PROPOSED AGENDA

Groundfish Advisory SubPanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Seattle Marriott Hotel Sea-Tac
Seattle Ballroom 2 and 3
3201 South 176th Street
Seattle, Washington 98188
206-241-2000
March 6-10, 2006

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2006 – 8 A.M.

A. Administrative Matters
(*8 a.m.*)

1. Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, etc. — Tom Ghio, Chair
2. Elect Chair and Vice Chair for 2006
3. Opening Remarks and Agenda Overview — Jim Seger
4. Approve Agenda

F. Groundfish Management

2. Stock Assessment Planning for the 2009-2010 Fishing Season — Elizabeth Clarke
(*9:30 a.m.; Joint Session with the Groundfish Management Team; Report to the Council on Tuesday*)

I. Marine Protected Areas (MPA)

1. Fishery Regulation in MPAs within the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary through Magnuson-Stevens Act and State Management Authority — Mike Burner
(*10:20 a.m.; Informational Update with the Habitat Committee; Report to the Council on Thursday*)

E. Pacific Halibut Management

2. Incidental Catch Regulations for the Salmon Troll and Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries — Brian Culver
(*10:40 a.m.; Report to the Council on Tuesday*)

F. Groundfish Management (continued)

3. Yelloweye Stock Assessment — Farron Wallace
   (*11 a.m.; Report to the Council on Tuesday*)

4. Pacific Whiting Management for 2006 — Tom Helser
   (*1 p.m.; Report to the Council on Wednesday*)

5. Consideration of Inseason Adjustments
   (*1:30 p.m.; Report to the Council on Thursday*)

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. Administrative Matters (continued)

5. Review Statements
   (*8 a.m.*)

F. Groundfish Management (continued)

4. Pacific Whiting Management for 2006
   (*9 a.m.; Joint Session with the Groundfish Management Team*)

5. Consideration of Inseason Adjustments
   (*10 a.m.; Joint Session with the Groundfish Management Team*)

4. Pacific Whiting Management for 2006
   (*11 a.m.*)

5. Consideration of Inseason Adjustments
   (*1 p.m.*)

Amendment 16-4 and 2007-2008 Groundfish Harvest Specifications and Management Measures
(*2 p.m.; Working Session with the Groundfish Management Team*)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. Administrative Matters (continued)

6. Review Statements
   (*8 a.m.*)

Amendment 16-4 and 2007-2008 Groundfish Harvest Specifications and Management Measures
(*11 a.m.; Working Session with the Groundfish Management Team*)

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. Administrative Matters (continued)

7. Review Statements
   (*8 a.m.*)

Amendment 16-4 and 2007-2008 Groundfish Harvest Specifications and Management Measures
(*1 p.m.; Working Session with the Groundfish Management Team*)

FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. Administrative Matters (continued)

8. Review Statements
   (*8 a.m., Washington Ballroom D*)

Amendment 16-4 and 2007-2008 Groundfish Harvest Specifications and Management Measures
(*8:30 a.m.; Working Session with the Groundfish Management Team*)

ADJOURN

PFMC
02/15/06

F:\!PFMC\MEETING\2005\November\GMT\Anc_B_Nov2005_GMT_Agenda.doc

PROPOSED AGENDA

Groundfish Management Team

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Seattle Marriott Hotel Sea-Tac
Seattle Ballroom 1
3201 South 176th Street
Seattle, Washington 98188
206-241-2000
March 6-10, 2006

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2006 – 8 A.M.

A. Administrative Matters
(*8 a.m.*)

1. Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, etc. — Susan Ashcraft, Chair
2. Opening Remarks and Agenda Overview — John DeVore
3. Approve Agenda

F. Groundfish Management

3. Yelloweye Stock Assessment — Brian Culver
(*8:30 a.m.; Report to the Council on Tuesday*)

2. Stock Assessment Planning for the 2009-2010 Fishing Season — Elizabeth Clarke
(*9:30 a.m.; Joint Session with the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel in Seattle Ballroom 2 and 3; Report to the Council on Tuesday*)

4. Pacific Whiting Management for 2006 — John Field
(*11 a.m.; Report to the Council on Wednesday*)

5. Consideration of Inseason Adjustments
(*1:30 p.m.; Report to the Council on Thursday*)

   a. Reconciliation of 2004 Total Catch Mortality for All Fisheries — John Wallace
   b. Reconciliation of 2005 Recreational Catches — State GMT Representatives
   c. Recreational Proposals — State GMT Representatives
   d. Final 2005 QSM Report — Merrick Burden
   e. Commercial Proposals — Merrick Burden

5. Consideration of Inseason Adjustments
(*3:30 p.m.; Joint Session with the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel*)

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. Administrative Matters (continued)

4. Review Statements
(*8 a.m.*)

F. Groundfish Management (continued)

4. Pacific Whiting Management for 2006
(*9 a.m.; Joint Session with the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel*)

4. Pacific Whiting Management for 2006
(*2 p.m.; After the Council Session on the Yelloweye Stock Assessment*)

5. Consideration of Inseason Adjustments
(*3 p.m.*)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. Administrative Matters (continued)

5. Review Statements
(*8 a.m.*)

Amendment 16-4 and 2007-2008 Groundfish Harvest Specifications and Management Measures
(*11 a.m.; Working Session with the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel*)

B. Administrative Matters

6. April 2006 Council Meeting Agenda and Three-Meeting Outlook
(*1 p.m.; Report to the Council on Friday*)

Efficiency Standards and Protocols
(*3:30 p.m.*)

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. Administrative Matters (continued)

6. Review Statements
   (*8 a.m.*)

Amendment 16-4 and 2007-2008 Groundfish Harvest Specifications and Management Measures
(*1 p.m.; Working Session with the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel*)

FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. Administrative Matters (continued)

8. Review Statements
   (*8 a.m, Washington Ballroom C*)

Amendment 16-4 and 2007-2008 Groundfish Harvest Specifications and Management Measures
(*8:30 a.m.; Working Session with the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel*)

ADJOURN

PFMC
02/15/06

PROPOSED AGENDA
Salmon Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Seattle Marriott Hotel Sea-Tac
Washington Ballroom B
3201 South 176th Street
Seattle, Washington 98188
206-241-2000
March 6-10, 2006

NOTE: There will be a special presentation Friday, March 10, at 10:30 A.M., on an experimental salmon excluder device used in the Makah tribal whiting fishery. The presentation will be held in Washington Ballroom B, the SAS meeting room.

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. Call to Order
(*8 A.M.*)

1. Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, etc. — Don Stevens, Chair
2. Opening Remarks and Agenda Overview — Chuck Tracy
3. Approve Agenda
4. Elect Chair and Vice Chair

C. Salmon Management

3. Review of 2005 Fisheries and Summary of 2006 Stock Abundance Estimates — STT
(*8:30 A.M. Monday Discussion with STT*;
1:00 P.M. Report to the Council on Tuesday)

2. Fort Bragg (and Oregon) March 15, 2006 Commercial Fishery Opening — STT
(*8:30 A.M. Monday. Discussion with STT*;
3*:00 P.M. Report to the Council on Monday*)

1. Mass Marking and Coded-Wire Tagging — Dave Hankin
(9*:30 A.M. Monday Discussion with SSC*;
2*:30 P.M. Report to the Council on Monday*)

E. Pacific Halibut Management

2. Public Review Options for the 2006 Incidental Catch Regulations in the Salmon Troll and Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries (*8:30 A.M. Report to the Council on Tuesday*) — Chuck Tracy

C. Salmon Management (continued)

4. Identification of Management Objectives and Preliminary Definitions of 2006 Salmon Management Measures (*1:30 P.M. Report to the Council on Tuesday*) — Chuck Tracy/Peter Dygert/ Robert Kope

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006 - 8 A.M.

C. Salmon Management (continued)

4. Identification of Management Objectives and Preliminary Definitions of 2006 Salmon Management Measures (*1:30 P.M. Report to the Council on Tuesday*) — Chuck Tracy

7. FMP Amendment Scoping for the Klamath River Fall Chinook Conservation Objective (8*:00 A.M. Report to the Council on Friday*) — Chuck Tracy

F. Groundfish Management

4. Pacific Whiting Management for 2006 (8*:00 A.M. Report to the Council on Wednesday*) — Peter Dygert

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2006 - 8 A.M.

G. Habitat

1. Current Habitat Issues (*11:00 A.M. Report to the Council on Wednesday*) — Jim Tuggle

C. Salmon Management (continued)

5. Council Recommendations of 2006 Management Option Analysis (*4:00 P.M. Report to the Council on Wednesday*) — Chuck Tracy

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. SAS Administrative Matters (continued)

5. Review Statements

C. Salmon Management (continued)

6. Council Direction for 2006 Management Options (If Necessary) — Chuck Tracy
   (*4 P.M. Report to the Council on Thursday*)

B. Administrative Matters

8. April 2006 Council Meeting Agenda and Three Meeting Plan
   (*9:30 A.M. Report to the Council on Friday*)

FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. SAS Administrative Matters (continued)

6. Review Statements

7. Presentation on Experimental Salmon Excluder Device Used in the Makah Tribal Whiting Fishery — John Gauvin
   (*1:00 P.M. in the SAS Meeting Room*)

C. Salmon Management (continued)

8. Adoption of 2006 Management Options for Public Review — Chuck Tracy
   (*1 P.M. Report to the Council on Friday*)

ADJOURN

PFMC
02/13/06

PROPOSED AGENDA
Salmon Technical Team

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Seattle Marriott Hotel Sea-Tac
Washington Ballroom A
3201 South 176th Street
Seattle, Washington 98188
206-241-2000
March 6-10, 2006

NOTE: There will be a special presentation Friday, March 10, at 10:30 A.M., on an experimental salmon excluder device used in the Makah tribal whiting fishery. The presentation will be held in Washington Ballroom B, the SAS meeting room.

