the review. To streamline the process, the team can reference whatever material it chooses, which was presented in the previous stock assessment (e.g., a description of methods, data sources, stock structure, etc.). However, it is essential that any new information being incorporated into the assessment be presented in enough detail, so the review panel can determine whether the update satisfactorily meets the Council's requirement to use the best available scientific information. Of particular importance will be a retrospective analysis showing the performance of the model with and without the updated data streams. Likewise, a decision table that highlights the consequences of mis-management under alternative states of nature would be useful to the Council in adopting annual specifications. Similarly, if any minor changes to the "model" structure are adopted, above and beyond updating specific data streams, a sensitivity analysis to those changes may be required.

In addition to documenting changes in the performance of the model, the STAT team will be required to present key assessment outputs in tabular form. Specifically, the STAT team's final update document should include the following:

- Title page and list of preparers
- Executive Summary (see STAR terms of reference, Appendix C)
- Introduction
- Documentation of updated data sources
- Short description of overall model structure
- Base-run results (largely tabular and graphical)
- Uncertainty analysis, including retrospective analysis, decision table, etc.
- 10 year harvest projections under the default harvest policy

Review Panel Report

The expedited stock assessment review panel will issue a report that will include the following items:

- Name and affiliation of panelists
- Comments on the technical merits and/or deficiencies of the update
- Explanation of areas of disagreement among panelists and between the panel and STAT team
- Recommendation regarding the adequacy of the updated assessment for use in management

Groundfish Multi-year Management Cycle (Agendum E.9)

The SSC discussed the implications of multi-year management for the science that underlies the advice provided to the Council, if the assessment process involves “on” and “off” years. Under one scenario, assessments would be conducted during “on” years and more strategic issues, such as model development, would occur during “off” years. The SSC re-iterates the importance of basing management advice on the most recent data, to the extent possible.

Changing to a multi-year management process may have unanticipated impacts. However, many of the identified disadvantages of multi-year management (e.g., the use in management of assessments not based on the most recent survey data) are common to the status-quo management process. The SSC recommends, however, that an analysis of the implications of setting acceptable biological catches (ABCs) for several years (3 to 4 years at present for some species) be conducted. The SSC also highlights the need to develop a process for selecting the assessments to be conducted during an “on” year and how each assessment is to be reviewed (through a full or expedited stock assessment review process).

The SSC identifies the following issues related to providing management advice for groundfish. It notes these issues relate both to the status-quo and a multi-year management process.

- There is currently a lack of sufficient agency staff to conduct assessments. The ability to conduct many assessments during an “on” year would be increased if the data used commonly for assessment purposes were stored in a standardized database. Extracting the basic data needed for assessments could be accomplished by support staff allowing analysts additional time to conduct assessments. There remains, however, a need for constant contact between analysts and data support staff to ensure that assessments consider the key uncertainties related to the data.
- The use of standardized models would simplify the process of reviewing assessments.
- A two-year assessment process would be consistent with the schedule for updating rebuilding analyses.
- There will be a need for adequate resources (e.g., funds for travel and workshops) and coordination of activities, to maximize the benefits from research during the “off” year.

The recreational data used for assessment purposes are summarized in two waves while the commercial data are summarized by quarter. The SSC notes that changing the start of the fishing year to other than July 1 would, therefore, lead to a mismatch with the time strata for the commercial and recreational data.

Public Comment

None.

Adjournment

The SSC adjourned at approximately 4:30 P.M., Tuesday, April 9, 2002.

Research and Data Needs

March 2002 –

Coho FRAM model needs documentation, post season review, evaluation and validation. It might be useful to establish model evaluation committees. Need estimates of abundance in addition to pre-season forecasts.

SSC may need to further define the requirements for model “validation.”

Need review of coded-wire tag data.

Research recommendations from the market squid (STAR) Panel should be incorporated into Research and Data Needs document. Note recommendation for 2004 squid STAR Panel.

April 2002 –

May need a workshop to review and refine estimates of B_0 , possibly as a follow-up to the Groundfish Harvest Policy Workshop held in 2000. National efforts are ongoing, but work will need to be done to tailor these results to regional needs. A major issue is “capturing uncertainty around B_0 ”. It was stressed that this issue relates to all fisheries, not just the groundfish fishery. Thus, the workshop should include a comprehensive review of all Council managed fisheries.

