

DRAFT MINUTES
218th Session of the
Pacific Fishery Management Council
April 6-11, 2013
Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel
8235 NE Airport Way, Portland, OR 97220

Table of Contents

A.	Call to Order (4/6/2013; 8:05 a.m.)	7
A.1	Opening Remarks.....	7
A.2	Roll Call.....	7
A.3	Executive Director’s Report	8
A.4	Agenda	8
A.4.a	Council Action: Approve Agenda.....	8
B.	Administrative Matters.....	8
B.1	Formalization of Council Decisions at the March Council Meeting (4/6/2013; 8:15 a.m.)	8
B.1.a	Agenda Item Overview	8
B.1.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	8
B.1.c	Public Comment	8
B.1.d	Council Action: Approve Actions taken at the March 2013 Council Meeting.....	8
B.2	Expansion of the Gulf of Farallones and Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuaries (4/6/2013; 9:09 a.m.)	9
B.2.a	Agenda Item Overview	9
B.2.b	Report of the National Marine Sanctuaries	9
B.2.c	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	9
B.2.d	Public Comment	9
B.2.e	Council Discussion: Discussion and Provide Feedback to National Marine Sanctuaries.....	9
B.3	Ocean Observation Initiative (OOI) Report (4/6/2013; 10:53 a.m.)	10
B.3.a	Agenda Item Overview	10
B.3.b	OOI Presentation	10
B.3.c	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	10
B.3.d	Public Comment	10
B.3.e	Council Discussion	11
B.4	Legislative Matters (4/11/2013; 8:02 a.m.)	11
B.4.a	Agenda Item Overview	11
B.4.b	Report of the Legislative Committee.....	11

B.4.c	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	11
B.4.d	Public Comment	11
B.4.e	Council Action: Consider Legislative Committee Recommendations	11
B.5	Approval of Council Meeting Minutes (4/11/2013; 12:49 p.m.)	19
B.5.a	Council Action: Approve Previous Council Meeting Minutes.....	19
B.6	Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures (4/11/2013; 12:50 p.m.).....	19
B.6.a	Agenda Item Overview	19
B.6.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	19
B.6.c	Public Comment	19
B.6.d	Council Action: Consider Changes to Council Operating Procedures and Appointments to Advisory Bodies.....	19
B.7	Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning (4/11/2013 12:55 p.m.).....	20
B.7.a	Agenda Item Overview	20
B.7.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	20
B.7.c	Public Comment	20
B.7.d	Council Discussion and Guidance on Future Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning	20
	Council Informational Session (4/6/2013; 8:50 a.m.).....	22
C.	Open Comment Period (4/6/2013; 8:20 a.m.).....	23
C.1	Comments on Non-Agenda Items.....	23
C.1.a	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	23
C.1.b	Public Comment	23
C.1.c	Council Discussion	23
D.	Groundfish Management.....	24
D.1	National Marine Fisheries Service Report (4/6/2013; 1:01 p.m.).....	24
D.1.a	Agenda Item Overview	24
D.1.b	Regulatory Activities.....	24
D.1.c	Fisheries Science Center Activities	24
D.1.d	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	24
D.1.e	Public Comment	24
D.1.f	Council Discussion	24
D.2	Status of the Rationalized Fishery (4/7/2013; 8:04 a.m.).....	25
D.2.a	Agenda Item Overview	25

D.2.b	Annual Report for the At-Sea Co-Op	25
D.2.c	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	25
D.2.d	Public Comment	25
D.2.e	Council Discussion	25
D.3	Stock Complexes Assemblages (4/7/2013; 9:16 a.m.).....	25
D.3.a	Agenda Item Overview	25
D.3.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities (4/7/2013; 11:00 a.m.)	26
D.3.c	Public Comment (4/7/2013; 1:02 p.m.)	26
D.3.d	Council Action: Adopt a Range of Alternatives and if Possible, Preliminary Preferred Alternatives, for Stock Complexes Assemblages (4/7/2013; 1:15 p.m.)	26
D.4	Implementation of the 2013 Pacific Whiting Fishery under the U.S. – Canada Pacific Whiting Agreement (4/7/2013; 1:53 p.m.)	28
D.4.a	Agenda Item Overview	28
D.4.b	Joint Management Committee Report.....	28
D.4.c	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities.	28
D.4.d	Public Comment (4/7/2013; 2:45 p.m.)	28
D.4.e	Council Action: Consider any Necessary Action for Implementation of the 2013 Pacific Whiting Fishery	28
D.5	Consider Barotrauma Device Mortality Rates (4/8/2013; 8:05 a.m.).....	28
D.5.a	Agenda Item Overview	28
D.5.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	28
D.5.c	Public Comment (4/8/2013; 9:21 a.m.).....	29
D.5.d	Council Action: Discussion and Guidance on Application of Bycatch Mortality Rates Associated with Barotrauma Reduction Devices in Groundfish Fisheries.....	29
D.6	Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Synthesis Report and Request for Proposals (4/8/2013; 11:26 a.m.)	32
D.6.a	Agenda Item Overview	32
D.6.b	NMFS Synthesis Report	32
D.6.c	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities (4/8/2013; 1:16 p.m.)	33
D.6.d	Public Comment	33
D.6.e	Council Action: Discussion and Guidance on Groundfish EFH Review Synthesis Report and Initiate Phase 2 of the Review by Approving the Request for Proposals to Modify Groundfish EFH. 33	

