

## D.3 SACRAMENTO RIVER FALL CHINOOK FISHERY REVISED SPAWNER ABUNDANCE AT MAXIMUM SUSTAINABLE YIELD – TERMS OF REFERENCE

### **Council Task:**

#### Part I

1. Review draft Peer Review Terms of Reference (TORs), advisory body reports, and public comments.
2. Discuss if the Council is either:
  - a. prepared to adopt the TORs as final, with minor modifications, or
  - b. requires further discussion on potential updates to the TORs.

#### Part II

3. Either:
  - a. adopt the TORs as final, or
  - b. further discuss the TORs, advisory body reports, and public comments, and provide direction to Council staff, in consultation with the Science Centers, on updates to the TORs.
4. Direct staff to plan for a peer review process to be held during the summer of 2026, if applicable.

**ODFW motion:**

I move to adopt the Draft Terms of Reference (TOR) as shown in Agenda Item D.3, Supplemental Attachment 4 with the following modifications:

- In the TOR title, add a reference to the Peer Review Process
- In the Scope section, specifically reference the current methodology in the second bullet rather than the word “those”.
- In the Peer Review Panelists experience/expertise section, add “experience in reference point estimation methods”.
- Provide Council staff the discretion to make minor changes to the language for clarity and consistency.

Moved by John North

Seconded by Marci Yaremko

Motion passes with Corey Ridings voting no.

## Guidance – Marci Yaremko

- **Reorder the sequence of events:** Begin with a review of the underlying Ricker and ratio methods. If these approaches are deemed suitable, proceed to evaluate the datasets. If not, the panel may, but is not required to recommend alternative methods or may recommend the SRWG develop recommended alternative methods for evaluation, which can then be reviewed by the Panel at a subsequent meeting. (Specifically, #5 in the TORs would need to be revised reflect this modification.)
- **Clarify that any evaluation and recommendations regarding the four datasets must consider the appropriate time series.** Indicate that, where the Panel deems it appropriate, final recommendations may include approaches such as truncating the time series, downweighting older data, applying time-blocking techniques, or other relevant methods.
- **Revise the language in the TOR to clearly state that the Panel’s role is to provide recommendations or identify areas for**

**further exploration.** Ensure the wording aligns with the BSIA policy directive on [assessment revision](#), and clarifies the process for any follow-up work undertaken by the SRWG in response to Panel requests. This should include how responses or revisions will be managed after the final peer review meeting and following the conclusion of the peer review panel.

- **Revise the TORs related to preliminary questions by removing any limit on the number of questions the Panel may submit.** Clarify that the Chair will work collaboratively with the Panel to refine and curate the list of questions, such as eliminating duplicates and ensuring the final set is reasonable for the SRWG to address in advance of the first session.
- **Clarify the role of the Chair:** Emphasize the importance of strong facilitation skills and provide additional detail on the Chair's responsibilities, particularly in guiding discussions and managing participation.
- **Define the role of the SRWG:** Clearly specify the responsibilities and scope of the SRWG within the process.
- **Clearly define the role of the advisors, the Panel members, and the general public:** Include specific advisor seats (one/two representatives from SSC, SAS, and STT) that sit alongside the panel. Advisors would contribute contextual information to inform the process but would not evaluate scientific merits. The Chair would determine appropriate timing for advisor input and when discussions should be limited to Panel members only. The general public would contribute information during public comment periods.

- **Panel membership:** Remove the designated SSC SC seats from the list of peer review panelists (since now SSC will be participating in an official advisory capacity).
- **Incorporate comparison to status quo:** In line with SSC recommendations and to support a comprehensive review, ensure that any proposed approach is compared to the status quo. Provide the peer review panel with relevant information on the status quo, including prior analyses. Clarify that the Panel's role is not to re-evaluate the methods used to develop the status quo, but to compare the scientific merits of the existing approach with any newly recommended methods.
- **Revise the TORs to aim for the final panel report by the November Council meeting.**

DRAFT - NOT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES