Jim T – redo M with other estimator; no good argument to use GAM instead of spatial-temporal estimates. GAMs have less fine scale variation.

Chris L – 0.02 M from where?

Jim T – for LL – treat as compositional data put in information on total catch of other species besides the one that we are standardizing; treat as two-category – fully bycatch survey; recommendation to investigate other species to look at hook competition.

Ben W – correlation between location and depth; when doing standardization it will take mean of locations at least take a look at mode for lat/long because standard GAM package will use the mean

Jim I – compare the impact and normalize to have same mean or starting point. Not sure how much of an effect this has.

Chris L – losing lots of data. Investigate IPHC survey data a lot more. Both surveys – ROV and reduced IPHC stations.

Ben W – what’s the biomass overall and the state’s management structure for 4 regions separate from the biomass; worth exploring overall.

Jim T – OFL should be lower than the average DC/AC to correct for that.

Jim I – SSC picks the timeframe for setting Tier 6; rounding error for Tier 6

Do low ABC and OFL work for low numbers?

Jim I – could put REMA model in the catch and possibly be Surplus Production. REMA model could bridge to SP model with simpler set of assumptions.

Chris L – Phil was pursuing it.

Paul – make exploitation rate table

Why is NSEO so much more variable? CI so much wider

Ben W – differences in underlying model – if you extend the 2022 model does it go up?

Chris L – SSEO hasn’t been surveyed since 2020 so IPHC survey is driving it up

Ben W – changed Dusky and do stairstep – drop down to 35% change

Sandra – SEO assessment was done with YE + non-YE DSR species

Paul – risk table; Fishery performance considerations should reflect issues; 3 is the worst you can get

Jim I – 19.5% drop from maxABC for all DSR; good with reduction. Going down to stair step which is still a big increase.

Jim T – if question about M; Hoenig and Hamel update – would be lower than 0.044.

Jim I – look at stair-step, look at M again,

Ben – lost ROV survey; relying on poor IPHC survey; bring down to area; closed to directed fishery and recreational fishing

Jim I – what is protocol for stairstep?

Chris L – dig into IPHC index

Ben W – currently closed to state

Craig – fix terminal points; use 2023 ABC and hold it forward until better assessment

Ben W – not going up due to good data, poor survey and loss of data, minimal bio data, less information than 5 years ago when things weren’t closed

Chat – switch to Tier 5 not due to ROV or loss of stock yet 20% reduction being called for?

Jim I – hold steady with last year’s recommendation

Jim T – 0.0174 M will be closer to the old one

Sandra – Tier 5 M and reliable? Sound like we don’t have either of those. So uncertain.

Jim T – stick with old M

Sandra – what new information would help us move from 0.02 M

Jim I – slide 40; OFL and ABC will be calculated with updated BIOMASS but same M as last time until more work is done.