

Forty Third Annual Meeting of the TSC
May 7-8, 2002
Hudson House
Point Lobos, California
Minutes

Day 1

Tuesday, May 7, 2002

I. Call to order (8:45 A.M)

II. The rapporteur for this meeting is Bob Leos, California Department of Fish and Game

III. Introductions

Rick Methot (TSC Chair) made introductory remarks and asked all those present to introduce themselves. Rick then covered the agenda items and asked the participants for any additions, corrections, etc. There was one question about the possibility for open discussion and it was agreed that that would be taken care of at the end, under the recommendations section.

2002 TSC Participants:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Jane DiCosimo	North Pacific Fishery Management Council
Tom Jagielo	WDFW, Olympia, Washington
Mark Wilkins	NJMF, AFSC, Seattle
Lynne Yamanaka	DFO, PBS, Nanaimo, B.C.
Rick Stanley	DFO, PBS, Nanaimo, B.C.
Tom Barnes	CDFG, La Jolla
Richard Methot	NMFS, NWFSC, Seattle
Todd Bridgeman	NMFS, NWFC, Newport
Al MacDonald	DFO, Vancouver, B.C.
Bill Barss	ODFW, Newport, Oregon
Deb Wilson-Vandenberg	CDFG, Monterey
Brenda Erwin	CARE, CDFG, Belmont, Ca.
Dave Clausen	NMFS, AFSC, Auke Bay Lab., Juneau, Alaska
Stephen Phillips	PSMFC, Gladstone, Oregon
Eric Coonrodt	ADF&G, Sitka, Alaska
Bob Leos	CDFG, Monterey

IV. Approval of the 2001 Report

The report is ready and Rick asked if anyone wanted to comment on the report with the following comments by the participants:

A. The Parent Committee minutes need to be inserted into the report

B. The 2000 catch data also need to be inserted (Canada and U.S. data) into the report.

- C. A mailing list needs to be established for the distribution of the report so that all recipients may make comments and to inform them of what the TSC is doing.
- D. A comment was made to acknowledge the good job on putting the report together.
- E. The report will be posted on the web site.

V. Approval of the 2002 Agenda

A very brief discussion on the agenda took place. There were no major points of contention.

VI. Working Group Reports

A. Committee of Age Reading Experts (CARE) presented by Brenda Erwin

A draft report to the TSC was created before the CARE workshop took place and that draft copy is now available. The CARE manual is now posted on its web site. Lingcod and Pacific whiting will be included in the next report. Brenda commented that the web page committee person quit, and as a result there are some delays in getting materials posted. Comments were then made about the items covered in the workshop and the species that were covered in what turned out to be an excellent workshop. This was followed by a discussion and questions on possible changes and suggestions about what and what not to include on the web site, and other topics, including the fact that the results of the workshop would be posted on the web site in a spreadsheet format. The final area of general discussion centered on ageing of sablefish.

B. Pacific Whiting Working Group – no formal report

Despite this, Rick commented on survey work that had been completed on a NOAA research vessel as well as a Canadian research vessel. Also, a stock assessment was completed by the NMFS and a review of the assessment was completed. A nother point that was brought up was that there is an interest in resuming discussions between the two countries to address the resolution of the allocation issues involved with this species.

There was a general discussion on how to continue work to prevent overfishing. It was proposed that this topic be discussed at a June 10th meeting. Further discussion took place that centered on how to set quota levels, the STAR panel work, comments about the uncertainty concerning a few key issues, and the possibility of a lower harvest rate as a result of the future meeting. It was also pointed out that the 1999 year class appears to be a strong one, but by how much is now known. Continued discussions touched upon several issues related to the Pacific whiting work and the fact that a major goal is to rebuild the stock in 10 years and how to accomplish this. Several questions were presented dealing with the report to the Council, litigation, recruitment and assessment work. The

final area of discussion centered on addressing the logistics of research (budget, timing, etc.).

C. Lingcod Working Group

D. Yellowtail Rockfish Working Group

No formal report because these two have been discontinued. However, there was some discussion and brief comments made on what is still being done despite the fact that there are no formal working groups. A comment was made in reference to the CARE work being done and that this was a good, positive area. One participant commented that the Russians are continuing work.

E. Pacific Sardine – Tom Barnes

California has been involved since the sardine 2000 symposium and work is continuing. There have been two meetings held since then. The data exchange issue between California and Mexico is still being discussed, though in the past this hasn't been too good – especially with raw data. It was noted that the CDFG Monterey ageing lab may undertake ageing of sardine. There were some comments about production aging. A few points about the current stock assessment report were made, including:

1. Last October's assessment place the resource at about 1.1 million tons
2. The yield from that is about 118,000 tons
3. Two-thirds is reserved for landings made south of Point Arguello and one-third for ports north of Point Arguello (this also includes landings made in Oregon and Washington ports).

Some issues concerning the population that were presented include the fact that a naturally occurring virus is present in the southern California stock and in the fish around Monterey. As a result of this, the Australian government is on the verge of prohibiting the importation of sardine as a feed for their pen-raised tuna. Domoic acid shows up from time to time, but so far no major problems have occurred as a result of this naturally produced substance. The harvest formula is in the Coastal Pelagic FMP. Sea surface temperatures from the Scripps pier are incorporated in the formula, with a three-year threshold.

A few comments were made about Pacific mackerel and that the stock assessment for this species puts the level at about 85,000 tons. A yield of 20,000 tons was reached in October, 2001 and as a result continued take was allowed only as incidental take.

A question was asked of the group about whether to include sardines in the CARE exchange table.

F. Other – none to report

VII. Other topics

A. IJFA Funding – Stephen Phillips

It was reported that there is funding for this year. Along these lines it was mentioned that there will be no tri-state FMP created for nearshore rockfish. Each state will need to create one on its own. There was a general discussion of the future of the monies available to various people/states for work. It was pointed out that there is a possibility that monies may be directed elsewhere away from nearshore rockfish work. However, monies are good through August 2003, but after that the status of those monies is not known. An update on the future of money will be presented at next year's meeting. A question was asked if money can be directed to any part of the implementation of a nearshore FMP. This will be investigated.

A general discussion was conducted on various issues relating to funding matters. It was pointed out that the money is not state money but Commission money and the level of funding is set at \$250,000 per year with each state to receive \$57,000. A few comments were made to explain why California created its own nearshore FMP (this due to the mandates set forth in the Marine Life Management Act, enacted by the state Legislature) and why it wasn't a coast wide FMP involving the other states. This concluded with a general discussion on the coordination of the three states and the monies used.

B. Groundfish Research Plan – Rick Methot

It was reported that there has been very little activity during the past year. There were many questions raised about various topics, including:

1. Is there going to be prioritization of species? This led to a discussion on the Research Plan and how it could address this. It was pointed out that an additional issue that needs to be addressed was how to prioritize the work and who would be doing what – this being difficult to do.
2. Meetings with the various state agencies to discuss future work may be proposed, but no other information can be provided at this time. As a result of this it was stated that it looks more like a five-year plan would be created rather than an annual plan. A general discussion followed on the timing of plans, whether to have them as annual plans or otherwise, the justification for these plans and their timing. One participant stated that these plans should be produced every other year. Another participant commented on the on-going process of the production of these plans and the idea of bringing together future plans and how to incorporate nearshore FMPs.
3. This was followed by a general discussion on the Sea Grant publication, *California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report*. Also, it was

pointed out the CDFG staff have been assigned work to address fishery independent work tasks and research protocols. Comments were made about nearshore FMPs and what are to be included in terms of research planning and how it ties in with federal research planning. This prompted a comment about transfer of authority to the state of California. It also was pointed out that the fishery independent work being planned will include input from many outside groups and organizations.

4. The final point of discussion dealt with the presentation of California's Nearshore FMP. A brief history and reasons for the FMP were covered as well as reasons for transfer of authority. The main point of this discussion was to identify the five main issues the NFMP addressed. These are:

- a. Control Rules
- b. Allocation (between the recreational and commercial sectors)
- c. Restricted Access – especially for the commercial sector
- d. Regional Management
- e. Marine Protected Areas

C. Age Validation

1. Updated list of species and techniques

2. Review prioritized list of species

It was pointed out that two species of rockfish are being examined; however, the CARE workshop agenda didn't get into this topic. Shortspine thornyhead is still an issue for validation. Additional topics briefly discussed included: techniques used in quillback rockfish validation, the International Pacific Halibut Commission's work on age validation, validation techniques on sardine, CARE's formal species priority list of work (none exists), and production ageing at Washington's lab.

There followed a general discussion on what the various agencies are doing with what species. This included comments about the use of fin rays and the logistics and difficulties of getting samples.

The final area of discussion centered on lingcod with an emphasis on recreational sampling, the logistics and methods of sampling, what personnel are involved, and finally standardized methods.

D. Marine Reserves

It was pointed out that this topic was dealt with last year. It was also pointed out that in Alaska, they are not called "reserves" but, instead, are called "closed areas." This led to a few comments about the HAPCs (Habitat Areas of Particular Concern) that is posted on the North Pacific Fishery Management Council's web site. Additional comments about some pending law suites related

to the issues of closed areas were discussed. In response to one question, a description of the proposed protected areas off British Columbia was made and how the jurisdiction of these areas is established.

The next area of discussion dealt with California's cowcod closure areas. The group was briefed on what the areas are, their size, where they are, and why and how they were created. It was pointed out that they were created as fishery management areas, or fishery closure areas, but not as true reserves. It was further explained that the intent of these areas was to reduce fishing mortality on cowcod. Additionally, more specifics of the areas were discussed, including the fact that the estimated stock size was as low as 7-10 percent of the unfished biomass. However, because of the biology of the species, and other factors, the estimated total rebuild time is 97 years. A question/answer period took place relating to the cowcod areas.

One question asked was what are the objectives of California's MLPAs? Five objectives are defined as:

1. Habitat protection
2. Encourage biodiversity
3. Reduce the risk of "inadvertent" mismanagement
4. Preserve the unique features of certain areas
5. Help in re-building of overfished stocks

One comment was made about attempts on the east coast and the problems that occurred there. Additionally, it was pointed out that in California's case, no percentages of physical area closure were presented. This led to a general discussion on the concept of how to set up a system of reserves without identifying percentage(s) of closed areas.

E. GIS - no discussion

F. Web Pages - no discussion

G. Genetics and Stock Structure – Rick Stanley

There is a need to know who is doing what work is being conducted. Inquires made of the agencies didn't initiate any responses. A comment was made on some work that is going on, followed by a general discussion of some small projects taking place, as well as what genetic researchers are doing and the ability of fishery biologists/managers to access these data. This was followed by some remarks about the fact that since fishery personnel get the physical materials (samples) for the geneticists there should be more say on the availability of the results of the research. It was suggested that for the next meeting, a spreadsheet be created to show who has what data and/or results and what projects are out there and who is working on them.

It was further suggested that this could be part of each agency's annual report. It was stated that a "catch-up" document is needed that provides an annotated bibliography of genetics projects that would cover the last 10 years. It was pointed out that at the last CARE workshop a proposal was made to have a web page posted by each agency to identify what work has been done. However, there has been no feedback since then on this idea (except for a response from Canada). This culminated in a general discussion on the need to document how work is been completed.

VIII. Review of Agency Groundfish Research, Assessment, and Management

A. Agency Overviews

1. NMFS, AFSC Seattle – Mark Wilkins
 - a. New director at Seattle's NMFS
 - b. Survey efforts in the Bearing Sea shelf and other areas around Alaska are being dealt with
 - c. Personnel changes
 - d. Possible move to Alaska is not likely

2. North Pacific Fishery Management Council – Jane DiCosimo
 - a. Much of what they do is centered on allocation issues
 - b. Some work on groundfish issues
 - c. Groundfish supplemental EIS is on-going
 - d. Work on habitat continues
 - e. Comments on the subsistence program involved with habitat fisheries and Native Americans
 - f. Groundfish management and a list of species that is appropriate for their FMP were commented upon
 - g. Inclusion of squid, sculpin, octopus, sharks, skates are classified as other species
 - h. ABCs are set for those species with quotas in the Gulf of Alaska
 - i. Work is being done on establishing ABCs for some species and how to manage non-target species
 - j. "Closed areas" may come into existence for certain species
 - k. CDQs (Community Development Quotas) are being used
 - l. Council is considering IFQs or cooperatives for everything in the Gulf of Alaska
 - m. Discussion on the logistics and rationale of quotas, TAC management, and IFQs.