D.7	Trawl Rationalization Trailing Actions – Electronic Monitoring Regulatory Process (4/9/2013; 1:00 p.m.).....	35
D.7.a	Agenda Item Overview	35
D.7.b	Electronic Monitoring Workshop Report	35
D.7.c	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission Report	35
D.7.d	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	35
D.7.e	Public Comment	36
D.7.f	Council Action: Discussion and Guidance on Electronic Monitoring Issues (4/9/2013; 4:14 p.m.)	36
D.8	Consideration of Inseason Adjustments (4/10/2013; 9:24 a.m.)	42
D.8.a	Agenda Item Overview	42
D.8.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	42
D.8.c	Public Comment	42
D.8.d	Council Action: Adopt Recommendations for Adjustments to 2013 Groundfish Fisheries	42
E.	Salmon Management.....	43
E.1	Tentative Adoption of 2013 Ocean Salmon Management Measures for Analysis (4/6/2013; 1:54 p.m.).....	43
E.1.a	Agenda Item Overview	43
E.1.b	Update on Estimated Impacts of March 2013 Alternatives	44
E.1.c	Summary of Public Hearings.....	44
E.1.d	Recommendations of the U.S. Section of the Pacific Salmon Commission	44
E.1.e	Recommendations of the North of Cape Falcon Forum	44
E.1.f	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	44
E.1.g	Public Comment	45
E.1.h	Council Action: Adopt Tentative 2013 Ocean Salmon Management Measures for Analysis (4/6/2013; 3:47 p.m.).....	45
E.2	Clarify Council Direction on 2013 Management Measures (4/7/2013; 2:50 p.m.)	46
E.2.a	Agenda Item Overview	46
E.2.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	46
E.2.c	Public Comment	47
E.2.d	Council Guidance and Direction	47
E.3	Salmon Amendment 18 – Essential Fish Habitat Revisions (4/8/2013; 2:51 p.m.)	48

E.3.a	Agenda Item Overview	48
E.3.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	48
E.3.c	Public Comment	48
E.3.d	Council Action: Further Consideration of Alternatives for Revision of Salmon EFH in Amendment 18	48
E.4	Final Action on 2013 Management Measures (4/10/2013; 1:43 p.m.)	48
E.4.a	Agenda Item Overview	48
E.4.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	49
E.4.c	Public Comment	49
E.4.d	Council Action: Adopt Final Management Measures for 2013 Ocean Salmon Fisheries... ..	49
E.5	Methodology Review Process and Preliminary Topic Selection for 2013 (4/10/2013; 3:01 p.m.)	51
E.5.a	Agenda Item Overview	51
E.5.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	52
E.5.c	Public Comment	52
E.5.d	Council Guidance on Potential Methodologies to Review in 2013	52
E.6	Council Guidance on Columbia Basin Situation Assessment (4/10/2013; 4:01 p.m.)	53
E.6.a	Agenda Item Overview	53
E.6.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	53
E.6.c	Public Comment	53
E.6.d	Council Guidance and Discussion	53
F.	Habitat	54
F.1	Current Habitat Issues (4/7/2013; 3:41 p.m.).....	54
F.1.a	Agenda Item Overview	54
F.1.b	Report of the Habitat Committee	54
F.1.c	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	54
F.1.d	Public Comments.....	54
F.1.e	Council Action: Consider Habitat Committee Recommendations	54
	Closed Executive Session	55
G.	Pacific Halibut Management.....	55
G.1	Final Incidental Catch Recommendations for Salmon Troll and Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries (4/8/2013; 3:22 p.m.).....	55
G.1.a	Agenda Item Overview	55

G.1.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	55
G.1.c	Public Comment	56
G.1.d	Council Action: Adopt Final Incidental Catch Recommendations for 2013 and April 2014	56
H.	Ecosystem Based Management	57
H.1	Final Fishery Ecosystem Plan (4/9/2013; 8:05 a.m.).....	57
H.1.a	Agenda Item Overview	57
H.1.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	57
H.1.c	Public Comment (4/9/2013; 8:52 a.m.).....	58
H.1.d	Council Action: Adopt Final Pacific Coast Fishery Ecosystem Plan (4/9/2013; 10:56 a.m.)	58
	Coastal Pelagic Species Management.....	61
I.1	Sardine Harvest Parameters Workshop Report (4/10/2013; 10:01 a.m.).....	61
I.1.a	Agenda Item Overview	61
I.1.b	Report overview and Description.....	61
I.1.c	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	61
I.1.d	Public Comment	61
I.1.e	Council Action: Consider Changes to Sardine Harvest Control Rule Parameters (4/10/2013; 1:20 p.m.).....	62
I.2	Shifting Sardine Harvest Start Date (4/11/2013; 11:15 a.m.).....	63
I.2.a	Agenda Item Overview	63
I.2.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	63
I.2.c	Public Comment	63
I.2.d	Council Action: Consider Initiating Process to Shift the Start of the Sardine Fishery	64
J.	Enforcement Issues.....	65
J.1.	Regulations for Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) Declarations (4/11/2013; 10:26 a.m.).....	65
J.1.a	Agenda Item Overview	65
J.1.b	Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities	65
J.1.c	Public Comment	65
J.1.d	Council Action: Consider Policy Process for Advancing VMS Declaration Regulations and Select Alternatives, as Appropriate	65
	ADJOURN	65

A. Call to Order (4/6/2013; 8:05 a.m.)

A.1 Opening Remarks

Mr. Dan Wolford, Chairman, called the 218th meeting of the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) to order at 8:05 a.m. on Saturday, April 6, 2013. Mr. Dave Bedford introduced himself to the Council as the Alaska State Official Designee. Mr. Steve Williams welcomed everyone to Oregon on behalf of Mr. Roy Elicker, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) Director. There will be a closed session held after the regular business concludes tomorrow afternoon to discuss litigation and personnel matters.

