

PROPOSED AGENDA

Groundfish Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Crowne Plaza Hotel
Marco Polo Room
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 15 - 20, 2003

SUNDAY, JUNE 15, 2003 - 1 P.M.

**NOTE: The GAP will convene in the Alexandria II on Sunday only.
After Sunday the GAP will meet in the Marco Polo Room.**

A. Call to Order

(1 P.M.)

Rod Moore, Chair

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

John DeVore

B. Groundfish Management

2. Observer Data Implementation Status
(1:30 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Tuesday)

Jim Hastie

4. Preliminary Range of Harvest Levels for 2004
(2:30 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Tuesday)

John DeVore

6. Standards and Criteria for Approving Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs)
(4 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Wednesday)

John DeVore

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 2003 - 8 A.M.

B. Groundfish Management (continued)

3. Stock Assessments and Rebuilding Analyses for 2004 Groundfish Management
(8:30 A.M.)

**NOTE: This will be a joint presentation to the GAP, GMT, SSC, HC, Council members and the
general public in the Marco Polo Room.**

3. Stock Assessments and Rebuilding Analyses for
2004 Groundfish Management (continued)
(1 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Tuesday)

GAP deliberations

4. Preliminary Range of Harvest Levels for 2004 (continued)
(2:30 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Tuesday)

GAP deliberations

5. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Initial Policy Consideration of Inseason Adjustments
(3:30 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Tuesday) GMT

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 2003 - 8 A.M.

Review Draft Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Statements

B. Groundfish Management (continued)

13. Final Adoption of FMP Amendment 16-1 and Amendment 16-2
(8:30 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Thursday) John DeVore
7. EFP Update and New Proposals for 2004
(9:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Wednesday) State GMT Representatives
9. Implementation of a Vessel Monitoring System
(10:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Wednesday) Becky Renko
10. Groundfish Stock Assessment Review Process for 2005 through 2006
(11:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Thursday)

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2003 - 8 A.M.

Review Draft Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Statements, Complete Unfinished Agenda Items

B. Groundfish Management (continued)

8. Final Action on Groundfish Inseason Management
(8:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Wednesday) GMT
11. Status of the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
(10:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Thursday) Steve Copps

<p>NOTE: This will be a joint presentation to the GAP, GMT, and the general public in the Marco Polo Room.</p>

12. Update on Groundfish FMP Programmatic EIS
(1 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Thursday) Jim Glock

G. Marine Reserves

1. Planning for Federal Waters Portion of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS)
(2 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Thursday) Sean Hastings
2. Central California Sanctuary Processes Including Krill Ban
(Report due to the Council on Thursday)

B. Groundfish Management (continued)

14. Adoption of a Proposed Range of 2004 Groundfish Management Measures
(3 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Friday)

GMT

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 2003 - 8 A.M.

Review Draft Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Statements, Complete Unfinished Agenda Items

B. Groundfish Management (continued)

15. Alternative Long-term Groundfish Management Strategies
(8:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Friday)

14. Adoption of a Proposed Range of 2004 Groundfish Management Measures
(9 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Friday)

GMT

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/03/03

PROPOSED AGENDA

Groundfish Management Team

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Crowne Plaza Hotel
Drake I Room
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 15 - 20, 2003

SUNDAY, JUNE 15, 2003 - 1 P.M.

**NOTE: The GMT will convene in the Alexandria I on Sunday only.
After Sunday the GMT will meet in the Drake I Room.**

A. Call to Order
(1 P.M.)

Michele Robinson, Chair

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

Mike Burner

B. Groundfish Management

6. Standards and Criteria for Approving Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs)
(1:30 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Wednesday)
2. Observer Data Implementation Status
(2 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Tuesday)
5. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Initial Policy Consideration
of Inseason Adjustments
(2:30 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Tuesday)

Michele Robinson

J. Hastie

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 2003 - 8 A.M.

B. Groundfish Management (continued)

3. Stock Assessments and Rebuilding Analyses for 2004 Groundfish Management
(8:30 A.M.)

**NOTE: This will be a joint presentation to the GAP, GMT, SSC, HC, Council members, and the
general public in the Marco Polo Room.**

3. Stock Assessments and Rebuilding Analyses for
2004 Groundfish Management (continued)
(1 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Tuesday)

GMT deliberations

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 4. Preliminary Range of Harvest Levels for 2004 (continued)
(2:30 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Tuesday) | GMT deliberations |
| 5. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Initial Policy Consideration
of Inseason Adjustments
(3:30 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Tuesday) | GMT/GAP |

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 2003 - 8 A.M.

Review Draft Groundfish Management Team Statements

B. Groundfish Management (continued)

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 13. Final Adoption of FMP Amendment 16-1 and Amendment 16-2
(8:30 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Thursday) | John DeVore |
| 7. EFP Update and New Proposals for 2004
(9:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Wednesday) | State GMT Representatives |
| 9. Implementation of a Vessel Monitoring System
(10:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Wednesday) | Becky Renko |
| 10. Groundfish Stock Assessment Review Process for 2005 through 2006
(11:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Thursday) | |

<p>NOTE: These discussions will occur in the Marco Polo Room with the GAP and GMT.</p>

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2003 - 8 A.M.

Review Draft Groundfish Management Team Statements, Complete Unfinished Agenda Items

B. Groundfish Management (continued)

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 8. Final Action on Groundfish Inseason Management
(8:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Wednesday) | GMT |
| 11. Status of the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Environmental
Impact Statement (EIS)
(10:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Thursday) | Steve Copps |

<p>NOTE: This will be a joint presentation to the GAP, GMT, and the general public in the Marco Polo Room.</p>

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 12. Update on Groundfish FMP Programmatic EIS
(1 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Thursday) | Jim Glock |
|--|-----------|

G. Marine Reserves

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Planning for Federal Waters Portion of the Channel Islands National
Marine Sanctuary (CINMS)
(2 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Thursday) | Sean Hastings |
|---|---------------|

2. Central California Sanctuary Processes Including Krill Ban
(*Report due to the Council on Thursday*)

B. Groundfish Management (continued)

14. Adoption of a Proposed Range of 2004 Groundfish Management Measures
(*3 P.M.; Report due to the Council on Friday*)
- GMT

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 2003 - 8 A.M.

Review Draft Groundfish Management Team Statements, Complete Unfinished Agenda Items

15. Alternative Long-term Groundfish Management Strategies
(*8:30 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Friday*)

14. Adoption of a Proposed Range of 2004 Groundfish Management Measures
(*9 A.M.; Report due to the Council on Friday*)
- GMT/GAP

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/03/03

PROPOSED AGENDA Scientific and Statistical Committee

Crowne Plaza Hotel
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 16 - 17, 2003

Please note there will be a joint meeting at 8:30 A.M. on Monday with the Groundfish Management Team (GMT), Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP), and others for presentations about stock assessments, rebuilding analyses, and the observer program.

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 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

Closed Session

4. Nominations for SSC

5. Nominations for Salmon Model Evaluation Workgroup (MEW)

SSC Salmon Subcommittee

Open Session

B. Groundfish Management

Joint meeting – 8:30 A.M. to 12 P.M., meeting with GAP, GMT, and others for review and discussion of new stock assessments and rebuilding analyses, and update from Northwest Fisheries Science Center on Observer Program. See separate agenda for details

Tom Jagielo/Steve Ralston

LUNCH

B. Groundfish Management, continued

2. Observer Data Implementation Status
(1 P.M., .5 hours; Lai, Francis) – Report due to Council Tuesday morning.

B. Groundfish Management, continued

3. Stock Assessments and Rebuilding Analyses for 2004 Groundfish Management
(1:30 P.M., 2 hours; Conser, Dalton) – *Report due to Council – Tuesday afternoon.*
4. Preliminary Range of Harvest Levels for 2004
(3:30 P.M., 1.5 hours; Dorn, Ralston) – *Report due to Council – Tuesday afternoon.*

GMT

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
4 P.M.

DINNER

A. SSC Administrative Matters, continued

6. Review Statements – B.2, B.3, B.4; if necessary.

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 2003 - 8 A.M.

A. SSC Administrative Matters, continued

7. Review Statements
(8 A.M., 1 hour)

E. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

2. Pacific Mackerel Harvest Guideline for 2003 through 2004
(9 A.M., 1 hour; Zhou, Punt) – *Report due to Council – Wednesday morning.*

Kevin Hill

F. Highly Migratory Species Management

2. Potential Modification of Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Preferred Alternative
for High Seas Longline Fishing in Response to Sea Turtle Impact Analysis
(10 A.M., 1 hour; Thomson, Byrne) – *Report due to Council – Wednesday morning.*

Kevin Hill

G. Marine Reserves

1. Planning for Federal Waters Portion of the Channel Islands National
Marine Sanctuary
(11 A.M., 1 hour; Hill, Lawson) – *Potential Report to Council – Thursday morning.*

Sean Hastings

LUNCH

B. Groundfish Management, continued

10. Groundfish Stock Assessment Review Process for 2005 through 2006

Elizabeth Clarke

(1 P.M., 1 hour; Ralston, Conser) – *Report due to Council – Thursday morning.*

11. Status of the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Steve Copps

(2 P.M., 1 hour; Francis, Lai) – *Report due to Council – Thursday afternoon.*

B. Groundfish Management, continued

13. Final Adoption of Amendment 16-1 and Amendment 16-2

Kit Dahl/John DeVore

(3 P.M., 1 hour; Punt, Dorn) – *Potential Report to Council – Thursday afternoon.*

A. SSC Administrative Matters, continued

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

ADJOURN

PFMC
05/29/03

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES Scientific and Statistical Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion Hotel Sacramento
Sierra B Room
1401 Arden Way
Sacramento, CA 95815
(916) 922-8041
March 10-11, 2003

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. Dr. Donald McIsaac briefed the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) on priority agenda items.

Mr. Jagielo noted concern about the need to ensure information for SSC review is received in advance. He noted that, given the demands on the SSC, limited amount of time for SSC meetings, and other demands on SSC member time, it is critical that materials are complete and provided in advance. These sentiments were affirmed by the SSC. Dr. McIsaac and Dr. Radtke acknowledged the SSC concerns and emphasized Council staff would endeavor to ensure materials would be provided to the SSC in advance.

Members in Attendance

Mr. Alan Byrne, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Nampa, ID
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. Martin Dorn, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
Dr. Robert Francis, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
Dr. Kevin Hill, California Department of Fish and Game, La Jolla, CA
Mr. Tom Jagielo, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA
Dr. Han-Lin Lai, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
Dr. Peter Lawson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Newport, OR
Dr. Stephen Ralston, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA
Dr. André Punt, University of Washington, 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

None.

Scientific and Statistical Committee Comments to the Council

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

A. Administrative Matters

Open Discussion

The SSC discussed the need to formalize procedures for ensuring materials are submitted to the SSC are complete and in advance of SSC meetings. This discussion and subsequent recommendations are encapsulated in the following report to the Council.

H.2. SSC Report on Planning Session on Improving Council Meeting Efficiency

The SSC requests the Council consider incorporating the following into its Council Operating Procedures:

The SSC requires good documentation and ample review time in order to provide the best possible advice to the Council. Agencies and review document authors should be responsible for ensuring materials submitted to the SSC are technically sound, comprehensive, clearly documented, and identified by author. If there is any uncertainty on the part of authors regarding SSC expectations, authors should clarify assignments and expectations of deliverables with the meeting Chair. In order that there be adequate time for careful review, documents and materials destined for review by the SSC or any of its subcommittees must be received at the Council office at least two weeks prior to the meeting at which they will be discussed and reviewed. The Council will then provide copies to appropriate SSC members at least five working days prior to the meeting. If this deadline cannot be met, it is the responsibility of the author to contact the meeting Chair prior to the two-week deadline, so appropriate arrangements, rescheduling, and cancellations can be made in a timely and cost-effective manner. This deadline applies to all official SSC activities and meetings.

Subcommittee Assignments

Subcommittee assignments from 2002 were reviewed. Other than deleting reference to Dr. Brian Allee, who resigned from the SSC effective January 2003, no changes were made.

Elect Chair and Vice Chair

For 2003 through March 2004, Mr. Jagielo and Dr. Hill were reconfirmed as SSC chair and vice chair, respectively.

Review Nominations for Groundfish Management Team Positions

Nominations to the Groundfish Management Team were reviewed. SSC recommendations were provided to the Council during the Council's closed session.

Review Nominations for Vacant SSC At-Large Position

No nominations were received for the vacant position. The Council is targeting social scientists to fill the position as per Council Operating Procedures.

B. Salmon Management

2. Final SSC Methodology Review Recommendations on the Chinook and Coho Fishery Regulation and Assessment Models (FRAM) for 2003 Salmon Management

Mr. Jim Packer and Mr. Larry LaVoy from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) presented a report to a joint meeting of the SSC Salmon Subcommittee and the Salmon Technical Team (STT) on proposed changes to the chinook and coho FRAM. This meeting was held on February 5, 2003 in Portland, Oregon. Major changes to the chinook FRAM were initially reviewed in November 2002. The purpose of the February meeting was to receive an update on tasks that were incomplete as of November and to review a proposed base period change to split the terminal time step of the coho FRAM.

Chinook

Terminal Area Management Modules (TAMMs) needed to be changed to accept marked and unmarked stock components. These changes have been completed. Additional material presented at this meeting supported the results reviewed in November which indicated the modified chinook FRAM is capable of duplicating the results of the previous version of the model in the absence of mark-selective fisheries. Therefore, the modified FRAM can be used to assess impacts if mark-selective fisheries are not under consideration.

At the joint meeting, the group was presented an example using chinook FRAM to evaluate the impacts of a mark-selective sport fishery in Washington Marine Areas 5 and 6 (Strait of Juan de Fuca) during July, August, and September. This example compared exploitation rates by stock projected by chinook FRAM for the final 2002 model run to those using chinook FRAM in selective fishery mode with the mark-selective fishery described above implemented. Modeled effects were in the expected direction, but the magnitudes of these changes could not be evaluated.

The SSC cannot endorse chinook FRAM as a tool for evaluating the impacts of proposed mark-selective fisheries. Our reservations stem from assumptions about the age structure, length composition, growth, mortality rates at age, and other factors that introduce additional uncertainty into model projections in the presence of mark-selective fisheries. Given the current status of model documentation describing how mark-selective fishery impacts will be estimated by chinook FRAM, we are unable to give the model the rigorous evaluation that is needed. If mark-selective fisheries are implemented for 2003 they should be of limited magnitude and used as an opportunity to evaluate specific predictions of the selective chinook FRAM. The SSC will continue review of the model in November 2003.

Coho

The coho FRAM was modified to accommodate the Abundance-based Management agreement of the Pacific Salmon Commission. This required splitting the September-December terminal time step into September and October-December time steps. The rationale for this change was to better capture the September transitional migration period and terminal area differences in stock composition between September and October.

Mr. LaVoy and Mr. Packer presented many spreadsheets comparing exploitation rates and impacts before and after the time split. After the split of base period time strata the estimated cohort sizes changed. Although no major differences were apparent for the first three time periods, there were larger differences in the terminal area for the final two time steps, most notably for the Stillaguamish/Snohomish river runs. Changes to the FRAM time step primarily affect the terminal area fisheries for the October-December stratum, whereas the Council is primarily managing for ocean fisheries during June-August and into September.

Some concern exists for the ability of available coded-wire tag (CWT) recovery data to support further disaggregation into an additional time step. The original criterion for CWT data was to have at least five tags per time-area stratum. Reliability of exploitation rate estimates is now reduced, because of smaller numbers of CWT recoveries in the two split strata. This is particularly noticeable for the October-December period. Despite this deficiency, the assessment authors still consider the time split to be a better representation of reality for the purposes of harvest management. The SSC does not have sufficient information to evaluate this assertion.

The SSC found it difficult to evaluate the overall effects of the time-step change. Although a brief summary report and many spreadsheets were available prior to the joint meeting, documentation comparing the relative impacts was lacking. Documentation for the method of splitting fisheries into the September or October-December strata was also insufficient. The Model Evaluation Work Group (MEW), currently being formed, should help to ease the documentation and testing problems.

3. Review of 2002 Fisheries and Summary of 2003 Stock Abundance Estimates

Mr. Dell Simmons, Chair of the STT, reviewed the 2002 ocean salmon fisheries and preliminary salmon stock abundance estimates for 2003 for the SSC. All natural coho and chinook stocks that are not "exceptions" met

their conservation objective in 2002. Ocean abundance forecasts of chinook and coho salmon in 2003 are high enough that all conservation objectives should be met this year.

Tables I-1 and I-2 in Preseason Report I (Stock Abundance Analysis for 2003 Ocean Salmon Fisheries) present several years of preseason predictors for coho and chinook stocks under Council management. The SSC requests the STT add postseason estimates where available. The SSC also requests the preseason abundance estimates include a statistical measure of variability such as confidence intervals or coefficients of variation when possible. Without variance estimates it is difficult to assess the likelihood of meeting management objectives and the risks to sensitive stocks of the proposed fishing seasons.

6. Status of Model Evaluation Work Group

Both the SSC and STT have been advocating the formation of a Model Evaluation Workgroup (MEW) to address issues related to the chinook and coho FRAM. The STT proposal (Exhibit B.6.b, Supplemental STT Report) differs considerably from the direction of earlier discussions that involved concepts similar to those outlined in Exhibit B.6. The SSC discussion of the two proposals was wide-ranging. However, there was not sufficient time available to reach a consensus. The SSC wants to continue these discussions and report to the Council in April. This report would:

- Summarize our view of the objectives of the MEW.
- Evaluate the two proposals currently before the Council (Exhibit B.6. and B.6.b, Supplemental STT Report).
- Suggest other potential approaches.
- Discuss the potential role of the SSC in the process.

A. Administrative Matters, continued

Bycatch Workshop Report and Report of SSC Groundfish and Economic Subcommittees Regarding Their Review of West Coast Observer Program Data

Dr. Dalton, chair of the Bycatch Workshop, presented the workshop report. A central question coming out of the workshop was how and when to incorporate data from the West Coast Observer Program into the bycatch model used by the Council. Summary recommendations from the workshop report include:

- *For inseason management in 2003, the panel recommends that the current model be used, with potential adjustment of historical vessel landings and/or bycatch rates to bring the projected inseason landings into agreement with fishticket and observer data.*
- *As soon as feasible, the panel recommends that the bycatch rates currently used in the model be replaced with rates from the Observer Program, in accordance with guidance provided by the SSC.*
- *The bycatch model is an empirical model with critical ad hoc assumptions. The only possible test of the model is how well the model predicts what actually occurs. Once the changes to the bycatch model recommended by this panel for the 2004 management cycle are made (e.g., use of 1999-2001 logbook data to assign harvest to target fisheries and estimate the depth distribution of harvest, use of fishticket-adjusted observer data rather than 1999 logbook data to estimate bycatch rates), the model should be run with the depth closures and cumulative limits in effect in 2003. Model results should be compared with actual harvest levels from the early months of 2003 and correction factors applied, as appropriate, to calibrate the model for 2004.*
- *The choice of bycatch rates is a technical, not a policy, decision. This decision should be made by the GMT, in consultation with the Groundfish Advisory Panel and subject to the approval of the SSC.*

Because of travel delays and lack of advance material, the subcommittees held an abbreviated meeting the evening of March 9, 2003. Mr. Jagielo, with the concurrence of other subcommittee members, expressed serious concern about the lack of advance materials, which resulted in the inability of the subcommittees to hold a full and effective meeting. He emphasized the critical need for cooperation and coordination from individuals and organizations presenting information to the SSC and SSC subcommittees, especially the need for effective communication and submission of complete materials in advance of meetings.

The SSC discussed with Dr. Hastie the current logbook-based bycatch model, recently available data from the Observer Program, and how observer data could be incorporated into the bycatch model. A central question was how to resolve a sparse Observer Program data set with the highly stratified logbook-based bycatch model. The SSC advised a parsimonious approach that used a lower number of strata, e.g., at minimum, 4 strata could be used – north, south, deep, and shallow; with the possible addition of a seasonal component. The question of when to begin using observer data for managing the groundfish fishery was also discussed. There appeared to be compelling reasons for using observer data as soon as possible and to make inseason adjustments to the 2003 groundfish management regime. This sentiment is echoed in the Bycatch Workshop report.

Initial Review of Groundfish Management Team Multi-Year Management Mid-Point Review Thresholds

Dr. Hastie provided background information and reviewed GMT consideration of this issue. He noted that when the Groundfish Multi-year Management Process (Amendment 17) was adopted, the Council directed the GMT to recommend a methodology 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.

In their February 2003 meeting summary, the GMT noted that thresholds need to be established for adjustments for both decreasing and increasing stock sizes.

The GMT developed several 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% to 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.*

Dr. Hastie noted that the GMT preferred an automatic process rather than a discretionary process. Under multi-year management and using the mid-point review process, when management specifications are developed, an evaluation of potential mid-course corrections should be included in the management specifications environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. This would facilitate changes to the specifications, because the effects would have been analyzed previously and could possibly be treated as an inseason change.

Because of the amount of work involved, the GMT advised this process should be used prudently and only if major adjustments were needed.

The SSC agreed it would be critically important to have an automatic process where impacts and alternatives had been previously analyzed. The SSC suggested that past stock assessments be reviewed to determine how often the need for mid-course corrections could arise. The SSC also discussed their previous advice to the Council on multi-year management, "The SSC reiterates that it is most important to base management advice on results from stock assessments that use the most recent data. However, across the four biennial options considered, there is a substantial range in the timeliness of the scientific information that will be used to manage the groundfish fishery. Alternative 5 provides the most current information and is, therefore, the option preferred by the SSC" (Exhibit G.5.c, Supplemental SSC Report, November 2002). The SSC will continue to work with the GMT as the GMT develops the mid-point review process.

I. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

2. Draft Regulatory Amendment and Analysis for Changes to Sardine Allocation

Dr. Sam Herrick briefed the SSC on the alternatives for an interim Pacific sardine allocation formula and the analysis of these alternatives. A status quo and eight other alternatives were considered, based on the choice of a north/south boundary, the initial allocation between the northern and southern subareas, the date of the re-allocation of any remaining OY between these subareas, the split between these areas at the re-allocation, and the date of a coastwide allocation. The nine alternatives were reduced to four by the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) based on feasibility, equity, the full utilization of the annual OY, the estimated change in net national benefits, and the probability of one of the fishing sectors having to close prematurely.

The allocation formula being considered is only expected to be used for two years (2003 and 2004) with plans to replace it by a formula that takes fuller account of biological and economic factors. The SSC noted that analysis of a long-term allocation formula should make use of the results of the sardine surveys that are planned to start in 2003. These surveys should provide information regarding biomass levels off Oregon and Washington relative to those off California. The analysis of future alternatives should also be based on economic data collected from designed surveys rather than voluntary information and attempt to incorporate the impacts of the seasonal variability in landings.

The SSC notes that all of the alternatives would increase harvest opportunities off Oregon and Washington. However, these alternatives are only designed to avoid the problems encountered in 2002; future analyses may identify other alternatives. The SSC, therefore, cautions that the alternatives under consideration for 2003 and 2004 should not be interpreted as a signal that the Oregon and Washington fisheries can continue to expand and suggests the current number of state permits for the Oregon/Washington-based sectors be frozen until a long-term allocation formula is selected.

3. Update on Sardine Stock Assessment Review Process

Dr. Robert Francis updated the SSC on the status of the draft terms of reference (TOR) for the planning of a Stock Assessment Review (STAR) workshop for coastal pelagic species (CPS). The draft TOR are complete, with only minor revisions expected. The SSC endorses preliminary approval of the draft TOR at this Council meeting with full approval anticipated at the April meeting.

The SSC discussion about the CPS STAR process focused on three questions:

- Would models and data for the new sardine and mackerel assessments be available in time for the STAR workshop?
- The STAR Panel will include the chair of the SSC CPS Subcommittee; would there be other SSC representatives?
- Would results from the STAR workshop be available in time to inform management decisions?

Timing of the STAR workshop faces two constraints: use of mackerel assessments at June Council meetings and use of sardine assessments at November Council meetings. The SSC considered two proposals for the timing of the STAR workshop: September 2003 and May 2004, and tentatively accepts the May proposal as being superior. Advantages of a May workshop include having results from both mackerel and sardine assessments available in time for the management process in 2004. Issues about stock status (rebuilding thresholds, for example) and funding for the workshop still need to be resolved.

D. Marine Reserves

1. Considerations for Integrating Marine Reserves with Effective Fishery Management
2. Update on Marine Reserves Activities

The SSC did not have access to all of the content of the presentations made by Drs. Lubchenco, Hixon, and Fluharty under agenda item D.1. However, the committee is pleased with the Council's efforts to engage these individuals in a discussion of the "effects of marine reserves on system productivity and yield in the presence of an effective fishery management program" (Exhibit D.1.a, Attachment 1, March 2003). As indicated in a previous SSC statement, the SSC considers it critically important that the Council's marine reserve deliberations focus on "empirical studies and theoretical models that most closely reflect conditions on the Pacific Coast, where highly restrictive management measures have been implemented" (Exhibit F.1.c, Supplemental SSC Report, November 2001). The SSC encourages an objective scientific dialogue on this important topic.

The SSC discussed the proposal by the National Fisheries Conservation Center (NFCC) to hold a workshop to improve the integration of marine reserves science and traditional fisheries management (Exhibit D.2.a, Attachment 3, March 2003). The SSC considers the questions that the NFCC intends to address at the workshop (Exhibit D.2.c, Public Comment, March 2003) to be important aspects of this issue. While the workshop will focus on these questions generically rather than in the specific context of fisheries managed by the Council, workshop output may be useful in terms of informing the Council's discussions of marine reserves. The SSC has a number of questions regarding workshop process (e.g., types of expertise to be represented on the review panel, terms of reference, workshop products). Given the importance of process to the outcome of the workshop, the SSC would like to encourage a representative of the NFCC to make a presentation to the SSC at the next available date to clarify these process questions.

To help the Council deal with the reserve issues before it (Exhibit D.2., Situation Summary, March 2003), the SSC proposes that its Marine Reserves Subcommittee meet some time this summer to prepare a white paper on marine reserves that could be presented at the Council's September or November meeting. The objective of the white paper would be to assist the Council in setting the technical ground rules for discussion of marine reserve initiatives generated within and outside of the Council family. The white paper would focus on issues of specific relevance to the Council. These would include (1) guidance for determining what constitutes "best available science" in terms of the applicability of the marine reserves literature to use reserves as a management tool, (2) the essential role of natural and social sciences in evaluating ecosystem and fishery effects associated with reserves, and (3) implications of marine reserves for stock assessments.

Other Matters

No additional matters were discussed.

Public Comment

No public comments on topics not on the SSC agenda were provided.

Adjournment

The SSC adjourned at approximately 5:30 P.M., Tuesday, March 11, 2003.

PFMC
05/29/03

SSC Subcommittee Assignments for 2003

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

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES Scientific and Statistical Committee

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 7-8, 2003

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. Dr. Donald McIsaac briefed the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) on priority agenda items.

Members in Attendance

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. Martin Dorn, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
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. André Punt, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
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
Ms. Cynthia Thomson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA

Scientific and Statistical Committee Comments to the Council

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

Open Discussion

The SSC queried staff about the recent letter sent by the Council to NMFS-Office of Sustainable Fisheries pertaining to review of National Standard-1 guidelines. The SSC was curious if the Council had received a response to the letter, particularly the request for consideration of regional councils (notably, SSCs) as full and formal participants in the review process. It was noted for the Council's information that NMFS was scheduled to convene a "NMFS-wide workshop on National Standard 1 guidelines." Staff stated he would inquire about a response, including information on coordination, schedules, roles and responsibilities, and points-of-contact.

[May 2003 – the Council received a response from NMFS stating regional council comments would be considered during the NMFS workshop. Specific information as requested by the SSC was not provided. Staff will continue to monitor this issue and inform the SSC as events warrant.]

C. Salmon Management

2. Identification of Stocks Not Meeting Escapement Goals for Three Consecutive Years

Mr. Dell Simmons of the Salmon Technical Team (STT) reviewed the escapements of natural salmon stocks for the SSC. All stocks, except one, met their escapement goals in 2002. The Grays Harbor fall chinook stock did not meet its escapement goal. The estimated escapement of this stock in 2002 was 11,300, while the escapement goal is 14,000. This is the fifth consecutive year this stock failed to meet the goal, although the escapement exhibited an increasing trend for the last three years. This stock is an exception to the overfishing criteria, because Council fisheries have limited impacts on this stock (about 1.5% as reported by Mr. Simmons). For the last several years the inriver harvest rate has been greater than 30%, which is one of the factors keeping the escapement below the goal. The SSC recommends the co-managers examine inriver harvest rates and other factors potentially affecting escapements.

As of 2002 the Queets River spring/summer chinook had not achieved its escapement goal for five consecutive years. However, in 2002 the escapement estimate was 738 fish; 38 fish above the goal. This stock is also an exception to the overfishing criteria, because of limited impacts by Council fisheries.

3. Establish Salmon Model Documentation and Evaluation Process

After considering several recommendations for forming a Model Evaluation Work Group (MEW), the SSC recommends the formation of a new Council advisory body to fulfill this function. Given the critical importance of the coho and chinook Fishery Regulation Assessment Models (FRAMs) to the Council salmon management process, it is appropriate that the MEW be a standing committee of the Council and receive support associated with this status. The initial focus of the MEW should be placed on the chinook and coho FRAMs.

In addition to members representing the management agencies that currently are most familiar with the development, data requirements, and usage of the FRAMs, the MEW membership should include members of existing advisory bodies such as the STT and SSC. Given that Canadian stocks are incorporated into coho and chinook FRAM, and that coho FRAM is being extended for use by the Pacific Salmon Commission (PSC), Canadian participation in the MEW should be encouraged.

The SSC recommends that the initial tasks of the MEW focus on the following four prioritized items:

1. Document the model structure and algorithms used in the model. We suggest that this task be the foremost priority of the MEW with a goal of completing it, so it can be reviewed by the SSC prior to the November meeting of the Council.
2. Document the data used as inputs to the model and model parameter estimating procedures. This should include an assessment of data quality and adequacy for use in the models, as well as the source of the data (agency and individual supplying the data), and a timetable for data requests. The SSC would like the Council to consider convening a workshop for sometime in 2004 to help address this item. If the Council decides to convene a workshop, the SSC would like to participate in drafting the Terms of Reference for the workshop.
3. Write a Programmer's Guide to the FRAMs. This is needed to facilitate maintenance of the model code.

4. Write a User's Guide to the FRAMs. This is needed to enable more people to use the FRAMs. The User's Guide should include information relating to, (a) input data requirements and data sources; (b) annual model calibration procedures; (c) operating instructions; and (d) interpretation of model results.

We recommend that Items 1 and 2 receive the immediate attention of the MEW, and these tasks should be considered when identifying the initial membership of the MEW. For the MEW to be successful, it is critical that interested agencies commit adequate resources to this effort. Membership in the Work Group may change as its immediate tasks change. Members with specific areas of expertise should be appointed as required on an as-needed basis.

4. Methodology Review Process for 2003

The SSC met with Mr. Dell Simmons of the STT to identify and prioritize potential methodology review issues for the coming year. Current issues include unresolved items from 2002 and one new item. The SSC has identified the following list of methodology review issues for 2003/2004 and places highest priority on the first three items:

Chinook and coho FRAM documentation: documentation of the chinook and coho FRAMs will be one of the first tasks of the new MEW. Review of this documentation will greatly facilitate review of Items 2 and 3.

Chinook FRAM for mark-selective fisheries: the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife modified the chinook FRAM to accommodate mark-selective fisheries. The SSC could not endorse chinook FRAM as a tool for mark-selective fisheries in 2003, but application of the model to estimate mark-selective fishery impacts should be reviewed if such a fishery is planned for 2004 and beyond. The SSC views this as a high priority.

Coho FRAM fisheries for Canadian stocks: the Coho Technical Committee of the PSC is modifying the coho FRAM to add fishery and stock strata for Canadian management. The PSC has requested SSC review of these changes before they are implemented in 2004.

