

APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

The draft June 2012 Council meeting minutes will be provided for review and approval at the Council meeting in Supplemental Attachment 1.

The full record of each Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) meeting is maintained at the Council office, and consists of the following:

1. The meeting notice and proposed agenda (agenda available online at <http://www.pcouncil.org/resources/archives/briefing-books/>).
2. The approved minutes (available online at <http://www.pcouncil.org/council-operations/council-meetings/past-meetings/>). The minutes summarize actual meeting proceedings, noting the time each agenda item was addressed and identifying relevant key documents. The agenda item summaries consist of a narrative on noteworthy elements of the gavel-to-gavel components of the Council meeting and summarize pertinent Council discussion for each Council Guidance, Discussion, or Action item, including detailed descriptions of rationale leading to a decision and discussion between an initial motion and the final vote.
3. Audio recordings of the testimony, presentations, and discussion occurring at the meeting. Recordings are labeled by agenda number and time to facilitate tape or CD-ROM review of a particular agenda item (available from our recorder, Mr. Craig Hess, Martin Enterprises, martinaudio@aol.com).
4. All documents produced for consideration at the Council meeting, including (1) pre-meeting advance briefing book materials, (2) pre-meeting supplemental briefing book documents, (3) supplemental documents produced or received at the meeting, validated by a label assigned by the Council Secretariat and distributed to Council Members; (4) written public comments received at the council meeting in accordance with agenda labeling requirements; and (5) electronic material or handout materials used in presentations to Council Members during the open session (available online at <http://www.pcouncil.org/council-operations/council-meetings/past-meetings/>).
5. The Council Decision Summary Document. This document is distributed immediately after the meeting and contains very brief descriptions of Council decisions (available online at <http://www.pcouncil.org/resources/archives/council-meeting-decisions/>).
6. Draft or final decision documents finalized after the Council meeting such as Environmental Impact Statements or Environmental Assessments.
7. Pacific Council News. The Spring Edition covers March and April Council meetings; the Summer Edition covers the June Council meeting; in some years, a Fall Edition covers the September meeting; and the Winter Edition covers the September and November Council meetings (available online at <http://www.pcouncil.org/resources/archives/newsletters/>).

Council Action:

- 1. Review and approve the draft June 2012 Council meeting minutes.**

Reference Materials:

1. Agenda Item F.1.a, Supplemental Attachment 1: Draft Minutes: 214th Session of the Pacific Fishery Management Council (June 2012).

Agenda Order:

- a. Council Member Review and Comments
- b. **Council Action:** Approve Previous Council Meeting Minutes

Dan Wolford

PFMC
10/12/12

FISCAL MATTERS

The Council's Budget Committee will meet on Friday, November 2, 2012, at 3:00 PM to consider budget issues as outlined in the Budget Committee Agenda.

The Budget Committee's report is scheduled for Council review and approval on Wednesday, November 7, 2012.

Council Action:

1. Consider the report and recommendations of the Budget Committee.

Reference Materials:

1. Agenda Item F.2.b, Supplemental Budget Committee Report.

Agenda Order:

- a. Agenda Item Overview
- b. Report of the Budget Committee
- c. Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities
- d. Public Comment
- e. **Council Action:** Consider Budget Committee Recommendations

Chuck Tracy
Dave Ortmann

PFMC
10/10/12

REPORT OF THE BUDGET COMMITTEE

The Budget Committee (BC) met on Friday, November 2, 2012 with the following in attendance:

Members Present: Mr. Dave Ortmann, Chairman; Dr. Dave Hanson, Mr. Mark Helvey, Mr. Frank Lockhart, Ms. Dorothy Lowman, Mr. Dale Myer, and Mr. Dan Wolford

Members Absent: Ms. Michele Culver

Non-members Present: Dr. Donald McIsaac, Mr. Chuck Tracy, Ms. Patricia Crouse, Mr. Donald Hansen, Mr. Pete Hassemer, Ms. Carolyn Porter, Mr. Steve Williams, Mr. Rod Moore, Ms. Gway Kirchner, Mr. David Crabbe, Mr. Gerry Richter.

After approving the meeting agenda, the BC received the Executive Director's budget report which follows below.

Status of Calendar Year (CY) 2012 Operating Budget and Expenditures

Dr. McIsaac reviewed the CY 2012 budget and expenditures by major category as of September 30, 2012, including a current projection of expected year-end balances. The projection indicates a positive balance at year's end of about 3 percent of the total budget. Dr. McIsaac noted that, absent objection, any positive year-end balance would be held in reserve for future use.

Provisional CY 2013 Operating Budget

Dr. McIsaac presented information to the BC indicating considerable uncertainty around the prospect of reasonable funding possibilities for 2013 and the next few years. While fully adequate funding is a possibility, and will be vigorously argued for, the current state of speculation about the Federal budget process outcome is primarily negative, and Dr. McIsaac felt it was prudent at this time to plan for reduced funding in future years.

Towards a goal of keeping the Council operations relatively stable over the next few years while factoring in a presumption for decreased funding during that time, Dr. McIsaac proposed a provisional total operating budget for CY 2013 of a little less than \$4.3 million, along with certain contingent responses in the event that the actual income would be more or less than planned for.

Budget Committee Recommendations

1. Approve a Provisional CY 2013 Operating Budget of \$4,277,141.
 - a. This budget is provisional pending any ear-marked funding, final cost of living and travel adjustments, and any minor adjustments for budgetary considerations arising between now and the end of the Council's fiscal year.
 - b. This budget represents a modest decrease from the 2012 budget with reductions in personnel costs, outside contracts, categories associated with shorter Council meetings, and stipends. However, relative stability with 2012 overall operational capacity could be achieved

2. Manage Council meetings for no more than five-and-one-half days of Council floor sessions to allow travel home on the last day of the meeting.
3. Employ the following contingency responses when the actual funding becomes known:
 - a. If the actual funding is slightly greater than assumed, the additional funding would go in reserve for future allocation.
 - b. If the actual funding is slightly less than assumed, the existing reserve would be used to provide for the Provisional CY 2013 Operating Budget.
 - c. If the actual funding is significantly different than assumed (5 percent less than 2011), the BC shall meet at the March, April, or June Council meeting to develop budget recommendations.
 - d. The contingency threshold for “significantly different” is approximately \$150,000, not including any ear-marked funding.

PFMC
11/7/12

MEMBERSHIP APPOINTMENTS AND COUNCIL OPERATING PROCEDURES

During this Agenda Item the Council has the opportunity to consider changes in the Council Membership Roster, including Council Members, advisory body membership, and also any relevant changes in Council Operating Procedures (COP) or the Council's Statement of Organization, Practices, and Procedures (SOPP). At this meeting the Council will also make decisions about advisory body structure and membership for the new 2013-2015 term.

Council Members and Designees, Standing Council Member Committee Appointments, and Appointments to Other Forums

No new resignations, nominations, or other changes were identified by the Briefing Book deadline.

Current Term Council Advisory Body Appointments

No new resignations, nominations, or other changes were identified by the Briefing Book deadline. The Council's advisory bodies include the Scientific and Statistical Committee, five technical/management teams and five subpanels (one each for the groundfish, salmon, coastal pelagic species, highly migratory species, and ecosystem plan), Enforcement Consultants, Groundfish Allocation Committee, Habitat Committee, Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Committee, and various ad hoc committees.

Changes to Council Operations and Procedures

Proposed COP 23 for CPS Exempted Fishing Permit Consideration

At the April 2012 meeting, the Council asked that a clear and efficient process for reviewing and approving exempted fishing permits be developed for coastal pelagic species management. Council staff developed a proposed COP which was adopted for advisory body and public review at the September 2012 Council meeting (reproduced for this meeting as Agenda Item G.2.a, Attachment 1). At this meeting the Council will consider final approval of COP 23 during Agenda Item G.2.

Proposed Addition of a Tribal Member to the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT)

The Quinault Indian Nation successfully entered the Pacific sardine fishery in 2012 and intends to continue exercising its right to do so in the future. In view of this new activity, they believe it would be mutually beneficial to add a tribal member to the CPSMT. Therefore, the Quinault Indian Nation is proposing the Council create a tribal position on the CPSMT (Attachment 1). Currently, the CPSMT has eight members and the Council could add a position if they deem it necessary. The Quinault Indian Nation has also nominated Mr. Alan Sarich to fill the tribal

position in the event that the Council would like to move forward on this at the November meeting. His Curriculum Vita is provided in Closed Session A.1.a, Attachment 1.

Changes to Advisory Body Membership for the 2013-2015 Term

At the September 2012 meeting, the Council adopted some changes to the membership criteria in COP 2 (Advisory Subpanels). The Council changed the trawl fisheries membership in the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) from one trawl representative for each state to one at-large, one bottom, and one midwater trawl representative. The second change was to allow waiving the requirement that the tribal representatives to the GAP and Salmon Advisory Subpanel must be active in the tribal fishery.

Selection of Advisory Body Members for the 2013-2015 Term

The Council is scheduled to select advisory body members for the 2013-2015 Advisory Body Term for the:

- Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel (CPSAS)—all 10 members
- Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel (EAS)—all 9 members
- Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP)—all 20 members
- Highly Migratory Advisory Subpanel (HMSAS)—all 13 members
- Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS)—all 15 members
- Habitat Committee (HC)—4 non-agency members, the Northwest or Columbia River tribal member, and the California tribal member
- Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC)—7 at-large members

A complete listing of all nominees for the positions that were received by the briefing book deadline is provided in Attachment 2. Closed Session A.1.a, Attachments 3 through 10 contain the actual nominations or supporting letters, compiled separately for each advisory body and listed alphabetically by nominee within each body. In Closed Session, the SSC will provide its recommendations regarding SSC nominees.

At the time of Briefing Book preparation, there were no nominations for the following positions:

- 1 California at-large position on the EAS
- 1 Tribal position on the GAP
- 1 Northwest or Columbia River tribal position on the HC
- 1 Idaho sport position on the SAS
- 1 Washington coastal tribal position on the SAS

Council Action:

Consider the following operational, appointment, and membership changes:

- 1. Incorporation into the COP of final action on COP 23 as adopted under Agenda Item G.2.**
- 2. The Quinault Indian Nation request for a tribal seat on the CPSMT and the nomination of Mr. Alan Sarich to that seat.**
- 3. The nominees for each advisory body position for the 2013-2015 term.**
- 4. Any necessary action to solicit additional nominees.**

Reference Materials:

1. Attachment 1: Letter from the Qunault Indian Nation requesting a seat on the CPSMT and nominating Mr. Alan Sarich to that seat.
2. Attachment 2: Complete Listing of Nominations for the 2013-2015 Advisory Body Term.

Agenda Order:

- a. Agenda Item Overview Chuck Tracy
- b. Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities
- c. Public Comment
- d. **Council Action:** Consider Changes to Council Operations and Procedures, and Appointments to Advisory Bodies Including Changes and Nominees for the 2013-2015 Term.

PFMC
10/16/12



Quinault Indian Nation

POST OFFICE BOX 189 □ TAHOLAH, WASHINGTON 98587 □ TELEPHONE (360) 276 - 8211

Mr. Dan Wolford
Chairman
Pacific Fishery Management Council
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 101
Portland, Oregon 97220-1384

October 10, 2012

Dear Chairman Wolford:

The Quinault Indian Nation appreciates this opportunity to ask the Council for its consideration of creating a Tribal Seat on the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT).

Our tribe successfully entered the Pacific sardine fishery this last summer (2012) and intends to continue exercising our treaty right to do so in the future. We believe that Tribes and the CPSMT would both benefit from having tribal participation in the management process for pelagic species.

In the interest of maintaining the use of best science in the process we would also take this opportunity to nominate our Quinault marine fish biologist, Alan Sarich, to that seat if the Council deemed it appropriate. Alan's CV and any other requested information is available upon request of the Council.