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. Call to Order
(*8 A.M.*)

1. Roll Call, Introductions, Announcements, etc. — Dell Simmons, Chair
2. Opening Remarks and Agenda Overview — Chuck Tracy
3. Approve Agenda
4. Elect Chair and Vice Chair
5. Schedule for Preseason Reports — Chuck Tracy

C. Salmon Management

2. Fort Bragg (and Oregon) March 15, 2006 Commercial Fishery Opening — STT
(*8:30 A.M. Monday Discussion with SAS*;
3*:00 P.M. Report to the Council on Monday*)

3. Review of 2005 Fisheries and Summary of 2006 Stock Abundance Estimates — STT
(*8:30 A.M. Monday Discussion with SAS*;
10:00 A.M. Monday Discussion with SSC;
1:00 P.M. Report to the Council on Tuesday)

1. Mass Marking and Coded-Wire Tagging — Dave Hankin
(9*:30 A.M. Monday Discussion with SSC*;
2*:30 P.M. Report to the Council on Monday*)

C. Salmon Management (continued)

7. FMP Amendment Scoping for the Klamath River Fall Chinook Conservation Objective (*11:00 A.M. Discussion with SSC; 8:00 A.M. Report to the Council on Friday*) — Chuck Tracy

B. Administrative Matters (continued)

6. April 2006 Council Meeting Agenda and Three Meeting Plan (*9:30 A.M. Report to the Council on Friday*)

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006 - 8 A.M.

C. Salmon Management (continued)

4. Identification of Management Objectives and Preliminary Definitions of 2006 Salmon Management Measures (*1:30 P.M. Report to the Council on Tuesday*) — Chuck Tracy

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2006 - 8 A.M.

C. Salmon Management (continued)

5. Council Recommendations of 2006 Management Option Analysis (*4:00 P.M. Report to the Council on Wednesday*) — Chuck Tracy

A. STT Administrative Matters (continued)

7. Review Statements

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. STT Administrative Matters (continued)

8. Review Statements

C. Salmon Management (continued)

6. Council Direction for 2006 Management Options (If Necessary) (*4:00 P.M. Report to the Council on Thursday*) — Chuck Tracy

FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. STT Administrative Matters (continued)

9. Review Statements

10. Presentation on Experimental Salmon Excluder Device Used in the Makah Tribal Whiting Fishery (*1:00 P.M. Joint Session in SAS Meeting Room*) — John Gauvin

C. Salmon Management (continued)

8. Adoption of 2006 Management Options for Public Review (*1:00 P.M. Report to the Council on Friday*) — Chuck Tracy

ADJOURN

PFMC
02/13/06

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES
Scientific and Statistical Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Hyatt Regency Islandia
Mission C
1441 Quivira Road
San Diego, CA 92109
619-224-1234
October 31 - November 1

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

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. Dr. Don McIsaac briefed the SSC on priority agenda items.

Subcommittee assignments for 2005 are detailed in the table at the end of this document.

Members in Attendance

Mr. Tom Barnes, California Department on Fish and Game, La Jolla, CA
Mr. Steve Berkeley, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA
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. Owen Hamel, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA
Dr. Kevin Hill, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA
Mr. Tom Jagielo, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA
Dr. André Punt, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
Dr. Hans Radtke, Yachats, OR
Dr. Stephen Ralston, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA
Dr. David Sampson, Oregon State University, Newport, OR
Ms. Cynthia Thomson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA

Members Absent

Dr. Peter Lawson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Newport, OR

Scientific and Statistical Committee Comments to the Council

The following is a compilation of November 2005 SSC reports to the Council. (Related SSC discussion not included in written comment to the Council is provided in italicized text).

Coastal Pelagic Species Management

D.1. Pacific Sardine Stock Assessment and Harvest Guideline for 2006 Rebuilding Plan Revision Rules

Dr. Kevin Hill (Southwest Fisheries Science Center) presented the stock assessment of Pacific sardine to the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC). The assessment is based on the age-structured assessment program (ASAP) model and is an update to last year's assessment which was based on the same methodology. This model was reviewed by a Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel during June 2004. The new data included in the assessment are 2004-05 catches for the U.S. fisheries, revised catches for the Ensenada fishery for 2000-2005, a recalculated series of spotter plane indices, and a daily egg production method estimate of abundance for 2005.

The assessment presented by Dr. Hill represents the best available science regarding the status of the Pacific sardine resource. The SSC endorses the use of the harvest guideline (118,937 mt) estimated using the fishery management plan control rule and the biomass estimate of 1.1 million mt for management of the Pacific sardine fishery for 2006. This harvest guideline is 13% lower than the 2005 harvest guideline. The SSC notes that the U.S. catches have been below the Council-specified harvest guidelines. However, after accounting for catches by Canada and Mexico, the total catches for 2002 and 2004 are now estimated to have been greater than the retrospective estimates of the stockwide harvest guidelines calculated as part of this assessment.

The biomass time-series from the assessment is similar to that from last year's assessment for the years after 1998-1999 and somewhat higher for the years prior to this. Last year's assessment estimated the 2003-2004 recruitment to be the largest in the time-series, but that estimate was based on a very limited amount of data (primarily the number of age-0 fish caught during 2003-2004). The data on which the 2006 assessment are based have now confirmed that there was a strong recruitment during 2003-2004.

The SSC notes that the harvest guideline depends on population weight-at-age, which is poorly known. The SSC supports regular systematic sampling, such as the proposed coastwide survey planned for 2006, which can provide annual estimates of population weight-at-age and as well as of maturity-at-age.

The next STAR Panel to review the Pacific sardine assessment is scheduled for 2007. The SSC anticipates that it should be possible to include the results from the coastwide survey in the assessment to be reviewed by this STAR Panel. The SSC recommends that review of the Pacific sardine and mackerel assessments will be enhanced if the SSC Coastal Pelagic Species subcommittee can meet to discuss the draft assessments prior to the Council meetings at which these assessment are to be presented.

D.2. Alternatives Analysis for Krill Management

Ms. Susan Smith and Mr. Svein Fougner met with the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC), and summarized the data and analyses used in the "Draft alternatives analysis for the management of krill fishing off the U.S. West Coast" (Agenda Item D.2.a., Attachment 1). Information in this document will be used in the Council's process of determining how krill may be managed off the U.S. West Coast.

Two species of krill are included in the proposed action, *Euphausia pacifica* and *Thysanoessa spinifera*. Although both species may range throughout the Exclusive Economic Zone, the distribution is patchy and varies annually. Areas of high krill abundance with the presence of predators have been proposed as defining "hot spots" for the purposes of management. However, the underlying data for those area determinations was not presented. The SSC suggests that maps of krill abundance be included in the document so that an objective approach to the designation of "hot spots" can be better understood. Also, the geographic inter-annual variability of krill should be provided for the discussion of "hot spots".

Abundance data were assembled for the document from several sources, based on different sample designs and survey methods. Issues such as avoidance of sample gear during daylight surveys, and the possibility that samples may not have been taken randomly may affect the interpretation of survey data, but the influence of these effects on the analyses was not clear. The question of abundance would benefit from standardized survey methods applied coast-wide, including hydroacoustic (multi-beam) and random survey design for plankton-net sampling.

Estimates of the krill standing stock that are provided in the document appear to be reasonable based on the available data, and may serve as a provisional range of values for B_0. However, the range for B_0 provided in the document (Table 3-3) only captures the uncertainty associated with habitat assumptions used to derive the values. The SSC notes that the range would be considerably broader if the CVs from the underlying density estimates were brought into the calculations.

If the Council desires to develop a control rule for West Coast krill stocks, the concept of maximum sustainable yield (MSY) does not appear to be practical or appropriate. As in the case of market squid and sardine, the SSC suggests that explicit dependence on MSY be avoided in developing a krill control rule. The technical review for market squid (Amendment 10) determined that attempts to estimate MSY were not scientifically supportable, and it is reasonable to expect that a more thorough review for krill would reach the same conclusion. The SSC recommends that an F-based approach to developing a krill control rule be explored as an alternative, if the Council decides to manage the stock and provide for a fishery. This approach may not be dependent on unreliable estimates of biomass, and could provide an advisable level of precaution for a resource that is ecologically important as forage for other species that are managed by the Council. The approach of adding krill to the CPS FMP would appear to be a reasonable way to provide management oversight for the krill resource, while also providing an opportunity to support research into the significant

data gaps that exist. However, the SSC cautions that additional work on krill may divert or dilute research resources that are important for ongoing management of other Council-managed species.

Considerable research on krill populations and harvest rates has previously been done for Antarctic krill stocks, and existing literature could provide additional insights into modeling a possible West

Coast krill fishery. Also, estimates of fishable krill harvest may be possible using existing ecosystem models.

Salmon Management

G.1. Salmon Methodology Review

A joint meeting of the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) Salmon Subcommittee and the Salmon Technical Team (STT) was held on October 12, 2005 in Portland. Presentations were given on the two items identified for review at the Council's September 2005 meeting:

- Documentation of the Coho and Chinook Fishery Regulation Assessment Models (FRAM), and
- Ocean abundance forecasts for Columbia River Fall Chinook salmon.

Coho and Chinook FRAM Documentation

Mr. Andy Rankis, Mr. Jim Packer, and Mr. Larrie LaVoy of the Model Evaluation Workgroup (MEW) gave presentations on the documentation of the Coho and Chinook FRAM models. Currently, the models are described in three documents:

1. Fishery Regulation Assessment Model (FRAM). An Overview for Chinook and Coho (2005 Update).
2. Coho FRAM Base Period Development.
3. Chinook FRAM Base Period Development.

The FRAM models project fishery effects in a given year using stock abundances and fishing efforts "scaled" to stock abundances and fishery exploitation rates (age-specific for Chinook) during a defined base period. The base period development reports were the focus of the meeting discussions.

FRAM Overview for Chinook and Coho - 2005 Update:

The overview document describes the modeling steps used by each FRAM to calculate fishery impacts for 33 Chinook stock groups and 123 coho stock groups. Unless a separate FRAM User's Guide is to be prepared, questions will arise regarding its application. A section describing the process through which FRAM parameter values are established during preseason planning processes would be helpful. The overview documentation also lacks any discussion of the interpretation of FRAM results. This is an extremely important area that should be addressed.

Although the FRAM steps are outlined in flow charts (Figure 1 for coho and Figure 2 for Chinook) and a discussion of some of the algorithms used in the model is included in the report, there is no linkage between these figures and text. If the steps in the figure and the corresponding text were linked a reader could refer to a specific section in the report for details on the methods used at each step.

The FRAM program interacts with two species-specific (Chinook and coho) Terminal Area Management Module (TAMM) spreadsheets that allow users to specify terminal fishery impacts on a finer level of time and area resolution. The Coho TAMM now serves more as a recipient of

FRAM output for customized report generation. In contrast, the Chinook TAMM remains a critical element of pre-season modeling for Puget Sound fisheries, as many populations of management interest need to be "extracted" from the aggregated FRAM stock groupings. The TAMM fishery inputs, in addition to a fixed catch, allow for two fishery control mechanisms that are not used by FRAM: (1) percent of terminal area abundance (TAA) and (2) percent of extreme terminal run size (ETRS). The SSC finds the documentation for the TAMM (section 7 of the overview document) incomplete. The SSC requests that a flow chart and the algorithms used to derive TAA and ETRS, and other TAMM calculations, be included in the overview document.

Coho FRAM Base Period Development:

The Coho FRAM Base Period Development documentation is in draft form. Although Figure 1 provides an overall view of how the data were put together and how the base period was developed, it is difficult to match each step in the figure with the corresponding text that describes the step in the document. The report would benefit if each step in Figure 1 was linked to a section in the document. A reader could then refer to that section in the report for details on the methods used. The text section that is linked to a step in Figure 1 should include all the data input files, data output, the programs used, a brief explanation of what each program does (not the program code), and the algorithms used to manipulate the data. The documentation of the model calibration process provided in the section 3 of the Chinook FRAM Base Period Development report provides an example of this level of documentation. Creating a linkage between the steps in Figures 2 – 9 with text would improve the value of each figure and the report as a whole.

Some of the 123 coho stock groups in the base period do not have coded-wire tag (CWT) data associated with them yet Production Expansion Factors (PEFs) are assigned to them. The report should include a section that describes the methods used to develop PEFs for stock groups without CWT recoveries.

Mr. Packer stated that work on the Coho FRAM is ongoing and the base period will include additional years in the future. The SSC recommends that any changes to the model or the base period be noted in the documentation.

Chinook FRAM Base Period Development:

The documentation for the Chinook FRAM base period was incomplete; consequentially it was difficult to track how the base period calculations were made. It appears that all steps used to develop a base period data set for Chinook are included in Figures 1, 2, 2a, and 3. The SSC suggests that these figures form the basis of the documentation. All steps outlined in these figures should be linked to a section in the report that describes all the data input files, data output, the programs used, a brief explanation of what each program does (not the program code), and the algorithms used to manipulate the data (similarly to the documentation for section 3 of the Chinook report).

A primary point of confusion among the SSC and STT was the derivation of an "all stocks" CWT recovery data set that includes CWT recovery data of stocks tagged during the base period with simulated CWT recoveries of stocks that were not tagged during the base period (Out of Base Stocks or OOB stocks). Because of the importance of stock abundance estimates in the base period for FRAM calculations, this report needs to provide a clearer explanation of the methods used to bring the OOB stocks into the base period. Providing a simple numerical example of how an OOB stock

could be incorporated into the base period would clarify this process.
The documentation for the Chinook FRAM is not yet sufficient to allow SSC review of the model, especially as it applies to mark-selective fisheries. The MEW has indicated that the changes requested could be available for SSC review at the June 2006 Council meeting. If a complete draft document were available in June, the SSC would be able to thoroughly review the documentation and provide additional feedback to the MEW for finalization of the documentation for review during the September/November 2006 PFMC meetings.

To facilitate better understanding of what FRAM does and how it works, the SSC recommends that all programs and data that are used in both the coho and Chinook FRAMs be archived in a single web FTP location and that they be accessible to the public. All changes and modifications to the models, programs, and input data sets should be documented and copies of the documentation should be available from the FTP site.

Ocean Abundance Forecasts for Columbia River Fall Chinook Salmon

Mr. Henry Yuen (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service) gave a presentation on methods to forecast ocean abundances for four Columbia River Chinook salmon stocks. Currently the Oregon Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) provides forecasts of the return to the mouth of the Columbia River for these stocks. These river-mouth forecasts must then be converted into ocean cohort abundance estimates for use in the Chinook FRAM. The current procedure for making this conversion introduces bias into the preseason planning models and processes. A method which is based on direct forecasts of ocean cohort abundance for these stocks that could be directly entered into Chinook FRAM would address this bias.

A number of the models presented in the report appear promising for forecasting ocean cohort abundance of these four Columbia River Chinook stocks. However, it is unclear how these methods could be utilized in the current management process to establish ocean abundance cohort sizes for Columbia River stocks for use in the Chinook FRAM. Currently, there are no forecast methods that are consistently applied annually to either stocks, age groups, or between years. Each year the TAC evaluates a large number of models and selects a forecast for each stock and age group. The proposed methods will increase the number of forecasts that the TAC evaluates each year and will produce forecasts of ocean cohort abundance estimates rather than Columbia River mouth abundance estimates as is done currently.

Additional work in this area is warranted, and further review is needed, before the SC can endorse the proposed methodologies. Specifically,

- There are several methods that could be used to calculate the ocean abundance of Columbia River Chinook stocks. For this report, a ratio of Columbia River mouth returns (estimated by WDFW) to Columbia River coded wire tag (CWT) recoveries was used to convert the ocean abundance of CWT recoveries to ocean abundance of Columbia River fish. Two other possible methods of estimating ocean abundance use: (1) a run reconstruction algorithm (cohort analysis) or (2) a recursive method which uses estimates of ocean mortality and survival. Before a decision on which forecast models are "best", an analysis of the differences between the estimates of ocean cohort size provided by the different methods and an examination of the advantages and disadvantages of each method is needed.

- The TAC should evaluate the advantages of using methods which forecast ocean abundance directly and determine whether the continued use of river-mouth abundance forecasts is warranted.

G.3. Klamath River Fall Chinook Conservation Objective

Mr. Michael Mohr presented the "Klamath River Fall Chinook Stock-Recruitment Analysis" report by the Salmon Technical Team (STT) to a joint meeting of the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) Salmon Subcommittee and the STT on October 12, 2005 in Portland. The report presents information on:

- Two Ricker-type stock-recruit analyses for Klamath River fall chinook salmon,
- A meta-analysis based on Ricker stock-recruit analyses and watershed area, and
- Correlation analyses of survival and flow during two time periods.

The analyses were technically sound and thoroughly documented.

The first Ricker-type stock-recruitment model was a standard analysis of recruits as a function of spawners. The second Ricker-type model included a measure of out-migration and early ocean survival. Including this survival measure adjusts for variability that is ostensibly not due to the density-dependent relationship between spawners and recruits and, in this case, substantially improved the fit of the model. Compared to model 1, the estimated spawners at maximum sustainable yield (S_{MSY}), for model 2 increased from 32,700 to 40,700 spawners. This latter is calculated using the mean of the logarithm of the survival measure, which results in a point estimate with an unrealistically small confidence interval. A simulation model could produce a more realistic point estimate of and confidence interval around the optimal escapement level for long term average harvest or other management goal. This would likely be larger than 40,700 spawners for model 2.

The meta-analysis was based on a study developed for the Pacific Salmon Commission that relates S_{MSY} (based on Ricker stock recruit functions) to watershed area. The Klamath Basin is south of and much larger than any of the systems in the original analysis and the results are based on extrapolations beyond the range of data used to develop the model.

The flow analyses correlated flow data from stations on the Trinity and Klamath Rivers with aggregate hatchery survival. Flows during juvenile out-migration and adult spawning migration were tested. Weakly significant correlations were found suggesting that higher flows related to higher survivals. Natural production is expected to be more sensitive to flows than hatchery production, but no natural survival data are available. Temperature in the Klamath Basin is known to be a problem for chinook salmon, but no appropriate time series of temperature data were available. In conclusion, the flow analysis is incomplete and necessary data are lacking. It does not provide an adequate basis for management decisions.

The stock-recruitment models estimated S_{MSY} as 32,700 spawners without an early life-history survival index and 40,700 spawners with an early life-history survival index. The habitat based model S_{MSY} was 70,900, however this was derived from a regression well outside the range of data used to develop the model. The analysis is thorough and informative, given the limitations of the data available. The SSC endorses the Ricker model analyses as the best available science that could be used to assess whether the 35,000 fish escapement floor is consistent with management goals.

Groundfish Management

H.2. Stock Assessments and Rebuilding Analyses for 2007-2008 Groundfish Fisheries

Stock assessments for Petrale sole, lingcod, and canary rockfish were carried over to the September wrap-up Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel, which also reviewed rebuilding analyses for the seven overfished species. The September STAR Panel consisted of six members of the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) groundfish subcommittee, one stock assessment scientist from the Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC) and one committee of independent experts reviewer. Revised stock assessments for all three species were reviewed and approved by the STAR Panel. The STAR Panel report was presented to the SSC by Dr. Martin Dorn, who chaired the STAR Panel.

Petrale Sole

The northern petrale sole stock assessment, originally scheduled for review at the April STAR Panel, was withdrawn because age composition data for recent years arrived during the review. Final review of both northern and southern petrale stock assessments were deferred to the September wrap-up STAR Panel.

The SSC reviewed the revised stock assessment and STAR Panel reports for both southern and northern petrale stocks (Agenda Item H.2.a, Attachment 2). The Stock Assessment Team (STAT) identified a number of issues with the northern stock concerning the modeling of multiple fisheries with dome-shaped selectivity patterns using sex-specific age data from different agencies. The model performed erratically and the complexity of the model made it difficult to interpret the results. To resolve these issues, the STAR Panel recommended that a radically simplified model, with all fisheries having the same asymptotic selectivity and with the sexes combined, be used. The simple model fit the data almost as well as the more complex model, giving very similar biomass trends.