SSC Subcommittee Assignments

Salmon	Groundfish	CPS	HMS	Economic	Marine Reserves
Brian Allee	Ray Conser	Michael Dalton	Alan Byrne	Michael Dalton, Chair	Ray Conser
Alan Byrne	Michael Dalton	Alan Byrne	Robert Conrad	Cynthia Thomson	Michael Dalton
Robert Conrad	Martin Dorn?	Ray Conser	Ray Conser		Tom Jagielo
Kevin Hill	Tom Jagielo	Robert Francis, Chair	Kevin Hill, Chair		Pete Lawson
Pete Lawson, Chair	Robert Francis	Tom Jagielo	Andre' Punt		Andre' Punt
Shijie Zhou	Andre' Punt	Andre' Punt	Cindy Thomson		Steve Ralston
	Steve Ralston, Chair	Shijie Zhou			Cynthia Thomson, Chair

PFMC
06/06/02

**PROPOSED AGENDA
Habitat Committee**

Crowne Plaza Hotel
Drake I Room
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 17 - 18, 2002

Note: Agenda numbering reflects the Council agenda. Council agenda items for HC comment are bolded.

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2002 - 8 A.M.

A. Call to Order and Habitat Committee (HC) Administrative Matters

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Opening Remarks | Don McIsaac |
| 2. Introductions and Approval of Agenda | HC |
| 3. Review of Council Actions/Directions | Jennifer Gilden |

F. Marine Reserves

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 2. Update on Other Marine Reserves Processes | Jim Seger |
| 1. Review of Proposal for Marine Reserves in State Waters of The Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) | Jim Seger |
| Work Item: Develop a response to the California Fish and Game Commission | HC |

LUNCH BREAK

E. Habitat Issues

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Programmatic Letter (Update) | Jennifer Gilden |
| 2. Fast-track Letter on NMFS Biological Opinion Regarding Klamath Flows (Update) | Michael Rode |
| 3. Draft Habitat Areas of Particular Concern Process Document | HC |
| 4. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH)/Magnuson-Stevens Act Review | Mark Helvey |
| 5. HC Mission Statement Regarding Groundfish Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) | Fran Recht |
| 6. Report on National EFH Rule (3:30 p.m.) | John Kurland |
| 7. Report on National EFH Workshop | John Kurland |
| 8. Review Letter on Columbia River Dredging Sent by Council in 1999 | Stuart Ellis |
| 9. HC Member Briefings | HC |

A. HC Administrative Matters (continued)

- | | |
|--|----|
| 4. September Meeting Agenda | HC |
| 5. Finalize Statements (F.1, F.2) <i>These comments due Thursday morning</i> | HC |

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 2002 - 8 A.M.

C. Groundfish Management

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. National Research Council Report on Trawling and Dredging Impacts | Susan Roberts |
| 2. FMP Programmatic Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (PSEIS) | Jim Glock |
| 3. EFH EIS | Steve Copps |
| 4. Report on Groundfish EIS Subgroup Meeting | Fran Recht |
| 5. Adoption of Draft Rebuilding Plans for Public Review for Pacific Ocean Perch, Lingcod, Cowcod,
Widow Rockfish,
and Darkblotched Rockfish | Chuck Tracy |
| Work Item: Develop Rebuilding Plans Language | HC |
| 6. Adopt Draft Alternatives for the FMP PSEIS. | Jim Glock |

F. HC Administrative Matters (continued)

- | | |
|--|----|
| 3. Finalize Statements (C.5, C.6) and HC Report (E.1.b).
<i>C.5 and C. 6 due Wednesday morning/mid-day;</i>
<i>HC Report due Wednesday afternoon</i> | HC |
|--|----|

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/05/02

PROPOSED AGENDA
Legislative Committee
Pacific Fishery Management Council
Alexandria I Room
Crowne Plaza Hotel
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 17, 2002

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2002 - 10 A.M

A. Call to Order

Bob Alverson

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda

B. Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) Reauthorization

Copies of HR 4749 (the Gilchrest Bill) have been provided to members of the committee along with a series of amendments that were introduced and withdrawn at a May 16, 2002 house hearing on the bill. The Council is particularly interested in the status of a possible trawl permit stacking program under the limitations placed on individual transferrable quota programs under the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the possibilities for relief from any limitation that would prevent implementation of a stacking program.

