

**MINUTES**  
**Scientific and Statistical Committee**

Pacific Fishery Management Council  
The Riverside Hotel  
Cinnabar Room  
2900 Chinden Boulevard  
Boise, Idaho 83714  
208-343-1871

**September 13-14, 2012**

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

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. on Thursday, September 13, 2012. Council Executive Director, Dr. Donald McIsaac briefed the SSC on priority agenda items.

**Members in Attendance**

Dr. Ramon Conser, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA (Sept. 13 only)  
Mr. Robert Conrad, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Olympia, WA  
Dr. Martin Dorn, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA  
Dr. Carlos Garza, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA  
Dr. Vladlena Gertseva, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA  
Dr. Owen Hamel, SSC Chair, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA  
Dr. Selina Heppell, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR  
Dr. Daniel Huppert, University of Washington, Seattle, WA  
Dr. Peter Lawson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Newport, OR  
Dr. Todd Lee, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, WA  
Dr. Charles Petrosky, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise, ID  
Dr. André Punt, University of Washington, Seattle, WA  
Dr. David Sampson, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Newport, OR  
Ms. Cindy Thomson, National Marine Fisheries Service, Santa Cruz, CA

**Members Absent**

Dr. Louis Botsford, University of California, Davis, CA  
Ms. Meisha Key, SSC Vice-Chair, California Department of Fish and Game, Santa Cruz, CA  
Dr. Tien-Shui Tsou, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA

<b>SSC Recusals for this Meeting.</b>		
<b>SSC Member</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>None</b>		
<b>SSC members of External Review Panels for items considered at this meeting.</b>		
<i>SSC members of external review panels are noted below for the record. SSC members of External Review Panels may participate in SSC deliberations, but they are expected to remain neutral if the SSC is being asked to arbitrate differences between review panels and technical teams.</i>		
<b>SSC Member</b>	<b>External Panel Membership</b>	
<b>None</b>		

### **Scientific and Statistical Committee Comments to the Council**

The following is a compilation of September 2012 SSC reports to the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) in the order they were discussed by the SSC. (Related SSC discussion not included in written comment to the Council is provided in *italicized text*).

#### ***Council Administrative matters***

##### G.2 Research Planning

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed the current draft of the Council Research and Data Needs document (Agenda Item G.2.a, Attachment 1) and discussed its completeness and the timeline for its adoption.

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is in the process of formulating a Strategic Science Plan, and the SSC discussed the relationship between the NMFS Strategic Science Plan and the Council Research and Data Needs document. While they are not formally coordinated, there is considerable overlap and the SSC recommends that the NMFS Strategic Plan be reviewed when available to identify any gaps or omissions in either document.

The SSC discussed the organization of the Council document and noted that the sections on Economics and Social Science Components and Marine Protected Areas and Essential Fish Habitat are similar to the Ecosystem-Based Fishery Management section, in that they all deal with overarching issues that apply to all four of the Fishery Management Plans. The SSC recommends that those two sections be moved to the beginning of the document, with the Ecosystem section, and that the introductory text be modified to include a statement recognizing these topics as addressing overarching issues.

The SSC also recommends some specific changes to the Council document, in several different sections. In the Emerging Issues section of the Ecosystem chapter, the SSC noted that the recommended analysis of trophic interactions requires substantial additional data which is not currently available. The SSC suggests that there be two bulleted items in this section, one

recommending collection of the basic trophic interaction data and another recommending its analysis and interpretation.

In the Groundfish chapter, the SSC noted that the mortality rate estimates used in the evaluation of halibut bycatch in the groundfish fisheries are outdated, and recommends that they be updated and expanded.

The SSC had more extensive recommendations for changes to the Salmon chapter that are summarized below.