We thank you for your consideration,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ed Johnstone". The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Ed Johnstone
Quinault Fisheries Policy

cc. David Sones, Tribal Representative, PFMC

ALL ADVISORY BODY NOMINATIONS FOR 2013-2015 TERM

(An asterisk (*) before name indicates incumbent)

Position & Nominee	Nominated/Supported by	Incumbent Attendance		
		2010	2011	2012
COASTAL PELAGIC SPECIES ADVISORY SUBPANEL (10 POSITIONS)				
<u>California Commercial (3 Positions)</u>				
* Mr. David Haworth San Diego, CA	Self; California Wetfish Producers Assoc.; Terry Hoinsky, Fishermen's Union of America; Vanessa Deluca, State Fish Company; Susan Ricci; Robert Wines; Frank Crabtree; John Ma; Lyan Tabuyo; Maria Ciolino; Gustavo Herrera; Klavs Brittinben; Tatiana Barbu; Kim Mendora; Sandy Snider; Tuan Tier; Ty Vuong; Jennifer Soto; Peter Ciaravitaro	4/6	4/4	2/2
* Ms. Terry Hoinsky Ranchos Palos Verdes, CA	Self, Fishermen's Union of America; Diane Pleschner-Steele, California Wetfish Producers Assoc.	4/6	4/4	2/2
* Mr. Nick Jurlin Long Beach, CA	Self and same as for Mr. David Haworth above	NA	NA	2/2
<u>Oregon Commercial (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Eugene Law Toledo, OR	Self; Terry Hoinsky, Fishermen's Union of America	6/6	4/4	2/2
<u>Washington Commercial (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Robert Zuanich Seattle, WA	Mr. Robert F. Kehoe, Executive Director, Purse Seine Vessel Owners Assoc.; Terry Hoinsky	5/6	3/4	1/2
<u>California Processor (1 Position)</u>				
* Ms. Diane Pleschner-Steele Buelton, CA	Self; California Wetfish Producers Assoc. Board of Directors; and same as Mr. David Haworth above	6/6	4/4	2/2
<u>Oregon Processor (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Mike Okoniewski [Current Chairman] Woodland, WA	Rod Moore, West Coast Seafood Processors Assoc.; Terry Hoinsky, Fishermen's Union of America	6/6	4/4	2/2
<u>Washington Processor (1 Position)</u>				
Mr. Richard Carroll Westport, WA	Self, Vice President, Ocean companies			
* Mr. A. Pierre Marchand Ilwaco, WA	Self; Terry Hoinsky, Fishermen's Union of America	6/6	2/4	0/2
<u>California Sport/Charter (1 Position)</u>				
* CPT Paul Strasser San Pedro, CA	Self; Diane Pleschner-Steele, California Wetfish Producers Assoc.; Terry Hoinsky, Fishermen's Union of America; Ken Franke, Sportfishing Assoc. of CA	1/6	0/4	2/2
<u>Conservation (1 Position)</u>				
Mr. Stephen Marx Portland, OR	Self			
* Ms. Sarah McTee Portland, OR	Self; Terry Hoinsky, Fishermen's Union of America	NA	NA	2/2

ALL ADVISORY BODY NOMINATIONS FOR 2013-2015 TERM

(An asterisk (*) before name indicates incumbent)

Position & Nominee	Nominated/Supported by	Incumbent Attendance		
		2010	2011	2012
ECOSYSTEM ADVISORY SUBPANEL (9 POSITIONS)				
<u>California (3 At-large Positions)</u>				
* Ms. Kathy Fosmark Pebble Beach, CA	Wayne Heikkila, Western Fishboat Owners Assoc.	3/3	5/5	1/2
* Mr. Donald Maruska Morro Bay, CA	Dean E. Wendt, Assoc. Dean & Director, Center for Coastal Marine Science at Cal Poly/San Luis Obispo Science and Ecosystem Alliance Strategy & Fisheries Policy Advisor	3/3	5/5	2/2
??				
<u>Oregon (3 At-large Positions)</u>				
* Mr. Ben Enticknap Portland, OR	Oceana	3/3	5/5	2/2
* Mr. Scott McMullen Astoria, Oregon	Self	3/3	5/5	0/2
Mr. Bill Peterson NMFS, Newport, OR	Self; Kurt Fresh			
* Mr. Frank Warrens Portland, OR	Self	2/3	5/5	2/2
<u>Washington (3 At-large Positions)</u>				
* Mr. Paul B. Dye Bainbridge Island, WA	Self	NA	NA	2/2
* Dr. Terrie Klinger Friday Harbor, WA	Self	NA	NA	2/2
* Mr. Nate Stone Seattle, WA	Self	NA	NA	2/2

ALL ADVISORY BODY NOMINATIONS FOR 2013-2015 TERM

(An asterisk (*) before name indicates incumbent)

Position & Nominee	Nominated/Supported by	Incumbent Attendance		
		2010	2011	2012
GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL (20 Positions)				
<u>Fixed Gear (3 At-large)</u>				
* Mr. Robert Alverson Seattle, WA	Fishing Vessel Owners' Assoc.	17/25	11/26	14/21
Mr. Lou Ferrari Greenbrae, CA	Tommy Ancona; Gerry Richter			
Ms. Michele Longo-Eder Newport, OR	Self			
* Mr. Gerry Richter Santa Barbara, CA	Phil Schenk, Point Conception Groundfishermen's Assoc.; Tom Ancona	25/25	25/26	17/21
<u>Bottom Trawl (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Thomas Ancona [Current Chairman] Fort Bragg, CA	Self; Gerry Richter; David Jincks, Midwater Trawlers Cooperative; Susan Chambers	25/25	26/26	21/21
Mr. Kevin L Dunn Astoria, OR	Self			
Ms. Michelle Norvell Fort Bragg, CA	Christopher Kubiak			
Mr. Brad Pettinger Brookings, OR	Self, Director of the Oregon Trawl Commission; Gerry Richter			
<u>Midwater Trawl (1 Position)</u>				
Ms. Heather Mann Siletz, OR	David Jincks, Midwater Trawlers Cooperative; Marion Larkin; Paul Kujala; Tom Libby, California Shellfish Co., Inc; Frank Dulcich, Pacific Seafood Group; Donna Parker, Arctic Storm Mgmt Group; United Catcher Boats Assoc.			
Mr. Brent Paine Seattle, WA	Self, United Catcher Boats Assoc.			
<u>At-large Trawl (1 Newly Created Position)</u>				
Mr. Thomas Ancona Fort Bragg, CA	Self; Gerry Richter; Susan Chambers			
Mr. Kevin L Dunn Astoria, OR	Self			
Ms. Michelle Norvell Fort Bragg, CA	Christopher Kubiak			
Mr. Brent Paine Seattle, WA	Self, United Catcher Boats Assoc.			
Mr. Brad Pettinger Brookings, OR	Self, Director of the Oregon Trawl Commission; David Jincks, President, Midwater Trawlers Cooperative			
Mr. Richard Carroll Westport, WA	Self, Vice President, Ocean companies			

ALL ADVISORY BODY NOMINATIONS FOR 2013-2015 TERM

(An asterisk (*) before name indicates incumbent)

Position & Nominee	Nominated/Supported by	Incumbent Attendance		
		2010	2011	2012
GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL (20 Positions) continued				
<u>Open Access South of Cape Mendocino (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Daniel Platt Fort Bragg, CA	Self	25/25	25/26	14/21
<u>Open Access North of Cape Mendocino (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Jeffery Miles Port Orford, OR	Self	NA	NA	14/21
<u>Processors (2 At-large Positions)</u>				
* Ms. Susan Chambers Coos Bay, OR	Rod Moore, West Coast Seafood Processors Assoc.; Tommy Ancona; Gerry Richter; David Jincks, Midwater Trawlers Cooperative	NA	26/26	20/21
* Mr. Tom Libby Astoria, OR	Rod Moore, West Coast Seafood Processors Assoc.; David Jincks Midwater Trawlers Cooperative	25/25	25/26	18/21
<u>At-Sea Processor (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Daniel A. Waldeck Portland, OR	Self, Executive Director, Pacific Whiting Conservation Cooperative	25/25	25/26	21/21
<u>California Charter South of Point Conception (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Joe Villareal Oxnard, CA	Self; Ken Franke, Sportfishing Assoc. of CA	18/25	12/26	7/21
<u>California Charter North of Point Conception (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Robert Ingles Hayward, CA	Self	22/25	17/26	17/21
<u>Oregon Charter (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Wayne Butler Bandon, OR	Self	17/25	16/26	8/21
<u>Washington Charter (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Mark Cedergreen Westport, WA	Steve Westrick, Westport Charterboat Assoc.; Butch Smith, Ilwaco Charter Assoc.	NA	9/12	18/21
<u>Sport Fisheries (3 At-large Positions)</u>				
* Mr. John Holloway Portland, OR	Self;	22/25	20/26	21/21
* Mr. David Seiler Olympia, WA	Steve Westrick, Westport Charterboat Assoc.	17/25	19/26	13/21
* Mr. Tom Marking McKinleyville, CA	Self	22/25	21/26	17/21
<u>Conservation (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Shems Jud West Linn, OR	Self; David Jincks, Midwater Trawlers Cooperative	22/25	23/26	19/21
<u>Tribal Fisher (1 Position)</u>				
??				

ALL ADVISORY BODY NOMINATIONS FOR 2013-2015 TERM

(An asterisk (*) before name indicates incumbent)

Position & Nominee	Nominated/Supported by	Incumbent Attendance		
		2010	2011	2012
HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES ADVISORY SUBPANEL (13 POSITIONS)				
<u>Commercial Troll (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Wayne Heikkila Redding, CA	Self; Lewis Hill, Western Fishboat Owners Assn	8/8	7/7	4/4
<u>Commercial Purse Seine (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. August Felando San Diego, CA	Self	8/8	7/7	4/4
<u>Commercial Gillnet (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Steve Fosmark Pebble Beach, CA	Kathy Fosmark	4/8	3/7	4/4
<u>Commercial Fisheries (3 At-large Positions)</u>				
* Mr. Pete Dupuy Tarzana, CA	Self	6/8	7/7	4/4
* Mr. Douglas Fricke [Current Chairman] Hoquiam, WA	Self	8/8	6/7	4/4
* Mr. William Sutton Ojai, CA	Self	8/8	7/7	2/4
<u>Processor South of Cape Mendocino (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Steve Foltz San Diego, CA	Self	5/8	5/7	4/4
<u>Processor North of Cape Mendocino (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. A Pierre Marchand Ilwaco, WA	Self	8/8	4/7	0/4
<u>California Charter Boat (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Mike Thompson San Juan Capistrano, CA	Self; Ken Franke, Sportfishing Assoc. of CA	8/8	7/7	4/4
<u>Washington/Oregon Charter Boat (1 Position)</u>				
* Ms. Linda Buell Cloverdale, OR	Self	8/8	6/7	4/4
<u>Private Sport (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Bob Osborne Surfside, CA	Tom Raftican, President, The Sportfishing Conservancy	8/8	7/7	4/4
<u>Conservation (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Charles Farwell Monterey, CA	Self	NA	7/7	4/4
	Mr. Richard Huff McGonigal Carmel, CA	Environmental Defense Fund		
<u>Public At-large (1 Position)</u>				
	Mr. Jonathan Gonzalez Santa Barbara, CA	Peter Howorth; Self		
	Dr. Doyle Hanon Rancho Sante Fe, CA	Self		
* Ms. Pamela Tom Davis, CA	Self	5/8	5/7	2/4

ALL ADVISORY BODY NOMINATIONS FOR 2013-2015 TERM

(An asterisk (*) before name indicates incumbent)

Position & Nominee	Nominated/Supported by	Incumbent Attendance		
		2010	2011	2012
SALMON ADVISORY SUBPANEL (15 POSITIONS)				
<u>California Troller (1 Position)</u>				
Mr. Jim Anderson Redwood City, CA	Geoff Bettencourt, Bettencourt Fisheries			
* Mr. Duncan MacLean El Granada, CA	Self	14/14	11/14	12/12
Mr. Aaron Newman Eureka, CA	Jim Caito, Caito Fisheries, Inc.; Dean Estep; Noyo Harbor Distr.; Ken Armstrong, fish buyer; Keith Olson, Fisherman, STMA Board Member; Joe Bainbridge; Anthony Cannia, fisherman; Jim & Susan Larsen; Rod Moore, West Coast Seafood Processors Assoc.; Tommy Ancona; Bill Meaks; Rob Ross, Fisheries & Seafood Institute; John Yearwood; John Josephs; Jack Carlson, commercial fisherman			
<u>Oregon Troller (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Paul Heikkila Coquille, OR	Nancy Fitzpatrick, Oregon Salmon Commission	10/14	10/14	5/12
<u>Washington Troller (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Jim Olson Auburn, WA	Steve Wilson & Jeremy Brown, Coastal Trollers Assoc.; Joel Kawahara; Butch Smith, Ilwaco Charter Assoc.; Steve Westrick, Westport Charterboat Assoc.; Gordon Bentler, Recreational Advisor Area 4; Dan Leinen Area 3; Steve Watrous; Paul Heikkila; Hobe Kytr, Salmon for All; Geoff Lebon	14/14	14/14	12/12
Mr. Michael Ziara Port Townsend, WA	Self; Joe Dazey, Washington Trollers Assoc.; Doug Fricke			
<u>Commercial Gillnet Fishery (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Kent Martin Skamokawa, WA	Hobe Kytr, Salmon For All; Jim Olson, Coastal Trollers Assoc.	14/14	11/14	12/12
<u>Processor (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Gerald Reinholdt St. Helens, OR	Nancy Fitzpatrick, Oregon Salmon Commission	12/14	9/14	10/12
<u>California Charter Boat (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Craig Stone Emeryville, CA	Self; Roger Thomas, Golden Gate Fisherman's Assoc.	11/14	14/14	11/12
<u>Oregon Charter Boat (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Mike Sorenson Toledo, OR	Self	10/14	13/14	12/12
<u>Washington Charter Boat (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Butch Smith [Current Chairman] Ilwaco, WA	Steve Westrick, Westport Charterboat Assoc.; Jim Olson, Coastal Trollers Assoc.; Steve Watrous	14/14	14/14	11/12
<u>California Sport Fisher (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Paul Pierce San Leandro, CA	Self	12/14	14/14	6/12