C. Fisheries Science Improvement Act

D. Ocean Habitat Protection Act (HR 4003)

E. Pacific Highly Migratory Species Conservation Act (HR 4618)

F. Other Business

G. Public Comment

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/06/02

PROPOSED AGENDA
Budget Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Crowne Plaza Hotel
Alexandria I Room
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 17, 2002

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2002 - 1 P.M.

A. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

Jim Harp, Chair

B. Executive Director's Report

Donald McIsaac

1. Status of Grants, Liaison Contracts, and 2001 Audit
 - a. Calendar Year (CY) 2000 No-Cost Extension for Strategic Plan Implementation
 - b. CY 2001 Base Grant
 - c. CY 2001 No-Cost Extension for Highly Migratory Species
 - d. National Environmental Policy Act Grant
 - i. Initial Grant
 - ii. Amended Grant
 - e. CY 2002 Base Grant
 - i. Initial Interim Grant
 - ii. Final Amended Grant
 - f. CY 2001 Audit
 - g. Liaison Contracts
2. Planning for Council Meeting Sites
 - a. Contracts for 2003
 - b. Dates and Bidding for 2004-2005

C. Other

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/12/02

PROPOSED AGENDA
Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Crowne Plaza Hotel
Drake 2 Room
121 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 18, 2002

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 2002 - 10 A.M.

- A. *Call to Order*** Bob Fletcher, Chair
- B. *Introductions***
- C. *Approve Agenda***
- D. *Approve March 13, 2002 Meeting Summary (including March HMSAS statement to Council)***
- E. *NMFS Report of Recent Activities - Domestic and International***
- F. *HMS PDT Progress Report, Schedule for Completion of FEIS/FMP***
- G. *Proposal for Marine Reserves in State Waters of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary***
- H. *HMSAS Discussion and Comment***
- I. *Other Business***
- J. *HMSAS Report to Council***

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/05/02

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES
Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion Hotel Sacramento
Comstock 3 Room
1401 Arden Way
Sacramento, CA 95815
(916) 922-8041
March 13, 2002

Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanel (HMSAS) Members Present:

Mr. Jock Albright, recreational at large, Costa Mesa, CA
Mr. Pete Dupuy, commercial at large, Tarzana, CA
Mr. August Felando, purse seine, San Diego, CA
Mr. Robert Fletcher, chair, charter boat, San Diego, CA
Mr. Douglas Fricke, commercial at large, Hoquiam, WA
Dr. Doyle Hanan, public at large, San Diego, CA
Mr. Wayne Heikkila, vice chair, commercial troll, Eureka, CA
Mr. Chuck Janisse, gillnet, Ventura, CA
Ms. Heather Munro, northern processor, Waldport, OR
Mr. Robert Osborn, private recreational, Lakewood, CA
Ms. Kate Wing, conservation, San Francisco, CA

Highly Migratory Species Plan Development Team (HMSPDT) Members Present:

Dr. David Au, NMFS, La Jolla, CA
Dr. Norm Bartoo, NMFS, La Jolla, CA
Mr. Steve Crooke, CDFG, Los Alamitos, CA
Dr. Sam Herrick, NMFS, La Jolla, CA
Ms. Jean McCrae, ODFW, Newport, OR
Ms. Michele Robinson, WDFW, Montesano, WA
Ms. Susan Smith, NMFS, La Jolla, CA

Others Attending:

Mr. Larry Six, consultant-plan coordinator, Portland, OR
Mr. Dan Waldeck, Council staff, Portland, OR
Dr. Kevin Hill, CDFG, SSC, La Jolla, CA
Dr. Russell Nelson, The Billfish Foundation, Fort Lauderdale, FL
Mr. Dick Stone, Recreational Fishing Alliance
Mr. Jim Morgan, NMFS, Long Beach, CA
Mr. Patrick Higgins, Canadian Consulate General, Seattle, WA
Mr. Rod McInnis, NMFS, Long Beach, CA
Mr. Steve Fosmark, fisherman, Monterey, CA
Mr. Peter Flournoy, Am. Fish. Research Foundation, San Diego, CA
Mr. Thomas Roff, Morro Bay Comm. Fish. Org., Morro Bay, CA
Mr. Jim Fisher, fisherman, Hammond, OR
Mr. Fred Hepp, fisherman, Santa Barbara, CA
Mr. Tim Hobbs, National Coalition for Marine Conservation
Mr. Jorge Gross, CDFG
Ms. Marija Vojkovich, CDFG, Santa Barbara, CA