A.2 Roll Call

Dr. Donald McIsaac, Council Executive Director, called the roll. The following Council members were present:

Mr. Phil Anderson (Washington State Official)
Mr. Dave Bedford (Alaska State Official, non-voting designee)
Mr. William L. "Buzz" Brizendine (At-Large)
Mr. Brian Corrigan U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), non-voting designee)
Mr. David Crabbe (California Obligatory)
Mr. Jeff Feldner (At-Large)
Mr. Rich Lincoln (Washington Obligatory)
Mr. Frank Lockhart (National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Northwest Region, designee)
Ms. Dorothy Lowman, Vice Chair (Oregon Obligatory)
Mr. Dale Myer (At-Large)
Mr. David Ortmann (Idaho State Official, designee)
Mr. Herb Pollard (Idaho Obligatory)
Mr. Tim Roth (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), non-voting designee)
Mr. David Sones (Tribal Obligatory)
Mr. Steve Williams (Oregon State Official, designee)
Mr. Dan Wolford, Chairman (At-Large)
Ms. Marci Yaremko (California State Official, designee)

During the week the following people were present in their designated seats for portions of the meeting:

Mr. Chuck Bonham (California State Official); Ms. Michele Culver (Washington State Official, designee); Mr. Kevin Duffy (NMFS, Northwest Region, designee); Ms. Joanna Grebel (California State Official, designee); Dr. Dave Hanson, Parliamentarian (Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, non-voting designee); Mr. Mark Helvey (NMFS, Southwest Region, designee); Ms. Gway Kirchner (Oregon State Official, designee); and Mr. Bob Turner (NMFS, Northwest Region, designee).

Mr. Dave Hogan (U.S. State Department, non-voting, designee) was absent from the meeting.

A.3 Executive Director's Report

Dr. McIsaac thanked the Council staff for all the work leading up to this April meeting, including the March Council meeting and preparation for the national conference in May. He thanked Council members for their attention to following procedures for making clear and visible motions which have made the Council and staff work much more efficient, as well as assisting the public in following the Council action. Regarding the 2013 budget, he noted that the Regional Council line item remained at status quo with 2012, however, it is still subject to the reduction imposed by the budget sequester and a rescission due to Hurricane Sandy. The final amount will be determined by NMFS from a combination of the Regional Council line item and some other separate funding sources. We anticipate having that information for a June Budget Committee meeting which will consider any necessary changes to the provisional 2013 budget approved by the Council last November. It is too early for any substantive information on the 2014 budget.

A.4 Agenda

A.4.a Council Action: Approve Agenda

Mr. Myer moved and Mr. Ortmann seconded Motion 1 for the Council to approve the Agenda as shown in Agenda Item A.4, Proposed Council Meeting Agenda, April 2013. Motion 1 Carried unanimously.

B. Administrative Matters

B.1 Formalization of Council Decisions at the March Council Meeting (4/6/2013; 8:15 a.m.)

B.1.a Agenda Item Overview

Dr. McIsaac provided the Agenda Item Overview and referenced:

- Agenda Item B.1.a, Attachment 1: Draft Voting Log, Pacific Fishery Management Council, 217th Meeting, March 2013.
- Agenda Item B.1.a, Attachment 2: Decision Summary Document, Pacific Fishery Management Council, March 7-11, 2013.

B.1.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

None.

B.1.c Public Comment

None.

B.1.d Council Action: Approve Actions taken at the March 2013 Council Meeting

Ms. Lowman moved and Mr. Anderson seconded Motion 2 to formally confirm the Council decisions made as preliminary selections at the March 2013 Council meeting, as contained in Agenda item B.1.a, Attachment 1 and Agenda Item B.1.a, Attachment 2.

Ms. Lowman noted that Attachment 1 lists the motions made by the Council in March and Attachment 2 speaks to those Council directions not included in motions. Together they represent an accurate record of the Council's actions at the March meeting.

Motion 2 carried (Mr. Lockhart abstained).

B.2 Expansion of the Gulf of Farallones and Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuaries (4/6/2013; 9:09 a.m.)

B.2.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Kerry Griffin provided the Agenda Item Overview and noted Agenda Item B.2.a, Attachment 1: *Federal Register* Notice regarding plans for expansion of National Marine Sanctuaries.

B.2.b Report of the National Marine Sanctuaries

Ms. Maria Brown (Sanctuary Superintendent, Gulf of Farallones National Marine Sanctuary) and Mr. Dan Howard (Sanctuary Superintendent, Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary) presented Agenda Item B.2.b, Supplemental NMS Report (PowerPoint).

B.2.c Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Mr. Joel Kawahara presented Agenda Item B.2.c, Supplemental HC Report.
Mr. John Holloway presented Agenda Item B.2.c, Supplemental GAP Report.

B.2.d Public Comment

Mr. John Holloway read the statement of Ms. Kathy Fosmark, Alliance for Community of Sustainable Fisheries, Monterey, California, into the record.
Mr. David Bitts, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, San Francisco, California; provided a written statement, Agenda Item B.2.d, Public Comment.
Agenda Item B.2.d, Public Comment; comments in response to the Federal Register Notice on the Expansion of California National Marine Sanctuaries.
Agenda Item B.2.c, Supplemental Public Comment 2; letters in support of the Boundary Expansion of Cordell Bank and Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuaries.