Parentage-based (intergenerational genetic) tagging (PBT) is now in place for many California and all Idaho Chinook salmon hatchery programs and allows identification of both the stock and exact age of individual fish. This technique can provide data for cohort reconstruction, migration and straying studies, survival-rate comparisons, and other fine-scale data needs. PBT should be included where other identification methods such as genetic stock identification (GSI) are referenced (sections 4.1, 4.2.1.1, 4.4 genetics)

#### Section 4.2.2

High Priority Research Issues: Delete the paragraph concerning Continuous Catch Equations. This concern has effectively been addressed with the development of unbiased methods for estimating non-catch mortalities. These methods have undergone a methodology review and been approved for implementation into the coho FRAM model. Model implementation will be reviewed at the Salmon Methodology Review meeting in October.

Stock Migration and Distribution. The current paragraph should be split into two with the second paragraph entitled “Ocean Distribution of Natural Stocks.”

#### Section 4.5

Emerging Issues, Genetic Identification Methods. Add: Evaluation of whether PBT sampling and tag recovery programs can be practically and cost-effectively implemented to provide information for annual stock assessment needs.

The SSC endorses the Research Planning and Data Needs document, with the changes recommended above, and recommends that it go out for public and further advisory body review.

### ***Salmon Management***

#### E.2 2012 Salmon Methodology Review

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) met with Mr. Chuck Tracy and Dr. Robert Kope to identify which of the following topics prioritized by the Council at the April meeting would be available for the 2012 Salmon Methodology Review.

1. Implementation and assessment of proposed bias-correction methods for mark-selective fisheries into the Coho Fishery Regulation Assessment Model (FRAM). [Model Evaluation Workgroup (MEW)]
2. Review of modifications to Chinook FRAM size limit algorithms implemented to allow evaluation of changes to size-limits. [MEW]
3. Review of alternative forecast methodologies for the Sacramento Fall Chinook index. [Salmon Technical Team (STT)]
4. A multi-year review and evaluation of preseason forecasts and postseason estimates for mark-selective coho fisheries both north and south of Cape Falcon. [STT]
5. Preliminary assessment of the feasibility of abundance-based management for California Coastal Chinook. [National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Region]
6. A user's manual for the Visual Studio version of FRAM. [MEW]
7. Investigate Chinook FRAM's sensitivity to age composition forecasts. [MEW]
8. Evaluate the feasibility of incorporating bias-correction methods for mark-selective fisheries into Chinook FRAM. [MEW]
9. Develop recommendations on management methodologies for Sacramento River Winter Chinook that better achieve the Council's objective, particularly at low abundance. [STT]

Reports on topics 1, 2 and 4 will be available for the methodology review. The topic 4 report will be focused on impacts to Washington natural coastal coho stocks in Washington mark-selective ocean fisheries.

Two additional review topics were identified for review: a) comparison of two methods for estimating coho salmon encounters and release mortalities in the ocean mark-selective fishery [Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission]; and b) evaluation of alternative marine survival indices for the Oregon Coastal Natural (OCN) coho matrix [Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife].

A report was also prepared on topic 9 and is available on the Council website. The SSC agrees with the STT that the topic 9 report would not be appropriate as a Salmon Methodology review topic at this time because the specific recommendations were not proposed for Council management in 2013.

The SSC will review reports on these topics at the November Council meeting. The SSC Salmon Subcommittee and STT will hold a joint meeting on October 10 and 11 in Portland, OR to review these issues. The SSC requires proper documentation and ample review time to make efficient use of the SSC Salmon Subcommittee's time. Materials for review should be submitted to the Council office by September 24. Agencies should be responsible for ensuring that materials submitted to the SSC are technically sound, comprehensive, clearly documented, and identified by author.

### ***Salmon Management, continued***

#### **E.4 Amendment 18 – Update Essential Fish Habitat for Salmon**

Mr. Kerry Griffin presented a detailed review of alternatives under consideration for essential fish habitat (EFH) in Amendment 18 to the Pacific Coast Salmon Plan (Agenda Item E.4.a, Attachment 1 with revised Table 1, E.4.a, Supplemental Attachment 2). Alternatives are organized under ten

subject areas. The organizational structure and the alternatives were clearly laid out. The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) had comments on the following specific alternatives which are labeled as in the document:

#### Freshwater EFH

##### Chinook:

- The SSC supports adoption of Alternatives 2B, 2C, and 2D.