ALL ADVISORY BODY NOMINATIONS FOR 2013-2015 TERM

(An asterisk (*) before name indicates incumbent)

Position & Nominee	Nominated/Supported by	Incumbent Attendance		
		2010	2011	2012
SALMON ADVISORY SUBPANEL (15 POSITIONS) continued				
<u>Oregon Sport Fisher (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Richard Heap Brookings, OR	Self	10/14	10/14	10/12
<u>Washington Sport Fisher (1 Position)</u>				
Mr. Kevin Lanier Burien, WA	Ron Garner, President, Puget Sound Anglers State Board; Mike Gilchrist; John A. Keizer; Steve Westrick, Westport Charterboat Assoc.			
* Mr. Steve Watrous Vancouver, WA	Lance Beckman, Retired USFWS fishery research biologist; Butch Smith, Ilwaco Charter Assoc.; Robert Moxley; Jim Olson, Coastal Trollers Assoc.; Clinton Winn; Larry Snyder, Vancouver Wildlife	14/14	12/14	10/12
<u>Idaho Sport Fisher (1 Position)</u>				
??				
<u>Washington Tribal (1 Position)</u>				
??				
<u>California Tribal (1 Position)</u>				
Mr. Dave Hillemeier Klamath, CA	Yurok Tribe			
<u>Conservation (1 Position)</u>				
Dr. Doug DeHart Oregon City, OR	Self			
* Mr. Jim Hie Napa, CA	Self	13/14	13/14	10/12

ALL ADVISORY BODY NOMINATIONS FOR 2013-2015 TERM

(An asterisk (*) before name indicates incumbent)

Position & Nominee	Nominated/Supported by	Incumbent Attendance		
		2010	2011	2012
HABITAT COMMITTEE (6 POSITIONS)				
<u>Commercial Fishing Industry (1 Position)</u>				
* Mr. Joel Kawahara [Current Chairman] Quilcene, WA	Self	8/8	8/8	2/4
<u>Sport Fishing Industry (1 Position)</u>				
* Ms. Liz Hamilton Oregon City, OR	Self, NW Sportfishing Industry Assoc.	5/8	6/8	3/4
Mr. Tom Welsh McCall, Idaho/Redmond, OR	Self			
<u>Conservation (1 Position)</u>				
Dr. Douglas DeHart Oregon City, OR	Mark Sherwood, ED, Native Fish Society			
* Mr. Jim Hie Napa, CA	Self	7/8	8/8	3/4
<u>Northwest or Columbia River Tribal Representative (1 Position)</u>				
??				
<u>California Tribal (1 Position)</u>				
Mr. Mike Orcutt Hoopa, CA	Hoopa Valley Tribe			
<u>Public At-large (1 Position)</u>				
Mr. Paul Engelmeyer Yachats, OR	Self			
* Mr. Stephen Scheiblaue Monterey, CA	Self	7/8	6/8	4/4
Mr. Tom Welsh McCall, Idaho/Redmond, OR	Self			
Mr. Sean White Ukiah, CA	Self			

ALL ADVISORY BODY NOMINATIONS FOR 2013-2015 TERM

(An asterisk (*) before name indicates incumbent)

Incumbent Attendance

Position & Nominee	Nominated/Supported by	2010	2011	2012
SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE (7 AT-LARGE POSITIONS)				
<u>Scientists (7 At-large Positions)</u>				
* Dr. John Carlos Garza NMFS, Santa Cruz, CA	Dr. Cisco Werner, Science Director, SWFSC	10/11	10/12	6/7
* Dr. Vladlena Gertseva NMFS, Seattle, WA	Dr. John Stein, Science & Research Dir., NMFS NWFSC	7/11	12/12	7/7
* Dr. Selina Heppell OSU, Corvallis, OR	Self; Dr. John Stein, Science & Research Dir., NMFS NWFSC	8/11	9/12	6/7
* Dr. Daniel Huppert Seattle, WA	Self	NA	NA	4/4
Mr. Tom Jagielo Seattle, WA	Self			
* Dr. Todd Lee NMFS, Seattle, WA	Dr. John Stein, Science & Research Dir., NMFS NWFSC	8/11	11/12	6/7
* Dr. André E. Punt UW, Seattle, WA	Self; Dr. John Stein, Science & Research Dir., NMFS NWFSC; Dr. Cisco Werner, Science Director, SWFSC	9/11	9/12	6/7
Dr. William Satterthwaite NMFS, Santa Cruz, CA	Mr. Michael Mohr, Fisheries Branch Chief, NMFS SWFSC, FED			
Dr. Andrew Thompson NMFS, La Jolla, CA	Dr. Cisco Werner, Science Director, SWFSC			
Dr. Raymond Webster IPHC, Seattle, WA	Dr. Bruce Leaman, International Pacific Halibut Commission			

PFMC
10/17/2012

**NOMINATIONS OR SUPPORT LETTERS FOR ADVISORY BODY MEMBERS
RECEIVED AFTER THE INITIAL DEADLINE (10/11/12)**

ECOSYSTEM ADVISORY SUBPANEL

California At-large

- Ms. Kathy Fosmark Support by: Zeke Grader, PCFFA

GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL

Trawl At-large and/or Bottom Trawl, or Unspecified

- Ms. Michelle Norvell Support by: Self—at-large
Henry Pontarelli, Lisa Wise Consulting, Inc.—unspecified
Robert Dooley, J & R Dooley, Inc.—at-large
Dave Turner, Mayor, City of Fort Bragg—unspecified
Bernie Norvell—unspecified
Merrick Burden—unspecified
Dwayne Oberhoff, Ecological Assets Mgmt--unspecified
Jared Huffman, Assemblymember—at-large or bottom trawl
Mike Thompson, Member of Congress—bottom or at-large
Michael Bell, The Nature Conservancy—unspecified
Lynn Walton, Ilwaco Fishermen And Marketing
Cooperative—at-large or bottom trawl
Bill Blue-unspecified
- Mr. Brad Pettinger Support by: Marion Larkin—at-large

California Charter, South of Mendocino

- Mr. Joe Villareal has withdrawn from consideration.
- Mr. Louis Zimm Nominated by: Self, Sport Fishing Association of California
Support by: Bob Fletcher

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES ADVISORY SUBPANEL

Commercial Fisheries At-large

- Mr. Doug Fricke Support by: Greg Mueller, WTA President

SALMON ADVISORY SUBPANEL

California Troll

- Mr. Duncan MacLean Support by: Zeke Grader, PCFFA
Jim Anderson
- Mr. Aaron Newman Support by: James Bassler

SALMON ADVISORY SUBPANEL (continued)

Washington Troll

- Mr. Jim Olson Support by: Russell Svec, Makah Tribe
 Nancy Fitzpatrick, Oregon Salmon Commission
 Glen Aurdahl
- Mr. Mike Ziara Support by: Greg Mueller, WTA President
 Tony Rouff

California Sport Fisher

- Mr. Marc Gorelnik Nominated by: Self

Washington Sport Fisher

- Mr. Kevin Lanier Support by: Clint Muns, Puget Sound Anglers State Board
- Mr. Steve Watrous Support by: Tony Floor, Northwest Marine Trade Assoc.
 Bruce Swanson
 William Robinett
 Robert Nevin
 Kelly Deschand
 Ron Lamkin
 Thomas Beller
 Danny Carey
 David Clark
 Don Mooney
 Leonard Swanson
 Jim Neva
 Richard Cross
 Mitchell Morey, Jr.
 Patrick Waber
 Earl Bowyer
 Roger Waite

Idaho Sport Fisher

- Mr. Richard J. Scully Nominated by: Self

SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE

At-large

- Dr. Louis Botsford Nominated by: Self

FUTURE COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA AND WORKLOAD PLANNING

This agenda item is intended to refine planning for future Council meetings and workload, especially in regard to the details of the proposed agenda for the March 2013 Council Meeting. The following two attachments are intended to help the Council in the overall agenda planning process (updated supplemental attachments will be provided as needed to reflect the latest information at the time of the agenda item):

1. An abbreviated display of potential agenda items for the next full year (Attachment 1).
2. A proposed March 2013 Council meeting Agenda (Attachment 2).

The Executive Director will assist the Council in reviewing the proposed agenda materials and discuss any other matters relevant to Council meeting agendas and workload. After considering supplemental material provided at the Council meeting, and any reports and comments from advisory bodies and public, the Council will provide guidance for future agenda development, a proposed March Council meeting agenda, and workload priorities for Council staff and advisory bodies.

Council Action:

- 1. Review pertinent reference materials and provide guidance on potential agenda topics for future Council meetings for the Year-at-a-Glance Summary.**
- 2. Provide guidance on a proposed agenda for the March Council meeting.**
- 3. Identify priorities for advisory body considerations at the next Council meeting as well as any needed direction on workload and workshop planning and priorities.**

Reference Materials:

1. Agenda Item F.4.a, Attachment 1: Pacific Council Workload Planning: Preliminary Year-at-a-Glance Summary.
2. Agenda Item F.4.a, Attachment 2: Preliminary Proposed Council Meeting Agenda, March 5-11, 2013 in Tacoma, Washington.
3. Agenda Item F.4.b, CPSMT Report: Workshop to Re-Evaluate Parameters of the Harvest Control Rule for Pacific Sardine
4. Agenda Item F.4.c, Public Comment.