B.2.e Council Discussion: Discussion and Provide Feedback to National Marine Sanctuaries

Ms. Johanna Grebel noted that her state has a special interest in the California sanctuary areas as they include state waters. She asked for the following items to be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). First, there needs to be a discussion of impacts in the expansion area on the sport and commercial harvest of urchins and abalones, kelp harvest, and the various recreational and commercial fisheries. While the sanctuaries don't regulate fisheries, there are indirect effects for both commercial and sport fisheries, and there should be a pointed discussion of the impacts of no-fishing zones and for things that may or may not be allowed. California does have an interest in impacts on aquaculture, especially that for Pacific oysters and manila clams. The document would benefit from a clear consideration of the impacts regarding invasive versus introduced species. There could be a discussion on the economic impacts if expansion of aquaculture is not allowed, specifically regarding shellfish farming jobs and the

future of shellfish farming. There are also some larger policy issues regarding national shellfish initiatives that need to be evaluated in the DEIS and the consistency with other regulations and policies, particularly with EO 13112, and also regarding the state's own Marine Protected Area process.

Mr. Steve Williams noted the need, at some point, to have an in-depth discussion of the potential impacts of unintended consequences on fisheries from sanctuary actions targeted on non-fishing issues. It is important to have good relations and communications with the sanctuaries to avoid actions which do not seem related to fisheries, but on closer examination prove to have such unintended consequences.

Mr. Crabbe and Mr. Anderson agreed with Mr. Williams' comments and also the public comment from Mr. Bitts concerning the importance of maintaining the trust of the fishermen and fishing communities. In particular, that the sanctuaries' regulations would not creep toward regulations that inadvertently or by design limit fishing activities.

Ms. Lowman agreed with the comments about regulation creep and noted that concern was expressed by the advisory bodies as well. She assumed these comments will be put into a letter by Council staff to formally convey these ideas.

Mr. Wolford concurred with the previous comments. He noted that both sanctuaries concerned with this expansion have been working well with the Council, but the worry is that the superintendents do change over time. The clarification on the sanctuaries' ability to limit fishing activities and all of the comments expressed in this agenda item would be picked up by the staff.

Mr. Ortmann noted that looking beyond our concern for unintended consequences, the sanctuaries offer the possibility of greatly assisting and expanding our habitat and ecosystem knowledge and management capabilities.

Mr. Wolford confirmed that staff will incorporate the comments and recommendations presented in this agenda item in a letter to the sanctuaries.

B.3 Ocean Observation Initiative (OOI) Report (4/6/2013; 10:53 a.m.)

B.3.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Kerry Griffin provided the Agenda Item Overview.

B.3.b OOI Presentation

Mr. Ed Dever and Cecile Durand presented Agenda Item B.3.b, Supplemental OOI PowerPoint.

B.3.c Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

None.

B.3.d Public Comment

None.

B.3.e Council Discussion

Mr. Anderson suggested it would be useful to have the Ocean Observation program staff come back in the future to interpret the data and describe how it could be utilized in the future.

Mr. Roth noted the long-term data set that could be developed and how we might take advantage of the data for the Fishery Ecosystem Plan.

Ms. Yaremko requested that they could bring a California collaborator to present that part of the data.

B.4 Legislative Matters (4/11/2013; 8:02 a.m.)

B.4.a Agenda Item Overview

Ms. Jennifer Gilden presented the Agenda Item Overview and referenced the following attachments:

- Agenda item B.4.a, Attachment 1: April 2013 Staff Summary of Federal Legislation.
- Agenda Item B.4.a, Attachment 2: Staff Summary of MSA Reauthorization Hearing.
- Agenda Item B.4.a, Attachment 3: Council letter on HR 6362, the Revitalizing the Economy of Fisheries (REFI) in the Pacific Act of 2012.

B.4.b Report of the Legislative Committee

Ms. Jenifer Gilden read Agenda Item B.4.b, Supplemental Legislative Committee Report into the record.

B.4.c Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Mr. Mike Okoniewski presented Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental CPSAS Report.

Mrs. Susan Chambers presented Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental GAP Report.

Mr. Tim Roth presented Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental HC Report.

Ms. Kelly Ames presented Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental GMT Report.

Dr. Selina Heppell presented Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental SSC Report.

B.4.d Public Comment

Mr. Rod Moore, West Coast Seafood Processors Association, Portland, Oregon; spoke concerning testimony on the Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA) reauthorization and S. 520 (mislabeling of seafood).

B.4.e Council Action: Consider Legislative Committee Recommendations

Mr. Wolford referenced the Legislative Committee (LC) discussion concerning preparation for the Managing our Nation's Fisheries 3 (MONF3) Conference. He noted that the conference was not just focused on legislative reauthorization of the MSA, but also with broader questions for non-legislative changes that need to be addressed for general fisheries management (e.g., National Standard 1).

Ms. Lowman expanded on Mr. Wolford's remarks, noting that the National Standards in the law, in many cases, are broad, while their interpretation through NMFS guidelines can be very

specific. Those guidelines are under review. Hopefully, MONF3 may help provide input for beneficial changes to the guidelines which then may or may not require changes in the MSA by Congress.

Ms. Yaremko noted that it would be hard to prioritize the top three recommendations for reauthorizing the MSA. She was glad the advisory bodies had an opportunity to consider this and it should be useful for the representatives and starts a good list for us. She had reservations about forwarding some recommendations, especially with regard to those of the SSC which are exclusively policy recommendations and are not appropriate in the reauthorization priority. In particular, she was concerned with the discussion on data confidentiality in both the SSC and GMT reports. There should also be some recognition of the states' rules for confidentiality since our management relies on state data programs. She also did not think it appropriate at the Federal level to include the recommendations concerning compensation of fishermen for research.

