

SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON  
FISHERY ECOSYSTEM PLAN (FEP) FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed the [draft of Chapter 3](#) and the [outlines for Chapters 4 and 5](#) of the Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP) five-year review and offers the following comments. The SSC commends the Ecosystem Workgroup's (EWG's) work on the development of the FEP and appreciates that the EWG has added additional staff and expertise since March. The SSC also supports the EWG's efforts to add a social scientist to the workgroup.

The revised fishery groupings described in section 3.4.2 (Current Fisheries), where fisheries are organized into benthic and pelagic categories, may not be the best way to organize this section. There are multiple possible ways to do this. A more human-centric way of organizing this section that relates more closely to how fishermen or fishing communities group or utilize fisheries may be preferable. For example, groups could be defined using seasonal patterns (see Figure 3-7), operational or cultural linkages, or by geographic area.

Section 3.4.6 (Fishing communities), as currently written and proposed contains too much information and analysis that will quickly become out of date. Much of this information can be found in more frequently updated documents, including the California Current Integrated Ecosystem Assessment team's annual report, stock assessment and fishery evaluation documents, and groundfish environmental impact statements. It may be more effective for the FEP to keep the discussion more qualitative and reference or link to these documents so readers can access current information on the state of fisheries and fishing communities.

The rationale for partitioning of the seven regions described in section 3.4.6 should be better explained. It is not clear whether or how these regions correspond to biogeographic regions, fishery management areas, or geographically distinct groups of related fishing ports/communities. The reasons why these regions were established should be described, or if they are based on existing regional definitions, references should be given.

Some examples cited as ecosystem-based management (EBM) measures within fishery management plans (FMPs), section 3.5.2 (Ecosystem-Based Management Measures within FMPs) are not necessarily EBM. While the list of FMP-specific EBM examples can be a useful reference, describing how these measures address EBM goals and objectives would improve this section. Also, there could be more exploration of cross FMP measures that address technical and biological interactions between species and fisheries.

The SSC supports the further development of Chapters 4 and 5 and looks forward to reviewing them as drafts are completed.