Agenda Order:

- a. Agenda Item Overview Don McIsaac
- b. Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities
- c. Public Comment
- d. **Council Action:** Council Discussion and Guidance on Future Agenda and Workload Planning

Pacific Council Workload Planning: Preliminary Year-at-a-Glance Summary

(Parenthetical numbers mean multiple items per topic; shaded Items may be rescheduled re workload priorities; deletions= struck-out; underline=new)

	<u>March 6-11, 2013</u> (Tacoma)	<u>April 6-11, 2013</u> (Portland)	★ ★	<u>June 20-25, 2013</u> (Garden Grove)	<u>September 11-17, 2013</u> (Boise)	<u>November 1-6, 2013</u> (Costa Mesa)
CPS		Sardine Hrvst Paramtrs Wrkshp Rpt and Alts for Changes EFPs: Final Recom. Inseason Rev of Mackerel Fishery if Needed	May 5-11: Hosting Annual CCC Meeting and Managing Our Nations Fisheries 3 National Conference, Washington, DC	NMFS Rpt Final Action on Sardine Hrvst Parameter Changes Mackerel HG & Mgmt Meas.		NMFS Rpt EFP Notice of Intent for 2014 Sardine Asmnt & Mgmt Meas. Including Tribal Allocation
Groundfish	NMFS Report Inseason Mgmt Consider Barotrauma Credits Adopt FPA for A-24: New Spx & Mgmt Measure Process <u>Status of Rationalized Fishery</u>	NMFS Report Inseason Mgmt Pacific Whiting Update Seabird Protection Regs Adopt Prelim Spx & Mgmt Meas —Process for Fisheries —beginning in 2015 <u>Stock Complex Briefing</u>	May 5-11: Hosting Annual CCC Meeting and Managing Our Nations Fisheries 3 National Conference, Washington, DC	NMFS Report Inseason Mgmt Approve Stock Assessments Finalize Stock Complex Issues Adopt Final Spx & Mgmt Meas Process for Fisheries beginning in 2015 <u>Midwater Sport Fishery</u>	NMFS Report Inseason Mgmt Approve Stock Assessments 2 Plan Science Improvements Initial Actions for Setting 2015- 2016 Fisheries & Beyond	NMFS Report Inseason Mgmt Stock Assessment Clean-up & Rebuilding Analyses Further Actions for Setting 2015- 2016 Fisheries & Beyond Preliminary EFP Approval Phase 2 EFH Report: Accept Proposals for further Consideration
HMS	NMFS Report NMFS Swordfish Rpt on Alt. Gear Impacts, Changes to Consv. Area, & Turtle Hardcaps <u>US-Canada Albacore Update</u>	Internat'l RFMO Matters Including Northern Committee albacore decision rules & IATTC	May 5-11: Hosting Annual CCC Meeting and Managing Our Nations Fisheries 3 National Conference, Washington, DC	NMFS Report	NMFS Report	NMFS Report Input to International RFMO
Salmon	NMFS Rpt Approve Rev, Forecasts, & ACLs Approve Rebuilding Plan Alts.	NMFS Rpt 2013 Method Rev.--Identify Topics 2013 Season Setting (3) Adopt FPA for EFH (A18)	May 5-11: Hosting Annual CCC Meeting and Managing Our Nations Fisheries 3 National Conference, Washington, DC		NMFS Report Method Rev: Adopt Priorities	NMFS Rpt 2013 Method Rev.--Final 2014 Preseas'n Mgmt Schd
Other	Routine Admin (9) Habitat Issues Annual CG Enforcement Rpt P. Halibut: Prelim Incidntl Regs P. Halibut: IPHC MTG 5-Yr Research Plan Final Adopt Final Fishery Ecosystem Plan	Routine Admin (9) Habitat Issues P. Halibut: Final Incidntl Regs S of Humbug Policy Cmte Rpt Ocean Observ. Initiative Report CMSP Update	May 5-11: Hosting Annual CCC Meeting and Managing Our Nations Fisheries 3 National Conference, Washington, DC	Routine Admin (11) Habitat Issues Unmanaged Forage Fish Protection	Routine Admin (11) Habitat Issues Tri-State Enforcement Rpt P. Halibut: CSP Change Alts P. Halibut Bycatch Estimate	Routine Admin (11) Habitat Issues Federal Enforcement Priorities P. Halibut: Final CSP Changes Ocean Obs Initiative Prog Rpt CA Current Ecosystem Rpt
Apx. Floor Time	5 days	5 days	★ ★	3.5 days	4 days	4.5 days

Agenda Item F.4.a
Attachment 1
November 2012

PRELIMINARY PROPOSED COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA, MARCH 6-11, 2013 IN TACOMA, WASHINGTON

(Shaded Items are Tentative)

Wed, Mar 6	Thu, Mar 7	Fri, Mar 8	Sat, Mar 9	Sun, Mar 10	Mon, Mar 11
	<p>A. OPEN SESSION 8:00 AM 1-4. Opening & Approve Agenda (30 min)</p> <hr/> <p>ENFORCEMENT 1. Annual USGS Fishery Enforcement Report (1 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>SALMON 1. Approve Review of 2012 Fisheries & Preseason Report I on 2013 Stock Abundance Forecasts & Status Determinations (1 hr 15 min) 2. Approve Rebuilding Plan Alternatives, if necessary (45 min) 3. Identify 2012 Mgmt Objectives & Initial Mgmt Alternatives (3 hr 30 min)</p> <hr/> <p>CLOSED SESSION (1 hr)</p>	<p>OPEN COMMENT 1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items (45 min)</p> <hr/> <p>HABITAT 1. Current Issues (45 min)</p> <hr/> <p>PACIFIC HALIBUT 1. Report on the Annual IPHC Mtg (45 min) 2. Adopt Incidental Catch Recommendations for Public Review (30 min)</p> <hr/> <p>SALMON 1. NMFS Report (1 hr) 5. Recommend 2013 Mgmt Alternatives for Analysis (2 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>GROUNDFISH 1. NMFS Report (1 hr) 2. Status of Rationalized Fishery (1 hr 15 min)</p>	<p>GROUNDFISH 3. Amendment 24 (Improved Mgmt Process): Adopt FPA (4 hr) 4. Consider Barotrauma Credits (2 hr) 5. Trawl Rationalization Trailing Actions: Electronic Monitoring Widow Rockfish Quota Share Reallocation PPA (2 hr)</p>	<p>GROUNDFISH 6. Inseason Adjustments (2 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>Ecosystem Based Management 1. Fishery Ecosystem Plan: Adopt Final (3 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES MANAGEMENT 1. NMFS Report (1 hr) 2. US-Canada Albacore Treaty Update (1 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>SALMON 7. Further Direction on 2012 Mgmt Alternatives as needed (1 hr)</p>	<p>HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES MANAGEMENT 3. Swordfish Mgmt Report on Alternative Gear Impacts, Changes to Turtle Conservation Area, & Hardcaps (3.5 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>ADMINISTRATIVE 1. 5-Year Research Plan: Approve Final (1 hr) 2. Approve Council Minutes (15 min) 3. Membership Appointments & COPs (15 min) 4. Future Mtg Agenda & Workload Planning (45 min)</p> <hr/> <p>SALMON 8. Adopt 2013 Mgmt Alternatives for Public Review (1 hr 30 min) 9. Appoint Salmon Hearing Officers (15 min)</p>
	8 hr	8 hr	8 hr	8 hr	8 hr
8 am SAS & STT 8 am SSC 8:30 am HC 11 am Secretariat 2 pm LC 4 pm Chair's Briefing	7 am WA/OR/CA 7 am Secretariat 8 am SAS & STT 8 am SSC 8 am GMT 8 am TPolGrp & WaTch 1 pm GAP 4:30 pm EC	7 am WA/OR/CA 7 am Secretariat 8 am EAS 8 am GAP & GMT 8:30 am Econ & GF Subcom Mtg on Impact Models 8 am SAS & STT 8 am TPolGrp & WaTch As needed EC 6 pm Chair's Reception	7 am WA/OR/CA 7 am Secretariat 8 am EAS 8 am GAP & GMT 8 am HMSAS & HMSMT 8 am SAS & STT 8 am TPolGrp & WaTch As needed EC	7 am WA/OR/CA 7 am Secretariat 8 am HMSAS & HMSMT 8 am SAS & STT/ 8 am TPolGrp & WaTch As needed EC	7 am WA/OR/CA 7 am Secretariat 8 am SAS & STT 8 am TPolGrp & WaTch As needed EC

Pacific Council Workload Planning: Preliminary Year-at-a-Glance Summary

(Parenthetical numbers mean multiple items per topic; shaded Items may be rescheduled re workload priorities; deletions= struck-out; underline=new)

	March 6-11, 2013 (Tacoma)	April 6-11, 2013 (Portland)	★ ★	June 20-25, 2013 (Garden Grove)	September 11-17, 2013 (Boise)	November 1-6, 2013 (Costa Mesa)		
CPS		Sardine Harvest Paramters Workshop Rpt	4.00	NMFS Rpt	0.50	NMFS Rpt	1.00	
	<u>EFPs: Final Recommendations</u>	0.75	EFPs: Final Recomm.	1.00	Consider Sardine Hrvst Parameter Changes	2.00	EFP Notice of Intent for 2014	
		1.00	Inseason Rev of Mackerel Fishery if Needed	1.00	Mackerel HG & Mgmt Meas.	1.50	Sardine Asmnt & Mgmt Meas.	
Groundfish			May 5-11: Hosting Annual CCC Meeting and Managing Our Nations Fisheries 3 National Conference, Washington, DC	<u>Evaluation of Shifting Sardine Fishery Start Date</u>	2.00			
	NMFS Report	1.00		NMFS Report	1.00	NMFS Report	1.00	NMFS Report
	Inseason Mgmt	2.00		Inseason Mgmt	2.00	Inseason Mgmt	2.00	Inseason Mgmt
	Pacific Whiting Update	1.00		Pacific Whiting Update	1.00	Approve Stock Assessments	4.00	Approve Stock Assessments
	Seabird Protection Regs	1.50		Seabird Protection Regs	1.50	Finalize Stock Complex Issues	2.50	Plan Science Improvements
	Adopt FPA for A-24: New Spx & Mgmt Measure Process	4.00		Adopt FPA for A-24: New Spx & Mgmt Measure Process	4.00	Adopt Final Spx & Mgmt Meas Process for Fisheries beginning in 2015	3.00	Initial Actions for Setting 2015-2016 Fisheries & Beyond
	Status of Rationalized Fishery	1.25		Stock Complex Briefing	2.00	Midwater Sport Fishery	1.00	Further Actions for Setting 2015-2016 Fisheries & Beyond
	Consider Barotrauma Mort Rates	2.00		Data Moderate SDC	1.50	Trawl Trailing Actions:	2.00	Preliminary EFP Approval
	Trawl Trailing Actions: Widow QS Reallocation PPA; Elec. Monitoring	2.00		EFH Rev, Analysis, & RFP Rel.	2.00	Widow QS Reallocation FPA	2.00	Phase 2 EFH Report: Accept Proposals for further Consideration
				<u>VMS Declaration Req. ROA</u>	1.00	<u>VMS Declaration Req FPA</u>	0.50	
HMS	NMFS Report	1.00	NMFS Report	1.00	NMFS Report	1.00	NMFS Report	
	<u>Including Alt. Gear Experiments</u>							
	Swordfish Mgmt: PLCA Changes Including Turtle Take Caps US-Canada Albacore Update	2.50	Internat'l RFMO Matters Including Northern Committee albacore decision rules & IATTC	2.00	<u>Preliminary EFP Approval</u>	1.00	<u>Final EFP Approval</u>	
Salmon								
	NMFS Rpt	1.00	NMFS Rpt	1.00	NMFS Report	1.00	NMFS Rpt	
	Approve Review, Status, Forecasts, & ACLs	1.25	Method Rev.-Identify Topics & CCC/WR ABM Update	2.00	Method Rev: Adopt Priorities & CCC/WR ABM Update	1.50	2013 Method Rev.--Final	
Other	2013 Season Setting (4)	8.00	2013 Season Setting (3)	5.50				
	Appnt Hearings Officers	0.25	Adopt FPA for EFH (A18)	4.00			2014 Preseas'n Mgmt Schd	
	Routine Admin (9)	3.50	Routine Admin (9)	3.75	Routine Admin (11)	4.25	Routine Admin (11)	
	Habitat Issues	0.75	Habitat Issues	0.75	Habitat Issues	0.75	Habitat Issues	
	Annual CG Enforcement Rpt	1.00					Tri-State Enforcement Rpt	
	P. Halibut: Prelim Incidntl Regs	0.50	P. Halibut: Final Incidntl Regs	0.50	P. Halibut: CSP Change Alts	1.00	Federal Enforcement Priorities	
	P. Halibut: IPHC MTG	0.75	S of Humbug Policy Crnte Rpt	1.00	<u>MONF 3 Report</u>	0.50	P. Halibut: Final CSP Changes	
	5-Yr Research Plan Final	1.00	Ocean Observation Initiative Rpt	1.00	<u>IEA Wkshp Rpt</u>	1.00	<u>Ocean Obs Initiative Prog Rpt</u>	
	Adopt Final Fishery Ecosystem Plan	3.00	CMSP Update	1.00	Unmanaged Forage Fish Protection	2.50	CA Current Ecosystem Rpt	
	Apx. Floor Time	5 days	5 days	39.50	4 days	33.00	4 days	4.5 days
	38.50		4.94		4.13	###	35.75	
	4.81		4.94		4.13	3.97	4.47	

Agenda Item F:4.a
Supplemental Attachment 3
November 2012

PRELIMINARY PROPOSED COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA, MARCH 6-11, 2013 IN TACOMA, WASHINGTON

(Shaded Items are Tentative)