Ms. Culver moved and Mr. Lincoln seconded Motion 29 to include consideration of the following comments on the reauthorization of the MSA, National Standards, and Regulations at the MONF 3 [the actual text for each bullet referred to in the motion has been added]:

- Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental SSC Report – Bullets numbered 2, 5, and 8:
 - The rule that defines the maximum time for overfished stocks to rebuild, T_{MAX} , is discontinuous at 10 years. It should be replaced by a rule that is not discontinuous, such as “ T_{MAX} is the larger of 10 years or the sum of T_{MIN} and one mean generation time.”
 - “Overfished” and “overfishing” are currently defined as the same in the Act. The definitions of these terms should be changed to reflect actual practice when applying status determination criteria. “Overfished” is related to population size relative to the Minimum Stock Size Threshold (MSST) and “overfishing” is related to exploitation rates relative to the Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold.
 - The term “overfished” gives the impression that a stock is below the MSST because of excessive fishing. This is often not the case, so the term “overfished” should be replaced by one such as “depleted.”
- Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental GMT Report, all of the items on the first page and the first bulleted item on page 2, but not the last bullet:
 - The integration of MSA and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that Congress mandated in the last reauthorization of the statute still has not been implemented. And there currently appear to be some redundancies that remain between Council processes under MSA and NEPA. In short, NEPA and the MSA could likely be better-integrated—in terms of process and environmental analysis—without reducing the quality of either. In addition, there are strong connections between the environmental questions NEPA raises and the analytical methods being advanced under ecosystem-based fisheries management, as we have been raising under the Council’s consideration of Amendment 24 and ecosystem related agenda items (Agenda Item H.1.c, Supplemental GMT Report). Recognizing those connections and better integrating NEPA with MSA-focused analysis could be a way for Congress to support continued progress toward ecosystem based fisheries management and align staff and scientific resources with the highest conservation needs. The perception of many seems to be the

- opposite--i.e. which proposed changes to NEPA are necessarily motivated by a desire to pay less attention of environmental impacts and conservation.
- We also think that Congress could learn from our west coast examples of rebuilding. Congress added the rebuilding provisions to the law in 1996 with certain policy goals in mind. Feedback from the Council's experience could help Congress' deliberations on whether those goals are being met. The results we have seen could be counter to expectations. For instance, with petrale sole the rebuilding projections showed the most long-term yield was expected by rebuilding using the standard F_{MSY} harvest rate, which was the slowest rebuilding alternative considered by the Council. This was counter to expectations and the widely held assumption that rebuilding "as short as possible" produces the most yield and economic benefit overall. In short, we believe Congress could change the law with a standard that more directly focuses on balancing the trade-off between short term economic consequences and long term yield and other impacts to the fishery and ecosystem without imposing overly formulaic constraints on the Councils.
 - Carryover in the Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) program is another area where questions about interpretations of the MSA have arisen. Consideration of carryover has been focused on the risk that issuing carryover might lead to an annual catch limit (ACL) overage despite everyone agreeing that such an overage would not raise a biological concern. More generally, this interpretation is one where we have questioned the emphasis of annual catch over the expected outcome over a multi-year period.
- Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental GAP Report, on Page 1, the 1st, 2nd, and 5th bullet, and the last bullet on Page 2:
 - Flexible Annual Catch Limits (ACL) management. The Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) is concerned that current ACL management is too stringent to accomplish the intent of optimum yield (OY) management. There is too much precaution in deciding the ACL specification. ACLs should be managed to better meet the goal of OY attainment, the socioeconomic objectives of the MSA, and to minimize fishery instability. The concept of long term averaging or multi-year ACLs will better enable implementation of the carry-over provisions in the fishery management plan (FMP). This conceptual change will have no biological consequence to our long-lived groundfish stocks.
 - Eliminate the 10-year rebuilding rule and provide more consideration of community needs for stocks that must be rebuilt in a longer time period. The 10-year rule, where stock rebuilding must occur within 10 years if possible, leads to an awkward and discontinuous policy that disrupts fisheries for little conservation gain. For example, if a stock can rebuild in 9.9 years but at a cost of closing all fisheries, this becomes a mandate even if the economic disruption is greatly lessened with an 11-year rebuilding plan. This is illogical and potentially disastrous for fishing-dependent communities.
 - Streamline the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and MSA processes. While the 2006 reauthorization of the MSA seemingly made streamlining the NEPA and MSA processes a mandate, NMFS has not addressed this. We still have an inefficient process where there are two administrative tracks to satisfy NEPA and MSA process mandates. This unnecessarily delays implementation of

regulations and ties up NMFS and Council resources that could be used to make progress on other important initiatives. Specifically, it makes sense to use the regional fishery management council process, which is designed to engage the public before decisions are made, as a substitute to the notice and comment rulemaking required in the NEPA process. This would not compromise the quality of analysis required by NEPA. Council decisions are widely noticed to the public to solicit maximum input before decisions are made.

- Maintain the positive aspects of the MSA. The GAP believes there are many mandates and aspects of the MSA that should not be changed. Decisions on allocation and on how to rationalize fisheries should continue to be made at the regional level and not be subject to top-down mandates. Catch share programs and formal allocations provide stability in fisheries management. National initiatives to sunset catch share programs or formal allocations are bad ideas. The aspects of the MSA establishing regional control in decision-making work very well and allow tailoring of fisheries management according to regional needs. Changing this aspect of the MSA will compromise the positive foundation of the MSA and will lead to disastrous consequences.
- Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental CPSAS Report, include the full report:
 - Members of the Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel (CPSAS) discussed priorities for consideration in Magnuson Act (MSA) reauthorization discussions. Any changes to existing MSA mandates should be accompanied by full analysis of what appropriate funding levels need to be to carry out the intention of such mandates. These should include but not be limited to adequate research funding, for NOAA Fisheries-sponsored as well as cooperative research. In addition, regional fishery management council operations must be funded at appropriate levels to achieve the directives and objectives of the re-authorized MSA. We also emphasize the need to develop more collaborative research opportunities and collaborative management.
- Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental HC Report: approve both bullets, but in the second bullet replace “needs” with “should be”
 - Develop a new term, other than “overfishing,” for when a run is depressed for reasons not related to fishing; and for the “overfishing” reports required when a stock is “overfished” for three years in a row.
 - The Habitat Committee (HC) agrees with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Assistant Administrator Sam Rauch, in his comments to the House Committee on Natural Resources, that ecosystem, habitat, and climate change ~~needs~~ should be incorporated into stock assessments and management decisions.

