

FINAL SUMMARY MINUTES

Scientific and Statistical Committee

Pacific Fishery Management Council

Salon III

[DoubleTree by Hilton Spokane City Center](#)

322 N Spokane Falls Court

Spokane, WA 99201

Telephone: 509-455-9600

June 11 & 12, 2026

Members in Attendance

Dr. Cheryl Barnes, Oregon State University and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Newport, OR

Dr. Aaron Berger, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center, Newport, OR

Dr. John Budrick, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, San Carlos, CA

Dr. Tim Copeland, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Boise, ID

Dr. E. J. Dick (alternate for Dr. John Field), National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center, Santa Cruz, CA

Dr. Chris Free, University of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA

Dr. Owen Hamel, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA

Dr. Michael Hinton, San Diego, CA

Dr. Dan Holland, National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA

Dr. Galen Johnson (SSC Chair), Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Olympia, WA

Dr. André Punt, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

Dr. Matthew Reimer, University of California Davis, Davis, CA

Dr. Alberto Rovellini, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

Dr. William Satterthwaite, National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center, Santa Cruz, CA

Dr. Jason Schaffler, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Auburn, WA

Dr. Tien-Shui Tsou, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA

Dr. Cisco Werner, Silver Spring, MD

Members Absent

Dr. John Field, National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center, Santa Cruz, CA

SSC Recusals for the June 2026 Meeting		
SSC Member	Issue	Reason
Dr. Owen Hamel	E.4 Final Stock Assessment Plan for 2027	Supervisor of stock assessment scientists
Dr. Aaron Berger	C.5 Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning	Contributor to eDNA methodology

SSC Administrative Matters

Dr. Galen Johnson (SSC Chair) called the meeting to order. Mr. Merrick Burden briefed the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) on their tasks at this meeting and answered questions from SSC members.

The June 2026 SSC agenda was approved. Several minor edits in italic notes were made prior to April 2026 SSC minutes being adopted as final. The June 2026 briefing book version of the April 2026 SSC Minutes will be updated to reflect SSC approved changes, and the final document will be posted to the [SSC minutes archive website](#).

Subcommittee assignments were reviewed with no modifications.

Open discussion included comments about the importance of the recusal process and links to potential members that are supported by the SSC for various panels.

C. Administrative Matters

4. Membership Appointments (SSC Closed Session)

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) discussed current and near future needs given existing and upcoming vacancies. The SSC currently has two at-large vacancies, for which only one nomination was received at this meeting. Dr. Christopher Free will be leaving his at-large position at the end of October, and retirements and job changes are likely to result in turnover in some agency seats in 2026. The SSC notes a particular need for economic expertise, and would also benefit from additional expertise in Groundfish and Coastal Pelagic Species, where the workload is currently quite demanding.

SSC Notes:

Vacancy announcements should be shared in arenas outside the already existent Council family (email blasts) to reach experts not already involved in the Council process and to increase the diversity of backgrounds and expertise.

Increasing workload and time demands make it more difficult to attract members.

Creating a “roving band of economists” may be a way to fill occasional specialized needs for SSCs across the nation; there are a limited number of fisheries economists in the U.S. and perhaps experts could be brought in for the relatively rare reviews of economic work. Still, the SSC would benefit from more full-time SSC members with economic expertise as they also bring valuable perspectives to other reviews and discussions.

E. Groundfish Management

3. Stock Assessment Process Review and Proposed Process Revisions

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) received an initial version of the Pacific Fishery Management Council Stock Assessment Review Process during March that was subsequently withdrawn. A revised report was presented at this meeting ([Agenda Item E.3 Attachment 1](#)). Thomas Remington (Lynker) provided an overview of the revised report and was available to answer questions.

The SSC was not requested to review the quality or the scientific rigor of the Lynker report. However, the SSC continues to have concerns about nonrepresentative sampling of interviewees from across the diverse groups impacted by Council actions, insufficient QA/QC, and a lack of transparency regarding analytical methods. The SSC consequently continues to lack confidence in the report and its conclusions.