Call to Order, Agenda, Minutes

Chair, Robert Fletcher, called the meeting to order at 8 a.m. on March 13, 2002. The agenda was approved as proposed. The Subpanel approved the draft summary of the October 31, 2001 meeting with the following changes:

- 1) Under section entitled "Advisors Comments on FMP," page 2, third paragraph, add a new sentence at the end of the paragraph: "Mr. Dupuy reluctantly approved the motion, and later responded that he rescinds his support of this alternative."
- 2) In the same section, page 2, last paragraph, delete the sentence: "Mr. Dupuy responded that he rescinds his support of the new alternative proposed by the sport fishery."

Reports of Recent Activities

Mr. Svein Fougner, NMFS, briefed the Subpanel on recent international activities relating to highly migratory species, including activities of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, the second preparatory conference for the Central and Western Pacific Fisheries Convention, and U.S./Canada Albacore Treaty discussions. Mr. Peter Flournoy added comments on the preparatory conference.

Regarding domestic activities, Mr. Fougner reported that the final rules to implement the Shark Finning Prohibition Act have been published.

Messrs. Wayne Heikkila and Chuck Janisse reported on progress in collecting cost and earnings data from the troll and gillnet fleets, respectively.

NMFS Comments on Draft EIS/FMP

Mr. Fougner summarized the March 8, 2002 letter from NMFS to the Council commenting on the Draft EIS/FMP. Consistent with the Regulatory Streamlining Program, NMFS would like the Council to have all of the required information in front of it before making a final decision, including the draft regulations and the Regulatory Impact Review. The letter suggested the Council delay final approval until the June 2002 Council meeting. Some specific comments were offered addressing the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Subpanel members asked Mr. Fougner a number of questions about the NMFS comments.

HMS PDT Report

Mr. Steve Crooke, PDT co-chair, reported on efforts underway to assemble information on the small-mesh drift gillnet fishery for albacore and bluefin tunas. CDFG is analyzing logbook data and corresponding fish tickets. The NMFS Southwest Center also has provided to CDFG the data from a gillnet experiment. Dr. Sam Herrick distributed a handout summarizing PacFIN data on drift gillnet vessels that had landings of albacore and bluefin. There are difficulties in using PacFIN data to examine the small-mesh fishery, largely due to gear coding problems. Pairing the logbook data with fish tickets, if this is possible, may be the best way to evaluate this fishery. However, protected species interactions and bycatch are key data needs and will likely require an observer program. The Subpanel deferred comment on this fishery until the results of ongoing analyses are presented.

The HMS PDT convened to discuss the NMFS comments and reported to the HMSAS that it would not likely be able to address adequately all of the proposed changes to the draft EIS/FMP in time for the June meeting. In particular, it will take a considerable amount of time and effort to address the comments on MSY, essential fish habitat, bycatch, monitoring and incidental catch allowance, and to provide for an open public process.

Several Subpanel members expressed support for doing a complete job of revising the FMP, no matter how long it takes. Some others supported final Council action in June.

Mr. Janisse recommended that the PDT prepare a supplemental document, rather than a new complete draft of the FMP, for the next version to be presented for Council action. There was Subpanel support for this notion.

Public Comments

Dr. Russell Nelson suggested the Council ask NMFS which of the comments are "deal killers" and which would be nice to do.

Mr. Jim Fisher spoke against the northern closure of the drift gillnet fishery.

Ms. Kathy Fosmark spoke against the recent closures to the drift gillnet fishery to protect turtles.

Advisory Subpanel Comments on Draft EIS/FMP

Mr. Janisse and Mr. Pete Dupuy recommended the whole suite of drift gillnet fishery management measures needs to be included in the federal regulations, including the California limited entry program. The Draft FMP includes only some of the existing state measures. If all of the regulations are not included, then none of the measures should be included. There was not consensus on this proposal, except there was agreement that this issue needs further review by the Council, since there may be some duplication of regulations at the state level.