Ms. Culver stated that her motion is intended to focus on the items that can be fixed or addressed through reauthorization of the MSA versus those which may be handled through the flexibility granted in the MSA and is expressed in Council policy and interpretation. There needs to be a balance that allows for flexibility within the MSA and National Standards rather than being too prescriptive that recognizes the necessary variations in governing all eight Regional Fishery Management Councils. There are a few items not included from the SSC recommendations that might merit consideration. However, given the limited time to develop and consider them, it would be very difficult to consider and include them today.

Ms. Yaremko asked why the SSC ecosystem bullet and the first bullet in the GAP recommendations, related to ACLs, were not included on the list.

Ms. Culver responded that the definition of ecosystem component is broad and gives us flexibility that allows us to decide how we want to treat those through the FMPs. In addition, the SSC has made no recommendation for how the definition should be changed. Without seeing that, she is hesitant to include the recommendation. Regarding the GAP recommendation on ACLs, she acknowledged that the terms “annual” and “limit” leave little flexibility and have limited our ability to access some of our healthier stocks. We have commented on this in the past and she thinks the staff should have a clear understanding and intent of that and should be able to flesh that out a little more if needed.

Ms. Lowman asked why recommendations of the LC were not included.

Ms. Culver stated that, except for the forage fish List of Fisheries issue, most of the LC recommendations were included in the other advisory body reports. She is not against including it and thought that could be considered in further discussion.

Dr. McIsaac asked if bullet 4 (differentiating between signal and noise) of the GAP recommendations was omitted, and if it was, what the rationale was.

Ms. Culver responded that bullet 4 of the GAP recommendations was not included in her motion. She noted it was also in the LC report. She believes this is one where the devil is in the details. She is not sure what a mandate or policy would look like and is afraid it might actually decrease our flexibility.

Dr. McIsaac stated that we are a long ways from final reauthorization and he views these recommendations as identifying starting points that would be further developed and explored with more opportunity for discussion over the next year or so.

Ms. Culver replied that she is not sure if the recommendation is necessary as an MSA fix or is part of our Terms of Reference process in which she presumes the entities are doing their best to differentiate between noise and signal. This can be a difficult task given the uncertainty of some assessments. Setting a mandated procedure in the MSA may not line up with the inexact science of our data and a more flexible Council policy to deal with it.

Dr. McIsaac noted that Dr. Punt will be giving a paper at MONF3 reflecting the SSC’s concern that the tiniest bit of noise in the data requires the Council to come back with FMP adjustments. Dr. McIsaac noted that this discontinuity of control rules addressed in bullet 4 of the GAP was also bullet 1 of the SSC.

Ms. Culver responded that she thought establishing continuous control rules across the minimum stock-size threshold is available to us now, and for groundfish it is something we could explore through our FMP and isn’t something that is prohibited.

Mr. Steve Williams asked for clarification regarding the purpose for identifying the reauthorization issues at this time. He presumed that this will not be the last time for this and wasn't sure if there was a need to carefully sift the recommendations at this time.

Dr. McIsaac laid out what he believes the process will look like based on the last reauthorization. At the beginning, issues and points of concern were identified. The Regional Councils then considered taking a position on those. The Administration drafted a bill, the Congress drafted a bill; over the course of more than 12 months these came back to the councils and solutions were debated. Ultimately, as reauthorization appeared imminent, the Council was able to look at the solutions and take a very specific position. At this point in the process the task is identifying issues and some obligation for describing them in general terms, but in terms of an exact solution, it is too early.

In response to Mr. Steve Williams, Ms. Culver stated that the purpose of her motion was to give guidance for the MONF3 conference in three weeks. She wanted to be sure she understood and was comfortable with any of the recommendations forwarded to the conference by the Council. At a later date, or throughout the two-year process, the Council could offer further comments on the recommendations.

Ms. Yaremko stated that with regard to the GAP recommendations on ACL management, she would ask the salmon advisors to consider this before moving forward. Also, she believes more clarity on the ecosystem component species is needed across the FMP's. In the long run, that could be a time saver for us.

Mr. Lincoln suggested that being clear on which of these issues need Congressional action and which simply need better discussions and understanding in their implementation between the Council and NMFS is very important. He would guess that many fall under the latter category and that we need to be careful about what we ask Congress to solve.

Mr. Williams moved and Mr. Feldner seconded Amendment 1 to Motion 29 to add to the list for consideration, bullet 3 on page 1 of the GAP Report. [Clarify rebuilding policy—There is an unwritten NMFS policy that once a rebuilding plan is adopted, it must be maintained until the biomass target is reached, even in the case when a new assessment representing the best available science indicates the stock was never overfished, or the stock is in the precautionary zone and subject to the harvest control rules in the FMP (e.g., the 40-10 rule). Changes in rebuilding rules could also clarify this policy.]