Columbia River Fall chinook ocean abundance predictors: there has been some preliminary work on producing ocean run-size predictors for these stocks. The SSC will review these predictors when they have been fully developed and documented.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife management plan for Lower Columbia River coho salmon: the draft plan needs data cleanup and method improvements. The SSC anticipates a document will be presented for review in October 2003.

Oregon Coastal Natural (OCN) coho salmon prediction methodology: new predictors are in development. The SSC will review any proposals for change as requested.

As always, 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.

E. Groundfish Management

2. Report on the Bycatch Workshop and Observer Data Update – Joint meeting with GMT and GAP

Dr. Michael Dalton (panel chair) presented the review panel report on the bycatch model. The SSC commends the review panel for a thorough and careful review of the bycatch model and data inputs. The panel report includes a number of recommendations for improving the bycatch model. These include both short-term recommendations for 2003 and 2004 and longer term recommendations for model development. The SSC fully endorses the panel recommendations. A key panel recommendation was that "as soon as feasible, the

bycatch rates currently used in the model be replaced with rates from the observer program, in accordance with guidance by the SSC."

Dr. Jim Hastie presented observer estimates of bycatch rates from the first year of the observer program (bi-monthly periods 5 and 6 of 2001 and bi-monthly periods 1 through 4 of 2002). To estimate bycatch rates, haul weights of retained catch were adjusted by fishtickets. Adjusted logbook data are not yet available to estimate retained catch. To calculate bycatch rates for use in the bycatch model, observer data can potentially be post-stratified by target fishery, period, area, and depth zone. Dr. Hastie presented tables of bycatch ratios (total bycatch/total landings) for various levels of stratification. As expected, there is a clear tradeoff between the level of stratification and precision of the estimated bycatch ratio. Lower coefficients of variation (CV) are obtained when fewer strata are used.

The SSC considers the example of a four-cell stratification (north-south, shallow-deep) as just one of several possible stratifications of the observer bycatch data. It is important to have a good stratification scheme, one which takes into account both the tradeoff between the number of strata and precision of the bycatch estimates and the utility of the model to evaluate complex management alternatives. Formal model selection criteria, such as AIC (Akaike Information Criterion), may be one possible approach to determine the appropriate level of stratification.

Comparison of bycatch projections for 2003 between observer-based bycatch rates and bycatch rates used previously indicates higher catch projections (in some cases much higher) for all overfished groundfish stocks with the exception of widow rockfish.

Bycatch projections using observer bycatch rates with alternative stratifications indicate sensitivity to the level of stratification, particularly whether or not a target fishery strata is defined. The SSC notes that with only a year of observer sampling available, the data are too sparse to support fully stratified bycatch estimates (i.e., by target fishery, bi-monthly period, area, and depth zone), particularly in the southern area. Additional work is needed to (1) characterize uncertainty in bycatch projections, and (2) further evaluate the sensitivity of bycatch projections to alternative levels of stratification.

The SSC considers the bycatch rates based on observer data to be the best available scientific data for use in the bycatch model. Notwithstanding the unresolved issues regarding stratification, the SSC recommends bycatch rates based on observer data be used for evaluating management alternatives for 2004 and for inseason management in 2003. The SSC urges the Council to move quickly to use the new bycatch rates for inseason management, as delay could severely restrict the range of potential management alternatives later in the year. For this meeting, the SSC recommends the Groundfish Management Team omit the target fishery strata and consider only bycatch rates stratified by area, depth zone, and perhaps season. Target fisheries were defined on the basis of historical fishing patterns, and there is little evidence these targeting strategies still exist under the current management policies.

9. Status of the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Environmental Impact Statement

This item was deleted from the SSC agenda.

5. Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment 16 - Rebuilding Plans

Dr. Kit Dahl provided an overview of Draft Amendment 16-1 to the groundfish fishery management plan (FMP) (Exhibit E.5, Attachment 2) with emphasis on modifications that have been incorporated since the last SSC review of the draft amendment (November 2002). The SSC focused on three of the issues delineated in Section 2.1 of the Draft Amendment, namely:

Issue 1: The form and required elements of rebuilding plans.

Issue 2: The process for periodically reviewing rebuilding plans.

Issue 3: Defining events or standards that would trigger revision of a rebuilding plan.

In previous statements (September 2002 and November 2002), the SSC has emphasized that the Council should expect numerical details of rebuilding plans (e.g., B_{MSY} or B_0) to change over time – whether due to improved estimates of these parameters from updated stock assessments, the development of new models, or due to technical errors that were not discovered in the previous stock assessment review. The SSC recommended that the use of hard numbers in the rebuilding amendment be minimized and that revisions to rebuilding plans be tied more closely to the stock assessment cycle. In general, the preferred options in the current draft of the amendment are now closely aligned with the SSC recommendations.

The remaining point that could be clarified is the specification of control rules in the FMP amendment. In the current draft, it is not clear whether future harvest guidelines (for stocks under rebuilding) will be based on constant-F strategies or whether, in some cases, constant catch strategies will be acceptable. The SSC suggests that constant-F strategies be used in all cases, and this should be clearly stated in the amendment.

Mr. John DeVore reviewed Draft Amendment 16-2, Parts I through V (Exhibit E.5, Attachments 3 through 7). The remaining sections of Amendment 16-2 – Environmental Review (Part VI) and Combined and Cumulative Effects (Part VII) – were not available for SSC review. However, Mr. DeVore provided a status report on Part VII. The subsequent SSC discussion focused primarily on the newly incorporated "mixed stock exception" option (MSE) that will be incorporated into the draft amendment and, in particular, the Part VII "cumulative effects analysis" that will support it. Under the MSE option, bocaccio, canary, yelloweye, and widow rockfish rebuilding plans would be exempted from the usual rebuilding guidelines (e.g., there would be no requirement for rebuilding to B_{MSY} within T_{MAX} years). Prior to consideration of the MSE option, the SSC recommends:

1. Clearly defined criteria should be established for species to be exempted.
2. Widow rockfish should be removed from the candidate list unless future harvest of widow constrains the catch of other species.
3. The "cumulative effects analysis" should include the full suite of biological effects and economic benefits under the MSE option. As currently envisioned, stock size changes for groundfish stocks that are not in the overfished category are not incorporated into the analysis. Benefit tradeoffs, such as in exvessel revenue, are likely to be dominated by the non-overfished stocks.

These recommendations are of utmost importance should the Council desire to use the MSE option as its preferred option in finalizing the amendment at the June 2003 Council meeting. Further, the Council should note that the SSC will not be able to review the "cumulative effects analysis" prior to the June Council meeting.

7. Standards and Criteria for Approving Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs)

The Council's groundfish FMP provides for the issuance of EFPs by NMFS to promote the increased use of underutilized species, to realize the expansion potential of the domestic groundfish fishery, and to increase the harvest efficiency of the fishery consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the goals of the groundfish FMP. The GMT has developed a draft set of protocols for EFP applications that is being considered for adoption as part of the Council's Operating Procedures (Exhibit E.7, Supplemental Revised Attachment 2, April 2003). Previously, the SSC had indicated a willingness to assist the GMT in evaluating scientific issues associated with EFP applications (Exhibit G.6.c, Supplemental SSC Report, November 2002).

The SSC discussed how it could be of greatest assistance to the GMT in evaluating EFP applications, considering that many submissions are designed to address a policy or management objective, and have little or no identifiable scientific purpose. Following that discussion the SSC concluded the following:

1. All EFP applications should first be evaluated by the GMT for consistency with the goals and objectives of the groundfish FMP and the Council's strategic plan for groundfish.
2. When a proposal is submitted that includes a significant scientific component that would benefit from SSC review, the GMT can refer the application to the SSC's groundfish subcommittee for comment.

3. In such instances, the groundfish subcommittee will evaluate the scientific merits of the application and will specifically evaluate the application's (a) problem statement, (b) data collection methodology, (c) proposed analytical and statistical treatment of the data, and (d) the generality of the inferences that could be drawn by the study.

A. Administrative

6. National Fisheries Conservation Center Presentation

The SSC was briefed by Mr. Brock Bernstein regarding a workshop being planned by National Fisheries Conservation Center (NFCC) to evaluate the current state of science regarding integration of marine reserves with fishery management. The workshop will be modeled on the National Institutes of Health (NIH) State of the Science workshops, which are designed to facilitate resolution of conflicting scientific evidence regarding treatment for medical conditions. NFCC proposes a 2.5 day meeting - slightly longer than the standard 2-day meeting used by the NIH, but more realistic in the current context, given the complexity of marine reserve issues.

[[[May be error in above paragraph that affects logic of full statement; i.e, NIH uses 2.5 day meetings.]]]

The workshop will involve two committees, (1) a planning committee to identify relevant papers from the marine reserve literature (whose purpose will be to develop questions to be addressed by the review panel and select the review panel), and (2) a review panel to evaluate the literature, hear presentations from experts, evaluate and synthesize the written and oral material, and prepare a final report.

Workshop funding will come from the Packard Foundation, Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO), Aquarium of the Pacific in Long Beach, fishermen's groups, and others.

The workshop will take place in an auditorium that holds about 175 people. The workshop will be open to the public, but no public comment will be allowed. The NFCC plans to videotape the proceedings for distribution.

While the workshop will likely involve discussion of West Coast marine reserve issues, the NFCC also wants to include experts from the East and Southeast United States., as well as international experts. Workshop recommendations will not be specific to a given geographic area, but will be broadly relevant to the issue of marine reserves.

Highlights of the SSC discussion regarding the NFCC workshop are as follows:

The composition of the planning committee will be critical to the success of the workshop. In response to SSC questions regarding how the committee would be chosen, Mr. Bernstein indicated that NFCC has broad representation from the conservation and fishing communities. The NFCC would have to be trusted to put together an appropriate planning committee, who would then select an appropriate review panel.

The NIH guidelines limit the material to be considered by the panel to peer-reviewed publications. The SSC noted that there is a considerable "gray" fishery management literature that would need to be considered as well.

In material provided to the SSC at the March 2003 Council meeting, NFCC indicated its intention to have a "preeminent ecologist" chair the review panel. The SSC emphasized the need to ensure that a broad range of expertise is represented on the panel (e.g., fishery managers as well as academic ecologists). A diverse panel will be essential for clarifying areas of convergence and divergence in the viewpoints of managers and ecologists and the currencies in which they evaluate outcomes.

Mr. Bernstein mentioned numbers of fish as a possible common currency for the discussion. The SSC indicated that fishery managers are concerned with yield, sustainable fisheries, essential fish habitat,

ecosystem management, and various socioeconomic indicators. Mr. Bernstein indicated that it would not be realistic to include socioeconomics in the scope of the workshop. The SSC indicated that socioeconomics could not be ignored. Fishery management is fundamentally management of people, not fish. It is not possible to evaluate effects of fishery regulations (including marine reserves) on fish stocks without considering how regulations affect people and how people in turn respond to regulations. Moreover, it was not clear to the SSC how the NFCC could fulfill its stated intention to address "congestion externalities" without considering socioeconomics. The SSC felt strongly that socioeconomics was an important key to bringing managers and academics together.

According to Mr. Bernstein, the NFCC will attempt to select panel members who do not have vested interests in marine reserve issues. If that is not possible, they will attempt to "balance" the panel with individuals with various types of biases. The panel may also include individuals who have expertise on terrestrial (rather than marine) areas set aside in reserves. Given the time frame of the workshop, the uncertain composition of the panel, and the apparent intention to exclude socioeconomics from panel consideration, the SSC questioned whether the panel would be able to get to the level of detailed discussion needed to substantively address the issues associated with integrating reserves and fishery management.

In response to Mr. Bernstein's request for SSC advice regarding how to keep the workshop on track, the SSC noted the importance of clear and comprehensive Terms of Reference and submission of presentation material to the review panel well in advance of the workshop date.

The NFCC requests SSC endorsement and participation. They are not seeking funding or any up-front commitment to abide by the findings of the workshop.

The SSC endorses the concept of having a workshop to identify the types of planning and research needed to integrate marine reserves with fishery management. A particularly useful outcome of such a workshop would be a list of collaborative activities that could be undertaken thereafter to facilitate planning, discussion, and research on integrating marine reserves with fishery management. The SSC encourages the organizers to include consideration of socioeconomic issues. Once the workshop proceedings become available, the SSC is willing to review the proceedings for the Council.

G. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

2. Approve Final Regulatory Amendment and Analysis for Changes to the Sardine Allocation

No new technical information or issues were included in the final draft regulatory amendment. The SSC discussed and commented on this item in March 2003.

3. CPS Stock Assessment Terms of Reference

Dr. Ray Conser updated the SSC on the Stock Assessment Review (STAR) workshop for coastal pelagic species (CPS). The SSC agrees the workshop should be scheduled during May 2004.

The Draft Terms of Reference (ToR), given preliminary approval at the March 2003 Council meeting, require a minor revision. Section 5 in Appendix A on rebuilding parameters is unnecessary for CPS species and should be replaced by a section that gives:

1. A full description of the harvest control rules in place for CPS species.
2. Current harvest rates based on the harvest control rules.
3. Harvest guidelines for the next fishing season.

The SSC expects that Council staff will complete this revision, and otherwise considers the ToR final and complete.

Other Matters

No additional matters were discussed.

Public Comment

No public comments on topics not on the SSC agenda were provided.

Adjournment

The SSC adjourned at approximately 5:30 P.M., Tuesday, April 8, 2003.

PFMC
05/28/03

SSC Subcommittee Assignments for 2003

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

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES Scientific and Statistical Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Red Lion Hotel Sacramento
Sierra B Room
1401 Arden Way
Sacramento, CA 95815
(916) 922-8041
March 10-11, 2003

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. Dr. Donald McIsaac briefed the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) on priority agenda items.

Mr. Jagielo noted concern about the need to ensure information for SSC review is received in advance. He noted that, given the demands on the SSC, limited amount of time for SSC meetings, and other demands on SSC member time, it is critical that materials are complete and provided in advance. These sentiments were affirmed by the SSC. Dr. McIsaac and Dr. Radtke acknowledged the SSC concerns and emphasized Council staff would endeavor to ensure materials would be provided to the SSC in advance.

Members in Attendance

Mr. Alan Byrne, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Nampa, ID
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. Martin Dorn, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
Dr. Robert Francis, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
Dr. Kevin Hill, California Department of Fish and Game, La Jolla, CA
Mr. Tom Jagielo, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA
Dr. Han-Lin Lai, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
Dr. Peter Lawson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Newport, OR
Dr. Stephen Ralston, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA
Dr. André Punt, University of Washington, 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

None.

Scientific and Statistical Committee Comments to the Council

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

A. Administrative Matters

Open Discussion

The SSC discussed the need to formalize procedures for ensuring materials are submitted to the SSC are complete and in advance of SSC meetings. This discussion and subsequent recommendations are encapsulated in the following report to the Council.

H.2. SSC Report on Planning Session on Improving Council Meeting Efficiency

The SSC requests the Council consider incorporating the following into its Council Operating Procedures:

The SSC requires good documentation and ample review time in order to provide the best possible advice to the Council. Agencies and review document authors should be responsible for ensuring materials submitted to the SSC are technically sound, comprehensive, clearly documented, and identified by author. If there is any uncertainty on the part of authors regarding SSC expectations, authors should clarify assignments and expectations of deliverables with the meeting Chair. In order that there be adequate time for careful review, documents and materials destined for review by the SSC or any of its subcommittees must be received at the Council office at least two weeks prior to the meeting at which they will be discussed and reviewed. The Council will then provide copies to appropriate SSC members at least five working days prior to the meeting. If this deadline cannot be met, it is the responsibility of the author to contact the meeting Chair prior to the two-week deadline, so appropriate arrangements, rescheduling, and cancellations can be made in a timely and cost-effective manner. This deadline applies to all official SSC activities and meetings.

Subcommittee Assignments

Subcommittee assignments from 2002 were reviewed. Other than deleting reference to Dr. Brian Allee, who resigned from the SSC effective January 2003, no changes were made.

Elect Chair and Vice Chair

For 2003 through March 2004, Mr. Jagielo and Dr. Hill were reconfirmed as SSC chair and vice chair, respectively.

Review Nominations for Groundfish Management Team Positions

Nominations to the Groundfish Management Team were reviewed. SSC recommendations were provided to the Council during the Council's closed session.

Review Nominations for Vacant SSC At-Large Position

No nominations were received for the vacant position. The Council is targeting social scientists to fill the position as per Council Operating Procedures.

B. Salmon Management

2. Final SSC Methodology Review Recommendations on the Chinook and Coho Fishery Regulation and Assessment Models (FRAM) for 2003 Salmon Management

Mr. Jim Packer and Mr. Larry LaVoy from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) presented a report to a joint meeting of the SSC Salmon Subcommittee and the Salmon Technical Team (STT) on proposed changes to the chinook and coho FRAM. This meeting was held on February 5, 2003 in Portland, Oregon. Major changes to the chinook FRAM were initially reviewed in November 2002. The purpose of the February meeting was to receive an update on tasks that were incomplete as of November and to review a proposed base period change to split the terminal time step of the coho FRAM.

Chinook

Terminal Area Management Modules (TAMMs) needed to be changed to accept marked and unmarked stock components. These changes have been completed. Additional material presented at this meeting supported the results reviewed in November which indicated the modified chinook FRAM is capable of duplicating the results of the previous version of the model in the absence of mark-selective fisheries. Therefore, the modified FRAM can be used to assess impacts if mark-selective fisheries are not under consideration.

At the joint meeting, the group was presented an example using chinook FRAM to evaluate the impacts of a mark-selective sport fishery in Washington Marine Areas 5 and 6 (Strait of Juan de Fuca) during July,

August, and September. This example compared exploitation rates by stock projected by chinook FRAM for the final 2002 model run to those using chinook FRAM in selective fishery mode with the mark-selective fishery described above implemented. Modeled effects were in the expected direction, but the magnitudes of these changes could not be evaluated.

The SSC cannot endorse chinook FRAM as a tool for evaluating the impacts of proposed mark-selective fisheries. Our reservations stem from assumptions about the age structure, length composition, growth, mortality rates at age, and other factors that introduce additional uncertainty into model projections in the presence of mark-selective fisheries. Given the current status of model documentation describing how mark-selective fishery impacts will be estimated by chinook FRAM, we are unable to give the model the rigorous evaluation that is needed. If mark-selective fisheries are implemented for 2003 they should be of limited magnitude and used as an opportunity to evaluate specific predictions of the selective chinook FRAM. The SSC will continue review of the model in November 2003.

Coho

The coho FRAM was modified to accommodate the Abundance-based Management agreement of the Pacific Salmon Commission. This required splitting the September-December terminal time step into September and October-December time steps. The rationale for this change was to better capture the September transitional migration period and terminal area differences in stock composition between September and October.

Mr. LaVoy and Mr. Packer presented many spreadsheets comparing exploitation rates and impacts before and after the time split. After the split of base period time strata the estimated cohort sizes changed. Although no major differences were apparent for the first three time periods, there were larger differences in the terminal area for the final two time steps, most notably for the Stillaguamish/Snohomish river runs. Changes to the FRAM time step primarily affect the terminal area fisheries for the October-December stratum, whereas the Council is primarily managing for ocean fisheries during June-August and into September.

Some concern exists for the ability of available coded-wire tag (CWT) recovery data to support further disaggregation into an additional time step. The original criterion for CWT data was to have at least five tags per time-area stratum. Reliability of exploitation rate estimates is now reduced, because of smaller numbers of CWT recoveries in the two split strata. This is particularly noticeable for the October-December period. Despite this deficiency, the assessment authors still consider the time split to be a better representation of reality for the purposes of harvest management. The SSC does not have sufficient information to evaluate this assertion.

The SSC found it difficult to evaluate the overall effects of the time-step change. Although a brief summary report and many spreadsheets were available prior to the joint meeting, documentation comparing the relative impacts was lacking. Documentation for the method of splitting fisheries into the September or October-December strata was also insufficient. The Model Evaluation Work Group (MEW), currently being formed, should help to ease the documentation and testing problems.

3. Review of 2002 Fisheries and Summary of 2003 Stock Abundance Estimates

Mr. Dell Simmons, Chair of the STT, reviewed the 2002 ocean salmon fisheries and preliminary salmon stock abundance estimates for 2003 for the SSC. All natural coho and chinook stocks that are not "exceptions" met their conservation objective in 2002. Ocean abundance forecasts of chinook and coho salmon in 2003 are high enough that all conservation objectives should be met this year.

Tables I-1 and I-2 in Preseason Report I (Stock Abundance Analysis for 2003 Ocean Salmon Fisheries) present several years of preseason predictors for coho and chinook stocks under Council management. The SSC requests the STT add postseason estimates where available. The SSC also requests the preseason abundance estimates include a statistical measure of variability such as confidence intervals or coefficients of variation when possible. Without variance estimates it is difficult to assess the likelihood of meeting management objectives and the risks to sensitive stocks of the proposed fishing seasons.

6. Status of Model Evaluation Work Group

Both the SSC and STT have been advocating the formation of a Model Evaluation Workgroup (MEW) to address issues related to the chinook and coho FRAM. The STT proposal (Exhibit B.6.b, Supplemental STT Report) differs considerably from the direction of earlier discussions that involved concepts similar to those outlined in Exhibit B.6. The SSC discussion of the two proposals was wide-ranging. However, there was not sufficient time available to reach a consensus. The SSC wants to continue these discussions and report to the Council in April. This report would:

- Summarize our view of the objectives of the MEW.
- Evaluate the two proposals currently before the Council (Exhibit B.6. and B.6.b, Supplemental STT Report).
- Suggest other potential approaches.
- Discuss the potential role of the SSC in the process.