Model results indicate that both stocks were above the overfishing threshold; Petrale sole in the north was estimated to be at 34% of unfished spawning biomass in 2005, and at 29% of unfished spawning biomass in the south. Biomass trends were quantitatively similar in both areas and the SSC recommends that a single coastwide assessment be considered in future stock assessments if issues with data patchiness can be resolved.

The current stock assessment presents a very different picture of stock trends over time in the north compared to the previous assessment. For example, in the 1999 stock assessment, spawning stock biomass in 1998, was estimated to be 39% of B_0, while the current assessment now estimates that the 1998 spawning biomass was 12% of B_0. The reason for these differences is unclear, but the SSC notes that there were many changes to the model and the catch data that may account for these results. The stock appears to have recovered from this very low level of abundance despite a long period of relatively stable catches.

The SSC endorses the STAR Panel conclusions that this assessment represents the best available science and can form the basis for Council decision-making.

Lingcod

Lingcod was first reviewed at the August STAR Panel meeting but was not approved largely because of uncertainty concerning the strength of the 1999 and 2000 year classes that were strongly influencing the perception of stock recovery. The STAT examined the evidence for these strong year classes and presented their findings at the September STAR Panel meeting.

The STAR panel found that the commercial age composition in 2001 and 2004, and the survey biomass estimates in 2001 and 2004 provided some support for above average year classes in 1999 and 2000, but the magnitude of these increases was uncertain. Data from the recreational fishery did not provide support for above average 1999 and 2000 year classes. However, sensitivity runs in which year class strength for 1999 and 2000 was set to the long term mean still showed the Lingcod-North (LCN) stock rebuilding, a result of the much higher productivity of lingcod compared to other groundfish stocks, and because of the substantial catch reductions in the northern area in recent years. In contrast, the southern stock has been rebuilding more slowly due to smaller reductions in catches and lower recruitment in recent years.

Estimated spawning stock biomass is 87% of unfished for the northern component of the stock and 24% of unfished for the southern component. The coastwide spawning stock biomass is estimated to be 64% of unfished biomass in 2005. Since the Council currently manages lingcod as a single coastwide stock, the stock is considered rebuilt. However, the SSC notes that the large disparity in spawning biomass between the north and south components, combined with different biological parameters suggest that there is some basis for managing lingcod on a regional basis.

The SSC endorses the STAR Panel conclusions that this stock assessment represents the best available science and can form the basis for Council decision making.

Canary Rockfish

At its September meeting, the SSC raised several technical issues with the canary rockfish assessment, and recommended that the canary assessment be revisited by the September STAR Panel. Specifically, the SSC requested that the STAT address the following four issues:
1. Survey catchability (q) was unusually high.
2. Assumed variability in the spawner-recruit relationship was low compared to other rockfish.
3. More complete documentation should be provided.
4. Inclusion of the Santa Cruz juvenile rockfish survey data should be considered.

The STAT complied with these requests and presented their findings at the September STAR Panel meeting. Comparing the survey q for canary with values estimated for other rockfish, it was determined that the q estimated for canary was larger than that estimated in other 2005 shelf rockfish assessments. Although the relatively high q estimate may be inconsistent with what is known of canary habitat (they are found in areas of high relief and complex substrate), this did not constitute sufficient evidence to reject the assessment. The SSC recommends further investigation of this matter in the next canary assessment.

The STAR Panel also noted that recruitment variability (sigma r) used in this and the previous canary stock assessment was the lowest of any rockfish, although there are other rockfish at or near the value used for canary (fixed at 0.4). However, the value of sigma r output by the assessment

model was even lower (0.29), driven largely by the age data, which showed remarkable consistency over time, suggesting very stable recruitment. Furthermore, it was noted that age data are considered more reliable for canary than for most other rockfish.

The STAT also explored the effect of including the Santa Cruz juvenile survey data and the STAR Panel concluded that this could be influential depending on how the survey data are modeled. Modeling as in the widow rockfish assessment resulted in higher recent recruitments and higher estimated spawner-recruit steepness, but there are technical issues with incorporating these kinds of data that were identified by the widow STAR Panel. In addition, it was noted that the juvenile survey is at the southern end of the range of canary and may not provide a good index of recruitment. The STAR Panel consensus was that exclusion of the juvenile survey data was not sufficient to reject the assessment.

The STAR Panel concluded that the variability around a single base model underestimated overall uncertainty. The STAT recommended, and the STAR Panel concurred, that an alternate model be run in which male and female length-based selectivity was the same ("no-diff" model). Both the "no diff" and the original model accepted by the August STAR Panel ("diff") were considered equally likely. Profiles on steepness were conducted for the two models which were then blended with equal weighting to capture more of the statistical uncertainty. These results were carried forward into the rebuilding analysis.

The SSC endorses the STAR Panel conclusions that this stock assessment represents the best available science and can form the basis for Council decision making.

Rebuilding Analyses

Rebuilding analyses were reviewed for all overfished stocks according to guidelines and standards that were in effect when the rebuilding analyses were conducted. Currently it is uncertain how the recent court ruling on darkblotched rockfish will impact rebuilding targets, but it appears that current rebuilding targets and time frames may not be consistent with the court ruling. Nevertheless, the SSC reviewed the current rebuilding analyses for consistency with previously established guidelines and notes that these analyses still provide important guidance on stock recovery and effectiveness of Council management actions to recover overfished stocks.

There are seven overfished stocks for which rebuilding analyses were conducted. A rebuilding analysis was not conducted for lingcod because this stock is now estimated to be above the $B_{40\%}$ recovery target (coastwide spawning biomass is estimated to be 64% of unfished). The overfished stocks are: bocaccio, canary, cowcod, darkblotched, Pacific Ocean perch, widow, and yelloweye. Of these, canary, cowcod, darkblotched, POP, and widow are rebuilding ahead of schedule. Progress is barely adequate for bocaccio, while yelloweye rebuilding is behind schedule. The SSC notes that it will be increasingly difficult to evaluate progress toward rebuilding for yelloweye because this species is not sampled by the survey and there is no fishery data being generated.

Six runs were requested of each STAT to evaluate rebuilding. These runs and the results for each overfished species are presented in the STAR Panel report, Rebuilding Analyses for Overfished Groundfish Stocks (Agenda Item H.2.a, Attachment 8). Agenda Item H.3.a, Supplemental Attachment 2 also summarizes rebuilding progress for each of the overfished stocks. The SSC notes, however, that this table contains some errors and should be corrected according to the STAR Panel

report before use by the Council. A corrected table is appended to this report.

The SSC reviewed the rebuilding analyses for each overfished stock and endorses the STAR Panel conclusion that these rebuilding analyses represent the best available science and can provide the basis for evaluating progress towards rebuilding given the guidelines that were in effect at the time the analyses were conducted. The SSC notes that the rebuilding tool developed and used in the current rebuilding projections can be used to evaluate other management alternatives and targets.

Summary of Stock Status Updates for Overfished Groundfish Species in the PFMC Area 1/

Species	Status Change	Target Rebuilding Year in the FMP	Previous Rebuilding Parameters			Updated Rebuilding Parameters				Comments/Implications
			Tmin	Tmax	Pmax	Tmin	Tmax	Pmax 2/	Ptarget 3/	
Lingcod	Rebuilt	2009	2004 N 2005 S	2009	60%	NA	NA	NA	NA	Coastwide biomass estimated to be B64%
POP	No signif. change	2026	2014	2042	70%	2015	2043	78.9%	59.7%	
Darkblotched	Much better	2030	2011	2044	>90%	2009.5	2033	97.2%	96.2%	
Yelloweye	Worse	2058	2027	2071	92%	2036	2080	0.3%	0%	Reduce harvest rate to get to ≥50% Pmax
Canary	Slightly better	2074	2057	2076	60%	2048	2071	55.4%	57.4%	FMP amendment required 4/
Widow	Much better	2038	2026	2042	60%	2013	2033	94.0%	96.3%	FMP amendment required 4/
Cowcod	Better	2090	2062	2099	60%	2035	2074	75.0%	82.0%	FMP amendment required 4/
Bocaccio	No signif. change	2023 5/	2018	2032	70%	2018	2032	67.8%	24.0%	FMP amendment required 4/

1/ Assuming the SSC endorses and the Council approves the 2005 assessments and rebuilding analyses for these species.

2/ Probability of rebuilding under the re-estimated Tmax assuming no change in harvest rate.

3/ Probability of rebuilding by the target year in the FMP assuming no change in harvest rate.

4/ Implied action is to change the target rebuilding year according to the tenets of the Pacific Coast Groundfish FMP. For canary, widow, and cowcod, this is because the target year in the FMP is outside the range of the re-estimated Tmin to Tmax. For bocaccio, the target year was originally mis-specified (see footnote #5).

5/ The target year was incorrectly specified as 2023. The actual year in accordance with the Council-specified harvest rate and Pmax should have been 2027.

Groundfish Management(continued)

H.3. Management Recommendations for 2007-2008 Groundfish Fisheries

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) heard a report from Mr. John DeVore and Dr. John Field summarizing the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) recommendations for 2007-2008 groundfish optimum yield (OY) alternatives. It is apparent that the recent court ruling on darkblotched rockfish has created uncertainty regarding how to set OY's for species requiring rebuilding, and consequently what the constraints on other species will be due to bycatch.

The SSC discussed the following specific issues of concern with the GMT:

1) Four new assessments are now available for species currently managed as part of species complex groups. The SSC discussed the merits of developing separate OY's for these species, as opposed to continuing to manage them within their respective complexes. The SSC sees merit in managing starry flounder under an OY separate from the flatfish complex, in consideration of protecting other potentially weak species in the complex. The SSC notes that, given the management considerations voiced by the GMT, it is reasonable to continue to manage blackgill, gopher, and kelp greenling within complexes.

2) With regard to Petrale sole, the SSC discussed the apparent paradox that the OY recommended for the southern area increased, despite a new assessment that indicates a relatively more depleted stock. It appears that the reason for the higher OY in the south in the short term is due to a transient and uncertain recruitment pulse. For the purpose of establishing a separate OY for the southern area, the SSC notes that using the 25% precautionary catch reduction as specified in the groundfish fishery management plan may be appropriate.

