

PROPOSED AGENDA
Groundfish Management Team

Red Lion Hotel Vancouver at the Quay
The Gull's Nest Room
100 Columbia Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
(360) 694-8341
April 6-11, 2003

SUNDAY, APRIL 6, 2003 - 8 A.M.

A. Call to Order

Michele Robinson, Chair

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

E. Groundfish Management

7. Standards and Criteria for Approving Exempted Fishing Permits (8:15 A.M. - 1 hr. Report due to the Council on Thursday) Michele Robinson
- California Nearshore Management Update (9:15 A.M. - 15 min. No report due to the Council) Dave Thomas
- Oregon Nearshore Management Update (9:30 A.M. - 15 min. No report due to the Council) Mark Saelens
- Update on 2003 Stock Assessment Review Process (9:45 A.M. - 15 min. No report due to the Council) Jim Hastie
4. Review of The Process for Setting 2004 Groundfish Specifications (10 A.M. - 30 min. Report due to the Council on Wednesday) John DeVore
3. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Consideration of Inseason Adjustments (10:30 A.M. - 3 hrs. Report due to the Council on Wednesday) Jim Hastie

LUNCH

6. Vessel Monitoring System (2:30 P.M. - 30 min. No report due to the Council) Becky Renko
5. Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment 16 - Rebuilding Plans (3 P.M. - 2 hrs. Report due to the Council on Wednesday) M. Harrington/K. Dahl/J. DeVore

NOTE: This agendum will be covered in the West River 1 Room with the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel and any interested public. This briefing will also serve as a public scoping session for rebuilding plans as noticed in the *Federal Register*.

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2003 - 8 A.M.

E. Groundfish Management (continued)

3. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Consideration of Inseason Adjustments (continued) (8 A.M. - 1 hr.)

Draft Summary Minutes Groundfish Management Team

Pacific Fishery Management Council
West Conference Room
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 200
Portland, OR 97220-1384
(503) 820-2280
February 3-7, 2003

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2003 - 1 P.M.

Members Present:

Mr. Tom Barnes, California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Brian Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dr. Jim Hastie, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center
Dr. Xi He, National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center
Mr. Rob Jones, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Mr. Steve Kupillas, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dr. Kevin Piner, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center
Ms. Becky Renko, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Ms. Michele Robinson, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Mark Saelens, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Dave Thomas, California Department of Fish and Game

Others Present:

Mr. Steve Bodnar, Coos Bay Trawlers Association
Mr. Mike Burner, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. William Daspit, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
Mr. John DeVore, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. Jim Glock, National Marine Fisheries Service
Mr. Marion Larkin, Washington Trawler, GAP
Mr. Rod Moore, West Coast Seafood Processors Association, GAP
Mr. Dan Waldeck, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. Ed Waters, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council

A. Call to Order

Jim Hastie/Brian Culver, Co-Chairs

Dr. Hastie called the meeting to order at 1300.

B. Adopt Agenda

Ms. Renko requested that the VMS agenda to be moved later in the week. The team to agreed to discuss this agenda item on Wednesday.

C. Elect Chair and Vice Chair for 2003

Mr. DeVore and Mr. Culver requested a team discussion on team function and the role of the chair prior to the election. Ms. Robinson had started a discussion thread via email on this subject. The discussion focused on ways to improve Team organization and work efficiencies. The Team also discussed the merits of electing two individuals, a chair and a co-chair or vice chair. This

2. Report on the Bycatch Workshop and Observer Data Update M. Dalton/E. Clarke/J. Hastie
(9 A.M. - 1.5 hrs. Report due to the Council on Wednesday)

NOTE: This will be a joint presentation to the GAP, Groundfish Management Team, and Scientific and Statistical Committee in the West River 1 Room.

3. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Consideration of Inseason Adjustments (continued)
(10:30 A.M. - 1.5 hr.)

F. Pacific Halibut Management

1. Adopt Final 2003 Incidental Catch Regulations for the Salmon Troll and Michele Robinson Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries
(1 P.M. - 15 min. Report due to the Council on Thursday)

E. Groundfish Management (continued)

- Buyback Presentation Bill Robinson
(1:30 P.M. - 30 min. No report due to the Council)

NOTE: This presentation will be in the West River I Room with the GAP and Legislative Committee.

9. Status of the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Environmental Impact Statement Steve Cops
(2 P.M. - 1 hr. Report due to the Council on Friday)

NOTE: This will be a joint presentation to the GMT, GAP, and SSC in the West River 1 Room.

3. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Consideration of Inseason Adjustments (continued) GMT/GAP
(3 P.M. - 2 hrs. Deliberations with the GAP)

TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2003 - 8 A.M.

E. Groundfish Management (continued)

3. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Consideration of Inseason Adjustments (continued) GMT
(8 A.M. - 1 hr.)
3. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Consideration of Inseason Adjustments (continued) GMT/GAP
(9 A.M. - Deliberations with the GAP)

ADJOURN

PFMC
03/24/03

organization is in keeping with other advisory bodies and works well when there are several duties to cover at one time or when one member cannot attend a meeting.

The Team identified a need for more focus during busy meetings. Dr. Hastie cautioned that it is very difficult for a person to deal with running the meeting when they have a large analytical role. Meeting inefficiency and a heavy workload compromised coordination of GMT products with the GAP at the September 2002 meeting. Mr. Culver said that it is very difficult for the chair to do all of the tasking/organization of the Team. Time constraints and workload are increasing for the Team and there will always be a hot topic for which the GMT chair is expected to be a technical spokesperson. Additionally, there is also an increasing number of groundfish agenda items and accompanying GMT statements. The Team discussed sharing GMT statement preparation responsibilities with all the members while preserving the chair's responsibility to report to the Council. Ms. Renko reminded the Team that 2002 was an improvement over 2001 with trip limit tables and ABC/OY summaries presented to the Council during their deliberations.

Elections

Dr. Hastie reported that he will remain on the Team at least through this year's September meeting but will definitely be off the Team by 2004 and will therefore not be running for chair. Dr. Piner reported that he too will likely leave the Team when Dr. Hastie leaves but may stay on briefly to transition through the NWFSC position rotation. Mr. Culver noted that the GMT has always relied on NMFS members for stock assessment and scientific expertise, a key element of GMT business. The Team discussed the benefits of less frequent position rotations given the complexity of groundfish management. A letter from the Council to NWFSC may be helpful in emphasizing the importance and value of NWFSC staff participation on the GMT. Dr. Hastie was hopeful that the NWFSC will identify his replacement so that they can shadow him during the process and learn the bycatch model and its background. Dr. He reported that the SWFSC has proposed a 2 year term for his GMT assignment. The SWFSC has embraced rotation in the past as a way of providing management experience to many staff members but, the issues were much less complex then.

Ms. Robinson and Mr. DeVore proposed a two-year term for a chair and a vice chair with new terms beginning at April Council meetings. The Team specified that the chairs do not have to present all of the Team reports to the Council and that the chair and vice chair can delegate roles as necessary.

Ms. Robinson was nominated as chair and Mr. Barnes was nominated as vice-chair and both were elected by unanimous voice vote.

D. Briefing on the Bycatch Workshop

Dr. Hastie reported on the workshop and provided the briefing documents to the Team. The panel consisted of Mr. Culver and Dr. MacCall of the GMT, Mr. Moore and Mr. Larkin of the GAP, two independent experts, and members of the SSC Groundfish and Economics Subcommittees. The first day covered the historical dataset available on bycatch as well as a review of the 2001 and 2002 bycatch models. The workshop focused on several aspects of the model and offered methods of improving behavioral modeling of fleet participation. Observed bycatch rates could not be discussed at the workshop as the report on the first year of the observer program was not available. The report has since been posted by the NWFSC and was distributed to the Team. During the workshop, Dr. Hastie was able to summarize the number of observed tows by fishery, depth range, and time strata in the existing bycatch model. The committee reviewed the level of coverage including the number of observed tows in depths and areas that are now closed and discussed ways in which data gaps could be treated. The workshop also considered several ways of utilizing

the existing logbook, Enhanced Data Collection Program, and PacFIN, data sources in conjunction with the new observer data. The panel was concerned about relying on historical data that was collected when the fisheries looked a lot different than they do today. There was also a lot of discussion on how to pool and/or smooth data to cover strata for which there is no data or for strata where the data doesn't meet minimum sample size criteria. One proposal is to model less specific fishery strata, perhaps something as simple as a deep versus shallow strategy north and south of Mendocino by the existing six time steps. Recommendations of the panel will include specific improvements to the model as well as conceptual ideas for model development and observer data incorporation. Dr. Hastie will complete analyses requested by the panel in mid-February including estimating bycatch rate variance and exploring ways of collapsing fishery strata to improve the number of observations per strata. The SSC members of the Bycatch Workshop panel will meet the Sunday afternoon prior to the March meeting and are scheduled to give a report to the full SSC on Monday.