A. Administrative Matters, continued

Bycatch Workshop Report and Report of SSC Groundfish and Economic Subcommittees Regarding Their Review of West Coast Observer Program Data

Dr. Dalton, chair of the Bycatch Workshop, presented the workshop report. A central question coming out of the workshop was how and when to incorporate data from the West Coast Observer Program into the bycatch model used by the Council. Summary recommendations from the workshop report include:

- *For inseason management in 2003, the panel recommends that the current model be used, with potential adjustment of historical vessel landings and/or bycatch rates to bring the projected inseason landings into agreement with fishticket and observer data.*
- *As soon as feasible, the panel recommends that the bycatch rates currently used in the model be replaced with rates from the Observer Program, in accordance with guidance provided by the SSC.*
- *The bycatch model is an empirical model with critical ad hoc assumptions. The only possible test of the model is how well the model predicts what actually occurs. Once the changes to the bycatch model recommended by this panel for the 2004 management cycle are made (e.g., use of 1999-2001 logbook data to assign harvest to target fisheries and estimate the depth distribution of harvest, use of fishticket-adjusted observer data rather than 1999 logbook data to estimate bycatch rates), the model should be run with the depth closures and cumulative limits in effect in 2003. Model results should be compared with actual harvest levels from the early months of 2003 and correction factors applied, as appropriate, to calibrate the model for 2004.*
- *The choice of bycatch rates is a technical, not a policy, decision. This decision should be made by the GMT, in consultation with the Groundfish Advisory Panel and subject to the approval of the SSC.*

Because of travel delays and lack of advance material, the subcommittees held an abbreviated meeting the evening of March 9, 2003. Mr. Jagielo, with the concurrence of other subcommittee members, expressed serious concern about the lack of advance materials, which resulted in the inability of the subcommittees to hold a full and effective meeting. He emphasized the critical need for cooperation and coordination from individuals and organizations presenting information to the SSC and SSC subcommittees, especially the need for effective communication and submission of complete materials in advance of meetings.

The SSC discussed with Dr. Hastie the current logbook-based bycatch model, recently available data from the Observer Program, and how observer data could be incorporated into the bycatch model. A central question was how to resolve a sparse Observer Program data set with the highly stratified logbook-based bycatch model. The SSC advised a parsimonious approach that used a lower number of strata, e.g., at minimum, 4 strata could be used – north, south, deep, and shallow; with the possible addition of a seasonal

component. The question of when to begin using observer data for managing the groundfish fishery was also discussed. There appeared to be compelling reasons for using observer data as soon as possible and to make inseason adjustments to the 2003 groundfish management regime. This sentiment is echoed in the Bycatch Workshop report.

Initial Review of Groundfish Management Team Multi-Year Management Mid-Point Review Thresholds

Dr. Hastie provided background information and reviewed GMT consideration of this issue. He noted that when the Groundfish Multi-year Management Process (Amendment 17) was adopted, the Council directed the GMT to recommend a methodology 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.

In their February 2003 meeting summary, the GMT noted that thresholds need to be established for adjustments for both decreasing and increasing stock sizes.

The GMT developed several 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% to 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.

Dr. Hastie noted that the GMT preferred an automatic process rather than a discretionary process. Under multi-year management and using the mid-point review process, when management specifications are developed, an evaluation of potential mid-course corrections should be included in the management specifications environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. This would facilitate changes to the specifications, because the effects would have been analyzed previously and could possibly be treated as an inseason change.

Because of the amount of work involved, the GMT advised this process should be used prudently and only if major adjustments were needed.

The SSC agreed it would be critically important to have an automatic process where impacts and alternatives had been previously analyzed. The SSC suggested that past stock assessments be reviewed to determine how often the need for mid-course corrections could arise. The SSC also discussed their previous advice to the Council on multi-year management, "The SSC reiterates that it is most important to base management advice on results from stock assessments that use the most recent data. However, across the four biennial options considered, there is a substantial range in the timeliness of the scientific information that will be used to manage the groundfish fishery. Alternative 5 provides the most current information and is, therefore, the option preferred by the SSC" (Exhibit G.5.c, Supplemental SSC Report, November 2002). The SSC will continue to work with the GMT as the GMT develops the mid-point review process.

I. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

2. Draft Regulatory Amendment and Analysis for Changes to Sardine Allocation

Dr. Sam Herrick briefed the SSC on the alternatives for an interim Pacific sardine allocation formula and the analysis of these alternatives. A status quo and eight other alternatives were considered, based on the choice of a north/south boundary, the initial allocation between the northern and southern subareas, the date of the re-allocation of any remaining OY between these subareas, the split between these areas at the re-allocation, and the date of a coastwide allocation. The nine alternatives were reduced to four by the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) based on feasibility, equity, the full utilization of the annual OY, the estimated change in net national benefits, and the probability of one of the fishing sectors having to close prematurely.

The allocation formula being considered is only expected to be used for two years (2003 and 2004) with plans to replace it by a formula that takes fuller account of biological and economic factors. The SSC noted that analysis of a long-term allocation formula should make use of the results of the sardine surveys that are planned to start in 2003. These surveys should provide information regarding biomass levels off Oregon and Washington relative to those off California. The analysis of future alternatives should also be based on economic data collected from designed surveys rather than voluntary information and attempt to incorporate the impacts of the seasonal variability in landings.

The SSC notes that all of the alternatives would increase harvest opportunities off Oregon and Washington. However, these alternatives are only designed to avoid the problems encountered in 2002; future analyses may identify other alternatives. The SSC, therefore, cautions that the alternatives under consideration for 2003 and 2004 should not be interpreted as a signal that the Oregon and Washington fisheries can continue to expand and suggests the current number of state permits for the Oregon/Washington-based sectors be frozen until a long-term allocation formula is selected.

3. Update on Sardine Stock Assessment Review Process

Dr. Robert Francis updated the SSC on the status of the draft terms of reference (TOR) for the planning of a Stock Assessment Review (STAR) workshop for coastal pelagic species (CPS). The draft TOR are complete, with only minor revisions expected. The SSC endorses preliminary approval of the draft TOR at this Council meeting with full approval anticipated at the April meeting.

The SSC discussion about the CPS STAR process focused on three questions:

- Would models and data for the new sardine and mackerel assessments be available in time for the STAR workshop?
- The STAR Panel will include the chair of the SSC CPS Subcommittee; would there be other SSC representatives?
- Would results from the STAR workshop be available in time to inform management decisions?

Timing of the STAR workshop faces two constraints: use of mackerel assessments at June Council meetings and use of sardine assessments at November Council meetings. The SSC considered two proposals for the timing of the STAR workshop: September 2003 and May 2004, and tentatively accepts the May proposal as being superior. Advantages of a May workshop include having results from both mackerel and sardine assessments available in time for the management process in 2004. Issues about stock status (rebuilding thresholds, for example) and funding for the workshop still need to be resolved.

D. Marine Reserves

1. Considerations for Integrating Marine Reserves with Effective Fishery Management
2. Update on Marine Reserves Activities

The SSC did not have access to all of the content of the presentations made by Drs. Lubchenco, Hixon, and Fluharty under agenda item D.1. However, the committee is pleased with the Council's efforts to engage these individuals in a discussion of the "effects of marine reserves on system productivity and yield in the presence of an effective fishery management program" (Exhibit D.1.a, Attachment 1, March 2003). As indicated in a previous SSC statement, the SSC considers it critically important that the Council's marine reserve deliberations focus on "empirical studies and theoretical models that most closely reflect conditions on the Pacific Coast, where highly restrictive management measures have been implemented" (Exhibit F.1.c, Supplemental SSC Report, November 2001). The SSC encourages an objective scientific dialogue on this important topic.

The SSC discussed the proposal by the National Fisheries Conservation Center (NFCC) to hold a workshop to improve the integration of marine reserves science and traditional fisheries management (Exhibit D.2.a,

Attachment 3, March 2003). The SSC considers the questions that the NFCC intends to address at the workshop (Exhibit D.2.c, Public Comment, March 2003) to be important aspects of this issue. While the workshop will focus on these questions generically rather than in the specific context of fisheries managed by the Council, workshop output may be useful in terms of informing the Council's discussions of marine reserves. The SSC has a number of questions regarding workshop process (e.g., types of expertise to be represented on the review panel, terms of reference, workshop products). Given the importance of process to the outcome of the workshop, the SSC would like to encourage a representative of the NFCC to make a presentation to the SSC at the next available date to clarify these process questions.

To help the Council deal with the reserve issues before it (Exhibit D.2., Situation Summary, March 2003), the SSC proposes that its Marine Reserves Subcommittee meet some time this summer to prepare a white paper on marine reserves that could be presented at the Council's September or November meeting. The objective of the white paper would be to assist the Council in setting the technical ground rules for discussion of marine reserve initiatives generated within and outside of the Council family. The white paper would focus on issues of specific relevance to the Council. These would include (1) guidance for determining what constitutes "best available science" in terms of the applicability of the marine reserves literature to use reserves as a management tool, (2) the essential role of natural and social sciences in evaluating ecosystem and fishery effects associated with reserves, and (3) implications of marine reserves for stock assessments.

Other Matters

No additional matters were discussed.

Public Comment

No public comments on topics not on the SSC agenda were provided.

Adjournment

The SSC adjourned at approximately 5:30 P.M., Tuesday, March 11, 2003.

PFMC
05/29/03

SSC Subcommittee Assignments for 2003

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

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES Scientific and Statistical Committee

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 7-8, 2003

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. Dr. Donald McIsaac briefed the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) on priority agenda items.

Members in Attendance

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. Martin Dorn, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
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. André Punt, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
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
Ms. Cynthia Thomson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA

Scientific and Statistical Committee Comments to the Council

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

Open Discussion

The SSC queried staff about the recent letter sent by the Council to NMFS-Office of Sustainable Fisheries pertaining to review of National Standard-1 guidelines. The SSC was curious if the Council had received a response to the letter, particularly the request for consideration of regional councils (notably, SSCs) as full and formal participants in the review process. It was noted for the Council's information that NMFS was scheduled to convene a "NMFS-wide workshop on National Standard 1 guidelines." Staff stated he would inquire about a response, including information on coordination, schedules, roles and responsibilities, and points-of-contact.

[May 2003 – the Council received a response from NMFS stating regional council comments would be considered during the NMFS workshop. Specific information as requested by the SSC was not provided. Staff will continue to monitor this issue and inform the SSC as events warrant.]