The SSC focused its review on the Stock Assessment Review Action Table prepared by Council staff ([Agenda Item E.3 Attachment 2](#)), which maps actions from the Lynker report to the current PFMC process and identifies the workload that would be needed to implement them. Diana Perry (Council staff) gave a presentation and was available to answer questions. The SSC discussed the table provided in Attachment 2 and used member experiences in previous assessment cycles to help inform recommendations for process improvement.

Attachment 2 was useful in guiding discussion around areas of improvement in the stock assessment review process. Some of the recommended actions are already included in the assessment review process. Others are being evaluated as part of current or scheduled processes such as the review of the groundfish stock assessment Terms of Reference ([Agenda Item E.7. Attachment 1](#)). Others are not fully developed and will require further discussion.

The SSC identified the following high priority actions that may improve the assessment review process and some of the considerations related to implementing these actions.

Efficiency

- Employ the full continuum of stock assessment methods. Given capacity constraints and the large number of stocks in the Fishery Management Plan, identifying and employing index-based approaches, indicator methods, and other methods as alternatives to benchmark and update assessments should be prioritized.

- Limit redundant review steps by developing a technical referral protocol that standardizes when the SSC should re-review materials. The criteria that trigger additional reviews should be developed carefully. In particular, socioeconomic considerations such as changes in the Annual Catch Limit (ACL) alone should not trigger additional review, and criteria for when new data may trigger additional reviews should be explicitly outlined. Reducing redundancies should not limit the SSC's ability to reopen discussion when appropriate. Implementing multi-stage approaches to STAR Panel meetings may increase redundancy and may add scheduling challenges.

Communication

- Develop plain language descriptions of model uncertainty alongside the accepted technical terminology. This will require additional effort from Council staff. Existing materials such as those used to train new Council members at NMFS headquarters may be repurposed to transmit information on stock assessments and the review process to the public.
- Improve SSC communications to the Council on the justifications behind Best Scientific Information Available (BSIA) determinations in statements.
- Implement pre-assessment workshops for both benchmark and update assessments. Data workshops should aim to document data sources rather than attempting to illustrate the technical rationale behind model structure and assumptions.
- Extend the stock assessment document repository on the Council website to include additional products to improve transparency, including catch-only projections and final harvest specifications, which may be collated into dedicated sections.

Engagement

- Improve participant understanding about when and how public engagement can be maximized during the assessment process. All participants in the stock assessment process should identify and participate in engagement opportunities. The current process minimally includes opportunities for stakeholder engagement during stock assessment prioritization, pre-assessment workshops, stock assessment review meetings, and subsequent Council meetings that involve decision-making. Increased public awareness of existing engagement opportunities (e.g., MREP) may help resolve many of the concerns communicated in previous stock assessment cycles.
- Ensure that the advisory bodies make full use of their representatives in stock assessment reviews and work with analysts to identify specific types of public comment that can be incorporated when assessment models are developed.
- Identify efficient ways to incorporate feedback into the assessment review process. Addressing all feedback and questions received as public comment during assessment review meetings would be impractical. Not all feedback is actionable, and addressing questions meaningfully can require substantial work from assessment scientists. A framework for managing requests for revisions and additional model runs that are received

as public comment may help categorize feedback into immediately actionable versus future research goals.

- Provide opportunities for engagement with stakeholders through the proposed GAP appendix. The appendix can be used as a conduit to collate feedback and information from the industry and the public. Initiating that appendix early in the stock assessment cycle would provide assessment scientists with actionable information. Additionally, GAP representatives participate in STAR Panel meetings, which is a direct way to continue engagements through the science review stage.
- Create an opportunity for scheduled opportunities for engagement between the SSC and the GAP to help build cross-body understanding and connection. Timing these opportunities with the April and June Council meetings could promote engagement in the early stages of the assessment review process.
- Develop a process for co-production of knowledge and supplemental data. This is desirable but would require substantial efforts and future research to implement. For example, incorporating local ecological knowledge from a broad range of user groups into stock assessments would require training participants in data collection, developing analytical frameworks to use the data, and setting expectations on the effects that supplemental data would have on model outcomes.