Mr. Williams stated he believes it is important at this point to add this item for discussion. It is discussed in the GAP report and referenced in the LC report. He noted the situation with widow rockfish where after declaring they were in trouble, the best science determined that they had never been in trouble. Some changes might help the Council deal with these situations in a more timely fashion. He sees no harm in adding this issue at this time.

Mr. Helvey noted that there is some confusion in this discussion over what is required by the statute (MSA) and by the guidelines which are about policy. This particular rebuilding problem results from the guidelines (which may not need to be solved by reauthorization). We need to distinguish between what is in the statute and everything else.

Ms. Culver agreed with Mr. Helvey and Mr. Lincoln. She thought the rebuilding issue falls under policy and is not something that we would want to have the MSA itself describe what we must do. She supports having a discussion in the future to clarify which issues belong at the NOAA policy level and which require Congressional action.

Ms. Lowman noted that the first sentence of Motion 29 includes consideration of issues for the MSA, National Standards, and regulations.

Ms. Culver stated that the motion identifies issues to be considered in the reauthorization of the MSA to be considered at the MONF3 conference. She was focusing on the ones relative to the MSA and not the guidelines.

Several Council members spoke to being more inclusive than exclusive of issues at this point, and to look toward further consideration and removal of issues that might just involve NMFS policy or regulations at a later time.

Mr. Wolford asked for clarification of the intent of the motion.

Ms. Culver confirmed that the intent of her motion was to focus on those items associated with reauthorization of the MSA as this was a legislative agenda item. MONF3 might consider the issues more broadly and include necessary changes to guidelines and policy.

Mr. Myer said he believes our purpose is to provide a broad list for MONF3 to consider. He supports the amendment.

Mr. Ortmann spoke in opposition to the amendment. He believes we need to keep the list simple and targeted on Congress and reauthorization.

Amendment 1 carried. Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Ortmann, and Ms. Culver voted no.

Ms. Yaremko moved and Mr. Brizendine seconded to amend Motion 29 (Amendment 2) by adding, to the list of issues, the seventh bullet in Agenda Item B.4.d, Supplemental SSC Report—"The term "Ecosystem Component" should be defined more clearly."

Ms. Yaremko said that not having a clear definition of "ecosystem component" has been a continuing problem that we have not been able to resolve in our management specifications process and in bringing all of our plans into alignment with the National Standards.

Mr. Crabbe stated he would support the amendment, even though it is broader than just reauthorization of the MSA.

Mr. Helvey noted that the preamble to this motion did include topics in addition to reauthorization, and wondered why we would not include all of the advisory body comments.

Ms. Culver spoke in opposition to the amendment. She did not think this short sentence provided enough information to guide any discussion of this issue since the remedy might be different for each FMP.

Ms. Yaremko stated that including this issue would at least signal to MONF3 participants that this is a problem and provide time to consider all the possible remedies and ramifications.

Mr. Wolford commented that the lack of specificity in this issue concerned him as he was not sure we might not get something we didn't want.

Amendment 2 carried. Mr. Ortmann, Ms. Lowman, Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Myer, and Ms. Culver voted no.

Mr. Lincoln moved and Mr. Ortmann seconded Amendment 3 to Motion 29 by striking out "National Standards, and regulations" from the original motion.

Mr. Lincoln stated that he viewed the primary purpose of the motion to provide a list for discussion of reauthorization at MONF3 and believes the amendment clarifies that purpose.

Ms. Culver expressed appreciation for the amendment as she believes it captures her original intent.

Amendment 3 carried unanimously. Motion 29, as amended, carried unanimously.

For the benefit of those who will be attending MONF3, Mr. Wolford asked for some guidance from Council members on what might be the highest priority issues on the list that was just approved.

Mr. Williams stated that the last bullet in the GAP Report (streamlining the NEPA and MSA processes) should be one of the top priorities for consideration.

Ms. Yaremko identified the List of Fisheries issue as a priority. It is cited in the Legislative Committee Report under the header of "Forage Fish." However, the issue really applies to all fisheries.

Ms. Yaremko moved and Mr. Crabbe seconded Motion 30 to adopt Agenda Item B.4.b, Supplemental Legislative Committee Report, and strike "Forage Fish" from the header and replace it with "List of Fisheries."

Ms. Culver responded in support of the motion. However, while the Legislative Committee commended Mr. Bob Dooley on his comments before the House Natural Resources Committee in their hearings on the MSA last month, she had concerns with his comments, especially those about finding the management thresholds confusing, contradictory, and needlessly inefficient. Considering those and other comments he made, she was not sure just what he supports with regard to National Standard 1, and his comments may not support the Council's views.

Mr. Lincoln asked for clarification about whether this should be an acceptance rather than an adoption of the Legislative Report and agreement with everything that may be in it.

Dr. Hanson stated that we usually “accept” the report, and as such, is not necessarily endorsing everything that is said in it.

Mr. Lincoln moved and Ms. Culver seconded Amendment 1 to Motion 30 to strike “adopt” and replace it with “accept.”

Amendment 1 carried unanimously. Motion 30, as amended, carried unanimously.

B.5 Approval of Council Meeting Minutes (4/11/2013; 12:49 p.m.)

B.5.a Council Action: Approve Previous Council Meeting Minutes

Mr. Ortmann moved and Mr. Pollard seconded Motion 33 to approve as final minutes, Agenda Item B.5.a, Attachment 1: Draft Minutes: 216th Session of the Pacific Fishery Management Council (November 2012).

Motion 33 carried unanimously.

B.6 Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures (4/11/2013; 12:50 p.m.)

B.6.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Chuck Tracy presented the Agenda Item Overview.

B.6.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

None.