Wed, Mar 6	Thu, Mar 7	Fri, Mar 8	Sat, Mar 9	Sun, Mar 10	Mon, Mar 11
	<p>A. OPEN SESSION 8:00 AM 1-4. Opening & Approve Agenda (30 min)</p> <hr/> <p>OPEN COMMENT 1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items (45 min)</p> <hr/> <p>ENFORCEMENT 1. Annual USCG Fishery Enforcement Rpt (1 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>SALMON 1. Approve Review of 2012 Fisheries & Preseason Report I on 2013 Stock Abundance Forecasts & Status Determinations (1 hr 15 min) 2. Identify 2012 Mgmt Objectives & Initial Mgmt Alternatives (3 hr 30 min)</p> <hr/> <p>CLOSED SESSION (1 hr)</p>	<p>COSATAL PELAGIC SPECIES MANAGEMENT 1. EFP for 2013: Approve Final (45 min)</p> <hr/> <p>HABITAT 1. Current Issues (45 min)</p> <hr/> <p>PACIFIC HALIBUT 1. Report on the Annual IPHC Mtg (45 min) 2. Adopt Incidental Catch Recommendations for Public Review (30 min)</p> <hr/> <p>SALMON 1. NMFS Report (1 hr) 5. Recommend 2013 Mgmt Alternatives for Analysis (2 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>GROUNDFISH 1. NMFS Report (1 hr) 2. Status of Rationalized Fishery (1 hr 15 min)</p>	<p>GROUNDFISH 3. Amendment 24 (Improved Mgmt Process): Adopt FPA (4 hr) 4. Consider Barotrauma Mortality Rates (2 hr) 5. Trawl Rationalization Trailing Actions: Electronic Monitoring Widow Rockfish Quota Share Reallocation PPA (2 hr)</p>	<p>GROUNDFISH 6. Inseason Adjustments (2 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>Ecosystem Based Management 1. Fishery Ecosystem Plan: Adopt Final (3 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES MANAGEMENT 1. NMFS Report Inc. Alternative Gear Impacts (1 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>SALMON 7. Further Direction on 2012 Mgmt Alternatives as needed (1 hr)</p>	<p>HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES MANAGEMENT 2. US-Canada Albacore Treaty Update (1 hr) 3. Swordfish Mgmt Report on Changes to Turtle Conservation Area and Take Caps (2.5 hr)</p> <hr/> <p>ADMINISTRATIVE 1. 5-Year Research Plan: Approve Final (1 hr) 2. Approve Council Minutes (15 min) 3. Membership Appmts & COPs (15 min) 4. Future Mtg Agenda & Workload Planning (45 min)</p> <hr/> <p>SALMON 8. Adopt 2013 Mgmt Alternatives for Public Review (1 hr 30 min) 9. Appoint Salmon Hearing Officers (15 min)</p>
	8 hr	8 hr	8 hr	7 hr	7.5 hr
<p>8 am SAS & STT 8 am SSC 8:30 am HC 11 am Secretariat 2 pm LC 4 pm Chair's Briefing</p>	<p>7 am WA/OR/CA 7 am Secretariat 8 am SAS & STT 8 am SSC 8 am GMT 8 am TPolGrp & WaTch 8 am GAP 4:30 pm EC</p>	<p>7 am WA/OR/CA 7 am Secretariat 8 am EAS 8 am GAP & GMT 8:30 am Econ & GF Subcom Mtg on Impact Models 8 am SAS & STT 8 am TPolGrp & WaTch As needed EC 6 pm Chair's Reception</p>	<p>7 am WA/OR/CA 7 am Secretariat 8 am EAS 8 am GAP & GMT 8 am HMSAS & HMSMT 8 am SAS & STT 8 am TPolGrp & WaTch As needed EC</p>	<p>7 am WA/OR/CA 7 am Secretariat 8 am HMSAS & HMSMT 8 am SAS & STT 8 am TPolGrp & WaTch As needed EC</p>	<p>7 am WA/OR/CA 7 am Secretariat 8 am SAS & STT 8 am TPolGrp & WaTch As needed EC</p>

Agenda Item F.4.a
Supplemental
Attachment 4
November 2012

COASTAL PELAGIC SPECIES MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON FUTURE COUNCIL
MEETING AGENDA AND WORKLOAD PLANNING

Workshop to Re-evaluate Parameters of the Harvest Control Rule for Pacific sardine

Recent research suggests that some of the underlying assumptions about Pacific sardine biology and productivity may need re-evaluation. Specifically, the relationship between F_{MSY} and temperature - the Fraction (exploitation rate) component of the harvest control rule (HCR) - may no longer be meaningful for management purposes (McClatchie et al. 2010; McClatchie 2012). In November 2011, based in large part on such new information, the Council tasked Council staff with convening a timely workshop to review the sardine HCR and its key parameters. The Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) supports such a workshop focused primarily on the appropriateness of the temperature-recruitment relationship, as well as evaluation of other potential environment-recruit covariates. A re-assessment of the environment-recruit relationship could suggest a change in F_{MSY} and Fraction terms in the present HCR. Participants would be expected to come into the workshop with proposals or information that could inform the environment-recruit relationship.

The meeting could, for example, focus on identifying possible oceanographic conditions or indices that could be used to predict sardine spawning/recruitment processes. Further, if a new ocean predictor/index can be identified, it may facilitate a thorough evaluation of the current rules with the “new” index. In any case, the CPSMT notes that the current Pacific sardine Overfishing Limit, Acceptable Biological Catch, and Harvest Guideline control rules have been very effective at providing yield (commercial harvest), while at the same time maintaining a sustainable spawning stock biomass and addressing ecosystem needs.

The CPSMT also recognizes the value of a formal management strategy evaluation (MSE), as proposed by the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) Coastal Pelagic Species Subcommittee. However, the need for a full MSE should first be examined, and an MSE should only occur after the results of the initial workshop on the environment-recruit relationship have been produced and considered. The CPSMT also suggests that if a full MSE is to be conducted, it should consider all Coastal Pelagic Species currently in the Coastal Pelagic Species Fishery Management Plan.

The CPSMT intends to work with the SSC-Coastal Pelagic Species Subcommittee to identify a Chairperson and key participants, with a target of early February 2013 for the workshop.

References

- McClatchie, S. 2012. Sardine biomass is poorly correlated with the Pacific Decadal Oscillation off California. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39, L13703, doi:10.1029/2012GL052140.
- McClatchie, S., R. Goericke, G. Auad, and K. Hill. 2010. Re-assessment of the stock–recruit and temperature–recruit relationships for Pacific sardine (*Sardinops sagax*) Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 67: 1782–1790.

COASTAL PELAGIC SPECIES ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON FUTURE COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA AND WORKLOAD PLANNING

Pacific mackerel stock assessment

The Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel (CPSAS) met with the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) to discuss data available and a proposed schedule for updating the Pacific mackerel assessment. Given the limited amount of new data available to support a mackerel stock assessment, the CPSAS is supportive of using a projection based on the 2011 model updated with recent catch data to guide Pacific mackerel management for the 2013-2014 fishing year.

Pacific sardine fishery start date

As outlined in the CPSAS statement on Agenda Item G.3.c, there is concern over this year's stock assessment update for Pacific sardine. One of the issues raised with respect to the stock assessment and update process is the timing of submitting and analyzing survey data, especially the aerial survey data in time for the assessment process. The CPSAS discussed at length the potential benefits and drawbacks of moving the start of the fishing year from January to July, with associated stock assessments occurring during the spring. This transition would provide additional time to complete the aerial survey and analyze data from both the aerial survey and the summer acoustic survey.

There are pros and cons to this approach that require further consideration and analysis. The CPSAS would like to recommend evaluation of the fishery start date as a future agenda item. This would allow the Council, the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC), and advisory bodies to have a more thorough discussion of how this may improve the availability, analyses, and accuracy of sardine stock assessment data.

For this reason, and the possibility of incorporating additional data, i.e. the West Coast Vancouver Island swept trawl survey, the CPSAS recommends a full assessment and Stock Assessment Review Panel review for Pacific sardine in 2014.

Harvest parameters workshop

During the November 2011 Council meeting, the Executive Director was tasked with "scheduling a timely workshop to review key fishery management parameters such as Fmsy, productivity regime shifts in Fmsy application, and geographic distribution dynamics"¹. After participating in the SSC discussion on this issue the CPSAS recommends the approach outlined in the CPSMT Report (Agenda Item F.4.b, CPSMT Report), with an initial workshop focused primarily on the appropriateness of the temperature-recruitment relationship, as well as evaluation of other potential environment-recruit covariates. A reassessment of the environment-recruit relationship could suggest a change in Fmsy and Fraction terms in the present harvest control rule. The CPSAS recognizes that this may be the first step towards a broader investigation of sardine management measures.

PFMC 11/04/12

¹ Decisions of the Pacific Fishery Management Council, November 2-7, 2011. <http://www.pccouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/1111decisions.pdf>

COASTAL PELAGIC SPECIES MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON
FUTURE COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA AND WORKLOAD PLANNING

Sardine assessment for 2013

The Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) reviewed the present schedule for conducting full versus update assessments for Pacific sardine. Currently, the next full assessment for Pacific sardine is slated for 2014. However, the CPSMT sees merit in a full assessment in 2013 to allow incorporation of improvements into the assessment model that are not permitted by the Terms of Reference during an update.

Pacific mackerel management in 2013

In May 2011, a full stock assessment for Pacific mackerel was reviewed by a Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel and subsequently by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) in June 2011. To provide time to address research and data needs associated with this species, the Council decided that no assessment should be conducted in 2012, with all management decisions applicable for at least two consecutive management cycles, i.e., the 2011-12 and 2012-13 fishing years. Given that the fishery continues to receive very low levels of fishing pressure and fishery independent information indicates there is no conservation concern, the CPSMT recommends using a projection based on the 2011 model updated with recent catch data to guide Pacific mackerel management for the 2013-2014 fishing year.

Alternative sardine management schedule

The CPSMT is concerned with the current timing of when survey data can be made available to incorporate in the stock assessment. The Stock Assessment Team (STAT) has very little time to evaluate the information provided and incorporate it into the assessment, precluding some desirable analyses and leading to a greater risk of errors. Recognizing there have been discussions about changing the start date of the fishery to address this problem, the CPSMT recommends a more thorough analysis of potential options and their full range of implications. For example, one suggestion has been to set July 1 as the start of the fishery management year. This change would not necessarily alleviate timing constraints placed on the survey analysts and STAT but merely shift them. If the Council chooses, it could task the CPSMT who would collaborate with the CPSAS to prepare a brief white paper that evaluates alternatives for the April 2013 meeting.

GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL STATEMENT ON
FUTURE COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA AND WORKLOAD PLANNING

On several occasions, the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) has supported a request from participants in the limited entry fixed gear sablefish tier limit fishery to amend regulations regarding ownership and control restrictions. Specifically, participants in this fishery are recommending these restrictions be similar to the trawl ownership and control limitations. It was the GAP's understanding that the Council and NMFS would be able to consider this request in workload planning after completion of the 2013-14 groundfish specifications process. The GAP understands that this regulatory amendment will require a two meeting process for the Council and subsequent rulemaking by NMFS; however, the GAP does not believe this is an overly complex action. The GAP requests consideration of this regulatory amendment in the 2013 Council process.

PFMC
11/06/12

GROUND FISH MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON
FUTURE COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA AND WORKLOAD PLANNING

The Groundfish Management Team (GMT) makes the following reminders of requests made to the Council in earlier agenda items regarding our meeting schedule:

- Under Agenda Item I.2, we requested that scheduling at the March meeting allow time for interested GMT members to attend the Scientific and Statistical Committee's (SSC's) discussion of rebuilding plans. We would suggest making time on the SSC's schedule on the afternoon of Wednesday, March 6, 2013 for this discussion.
- Under Agenda Item I.3, we requested and the Council passed a motion, requesting that the GMT and an SSC sub-group meet to discuss refinement of the mortality rate estimates at the January GMT meeting.

PFMC
11/06/12

SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON
FUTURE COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA AND WORKLOAD PLANNING

In November 2011, the Council tasked its Executive Director with “... scheduling a timely workshop to review key fishery management parameters (for Pacific sardine) such as F_{MSY} , productivity regime shifts in F_{MSY} application, and geographic distribution dynamics.” In June 2012, the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) presented a proposal entitled “*Management Strategy Evaluation Planning Workshop for Pacific Sardine*” to address the Council’s request. Dr. André Punt reviewed the SSC’s proposal highlighting the four key steps involved:

1. Identification of management objectives and quantification of these by means of performance statistics (e.g., average catch, probability the resource drops below a threshold biomass level over a 20-year projection period, impact of abundance of other ecosystem components).
2. Identification of a set of models of the system to be managed (referred to as operating models). This set of models needs to be selected to cover (to the extent possible and feasible given available data) the key uncertainties which may impact the performance of control rules.
3. Identification of candidate overfishing limit/acceptable biological catch/harvest guideline control rules.
4. Projection of the system as reflected in each operating model, given catch limits set by each candidate control rule.

The Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) proposed an alternative, more narrowly-focused workshop to address the Council’s November 2011 request, entitled “*Workshop to Re-evaluate Parameters of the Harvest Control Rule for Pacific Sardine*” (Agenda Item F.4.b, CPSMT Report). This workshop would focus primarily on the appropriateness of the temperature-recruitment relationship, as well as evaluation of other potential environment-recruit covariates. This reassessment of the environment-recruit relationship could suggest a change in the F_{MSY} as used in the current harvest control rule.

The SSC recognizes the importance of the work proposed by the CPSMT. A better understanding of the environmental effects on Pacific sardine productivity is also an important prerequisite for conducting a management strategy evaluation (MSE) – specifically for carrying out Steps 2 and 4, above. The original simulation work carried out in the late 1990s (Amendment 8 of the Coastal Pelagic Species Fishery Management Plan (FMP)) used an MSE-like design to determine a harvest guideline (HG). This involved jointly identifying the parameters FRACTION (a temperature-dependent exploitation rate) and CUTOFF. The current management structure includes, in addition, the F_{MSY} -based OFL control rule. A new MSE, incorporating updated information on environmental correlates of productivity, could provide

updated parameters F_{MSY} , FRACTION and CUTOFF (or parameters for alternative HG formulations) with a more comprehensive analysis than was possible given the computing power available when the analysis for Amendment 8 was conducted.

The SSC recognizes the considerable workload associated with conducting the proposed MSE. In order to make the effort more manageable and efficient and to provide some of the key results in the near term, a series of short workshops (2-3 days) is suggested:

1. **Environment-Productivity Relationship (February 2013)** Following the CPSMT proposal (Agenda Item F.4.b), the goal of this workshop is to evaluate the environment-productivity relationship, and to recommend which (if any) environmental covariates are important and how they should be modeled. Both oceanographers and biologists should participate.
2. **Operating Model (March 2013)** Using the management objectives from the previous MSE work (Amendment 8 of the FMP) and the recommendations from Workshop 1, above, the key attributes of the operating model will be agreed. Some aspects of the original biological modeling will be updated to take advantage of advances in computer technology. The goal of this workshop is to establish all the detailed aspects of the operating model in principle. The actual coding of the model and runs to re-estimate the parameters of the current control rule will most likely occur after the workshop.
3. **Feedback and Remaining Issues (Timing TBD)** Workshops 1 and 2, above, are designed to produce some key results in the near term by streamlining the process. However, they will not be able to consider all of the important issues, e.g. international management (portion of the stock in USA waters); key economic factors; and ecosystem considerations. After the work of Workshops 1 and 2 has been completed and based on the feedback from the Council and other stakeholders, a third workshop should be convened to scope out the remaining work.

Finally, the SSC notes that a properly done MSE is a considerable effort involving many players (scientists, fishery managers, and stakeholders). The SSC recommends an MSE be conducted within the next two years. However, while results and conclusions are often desired sooner rather than later, the nature of the process is such that delays are not uncommon, and are often necessary to do the job well.

PFMC
11/06/12



October 11, 2012

Mr. Dan Wolford, Chair

Pacific Fishery Management Council
7700 Ambassador Place, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97220

Dear Mr. Wolford,

RE: November meeting agenda item F.4, Future Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning.

I am requesting that the Council place into the June 2013 agenda an item to address a potential recreational midwater fishery using the resulting data from the recent RFA Oregon yellowtail EFP fishery. It was suggested at the September Council meeting that there is potentially space available for this item in the June 2013 agenda.

Sincerely,

John Holloway, Co-Chair
Recreational Fishing Alliance, Oregon Chapter

October 5, 2012

Dr. Donald McIsaac
Director, Pacific Fishery Management Council
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 101
Portland, OR 97220-1384

Mr. Rodney R. McInnis
Regional Administrator, SW Region
National Marine Fisheries Service
501 West Ocean Blvd., Suite 4200
Long Beach, CA 90802

RE: Coastal Pelagic Species Management: Harvest Parameters Workshop

Dear Dr. McIsaac and Mr. McInnis:

We understand on October 9 the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team (CPSMT) is hosting a conference call to discuss the proposed CPS harvest parameters workshop. We expect this will be the foundation of a very important conversation at the Council and within the agency about the long-term conservation and management of Pacific sardine. We are unable to attend this initial meeting, but as you know, Oceana is greatly interested in the conservation and sustainable management of forage species like Pacific sardine. We are writing to request the harvest parameter workshop address the full scope of issues associated with the conservation and management of Pacific sardine including maximum sustainable yield (MSY), optimum yield (OY) and the various factors in the harvest control rule including FRACTION, DISTRIBUTION, MAXCAT, CUTOFF and MSST.

Forage species, including the species managed under the CPS Fishery Management Plan (FMP), play a vital ecological role in the California Current Large Marine Ecosystem as prey for other commercially and recreationally important fish species, marine mammals and seabirds. A recent study published in *Fish and Fisheries* found that forage fish in the Northern California Current ecosystem support the greatest production of predators out of 72 ecosystems evaluated around the planet.¹ It is imperative that CPS management complies with the requirements of the Magnuson-Steven Fishery Conservation and Management Act, national standard guidelines, and that we continue to improve the science, and harvest controls for stocks in the fishery.

For many years now, there has been broad agreement that the harvest control rules for Pacific sardine and Pacific mackerel are in need of formal review.² As stated in the 2008 CPS SAFE

¹ Pikitch, E. K., Rountos, K. J., Essington, T. E., Santora, C., Pauly, D., Watson, R., Sumaila, U. R., Boersma, P. D., Boyd, I. L., Conover, D. O., Cury, P., Heppell, S. S., Houde, E. D., Mangel, M., Plagányi, É., Sainsbury, K., Steneck, R. S., Geers, T. M., Gownaris, N. and Munch, S. B. (2012), The global contribution of forage fish to marine fisheries and ecosystems. *Fish and Fisheries*. doi: 10.1111/faf.12004

² See Research and Data needs, PFMC CPS SAFE. 2009, at 62. And, research and data needs in PFMC CPS SAFE. 2011., at 98. "Develop a formal review process for the harvest control rules for Pacific sardine and Pacific mackerel.

report, "...the harvest control rules in the CPS FMP are dated and in need of review and potential revision. Review of the harvest control rules in the CPS FMP has been repeatedly characterized as a high priority research and data need by the Council and its advisory bodies."³ Importantly, in November 2011 the SSC recommended for Pacific sardine management,

*that a workshop be convened within the next year to design a simulation analysis similar to Amendment 8 analysis but employs current modeling approaches provide estimates of F_{MSY} and updated parameters for the harvest control rule. The SSC further recommends that a **full management strategy evaluation be performed** for the northern subpopulation of Pacific sardine as soon as time and resources permit.⁴*

This recent push to review the harvest control rule is in part due to the findings in the McClatchie et al. study that demonstrated "the environmental proxy derived from SIO pier temperature, which has never affected the harvest guideline since its implementation, **no longer predicts recruitment of Pacific sardine, and should be removed from sardine management.**"⁵ This fact has great ramifications for the harvest control rule, as the various performance metrics analyzed in Amendment 8 for the various control rules are dependent on this predictive relationship. In other words, if the temperature-recruitment relationship for Pacific sardine is removed, the various harvest control rules result in significantly different outcomes than those produced in Amendment 8 and Amendment 13. Therefore, the lack of a temperature-recruit relationship means that all aspects of the harvest control rule must be re-assessed. We are encouraged that the Council and NMFS will be working to address this issue.

To that end, Oceana has acquired both the original Amendment 8 simulation model as well as the updated simulation model as presented in Appendix 4 of the 2011 stock assessment. We are currently in the process of analyzing these models, and plan to share the results of our analysis with the CPSMT, SSC, PFMC, and NMFS in the context of Pacific sardine harvest specifications and the current revisions to the harvest control rule.

While McClatchie et al. 2011 are clear that SIO temperatures are not a useful predictor of future recruitment and scientists do not fully understand these relationships, it is clear from previous history that Pacific sardines do undergo prolonged periods of low and high productivity. We are concerned, however, that the revised simulation model with updated parameters as presented in Appendix 4 of the 2011 Stock Assessment removed any temperature-recruitment relationship, and hence the oscillatory (boom and bust) nature contained in the original model. Our preliminary analysis of this model suggests that the increase in F_{MSY} from the simulations (from 12% to 18%) is more related to the removal of the oscillatory productivity rather than the inclusion of more recent data. In addition, removal of the oscillatory productivity results in a

Currently this review is not part of the stock assessment process." And "Evaluate the role of CPS resources in the ecosystem, the influence of climatic/oceanographic conditions on CPS, and define predatory-prey relationships."

³ PMFC 2008. SAFE. June 2008, at 46. and see PFMC 2011. Status of the Pacific Coast Coastal Pelagic Species Fishery and Recommended Acceptable Biological Catches. Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation. June 2011, at 68.

⁴ PFMC, November 2011. Agenda Item F.2.c Supplemental SSC Report

⁵ McClatchie, S., Goericke, R., Auad, G., and Hill, K. 2010. Re-assessment of the Stock-Recruit and Temperature-Recruit Relationships for Pacific Sardine (*Sardinops sagax*). 2010. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 67:1782-1790

much different effect of the CUTOFF parameter with respect to various model outputs. This raises serious concerns about the use of the updated F_{MSY} in the context of management, and at the least, suggests that the original simulation model is more appropriate for determining F_{MSY} and other performance measures until a comprehensive revision of the simulation model occurs.

However, there is new best available science and information that indicates that the Pacific sardine harvest control rule and management framework need to be re-assessed and revised in its entirety at this time. We request the proposed harvest parameter workshop include a review of not only the temperature-recruit relationship and F_{MSY} but also optimum yield, the effective fishing rate, and the distribution, maximum catch and cutoff factors in the harvest control rule.

Optimum Yield

The MSA mandates that fisheries be managed to achieve OY, which reflects an effort to balance fisheries production with the need to take into account the protection of marine ecosystems.⁶ Hence, OY is prescribed as MSY **as reduced** by any relevant economic, social, or ecological factors.⁷ The NS1 regulations implementing the MSA repeatedly emphasize that OY and even MSY must account for ecological considerations.⁸ This incorporation of ecological factors into the setting of catch levels is a required element of FMPs.⁹ The ecological factors used in determining MSY and OY specifically include the benefits of protection afforded to marine ecosystems, such as “maintaining adequate forage for all components of the ecosystem.”¹⁰ The regulations implementing the MSA go beyond simply incorporating the impacts to forage species in setting catch levels, stating that “consideration should be given to managing forage stocks for higher biomass than B_{MSY} to enhance and protect the marine ecosystem.”¹¹ In addition, the CPS FMP itself lists “provide adequate forage for dependent species” as a primary goal of the management of CPS fisheries, indicating that the role of CPS as forage is clearly a “relevant economic, social, or ecological factor”.

So far, however, the opportunity cost of sardines as prey for other fish and animals has not been explicitly considered in setting catch quotas for sardines.... The main conclusion is that taking the opportunity cost of sardines as forage fish into consideration could quite possibly mean closing down the sardine fishery altogether, and at the very least would have an appreciable impact on how much of sardines should be caught in any particular year. (Hannesson and Herrick 2010)

Ultimately the choice of harvest control rule through which ACLs and ACTs are set must achieve OY. We remain concerned that the FMP does not include an assessment and specification of OY for stocks in the fishery, including sardine, and we hope to see the Council and National Marine Fisheries Service begin to remedy this by including an assessment of OY as

⁶ 16 U.S.C. 1851 § 301(a)(1); *see also* 16 U.S.C. 1802 § 3(33).

⁷ 16 U.S.C. 1802 § 3(33)(B). Emphasis added.

⁸ *See, e.g.*, 50 C.F.R. § 600.310(e)(1)(iv) and (e)(3)(ii).

⁹ 50 C.F.R. § 600.310(e)(3)(iv)(C).

¹⁰ 50 C.F.R. § 600.310(e)(3)(iii)(C).