3. DFO, PBS, Nanaimo, B.C. – Rick Stanley
 - a. Groundfish section is now one group instead of two
 - b. No major groundfish management issues

4. DFO, Vancouver, B.C. – Al MacDonald

- a. Comments on sablefish closure of a couple of months with reopening with a smaller TAC
 - b. Commented on management issues relating to skates
5. ADF&G, Alaska – Eric Coonrod
- a. Many allocation issues – lingcod were over-harvested by 400% for each of the last few years
 - b. FMP for black rockfish will be completed
 - c. General discussion on how recreational catches are monitored with the associated problems involved
6. WDFW, Washington – Tom Jajielo
- a. Commented on personnel changes and who's doing what
7. ODFW, Oregon – Bill Barss
- a. Commented on personnel changes
 - b. Dr. Patty Burke will come on board in June
 - c. Agency is grossly understaffed
 - d. May be going back to marine regional status
8. NMFS, NWFSC, Newport Oregon – Todd Bridgeman
- a. NWFSC will be celebrating its 70th birthday
 - b. Five divisions in the NWFSC
 - c. Commented on the physical facilities
 - d. Commented on the personnel involved in the various projects at the ageing lab in Newport
 - e. Surveys now conducted with contracted commercial fishing vessels
 - f. Observer program is going well and shooting for 40 observers by this summer
 - g. Habitat/ecosystem team is creating detailed maps
 - h. Comments were made on projects currently going on and those in the future (Rick Methot)
 - i. General discussion on the observer program, its purpose, goals, costs, logistics, and fishing coverage
9. CDFG – Tom Barnes
- a. Commented on organization changes – Patty Wolf if the new marine regional manager
 - b. Commented on groundfish issues
 - c. Allocation issues in the recreational fishery are being considered
 - d. De facto transfer of authority to the state for cabezon and greenlings
 - e. Brief description of in-season monitoring for above two species and status of those fisheries in relation to their established OYs

- It appears, based on the current harvest rate, that the commercial sector will reach its portion of the OY by the end of May, 2002
- A major difficulty in conducting in-season monitoring is the recreational sector, because of the large time-lag involved in the estimated landings.

10. NMFS, NWFSC – Rick Methot

- a. Santa Cruz lab is now operational
- b. New project using transects
- c. There are rebuilding plans for eight species
- d. Commented on capitalization of the fleet
- e. Commented on multi-year management techniques for the species

B. Multispecies Studies – no discussion.

C. Other Species

1. Pacific Cod

A comment was made on the vertical movement pattern as they relate to this species availability to survey techniques. An additional comment was made about the work that some researchers are doing.

2. Nearshore Rockfish

The initial comments covered work that is taking place in areas off Alaska. After this it was asked of the group to comment on monitoring techniques that are currently taking place. This was followed up by a brief summary of what the NWFSC is doing (not too much).

Tom Barnes commented on the work to develop protocols and the CRANE (Cooperative Research and Assessment of Nearshore Ecosystems) group's work to standardize methods. This work will include university personnel and will utilize diving transects to gather data. A discussion followed about this work and if and/or how it was linked to the surveys on offshore sites using ROVs.

Bill Barss spoke about the nearshore reef habitat survey work with small ROVs in very shallow areas. Tagging of black rockfish is taking place as well as using charter boats to get samples (otoliths).

Tom Jajielo commented on CWTs being used for lingcod and rockfish studies. Comments were made about direct observation techniques using drop camera systems on a grid to help make estimates for stock assessments. It was noted that in 1998 a study was completed using a Delta submersible for conduct density estimates for stock assessments.

Additional comments were provided on other studies in different area especially for Yelloweye rockfish.

Lynne Yamanaka presented information about the quillback rockfish fishery off British Columbia and that it is a live-fish fishery. Survey work has been conducted plus collection of biological samples to help in estimating total mortality. She discussed the four areas being studied, and noted that there is a decreasing level of fishing effort as one goes north. She also covered other programs and what they are set out to accomplish.

Eric Coonrod spoke about the black rockfish work being conducted and as a result of this work, a “patch-work” of open and closed areas in the areas off Oregon may be created. They are still working on establishing quotas. He also covered the topics of a t-bar tagging study, a logbook program, port sampling, and a scuba diving transect study.

