

GROUND FISH ADVISORY PANEL REPORT ON STOCK DEFINITIONS UPDATE

The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) heard from Mr. Todd Phillips and Dr. Chantel Wetzel on the topic of stock definitions and offers the following comments.

The GAP supports the phased approach to this process as described in the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) report under this agenda item (Agenda Item G.5.a, Supplemental GMT Report 1). This report lists two options with respect to four species listed in Table 1 of the GMT report. The GAP supports Option 1, “Coastwide” as they recommend for all other species in that table. Further, the GAP supports the “Coastwide” Option 1 listed in Table 1 of G.5, [Attachment 2](#) under this agenda item. As stated by the GMT in Supplemental GMT Report 1 “defining these stocks at a coastwide scale, which would allow the Council to define stocks for stock status and then utilize localized management measures to manage stocks at the spatial scales aligning with BSIA.”

As for phase 2 work, the GAP highlights the final paragraph in G.5, Attachment 2, which details how management measures on the basis of a single species within a complex have the potential to de-optimize fisheries of the other co-occurring species. Careful evaluation should be made of a species’ importance to the overall production of the complex prior to deciding whether or not to remove it from the complex.

The GAP opposes the suggestion in [Attachment 1](#) under this item, “An expedient action that can be considered in Amendment 31 is explicitly stating that an OFL contribution is the overfishing threshold for category 1 and 2 stocks managed in complexes.” This choice would tend to circumvent such careful consideration and result in counterproductive management measures, contrary to Magnuson-Stevens Act, National Standards, 1 and 3.

PFMC
09/09/22