Logbook data needs to be available to fully utilize observer data because observers initially record haul weights and logbook data for retained catch and these values need to be adjusted by fish ticket information to achieve total catch estimates. The importance of timely reporting of logbook data was stressed. Logbook data from 2002 is currently available from Washington, Oregon data is expected in March, and California will try to get data from January - August, 2002 in by mid-March. Mr. Dave Colpo with PSMFC attended the workshop and asked what data needs are most critical? It was requested that he help with speeding the availability of logbook data.

When formal decisions have been made on incorporating the observer data, there will be a more aggressive effort in assessing how the new model estimates bycatch in the 2003 fishery. This exercise could highlight situations where taking inseason action could be justified, perhaps in time for the April Council meeting. April will be the earliest look at the new data in the model and by the May meeting of the Ad Hoc Allocation Committee there will be a final model available to begin developing management measures for 2004. By the June Council meeting, or perhaps the May GMT meeting, the Team will look at QSM data from the first two periods and compare them to catch projections from the model. Results from the new model need to be expressed in a management context well before the April meeting so that people can start thinking about possible adjustments.

The panel also strongly recommends that the new bycatch rates receive SSC approval prior to use rather than having bycatch rates chosen by the Council as a policy decision.

While preparing for the workshop, Dr. Hastie discovered that he had erroneously modeled the outside line south of Point Reyes as 250 fathoms during part of the year. The resulting difference in bocaccio impacts is considerable. Table 27 on page T-34 of the report on bycatch model documentation presented by Dr. Hastie details the difference. At the September 2002 meeting the coastwide bocaccio bycatch in non-whiting trawl fisheries was estimated at 1.4 mt and, with the correction, the estimate increases to 3 mt. The modeled differences in total mortality for all other species is less than one ton and will not greatly effect fisheries. The GMT needs to articulate their position on bocaccio in a statement under the 2003 management agenda item at the April meeting.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2003 - 8 A.M.

Members Present:

Mr. Tom Barnes, California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Brian Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dr. Jim Hastie, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center
Dr. Xi He, National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center
Mr. Rob Jones, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Mr. Steve Kupillas, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dr. Kevin Piner, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center
Ms. Becky Renko, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Ms. Michele Robinson, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Mark Saelens, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Dave Thomas, California Department of Fish and Game

Others Present:

Mr. Steve Bodnar, Coos Bay Trawlers Association
Mr. Mike Burner, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Dr. Kit Dahl, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. William Dasplit, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
Mr. John DeVore, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. Marion Larkin, Washington Trawler, GAP
Mr. Pete Leipzig, Fishermen's Marketing Association
Mr. Rod Moore, West Coast Seafood Processors Association, GAP
Mr. Jim Seger, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council

On Conference Call:

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

E. Evaluate 2003 Management Options

Observer Data

The Team stressed the importance of incorporating observer data into management tools quickly if the information is to be used for inseason adjustments in 2003. The data report on the observer program focused on the trawl fishery but data was collected for other fishery sectors by state and federal efforts. It would be desirable in the next few weeks to update the bycatch rates and the scorecard allowing discussions to ensue in preparation for taking inseason action at the April meeting.

Yellowtail trip limits in the flatfish fishery

As fish ticket information for the end of 2002 comes in, Dr. Hastie will update his analysis of catch rates of yellowtail in the flatfish fishery. The 3,000 pounds per month limit for January and February of 2003 has not been working well and could be reconsidered in the proposed rule for changes starting on March 1st. Industry wants consideration for a 30,000 lbs/2 months limit (or a higher limit than 3,000 pounds per month). However, a preliminary look at the data suggests that only a few vessels in the first two periods catch more than 3,000 pounds per month.

California Recreational Fishing in areas deeper than 150 fm

A recreational angler in California has asked for GMT and Council consideration of allowing recreational opportunity in the deep water fishery. Currently, recreational anglers are restricted to within 20 fm while open access fishers can operate within 20 fm and outside of 150 fm. The angler is interested in blackgill fishing. The recreational bag limit in California would need to be readdressed if recreational anglers fish outside of 20 fm. The southern nearshore regulations allow retention of shelf species inside 20 fm. The Team discussed the need for different bag limits, mandatory observers or VMS as ways to enforce depth based closures and to limit the retention of shelf species. The Team thought disallowing retention of nearshore and shelf species when slope species are on board might be a reasonable solution. Additionally, there may be cowcod concerns with this proposal, as they prefer deeper water.

Party Fishing

California is considering allowing the common practice of attaining a boat limit aboard charter vessels rather than individual bag limits. This issue was raised at the last California Fish and Game Commission (CFGF) meeting but the CFGF has not yet taken action. NMFS has asked to stay informed on the issue and may decide to weigh in against the proposal. Oregon and Washington have similar issues. Charter boats in both states are already practicing party fishing with minimal enforcement. NMFS representatives asked about the potential for latent effort and additional mortality. The Team generally agreed that because the practice is already occurring, a regulation change will not increase effort. Washington has already taken measures to eliminate the difficulty of enforcing individual bag limits. If a vessel is boarded the boat limit is enforced, but once the angler is off the boat, individual possession limits are enforced. State representatives on the GMT will look into the specific language of proposed or existing regulations and keep NMFS and the Team informed of upcoming decision points. The Team would like to know if new bag limit changes apply only to charter vessels or to all recreational vessels. Boat limits are allowed for both charter and private recreational vessels in Washington.

One trawl gear type on board

The emergency rule and proposed rule both include language allowing only one type of trawl gear onboard a vessel at one time. The Team discussed the midwater opportunity in the closed area as the most likely place where a one gear type on board rule should be required. Enforcement Consultants and the GMT need to review the one gear requirement to determine the need for this regulation. The issue is intertwined with the VMS/declaration process. GAP members were frustrated with the lack of coordination and communication on gear-related regulations for the 2003 management measures. The group discussed better coordination between the EC and the GMT and GAP and stated that minutes at enforcement meetings would be useful in this endeavor. Ms. Renko agreed to contact the EC on behalf of the GMT on this regulation prior to the April Council meeting. Trawl gear regulation issues are to be anticipated on EC, GAP, and GMT agendas then.

Management Lines

Dr. Dahl presented management line charts for Team review. The Team discussed the calculations of the amount of closed area and the potential for eventually overlaying effort data to estimate the percentage of the usual fishing grounds now closed. Refining the bycatch model using closed area coordinates and GIS data on fishing effort patterns was discussed and may be possible in time for 2004 management. The observer data may be able to identify bycatch 'hot spots', but limited observations within a specific area may require incremental modifications of closed areas

as new observations further define the bycatch implications of fishing effort in various regions. The bathymetry on the West Coast makes it difficult to define depth-based closed areas that are also wide enough to expect reasonable enforcement. The Team discussed the merits of future actions to identify specific closed areas rather than continuous coastwide bands.

Defining lines was a labor-intensive process which included many different criteria including industry input, conservation considerations, and the location of undersea cables. Additionally, bathymetry data also changes as new surveys and new data sources become available and closed areas may be refined according to new depth information. The Team discussed the mechanism for minor changes to existing lines to better fit depth contours. There are a few places along the 75 fm line in Oregon and Washington that need to be changed to better reflect the depth contour. California is considering changes to their 50, 60 and 250 fm lines. NMFS is requesting modifications to 2003 management lines along with descriptions of how lines were generated by February 7, the end of the public comment period for the proposed rule on 2003 management measures. Line changes after that date, so long as they are only modifications to existing, analyzed lines, can be made as an inseason action at one Council meeting. Defining a new line is not considered routine and will likely require a two meeting process.

California will probably propose revised boundaries for the cowcod closed area for 2004 that will require a two meeting process. Additionally, California wants to revisit the petrale exemptions for the outside trawl lines in the last part of 2003. The waypoints for the management lines were not specified in time for the EIS so they were only analyzed conceptually and it is unclear at this point whether the modifications that California is proposing for petrale grounds are significantly different from what has already been analyzed. Currently, the 150 fm line is used as the petrale exception. The Council was clear in the fall of 2003 that petrale exceptions could not occur shallower than 150 fm, but that does not imply that the use of a 150 fm line as a petrale exception is preferable. California did not identify petrale areas at the September, 2002 Council meeting and may need a two meeting process to adjust the outer trawl line. However, if a 150 fm line was analyzed as a petrale exception and California comes forward with smaller, more conservative areas, it may be allowed in a one meeting process. The California proposal will need to be available at the June meeting for implementation prior to period six if it requires a two meeting process.

Dr. Hastie cautioned that the states need to identify changes to the 75 fm curve soon in the event that the new bycatch rates indicate the need for inseason management in April.

Ms. Nordeen notified the Team that the original public notice on the waypoints corrections had an incorrect web site address and NMFS has posted a new public notice. In the future it would be helpful to have the EC review proposed lines and waypoints to avoid errors. LTJG Gregg Casad with USCG was very helpful for the 2003 process and that effort could be expanded.