3) With regard to Dover sole, the SSC discussed the relatively large increase in OY, and considered the merits of analyzing an alternative lower OY option. The SSC notes that the estimate of maximum sustainable yield from the assessment (16,500 mt) may provide a logical alternative OY that could be sustainable in the long term.

Marine Protected Areas

I.1. Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary

At its September 2005 meeting, the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed a document from the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) dated May 25, 2005 and entitled "Supporting Materials," which described draft alternatives for marine reserves in Federal waters at CINMS. "Supporting Materials" was not a self-contained analysis but drew heavily from a document cited therein as "Leeworthy and Wiley (2005)." Based on its ongoing technical concerns regarding previous analyses conducted by Leeworthy and Wiley in 2002 and 2003, the SSC noted the importance of having access to the Leeworthy and Wiley (2005) document cited in "Supporting Materials." CINMS has provided that document.

At this meeting, the SSC reviewed the document: Leeworthy, Dr. Vernon R., Peter C. Wiley, and Edward A. Stone. October 7, 2005. *Socioeconomic Impact Analysis of Marine Reserve Alternatives for the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary*. The specific reserve alternatives analyzed in

the 2005 document differ from the alternatives analyzed by Leeworthy and Wiley in 2002 and 2003; however, the methods of analysis are quite similar. The SSC's concerns regarding the methods used in the 2002 and 2003 analyses continue to be unaddressed in the 2005 analysis. Major concerns include: (1) the method of estimating consumer surplus for consumptive and non-consumptive use value, (2) the method of projecting changes in non-consumptive recreation activity and value, and (3) the method of estimating passive-use value. In addition, the analysis largely disregards the SSC's recommendation (made in July 2004) that a baseline of 2003 be used to analyze the current draft alternatives; this change in baseline is important to ensure that the analysis reflects recent regulatory changes, including the establishment of reserves in State waters at CINMS.

The SSC supports the Council in its efforts to collaborate with CINMS on issues of mutual interest. The SSC understands that some modification to the Council's regulatory process may be warranted to accommodate CINMS. The Council is being asked to formulate fishing regulations and thus implicitly select a preferred alternative. The Council is expected to take this action on the basis of an analysis – portions of which are technically inadequate. The SSC is concerned about the potential precedent created by this major departure from the Council's customary requirement for a Draft Environmental Impact Statement to inform its decisions.

Groundfish Management (continued)

H.5. Off-Year Science Improvements

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) received a briefing from Dr Jim Hastie Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) regarding off-year science activities. The NWFSC has committed to supporting a workshop to examine the two available pre-recruit groundfish surveys. Also under consideration is a de-briefing meeting, which probably would be held in conjunction with the March Council meeting, to review the lessons learned during the 2005 assessment cycle and begin development of terms of reference for the 2007 cycle.

The SSC strongly recommends that plans for the de-briefing meeting be developed as soon as possible. For this meeting the SSC requests that the NWFSC staff summarize the comments provided by the committee of independent experts (CIE) reviewers regarding technical as well as process and logistical issues that arose during the 2005 Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panels. The SSC recommends that Dr. Robert Mohn, the CIE reviewer who participated in all of the 2005 STAR Panels, be invited to the de-briefing meeting to share his view on how the STAR Panel process could be improved.

Members of the SSC identified numerous issues that could be organized into a series of four workshops during 2006 (not listed in priority order): (1) a RecFIN Workshop to discuss issues regarding recreational data collection, estimation, and use in in-season management, (2) a Data Workshop to discuss issues such as reconstructing historical catches and developing guidelines for pre-processing of assessment data and producing abundance indices for assessments, (3) a Modeling Workshop to develop guidelines for issues such as adjusting input CVs on tuning indices and effective sample sizes for length and age composition data, and (4) an Assessment Science Workshop to discuss approaches to estimating B_0 and threshold biomass levels, and using these estimates in harvest control rules. The workshops probably will not be able to occur until summer or fall 2006, and times for the workshops should be identified soon so that interested parties will be able to plan their schedules.

The SSC Groundfish Subcommittee will take the lead in developing a comprehensive list of issues arising during the 2005 assessment cycle and topics for discussion at each of the 2006 workshops. SSC Groundfish Subcommittee will collaborate with the NMFS and Council to develop terms of reference for the workshops. Members of the Groundfish Management Team and Groundfish Advisory Subpanel will be invited to share their thoughts on the 2005 assessment cycle and how the process could be improved for the next cycle.

Possible Workshop Topics Arising during SSC Discussions:

- *Use of juvenile surveys.*
- *Tuning data errors.*
- *Biomass-based targets and thresholds.*
- *RecFIN especially CRFS.*
- *Age data, ageing errors, age composition generation.*
- *Pre-assessment workshop to encourage input from industry and other groups.*
- *Spatial assessments.*
- *Priors on steepness and q.*
- *Reconstructing historical catch series.*
- *Model complexity.*
- *Steps towards developing an ecosystems report.*
- *Longitudinal review to compare modeling approaches and look for common patterns across species.*
- *Guidelines for dealing with trans-boundary stocks, e.g., lingcod.*
- *Estimating (defining) SB_0 when there are changes in growth and/or maturity.*
- *Guidelines for assessments lacking current tuning indices (e.g., cowcod and yelloweye).*

Groundfish Management (continued)

H.11. Update on Trawl Individual Quota Process and Community Concerns

Mr. Jim Seger updated the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) on the process for trawl individual quotas (TIQs) in the West Coast Limited Entry Groundfish Trawl Fishery. This update was a follow up to the presentation by Ms. Kate Quigley and Ms. Suzanne Russell at the September 2005 Council meeting that reviewed literature on TIQ programs with a community-based component. The SSC understands that prior to an April 2006 workshop, the range of alternatives for general elements of the TIQ program (e.g. initial allocation, rules for trade, etc.), and the mechanisms for community involvement will be narrowed. An analysis will be provided to the SSC that evaluates efficiency-equity trade offs among the different options. With the Council's approval, members of the SSC Economics and Groundfish Subcommittees plan to review that analysis and participate in the April 2006 TIQ workshop.

Public Comment

None.

Adjournment – The SSC adjourned at approximately 4 p.m., Wednesday, September 21, 2005.

PFMC
02/10/06

SSC Subcommittee Assignments for 2005

Salmon	Groundfish	CPS	HMS	Economic	Marine Reserves
Alan Byrne	Steve Berkeley	**Tom Barnes**	Tom Barnes	**Michael Dalton**	Tom Barnes
Robert Conrad	Ray Conser	Alan Byrne	Steve Berkeley	Hans Radtke	Steve Berkeley
Owen Hamel	Michael Dalton	Michael Dalton	Alan Byrne	Cynthia Thomson	Michael Dalton
Kevin Hill	**Martin Dorn**	Ray Conser	Robert Conrad	David Sampson	Martin Dorn
Pete Lawson	Owen Hamel	Tom Jagielo	**Ray Conser**		Tom Jagielo
Hans Radtke	Tom Jagielo	André Punt	Kevin Hill		Pete Lawson
David Sampson	André Punt		André Punt		André Punt
	Steve Ralston		Hans Radtke		Steve Ralston
	David Sampson				**Cynthia Thomson**

Bold denotes Subcommittee Chairperson

PROPOSED AGENDA
Scientific and Statistical Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Seattle Marriott Hotel Sea-Tac
Washington Ballroom C
3201 South 176th Street
Seattle, Washington 98188
206-241-2000
March 6-7, 2006

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2006 - 8 A.M.

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

1. Report of the Executive Director — Don McIsaac
2. Approve Agenda
3. Open Discussion
4. Election of Officers for April 2006 - March 2007 term
5. Subcommittee Assignments – Current assignments are listed at the end of the November 2005 Meeting Summary

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.

B. Council Administrative Matters

4. Appointments to Advisory Bodies, Standing Committees, and Other Forums (Closed Session)
   (9 a.m., 0.5 hours) Report to Council – Monday Afternoon Closed Session

C. Salmon Management

1. Mass Marking and Coded-Wire Tagging — Dave Hankin
   (9:30 a.m., 0.5 hours; Byrne, Sampson) *Report to Council – Monday Afternoon*

3. Review of 2005 Fisheries and Summary of 2006 Stock Abundance Estimates — Dell Simmons
   (10 a.m., 1 hour; Lawson, Byrne) *Report to Council – Tuesday*

7. Klamath River Fall Chinook Conservation Objective
   (11 a.m., 1 hour; Conrad, Lawson) *Report to Council – Friday*

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2005 - (continued).

LUNCH

F. Groundfish Management

2. Stock Assessment Planning for the 2009-2010 Fishing Season
   1. Preliminary Stock Assessment Terms of Reference — Martin Dorn
   2. Recommended List of Stocks to be Assessed and Schedule

   (1 p.m., 1.5 hours; Dorn, Berkeley) *Report to Council – Tuesday*

3. Yelloweye Stock Assessment
   (2:30 p.m., 1.5 hours; Hamel, Ralston) *Report to Council – Tuesday*

A. SSC Administrative Matters, continued

6. Review Statements
   (4 p.m., following public comment period)

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

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006 - 8 A.M.

A. SSC Administrative Matters, continued

7. Review Statements
   (8 a.m., 1.5 hours)

J. Highly Migratory Species Management

3. Drift Gillnet Management
   (9 a.m., 1 hour; Radtke, Thomson) *Report to Council – Thursday*

F. Groundfish Management, continued

4. Pacific Whiting Management for 2006
   (10 a.m., 2 hours; Jagielo, Punt) *Report to Council – Wednesday*

LUNCH

H. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

2. Fishery Management Plan Amendment - Krill Management — Svein Fougner
   (1 p.m., 1.0 hour; Conser, Barnes) *Report to Council – Wednesday*

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006 - (continued).

