

GROUND FISH ADVISORY SUBPANEL REPORT ON
FISHERY ECOSYSTEM PLAN COORDINATED ECOSYSTEM INDICATOR REVIEW
INITIATIVE

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) received a presentation from Dr. Kit Dahl and appreciates the Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (IEA) Team's annual State of the California Current Ecosystem Report (SCCE Report).

While the GAP has not spent as much time as other advisory bodies discussing the report, we do see some advantages to indicators already included in the report. Furthermore, we support the [Supplemental Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel](#) report under this agenda item but caution that most of the indicators can be misleading and analysis should include balanced comparisons relative to fisheries. The GAP cautions that indicators, while useful, can be misleading. For example, an expanding population of some bird species would be seen as a success. However, that same bird species may prey on some fish species that support a number of fisheries.

Regarding specific indicators, the GAP offers support for the [Salmon Advisory Subpanel](#) (SAS) report (Agenda Item D.1.a, SAS Report, under this agenda item, specifically the recommendations related to vertical temperature profiles, oxygen minimums and upwelling. Those recommendations in the SAS Report could apply to many groundfish species – blackgill and sablefish, for example – as well as salmon.

The GAP also suggests that some indicators take into account normal cyclical changes and variations. Looking at trends over time would be appropriate.

The GAP generally agrees with the Ecosystem Workgroup when it noted in its [March 2016](#) report that some of the indicators in the report are of informational value and helpful for “building general ecosystem awareness and literacy that may lead to new applications of the information in the future.” We also agree that focusing analysis on specific fisheries, such as is being done with sablefish, is appropriate, and that furthering the dialogue between the Integrated Ecosystem Assessment Team (IEA), Council and advisory bodies is important as new information is added and refined.

Another concern is workload: Reviewing this report every year, as suggested, may take time away from the Council, Council staff and advisory bodies working on more immediate action items, rather than informational reports. The GAP suggests prioritizing which items should be included in the annual report, similar to the way the Council prioritizes groundfish work items through Omnibus planning.