The Team discussed a coordinated effort to produce some plots or maps that visually present these closures for the public. Changes to the lines are currently occurring too often to invest significant resources in printing charts. Additionally, the closed area nomenclature needs to be defined because different entities utilize different names for the wide variety of closed areas.

F. PacFIN Data Committee Recommendations

Newly requested categories for the QSM database are being implemented quickly by PacFIN. Oregon has not been able to incorporate the data changes in its fish ticket system but an alternate system has been identified to get the required utilization codes to PacFIN. The ability to pull out whiting trips, observed trips, or EFP trips by a flag code is advantageous. Implementation of the observed trip flag will be taken care of by the NWFSC. Flag disposition codes are needed for EFP,

compensation fish, research, whiting, and observed trips (state and federal). The Team discussed the pros and cons of either a general EFP code or codes specific to each EFP. There was concern for an over proliferation of codes and the potential for error that accompanies it. Each state could submit a list of newly requested categories to PSMFC so they could fit together the various proposals and determine the best way of folding the recommendations into the data system. Mr. Saelens, Mr. Culver, Mr. Thomas, and Dr. Hastie will work together as a PacFIN GMT sub-committee to get a list of new data categories to Mr. Daspit by the end of February.

There is also a need to improve the reporting or coding of groundfish take in state permitted research or marine work. This can be expanded to consider many types of removal that are not recorded on fish tickets. PSMFC is willing to work with the states to identify these sources of mortality as well as means of reporting them in PacFIN. Additionally, there would be some utility to having RecFIN summaries available through PacFIN so that a 'total' mortality database could be created.

Sablefish reporting issues in QSM were discussed. Two changes have been implemented in QSM: differentiating DTL sablefish from primary season sablefish landings and including tribal fisheries. These changes are planned but are not in place yet. The DTL fishery starts in April and the hope is to have the changes implemented by then.

The Team agreed that better coordination between the GMT and PSMFC would benefit both groups. The GMT will include a PacFIN agenda item for all meetings. Council staff will incorporate PSMFC staff in meeting planning. Mr. Daspit said that in the past the GMT identified a data liaison with PacFIN and it worked well. Dr. Hastie has performed this role unofficially lately. He suggests that the Team again identify a person for this role and that it tends to work best if the data liaison is someone other than the chair. Mr. Saelens agreed to function as the GMT PacFIN data liaison.

G. RecFIN Issues

Data needs for NEPA Analyses

Mr. Seger discussed the difficulty of identifying groundfish directed sport trips in RecFIN. Another way to look at the issue is to consider what regulations it would take to keep anglers from wanting to target groundfish. Recreational anglers will often plan to target several species before going out or will decide to switch while fishing. These data needs are becoming more of an issue as management measures for groundfish get more and more restrictive. Minimizing bycatch requires a better understanding of recreational fishing behavior. Even if rockfish retention is prohibited, incidental mortality will occur and the best way to estimate that is to have a better understanding of recreational fishing behavior. For example, if one cannot distinguish salmon trips by those that are likely to catch groundfish and those that are not, then the entire recreational salmon fishery would need to be regulated to control groundfish bycatch. However, if RecFIN could identify salmon fishing strategies that have a higher bycatch than other strategies, regulations could be crafted to limit salmon fishing methods rather than closing the entire fishery. Or, if management measures are needed to achieve zero bocaccio mortality, what management measures would need to be imposed on the groundfish and non-groundfish recreational fisheries? Perhaps RecFIN is not the source for this type of information and what is really needed is observer data from the recreational sector. CDFG had to determine the type of effort shift to expect with deep water closures and found that observer data, even if dated, was very useful for detailed assessments and that RecFIN data was limited. In analyzing alternatives for the annual specifications EIS, Mr. Seger and Dr. Alec McCall had similar problems. The Team was requested to consider what fisheries may look like under 'zero mortality' alternatives for rebuilding plan and management measure NEPA analyses.

GMT coordination with RecFIN

The Team discussed the shortfall in communication between the GMT and PSMFC and reiterated the need for PSMFC participation at GMT meetings. PSMFC and GMT personnel are very busy and it has been difficult to maintain coordination. Similarly, it is difficult to allocate limited GMT resources to RecFIN issues. Recreational groundfish management is coming under increasing scrutiny and this need for timely data is critical. As an example, the Team discussed recreational lingcod catch in 2002 and roughly accounted for 600 mt in the recreational fishery alone when the total catch OY for 2002 was only 570 mt. There is a real need, given the number of overfished species, for better data coordination and a timely inseason estimator. Mr. Daspit volunteered to function as the data liaison from PSMFC. Mr. Saelens agreed to temporarily function as the GMT liaison on data coordination and will work with Dr. Piner to draft a GMT letter to PSMFC on the subject. In addition to data liaisons, the GMT would benefit from a recreational fishery technical person who could replace the role filled by Dr. Alec McCall. The person would need a good understanding of the recreational fisheries and their datasets. Dr. He will talk to Dr. MacCall about the possibility of working together to furnish the required analyses for the 2004 specifications NEPA document.

H. SAFE Document Preparation

Volume 2 of the 2002 SAFE document is no longer a pre-decisional document so the timing is not as critical as it has been in the past. The original goal set by the GMT is the April Council meeting. Final versions of the report need to be to the Council staff a month before a Council meeting to allow for compilation and printing. Therefore, all SAFE document contributions will be needed four weeks from now to enable distribution at the April Council meeting. Economic analyses, species descriptions, catch accounting tables, etc. still need to be finished. NWFSC can provide the catch and economic tables in time and Mr. Saelens will attempt to complete the history of the fishery section. The bycatch scorecard is available from the 2002 annual specifications EIS and the remaining tables can be quickly pulled from PacFIN. Ms. Renko will update and perhaps revise the section on the whiting fishery. Mr. Jones will put together a description of the tribal fishery regulations and catch. Ms. Robinson will compile an overall summary of non-whiting EFP fisheries in Washington and California in 2002. Dr. Hastie will provide the description of the bycatch model and the Team will include the report of the panel from the bycatch workshop. The absolute deadline for camera-ready documents is March 7th. Documents should be in Arial 10 point font and fully justified.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2003 - 8 A.M.

Members Present:

Mr. Tom Barnes, California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Brian Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dr. Jim Hastie, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center
Dr. Xi He, National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center
Mr. Rob Jones, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Mr. Steve Kupillas, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dr. Kevin Piner, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center
Ms. Becky Renko, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Ms. Michele Robinson, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Mark Saelens, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Dave Thomas, California Department of Fish and Game

Others Present:

Mr. Steve Bodnar, Coos Bay Trawlers Association
Mr. Mike Burner, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Dr. Kit Dahl, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. William Daspit, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
Mr. John DeVore, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. Jim Glock, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Mr. Jim Golden, Consulting on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
Mr. Jack Holland, Oregon Fisherman's Cable Committee
Mr. Pete Leipzig, Fishermen's Marketing Association
Mr. Scott McMullen, Oregon Fisherman's Cable Committee
Mr. Rod Moore, West Coast Seafood Processors Association, GAP
Mr. Jim Seavers, Oregon Fisherman's Cable Committee
Mr. Jim Seger, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. Dan Waldeck, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council

I. Capacity Reduction and Fisheries Rationalization Initiatives

Limited Entry Trawl

Mr. Leipzig reported on the progress of capacity reduction legislation in Congress. The omnibus appropriations bill contains the same trawl buyback language that floated through Congress last session but died in the House. During the current session, \$10M was approved for the trawl buyback program and the bill passed the Senate. The bill is now in committee and includes all of the original capacity reduction provisions. If the bill survives committee and passes the House without major revisions it will go to the President for expected signature by mid-February. NMFS then has 90 days to implement the program and, if all goes well, the program could be implemented in 2003. In the last session, the house approved \$500K for the program which allowed NMFS to take out a \$50M loan in addition to the \$10M recently approved. NMFS may not want to take out such a large loan so the total available to the program may be less than \$60M. Once the funds and the law are in place, NMFS will need to develop criteria and scoring systems for the program. The program covers the limited entry trawl fleet with the exception of catcher/processor whiting boats. Decisions made in late 2002 removed consideration of limited entry fixed gear fisheries in the program. The minimum duration of the loans is 30 years without a fixed end date, making it unclear what the interest debt will be. Fishing revenue from groundfish, shrimp, and crab landings between 1998-2001 is to be used in the scoring process. Once the vessels are scored and the true costs of the program are estimated, NMFS will issue a referendum to determine if the fleet wants to

implement the program and assume the debt. Votes will be weighted by the debt obligation by sector (groundfish, Oregon crab, Washington crab, California crab, etc.). The 2001 questionnaire showed that 70% of the fleet was interested in submitting a bid for capacity reduction eligibility. It is yet to be determined exactly how many vessels will submit bids and how many vessels the program can afford to cover. All three state governments are creating laws to authorize fees on groundfish, crab, and shrimp landings to pay back the capacity reduction loan.