A. SSC Administrative Matters, continued

7. Review Statements
   (2 p.m., 1.5 hours)

8. Planning Remaining 2006 SSC Meetings — Mike Burner
   (3:30 p.m., 0.5 hours)

ADJOURN

PFMC
02/15/06

PROPOSED AGENDA
Legislative Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Seattle Marriott Hotel Sea-Tac
Aberdeen Room
3201 South 176th Street
Seattle, Washington 98188
206-241-2000
March 6, 2006

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2006 – 8:30 A.M.

A. Call to Order Dave Hanson

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Agenda

B. Update on Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Reauthorization

C. U.S. Coast Guard Authorization Bill Amendment of the American Fisheries Act
Tentative Agenda Item, contingent upon solicited Council input being applicable after March Council meeting.

D. Discussion of Other Legislative Matters

E. Other Business

F. Public Comment

G. Develop Report to Council

ADJOURN

PFMC
02/15/06

PROPOSED AGENDA
Habitat Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Washington Ballroom D
Seattle Marriott Hotel
Sea Tac, Washington 98188
206-241-2000
March 6, 2006

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2006 – 10 A.M.

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

1. Introductions and Approval of Agenda — Stuart Ellis, Chair
2. Review of Council Actions/Directions — Jennifer Gilden

I. Marine Protected Areas (10:20 A.M.) (Joint meeting with GAP in Seattle Ballroom 2 and 3)

1. Update on Regulation of MPAs within the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) through Magnuson-Stevens Act and State Management Authority (includes update on Oregon Governor's marine reserves proposal) — Mike Burner

B. Administrative Matters (11:00 A.M.)

2. Council Meeting Agenda Planning — HC
5. April 2006 Council Meeting Agenda and Three-Meeting Outlook — HC

H. Coastal Pelagic Species Management (11:20 A.M.)

2. Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment – Krill Management — Josh Lindsay

LUNCH BREAK (12 P.M.-1 P.M.)

G. Habitat Issues

1. Letter on liquefied natural gas proposal for Oregon — Stuart Ellis
3. Update on Klamath River parasite infestations — Jim Welter
3. Klamath hydro project relicensing update and resolution — Dave Hillemeier
4. Update on other current salmon issues — Liz Hamilton
5. HC Member Updates — HC

A. HC Administrative Matters

3. Elections for Chair and Vice-Chair HC
4. Prepare HC report and comments HC

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD (4:30 P.M)

ADJOURN

PFMC
02/21/06

Summary Minutes
Enforcement Consultants

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Hyatt Regency Islandia
Garden F
1441 Quivira Road
San Diego, California 92109
October 31, 2005 – November 4, 2005

MONDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2005 – 5:30 P.M.

A. Call to Order Dave Cleary

Members in Attendance

CAPT Mike Cenci, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
LT Dave Cleary, Oregon State Police
Mr. Brian Corrigan, 13th District, USCG
Mr. Otha Easley, Southwest Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Office for Law Enforcement (OLE)
Lt. Jacob Gustafson, 11th District, USCG
Mr. Tony Warrington, California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Dayna Matthews, Northwest Region, NOAA, OLE
Mr. Dan Torquemada, NOAA, OLE

Others in Attendance

Mr. Joe Albert, Northwest Region, NOAA, OLE
Mr. Tim Broadman, Southwest Region, NOAA,, OLE
Mr. Steve Copps, Northwest Region, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
Ms. Yvonne deReynier, Northwest Region, NMFS
Mr. Sean Hastings, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary
Mr. Khris Johns, 13th District, USCG
Ms. Heather Munro-Mann, Munro Consulting, Inc.
Mr. Jim Seger, Staff, Pacific Fishery Management Council

B. Council Agenda Items for Possible Comment

The Enforcement Consultants' (EC) reports to the Council were as follows:

Agenda Item H.7.c
Supplemental EC Report
November 2005

ENFORCEMENT CONSULTANTS REPORT ON AMENDMENT 19
(ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT)

The Enforcement Consultants (EC) have reviewed and discussed Amendment 19 and draft essential fish habitat (EFH) regulations.

The EC has worked with National Marine Fisheries Service on the draft regulations and concentrated heavily on proposed definitions and how they relate to current definitions. Most of our suggestions have been incorporated into the latest draft.

We note the following slight difference still exist in Agenda Item H.7.a, Supplemental Attachment 3-Revised Draft EFH Regulations.

(6)(iii) Bottom Longline: The definition in this section is unchanged. Simply inserting "bottom" to the term being defined may have consequences. We are not sure the reason for the change.

(9)(ii) Midwater trawl. This definition has new language added: "…on any part of the net or its component wires, ropes, and chains." The additional language appears to be redundant and we are not sure it is necessary.

660.306 Prohibitions: Replace section (12) with the following:

Section (12) Fish within the EEZ in the Anacapa Island SMCA (as defined in 50 CFR 660.396), except for the following recreational fishing:

Species: Lobster
Gear: only by hand, or hoop net

Species: Pelagic fin fish
Gear: Hook and line with terminal gear not more than 6 ounces of weight

The last issue we have is found in the draft fishery management plan (FMP) on page 62 and continued to 63.

We see a very good description and discussion about EFH area identification. On page 63, a map shows these areas. The EC would hope that this would be sufficient in the plan and a series of thousands of coordinates describing these areas would not be necessary in regulation. We would expect any sub-areas with EFH restrictions would be described as done in the past where coordinates were used.

ENFORCEMENT CONSULTANTS REPORT ON EXPANSION OF VESSEL MONITORING SYSTEM

The Enforcement Consultants (EC) endorses the vessel monitoring system (VMS) expansion recommendations presented in Agenda Item H.10.c, Ad Hoc Vessel Monitoring System Committee Report, November 2005, and offers the following comments and clarifications.

The original Alternative 5B, which is the core of the Ad Hoc VMS Committee's recommendation, was first developed by the EC based on its understanding of the fisheries, the gear used within those fisheries. In general, longline, pot, trawl, and line gear, when used to target groundfish are effective, and when deployed in rockfish habitat represent a significant threat to the Council's rockfish conservation goals. Conversely, when these gear types are used properly to target species such as anadromous, shellfish, pelagic, and highly migratory species, their deployment is of little consequence to rockfish conservation goals. Given this second parameter, exempting highly migratory species (HMS) line, Dungeness crab pot, and salmon troll seems appropriate.

VMS is a tool, which tells enforcement where vessels are fishing, not whether the gear being deployed is legal. This is an important element to remember when evaluating who should be required to carry VMS and who should be exempt. In general, VMS should be required of vessels using otherwise legal gear in areas closed to harvest by those gear types. HMS pelagic longline gear is currently prohibited within the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), so we did not consider requiring VMS for this gear type under our proposed alternative. The same logic follows coastal pelagic species (CPS) purse seine gear, which is not legal Federal groundfish gear.

"Net" gears are not included in the EC proposal. California gill net is used in state waters to harvest species such as sea bass and highly migratory species. While they do harvest minimal groundfish, they do not target groundfish; nor does HMS net gear. HMS net gear is defined in Federal regulations as gill, set, drift, and trammel nets. While a "set net" is legal Federal groundfish gear, "drift nets" are not. A surface "drift net" must be anchored to the bottom to meet the Federal legal requirements of groundfish set net gear. Much of the fishing done with these net gear types is done exclusively within State waters and therefore, outside the jurisdiction of this Federal regulation proposal. The limited amount of otherwise legal fishing occurring in Federal waters using these gear types generates minimal if any take of groundfish (i.e. shark drift net with 14-inch mesh). Common sense would indicate that these gear types should not be included in the VMS expansion deliberations pursuant to Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA) management goals.

Sheephead pot gear should also be exempted. The score card projects no overfished species fishing mortality for this fishery. Historic landings of groundfish taken from the shelf and slope with this gear area are very low (0.2 and 0.1 ton per year respectively).

The use of spot prawn trawl gear is prohibited in all three coastal states, therefore, as with other illegal groundfish gear, not considered under this proposal. The EC did not spend significant time evaluating the numerous small trawl fisheries' (California halibut, sea cucumber, and ridgeback prawn) primarily operating under State permits in California under this directed groundfish open access expansion proposal. As with shrimp trawl, when deployed properly, including the use of by-catch reduction devices (BRDs), these gear types do not represent significant threats to the Council's rockfish conservation goals. However, given the concern for potential damage of the sea bed caused by bottom contact gear, particularly trawl gear, we do endorse the Council's proposed action of requiring VMS on all non-groundfish trawl vessels as a primary enforcement tool for protecting the integrity of essential fish habitat (EFH) area restrictions and closures.

The Council's 2003 deliberations over VMS deployment identified the directed groundfish open access fishery as the fleet having the highest risk factors regarding the Council's rockfish conservation goals and objectives. These same deliberations identified VMS as "the primary enforcement tool for ensuring the integrity of the RCAs." Rather than implementing a new VMS program using a fleet with numerous unknowns regarding its participants, the Council chose to initiate the VMS program beginning with the limited entry fleet.

During the period September through December 2003, when the RCA restrictions were in place without a VMS requirement, District 13 United States Coast Guard (USCG) at-sea assets discovered 17 incursions (11 by aircraft and six by cutters). Virtually every one of these 17 incursions was investigated as a violation of the RCA fishing restrictions, with four resulting in penalties being assessed and/or catch seizures. Several of these cases are still pending. Since implementation of the limited entry VMS requirement in January 1, 2004, USCG at-sea assets patrolling at a level consistent with pre-VMS patrol efforts have found only two incursions. During that same time period, over 80 incursions have been detected through VMS monitoring. In investigating these 80 plus incursions, 35 case investigations have been initiated with dozens more still under review. Of these 35 cases, 12 have been closed or dismissed, three have resulted in some type of formal charge, with the remaining cases still under investigation. We believe the number of incursion discovered by VMS, versus those discovered by at-sea assets demonstrates the efficiency of VMS as an enforcement-monitoring tool. We also believe the relatively low number of incursions discovered by VMS since January 2004, verses the number discovered by at-sea assets, during the few short months prior to VMS implementation, demonstrates the positive behavior modification we all deem necessary and desirable if our compliance objectives are to be met. The EC believes strongly that this highly desired behavior modification demonstrated within the limited entry fleet is the direct result of VMS monitoring. The limited entry fleet demonstrates daily that as a fleet, they know where they can fish and where they can't fish. The system is working for the limited entry fleet in providing additional fishing opportunity, and the system is working for fisheries management, assuring the integrity of the RCAs.