Mr. Janisse stated there is no justification presented in the document for the drift gillnet closure north of 45° N latitude, nor is there a justification in chapter 8 for closing the EEZ to longline fishing. It was noted that chapter 8 does not include rationale for any of the alternatives. This information is in chapter 9. (C. Janisse comment, 3/18/02)

Mr. Janisse noted that, while the FMP states that no initial allocations are proposed, the prohibition on sale of striped marlin in effect allocates this species to the sport fishery.

Mr. Janisse questioned the practicality of the proposed gear endorsements on the HMS permit. This could be construed as a limited entry program if some evidence of minimal landings is required. If no such evidence is required, then anyone can check any or all gear boxes on the permit, rendering the endorsement essentially useless. Mr. Wayne Heikkila stated that his organization supports the endorsement program and suggested that a way be found to make this work without creating a limited entry program. The Subpanel agreed to raise this issue as a potential problem.

Ms. Kate Wing opposed the provision allowing sale of prohibited shark species, but suggested donations be encouraged. The Team responded that it wanted to allow the sale of specimens to recognized research institutions. There was no consensus on this point.

Ms. Wing suggested that a description of the net pen operation for bluefin tuna be added to chapter 2.

Mr. Douglas Fricke recommended that permits be assigned to individuals, not vessels. He also recommended that the FMP address permit requirements for Canadian troll vessels fishing in U.S. waters.

Mr. Fricke expressed concern about the process at the last meeting when a new longline alternative was developed at the meeting and became the preferred alternative. He recommended that Subpanel meetings be held two weeks in advance of Council meetings when actions are taken.

Mr. Jock Albright and Mr. Robert Osborn suggested that the language on page 8-25 regarding the sale of striped marlin be revised to make it clear that sale of all striped marlin caught in waters under the jurisdiction of the Council is prohibited.

Mr. August Felando stated that there was insufficient justification and analysis provided for the purse seine closure north of 44° N latitude. He recommended an alternative of closing the area east of a longitude to be determined north of 44° N latitude. The Subpanel agreed.

Mr. Heikkila presented some of the recommendations of Western Fishboat Owners' Association:

- 1) Framework alternative 2, without the point-of-concern mechanism.
- 2) Management cycle alternative 2 (annual cycle).
- 3) Observer authority: language needs to be revised to recognize problems with an observer program on the hook-and-line fishery.

Mr. Heikkila and Mr. Fricke expressed concern about the proposed March - September management cycle. The September Council meeting, when final action would be taken on new measures, occurs during the middle of the albacore season.

Mr. Dupuy made a motion to recommend that the Council change its preferred alternative on longlining inside the EEZ to alternative 3, which is the industry proposal. The vote was 5 yes, 4 no, 1 abstention.

Mr. Dupuy made a motion to request that the Council delete the drift gillnet closure north of 45° N latitude, and replace it with a closure east of 125° W longitude off Oregon and Washington. The vote was 9 yes, 1 no.

Mr. Fletcher recommended the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission look at the economic information for the charter fleet throughout the entire coast. The current data in the FMP is limited to southern California. The Subpanel agreed.

Ms. Wing recommended that the HMSAS urge NMFS to commit additional resources necessary to revise the FMP. The Subpanel agreed.

The Subpanel recommended that the FMP process continue as a completely open public process.

Report to Council

The HMSAS reviewed and approved a report to the Council to be presented on March 14, 2002 (Exhibit G.2.d, Supplemental HMSAS Report, March 2002).

PFMC
06/05/02

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES ADVISORY SUBPANEL STATEMENT ON
DRAFT HMS FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanel (HMSAS) met March 13 to discuss the December 2001 draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and has the following comments.

Small-Mesh Gillnet Fishery

One unresolved issue is the treatment of the small-mesh drift gillnet fishery for albacore and bluefin. The Highly Migratory Species Plan Development Team (HMSPDT) is in the process of analyzing information on this fishery. The HMSAS reserves comment on this issue until the new information is presented.

Drift Gillnet Fishery Measures

Drift gillnet fishery representatives believe the federal regulations should include all of the existing state drift gillnet measures, including the California limited entry program. While there was no consensus on this point, HMSAS members agreed this issue needs further review by the Council and NMFS, since there may be some duplication of regulations at the state level.

The HMSAS voted (9 yes, 1 no) to recommend deletion of the proposed closure of the drift gillnet fishery north of 45° N Latitude, and inclusion of a closure east of 125° W Longitude off Oregon and Washington.

Longline Fishery Measures

The HMSAS voted (5 yes, 4 no, 1 abstain) to recommend longline alternative 3: authorize a limited entry pelagic longline fishery for tunas and swordfish with effort and area restrictions to evaluate longlines as an alternative to drift gillnets to reduce bycatch (industry proposal).

Purse Seine Fishery Measures

There is consensus there is insufficient justification in the FMP for prohibiting purse seine fishing north of 44° N Latitude. The HMSAS recommends the Council develop an alternative which closes the area east of a certain longitude north of 44°.

Sale of Striped Marlin

Some members felt that, while the FMP states that no initial allocations are proposed, the preferred alternative of prohibiting the sale of striped marlin in effect allocates this species to the sport fishery.

Some members representing the sport fishery suggest the language on page 8-25 needs to be revised to make it clear that sale of all striped marlin caught in waters under the jurisdiction of the Council is prohibited.

Permits

The HMSAS is concerned with the requirement for gear endorsements on HMS permits. If some evidence of minimal participation in a fishery is required to get an endorsement, this could be considered a limited entry program. It may be desirable to find a way of achieving the objective of the endorsement without creating a limited entry program. The HMSAS recommends the Council explore with NMFS the possible impacts of an endorsement.

Hook-and-line fishery representatives proposed that the FMP address permit requirements for Canadian troll vessels fishing in U.S. waters.

Sale of Prohibited Species

Several members expressed support for a complete prohibition on the sale of prohibited shark species. The FMP allows the sale to recognized scientific institutions. There was no consensus on this point.

Bluefin Net Pens

A description of the net pen operation for bluefin tuna needs to be included in chapter 2.

Charter Survey

There was consensus to recommend the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission look at the economic information for the Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel fleet throughout the entire coast. The current data in the FMP is limited to southern California.

Management Cycle

Some members expressed concern about making decisions at the September Council meeting, during the middle of the albacore season.

Process After March Meeting

The agency comments on the FMP suggest that substantial revisions to the EIS/FMP are necessary before final Council action can be taken. The HMSAS does not have a consensus recommendation on the time required to complete these revisions, but does want the job done completely and correctly so the final FMP will be approvable. The HMSAS recommends NMFS commit additional resources as necessary to ensure the revisions can be completed.

We also recommend the process continue to be very transparent with opportunities for HMSAS and public comment. The HMSAS would like to meet in advance of the Council meeting when final action is taken, not during the Council meeting week, to give us more time to develop recommendations to the Council.

With regard to the next draft, the HMSAS recommends the Council and HMSPDT consider preparation of a supplement, instead of a new complete version of the FMP. The supplement would contain only the revisions prepared in response to Council direction at this meeting. This document should reduce costs and facilitate understanding of the changes.

PFMC
03/14/02

PROPOSED AGENDA
Enforcement Consultants

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Alexandria I Room
Crowne Plaza Hotel
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 18 - 21, 2002

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 2002 - 5:30 P.M. (or Immediately Following the Council Meeting)

A. Call to Order

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda

Dave Cleary

B. Council Agenda Items for Comment

- C. Groundfish Management
4. Harvest Levels and Preliminary Management Measures
 8. Proposed Management Measures for 2003
 9. Inseason Adjustments

C. Vessel Monitoring System

1. NMFS comments

D. Other Business

E. Public Comment

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2002 THROUGH FRIDAY JUNE 21, 2002 (As Necessary)

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/06/02

PROPOSED AGENDA
Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Crowne Plaza Hotel
Drake 1 Room
121 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 19, 2002

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 2002 - 10 A.M.

A. Call to Order

John Royal, Chair

B. Introductions

C. Approve Agenda

D. NMFS Report

Jim Morgan

E. Proposal for Marine Reserves in State Waters of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary

F. Pacific Mackerel Stock Assessment and Harvest Guideline

THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2002 - 8 A.M.