##### Coho:

- The SSC supports adoption of Alternative 3B. We recommend considering the inclusion of HUC 60002 (Pajaro River) based on historic presence of coho salmon.
- The SSC supports adoption of Alternative 3C.

##### Pink:

- The SSC supports adoption of Alternatives 4B and 4C.
- Adoption of Alternatives 4D and 4E should depend on data establishing that Puget Sound Pink Salmon are occupying these areas, which lie outside of Puget Sound.

#### Impassible barriers

- The SSC supports adoption of Alternative 5B.
- The SSC supports adoption of Alternative 5D with a change to Criterion 3. We suggest Criterion 3 should read:
  3. *Is fish passage in the construction or planning phase by a state or federal agency or facility operator?"*
    - *If yes, then the dam should not be considered the upstream extent, and the habitat above the dam should be designated as EFH.*
    - *If no, then go to 4.*

Other cases, including EFH above barrier projects that are not yet in planning or construction phases, can be considered under Criterion 4.

#### EFH descriptions

- The SSC supports adoption of Alternative 7B.

#### Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPCs)

- The SSC supports adopting the 5 HAPCs defined in Alternatives 8B – 8F.
- The SSC highlights the particular importance of Alternative 8E: estuaries and estuary-influenced offshore areas. These are utilized by multiple species and support a variety of ecosystem functions.

#### Fishing activities

- The SSC supports adoption of Alternatives 9B and 9C.

#### Non-fishing activities

- The SSC supports adoption of Alternative 10B. Dam removal should be added to the dam construction/operation item.
- The SSC supports adoption of Alternatives 10C1 through 10C9 but we recommend removing Alternative 10C10. Individual activities that contribute to climate change are impossible to relate directly to salmon EFH. Instead we encourage research to understand the effects of climate change on salmon populations, predator/prey relationships, and habitat needs.

#### Information and research needs

- Several data issues constrained the designation of EFH in this document. Research on these topics should be included in the data needs. Examples include: pink salmon

populations, the role of fishing activities in reducing prey availability, and ocean habitat associations.

- Climate change impacts on salmon habitat should be included as a research topic.

### ***Pacific Halibut Management***

#### F.3 Pacific Halibut Bycatch Estimate for Use in 2013 Groundfish Fisheries

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed the Pacific halibut bycatch report submitted by the Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFS) and Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. Dr. Jason Jannot of the NWFS West Coast Groundfish Observer Program presented the results of the analysis.

There were changes in both data and methodology used for the 2011 estimates of halibut bycatch. Observer data from all fishing sectors were included in the analysis. Data from the new individual fishing quota (IFQ) trawl fishery and at-sea hake fishery were based on nearly every trawl because of the 100 percent observer coverage, negating the need for sector-wide extrapolations that were done in previous years. The species correlation variable used in analyses through 2010 was removed from the 2011 analysis.

The estimate of total halibut discard mortality in the IFQ fisheries is much lower than estimates from limited entry bottom trawl fisheries in previous years. Recent changes in fishing gears and behavior are likely contributing to this reduction. However, some of the reduction could be due to changes in the analysis methodology or reductions in overall fishing effort. The SSC requests a table to compare discard rates for 2010 and 2011 using the strata from the 2010 analysis. The SSC suggests applying the analysis and extrapolation procedures used in previous years to random subsets of the 2011 data to evaluate the potential for methodology-dependent changes in the discard mortality estimate.

Halibut viability estimates used in the mortality rate calculations are based on very old studies and new research is needed to update the rates for different gear types. The SSC also notes that high variability in the very small discards estimated for non-trawl sectors, which do not have 100 percent observer coverage, is likely due to sampling error.

The SSC supports the use of this report and bycatch estimates for 2013 management. However, the SSC notes that the final report arrived too late for full review, and inferring the cause of the drop in halibut bycatch requires further analysis.