There followed a general discussion on the fishery quota management process, monies for nearshore FMPs, the general feeling about the status of the nearshore resources, the high value (ex-vessel value) of the live-fish fishery and its influence on fishing practices to thusly cause the resource to be harmed. The final point of discussion centered on how to link log book data to other data sources in order to manage the resources.

Day 2

Wednesday, May 8, 2002

VIII. Review of Agency Groundfish Research, Assessment, and Management (con't.)

3. Shelf Rockfish

Rick Methot explained that the NMFS shelf bottom trawl survey for stock assessment will continue. In addition:

- There is a high priority to use the existing time series (1977 – 2000 +) to decide where to go next, some possibilities were:

1. Increase frequency from triennial to shorter, change gear, vessel, station allocation (habitat type)

this summer there will be no shelf trawl survey, they will be doing experimental work on shelf (move from slope)

2. Distribute tows by habitat, assess calibration issues – any workshops coming up? No.

Rick Stanley suggested that if changes are made to the survey, it would be desirable to coordinate the efforts with British Columbia because they have same interests.

It was pointed out that in the near future (off California) there may no longer be a directed shelf rockfish fishery due to the continued decline of the stocks. Surveys will be critical in future management of these and all resources, with trawl surveys as the workhorse. There is a growth and interest in experimental fisheries.

The Pacific Fisheries Management Council has a two-year assessment schedule. A high priority for the council is to decide what assessments are to be completed.

4. Slope Rockfish

Information was presented about recent work of Tony Garrett on the genetics on rougheye rockfish and that two separate species are possibly identified instead of just one. Some discussion followed about this work.

The shortraker rockfish fishery is to close as a directed fishery in Alaskan state waters – this on a permanent basis. Shortraker rockfish will be allowed only as a bycatch to the sablefish fishery.

Several other topics were addressed including: Pacific Ocean perch trawl survey attempts to bring these fish to the surface slowly to increase the chance for survival after tagging, and new tagging machines.

5. Thornyheads

There is work on tagging long-line caught thornyheads. Coded wire tags are to be used, but other types of tags are being looked at, such as Floy tags. The main thrust of this work is to document movement and growth validation, but not population movements. Canadians are continuing work on tagging longspine thornyheads. There is an exploratory fishery in the north coast and therefore management research plans are being considered.

Tom Barnes pointed out that in California, live shortspine thornyheads make up two percent of the overall thornyhead landings by weight, but account for 18 percent by value.

6. Sablefish

General comments were made about various sablefish issues including:

- a. External review of northern sablefish fishery off Alaska

- b. Pit tags are going to be used for sablefish this year in Alaska
- c. A tag shedding study will be conducted
- d. Movement data is the goal of the tagging study
- e. Pit tags are to be used because fishermen were holding external tags so as to prevent lowering of the quota
- f. Off British Columbia, sablefish studies have all been by tagging
- g. A live-sablefish tagging study will be conducted off Sitka, Alaska
- h. It was reported that in a reward study, a total of 33 out of 463 tagged sablefish were returned, but the cost was very high – may be the last year for reward tag studies
- i. Strong year classes for 1999 and 2000 indicated by survey results with the 2000 year class appearing a bit stronger

7. Flatfish

- a. A student at the University of Washington is going to examine the entire west coast assemblage of flatfish.
- b. A 2001 trawl shelf survey indicated that there was a large increase in small flatfish, especially for Dover and rex soles
- c. Maturity and fecundity work is being conducted
- d. Increase effort in the flatfish fisheries as a result of a decrease in rockfish fisheries
- e. Sampling program for flatfish to go into effect next year in California
- f. Arrowtooth flounder market is developing – general discussion on arrowtooth flounder and the associated Pacific halibut fishery
- g. Bycatch analysis work conducted on the shrimp beam trawl fishery

8. Lingcod

- a. Comments about the nesting behavior of male lingcod – one male attracting several females and a male may have more than one nest (British Columbia work)
- b. Off Vancouver, B. C., only the recreation fishery exists; therefore there are management concerns for this fishery
- c. Concern about marine mammals having a substantial impact on the lingcod stocks
- d. Puget Sound studies being conducted for stock enhancement (only on the inside)

