

Stock structure/spatial management



- Council policy (review)
- Action by Council in October
- Established temporary/potentially permanent work group
- Membership
- Meeting Friday Nov13th
 - BSAI BS/RE
 - 5 questions from Joint Team minutes (2014)
- Where do we go from here?

Council policy (adopted October 2013):



1. As soon as preliminary scientific information indicates that further stock structure separation or other spatial management measures may be considered, **the stock assessment authors, plan teams (groundfish, crab, scallop), and SSC should advise the Council of their findings and any associated conservation concerns.**
2. **With input from the agency, the public, and its advisory bodies, the Council (and NMFS) should identify the economic and management implications and potential options for management response to these findings and identify the suite of tools that could be used to achieve conservation and management goals.** In the case of crab and scallop management, ADF&G needs to be part of this process.
3. To the extent practicable, further refinement of stock structure or other spatial conservation concerns and potential management responses should be discussed through **the process described in recommendations 1 and 2 above.**
4. Based on the best information available provided through this process, the SSC should continue to recommend OFLs and ABCs that prevent overfishing of stocks.

Action by Council in October:



- **Council motion:**
 - The Council will form a workgroup and begin discussion and development of stock structure and spatial management for BSAI and GOA with an emphasis to begin the discussion with BSAI Blackspotted/Rougheye rockfish.
- **Additional direction (not included in motion):**
 - Initial discussion to be internal scientific and management discussion and not to include Council members
 - Comprised of SSC, Plan Team, Council staff and NMFS RO

Workgroup established



- Temporary/potentially permanent (?)work group
- Membership: Farron Wallace (SSC), Anne Hollowed (SSC), Dana Hanselman (BSAI co-Chair), Grant Thompson (BSAI co-Chair), Jim Ianelli (GOA co-chair), Jon Heifetz (GOA co-chair), Paul Spencer (GOA), Cindy Tribuzio (BSAI), Glenn Merrill (NMFS RO), Mary Furuness (BSAI and NMFS RO), Jim Armstrong (GOA, Scallop and Council staff), and Diana Stram (BSAI, Crab and Council staff).

Workgroup meeting Friday the 13th



- **Topics:**
 - BSAI RE/BS
 - How to address bullet 2 of Council spatial management policy
 - 5 questions from Joint Plan Team meeting November 2014

BSAI RE/BS



- Discussed issues raised in exceeding MSSC 2 years in a row
- Recommendations for improved outreach to fleet in 2016
- Recommend looking at additional tools for 2016 assessment including possibly area-specific TAC, area specific ABC, Area specific OFL/ABC/TAC
- Need to be prepared (analytically) to take alternate action in 2016 assessment
 - Draft list of information needs/analysis/etc that would be filled out and brought forward next fall to facilitate action including follow up of how was this information considered in final recommendation (by Council)
 - Recommendation for WG to draft this
 - ✦ What review of this by Plan Team?

5 questions

The Teams recommend that the following outstanding issues and questions of clarification be forwarded to the appropriate body (SSC, Council, or both):

1. Does the Council's policy apply only to spatial structure, or does it also apply to stock structure? For example, does it apply to the process of splitting a stock out from a complex, or only to spatial management of the complex?
2. Need for specific guidance on the role of the Teams.
3. Need for a proactive default policy that covers both of the following cases: 1) data are insufficient to determine whether a biological concern exists, and 2) sufficient data exist to make such a determination but time or other resource constraints are anticipated to prevent those data from being analyzed for several years.
4. Clarification of whether the current inconsistencies in spatial management between the two FMP areas that were summarized by the Stock Structure Working Group should be further examined or revised (and to whom such a charge would be assigned).
5. How much time is allowed for acceptance (by the Council or SSC) of an industry response to a management concern?
6. What is the relationship between evidence of stock structure and degree of concern? Two possibilities have been discussed: 1) degree of concern is synonymous with strength of evidence of stock structure, and 2) degree of concern is a function of both the strength of evidence of stock structure and the extent to which the fishery is impacting that structure.

Where do we go from here?



- Additional WG meeting Monday November 23rd to continue discussions
- Report to SSC/AP/Council in conjunction with specifications in December
- How should/will plan team weigh in on process as well as decisions
 - Report as a workgroup in September with template?