### ***Groundfish Management***

#### H.3 Stock Assessment Planning

#### **Methodology Review Recommendations**

##### *Collaborative Optical-Acoustic Survey Technique*

The review of this technique concluded that the resulting estimates of abundance should not be

used in Council stock assessments at this time, and provided several recommendations which should help to address the current concerns with the technique. The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) endorsed the recommendations and conclusions of the Review Panel.

### *Data-Moderate Species Assessment Methods*

Dr. Martin Dorn summarized the report of the Data-Moderate Panel. The Panel provided recommendations related to application of the catch data-only methods, Depletion-Corrected Annual Catch (DCAC), Depletion-Based Stock Reduction Analysis (DB-SRA) and Simple Stock Synthesis (SSS). In particular, the Panel recommended that the input probability distribution for depletion should take account of the score from the Productivity-Susceptibility Analyses, as this improved the ability of catch-only methods to replicate the results of Tier 1 assessments. The Panel also evaluated two data-moderate methods, Extended DB-SRA and Extended SSS, which use index data, and recommended that they be accepted for use in Council stock assessments. The Panel also outlined a process for reviewing the results of assessments conducted using data-moderate methods.

The SSC endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the Panel regarding the modifications to the catch-only methods and the acceptability of the two data-moderate methods for use in Council stock assessments. It also agreed with the Panel that the first review of assessments based on data-moderate methods should be conducted by a full Stock Assessment Review (STAR) Panel, but that subsequently such reviews could be conducted by the SSC or its groundfish subcommittee.

The SSC noted that the data-moderate methods fill an important gap in the set of methods available to the Council, but their utility still needs to be fully understood. Specifically, both catch-only and data-moderate methods provide sustainable catch estimates which could be used to recommend over fishing limits (OFLs). However, data-moderate methods also provide estimates of spawning biomass relative to  $B_0$ ,  $B_{MSY}$  and the overfished threshold. The Panel recommended that data-moderate assessments should not be used for status determination, but rather to identify whether there is potential concern with stock status, and to prioritize stocks for a full assessment at the earliest opportunity, at which time all available information should be considered. The SSC agreed that stock status estimates from data-moderate assessments should not automatically be accepted for use in status determinations. The SSC recommended that the Council develop a formal process for how to use the estimates of stock status from data-moderate assessments in management. As part of this process, assessment authors should be asked to summarize what other information is available, including the amount of age and length composition data (and number of unaged structures) from survey and fishery catches, when the results of data-moderate assessments are of concern. The SSC will use this information to comment on the value of conducting a full assessment.

### **Stock Assessment Planning**

The SSC discussed the list of species to be assessed in 2013. Dr James Hastie presented the NMFS report on groundfish stock assessment planning for 2013 (Agenda Item H.3.b, NMFS Report).

The list of species for full assessments to be conducted in 2013 was previously discussed at the

June Council meeting, where seven species were identified. NMFS developed the STAR Panel schedule to accommodate review of these seven species (Fig. 1). The STAR Panel schedule has space for one additional species to be fully assessed and reviewed. The SSC discussion focused on yellowtail and rougheye rockfish as candidates for the eighth species for full assessment. Rougheye rockfish has never been assessed, and it has the highest vulnerability score of all Groundfish Fishery Management Plan species. Yellowtail rockfish was most recently assessed in 2005 (as an update assessment). It has been harvested at a modest percentage of its annual catch limit (ACL) over the past decade. However, the prospect of increased targeting of widow rockfish may result in greater harvest of yellowtail.

The SSC agreed that it would be beneficial to assess both of these species. Regardless of which species the Council selects for full assessment, the other one should be assessed using data-moderate assessment methods. The SSC emphasizes that the full STAR process is better structured to deal with a stock for which status is of concern.