G. Pacific Sardine Allocation

H. Sea Surface Temperature and the Pacific Sardine Harvest Guideline Control Rule

I. Amendment 10

J. Other Business

K. Develop Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel Reports to the Council

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/05/02

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES
Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion Hotel Sacramento
Comstock 2 Room
1401 Arden Way
Sacramento, CA 95815
(916) 922-8041
March 13, 2002

Members in Attendance

Mr. Orlando Amoroso, Purse Seine Owners of San Pedro
Ms. Terry Hoinsky, Fishermen's Union
Mr. Eugene Law, Oregon fisherman
Mr. A. Pierre Marchand, Jr., Jessie's Ilwaco Fish Company
Ms. Heather Munro, Munro Consulting
Ms Karen Reyna, Pacific Ocean Conservation Network
Mr. John Royal, Chair
Mr. Paul Strasser, Sportfishing Representative

Others in Attendance

Ms. Jennifer Gilden, Council Staff
Dr. Kevin Hill, Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team
Mr. Jim Morgan, National Marine Fisheries Service
Mr. Steve Franklin, Fisherman
Mr. Dave Franklin, Fisherman
Mr. Dan Waldeck, Council Staff

The draft agenda was approved.

Meeting Summary

Election of Officers

Mr. Royal and Ms. Munro were re-elected chair and vice-chair, respectively.

Pacific Mackerel

Mr. Morgan, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), reported the directed fishery for Pacific mackerel closed November 21, 2001. An incidental allowance of 45% has been in place since then. Currently, about 7,300 mt of the 13,837 mt Pacific mackerel harvest guideline for 2001-2002 had been landed, and about 6,500 mt remained. Given the rate of fishing and the amount of harvest guideline remaining, NMFS could re-open the directed fishery.

Dr. Hill, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), distributed a handout detailing landings of Pacific mackerel. Landings have been low since the directed fishery was closed. He suggested the industry has the capacity for a mop-up fishery, but the amount landed will depend on market orders. It would be acceptable to re-open the directed fishery. It is likely total landings for the season will be below the harvest guideline.

Generally, the Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel (CPSAS) was satisfied with the performance of the season structure for Pacific mackerel. Prior to the June 2002 Council meeting, the CPSAS and Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) will plan the structure for the 2002-2003 season, improvements will be made based on the performance of the 2001-2002 season. An issue for consideration will be mixed Pacific mackerel and Pacific sardine catches.

Ms. Munro indicated she would put together information on markets, which will be useful in developing the season structure. Last year, industry input was very helpful in developing the season structure. For the coming season, the CPSAS will explore with their constituents how best to structure the direct fishery and incidental allowance.

The CPSAS discussed whether to recommend re-opening the directed Pacific mackerel fishery prior to the end of the 2001-2002 season. It was decided that the CPSAS would provide a report to the Council requesting NMFS re-open the directed fishery no later than April 1, 2002.

CPSAS Comments on NMFS Report

The CPSAS would like to recommend that NMFS trigger an automatic action to reopen the directed pacific mackerel fishery. Further, the CPSAS recommends this fishery begin no later than April 1st. The Council is not slated to discuss the mop-up fishery until the April meeting. However, given the mackerel landings to date, and the amount of harvest guideline which has not been landed, the CPSAS believes there is urgency to beginning the mop-up fishery as soon as possible. Due to time constraints, if NMFS waits until after the April council meeting to begin this process, it will likely be May before the mop-up fishery begins. Beginning the process prior to the April Council meeting will ensure that the industry has a higher probability of harvesting the majority of the harvest guideline available.

Amendment 10

Dr. Hill gave a background presentation on Amendment 10 to the Coastal Pelagic Species (CPS) fishery management plan (FMP). He reviewed the capacity-related alternatives and the market squid maximum sustainable yield (MSY) alternatives. He highlighted the current preferred alternatives and noted areas where preferred alternatives have not yet been identified by the Council.

The CPSAS discussed the use of gross registered tonnage (GRT) as a measure of vessel and fleet capacity. Operational aspects of the permit transfer provisions were also discussed. Several of the topics discussed had been thoroughly aired at past meetings. Based on the advice of the CPSMT and CPSAS, the Council previously selected preferred alternatives for a capacity goal and transferability allowance (i.e., transfer to equal gross tonnage + 10%). These preferred alternatives and the rationale for why they are preferred are discussed and analyzed in Amendment 10. It was noted that there will be time to review and comment on all aspects of Amendment 10 during the public review period.