Fixed Gear

Mr. Seger gave the Team an update on capacity reduction efforts in fixed gear fisheries. The fixed gear sablefish fleet is no longer pursuing the permit stacking proposal (consideration for up to 6 stacked permits per vessel) this year. Industry meetings have not occurred this winter as originally planned. Council workload issues and mixed reactions from the industry have slowed the process.

Open Access

Open access capacity reduction is in the works in California and Oregon. Mr. Thomas reported that, at its April meeting, the California Fish and Game Commission (CFGF) will consider nearshore permitting systems. The deep nearshore species complex fishery is proposed to be on a permit system with the shallow-nearshore complex continuing as a restricted access program. The CFGF will meet this week to adopt the qualifying criteria for the program. The landing criteria are expected to be low enough that the program functions like a moratorium on new permits at this time. Additionally, in May, the CFGF will consider closing a loophole that allows individuals to land more than one open access trip limit using different vessels (the federal system prescribes vessel-based limits, while the state system has individual-based limits). The proposal would allow any open access fisher to land only one cumulative limit whether fish are landed from one or more vessels.

Mr. Saelens and Mr. Kupillas reported on the Oregon nearshore open access capacity reduction efforts. At the time the strategic plan was adopted in 2001, Oregon was expecting a federal process for open access capacity reduction. In the last year, ODFW has completed a nearshore fishery report sparking discussions and negotiations on capacity reduction. In 2002, caps on nearshore species were put in place, and the OFWC adopted an Interim Nearshore FMP with qualifying criteria of landings of 500 pounds in any one year between January, 1999 and July, 2001 to continue in the Oregon nearshore fishery. The capacity reduction goal of the Interim Nearshore FMP is to reduce the fleet to about 70 total vessels, permitted by north and south coast port areas. The resulting permit system was proposed to have separate endorsements, one for 21 nearshore species including cabezon, kelp greenling, and vermillion rockfish and another covering black and blue rockfish. In late December, an Oregon legislative effort was launched that could supercede the Interim Nearshore FMP adopted by the OFWC under which the fleet would be reduced to about 100 vessels. However, actual attrition is unknown and is expected to be realized as other capacity reduction programs develop. Catch history issues have arisen when vessel owners/operators/lease holders attempt to sort out who can claim past landings.

Caps on cabezon and kelp greenling are expected to be reviewed for possible state emergency actions to limit two month trip limits in state waters. Kelp greenling appear to need substantial landing reductions. There are two federally managed shelf species in the list of state managed nearshore species under the proposed permit system possibly creating discard problems if the state closes nearshore opportunity and fishers continue to land federally regulated species while discarding nearshore species.

J. Oregon Fishermen's Cable Committee Presentation

Mr. Scott McMullen introduced Mr. Jim Seavers and Mr. Jack Holland from the Oregon Fisherman's Cable Committee (OFCC). The group gave a presentation on their organization, cable exposures and management lines. The committee is made up of fishers and cable owners and has as members, 81% of the trawlers within 100 nm of the cables within their jurisdiction and 58% of the coastwide trawl fleet. The goals of the committee are to prevent loss of trawl grounds and protect against liability of trawl vessels if a cable break occurs. OFCC also administers a sacrificed gear fund designed to help fishers replace gear that was cut loose when snagged on a cable. Several cable routes are represented including five existing cables out of Rockaway, Oregon and one planned out of Clatsop County, Oregon. When cables become obsolete there is no obligation to remove the cable. Cables carry fiber optics, protective materials, and copper conduits for high voltage to power optical repeaters. Undersea cables are an important component of telecommunication, are less likely to be damaged than land based cables, and carry much more capacity than satellites.

The committee is concerned about one cable suspension, one cable exposure, and one unknown cable situation. All three situations are near the 250 fathom management line off of Oregon. The OFCC has worked with industry and Oregon GMT representatives to highlight these locations and to increase awareness. Cable suspensions are more frequent in steep areas between 700-800 fathoms where it is difficult to bury cable but this is not a major concern for bottom trawl interactions. Cables are currently buried to an average depth of 1 meter out to 800 fm but are armored out to 1,000 fm in the event that trawl activity expands and more burial is required.

The OFCC is sensitive about the opinion that cable routes are *de facto* no fishing zones. The industry goes to great lengths to minimize loss of fishing grounds and well over 99% of the cable is buried and is not a problem for trawl gear. Of the 232 nm of cable located within 700 fm off Oregon, only 500 meters is not buried. Prior to the OFCC agreements between fisherman and cable owners, fisherman were asked not to fish within 1 nm on either side of an undersea cable. Under those limitations the current cables on the north Oregon coast would have closed over 460 nm² of fishing grounds. Under the OFCC agreements the fishing area listed as cautionary zones around cable exposures amounts to only 0.8 nm².

K. Groundfish Programmatic EIS Alternatives

Mr. Jim Glock gave a similar presentation as the one for the Council in November summarizing the work on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). The Council has drafted five alternatives including status quo, the strategic plan, short term social and economic benefits, and risk-averse alternatives. The schedule of the PEIS process: Affected Environment section and draft analyses of alternatives to the Council in April 2003, DPEIS to the Council family in August with a preferred alternative chosen at the September meeting, FR notice and public comment in Jan.-Feb., 2004, and the FPEIS submitted in the summer of 2004.

Mr. Jim Golden is working on the groundfish fishery analyses required for the NEPA documents and will coordinate his efforts with Council staff and the GMT.

L. Vessel Monitoring Systems

Ms. Renko presented a draft version of the proposed rule and a time line of the VMS regulatory process. The proposed rule has been updated since the December, 2002 meeting of the Ad Hoc VMS committee. Implementation of the pilot VMS program has been delayed from June to September. Designing the declaration system has taken longer than expected and inclusion of the

open access fleet has been difficult. A phone system is being established which includes an automated key-pad entry system and new identification numbers are being assigned to limited entry vessels. The information received by phone is then automatically entered into an Oracle database. On the phone system, vessels can make a declaration, cancel a declaration, or apply for an exception when boats are to be taken out of the water for more than 7 days or if they leave the EEZ. Sharing of VMS data between state and federal agencies needs to be addressed. Ms. Renko will draft a GMT statement on VMS including language from the November, 2002 GMT statement on the use of VMS data in fishery management.

M. Rebuilding Plans and Amendment 16

Process and Standards

Dr. Kit Dahl presented the preliminary time line, Council preferred options chosen to date, and proposed NEPA document preparation plans to the Team. It has been suggested that T_{TARGET} should be stated in terms of the median time to rebuild and the Council choose a harvest control rule in terms of $F_{\%spr}$. All other parameters would be calculated in stock assessments and rebuilding analyses and specified as historical artifacts in the FMP as the initial parameters used to rebuild the stock. These parameters could be then updated when new stock assessments occur as a part of the annual management cycle without the need for FMP amendment. The Team raised concerns for overfished stocks which do not meet the SSC's Terms of Reference on rebuilding parameters and therefore do not fit the structure of the process and standards. It is generally understood that the Council is required by the MSA to specify T_{TARGET} . The Team discussed the unlikely possibility that the Council could specify a moving target such as T_{MID} which changes with each assessment. The Team agreed that the parameter that could both specify a long term policy yet allow short term management in the face of changing stock assessments, is P_{MAX} (the probability of rebuilding within T_{MAX}).

The Team reviewed the following strawman text proposed by Dr. Dahl:

The following elements in each rebuilding plan will be incorporated into the FMP in Section 4.5.4:

- 1. A brief description of the status of the stock and fisheries affected by stock rebuilding measures at the time the rebuilding plan was prepared.*
- 2. The methods used to calculate stock rebuilding parameters, if substantially different from those described in Section 4.5.2.*
- 3. The estimate at the time the rebuilding plan was prepared of:
unfished biomass (B_0) and target biomass (B_{MSY});
the year the stock would be rebuilt in the absence of fishing (T_{MIN});
the year the stock would be rebuilt if the maximum time period permissible under National Standard Guidelines were applied (T_{MAX});
the year in which the stock would be rebuilt based on the application of stock rebuilding measures (T_{TARGET}).*
- 4. The management target the Council has chosen for this stock. The Council may choose the target year, an estimate of the probability of the stock achieving target biomass in the maximum permissible time period, or the harvest control rule (typically, the F used to calculate annual optimum yields) intended to rebuild the stock by the target year as its management target. Once the management target has been determined, estimates of the other two parameters made at the time of rebuilding plan formulation will be provided.*

It is likely that over time the parameters listed above will change. It must be emphasized that, with the exception of the parameter the Council chooses as its management target, the values enumerated in the FMP represent estimates at the time the rebuilding plan is prepared. Therefore, the FMP need not be amended if new estimates of these values are calculated. The values for these parameters found in the FMP are for reference, so that managers and the public may track changes in the strategy used to rebuild an overfished stock.