C. Salmon Management

2. Identification of Stocks Not Meeting Escapement Goals for Three Consecutive Years

Mr. Dell Simmons of the Salmon Technical Team (STT) reviewed the escapements of natural salmon stocks for the SSC. All stocks, except one, met their escapement goals in 2002. The Grays Harbor fall chinook stock did not meet its escapement goal. The estimated escapement of this stock in 2002 was 11,300, while the escapement goal is 14,000. This is the fifth consecutive year this stock failed to meet the goal, although the escapement exhibited an increasing trend for the last three years. This stock is an exception to the overfishing criteria, because Council fisheries have limited impacts on this stock (about 1.5% as reported by Mr. Simmons). For the last several years the inriver harvest rate has been greater than 30%, which is one of the factors keeping the escapement below the goal. The SSC recommends the co-managers examine inriver harvest rates and other factors potentially affecting escapements.

As of 2002 the Queets River spring/summer chinook had not achieved its escapement goal for five consecutive years. However, in 2002 the escapement estimate was 738 fish; 38 fish above the goal. This stock is also an exception to the overfishing criteria, because of limited impacts by Council fisheries.

3. Establish Salmon Model Documentation and Evaluation Process

After considering several recommendations for forming a Model Evaluation Work Group (MEW), the SSC recommends the formation of a new Council advisory body to fulfill this function. Given the critical importance of the coho and chinook Fishery Regulation Assessment Models (FRAMs) to the Council salmon management process, it is appropriate that the MEW be a standing committee of the Council and receive support associated with this status. The initial focus of the MEW should be placed on the chinook and coho FRAMs.

In addition to members representing the management agencies that currently are most familiar with the development, data requirements, and usage of the FRAMs, the MEW membership should include members of existing advisory bodies such as the STT and SSC. Given that Canadian stocks are incorporated into coho and chinook FRAM, and that coho FRAM is being extended for use by the Pacific Salmon Commission (PSC), Canadian participation in the MEW should be encouraged.

The SSC recommends that the initial tasks of the MEW focus on the following four prioritized items:

1. Document the model structure and algorithms used in the model. We suggest that this task be the foremost priority of the MEW with a goal of completing it, so it can be reviewed by the SSC prior to the November meeting of the Council.
2. Document the data used as inputs to the model and model parameter estimating procedures. This should include an assessment of data quality and adequacy for use in the models, as well as the source of the data (agency and individual supplying the data), and a timetable for data requests. The SSC would like the Council to consider convening a workshop for sometime in 2004 to help address this item. If the Council decides to convene a workshop, the SSC would like to participate in drafting the Terms of Reference for the workshop.
3. Write a Programmer's Guide to the FRAMs. This is needed to facilitate maintenance of the model code.
4. Write a User's Guide to the FRAMs. This is needed to enable more people to use the FRAMs. The User's Guide should include information relating to, (a) input data requirements and data sources; (b) annual model calibration procedures; (c) operating instructions; and (d) interpretation of model results.

We recommend that Items 1 and 2 receive the immediate attention of the MEW, and these tasks should be considered when identifying the initial membership of the MEW. For the MEW to be successful, it is critical that interested agencies commit adequate resources to this effort. Membership in the Work Group may change as its immediate tasks change. Members with specific areas of expertise should be appointed as required on an as-needed basis.

4. Methodology Review Process for 2003

The SSC met with Mr. Dell Simmons of the STT to identify and prioritize potential methodology review issues for the coming year. Current issues include unresolved items from 2002 and one new item. The SSC has identified the following list of methodology review issues for 2003/2004 and places highest priority on the first three items:

Chinook and coho FRAM documentation: documentation of the chinook and coho FRAMs will be one of the first tasks of the new MEW. Review of this documentation will greatly facilitate review of Items 2 and 3.

Chinook FRAM for mark-selective fisheries: the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife modified the chinook FRAM to accommodate mark-selective fisheries. The SSC could not endorse chinook FRAM as a tool for mark-selective fisheries in 2003, but application of the model to estimate mark-selective fishery impacts should be reviewed if such a fishery is planned for 2004 and beyond. The SSC views this as a high priority.

Coho FRAM fisheries for Canadian stocks: the Coho Technical Committee of the PSC is modifying the coho FRAM to add fishery and stock strata for Canadian management. The PSC has requested SSC review of these changes before they are implemented in 2004.

Columbia River Fall chinook ocean abundance predictors: there has been some preliminary work on producing ocean run-size predictors for these stocks. The SSC will review these predictors when they have been fully developed and documented.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife management plan for Lower Columbia River coho salmon: the draft plan needs data cleanup and method improvements. The SSC anticipates a document will be presented for review in October 2003.

Oregon Coastal Natural (OCN) coho salmon prediction methodology: new predictors are in development. The SSC will review any proposals for change as requested.

As always, 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.

E. Groundfish Management

2. Report on the Bycatch Workshop and Observer Data Update – Joint meeting with GMT and GAP

Dr. Michael Dalton (panel chair) presented the review panel report on the bycatch model. The SSC commends the review panel for a thorough and careful review of the bycatch model and data inputs. The panel report includes a number of recommendations for improving the bycatch model. These include both short-term recommendations for 2003 and 2004 and longer term recommendations for model development. The SSC fully endorses the panel recommendations. A key panel recommendation was that "as soon as feasible, the bycatch rates currently used in the model be replaced with rates from the observer program, in accordance with guidance by the SSC."

Dr. Jim Hastie presented observer estimates of bycatch rates from the first year of the observer program (bi-monthly periods 5 and 6 of 2001 and bi-monthly periods 1 through 4 of 2002). To estimate bycatch rates, haul weights of retained catch were adjusted by fishtickets. Adjusted logbook data are not yet available to estimate retained catch. To calculate bycatch rates for use in the bycatch model, observer data can potentially be post-stratified by target fishery, period, area, and depth zone. Dr. Hastie presented tables of bycatch ratios (total bycatch/total landings) for various levels of stratification. As expected, there is a clear tradeoff between the level of stratification and precision of the estimated bycatch ratio. Lower coefficients of variation (CV) are obtained when fewer strata are used.

The SSC considers the example of a four-cell stratification (north-south, shallow-deep) as just one of several possible stratifications of the observer bycatch data. It is important to have a good stratification scheme, one which takes into account both the tradeoff between the number of strata and precision of the bycatch estimates and the utility of the model to evaluate complex management alternatives. Formal model selection criteria, such as AIC (Akaike Information Criterion), may be one possible approach to determine the appropriate level of stratification.

Comparison of bycatch projections for 2003 between observer-based bycatch rates and bycatch rates used previously indicates higher catch projections (in some cases much higher) for all overfished groundfish stocks with the exception of widow rockfish.

Bycatch projections using observer bycatch rates with alternative stratifications indicate sensitivity to the level of stratification, particularly whether or not a target fishery strata is defined. The SSC notes that with only a year of observer sampling available, the data are too sparse to support fully stratified bycatch estimates (i.e., by target fishery, bi-monthly period, area, and depth zone), particularly in the southern area. Additional work is needed to (1) characterize uncertainty in bycatch projections, and (2) further evaluate the sensitivity of bycatch projections to alternative levels of stratification.

The SSC considers the bycatch rates based on observer data to be the best available scientific data for use in the bycatch model. Notwithstanding the unresolved issues regarding stratification, the SSC recommends bycatch rates based on observer data be used for evaluating management alternatives for 2004 and for inseason management in 2003. The SSC urges the Council to move quickly to use the new bycatch rates for inseason management, as delay could severely restrict the range of potential management alternatives later in the year. For this meeting, the SSC recommends the Groundfish Management Team omit the target fishery strata and consider only bycatch rates stratified by area, depth zone, and perhaps season. Target fisheries were defined on the basis of historical fishing patterns, and there is little evidence these targeting strategies still exist under the current management policies.

9. Status of the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Environmental Impact Statement

This item was deleted from the SSC agenda.

5. Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment 16 - Rebuilding Plans

Dr. Kit Dahl provided an overview of Draft Amendment 16-1 to the groundfish fishery management plan (FMP) (Exhibit E.5, Attachment 2) with emphasis on modifications that have been incorporated since the last SSC review of the draft amendment (November 2002). The SSC focused on three of the issues delineated in Section. 2.1 of the Draft Amendment, namely:

Issue 1: The form and required elements of rebuilding plans.

Issue 2: The process for periodically reviewing rebuilding plans.

Issue 3: Defining events or standards that would trigger revision of a rebuilding plan.

In previous statements (September 2002 and November 2002), the SSC has emphasized that the Council should expect numerical details of rebuilding plans (e.g., B_{MSY} or B_0) to change over time – whether due to improved estimates of these parameters from updated stock assessments, the development of new models, or due to technical errors that were not discovered in the previous stock assessment review. The SSC recommended that the use of hard numbers in the rebuilding amendment be minimized and that revisions to rebuilding plans be tied more closely to the stock assessment cycle. In general, the preferred options in the current draft of the amendment are now closely aligned with the SSC recommendations.

The remaining point that could be clarified is the specification of control rules in the FMP amendment. In the current draft, it is not clear whether future harvest guidelines (for stocks under rebuilding) will be based on constant-F strategies or whether, in some cases, constant catch strategies will be acceptable. The SSC suggests that constant-F strategies be used in all cases, and this should be clearly stated in the amendment.

Mr. John DeVore reviewed Draft Amendment 16-2, Parts I through V (Exhibit E.5, Attachments 3 through 7). The remaining sections of Amendment 16-2 – Environmental Review (Part VI) and Combined and Cumulative

Effects (Part VII) – were not available for SSC review. However, Mr. DeVore provided a status report on Part VII. The subsequent SSC discussion focused primarily on the newly incorporated "mixed stock exception" option (MSE) that will be incorporated into the draft amendment and, in particular, the Part VII "cumulative effects analysis" that will support it. Under the MSE option, bocaccio, canary, yelloweye, and widow rockfish rebuilding plans would be exempted from the usual rebuilding guidelines (e.g., there would be no requirement for rebuilding to B_{MSY} within T_{MAX} years). Prior to consideration of the MSE option, the SSC recommends:

1. Clearly defined criteria should be established for species to be exempted.
2. Widow rockfish should be removed from the candidate list unless future harvest of widow constrains the catch of other species.
3. The "cumulative effects analysis" should include the full suite of biological effects and economic benefits under the MSE option. As currently envisioned, stock size changes for groundfish stocks that are not in the overfished category are not incorporated into the analysis. Benefit tradeoffs, such as in exvessel revenue, are likely to be dominated by the non-overfished stocks.

These recommendations are of utmost importance should the Council desire to use the MSE option as its preferred option in finalizing the amendment at the June 2003 Council meeting. Further, the Council should note that the SSC will not be able to review the "cumulative effects analysis" prior to the June Council meeting.

7. Standards and Criteria for Approving Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs)

The Council's groundfish FMP provides for the issuance of EFPs by NMFS to promote the increased use of underutilized species, to realize the expansion potential of the domestic groundfish fishery, and to increase the harvest efficiency of the fishery consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the goals of the groundfish FMP. The GMT has developed a draft set of protocols for EFP applications that is being considered for adoption as part of the Council's Operating Procedures (Exhibit E.7, Supplemental Revised Attachment 2, April 2003). Previously, the SSC had indicated a willingness to assist the GMT in evaluating scientific issues associated with EFP applications (Exhibit G.6.c, Supplemental SSC Report, November 2002).