Next, Dr. Hill reviewed the MSY proxy approach developed for market squid. It was noted that this information had been previously reviewed and approved by the CPSAS. The CPSAS continues to support the squid workshop findings and CPSMT recommendations. A minority of the CPSAS offered up language for an additional alternative.

A member of the public commented on the Amendment 10 capacity-related issues. His questions revolved around the number of times a permit could be transferred and to whom a permit could be transferred.

CPSAS Comments on Amendment 10

The CPSAS heard a presentation from CPSMT Chairman Kevin Hill reviewing the draft document of Amendment 10 to the CPS FMP. The majority (7 of 8) of the CPSAS agree the draft represents a reasonable range of alternatives for issues relative to limited entry fleet capacity management and an MSY control rule for squid. The majority of the CPSAS believe the document is adequate for public review and recommends the Council send out the document for public review and comment.

Minority Report

Although the CPSAS was unanimous in agreeing that a reasonable range of alternatives exists for issues relative to limited entry fleet capacity, the minority opinion believes that for squid MSY, Alternative 4, the preferred alternative needs an additional sub-option. It is proposed that this sub-option use the same model as Alternative 4, but include an egg escapement threshold of 0.4 (40%). This is a reasonable alternative to consider because of (1) the environmental concerns from the rapid increase of its catches, (2) the fisheries propensity to crash during El Niño events, (3) its importance to the ecosystem as a prey species, and (4) since 0.4 (40%) is used as the threshold in the Falkland Islands fishery.

Other Business

Pacific Sardine Allocation

The CPSAS discussed allocation of the annual sardine harvest guideline and timing of the automatic re-allocation. Many different opinions were expressed about the issues involved and the whether changing the current policy is necessary. Of concern is preemption of the Monterey, California fishery by the Oregon and Washington fisheries due to the different timing of these fisheries.

The consensus was to thoroughly discuss this topic at the next CPSAS meeting. One specific issue is changing the re-allocation date, which is currently nine months after the start of the Pacific sardine fishery (i.e., fishery starts January 1, re-allocation occurs October 1). Ms. Munro highlighted that she had previously developed and distributed a white paper on this subject. She suggested the CPSAS members read the document and familiarize themselves with the issues.

Sea Surface Temperature and Pacific Sardine Harvest Guideline Control Rule.

The issue of the role of sea surface temperature (SST) in the formula for determining the sardine harvest guideline was discussed. It is feared that if SST continues to trend downward, the harvest guideline could be severely curtailed. This issue will be discussed more thoroughly at the next CPSAS meeting.

Tri-national Sardine Forum

The November 2001 meeting of the Tri-national Sardine Forum was discussed. Concern was expressed that the cooperative research envisioned by the Forum is not developing. Of particular concern, is lack of information from Mexico on CPS fisheries in their region. The CPSAS discussed the critical need for improvements to coastwide Pacific sardine research.

Update on Viral Hemorrhagic Septicaemia

Dr. Hill briefed the CPSAS on the latest news about viral hemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) virus occurring in West Coast populations of Pacific sardine. The virus first appeared in the North Pacific and the Pacific Northwest. It has been detected in several species including herring, pollock, hake, Pacific cod, sablefish. More recently, it has been found in sardine and mackerel from landings into the San Pedro area.

Outbreaks of the virus typically occur when fish are under stress. The virus eats away at tissues and can cause mass mortalities. There is not a concern the entire West Coast sardine population could die off. Although mass mortalities have occurred (in British Columbia in 1998 or 1999). These mass die offs occurred during periods of extremely cold (relative to sardine) water temperatures.

The principle concern is the potential for a quarantine imposed by the Australian government, which is currently doing a risk assessment.

In the mid-1990s, Australian fisheries experienced mass mortalities concurrent with the growth of the bluefin tuna pen industry. The die-offs were attributed to a different virus, but awareness of these types of environmental concerns is heightened. At that time, there was a temporary ban on imports.

An Australian quarantine would be a significant blow to the West Coast sardine industry. Currently, Australia is going through a public comment period on the topic of importing fish from areas where VHS has been detected. A final decision is expected by mid-April 2002. The CPSMT will continue to track the issue and keep the Council and CPSAS informed.

PFMC
06/05/02