The Council may decide to respecify the management target. If a different parameter will be used, the FMP must be amended to correct the specification in Section 4.5.4. If the parameter value is to be changed, the new value will be published through notice and comment rulemaking as described in Section 6.2 of this FMP. For example, if the Council chose a probability of rebuilding within the maximum permissible time period of 80% as its management target, but subsequently decided to use the harvest control rule as its management target, the FMP would have to be amended. If the Council chose to respecify the probability as 70%, this new value would be promulgated through notice and comment rulemaking. In addition, any change in the estimate of the target rebuilding year that would affect the management strategy intended to achieve the target biomass would have to be published through notice and comment rulemaking.

The Team had many questions regarding the Council specifying T_{TARGET} . If the Council specifies T_{TARGET} , can the Council change T_{TARGET} through notice and comment rulemaking when a new stock assessment becomes available, or can it be done through management measure rulemaking process? The Team needs a legal opinion on whether the Council has to specify a T_{TARGET} and what ways the Council can change T_{TARGET} if a stock assessment changes our understanding of biomass.

Mr. DeVore presented the concept that Council staff and NWFSC staff have been considering. The idea is to model out the values of the various rebuilding parameters under various stock sizes and a changing fixed parameter. This sensitivity analysis is posed to better understand the fluctuation of rebuilding "policy" parameters (F , T_{TARGET} , and P_{MAX}) and rebuilding OYs when any one of these parameters is fixed. Dr. Hastie will work with Dr. Rick Methot on ways to illustrate the relationships between the rebuilding parameters and the implications of fixing various policy parameters.

The Team is encouraged to review the entire strawman text that Dr. Dahl has proposed for the FMP and get comments back to him soon.

Cumulative Impacts Analysis

Mr. DeVore asked the Team for feedback on discussions between Mr. Glock, Mr. Golden and Council staff on how to approach cumulative effects analyses in upcoming NEPA reports. The first issue focuses on how to model out scenarios under various rebuilding policies from slowest to fastest time scales. The difficult part of the exercise is determining what is a useful range of alternatives that provides meaningful analyses without creating undue modeling burdens. Dr. Hastie suggested starting with the bycatch model as it exists and projecting potential OYs under rebuilding projections for various overfished species with a fixed harvest rate until the stock is rebuilt. Once a stock is rebuilt, the stock productivity may be low enough that the stock remains a fishery constraint. This modeling exercise has two aspects, one where you consider the effects of the constraints of one overfished stock and another look at what fisheries may look like under the constraints of all overfished species. The analyses get more complicated as you include consideration of what is likely to happen to relatively healthy stocks as well. There are many tasks

between now and June so the sooner we can identify a reasonable range of cumulative impacts analyses, the better.

N. Standards for Recommending Exempted Fishing Permits

The Council has tasked the Team to develop strawman standards and criteria for recommending future EFPs. It has been suggested that the standards could be a part of the Council Operating Procedures rather than part of the FMP. This would allow for easier updates in the future. The timing of permit review and application of standards needs to be carefully aligned with establishing management measures to avoid a situation like 2002 where the Team was forced to set aside OY for EFPs that were only anticipated to be approved. This gets even harder if the Team had to guess which proposals are likely to meet standards. It would be valuable for the GMT to set a schedule for EFP permitting that would precede the management measures process. This implies a biennial EFP process under multi-year management. Another approach would be to set a certain percentage or tonnage for critical species that everyone was comfortable setting aside for experimental fishing. Approval of the EFPs could come later in the process as long as the impacts associated with them is within the set-aside poundage. One benefit of this method is that the Council could not only announce what sort of set-aside is available but they could also announce what sort of studies are a priority such as bycatch reduction devices. Critical for the standards are the EFP application content, a schedule of submission and approval, and the potential the experiment has for producing information with wide-ranging benefits to the fishery and the resource. Ms. Robinson will draft a set of standards which includes the checklist currently in use for GMT/NMFS review in time for Council review at the April meeting.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2003 - 8 A.M.

Members Present:

Mr. Tom Barnes, California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Brian Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dr. Jim Hastie, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center
Dr. Xi He, National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center
Mr. Rob Jones, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Mr. Steve Kupillas, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dr. Kevin Piner, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center
Ms. Becky Renko, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Ms. Michele Robinson, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Mark Saelens, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Dave Thomas, California Department of Fish and Game

Others Present:

Mr. Steve Bodnar, Coos Bay Trawlers Association
Mr. Mike Burner, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. John DeVore, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. Rod Moore, West Coast Seafood Processors Association, GAP
Dr. Hans Radtke, Chair, Pacific Fishery Management Council
Mr. Dan Waldeck, Council staff officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council

On Conference Call:

Ms. Yvonne de Reynier, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Region
Dr. Alec MacCall, National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center

O. STAR Panel Assignments

Please note that the dates and times of the panels are tentative.

GMT Assignments for 2003 STAR/STARLITE(*) Panels			
Whiting	March 24-27	Seattle, WA	Dr. Piner
POP/Widow	April 14-18	Seattle, WA	Mr. Saelens
Black/Bocaccio	April 21-25	Santa Cruz, CA	Mr. Thomas
Darkblotched/Cowcod/Yellowtail*	April 28-29	Portland or Seattle	Mr. Culver
Cabazon/Lingcod	Sept. 15-19	Seattle, WA	Dr. Hastie

P. Thresholds for Mid-Course Corrections to OYs During the Multi-Year Management Process

The Team was asked to recommend a methodology to react to survey results (or any new relevant information) in an off-year that is dramatically different from those previously considered to set OYs under multi-year management. The Team initially considered a percentage drop in biomass as a trigger for action but stock health is also dependent on the strength of individual age classes. However, survey results are highly variable and corrections should not be based on one survey alone. In addition to survey results changing, exceeding OYs in a given year could also be a reason for mid-course correction.

The Team proposed some modeling of future stock productivity to test the sensitivity of management measures or OYs to stock fluctuations but these efforts cannot begin until after this year's STAR panels. This issue needs to be more fully developed with input from the Science Centers and the SSC. Thresholds need to be established for adjustments for both decreasing and increasing stock sizes.

Table from the GMT Statement at the November, 2002 Council meeting:

Multi-year Management Timeline (Alternative 3, Amendment 17)							
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Survey	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Assessment		A		A-C*		A-E	
Management			A		A-C		A-E
Fishing				A	A	A-C	A-C

Mid-course assessments, like those in 'Year 4' in the above table, will be calculating an OY for the next two year period (Years 6 and 7) which is not directly comparable to the previously calculated

OY for the current two year period. The only directly comparable values following the mid-course assessment would be things like biomass estimates.

The Council intent for the schedule is that the GMT will work on this in February for SSC review during the March meeting, and for Council and GAP consideration at the April meeting. The GMT has the discretion to change the schedule if this time line cannot be met (the November, 2003 Council meeting is the start of the initial multi-year management process). Even a relatively simple trigger will likely take all year to development given the current workload. If the end result is a COP change and not an FMP amendment the administrative workload would be less. A COP could be administered as a mechanism for management, but a NEPA analysis will be required to assess the effects of the decision.

Dr. MacCall proposed a scenario where the threshold consideration is a product of the STAR panel. There would then need to be a formal public process to address what actions, if any, need to be taken. He proposed the following steps:

- 1) *Identify the potential issue, e.g., value of upcoming survey abundance (Note: this can only apply to statistics than are not subject to behavioral modification, so something like CPUE cannot be used.)*
- 2) *Give the anticipated expected value, based on the current stock assessment. This is status quo.*
- 3) *Identify range of alternative values, +100%, -50% etc.*
- 4) *Do simulated assessment using alternative values of the survey abundance.*
- 5) *Give resulting biomass estimates. Assume F_{MSY} is unchanged.*
- 6) *Give resulting ABC values B^*F_{MSY} .*
- 7) *Present to Council as an if-then action (could be based on ranges, or on a linear formula, for example), which will be pre-decided at the time the first OY is adopted, and will be adopted automatically when the actual number comes in.*

Do we need several thresholds, one for how a new assessment can change management, another for how catch deviations from expectations can change management? This is also a stock-specific situation. For some species for which we already do not attain OY, a large change in OY will not have any appreciable effect on management. Therefore, thresholds need to be considered on a case by case basis. If triggers or thresholds are set at too sensitive a level the process will slide back into annual management.

Stock assessment scientists would have a new task of looking forward to consider the likely range of future population trends. The GMT then would have a new task of considering what the management implications may be in response to the new stock assessment and these projections.

It is important to include in the NEPA document a range of possible threshold mechanisms and responses so that if a threshold is met, action needed to be taken can happen in an efficient manner. The threshold process should be kept fairly simple and automatic and should not require a huge workload given the other tasks ahead and the novelty of multi-year management. As the multi year program gets more institutionalized, a more complicated threshold and action process can evolve.