SSC Notes

Comments on specific actions outlined in [Attachment 2](#).

1a: Outlining how different groups and advisory bodies contribute to the review process helps understand where public input can be incorporated and who the appropriate recipients of that input are.

1c: Technical issues in hybrid meetings are detrimental to transparency and engagement. Exploring alternative technical solutions (e.g., meeting owls, alternative broadcast media, etc.) could alleviate some frustrations.

1c-iii: Marked as yellow but there are substantial amounts of hybrid meeting training resources now that could be leveraged to train meeting participants.

2a-i: Some terms such as “risk” and “bias” are often misinterpreted or misused (e.g., the risk of overfishing assumes a highly negative connotation regardless of how long overfishing occurs for). Uncertainty is characterized using several terms (CI, CV, sigma, etc.), and communicating those in plain English is challenging. Risk tables have contributed to communicating the meaning of sigma, but bootcamps for interested participants may be a valuable resource.

2b-ii: Developing a technical referral protocol could standardize when the SSC is asked to conduct additional review. On one hand this could help avoid ad-hoc additional reviews. On the other hand, it may normalize revisiting assessments if sideboards are not set to guarantee unbiased

referrals. Would the triggers be new data? New LEK, including fishery observations? It would be important to avoid cherry-picking data to trigger a referral.

2c-ii: New SSC members would greatly benefit from scheduled support from longer-standing members, for example in the form of 30-minute briefings before each SSC meeting to walk through the process. The SSC could also revisit the slides for new members.

3a-i: Two-tiered data workshops seem feasible for research assessments but not for management track ones.

3a-iii: Setting expectations on how additional data and/or LEK could be used would avoid frustration in cases where data is collected and then not used in an assessment.

3b-ii: Public participation in data workshops may be low for assessments that are not expected to produce negative outcomes at the time of the workshop. However, unexpected changes arising during the assessment can then trigger engagement at later stages in the process (e.g., STAR Panels), but by then it can be too late to meaningfully address public comment.

4a-ii: Eliminating GFSC review when there is a STAR Panel may reduce redundancies. However, the SSC is unsure whether the current process allows it because doing so may hamper identifying when an assessment should undergo supplementary review.

4b: Multistage options for STAR Panels are not easy to implement in the current process and would require ample discussion. A multistage process may work against reducing redundancies.

5c-i/5c-ii: These seem untenable in terms of workload for management-track assessments. Generating questions is easy, generating answers is not. The SSC is a review body, and the STAT produces and defends the assessment. There is also a disconnect in timing, as if the SSC and the public receive materials for review two weeks in advance of a meeting, public comment can't get in in time for incorporation. Archiving questions is a reasonable idea - expecting answers to all those questions is harder. When model runs come from public comments it should be stated in the report document.

5c-iv: It could be useful to have a FAQ of common questions and when they are asked.

5d-i: Feedback does get incorporated into assessment models and there is a section of the report addressing STAR Panel / SSC requests.

At-a-glance summary documents developed during the last assessment cycle were recognized as effective communication tools.

Participation in pre-assessment workshops increased during the last stock assessment cycle. However, the level of participation has varied considerably over time. It would be beneficial to clarify how the public can engage in these workshops.

Indicators of persistent QA/QC problems with the report:

The AI disclosure says AI was used for four items and then provides a numbered list of five things.

It is stated that a mixed-methods approach was applied. However, mixed-methods means mixing qualitative and quantitative analyses, but this work was purely qualitative.

E. Groundfish Management

4. Final Stock Assessment Plan for 2027, Preliminary Priorities for 2029 and Beyond

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed the Council's preliminary list of species proposed for stock assessments in 2027 and 2029. In response to the Council's March 2026 request, the SSC evaluated new information from the Science Centers regarding age-reading capacity, data availability, and other considerations relevant to identifying the number and type of assessments that are feasible. Kristin Marshall and Chantel Wetzel (Northwest Fisheries Science Center) briefed the SSC on the additional information and a preliminary 10-year schedule for groundfish assessments as provided in [Agenda Item E.4, Attachment 1](#).