¹¹ 50 C.F.R. § 600.310(e)(3)(iv)(C).

a specific part of this workshop. Importantly we request that there be consideration of bio-economic models that have been developed to evaluate the role of sardine as forage, and the economic value of sardine as prey to other managed fisheries.¹² In determining which harvest control rule achieves the overall greatest benefit to the Nation, NMFS and the PFMC must explicitly incorporate the supportive roles of CPS to the ecosystem and to other sectors, in addition to considering the effects of alternative harvest rates on the wetfish industry itself.

Ultimately, for naturally fluctuating forage fish stocks such as Pacific sardine, there are important trade-offs across multiple management objectives. While there are many objectives at play, we recognize three general objectives at the heart of sardine management, which can be assessed in different ways:

1. Account for the ecological services provided as forage, as part of the overall forage base, to specialist predators, and various sectors;
2. Consider cumulative or average long-term catch;
3. Consider variance, or stability in the catch (e.g., % of years with a significant fishery).

Clearly, all of the parameters in the current harvest rule (DISTRIBUTION, FRACTION, CUTOFF, and MAXCAT) affect the performance of the fishery across the various performance measures, as has been demonstrated in the original Amendment 8 analysis. Based on this and the wealth of new best available information, we request that any undertaking of revisions to the current harvest control rule address all of the following parameters.

1. Exploitation Rate (FRACTION)

The Lenfest Forage Fish Task Force conducted the most comprehensive analysis of harvest control rules for forage fish stocks to date. The unanimous recommendations are that for forage fish stocks for which a medium level of information exists (arguably the situation for Pacific sardine), harvest rates should include a cutoff of at least 40% of the long-term mean unfished biomass, and be less than one half of the F_{MSY} rate. They argue that following these recommendation results in low probability of collapse for forage species, lower declines in dependent species, and ultimately a more stable fishery.¹³ Similar, Smith et al. (2011) recommended “Halving exploitation rates” from traditional MSY rates, which “would result in much lower impacts on marine ecosystems, while still achieving 80% of MSY.”¹⁴ We request that model evaluations of Pacific sardine consider a range of alternative FRACTION parameters in combination with other parameters, including alternatives where the catch levels would be set no higher than half of F_{MSY} .

¹² See: Hannesson, R. S.H. Herrick, and J. Field. 2009. Ecological and economic considerations in the conservation and management of the Pacific sardine (*Sardinops sagax*). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 66: 859-868 and Hannesson, R. and S.F. Herrick. 2010. The value of Pacific sardine as forage fish. Marine Policy (34) 935-942 942.

¹³ Pikitch, E., Boersma, P.D., Boyd, I.L., Conover, D.O., Cury, P., Essington, T., Heppell, S.S., Houde, E.D., Mangel, M., Pauly, D., Plagányi, É., Sainsbury, K., and Steneck, R.S. 2012. Little Fish, Big Impact: Managing a Crucial Link in Ocean Food Webs. Lenfest Ocean Program. Washington, DC. 108 pp.

¹⁴ Smith et al. 2011. Impacts of Fishing Low-Trophic Level Species on Marine Ecosystems. Science. www.sciencemag.org July 21, 2011.

2. Distribution

In the Pacific sardine harvest control rule, the DISTRIBUTION parameter is intended to reflect the average proportion of Pacific sardine biomass in U.S. waters, versus other nations (Mexico and Canada), with the inherent assumption that each nation is entitled to catch that proportion out of the overall coastwide harvest guideline as determined by the harvest control rule. The simulation model used in Amendment 8 included the entire Pacific sardine stock across Mexico, the U.S., and Canada, and was based on coastwide landings, not U.S. landings alone. Ultimately, the model simulations and various outcomes of any given harvest rule as described in Amendment 8 assume that the harvest guidelines are not being exceeded on a coastwide basis. The DISTRIBUTION factor was based on summer-fall fish spotter surveys conducted two decades ago during a period of low sardine abundance and has been used to justify the assumption that 87% of the stock is in U.S. waters, 13% of the stock is in Mexico waters and 0% is found off Canada.¹⁵ This results in a much greater estimate of the proportion of Pacific sardine in U.S. waters than the current proportions of the total catch landed in recent years by each country.

According to this distribution estimate there should be no portion of the coastwide Pacific sardine stock in Canada at all. Canadian landings data demonstrate that the current HCR uses the one value for Pacific sardine biomass in Canadian waters that we know is incorrect – zero percent. It is the *least* rational assumption available as the basis for the distribution parameter, and using it places the Pacific sardine stock at increased risk for international overfishing, and exceeding the harvest guidelines identified in the Amendment 8 simulations.

The October 2011 Pacific Sardine STAR Panel report explains that “[t]he current Canadian harvest control rule is based on the U.S. assessment of coastwide adult biomass and the migration rate of sardines into Canadian waters.”¹⁶ The report upon which this summary is based reveals that **Canada assumes a distribution of 27.2%** to calculate their catch level. *Evaluation of Pacific sardine stock assessment and harvest guidelines in British Columbia* (http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas-sccs/Publications/SAR-AS/2011/2011_016-eng.pdf) DFO 2011).¹⁷ We request that alternatives to the current distribution factor be considered based on more recent data, including one that assumes the distribution factor recognized by Canada equal to 27.2% and recent catch in Mexico. Other data also exist, including the recent acoustic trawl estimates of sardine biomass of the U.S. and Canada.¹⁸

3. Cutoff and MSST

¹⁵ CPS FMP Amendment 8, Appendix B, p. B-87-88.

¹⁶ PFMC. 2011, Agenda Item F.2.b Attachment 5, at 22

¹⁷ DFO. 2011. Evaluation of Pacific sardine (*Sardinops sagax*) stock assessment and harvest guidelines in British Columbia. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Science Advisory Report. 2011/016.

¹⁸ Zwolinski, J. D.A. Demer, B.J. Macewicz, G.R. Cutter, K.A. Byers, J.S. Renfree and T.S. Sessions. 2012. Acoustic-trawl estimates of sardine biomass off the west coast of the United States and Canada during summer 2012. NMFS. In Appendix B to the Assessment of the Pacific Sardine Resource in 2012 for U.S. Management in 2013. Draft Summary Report. September 8, 2012

The CUTOFF parameter in the Pacific sardine harvest control rule plays a critical role in maintaining stock biomass, providing forage to dependent predators, preventing stock collapse, and promoting timely recovery of the Pacific sardine population following natural declines. A recent scientific paper by NMFS SW Fisheries Science Center researchers (Zwolinski and Demer 2012) published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences finds that the Pacific sardine biomass has “declined precipitously in the California Current” (see: <http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2012/02/24/1113806109.full.pdf>) As if that is not enough to warrant concern, the authors found, “Also alarming is the repetition of the fishery’s response to a declining sardine stock – progressively higher exploitation rates targeting the oldest, largest, and most fecund fish.”¹⁹

“Currently, the exploitation of sardine off the west coast of North America is at the highest possible rate within the management framework, and the largest, most fecund fish have been targeted increasingly despite clear indicators of their depletion.” (Zwolinski and Demer 2012)

Zwolinski and Demer (2012) identify a “critical biomass” of approximately 750,000 metric tons, below which the Pacific sardine stock is at grave risk of stock collapse. The clear implication of this threshold is that the current cutoff and minimum stock size threshold (MSST) should be greater than 750,000 mt. In the report “*little fish BIG IMPACT*”, (available at: <http://www.oceanconservation.org/foragefish/>) the Lenfest Forage Fish Task Force recommends that fishing stop for forage fish when the biomass reaches at least 40% of the unfished biomass. Dr. Hill’s updated simulation model estimates the average unfished biomass of Pacific sardine at approximately 2,225,000 metric tons.²⁰ Applying the Lenfest Forage Fish Task Force recommendations to Pacific sardine would then require a cutoff of approximately 900,000 metric tons, or six times higher than the current 150,000 metric ton cutoff. Another study published in the journal *Science* looked at the impacts of fishing forage species on seabird predators, and concluded that forage fish populations should be kept above one third of historic maximum levels, which would mean a Pacific sardine cutoff of well over one million metric tons.²¹

NMFS has suggested that the current cutoff is conservative simply because it is three times the minimum stock size threshold (MSST), yet the sardine MSST and the cutoff are not even consistent with national standard one guidelines that state MSST should be at least one-half of

¹⁹ Zwolinski, J. and D.A. Demer. 2012. A cold oceanographic regime with high exploitation rates in the Northeast Pacific forecasts a collapse of the sardine stock. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS) 109 (11) 4175-4180 (attached).

²⁰ See figure 5. Hill, K.T. 2011. Re-evaluation of F_{MSY} for Pacific sardine in the absence of an environmental covariate. In, Pacific Fishery Management Council Agenda Item F.2.b Supplemental Attachment 8. Pacific Sardine Assessment Report. November 2011.

²¹ Curry, P.M., I.L. Boyd, S. Bonhommeau, T. Anker-Nilssen, R.J.M. Crawford, R.W. Furness, J.A. Mills, E.J. Murphy, H. Österblom, M. Paleczny, J.F. Piatt, J.P. Roux, L. Shannon, and W.J. Sydeman. 2011. Global Seabird Response to Forage Fish Depletion – One-Third for the Birds. *Science* (334)6063 1703-1706.

the MSY stock size.²² For Pacific sardine, one-half the MSY stock size as determined in CPS FMP Amendment 8 is 704,000 metric tons.²³ This is based on the constant harvest strategy of $F_{MSY} = 12\%$ (stochastic F_{MSY}), resulting in a long-term mean biomass of 1,408,000 metric tons of age 1+ sardine. This is coincidentally close to the critical biomass threshold Zwolinski and Demer identified of 750,000 mt. Even under Dr. Hill's updated simulation model in Appendix 4, the MSY stock size is approximately one million mt, so one-half the MSY stock size would be 500,000 mt, which is 10 times greater than the current MSST. The main point here is that the message coming from multiple scientific publications and the national guidelines is that the Pacific sardine cutoff is far too low and we recommend that both CUTOFF and MSST be reviewed with different alternatives including those presented in these scientific publications.

4. Maximum Catch

The MAXCAT parameter in the harvest control rule serves several functions, including increased stability for the fishery, preventing overcapitalization, and a buffer against uncertainty. The level of MAXCAT interacts in several important ways with the other parameters of the harvest control rule. For example, the role and relative importance of MAXCAT in various model outputs depends largely on the other parameters. Therefore, any revisions to the harvest rule should re-evaluate the MAXCAT in combination with other parameters in assessing the extent to which any given harvest control rule achieves Optimum Yield.

In conclusion, we appreciate this opportunity to comment on the CPS harvest parameters workshop. There is a tremendous amount of new information on the distribution of the Pacific sardine stock, changes to the simulation model used in Amendment 8, our understanding of the temperature-recruit relationship, and our ability to incorporate the opportunity cost of sardines as forage. We look forward to sharing the results of our analysis of the existing simulation models, and helping define the appropriate scope of revisions to the Pacific sardine harvest control rule.

We hope you will give these comments your full consideration and that you will work with your management teams and scientists to undertake a rigorous and complete evaluation of OY and all parameters of the harvest control rule. Thank you for your time and attention to this issue.

Sincerely,



Ben Enticknap
Pacific Project Manager

cc. Dr. Owen Hamel, Chair, PFMC Scientific and Statistical Committee
Dr. Robert Emmett, Chair, PFMC Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team

²² 50 CFR § 600.310 (e)(2)(ii)(B) (MSSTs must be expressed in terms of spawning biomass or other measure of reproductive potential and should equal whichever is greater: one-half the MSY stock size, or the minimum stock size at which rebuilding to the MSY level would be expected to occur within 10 years.)

²³ PFMC and NMFS 2011. Amendment 13 to the Coastal Pelagic Species Fishery Management Plan. Draft Environmental Assessment and Regulatory Impact Review, at 57 .Option L, Stochastic F_{MSY} .

October 23, 2012

Mr. Dan Wolford, Chairman
Pacific Fishery Management Council
7700 NE Ambassador Place, #101
Portland, OR 97220

RE: Agenda Item F.4.c, Management Strategy Evaluation for Pacific Sardine

Dear Chairman Wolford and Council Members:

I am writing with regard to the upcoming Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) for Pacific sardine. The Pew Environment Group appreciates that the Council has made this a priority, and we are optimistic that the Pacific sardine fishery can serve as a model for forage fishery management worldwide. However, we are concerned that the scope of the MSE will be limited to an evaluation of just one parameter in the harvest control rule. In order to manage this fishery in a way that truly achieves Optimum Yield (OY) as defined in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), we request that the Council take action to ensure that the scope of the MSE includes an evaluation of all control rule parameters with particular emphasis on the performance metric of avoiding negative impacts to the broader ecosystem. We discuss the specific parameters and metrics we would like to see evaluated in greater detail below.