9. Pacific Whiting

- a. General discussion about the status of the ABC off the Canadian coast
- b. Comments were made about the technical review and logistics of the two countries and how to work things out
- c. It appears that there is a good year class developing

10. Walleye Pollock

- a. There appears to be a potential shift in the spawning aggregation with the Gulf of Alaska population being low
- b. In the Bering Sea, a cooperative management regime is in place
- c. Fishing is slower and “cleaner” in this fishery
- d. Strong momentum to do anything to save this Bering Sea fishery
- e. General discussion on how decisions are made by the cooperatives – this based on catch history
- f. Lack of allocation is the stumbling block for the buy-back programs

11. Dogfish

- a. A student at the University of Washington is working on this species
- b. Board of Fisheries proposal not to re-open this fishery
- c. General comments on studies of sharks and skates – ABC work of various types

12. Pacific Mackerel and Sardines

- a. In the spring of 2003, a regular STAR panel is planned for both species (a first for these two species)
- b. Recent research by Paul Smith indicates northern and southern stocks of Pacific sardine exists with a boundary around Monterey Bay
- c. Current assessment doesn't take this into account (north/south stocks)
- d. Vertebrae analysis correlating water temperature with larvae development

13. Other Species

- a. Increasing demand to go in the direction of ecosystem perspective on the approach to management
- b. Looking at ways to conduct trawl surveys on Atka mackerel off Washington – best time to conduct surveys is at night
- c. Other work on Atka mackerel to observe nesting sites and behavior patterns to be conducted this summer
- d. General comments on the use of time-lapsed photography as another tool
- e. DFO, B.C., all the data since 1995/96 is now being archived with work on earlier data, including cruise reports back to the 1940s for rockfish

D. Other Related Studies

- 1. There was a general discussion on fishery databases, such as the biological data archived in PacFIN.

2. Comments were made on what has been going on with other studies centered on the effects of fishing. Additionally mention was made of work on corals, habitat, fish habitat and the effects of trawling on these habitats.
3. There has been, and will be a lot of work on Steller's sea lion prey effects. Seven new people will be hired by the NMFS to conduct this work. It was pointed out that winter surveys were conducted in 2001. Additionally, a study on sleeper shark predation of Steller's sea lions last year will resume this year. There was a general discussion on sea lion studies.
4. The USGS is doing work on pop-up tag studies on halibut.
5. It was announced by Rick Methot that the next Western Groundfish Conference will be held Victoria in February 2004. Ideas and possible themes will be asked for as soon as the first announcement goes out.

IX. Progress on 2001 Recommendations

A. From TSC to itself

1. Initially, it was thought that there were no recommendations but it was pointed out that there are six, listed on page 29 of the report.

2. Age structure exchange

It was suggested that agers be allowed to do more research and coordinate in participation. It was then pointed out that the level of exchange is progressing at an acceptable level and did the group accept this. The group agreed to this with a 'yes.'

3. Survey planning working group

There should be a drive to get people from the different agencies to get together to cover such topics such as sablefish survey work and the standardization of procedures. Additionally, there is a need for an overall coordination. There is no activity on a coast-wide basis.

4. Genetics

There were no responses to the inquiry for a report on the progress

5. It was agreed that a 'disbanding' of the lingcod and yellowtail rockfish working groups seems to be successful, since there were no status reports from either working group.

6. Fishery oceanography

There is a high level of activity in this area, but not in this arena. A bulk of the work is being conducted by the Pacific Fisheries Environmental Laboratory at Pacific Grove, California. This group is made up of several researchers including John Hunter, Rich Methot and others.

B. TSC to Parent Committee

1. It was asked about the inclusion of Canadian data into PacFIN, and it was announced that this has been done.

C. TSC to CARE

1. There was a discussion about the CARE charter and it was stated that the work objective has been met.

X. 2002 Recommendations

A. From TSC to itself

1. Annual Report

The initial topic for a recommendation dealt with the production of the annual report with the goal to include the following:

- a. Standard cover
- b. Have it camera ready
- c. Agency reports need to follow similar format
- d. Standardization of heading style and fonts

It was noted that a lot of effort that goes into making the report and the question was posed: how can it be streamlined? Tom Jajielo noted that web postings have been very successful, raising the possibility that a hard copy may not be needed. Another option is that the annual report could be distributed as a CD.