SSC Recommendations for the 2027 Stock Assessment Cycle

Based on the information provided, the SSC recommends the following stock assessments for 2027:

Benchmark Assessments

- Redbanded rockfish
- Lingcod north of 40°10' N latitude
- Lingcod south of 40°10' N latitude
- Yellowtail rockfish south of 40°10' N latitude

These stocks warrant full benchmark assessments due to the age (or lack) of existing assessments, evolving data needs, and their management importance.

Update Assessments

- Petrale sole

Available data and the timing of recent assessments support conducting an update for petrale sole rather than a benchmark assessment. Industry has expressed interest in conducting an assessment for shortspine thornyhead in 2027. This stock would be suitable for an update assessment in 2027.

Species-specific considerations

Widow rockfish – It is uncertain whether new information will be available (e.g., from the development of novel fishery-dependent CPUE and eDNA indices) for a widow rockfish assessment in 2027. A methodology review is scheduled for the development and use of fishery-dependent CPUE indices and eDNA indices in early October 2026. Postponing a benchmark assessment for widow rockfish to 2029 will allow adequate time to further develop these new indices and alternative modeling approaches. A benchmark assessment without these new data sources is unlikely to yield a different result from the last assessment.

Bocaccio – The SSC does not recommend an update assessment for bocaccio in 2027. The existing benchmark was conducted over 10 years ago and there are no new age estimates

available at this time. Also, there is a mismatch between the spatial extent of the last assessment and the stock definition recently adopted by the Council. Given its importance for California fisheries, the SSC recommends a benchmark assessment for bocaccio in 2029.

Long-term Planning

The SSC supports the preliminary 10-year groundfish stock assessment plan presented by the Science Centers (Table 2 of [Agenda Item E.4, Attachment 1](#)). The plan establishes a regular rotation for ten species based on commercial, tribal, and recreational importance. Three assessment "slots" are reserved for shelf rockfish, slope rockfish, and elasmobranch stocks each cycle.

The SSC supports the development of less intensive approaches for providing management advice for species with informative survey indices, stock size estimated to be above the target biomass and with landings well below full attainment. These new approaches will need to be reviewed by the SSC and incorporated into the terms of reference for groundfish stock assessment.

SSC Notes

- *The spatial extent of the 2015 stock assessment for bocaccio was from the US-Mexico border to Cape Blanco, OR. The most recent stock definition for bocaccio is coastwide.*
- *Related to the 2023 shortspine assessment, both the STAR and the SSC recommended that the next assessment be an update assessment unless new ageing information becomes available.*

E. Groundfish Management

6. 2027-28 Harvest Specifications, Management Measures, and Exempted Fishing Permits—Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment Final Action

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed the revised annual catch limit (ACL) alternatives for widow rockfish ([Agenda Item E.6, Attachment 4](#)). The SSC clarified the rationale supporting the Overfishing Limit (OFL) recommendation for Alternative 2d (6,239 mt), originally presented at the April 2026 meeting ([Agenda Item C.3.a, Supplemental SSC Report 1](#)). The SSC discussed whether specifying an OFL and Acceptable Biological Catch (ABC) under Alternative 2b is justified. Alternative 1 (no action) was not discussed further, as the OFL was derived from the default harvest control rule. Jessi Waller (Council staff) was available to answer questions and clarify Council requests.

Alternative 2d represents the SSC-specified OFL for widow rockfish (6,239 mt) for 2027 and 2028. The SSC recommends an OFL based on the yield associated with $B_{40\%}$ as a justifiable proxy for MSY, and thus the OFL given that the stock is estimated to be above the $B_{40\%}$ reference point. This approach is consistent with recent NOAA technical guidance ([March 2026, Informational Report 4](#)) related to specifying reference points identified in National Standard 1 (NS1) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) and prevents overfishing, while allowing for long term optimum yield. The proposed ABC of 6,238

mt is applied over the next two years which is consistent with National Standard 1 technical guidance for phase-in provisions.