At the June meeting, the SSC and the Council also discussed whether an update assessment should be conducted for sablefish. NMFS conducted an additional analysis of sablefish to provide more information with which to evaluate the need for a sablefish update assessment in 2013. The 2011 assessment model was updated with 2011 catch data, along with biomass and length composition data from the 2011 trawl survey. The new results are consistent with the 2011 assessment, with depletion ratio being slightly higher than that from the 2011 model (32.4 percent versus 31.8 percent, respectively), suggesting that an update assessment of sablefish in 2013 would result in little change in model output. The SSC supports the NMFS recommendation not to conduct an update assessment for sablefish in 2013. The SSC requested that NMFS provide OFL and ACL estimates for 2015 and 2016 generated by the sablefish analysis. Those estimates were found to be very close to those produced by the 2011 assessment, which further supports NMFS recommendation to not conduct a sablefish update assessment in 2013.

The SSC also discussed the list of potential species for data-moderate assessments. NMFS presented a list of 15 species, including some that have previously been assessed (such as English sole and Arrowtooth flounder). At this point, there is significant uncertainty associated with how many data-moderate assessments can be conducted by NMFS, and how many can be thoroughly reviewed during a week-long STAR Panel. The SSC suggests capping the number of data-moderate assessments at 10, with some assessments being based on survey abundance indexes and some utilizing recreation fishery CPUEs. It may not be possible to conduct 10 data-moderate assessments because of data- and workload-related issues.

The SSC supports the NMFS recommendation to have methods used to develop indices of abundance (to be utilized in the data-moderate assessments) reviewed by the SSC Groundfish subcommittee prior to the data-moderate assessments STAR Panel; this would make STAR Panel review more efficient.

<b>Review Meeting</b>	<b>Timing</b>	<b>Tentative Location</b>	<b>Species</b>	
Hake Review (Treaty)	Late Feb.	Canada	Pacific Hake	
Data-Moderate Panel	4/29-5-3	Santa Cruz or Seattle	Number and Names To Be Determined	
Full Panel 1	5/13-5/17	Seattle	Petrals sole	Darkblotched or Yellowtail
June Council Meeting	6/18-6/25	Orange County	Petrals sole & Darkblotched/or/ Yellowtail STAR reports; Bocaccio update POP, Canary, & yelloweye data reports	
Full Panel 2	7/8-7/12	Seattle	Rougheye rockfish or Darkblotched	Aurora rockfish
Full Panel 3	7/22-7/26	Seattle	Shortspine thornyhead	Longspine thornyhead
Full Panel 4	8/5-8/9	Santa Cruz	Cowcod	Pacific sanddabs
Sept. Council Meeting	9/10-9/17	Boise	STAR reports for: shortspine and longspine, rougheye/or/darkblotched, and aurora rockfishes, cowcod, and Pacific sanddab	
Mop-up / Rebuilding	9/23-9/27	Seattle	Rebuilding analyses and continuing issues, as determined to be necessary	

Table 1. STAR Panel schedule for 2013 full and data-moderate stock assessments proposed by NMFS.

### **Approve Terms of Reference (TOR)**

#### *TOR for Stock Assessments*

The SSC recommends the adoption of the STAR TOR (Agenda Item H.3.a) with an inclusion of a note that PacFIN should be treated in stock assessments as a standard source of commercial landings. This edit was suggested by the Groundfish Management Team (GMT).

#### *TOR for Methodology Reviews*

The SSC noted that the TOR require that revised versions of the documents reviewed by Methodology Panels be provided to the Council Advisory Bodies. However, this does not always occur. For example, no revised COAST documents were available at this meeting. The SSC requests that the TOR be updated to request that Panel chairs (1) identify which documents should be provided to the Council meeting at which the Panel report is to be reviewed by the SSC, and (2) ensure that this takes place.

### *TOR for Rebuilding Analysis*

The SSC reviewed the GMT comments on the rebuilding TOR and on issues related to the evaluation of rebuilding plans. The SSC welcomed the GMT comments, which continue the discussion regarding the evaluation of rebuilding plans which was initiated during a meeting following the April 2012 SSC meeting. The SSC recommended that these discussions continue during further joint meetings. A key aspect for discussion is the development of an operational definition of “adequate progress of rebuilding”. The SSC has a process for evaluating such progress, but it is not currently based on documented quantitative measures. Developing such measures may require additional analyses.

The SSC recommended the following additions to the TOR:

- the time series of cumulative catches should be reported (Item 7f in Section 5).
- scenarios should include cases in which the released catch is not equal to the annual catch limit (implementation error) (Section 2.5). Analysts should develop scenarios regarding implementation error with the GMT.

The ability of the GMT to interpret the results from rebuilding analyses will be greater if the output files from the rebuilding program (Puntalyzer) are available. The SSC therefore recommends that all input and output files be housed both at the Science Centers and at the Council office.

### ***Groundfish Management, continued***

#### H.7 Reconsideration of Initial Catch Shares in the Mothership and Shoreside Pacific Whiting Fisheries

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) met with Mr. Jim Seger to discuss the September 2012 version of the Draft Environmental Assessment of Pacific Whiting initial catch shares in the mothership and shoreside Pacific whiting fisheries. The SSC finds the additional information and analyses presented to be a useful addition to those presented in the June version of the report. The SSC has no additional substantive comments beyond those we submitted in June, hence we insert our comments from the June SSC meeting below.

#### June 2012 SSC Report (June 2012 Agenda Item, D.7.b, Supplemental SSC Report)

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) met with Mr. Jim Seger to discuss the reconsideration of initial catch shares in the mothership and shoreside Pacific whiting fisheries. Although most of the information presented in the briefing book deals solely with distributional or policy issues, there are several scientific components the SSC wishes to highlight.

The way the fisheries are actually prosecuted (geographic location of fishing and landings, timing of fishing, and participants) will in the long-term tend not to be affected by who receives the initial allocation of catch shares. Over time, the use of the catch shares will likely migrate through leases or sales to the participants who can put them to their most profitable use. This means that the eventual biological, ecological, and economic performance of the fisheries will be relatively

independent of the initial allocation of catch shares. It has been the experience of many catch share programs that such transitions occur rather quickly, often within the first few years. As a consequence, the initial allocation of quota shares is not an effective tool to direct fishing or processing effort to particular geographic locations.

Furthermore, it is not evident whether, and to what degree, changes in fishing effort between the ports would affect the Pacific whiting resource. The harvest control rule for Pacific whiting is robust to changes in the distribution of effort, thus there is unlikely to be a conservation issue. However, the overall yield from the resource may be affected, and a bioeconomic model would need to be developed to answer this question.

A control date for quota share allocation can be an effective tool to discourage excessive resource expenditures intended exclusively to secure additional quota shares. This applies equally to catcher vessels, at-sea processors, and shoreside processors.

### ***Groundfish Management, continued***

#### **H.6 Phase I Report for Essential Fish Habitat Review**

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed the Phase I Report for Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Review (Agenda Item H.6.b, EFHRC Report 1) and received a summary presentation of the report from Dr. Waldo Wakefield. Mr. Kerry Griffin and Mr. Chris Romsos were available to address questions from the SSC. The Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Review Committee report summarizes the information underlying the EFH designations specified in Amendment 19 as well as new information and analysis techniques that have become available since the conclusion of the last groundfish EFH review. The new information, which was obtained in response to National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) data calls and from reviews of published information, represents a considerable expansion of the data available for the analysis of groundfish EFH. The new information is extensive and includes:

- high-resolution maps of seafloor substrate and habitat types for a much wider expanse of the Fishery Management Plan region;
- an expanded database of observations of corals and sponges that will allow the development of more extensive biogenic habitat maps;
- an expanded database of information on associations of groundfish life-stages with different habitats;
- an expanded database of information on the spatial distribution of fishing;
- additional studies and reviews of the effects of fishing on habitat; and
- identification of new non-fishing threats to groundfish EFH.

There also have been further developments of modeling tools that could be used in conjunction with the newly available information.

The SSC supports the use of the information in the report in the Council's review of its groundfish EFH provisions. The SSC notes that it would be useful to prioritize the recommendations in Section 7 into immediate needs to support the Phase II review, versus longer-term recommendations. The SSC also notes that individual activities that contribute to climate change will be impossible to relate directly to groundfish EFH. We encourage research to understand the

effects of climate change on groundfish populations, predator/prey relationships, and habitat needs.