The SSC discussed how it could be of greatest assistance to the GMT in evaluating EFP applications, considering that many submissions are designed to address a policy or management objective, and have little or no identifiable scientific purpose. Following that discussion the SSC concluded the following:

1. All EFP applications should first be evaluated by the GMT for consistency with the goals and objectives of the groundfish FMP and the Council's strategic plan for groundfish.
2. When a proposal is submitted that includes a significant scientific component that would benefit from SSC review, the GMT can refer the application to the SSC's groundfish subcommittee for comment.
3. In such instances, the groundfish subcommittee will evaluate the scientific merits of the application and will specifically evaluate the application's (a) problem statement, (b) data collection methodology, (c) proposed analytical and statistical treatment of the data, and (d) the generality of the inferences that could be drawn by the study.

A. Administrative

6. National Fisheries Conservation Center Presentation

The SSC was briefed by Mr. Brock Bernstein regarding a workshop being planned by National Fisheries Conservation Center (NFCC) to evaluate the current state of science regarding integration of marine reserves with fishery management. The workshop will be modeled on the National Institutes of Health (NIH) State of the Science workshops, which are designed to facilitate resolution of conflicting scientific evidence regarding treatment for medical conditions. NFCC proposes a 2.5 day meeting - slightly longer than the standard 2-day meeting used by the NIH, but more realistic in the current context, given the complexity of marine reserve issues.

[[[May be error in above paragraph that affects logic of full statement; i.e, NIH uses 2.5 day meetings.]]]

The workshop will involve two committees, (1) a planning committee to identify relevant papers from the marine reserve literature (whose purpose will be to develop questions to be addressed by the review panel and select the review panel), and (2) a review panel to evaluate the literature, hear presentations from experts, evaluate and synthesize the written and oral material, and prepare a final report.

Workshop funding will come from the Packard Foundation, Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO), Aquarium of the Pacific in Long Beach, fishermen's groups, and others.

The workshop will take place in an auditorium that holds about 175 people. The workshop will be open to the public, but no public comment will be allowed. The NFCC plans to videotape the proceedings for distribution.

While the workshop will likely involve discussion of West Coast marine reserve issues, the NFCC also wants to include experts from the East and Southeast United States., as well as international experts. Workshop recommendations will not be specific to a given geographic area, but will be broadly relevant to the issue of marine reserves.

Highlights of the SSC discussion regarding the NFCC workshop are as follows:

The composition of the planning committee will be critical to the success of the workshop. In response to SSC questions regarding how the committee would be chosen, Mr. Bernstein indicated that NFCC has broad representation from the conservation and fishing communities. The NFCC would have to be trusted to put together an appropriate planning committee, who would then select an appropriate review panel.

The NIH guidelines limit the material to be considered by the panel to peer-reviewed publications. The SSC noted that there is a considerable "gray" fishery management literature that would need to be considered as well.

In material provided to the SSC at the March 2003 Council meeting, NFCC indicated its intention to have a "preeminent ecologist" chair the review panel. The SSC emphasized the need to ensure that a broad range of expertise is represented on the panel (e.g., fishery managers as well as academic ecologists). A diverse panel will be essential for clarifying areas of convergence and divergence in the viewpoints of managers and ecologists and the currencies in which they evaluate outcomes.

Mr. Bernstein mentioned numbers of fish as a possible common currency for the discussion. The SSC indicated that fishery managers are concerned with yield, sustainable fisheries, essential fish habitat, ecosystem management, and various socioeconomic indicators. Mr. Bernstein indicated that it would not be realistic to include socioeconomics in the scope of the workshop. The SSC indicated that socioeconomics could not be ignored. Fishery management is fundamentally management of people, not fish. It is not possible to evaluate effects of fishery regulations (including marine reserves) on fish stocks without considering how regulations affect people and how people in turn respond to regulations. Moreover, it was not clear to the SSC how the NFCC could fulfill its stated intention to address "congestion externalities" without considering socioeconomics. The SSC felt strongly that socioeconomics was an important key to bringing managers and academics together.

According to Mr. Bernstein, the NFCC will attempt to select panel members who do not have vested interests in marine reserve issues. If that is not possible, they will attempt to "balance" the panel with individuals with various types of biases. The panel may also include individuals who have expertise on terrestrial (rather than marine) areas set aside in reserves. Given the time frame of the workshop, the uncertain composition of the panel, and the apparent intention to exclude socioeconomics from panel consideration, the SSC questioned whether the panel would be able to get to the level of detailed discussion needed to substantively address the issues associated with integrating reserves and fishery management.

In response to Mr. Bernstein's request for SSC advice regarding how to keep the workshop on track, the SSC noted the importance of clear and comprehensive Terms of Reference and submission of presentation material to the review panel well in advance of the workshop date.

The NFCC requests SSC endorsement and participation. They are not seeking funding or any up-front commitment to abide by the findings of the workshop.

The SSC endorses the concept of having a workshop to identify the types of planning and research needed to integrate marine reserves with fishery management. A particularly useful outcome of such a workshop would be a list of collaborative activities that could be undertaken thereafter to facilitate planning, discussion, and research on integrating marine reserves with fishery management. The SSC encourages the organizers to include consideration of socioeconomic issues. Once the workshop proceedings become available, the SSC is willing to review the proceedings for the Council.

G. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

2. Approve Final Regulatory Amendment and Analysis for Changes to the Sardine Allocation

No new technical information or issues were included in the final draft regulatory amendment. The SSC discussed and commented on this item in March 2003.

3. CPS Stock Assessment Terms of Reference

Dr. Ray Conser updated the SSC on the Stock Assessment Review (STAR) workshop for coastal pelagic species (CPS). The SSC agrees the workshop should be scheduled during May 2004.

The Draft Terms of Reference (ToR), given preliminary approval at the March 2003 Council meeting, require a minor revision. Section 5 in Appendix A on rebuilding parameters is unnecessary for CPS species and should be replaced by a section that gives:

1. A full description of the harvest control rules in place for CPS species.
2. Current harvest rates based on the harvest control rules.
3. Harvest guidelines for the next fishing season.

The SSC expects that Council staff will complete this revision, and otherwise considers the ToR final and complete.

Other Matters

No additional matters were discussed.

Public Comment

No public comments on topics not on the SSC agenda were provided.

Adjournment

The SSC adjourned at approximately 5:30 P.M., Tuesday, April 8, 2003.

PFMC
05/28/03

SSC Subcommittee Assignments for 2003

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

**PROPOSED AGENDA
Habitat Committee**

Crowne Plaza Hotel
Alexandria II Room
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 16, 2003

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

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 2003 - 10 A.M.

A. Call to Order and HC Administrative Matters

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

D. Habitat Issues (10:15 a.m.)

1. Klamath/Trinity River Flows Update
 2. Letter to Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) on Klamath Flows
 3. Portland Harbor Superfund Site Update
 4. NEPTUNE Project update
 5. Habitat Mapping Update
- Michael Rode/Mike Orcutt
Michael Rode
Paul Engelmeyer
Waldo Wakefield
Waldo Wakefield

H. Council Administrative Matters (11:45 a.m.)

1. Communications Update
- Jennifer Gilden

Lunch Break (12 p.m. - 1 p.m.)

D. Habitat Issues (continued) (1 p.m.)

6. Letter to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on Priest Rapids Hydro Project Relicensing
 7. Hanford Reach Ramping/Stranding Issues
 8. HC Member Briefings
- Stuart Ellis
Tim Roth/Stuart Ellis
HC

G. Marine Reserves (2 p.m.)

1. **Planning for Federal Waters Portion of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary**
 3. Proposal for Phase II of the Council's Marine Reserves Planning
 2. **Central California Sanctuary Processes Including Krill Ban**
- Sean Hastings
Richard Parrish
Jennifer Gilden

B. Groundfish Management (4:30 p.m.)

11. **Status of the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**
 12. **Update on Groundfish Fishery Management Plan Programmatic EIS**
- Steve Copps
Jim Glock

A. HC Administrative Matters (continued) (6 p.m.)

- | | |
|---|----|
| 3. September 2003 Meeting Agenda | HC |
| 4. Finalize Statements and Letters | HC |
| a. Habitat Report (D.1., Wednesday morning) | |
| b. EFH EIS (B.11, Thursday afternoon) | |
| c. Programmatic EIS (B.12, Thursday afternoon) | |
| d. Channel Islands Planning (G.1, Thursday morning) | |
| e. Central California Marine Reserves (G.2, Thursday morning) | |
| f. FERC Letter (need by Wednesday morning) | |
| g. BOR Letter (need by Wednesday morning) | |

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/02/03

PROPOSED AGENDA
Legislative Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Crowne Plaza Hotel
Drake II Room
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 16, 2003

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 2003 - 10 A.M.

A. Call to Order

Bob Alverson

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda

B. Discussion of Legislative Matters

1. Senate Bill 1106 – To establish national standards for fishing quota programs.

C. Proposed Capacity Reduction Program

1. Notice of proposed National Marine Fisheries Service capacity reduction program to implement the West Coast groundfish fishery buyback program.

D. Other Business

E. Public Comment

F. Develop Report to Council

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/02/03

PROPOSED AGENDA
Budget Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Crowne Plaza Hotel
Drake III Room
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 16, 2003

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 2003 - 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, Annual Audit, and Contracts
 - a. Calendar Year 2002 Base Grant
 - b. Calendar Year 2003 Base Grant
 - c. National Environmental Policy Act and Groundfish Environmental Impact Statement Grant
 - d. Contracts with Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (\$30,000 and \$59,000)
2. Planning for Council Meeting Sites
 - a. Dates for 2006 and 2007 Council Meetings

C. Other

ADJOURN

PPMC
06/09/03

PROPOSED AGENDA Enforcement Consultants

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Drake II Room
Crowne Plaza Hotel
1221 Chess Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 570-5700
June 17 - 20, 2003

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 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. Groundfish Management
 5. Status of Groundfish Fisheries and Initial Policy Consideration of Inseason Adjustments
 6. Standards and Criteria for Approving Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs)
 7. EFP Update and New Proposals for 2004
 9. Implementation of a Vessel Monitoring System
 14. Adoption of a Proposed Range of 2004 Groundfish Management Measures
 15. Alternative Long-term Groundfish Management Strategies
- G. Marine Reserves
 1. Planning for Federal Waters Portion of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS)
 2. Central California Sanctuary Processes Including Krill Ban

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

C. Other Topics (not for final action)

D. Public Comment

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2003 THROUGH FRIDAY JUNE 20, 2003 (As Necessary)

ADJOURN

PFMC
06/02/03