The NOAA technical guidance recommends the use of a proxy ($B_{40\%}$ in this case) for B_{MSY} when unfished biomass (B_0) can be estimated more reliably than the biomass that corresponds to MSY. Moreover, when total egg production is estimated rather than spawning biomass, as is now the case for widow rockfish, it is appropriate to base the F_{MSY} proxy on the F that achieves that B_{MSY} proxy rather than on the F_{MSY} proxy for rockfish ($F_{50\%}$). Estimates of B_{MSY} and F_{MSY} based on the stock assessment output are not recommended when steepness is pre-specified rather than estimated. This is because the ratio of B_{MSY} to B_0 is effectively set, independent of any data, and thus is unreliable and overly precise. Steepness was pre-specified in the widow rockfish assessment, thereby justifying the use of proxies over model estimates. In contrast, estimates of B_0 in the assessment were relatively stable across all sensitivity model runs, indicating the data are informative about B_0 .

The pre-determined ACL for Alternative 2b is 6,720 mt and not compliant with (is greater than) the OFL of 6,239 mt.

The SSC reiterates that the application of the approach used to derive the OFL for Alternative 2d is limited to this specific case. The SSC recommends that the Council request analyses followed by a workshop or methodology review to evaluate harvest strategies that depart from currently used default control rules which have been previously evaluated for risk.

Value	Alt 1 (Default)		Alt 2b (20% ramp down)		Alt 2d (SSC-1)	
	2027	2028	2027	2028	2027	2028
OFL (mt)	4,916	5,172	6,239	6,239	6,239	6,239
ABC (mt)	4,596	4,810	-	-	6,238	6,238
ACL (mt)	4,596	4,810	6,720	6,720	6,238	6,238
Implied ABC buffer	0.935	0.930	-	-	0.9998	0.9998
Sigma	0.5375	0.5750	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Implied P*	0.45	0.45	-	-	0.4999	0.4999
2029 fraction unfished	0.420		0.397		0.402	
Max. risk $B < B_{40\%}$	0.474 in 2028		0.505 in 2029		0.497 in 2029	
Max. risk $B < B_{25\%}$	0.242 in 2036		0.252 in 2036		0.249 in 2036	

SSC Notes

Other than for widow rockfish (as highlighted in the statement), the SSC has no further comments on interim 2027-28 harvest specifications that the Council adopted at the April 2026 meeting ([Agenda Item C.4., Attachment 1](#)).

From the technical guidance about not using direct estimates of MSY when steepness is fixed: “Brooks et al. (2010) note that fixing the steepness parameter at a single value is essentially the same as using a %SPR proxy but with less transparency and a false sense of precision in the reference points.”

Alternative 2d increases the OFL by 27% in 2027 and 22% in 2028 relative to the default harvest control rule (no action alternative 1), allowing for recognition of the importance of this fishery resource to fishing communities, following NS8.

Public comments related to Northeast examples are fundamentally different situations because they dealt with ABC (not OFL) recommendations and the adaptations used were to counteract consistent retrospective patterns in the assessment. The widow rockfish assessment does not show a consistent retrospective pattern.

The SSC has used the $B_{40\%}$ proxy in the past (e.g. cowcod in 2013).

The requested analysis presented by the Northwest Fisheries Science Center ([Agenda Item E.6. Attachment 4](#)) indicates that Alternative 2d (and the no action Alternative 1) have a greater than 50% probability of maintaining stock size above $B_{40\%}$ in 2029 and an implied P^ of 0.4999 (Alternative 2d) and 0.45 (Alternative 1).*

E. Groundfish Management

7. Stock Assessment Terms of Reference for 2027-28

The SSC reviewed and discussed the outline of proposed changes to the Terms of Reference for groundfish stock assessments ([Agenda Item E.7 Attachment 1](#)).

At-A-Glance One Pagers

The SSC is supportive of the continued production of the at-a-glance one page summaries, which are helpful for stakeholders, but does not recommend including them in the TOR. The at-a-glance summaries are an outreach tool and are not appropriate for inclusion in the TOR for assessment reviews. These summaries should be provided to the Council prior to decision-making and ultimately archived with the final version of the stock assessment document on the Council website.