Steve Phillips noted that the mailing list for the report is about 30 recipients, for a total of about 50 printed copies. There was a discussion about whether or not to ask the past recipients if they wanted to continue to receive it, and there was general agreement that the printed copy served a purpose and should be continued.

The following recommendations were made concerning the report:

1. It should be published in a consistent format, using the existing web page graphics layout as the cover (depicting the two flags of the member nations).
2. It should have a Table of Contents –
 - a. Treat agency reports as Appendices
3. Establish a Working Group to work on other aspects of report format and content
 - a. Members are Mark Wilkins and Stephen Phillips. They will develop proposed standards and format.
4. Each agency is responsible to send a revised, final agency report to the PSMFC by June 1 – then Tom Barnes will get them from PSMFC

2. Genetics

- a. Prepare a report that lists the genetic studies and documents data specimen requests.
- b. Have the agency reports to include what genetic information has been collected. CARE will take up part of this work to be included in the report.

- c. It was suggested that a special study section be included in the agenda as a “stand alone” item.
- d. It was recommended that a catch-up effort task for each agency be included that summarizes the most recent work. This task would cover the previous five years, and would document what work has been completed.
- e. It was next recommended that a survey workshop be created. The TSC would need to encourage someone to coordinate and organize this workshop to explore suggestions for different topics.

B. TSC to Parent Committee

1. The Pacific whiting statement will be taken care of by Tom Jajielo
2. It was suggested that Pacific mackerel and sardine be kept as working groups. This was followed by a general discussion on what happened to lingcod and yellowtail rockfish.
3. It was then recommended that a blanket statement is needed to cover a cross boundary concept. This lead to a discussion on what to say in such a statement and the wording with the following suggestions:
 - a. Species by species approach be considered
 - b. Set up a statement covering the topics of concern no covered in other areas or by other groups or organizations
 - c. Come up with a method for a formal recommendation process to include specific people
 - d. Mark Wilkins will work on the report standard
4. There was a general discussion on what the TSC is chartered to do, that is, what is its purpose?
5. “Terms of Reference” should have been included in the 2001 report.
6. The final area of discussion in category dealt with what the TSC should get the Parent Committee to champion for. This includes the following two main recommendations:
 - a. Survey workshop(s)
 - b. Possible sablefish workshop to be held with the goals to cover data exchange and an exchange on tagging data processes.

C. TSC to CARE

1. It was pointed out by one participant that the work of the CARE group was very good with actual hands-on work taking place the direction that the CARE group is heading is also good. This lead to a lengthy discussion about the timing issue of the CARE workshops so that those workshops would not conflict with the Western Groundfish Conference. It was finally recommended that this issue needs to be continued for further discussion and consideration.
2. Two recommendations were brought to the table:
 - a. Keep the internal statistics in the exchange table off the public web site.

- b. Include a caveat or note in the table to make it clear that those data are provisional.

A general discussion followed on the timing of the response to these recommendations it was suggested to act upon them next year and have this topic be included in the "From TSC to itself" section.

3. Lastly, a list of personnel was covered that would be responsible for the writing of the recommended tasks. They are:

- a. Report format issue – Mark Wilkins
- b. Genetic studies/report for next year – Rick Stanley
- c. Workshop request to the Parent Committee – [*didn't get this one*]
- d. Sardine – request to remove and have it as its own separate working group – Tom Barnes
- e. TSC to Parent Committee issues
 - Standardized Pacific whiting statement – Rick Methot
 - Request for workshops (two)

? Bottom trawl survey – Rick Stanley

? Sablefish workshop – Rick Methot

- f. TSC to CARE – Tom Jajielo
 - Receive two reports from CARE

XI. Appointment of 2003/2004 TSC Chair

A. Rick Methot covered who handled this in the past. It was then decided that the 2003/2004 TSC Chair will be Tom Jajielo.

B. It was recommended, at this point, that a history table of these appointments be included in the report

XII. Schedule and location of 2003 meeting

After some brief discussion it was proposed and accepted that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is to be the next host with the location at the Sitka facilities. The dates for next year's meeting were set as May 6th and 7th, 2003.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 P.M.