The NMFS Science Center Outline for synthesizing the information provided by the Phase I report describes an important step in evaluating the available information and how that information could be used in the EFH review process.

The SSC recommends that the request for proposals for changes to EFH be released subsequent to the analyses indicated in the NMFS Outline.

**Adjournment:** The SSC adjourned at approximately 5:30 p.m., Friday, September 14, 2012.

## SSC Subcommittee Assignments, September 2012

<b>Salmon</b>	<b>Groundfish</b>	<b>Coastal Pelagic Species</b>	<b>Highly Migratory Species</b>	<b>Economic</b>	<b>Ecosystem-Based Management</b>
<b>Robert Conrad</b>	<b>Vlada Gertseva</b>	<b>André Punt</b>	<b>Ray Conser</b>	<b>Cindy Thomson</b>	<b>Loo Botsford</b>
Loo Botsford	Loo Botsford	Ray Conser	Robert Conrad	Vlada Gertseva	Ray Conser
Carlos Garza	Ray Conser	Carlos Garza	Selina Heppell	Dan Huppert	Martin Dorn
Owen Hamel	Martin Dorn	Owen Hamel	André Punt	Todd Lee	Vlada Gertseva
Meisha Key	Owen Hamel	Selina Heppell		André Punt	Selina Heppell
Pete Lawson	André Punt	Dan Huppert		David Sampson	Pete Lawson
Charlie Petrosky	David Sampson	Meisha Key			Todd Lee
	Tien-Shui Tsou				André Punt
					Cindy Thomson
					Tien-Shui Tsou

**Bold** denotes Subcommittee Chairperson

## DRAFT Tentative Council and SSC Meeting Dates for 2012

<b>Council Meeting Dates</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Likely SSC Mtg Dates</b>	<b>Major Topics</b>
<b>March 2-7, 2012</b> Advisory Bodies may begin Thu, March 1 Council Session begins Fri, March 2	<a href="#">DoubleTree Hotel Sacramento</a> 2001 Point West Way Sacramento, CA 95815 Phone: 916-929-8855	Two Day Session <b>Thurs, March 1 – Fri, March 2</b>	GF Stocks for 2013 Assessments Salmon Review/Pre I
<b>April 1-6, 2012</b> Advisory Bodies may begin Sat, Mar 31 Council Session begins Sun, Apr 1	<a href="#">Sheraton Seattle Hotel</a> 1400 Sixth Avenue Seattle, WA 98101 Phone: 206-447-5534	One Day Session <b>Sun, April 1</b>	Groundfish EFH Salmon Meth. Rev. Topics Final CPS EFP
<b>June 21-26, 2012</b> Advisory Bodies may begin Wed, June 20 Council Session begins Thurs, June 21	<a href="#">San Mateo Marriott</a> 1770 South Amphlett Boulevard San Mateo, CA 94402 Phone: 650-653-6000	Two Day SSC Session <b>Wed, June 20 – Thurs, June 21</b>	P. Mackerel OFL Final 2013 GF Stock Assess. Fishery Ecosystem Plan
<b>September 13-18, 2012</b> Advisory Bodies may begin Wed, Sept 12 Council Session begins Thurs, Sept 13	<a href="#">Doubletree Hotel Boise-Riverside</a> 2900 Chinden Blvd Boise, ID 83714 Phone: 208-343-1871	Two Day SSC Session <b>Thurs, Sept 13 – Fri, Sept 14</b>	Salmon Meth. Topic Select GF Stk Assess. Schedule Halibut bycatch in GF
<b>November 2-7, 2012</b> Advisory Bodies may begin Thurs, Nov 1 Council Session begins Fri, Nov 2	<a href="#">Hilton Orange County/Costa Mesa</a> 3050 Bristol Street Costa Mesa, CA 92626 Phone: 714-540-7000	Two Day SSC Session <b>Thurs, Nov 1 – Fri, Nov 2</b>	Salmon Methodology Rev Pacific Sardine Assess. Fishery Ecosystem Plan