The GMT considered the possibility of exempting rebuilding species' OYs from mid-course correction. The only consideration would be if a rebuilding threshold is attained (B_{MSY}). However, if you do not develop thresholds for the species that are constraining fisheries, then the development of thresholds for other stocks has little use or value to management

Ms. Robinson reviewed the following threshold options for consideration:

- Only species not under rebuilding
- Any change (in either direction) that has significant effects- “case-by-case” basis
- Minimum change of 5-10% in OY (in either direction)
- Maximum change of 20% in OY (in either direction) as a cap on the amount of change allowed
- Include potential changes in NEPA documents when two one-year OYs are adopted for analytical purposes

A review of stock assessments over the last 10 years to estimate the variability in stock assessment results was proposed. It would be helpful to then see how often your mid-course corrections would have been made under various threshold policies. Dr. Hastie will work with staff at the NWFSC to determine the value of the work and to see what sort of resources are available for this exercise.

There could be need in the future, after initial review by the GMT and SSC, of holding a workshop with technical, industry and management people. The question of thresholds is more than a technical question and will have to be decided at a policy level as well.

Q. Cabezon Issues

The STAR panel is tentatively scheduled to review new assessments for cabezon and lingcod for the week of September 15th. This is intended to provide new stock information for setting the 2005-06 multi-year management cycle. However, if the result of the assessment shows an overfishing situation, it will be impossible to ignore those results for 2004 management. There are many nearshore implications. California is currently working to adopt cabezon OYs for 2004. State nearshore management will certainly take the new stock assessment into consideration for state-managed fisheries in 2004 but it is unclear if those actions would be sufficient from the federal perspective. The Council and NMFS may want to take more extensive action on a nearshore complex rather than only cabezon.

Oregon nearshore management caps are intended as a one year tool until stock assessment information is available. OFWC will be briefed at their July 11 meeting on the results of the black rockfish assessment and will address final nearshore measures for 2004 at the October 10th or November 7th meeting.

California is planning to ask the Council to defer taking federal action above and beyond state nearshore regulations for 2004. After the cabezon, lingcod, and black rockfish assessments are completed later in the year, the state will develop specific management measures that will serve as the basis for consideration of deferral by the Council. If state plans are deemed adequate to protect the nearshore species in the short term, then the Council would have the flexibility to defer action until the first set of biennial management measures for 2005-06 are adopted in June, 2004. At the April, 2002 Council meeting, California will request consideration of a protracted deferral process to begin at the June meeting. In May the CFGC will request state authority to go to notice to set regulations for 2004 and, in June, will submit proposed ranges for OYs and an initial statement of reason. Public comment to the CFGC will be open through late August after which CFGC will select a preferred alternative, taking into consideration the recently completed stock assessments and input from the Council. The Council then will be asked to decide on the deferral of nearshore

management, and CFGC will then adopt regulations for 2004 at its October or November meeting.

If the Council chooses a rollover option for the first four months in 2004 in June and the cabezon assessment is pessimistic, California will have potentially adequate regulations because the recreational fishery is currently closed through June and commercial opportunity is very limited. Oregon regulations defer to the federal regulations and the caps in place for 2003 are limited to one year without further modification.

The cabezon assessment may be stratified into California and Oregon/Washington populations.

NEPA documentation for 2004 needs to anticipate possible nearshore reductions prior to the fall of 2003. The Team will need to identify a range of OYs and or management measures at its May meeting. State representatives should bring some catch history information to the May meeting to help in the development of a range of alternatives that may encompass possible stock assessment results. Data should include the years 1994-2002 and be stratified by two month periods if it is to be useful for management measure alternatives. If data is only provided with an annual stratification, then alternatives may only be able to consider ranging annual harvest levels. The Team will focus on development of a nearshore trip limit mechanism for the 2004 annual specifications.

R. Annual Workload Planning

Recommending management measures for the 2004 and 2005-06 cycles will entail a large workload for the Team between now and September. The Team will be more informed at the July meeting as to rollover implications and stock assessments will be finished with the exception of cabezon and lingcod. September will be smoother if the Team does a good job on the NEPA analysis. The Team will need to do a detailed scorecard exercise for all alternatives, not just the preferred alternative. The earlier Team members can provide data along these lines the better. We will need catch accounting and bycatch accounting for any exemption to RCAs. Updates on state observed fisheries, research on excluders, and any available data relevant to the effectiveness of depth-based management are also requested. Council staff will develop a list of data needs by the May meeting when we have a better picture of future NEPA needs given new stock assessment results.

Other tasks identified:

- Council staff requests any bycatch data from state-observed fisheries including Washington charter halibut data, shrimp fishery bycatch, and an evaluation of excluder devices.
- Mr. Saelens, Mr. Culver, Mr. Thomas, and Dr. Hastie will work together as a GMT PacFIN sub-committee to get a list of new data categories to Mr. Dasplit by the end of February.
- Dr. Hastie will work with the NWFSC and SSC to refine the trawl bycatch model in time for consideration of inseason adjustments at the April Council meeting.
- State representatives will bring cabezon catch history information to the May meeting to help in the development of a range of alternatives that may encompass possible stock assessment results.
- A review of stock assessments over the last 10 years to estimate the variability in stock assessment results was proposed. It would be helpful to see how often mid-course corrections would have been made under various threshold policies. Dr. Hastie will work

with staff at the NWFSC to determine the value of the work and to see what sort of resources are available for this exercise.

- Ms. Renko will draft a GMT statement on VMS including language from the November statement on the use of VMS data in fishery management.
- Ms. Renko agreed to contact the EC on behalf of the GMT concerning commercial gear regulations prior to the April Council meeting.
- Mr. Seger distributed a data request in a table format for the state representatives to fill out and return that will help with cumulative effects analyses for rebuilding plans and the GF PEIS.
- Ms. Robinson will draft a set of standards which includes the checklist currently in use for GMT review of proposed EFPs in time for Council review at the April meeting.
- Mr. Saelens agreed to temporarily function as the GMT liaison on PacFIN and RecFIN data coordination and will work with Dr. Piner to draft a GMT letter to PSMFC on the subject.
- SAFE Document deadline for camera ready version is March 7. See the SAFE document agenda item for specific assignments.
- Dr. Hastie will work with Dr. Rick Methot on ways to illustrate the relationships between rebuilding parameters and the implications of fixing various policy parameters and the Team is encouraged to review the strawman text that Dr. Dahl has proposed for Amendment 16 to the FMP and get comments back to him soon.
- The Team was requested to consider what fisheries may look like under 'zero mortality' alternatives for rebuilding plan and management measure NEPA analyses.
- State representatives will look into the specific language of proposed or existing regulations on party fishing and keep NMFS and the Team informed of upcoming decision points.

Future meetings

May 5-9, Santa Cruz.

July 14-18, Portland (moved to a week earlier than the tentative schedule developed late last year).

Conference call likely between July 28 and August 6.

October 14-17, Seattle.

ADJOURN

PFMC

03/19/2003

PROPOSED AGENDA
Groundfish Advisory Subpanel

Red Lion Hotel Vancouver at the Quay
West River 1 Room
100 Columbia Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
(360) 694-8341
April 6-11, 2003

SUNDAY, APRIL 6, 2003 - 12:30 P.M.

A. Call to Order

Rod Moore, Chair

1. Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, Approve Agenda, etc.
2. Elect Chair and Vice Chair
3. Agenda Overview
(12:30 P.M. - 1 hour)

E. Groundfish Management

6. Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) Enforcement Consultants
(1:30 P.M. - 1.5 hrs. No report due to the Council)

5. Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment 16 -
Rebuilding Plans M. Harrington/K. Dahl/J. DeVore
(3 P.M. - 2 hrs. Report due to the Council on Wednesday)

NOTE: This agenda will be covered in the West River 1 Room with the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) and any interested public. This briefing will also serve as a public scoping session for rebuilding plans as noticed in the *Federal Register*.

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2003 - 8 A.M.

E. Groundfish Management (continued)

7. Standards and Criteria for Approving Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs) Michele Robinson
(8 A.M. - 30 min. Report due to the Council on Thursday)

4. Review of The Process for Setting 2004 Groundfish Specifications John DeVore
(8:30 A.M. - 15 min. Report due to the Council on Wednesday)

Update on the 2003 STAR process John DeVore
(8:45 A.M. - 15 min. No report due to the Council)

2. Report on the Bycatch Workshop and Observer Data Update M. Dalton/E. Clarke/J. Hastie
(9 A.M. - 1.5 hrs. Report due to the Council on Wednesday)

NOTE: This will be a joint presentation to the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP), GMT, and Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) in the West River 1 Room.

3. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Consideration of Inseason Adjustments GMT/GAP
(11 A.M. - 1 hr. Deliberations with the GMT. Report due the Council on Wednesday)

F. Pacific Halibut Management

1. Adopt Final 2003 Incidental Catch Regulations for the Salmon Troll and Michele Robinson
Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries
(1 P.M. - 15 min. Report due to the Council on Thursday)

E. Groundfish Management (continued)

Buyback Presentation Bill Robinson
(1:30 P.M. - 30 min. No report due to the Council)

NOTE: The GMT and Legislative Committee will join the GAP for this presentation.

9. Status of the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Environmental Impact Statement Steve Capps
(2 P.M. - 1 hr. Report due to the Council on Friday)

NOTE: This will be a joint presentation to the GAP, GMT, Habitat Committee, and SSC in the West River
1 Room.

3. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Consideration of Inseason
Adjustments (continued) GMT/GAP
(3 P.M. - 2 hrs. Deliberations with the GMT)

TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2003 - 8 A.M.

D. Habitat Issues

1. Essential Fish Habitat Issues Jennifer Gilden
(8 A.M. - 30 min. Report due to the Council on Tuesday)

B. Administrative Matters

2. Planning Session on Enhancing Communication with Fishing Communities Jennifer Gilden
(8:30 A.M. - 30 min. Report due to the Council on Friday)

E. Groundfish Management (continued)

Programmatic Fishery Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement Jim Glock
(9 A.M. - 1 hr. No report due to the Council)

3. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Consideration of Inseason
Adjustments (continued) GMT/GAP
(10 A.M. Deliberations with the GMT)

ADJOURN

PFMC
03/25/03

PROPOSED AGENDA
Salmon Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion Hotel Vancouver at the Quay
East River I Room
100 Columbia Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
(360) 694-8341
April 7-11, 2003

Of Special Note

- The April Council meeting has a salmon management agenda which begins at about **9 a.m. on Tuesday** with a report from NMFS, identification of overfished stocks, establishment of a model evaluation work group, and methodology reviews. Tentative adoption of the salmon management recommendations is scheduled for Tuesday late morning or early afternoon, with final adoption of season recommendations late Thursday afternoon.
- The salmon agenda of the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) will occur on Monday starting with overfishing concerns discussed at 10:30 a.m. (West River II Room).
- The Council has an agendum on enhancing communication with fishing communities scheduled for Friday morning.

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2003 - 8 A.M.^{1/}

D. Call to Order

Don Stevens

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

Priority Agenda Items for Monday are C.4 and C.5

C. Salmon Management

5. Tentative and Final Adoption of 2003 Ocean Salmon Management Measures (Council agenda C.5 on Tuesday at 11 a.m.; C.6 on Wednesday, mid morning and on an as-needed basis; and C.7 on Thursday afternoon)

The Salmon Technical Team (STT) will join the meeting at about 8:30 a.m. Monday and respond to technical questions regarding the 2003 fishery options as presented in *Preseason Report II Analysis of Proposed Regulatory Options for 2003 Ocean Salmon Fisheries*.

The SAS should have its preliminary management measures completed in time to allow editing, collation, and copying in the Council Secretariat. We would like your final input no later than 9 a.m., Tuesday morning. Please work with the Council staff to coordinate your efforts and forms.

1. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Report on Salmon Management (Council agenda C.1, Tuesday morning)

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 management measures on Thursday.

NMFS may take this opportunity to update the Council on development of management objectives for Puget Sound chinook.

4. Methodology Review Process for 2003 (Council agenda C.4, Tuesday morning)

The SSC will report to the Council on the need and scheduling of methodology reviews. The SAS may wish to make recommendations to both the SSC and Council on reviews or revisions which should be initiated. The SSC will cover this issue at its meeting on Monday early afternoon (West River II Room).

2. Identification of Stocks Not Meeting Escapement Goals for Three Consecutive Years (Council agenda C.2, Tuesday morning)

The STT will update spawning escapements from the *Review of 2002 Ocean Salmon Fisheries and Preseason Report I*, and identify any stocks not meeting conservation objectives for three consecutive years. Those stocks must be reviewed under the Council's process to prevent overfishing. The STT chair is scheduled to discuss this issue with the SSC on Monday morning at 10:30 a.m.

3. Establish Salmon Model Documentation and Evaluation Process (Council agenda C.3, Tuesday morning)

The Council will hear a report on the formation of the Model Evaluation Work Group, including proposed composition and leadership, and interface with the Council's existing Salmon Methodology Review process.

The SSC will discuss this issue late morning or early afternoon Monday. The SAS may want to have someone sit in on that discussion.

D. Habitat Issues

1. Essential Fish Habitat Issues (Council agenda D.1, Tuesday afternoon)

The Habitat Committee (HC) 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 HC or directly to the Council during the habitat agenda.

F. Pacific Halibut Management

1. Adopt Final 2003 Incidental Catch Regulations for the Salmon Troll and Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries (Council agenda F.1, Thursday late afternoon)

The SAS will need to recommend landing restrictions for the troll salmon options to allow utilization of the incidental halibut harvest without undue risk of exceeding the halibut quota. The SAS will also need to comment on a proposal to avoid the "C-shaped" yelloweye rockfish conservation area in Washington Marine Area 3.

B. Administrative Matters

2. Planning Session on Enhancing Communication with Fishing Communities (Council agenda B.2, Friday Morning)

The Executive Summary of a report on the study "An Investment in Trust" is included in your briefing materials. The report provides context, outlines some of the challenges to communication in fisheries management, describes methods currently used to communicate, and offers suggestions on how to improve communication. Ms. Jennifer Gilden, Council staff Information Communications Staff Officer, will brief the SAS on the report Wednesday morning.

The SAS Chair has a copy of the complete report if you are interested in more detail. The SAS may wish to provide the Council with comments or suggestions for improving communication with fishing communities.

ADJOURN

PFMC
03/26/03

PROPOSED AGENDA
Salmon Technical Team

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion Hotel Vancouver at the Quay
East River II Room
100 Columbia Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
(360) 694-8341
April 7-11, 2003

Of Special Note

- The April Council meeting has a salmon management agenda which begins at about **9 a.m. on Tuesday** with a report from NMFS. Tentative adoption of the salmon management recommendations is scheduled for Tuesday late morning or early afternoon, with final adoption of season recommendations late Thursday afternoon.
- The salmon agenda of the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) will occur on Monday starting with overfishing concerns discussed at 10:30 a.m. (West River II Room).
- STT members, especially State representatives, should attend the SAS meeting at 8:30 a.m. on Monday to answer any questions about option impacts.

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2003 - 8 A.M.

D. 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 analysis of the Council's tentative and final fishery management options and respond to 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.

C. Salmon Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Report on Salmon Management (Council agenda C.1, Tuesday morning)

NMFS may take this opportunity to update the Council on development of management objectives for Puget Sound chinook.

2. Identification of Stocks Not Meeting Escapement Goals for Three Consecutive Years (Council agenda C.2, Tuesday morning)

The STT will update spawning escapements from the *Review of 2002 Ocean Salmon Fisheries and Preseason Report I*, and identify any stocks not meeting conservation objectives for three consecutive years. Those stocks must be reviewed under the Council's process to prevent overfishing. The STT chair is scheduled to discuss this issue with the SSC on Monday morning at 10:30 a.m. (West River II Room).

3. Establish Salmon Model Documentation and Evaluation Process (Council agenda C.3, Tuesday morning)

The Council will hear a report on the formation of the Model Evaluation Work Group, including proposed composition and leadership and interface with the Council's existing Salmon Methodology Review process.

The SSC will discuss this issue late morning or early afternoon Monday. The STT may want to have someone sit in on that discussion.

4. Methodology Review Process for 2003 (Council agenda C.4, Tuesday morning)

The SSC will report to the Council on the need and scheduling of methodology reviews. The STT will make recommendations to both the SSC and Council on reviews or revisions which should be initiated. The STT chair and state representatives are scheduled to discuss this issue with the SSC on Monday morning.

5. Tentative and Final Adoption of 2003 Ocean Salmon Management Measures (Council agenda C.5 on Tuesday at 11 a.m.; C.6 on Wednesday, mid morning and on an as-needed basis; and C.7 on Thursday afternoon)

Scheduling will be tight, but STT members should make themselves available to meet briefly with the SAS on Monday morning at 8:30 a.m. to answer any questions about option impacts. The Council's tentative management measures should be ready for analysis by the STT as early as Wednesday morning.

ADJOURN

PFCM
03/26/03

PROPOSED AGENDA
Scientific and Statistical Committee

Red Lion Hotel Vancouver at the Quay
West River II Room
100 Columbia Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
(360) 694-8341
April 7-8, 2003

Please note there will be two joint meetings. The first will be 9 A.M. on Monday with the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) and Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) for presentations about the Bycatch Workshop and Observer Program. The second will be 2 P.M. on Monday with the GMT, GAP, and Habitat Committee (HC) for a presentation about the Essential Fish Habitat Environmental Impact Statement.