On Ramps/Off Ramps

The TOR should include criteria for changes in stock assessment type (e.g., update to benchmark assessment, referred to as “on ramps”) and when such changes should occur. There needs to be clear criteria guiding this process. In particular, the decision to change the assessment approach should ideally take place prior to the pre-assessment workshops. In addition, arrangements would need to be made for a STAR Panel and scheduling of CIE reviewers when an update changes to a benchmark assessment. An off ramp may also re-scope an assessment to a research assessment.

Assessment Executive Summary Content

There may need to be rearrangement of information already contained in the stock assessment document to align with the NMFS guidance ([Agenda Item, E.7, Attachment 3](#)). Some sections of the Executive Summary may need to be reduced, as [Agenda Item, E.7, Attachment 3](#) notes it is expected to be fewer than 5 pages in length. A longer Executive Summary may be needed to meet stakeholder needs.

GAP Appendix

Developing a GAP-led report on the state of the fishery before the pre-assessment workshop would provide maximum benefits to the STAT and promote a more-informed assessment process. The GAP-led report would add value by capturing the perspectives and opinions of stakeholders and collecting Local Ecological Knowledge (LEK) of the fishery. The GAP-led report could include on-the-water observations and factors that relate to fishery dynamics (e.g., when selectivity may have changed) that the STAT could consider during the development of an assessment. The contents of the appendix and how they have been addressed could be discussed during the STAR Panel. The end-of-cycle assessment process review is a final opportunity for the GAP to identify unaddressed issues.

Risk Tables

The SSC recommends that risk tables be added to the TOR. The risk tables provide a way to identify sources of scientific uncertainty that are not captured in the statistical model and transparently define sigma values. The TOR should be clear that the risk tables do not add an additional buffer between the OFL and ABC; instead, they adjust the sigma (upwards or downwards) used to characterize uncertainty in the existing ABC buffer.. The SSC recommends renaming the "risk tables" with a name that better reflects that the method is used to characterize scientific uncertainty.

Other TOR Considerations

The roles and responsibilities should be in a Council Operating Procedure (COP) rather than the TOR.

A section governing research track assessments outside the biennium would be beneficial. Research assessments may take time from the management track assessments and present an opportunity for detailed exploration and methods development. Research track assessments should be integrated in assessment prioritization. Further guidance from the Council and Science Centers may prove useful in scoping this section.

SSC Notes

The SSC recommends examining how other Councils implement offramps to provide an initial basis for this section of the TOR. Timing is critical for when offramps are triggered based on prespecified conditions and criteria.

Errors in an assessment that is being updated would trigger the need for a benchmark assessment, if those errors are consequential in terms of management outputs.

The question arises as to whether the Council should be involved in selecting or prioritizing a research track assessment or whether it should be the role of the Science Center to notify the SSC of their efforts in selection and prioritization of the research assessments. Regular updates prior to the stock assessment prioritization regarding ongoing efforts and how they might interact through competing workload would be beneficial and clarifying a process to elucidate implications of research track assessments for stock assessment prioritization and workload.

While this might be considered redundant with the Executive Summary, producing the at-a-glance after the STAR Panel is valuable, especially given any pre-STAR draft will change given the review process.

The at-a-glance documents could be provided during the September Council presentation of stock assessments rather than as a part of the assessment itself.

It would be most beneficial to receive GAP-lead stakeholder input early in the process, with sufficient time to allow for discussion at the pre-assessment workshop.

Relevant items from the GAP appendix should be mentioned in the final assessment report to track items from useful input to resolution. Specific data identified in the GAP appendix should be referenced in the Data Used/Data Not Used section of the assessment document.

D. Cross Fishery Management Plan

3. Special Project 2: Socioeconomic Framework

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed the draft Community Resilience Decision Tool Methodology ([D3 Attachment 1](#), [D3 Attachment 2](#)) and the report from an online review of the Decision Tool by the Scientific and Statistical Committee Economics Subcommittee ([SSC-ES Report](#)).

The Decision Tool Methodology is being developed to evaluate the resilience of West Coast fishing communities as part of a Community Resilience Decision Support Framework under Council Special Project 2 ([D3 Situation Summary](#)). It is based on the premise that fishing communities with lower vulnerability are more likely to be resilient, and seeks to provide a practical, flexible, and evolving framework for evaluating resilience across West Coast fishing communities. Although the tool could be applied to a range of stressors (e.g., climate change and market disruptions), the SSC-ES focused on its use for evaluating the community impacts of fishery regulatory changes. The decision tool's development was informed by a synthesis of literature, stakeholder interviews, advisory team input, and a review of Council processes, which found that existing metrics and indicators (e.g., available in the California Current Ecosystem

Status Reports) provide a foundation for resilience assessments. The SSC-ES's review also identified key needs, including greater emphasis on forward-looking, *ex-ante* analyses, improved understanding of adaptive capacity, and better information on infrastructure and social capital. The framework defines vulnerability as a function of exposure to stressors, sensitivity arising from fishery dependence and social vulnerability, and adaptive capacity. Adaptive capacity (the ability to respond to change) is recognized as a critical and forward-looking dimension encompassing factors such as flexibility, assets, organization, learning, and agency, but it remains the least developed component in terms of available indicators.

The SSC endorses the findings and recommendations in the SSC-ES report and identifies the following additional considerations:

1. On "Methodology Applicability", the SSC noted the challenge of choosing a single spatial scale for analyses. For example, reporting indicators at a scale of Census Place (currently used for community social vulnerability indices) would create data confidentiality concerns. On the other hand, coarser scales, such as IOPAC port groups, may not capture variation across communities within a port group. Clarification from the Council on how it anticipates using the decision tool will help identify the appropriate scale for future analyses.
2. On "Case Studies", the SSC suggested consideration of the effects of the marine heat wave of 2014-2015 (warm blob) on coho returns with respect to fishery decisions. This would offer a different driver (environmental shock) and fishery management plan from the two potential case studies suggested by the SSC-ES (both groundfish). The SSC recommends that no more than two case studies be used to validate the tool, given the time available for the project.
3. The SSC recommends an additional check-in with the SSC-ES after baseline indicator data are assembled or when the initial case studies are underway. This will allow the SSC-ES to provide feedback on the tool before it is finalized. The date was left to be determined in discussion with the Northern Economics, Inc. team and the SSC-ES, ranging from late winter 2026 to spring 2027.

C. Administrative Matters

5. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning

The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) discussed workload planning and has the following updates to its April 2026 statement under this agenda item.

Sacramento River Fall Chinook peer review is scheduled for August 19-20, 2026. This review will be in person in Sacramento, California with hybrid access for virtual participation. The SSC (Jason Schaffler) is participating in an advisory capacity. If necessary, followup meetings are tentatively scheduled as webinars on September 11 and October 1, 2026.

The SSC recommends that the Groundfish and Economics Subcommittee meetings scheduled for the day preceding the September 2026 SSC meeting be changed to a full SSC review the same day. These two subcommittees include the vast majority of the SSC, so it is more efficient to have the three additional SSC members present for one review than to have the rest of the SSC conduct two reviews of the material.

The SSC requests that the Ecosystem and Economics subcommittees hold a one day webinar during August or on September 29, 2026 or one day hybrid meeting ahead of September SSC meeting to review future topics for the California Current Integrated Ecosystem Assessment Ecosystem Status Report.

An eDNA-based index of abundance, which has been developed for the Pacific hake stock assessment, has been informally proposed for application to widow rockfish and other groundfish species. The SSC requests a meeting to review this methodology. The SSC requests pairing this review with the methodology review for fishery-dependent indices of abundance for midwater rockfish assessments in early October of 2026.

An update assessment for the Northern Subpopulation of Pacific sardine is scheduled for early 2027 (likely online). An update assessment for Pacific mackerel is scheduled for early 2027 as an online meeting.