**SSC Meeting Dates and Durations are tentative and are subject to change in response to Council meeting dates and agendas, workload, etc.**

## Proposed Workshops and SSC Subcommittee Meetings for 2012

Tentative – Depended on funding, dates subject to change

☐- Prep. Work Underway, Scheduled to Occur;   ▣- Status of Supporting Analyses Uncertain, Remains a Priority;

▨- Setbacks exist, Questionable;   ■- Funding or Prep. Not Avail, likely to be canceled or postponed

	<b>Workshop/Meeting</b>	<b>Potential Dates</b>	<b>Sponsor/ Tentative Location</b>	<b>SSC Reps.</b>	<b>Additional Reviewers</b>	<b>AB Reps.</b>	<b>Council Staff</b>
1	Groundfish/CPS Assessment Process Review (Post Mortem)	COMPLETED Dec. 2011	NWFSC Teleconference/Webinar	2011 STAR Panel Participants.	2011 CIE participation		DeVore Burner
2	Acoustic ROV survey for Rockfishes	COMPLETED Feb. 15-17	SWFSC La Jolla	Dorn, Punt	3 CIE		
3	Groundfish Impact and Economic Model Reviews	Held the day after 2012 SSC sessions	Council Various	GF/Econ Subctes & GMT	None	GMT Reps	Burner, Dahl
4	Clarification on the Conservation Performance of Rebuilding Plans	COMPLETED April 2 SSC	Council Seattle	GF/Econ Subctes & GMT reps.	None	GMT Reps	Burner, DeVore, Dahl, Ames
5	CPS Methodology Review –Canadian Survey Data	COMPLETED May 29-31	Council La Jolla	Chair: Punt Conser	CIE: TBD	CPSAS CPSMT	Griffin
6	Data Poor Species Assessment	COMPLETED June 26-29	NWFSC Seattle	Dorn, Punt, Conser	CIE: TBD	GMT GAP	DeVore
7	Pacific Sardine Updated Assess. Review	Oct. 2-3	Council La Jolla	CPS Subcte. Hamel	CPS Subcte. Members	CPSMT/ CPSAS	Griffin
8	Salmon Methodology Review	October 10-11	Council Portland	Salmon Subcte.	None	STT MEW	Tracy

## Proposed Workshops and SSC Subcommittee Meetings for 2012

Tentative – Depended on funding, dates subject to change

☐- Prep. Work Underway, Scheduled to Occur;   ▣- Status of Supporting Analyses Uncertain, Remains a Priority;

▨- Setbacks exist, Questionable;   ■- Funding or Prep. Not Avail, likely to be canceled or postponed

	<b>Workshop/Meeting</b>	<b>Potential Dates</b>	<b>Sponsor/ Tentative Location</b>	<b>SSC Reps.</b>	<b>Additional Reviewers</b>	<b>AB Reps.</b>	<b>Council Staff</b>
<b>9</b>	Integrated Ecosystem Assessment – Annual Report and App. to Stock Assessments	Winter 2012	NWFSC/ SWFSC TBD	EBM Subcte.	?	EPDT EAS	Burner
<b>10</b>	Harvest Parameters for Pacific Sardine	Dec 2012?	Council La Jolla?	2-3 TBD	CIE: TBD	CPSMT CPSAS	Griffin Burner
<b>11</b>	Reference Points (Bzero) Workshop II	Summer/Fall	Council Portland	GF Subcte?	CIE/External 1-3:	GMT GAP	DeVore
<b>12</b>	Groundfish Historic Catch Reconstructions	NMFS Rpt. at Council Mtgs – Poss. Workshop in late 2012	Council Meetings - Wrkshp	2-3 TBD	None	GMT GAP	DeVore
<b>13</b>	Assessing Socioeconomic Impacts in Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management	?	NWFSC Seattle?	Econ and EBM Subctes.?	?	EPDT IEA	Burner
<b>14</b>	Transboundary Groundfish Stocks	Initial Steps in 2012	Council	2?		GMT GAP	DeVore