As you heard from Captain Cenci earlier this week, 36% of his marine division's commercial groundfish activity involved open access violations. Oregon has only six commercial fisheries officers coast wide. NMFS has no ocean going enforcement assets. Southern California is overwhelmed by open access activity. California Department of Fish and Game is understaffed and over committed. USCG District 11 assets have limited availability for fishery patrols in Southern California due to other high priority missions such as drug interdiction. Limited entry fixed gear fishers have repeatedly told the Council that they are being victimized, with their markets being infiltrated by fish illegally caught by open access vessels. Status quo is not an option for enforcement. The sheer volume of open access activity, with few if any assets to employ, is overwhelming us. We need the Council's help.

The West Coast VMS Pilot Program implemented in January of 2004 has been successful. Given ongoing risks of illegal incursions into the RCAs associated with the directed groundfish open access fishing regime, the EC believes it is imperative that the highly effective enforcement tool, VMS, be expanded to a significant portion of the directed groundfish open access fleet.

EC Recommendations

(1) Per consideration of RCA conservation goals and objectives, expand VMS and declaration requirements to include:

Alternative 5B: longline, pot, trawl, and line gear vessels; excluding pink shrimp trawl, HMS line gear and Dungeness crab pot gear.

As modified: (1) exclude salmon troll
(2) exclude all non-groundfish trawl
(3) exclude sheephead pot

Clarification: 1. No Federal Nexus. Open access vessels that do not fish in Federal water and/or do not retain or possess groundfish are exempt.

2. This recommendation does not include HMS net gear, defined in Federal regulations as gill, set, drift, and trammel nets, nor does it include HMS pelagic longline gear, or CPS purse seine gear.

(2) Per consideration of EFH conservation goals and objectives, expand VMS and declaration requirements to include:

Alternative 4B as modified: Require VMS and declaration reports of all non-groundfish trawl vessels (to include pink shrimp, California halibut, sea cucumber, and ridgeback prawn) as a primary enforcement tool for protecting the integrity of EFH area restrictions and closures.

(3) Implementation date of recommendations 1 and 2: May 1, 2006.

Agenda Item I.1.c
Supplemental EC Report
November 2005

ENFORCEMENT CONSULTANTS REPORT ON CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY

The Enforcement Consultants (EC) have reviewed the materials as they relate to the Channel Islands Marine Sanctuaries. A staff proposal and a proposal drafted by Sanctuary personnel as well as draft EFH regulations were reviewed. In order to try and avoid confusion, we will first comment on each individually, and then attempt to blend the proposals into a single option A full report on the EFH draft regulations will be available for the agenda item.

Supplemental Item I.1.a, Attachment 1

Using Agenda Item I.1.a, Attachment 1, proposed regulations (staff draft):

2.1 No-Take Marine Reserve Closure. It is unlawful to fish[1] or possess fish within the following marine reserve areas (defined by the coordinates below in 2.4 Marine Protected Area Descriptions): Anacapa Island, Carrington Point, Footprint, Gull Island, Harris Point, Judith Rock, Painted Cove, Richardson Rock, Santa Barbara, Scorpion, Skunk Point, and South Point, except for possession as provided below under 2.3 Fish and Fishing Gear in Transit.

This language is clear and simple with the exception of 2.3 reference, which will be discussed further.

2.2 Marine Conservation Area Closure. It is unlawful to fish[1] or possess fish within the Anacapa Island Marine Conservation Area (defined by the coordinates below in 2.4 Marine Protected Area Descriptions), except for (1) fishing and possession of fish caught with (a) recreational fishing with hook and line gear as defined and limited in this regulation or recreational fishing gear for lobster as defined in this regulation and (b) commercial fishing with gear as defined in this regulation and (2) possession as provided below under 2.3 Fish and Fishing Gear in Transit.

[1] *To fish* is defined for the purpose of this regulation is defined as in the *Code of Federal Regulations* (50 CFR part 660 Section 600.10): *Fishing*, or *to fish* means any activity, other than scientific research conducted by a scientific research vessel, that involves: (1) The catching, taking, or harvesting of fish; (2) The attempted catching, taking, or harvesting of fish; (3) Any other activity that can reasonably be expected to result in the catching, taking, or harvesting of fish; or (4) Any operations at sea in support of, or in preparation for, any activity described in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this definition.

2.2.a Recreational hook and line fishing gear definition. Recreational hook and line fishing gear is defined for the purpose of this regulation as the current definition in the State of California Fish and Game, Code of Regulations for recreational hook and line fishing gear, absent any reference to the use of weights; such gear used in this area may not be augmented with any weights such that the total weight of the terminal gear is greater than six ounces, not counting the weight of any natural bait.

2.2.b Recreational lobster fishing gear definition. Recreational lobster fishing gear is defined for the purpose of this regulation as the current gear and methods allowable under the State of California Fish and Game Code of Regulations in the immediately adjacent open area.

2.2.c Commercial fishing gear definition. Commercial fishing gear is defined for the purposes of this regulation as the current definition in the State of California Fish and Game Code of Regulations for allowable lobster gear and methods in the immediately adjacent open area. It is unlawful to retain fish other than lobster when using commercial fishing gear allowable under this regulation.

2.2.d Size and Bag Limits. It is unlawful to possess fish caught under this regulation in the Anacapa Island Marine Conservation Area different than the allowable size limit in place in the immediately adjacent open area, or in an amount greater than the daily retention limit in place in the immediately adjacent open area.

The proposal is acceptable with one exception. The language in 2.2 a, b, and c makes reference to the definitions found in the California Fish and Game Code. We would recommend that rather than relying on access to the Code in order to view this language, which can change on a State level without Council input, the actual language should be provided in the regulation .

2.3 Fish and Fishing Gear in Transit. It is unlawful to possess or transport (1) fish taken legally in open waters and/or (2) fishing gear, through the no-take marine reserve areas described in 2.4 Marine Protected Area Descriptions except while in a vessel in active transit though the area in question with all fishing gear stowed and not in use. It is unlawful to possess or transport (1) fish taken legally in open waters with gear other than allowed under 2.2 above and/or (2) fishing gear not allowable under 2.2 above, through the marine conservation area described in 2.4 Marine Protected Area Descriptions except while in a vessel in active transit though the area in question with all fishing gear stowed and not in use.

The EC recommends that the above section should be structured differently to clearly differentiate between No-take Marine Reserves and Marine Protected Areas by splitting the two sections. Also, the current language indicates that illegally taken fish could be possessed if you remain within the parameters of the Reserve or Protected Area. The following is the suggested language:

2.3 Fish and Fishing Gear in Transit.
No- take Marine Reserve
It is unlawful to possess or transport (1) fish ~~taken legally in open waters~~ and/or (2) fishing gear, through the no-take marine reserve areas described in 2.4 Marine Protected Area Descriptions except while in a vessel in active transit though the area in question with all fishing gear stowed and not in use.
Marine Protected Areas: It is unlawful to possess or transport (1) fish taken ~~legally~~ in open waters with gear other than allowed under 2.2 above and/or (2) fishing gear not allowable under 2.2 above, through the marine conservation area described in 2.4 Marine Protected Area Descriptions except while in a vessel in active transit though the area in question with all fishing gear stowed and not in use.
2.3.a Stowed Gear Definition. For the purposes of this regulation, (1) stowed recreational hook and line fishing gear is defined as hook and line gear with all line reeled to the reel or rod tip and no fishing gear other than a swivel attached to the line, with the rod and reel placed on the vessel in a manner different than when actively fishing; (2) stowed recreational lobster fishing gear is defined as placed on or below a vessel surface and tied to such surface in a manner would not allow immediate deployment; and (3) stowed commercial fishing gear is defined as placed on or below a vessel surface and tied to such surface in a manner that would not allow immediate deployment.

The EC met with the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) and representatives from the Sanctuary and discussed the definition of stowed gear. The GAP very concerned about the requirement to stow. They suggested that the term be dropped instead of trying to define it. The EC thinks that this is possible, however, note that this term is used in California State regulations.

Language in Sub-section (2) raised some concern with members of the GAP as it related to the stowing or securing of recreational lobster gear. Some vessels may not have the capability to comply with this regulation due to the lack of space onboard the vessel. In order to address these concerns we recommend language that would require hoop nets to be un-baited and mandate that lines be detached from the gear.

In regards to Sub-section (3), the EC recommends that the same language used in the Federal Regulations concerning the stowage of fixed gear while transiting Rockfish Conservation Areas (RCA's) be used to address this issue in Sanctuaries.

Agenda Item I.1.b, Supplemental CINMS Report Model Regulations

In discussion with Sanctuary personnel, the common view was that the regulations as drafted were insufficient to provide the level of desired protection in several areas. The EC believes that in many cases the resources that the Sanctuary is attempting to protect are unrelated to fishing. We recommend the following language in order to alleviate this concern and protect all of the things desired:
Unless already prohibited by 50 CFR part 660, or the section above on fishing regulations in a marine reserve or marine conservation area, it is unlawful to harvest, remove, take, injure, destroy, possess, collect, move, or cause the loss of any living or dead organism, geological resource, cultural or historical resource, or other Sanctuary resource, or attempt any of these activities.

In addition, the EC noted that the Sanctuary listed all of the pelagic fish species that were allowed to be taken in Marine Conservation Areas with hook and line and spear fishing, and that list mirrors the regulations of the State of California. The Staff proposal does not address this issue, and in order to be consistent, the list of species that can be taken should be listed in the Federal Regulation.

One other item listed in the Sanctuary proposal caused us some concern - the anchoring of vessels in Marine Reserves, which do not allow take of fish. The EC does not feel that anchoring should be allowed if it involves the possession of fish species. We were advised that the anchoring allowance was consistent with California State regulations, but where it involved the possession of fish, the proposal would be inconsistent with current federal regulations. If fish were not allowed to be possessed during anchoring, then the proposal and current regulation would be in alignment. For Marine Conservation Areas, which do allow some take, as long as the species in possession complied with regulations for the area being anchored in, this activity would be allowed.