Proposed Workshops and SSC Subcommittee Meetings for 2026 and Beyond <i>Italic items are noted as potential or preliminary</i> <i>Shaded rows indicate newly added items since the prior statement</i>						
Workshop/Meeting	Potential Dates	Sponsor/ Tentative Location	SSC Reps.	Additional Reviewers	AB Reps.	Council Staff
<i>Review of Pacific Sardine Management</i>	<i>July 22-24, 2026</i>	<i>La Jolla, CA</i>	<i>CPS Subcommittee (Hamel chairing)</i>	<i>TBD</i>	<i>CPSMT CPSAS</i>	<i>Katrina Bernaus</i>
<i>CPS Terms of Reference</i>	<i>August 5, 2026</i>	<i>Virtual</i>	<i>CPS Subcommittee</i>	<i>TBD</i>	<i>CPSMT CPSAS</i>	<i>Katrina Bernaus</i>
Sacramento River Fall Chinook Peer Review	August 19-20, 2026 (with tentative webinar follow-ups September 11 and October 1)	Sacramento, CA	Schaffler	Buehrens, Copeland, Garrison, Hamazaki, Liermann, Lindley, Rumsey	SSC STT SAS	Angela Forristall
<i>Groundfish Harvest Specifications Flexibility Topic Review</i>	<i>September 16, 2026</i>	<i>Vancouver, WA (Council)</i>	<i>SSC</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Jessi Waller</i>
Ecosystem Status Report Science Topics Review (2026 topics)	September 29, 2026	Virtual	Ecosystem and Economics Subcommittees	TBD	EWG EAS	Gilly Lyons
Groundfish Methodology Review - Standardization of fishery-dependent indices, midwater rockfishes	October 6-8, 2026; Occurs 1st: (6th-7th)	Seattle preferred or Portland	Groundfish and Economics Subcommittees	TBD/CIE	GMT GAP	Diana Perry
Groundfish Methodology Review - eDNA index of abundance for use in groundfish stock assessments	October 6-8, 2026; Occurs 2nd: (7th-8th)	Seattle preferred or Portland	Groundfish Subcommittee	TBD/CIE	GMT GAP	Diana Perry
<i>Salmon Methodology Review</i>	<i>October 2026</i>	<i>Council/TBD In person preferred</i>	<i>Salmon Subcommittee</i>	<i>TBD</i>	<i>STT</i>	<i>Angela Forristall</i>
<i>Sardine stock assessment (update)</i>	<i>Early 2027</i>	<i>Online (Council/TBD)</i>	<i>CPS Subcommittee</i>	<i>TBD</i>	<i>CPSMT CPSAS</i>	<i>Katrina Bernaus</i>

<i>Pacific mackerel stock assessment (update)</i>	<i>Early 2027</i>	<i>Online</i>	<i>CPS Subcommittee</i>	<i>TBD</i>	<i>CPSMT CPSAS</i>	<i>Katrina Bernaus</i>
---	-------------------	---------------	-------------------------	------------	------------------------	------------------------

SSC Subcommittee Assignments

Salmon	Groundfish	Coastal Pelagic Species	Highly Migratory Species	Economics	Ecosystem-Based Management
Jason Schaffler	Cheryl Barnes (Co-Chair)	André Punt	Michael Hinton	Dan Holland	Chris Free
John Budrick	Aaron Berger (Co-Chair)	Aaron Berger	Cheryl Barnes	Chris Free	Cheryl Barnes
Tim Copeland	John Budrick	John Budrick	Aaron Berger	Michael Hinton	Tim Copeland
Owen Hamel	John Field	John Field	John Field	André Punt	John Field
Galen Johnson	Owen Hamel	Owen Hamel	Dan Holland	Matthew Reimer	Dan Holland
Will Satterthwaite	André Punt	Michael Hinton	André Punt	Cisco Werner	Galen Johnson
	Alberto Rovellini	Tien-Shui Tsou	Matthew Reimer		André Punt
	Jason Schaffler	Cisco Werner	Cisco Werner		Matthew Reimer
	Tien-Shui Tsou				Alberto Rovellini
					Will Satterthwaite
					Cisco Werner

Bold denotes Subcommittee Chairperson

ADJOURN

PFCMC
06/13/26