Management Strategy Evaluation Background

There are four parameters in the existing harvest control rule for Pacific sardine that is used to determine the annual harvest guideline for the fishery: BIOMASS, CUTOFF, FRACTION and DISTRIBUTION. While BIOMASS is determined through the annual stock assessment and update process, the CUTOFF, FRACTION and DISTRIBUTION parameters are either fixed or fixed within a range as the result of a policy determination made by the Council with advice from the relevant advisory bodies and the Council's Science and Statistical Committee (SSC).

The SSC and others have discussed the need for an MSE for Pacific sardine for several years.¹ However, the Council hadn't made it a priority until the release of a study in 2010 that raised concerns over the FRACTION parameter in the existing harvest control rule, which is utilized as a proxy for F_{MSY} .² This parameter specifies the amount of Pacific sardine available to the fishery

¹ PFMC. June 2008. Coastal Pelagic Species Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation. See also: PFMC, November 2011. Agenda Item F.2.c Supplemental SSC Report.

² PFMC. Amendment 13 to the Coastal Pelagic Species FMP, Draft Environmental Assessment.

when BIOMASS exceeds CUTOFF (set at 150,000mt) and is based on average sea-surface temperature at the Scripps Pier in La Jolla, CA. The study re-evaluated the stock-recruit and temperature-recruit relationships that are used to determine FRACTION and showed that the sea-surface temperature data collected at Scripps Institute of Oceanography Pier was no longer a reliable predictor of sardine productivity.³

This study prompted discussion at the Council of whether the harvest control rule should continue to be utilized as-is, whether FRACTION should be set at some more scientifically defensible harvest rate in the meantime, or whether a new parameter or new harvest control rules needed to be evaluated for use in management. Ultimately, the Council opted to propose a management strategy workshop as an initial step in evaluating the current control rule parameters. Yet while the genesis of the MSE may have come from concern over the FRACTION parameter, it is clear that the entire management framework for Pacific sardine in particular and all coastal pelagic species (CPS) in general, is in need of fundamental re-evaluation.

Management Strategy Evaluation Objective

The Council's June briefing book provides an outline of the MSE and the methodology to be used. According to this document:

*"The primary aim of the management strategy evaluation would be to provide the Council with the trade-offs achieved by alternative OFL/ABC/HG control rules. These trade-offs need to consider performance in terms of fishery yield, resource conservation, and impact on the broader ecosystem (through trophic interactions)."*⁴

Simply put, the stated aim of the MSE cannot be achieved if its scope is limited to an evaluation only of the FRACTION parameter in the current harvest control rule. In addition to FRACTION, the MSE should evaluate the CUTOFF and DISTRIBUTION parameters. Essentially, this should consist of a complete reworking of the analysis done during Amendment 8 to the CPS FMP (then called the Northern Anchovy FMP), which established the current suite of control rules and respective parameters. A truly robust MSE should also establish a process and framework for incorporating ecosystem considerations into the current stock assessment methodology for Pacific sardine.

³ McClatchie, S., Goericke, R., Auad, G., and Hill, K. 2010. Re-assessment of the Stock-Recruit and Temperature-Recruit Relationships for Pacific Sardine (*Sardinops sagax*). 2010. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 67:1782-1790.

⁴ PFMC. June 2012. Harvest Parameters for Pacific Sardine. Management Strategy Evaluation Planning Workshop. See Agenda Item G.7.a, Attachment 3, Proposed Workshops and SSC Subcommittee Meetings for 2012.

Management Strategy Evaluation Process

According to the MSE Planning Workshop document in the Council's June briefing book, the methodology for the MSE is broken down into four distinct steps.⁵ First, the Council must identify the management objectives it seeks to achieve and the metrics by which the alternative control rules will be evaluated. Many of these metrics are common across fisheries, such as stability in catch, probability of overfishing, impacts to habitat, bycatch, etc. However, for important forage species like Pacific sardine, the most critical metric by which to evaluate alternative control rules should address the impacts of the fishery on other managed fisheries and ecosystem components.

The second step in the MSE process is to identify the models that will be used to represent the system, including a selection of hypotheses for the operating model and a set of parameters that corresponds to the data inputs. In order to determine the impacts of sardine removal on the broader ecosystem, one approach would be to use a model such as Atlantis or Ecosim w/Ecosim. Employing a model such as Atlantis would also allow for the inclusion of spatial structure in a way that more accurately reflects the migratory dynamics of the species. While this would make parameterizing the operating model a somewhat daunting task, we feel that such an approach is necessary in order to properly account for the ecosystem aspects of the MSE. Furthermore, because ecosystem models do not adequately account for the cyclical nature of forage stocks such as Pacific sardine, the models chosen should include environmentally driven parameters to simulate regime-changes and shifts in productivity.

The third step in the process is to identify and select the alternative control rules to be evaluated. This may consist of assigning alternate values or proxies for the parameters in the current control rules, such as CUTOFF, DISTRIBUTION, FRACTION, BUFFER or Fmsy. This step may also include identification of alternate control rules that utilize parameters not found in the existing control rules. Regardless of the form taken or how the rules are parameterized, the important thing for this step is to ensure that selection of alternate control rules is done in a way that clarifies and makes explicit the ecological tradeoffs associated with each strategy.

Finally, the last step is to run the model simulations to project how the system would be impacted by the catch levels determined by each of the control rules analyzed. Depending on the management objectives established by the Council and the metrics by which the control rules will be weighed, a control rule or set of rules will be selected to form the basis of the Council's strategy for managing the Pacific sardine fishery. As stated above, this strategy must seek to minimize any negative impacts to the other marine wildlife and maintain the ecological role of Pacific sardine in the ecosystem.

⁵ *Ibid.*

Control Rule Parameters

While the genesis of the MSE stemmed from concerns over the FRACTION parameter in the existing control rule, a re-evaluation of the other parameters in the control rules are equally as important to Council's long term strategy for the fishery.

CUTOFF

In the harvest control rule for actively managed coastal pelagic species, the CUTOFF parameter is the biomass level below which directed harvest is not permitted. Should overfishing occur, CUTOFF is intended to set aside a buffer of spawning stock that is protected from fishing and available for use in rebuilding if the stock becomes overfished.⁶ For Pacific sardine, the CUTOFF value is fixed at 150,000mt and is subtracted off the top from the overall biomass available to the fishery. Accordingly, harvest levels determined by the rule will decline as overall biomass declines until it reaches the CUTOFF, at which point the harvest guideline would be zero.

There is a lack of transparency regarding how the CUTOFF value was derived and what its purpose is within the harvest control rule. For Pacific sardine, CUTOFF is set at three times the Minimum Stock Size Threshold (MSST) of 50,000 mt. According to the NS1 guidelines, MSST is defined as the greater of $\frac{1}{2} B_{MSY}$ or the minimum stock size at which rebuilding to the Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) level would be expected to occur in 10 years if the stock was fished at the Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold (MFMT).

This approach to defining MSST and therefore CUTOFF is problematic because the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) maintains that B_{MSY} is not used as an MSY reference point for Pacific sardine due to its cyclical nature of abundance.⁷ One objective of the MSE should be to eliminate this confusion regarding how CUTOFF is defined and its purpose within the context of the harvest control rule. If CUTOFF is intended to provide a "forage set aside" as has been claimed by some observers including one of the authors of the harvest control rule,⁸ we request that the Council transparently define a variable that both adequately accounts for rebuilding needs and provides sufficient forage for other marine species in the ecosystem by maintaining Pacific sardine's relative contribution to the California Current forage base. Recently published studies including the Lenfest Forage Fish Task Force report, the study released by Smith et al. in July 2011, and the study released by Cury et al. in November 2011, provide alternative approaches to establishing thresholds and other reference points for forage fisheries and

⁶ PFMC. January 2011. Amendment 13 to the Coastal Pelagic Species FMP, Draft Environmental Assessment. Page 23.

⁷ See Response to Public Comments. Federal Register, May 25, 2011. Vol. 76, No. 101. Final rule: Fisheries Off West Coast; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries, Annual Specifications. (RIN 0648-XA109)

⁸ PFMC. June 2008. Pacific Mackerel Management for 2008-2009. Agenda Item G1d. Public Comment.

should inform the MSE's review of the use of CUTOFF and MSST in the existing management strategy for Pacific sardine.⁹

DISTRIBUTION

The current Pacific sardine harvest control rule sets the portion of the fishery available in U.S. waters at 87%, implying that 13% is available outside of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone. There is broad agreement that this fixed DISTRIBUTION parameter does not accurately reflect the dynamic ecology of Pacific sardine and the way in which the stock expands and contracts north and south along the West Coast as the population fluctuates. Furthermore, it directly contradicts the assumption used in the Canadian sardine fishery of a 27.2% migration rate for Pacific sardine.¹⁰

The current lack of coordinated transboundary management for Pacific sardine jeopardizes the long term health of the stock. Regardless of how precautionary an approach is being taken in U.S. waters, our efforts to maintain an ecologically sustainable fishery will be for naught if total exploitation rates for Pacific sardine continue to rise, as is currently the trend. We request that the MSE include a revision of this variable for all the Pacific sardine control rules to accurately reflect actual distribution of the stock. We also encourage the Council, NMFS and the U.S. State Department to continue to explore avenues that will expand cooperation with Canada and Mexico on scientific research and coordinated international management of the fishery to prevent overfishing and provide sufficient forage in the ecosystem.

Conclusion

The MSA mandates that FMPs seek to achieve OY in order to provide the greatest overall benefit to the nation, particularly with respect to food production, recreational opportunities and protecting marine ecosystems.¹¹ Under the MSA, OY is defined as MSY as reduced by relevant social, economic and ecological factors.¹² The incorporation of these factors is thus a requirement of FMPs.¹³ Additionally, both the CPS FMP and the National Standard 1 Guidelines recognize the need for fishery managers to provide adequate forage for dependent predators.^{14, 15} The NS1 guidelines go even further by directing that in FMPs, "consideration

⁹ Smith ADM et al 2011. Impacts of Fishing Low-Trophic Level Species on Marine Ecosystems. *Science* **333** (6046): 1147-50, 26 August 2011 (published online July 21, 2011); Cury, P.M. et al. 2011. "Global Seabird Response to Forage Fish Depletion – One Third for the Birds." *Science* 334:1703-06; Pikitch, E., et al. 2012. Little Fish, Big Impact: Managing a Crucial Link in Ocean Food Webs. Lenfest Ocean Program. Washington, DC.

¹⁰ DFO. 2011. Evaluation of Pacific sardine (*Sardinops sagax*) stock assessment and harvest guidelines in British Columbia. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Science Advisory Report. 2011/016.

¹¹ 16 U.S.C. 1851 § 301(a)(1)

¹² 16 U.S.C. 1802 § 3(33)(B).

¹³ 50 C.F.R. § 600.310(e)(3)(iv)(C).

¹⁴ PFMC. 1998. Coastal Pelagic Species FMP. Page1-4.

¹⁵ 50 C.F.R. § 600.310(e)(3)(iii)(C).

should be given to managing forage stocks for higher biomass than B_{MSY} to enhance and protect the marine ecosystem.”¹⁶

As the Council determines the intent and scope for this MSE, it is important to keep these objectives and guidelines in mind. The tradeoffs (fishery yield, resource conservation and impact on the broader ecosystem) achieved by alternative control rules will reflect differing approaches to the determination of OY. Ultimately, the set of control rules chosen by the Council will be a *de facto* statement on how it intends to manage coastal pelagic fisheries, and how it evaluates the social, economic and ecological factors that go into setting catch levels. As stated above, a critical performance metric to evaluate alternative control rules should address the impacts of the Pacific sardine fishery on the broader ecosystem, including the Council’s other managed fisheries. In many ways this MSE is a test case for the implementation of ecosystem-based fishery management; it is essential that we get it right.

We appreciate the Council undertaking this endeavor and look forward to working with all stakeholders to maintain healthy oceans and sustainable fisheries.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steve Marx", written in a cursive style.

Steve Marx
Pacific Fish Conservation Program
Pew Environment Group

¹⁶ 50 C.F.R. § 600.310(e)(3)(iv)(C).