Please find attached the EC's regulation proposal for the Channel Islands.

SUMMARY OF EC PROPOSED REGULATIONS FOR CHANNEL ISLANDS

2.1 No-Take Marine Reserve Closure. It is unlawful to fish[b] or possess fish within the following marine reserve areas (defined by the coordinates below in 2.4 Marine Protected Area Descriptions): Anacapa Island, Carrington Point, Footprint, Gull Island, Harris Point, Judith Rock, Painted Cove, Richardson Rock, Santa Barbara, Scorpion, Skunk Point, and South Point, except for possession as provided below under 2.3 Fish and Fishing Gear in Transit.

2.2 Marine Conservation Area Closure. It is unlawful to fish[1] or possess fish within the Anacapa Island Marine Conservation Area (defined by the coordinates below in 2.4 Marine Protected Area Descriptions), except for (1) fishing and possession of fish caught with (a) recreational fishing with hook and line gear as

[b] *To fish* is defined for the purpose of this regulation is defined as in the *Code of Federal Regulations* (50 CFR part 660 Section 600.10): *Fishing*, or *to fish* means any activity, other than scientific research conducted by a scientific research vessel, that involves: (1) The catching, taking, or harvesting of fish; (2) The attempted catching, taking, or harvesting of fish; (3) Any other activity that can reasonably be expected to result in the catching, taking, or harvesting of fish; or (4) Any operations at sea in support of, or in preparation for, any activity described in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this definition.

defined and limited in this regulation or recreational fishing gear for lobster as defined in this regulation and (b) commercial fishing with gear as defined in this regulation and (2) possession as provided below under 2.3 Fish and Fishing Gear in Transit.

2.2.a Recreational hook and line fishing gear definition. Recreational hook and line fishing gear is defined for the purpose of this regulation ((~~as the current definition in the State of California Fish and Game Code of Regulations))~~ **INSERT NEW LANGUAGE HERE** for recreational hook and line fishing gear, absent any reference to the use of weights; such gear used in this area may not be augmented with any weights such that the total weight of the terminal gear is greater than 6 ounces, not counting the weight of any natural bait. **INSERT PELAGIC FINFISH SPECIES LIST HERE**

2.2.b Recreational lobster fishing gear definition. Recreational lobster fishing gear is defined for the purpose of this regulation as the current gear and methods allowable under ((~~the State of California Fish and Game Code of Regulations))~~ **INSERT NEW LANGUAGE HERE** in the immediately adjacent open area.

2.2.c Commercial fishing gear definition. Commercial fishing gear is defined for the purposes of this regulation as the current definition in the ~~State of California Fish and Game Code of Regulations~~ **INSERT NEW LANGUAGE HERE** for allowable lobster gear and methods in the immediately adjacent open area. It is unlawful to retain fish other than lobster when using commercial fishing gear allowable under this regulation.

2.2.d Size and Bag Limits. It is unlawful to possess fish caught under this regulation in the Anacapa Island Marine Conservation Area different than the allowable size limit in place in the immediately adjacent open area, or in an amount greater than the daily retention limit in place in the immediately adjacent open area.

2.3 Fish and Fishing Gear in Transit.

No- take Marine Reserve

It is unlawful to possess or transport (1) fish ~~taken legally in open waters~~ and/or (2) fishing gear, through the no-take marine reserve areas described in 2.4 Marine Protected Area Descriptions except while in a vessel in active transit though the area in question with all fishing gear stowed and not in use.

Marine Protected Areas: It is unlawful to possess or transport (1) fish taken ~~legally~~ in open waters with gear other than allowed under 2.2 above and/or (2) fishing gear not allowable under 2.2 above, through the marine conservation area described in 2.4 Marine Protected Area Descriptions except while in a vessel in active transit though the area in question with all fishing gear stowed and not in use.

2.3.a Stowed Gear Definition. For the purposes of this regulation, (1) stowed recreational hook and line fishing gear is defined as hook and line gear with all line reeled to the reel or rod tip and no fishing gear other than a swivel attached to the line, with the rod and reel placed on the vessel in a manner different than when actively fishing; (2) stowed recreational lobster fishing gear is defined as ~~placed on or below a vessel surface and tied to such surface in a manner would not allow immediate deployment~~ un-baited hoop-net gear with all lines detached from the net; and (3) ~~stowed commercial fishing gear is defined as placed on or below a vessel surface and tied to such surface in a manner that would not allow immediate deployment~~ Insert language from Federal Regulations here concerning the stowage of fixed gear while transiting the RCA.

Unless already prohibited by 50 CFR part 660, or the section above on fishing regulations in a marine reserve or marine conservation area, it is unlawful to harvest, remove, take, injure, destroy, possess, collect, move, or cause the loss of any living or dead organism, geological resource, cultural or historical resource, or other Sanctuary resource, or attempt any of these activities.

Anchoring – the EC requests guidance from the Council on how to deal with the anchoring issue where State law may be in conflict with Federal Regulations.

ADJOURN

PFMC
10/17/05

PROPOSED AGENDA
Enforcement Consultants

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Seattle Marriott Hotel Sea-Tac
Aberdeen Room
3201 South 176th Street
Seattle, Washington 98188
206-241-2000
March 6-10, 2006

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2006 – 5:30 P.M.

A. Call to Order Dave Cleary

1. Introductions
2. Review and Adopt Agenda

B. Council Agenda Items for Possible Comment

(There may or may not be enforcement issues associated with all of the following items. Items on the Council Agenda but not listed here may also be considered during the EC meeting.)

B. Administrative Matters

5. April 2006 Council Meeting Agenda and Three-Meeting Outlook

C. Salmon Management

2. Fort Bragg March 15, 2006 Commercial Fishery Opening
4. Identification of Management Objectives and Preliminary Definition of 2006 Salmon Management Options
8. Adoption of 2006 Management Options for Public Review
9. Salmon Hearings Officers

D. Enforcement Issues

1. Fishery Enforcement Activity Report

E. Pacific Halibut Management

2. Incidental Catch Regulations for the Salmon Troll and Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries

F. Groundfish Management

4. Pacific Whiting Management for 2006
5. Consideration of Inseason Adjustments

H. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

2. Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment—Krill Management

I. Marine Protected Areas

1. Fishery Regulations in MPAs within the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary through Magnuson-Stevens Act and State Management Authority

J. Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Management

3. Drift Gillnet Management
4. Exempted Fishing Permit (EFP) Applications for Highly Migratory Species

C. Other Topics

1. Items for Enforcement Corner of the Council Newsletter
2. Enforcement Presentations at Council Meetings

D. Public Comment

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006 THROUGH FRIDAY MARCH 10, 2006 (As Necessary)

ADJOURN

PFMC
02/13/06

PROPOSED AGENDA
Highly Migratory Species Management Team

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Seattle Marriott Hotel, Sea-Tac
Washington Ballroom D
3201 S. 176th Street
Seattle, Washington 98188
206-241-2000
March 7-8, 2006

This is a public meeting, and time for public comment will be provided during the meeting at the discretion of the meeting Chair. In addition, a public comment period is scheduled at the end of the joint session described below.

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006 – 8 A.M.

A. Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda (8 A.M.–8:30 A.M.) Michele Culver/Dale Squires

B. NMFS Report (8:30 A.M.–9:00 A.M.) ***Craig Heberer***

Report to the Council under J.1

C. Bigeye Tuna Overfishing Response (9:00 A.M.–10:30 A.M.) Suzie Kohin

Report to the Council under J.2

D. Drift Gillnet Management (10:30 A.M.–2:30 P.M.) Michele Culver/Liz Petras

Report to the Council under J.3

E. Exempted Fishing Permit Applications for Highly Migratory Species (2:30 P.M. –4:00 P.M.) Craig Heberer

Report to the Council under J.4

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2006 – 8 A.M.

F. Reference Points for HMS Stocks (8:00 A.M.–9 A.M.) Suzie Kohin

G. SAFE Report: Planning Improvements for 2006 (9 A.M.–10 A.M.) Dale Squires

BREAK

(Selected HMSMT members to brief HMSAS on Bigeye Overfishing FMP amendment at 9:00 A.M. and drift gillnet EA at 10:30 A.M.)

H. Finalize Reports (12:30 P.M.–5:30 P.M.)

ADJOURN

PFMC
02/10/06

PROPOSED AGENDA
Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanel

Pacific Fishery Management Council
Seattle Marriott Hotel, Sea Tac
Washington Ballroom C
3201 S. 176th Street
Seattle, Washington 98188
206-241-2000
March 8, 2006

The Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanel (HMSAS) is a public meeting, and time for public comment will be provided during the meeting at the discretion of the meeting Chair. Breaks will be taken as needed at the discretion of the Chair.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2006 – 8 A.M.

A. Call to Order and HMSAS Administrative Matters (8 A.M.–8:30 A.M.) Wayne Heikkila

1. Introductions
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Elect Chair and Vice Chair

B. NMFS Report (8:30 A.M.–9:00 A.M.)

Report to the Council under J.1

C. Bigeye Tuna Overfishing Response (9:00 A.M.–10:30 A.M.)

Report to the Council under J.2

D. Drift Gillnet Management (10:30 A.M.–12:30 P.M.)

Report to the Council under J.3

E. Exempted Fishing Permit Applications for Highly Migratory Species (1:30 P.M. –3:00 P.M.)

Report to the Council under J.4

G. Develop Recommendations for U.S. Position on Renegotiation of the U.S.–Canada Albacore Treaty (3:00 P.M.–4:00 P.M.)

Note: This issue is scheduled for the Council to take up at the April 2006 meeting. The HMSAS may prepare a report with recommendations at this meeting to be presented at the April meeting.

H. Review and Finalize Reports (4:00 P.M.–)

Reports to be submitted to the Secretariat by 8 A.M. Thursday.

ADJOURN

PFMC
02/15/06