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2003 - 8 A.M.

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

1. Report of the Executive Director
2. Approve Agenda

Don McIsaac

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

E. Groundfish Management

2. Report on the Bycatch Workshop and Observer Data Update – Joint meeting with GMT and GAP (9 A.M., 1.5 hours; Dalton, Dorn)

C. Salmon Management

2. Identification of Stocks Not Meeting Escapement Goals for Three Consecutive Years (10:30 A.M., .5 hours; Byrne, Zhou) *Report due to Council – Tuesday morning*
3. Establish Salmon Model Documentation and Evaluation Process (11 A.M., 1 hour; Lawson, Byrne) *Report due to Council – Tuesday morning*

Dell Simmons

LUNCH

C. Salmon Management, continued

- 4. Methodology Review Process for 2003
(1 P.M., 1 hour; Conrad, Hill) *Report due to Council – Tuesday*

Pete Lawson

E. Groundfish Management, continued

- 9. Status of the Groundfish EFH Environmental Impact Statement – Joint presentation with the HC, GMT, and GAP
(2 P.M., 1 hour; Ralston, Lai) *Report due to Council – Friday*
- 2. Bycatch Workshop Report and Observer Data Update
(3 P.M., 1 hour; Dalton, Dorn)

A. SSC Administrative Matters, continued

- 4. Review 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, APRIL 8, 2003 - 8 A.M.

A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)

- 5. Review Statements
(8 A.M., 1 hour)

E. Groundfish Management, continued

- 5. Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment 16 - Rebuilding Plans
(9 A.M., 2 hours; Punt, Conser)
- 7. Standards and Criteria for Approving Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs)
(11 A.M., 1 hour; Dorn, Ralston)

LUNCH

A. Administrative, continued

- 6. National Fisheries Conservation Center Presentation
(1 P.M., 1 hour; Ralston, Lawson)
- 7. Review Statements
(2 P.M., 1 hour)

Brock Bernstein

G. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

- 2. Approve Final Regulatory Amendment and Analysis for Changes to the Sardine Allocation
(3 P.M., .5 hours; Hill, Punt) *Report due to Council – Thursday*

Sam Herrick

3. CPS Stock Assessment Terms of Reference
(3:30 P.M., .5 hours; Conser, Dalton) *Report due to Council – Thursday*

A. SSC Administrative Matters, (continued)

8. Review and Finalize Statements
(4 P.M.)

ADJOURN

PFMC
03/26/03

**PROPOSED AGENDA
Habitat Committee**

Red Lion Hotel Vancouver at the Quay
After Deck Room
100 Columbia Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
(360) 694-8341
April 7, 2003

Note: Agenda numbering reflects the Council agenda. Council agenda items for Habitat Committee (HC) comment are bolded. Times are approximate.

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2003 - 10 A.M.

A. Call to Order and HC Administrative Matters

1. Introductions and Approval of Agenda HC
2. Review of Council Actions/Directions Jennifer Gilden

D. Habitat Issues

1. Klamath/Trinity Flows Update and Letter Michael Rode/Mike Orcutt
2. U.S. Geological Survey Report on Value of Klamath fisheries Michael Rode
3. Battle Creek and American River Fish Kills HC
4. Portland Harbor Superfund Site Update Paul Engelmeyer
5. Hanford Reach Ramping/Stranding Issues Tim Roth

Lunch Break (12 P.M. - 1 P.M.)

E. Groundfish Management

1. Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Update Jim Glock

B. Administrative Matters

2. Planning Session on Enhancing Communication with Fishing Communities Jennifer Gilden

E. Groundfish Management (Joint meeting with Groundfish Advisory Subpanel) (2 P.M. - 3 P.M.)

9. Status of the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat EIS Steve Copps
 - Habitat Mapping Update Waldo Wakefield
 - Gear Descriptions Update Fran Recht

C. Habitat Issues (continued) (3 P.M.)

6. Columbia Basin Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Relicensing: Stuart Ellis
 - Priest Rapids and Wanapum Dams
 - Hells Canyon Complex
7. FERC Relicensing Rulemaking Comments Stuart Ellis

8. Marine Reserves: Jennifer Gilden
- Richard Parrish Report Review
 - Planning for Federal Waters Portion of Channel Islands
 - National Fisheries Conservation Center Proposal Review

9. HC member briefings HC

A. HC Administrative Matters (continued)

3. June 2003 Meeting Agenda HC
4. Finalize Statements: HC
- D.1.b Habitat Report (Tuesday afternoon)
 - E.9.c Groundfish EFH EIS (Friday)
 - B.2.c Communications (Friday)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

ADJOURN

PFMC
03/25/03

PROPOSED AGENDA
Legislative Committee
Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion Hotel Vancouver at the Quay
Quay Side Room
100 Columbia Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
(360) 694-8341
April 7, 2003

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2003 - 1:30 P.M.

A. *Call to Order*

Bob Alverson

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda

B. *NMFS Report on Implementation of West Coast Groundfish Buyback Program*

C. *Discussion of Legislative Matters*

D. *Other Business*

E. *Public Comment*

F. *Develop Report to Council*

ADJOURN

PFMC
03/20/03

PROPOSED AGENDA
Enforcement Consultants

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion Hotel Vancouver at the Quay
Quay Side Room
100 Columbia Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
(360) 694-8341
April 8-11, 2003

TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2003 - 5:30 P.M. (or Immediately Following the Tuesday Council Session)

A. Call to Order

Mike Cenci

1. Introductions
2. Review of Agenda

B. Council Agenda Items for Possible Comment

- B. Administrative Matters
 1. Annual U.S. Coast Guard Report
- C. Salmon Management
 6. Clarify Council Direction on 2003 Management Measures (If Necessary)
 7. Final Action on 2003 Salmon Management Measures
- E. Groundfish Management
 3. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Consideration of Inseason Adjustments
 4. Review of the Process for Setting 2004 Groundfish Specifications
 6. Vessel Monitoring System (VMS)
 7. Standards and Criteria for Approving Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs)
- F. Pacific Halibut Management
 1. Adopt Final 2003 Incidental Catch Regulations for the Salmon Troll and Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries
- G. Coastal Pelagic Species Management
 2. Approve Final Regulatory Amendment and Analysis for Changes to the Sardine Allocation

Other issues on the Council agenda may be addressed if concerns with enforcement implications arise during the week.

C. Schedule for Enforcement Action Briefing/Presentations for Future Council Meetings

D. Public Comment

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2003 THROUGH FRIDAY APRIL 11, 2003 (As Necessary)

ADJOURN

PFMC
03/26/03

PROPOSED AGENDA
Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion Hotel Vancouver at the Quay
West River II Room
100 Columbia Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
(360) 694-8341
April 9, 2003

This is a public meeting, and time for public comment will be provided at the discretion of the Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel (CPSAS) Chair. Generally, a public comment period will be provided just prior to the end of each day. Please note, this is not a public hearing, it is a work session devoted to reviewing analysis of sardine allocation alternatives, which will be considered by the Council at the April 2003 Council meeting.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2003 - 8 A.M.

A. Call to Order

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda

B. Review CPS Fishery Landings

1. NMFS Report
2. State Reports

C. Review Analyses of Sardine Allocation Alternatives

Sam Herrick

1. Review Exhibit G.2.b, CPSMT Report – *Discussion and Analysis of Management Alternatives for an Interim Revision to the Pacific Sardine Allocation Framework within the Coastal Pelagic Species Fishery Management Plan*

D. Review Preliminary Terms of Reference for a CPS Stock Assessment Review Process

E. Enhancing Communication with Fishing Communities

Jennifer Gilden

F. Other Business

G. Develop CPSAS Reports to the Council

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2003 - 8 A.M.

Continue as Necessary

ADJOURN

PFMC
03/25/03

PROPOSED AGENDA
Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion Hotel Vancouver at the Quay
After Deck Room
100 Columbia Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
(360) 694-8341
April 9, 2003

This is a public meeting, and time for public comment will be provided at the discretion of the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) Chair. Generally, a public comment period will be provided just prior to the end of each day. Please note, this is not a public hearing, it is a work session devoted to reviewing analysis of sardine allocation alternatives, which will be considered by the Council at the April 2003 Council meeting.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2003 - 8 A.M.

A. Call to Order

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda

B. Review CPS Fishery Landings

1. NMFS Report
2. State Reports

C. Review Analyses of Sardine Allocation Alternatives

Sam Herrick

1. Review Exhibit G.2.b, CPSMT Report – *Discussion and Analysis of Management Alternatives for an Interim Revision to the Pacific Sardine Allocation Framework within the Coastal Pelagic Species Fishery Management Plan*

D. Review Preliminary Terms of Reference for a CPS Stock Assessment Review Process

E. Develop CPSMT Reports to the Council

F. Other Business

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2003 - 8 A.M.

Continue as Necessary

ADJOURN

PFMC
03/25/03