B.6.c Public Comment

None.

B.6.d Council Action: Consider Changes to Council Operating Procedures and Appointments to Advisory Bodies

Mr. Wolford confirmed selection of new advisory body chairs and vice chairs as follows: Dr. Bob Emmett as Chair and Ms. Lorna Wargo as Vice Chair of the CPSMT; Mr. Joel Kawahara and Ms. Fran Recht as Co-Chairs of the HC; and Mr. Crabbe as Vice Chair of the LC.

Mr. Helvey moved and Mr. Sones seconded Motion 34 to appoint 1) Dr. Tim Sippel to one of the NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center seats on the Highly Migratory Species Management Team (HMSMT), replacing Dr. Suzanne Kohin and 2) Dr. Ian Taylor to the NMFS Northwest Fisheries Science Center seat on the Groundfish Management Team (GMT), replacing Dr. Jason Kope.

Motion 34 carried unanimously.

B.7 Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning (4/11/2013; 12:55 p.m.)

B.7.a Agenda Item Overview

Dr. Don McIsaac presented the Agenda Item Overview and reviewed the following exhibits.

- Agenda Item B.7.a, Supplemental Attachment 3: Pacific Council Workload Planning: Year-at-a-Glance Summary.
- Agenda Item B.7.a, Supplemental Attachment 4: Proposed Council Meeting Agenda, June 20-25, 2013 in Garden Grove, California.

B.7.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Ms. Kelly Ames read Agenda Item B.7.b, Supplemental GMT Report into the record.

Ms. Susan Chambers and Mr. John Holloway presented Agenda Item B.7.b, Supplemental GAP Report.

Mr. Mike Burner read Agenda Item b.7.b, Supplemental SAS Report.

B.7.c Public Comment

Mr. Steve Marx, PEW Charitable Trusts, Portland, Oregon.

Mr. Whit Sheard, Oceana, Portland, Oregon.

Mr. John Holloway, Recreational Fishing Alliance-Oregon, Portland, Oregon.

Agenda Item B.7.c, Supplemental Public Comment.

B.7.d Council Discussion and Guidance on Future Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning

Mr. Myer spoke to the request by the GAP to consider the quota pounds transfer deadline in the Program Improvement and Enhancement (PIE) II Rule at the June meeting. He and others were concerned about the workload and notice that may be involved. After some discussion and clarification by Mr. Seger, it appeared that the workload would not be great and notice in the June agenda would be sufficient. If a change were to be made in what is now the recommended deadline, it would need to be in June.

In response to a request by Mr. Helvey regarding the winter-run update, Dr. McIsaac indicated that he would mark it “tentative” for September.

Ms. Culver did not see Amendment 24 or the Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) coming back in the year-at-a-glance display and wondered if that was correct.

Dr. McIsaac responded that those discussions would occur under the specifications and management measures for 2015-2016 and beyond in groundfish agenda item 8 in the June Council meeting display and also in September and November as well.

Based on that response, Ms. Culver presumed that we would not be looking at a draft EIS in June, but more the specification issues and process, including Council Operating Procedure (COP) 9. Dr. McIsaac agreed and indicated it would be more an annotated outline and assessment of doing the Tier 1 and biennial specifications in synchrony.

Ms. Culver assumed that a revised Amendment 24 Workgroup would meet between now and June to develop the briefing book items. Dr. McIsaac noted, however, that in March when we came up with a workload assessment, the Council decided that the workgroup would not be convened and that the staff would work up the documents for the advisory bodies and Council to review in June.

Ms. Culver suggested that perhaps the Amendment 24 Workgroup could be convened at the June Council meeting to review the staff outline and provide input to the Council. Dr. McIsaac reviewed the Council motion from March. He concluded that the intent of the Council action was not to have the workgroup meet until presumed necessary after the design is worked on by the Council staff. In addition, the Council chose not to select all the members of the workgroup.

Ms. Culver suggested that after the Council reviews the advisory body input in June, they could decide when or if to convene the Amendment 24 Workgroup and appoint members as needed. Dr. McIsaac agreed.

In line with the action the Council took this week, Ms. Culver stated her understanding that the June agenda would include updating the List of Fisheries, but that the unmanaged forage fish protection initiative would be on the September agenda. After further discussion, the Council agreed and clarified that both would be under the ecosystem agenda.

Mr. Williams expressed his support for the Salmon Advisory Subpanel (SAS) recommendation regarding the cormorant management plan agenda item in September. He also lent his support to removing the shading from the midwater sport fishery agenda item in June. He and Mr. Wolford noted that the midwater recreational fishery item would have to be an action item if the fishery were to occur in 2014.

Ms. Culver suggested that the midwater recreational fishery issue should not be considered for implementation prior to the 2015-2016 fisheries. She thought that the Council had reached a consensus to keep the 2013-2014 groundfish management in line with status quo to reduce workload.

Mr. Williams agreed with Ms. Culver's characterization of limiting new management measures as the Council went through the specifications process. However, he was very concerned that this potential management change would disappear if we do not move it ahead for 2014, and we would lose all the work that has been done. In addition, the Northwest Region (NWR) made a very strong commitment to move this forward.

Ms. Ames pointed out that, under Amendment 24, there was a stipulation for limiting new management measures in the biennial process to those which would keep catch within the ACL or address other conservation concerns. The Council has not discussed whether or not the midwater recreational fishery meets this criteria, but it is likely that it does not and would not fit into implementation in the 2015-2016 measures.

Ms. Culver indicated her main concern was still the number and breadth of groundfish items on the June agenda and the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) workload. She suggested the

methodology review (including barotrauma) could be moved to September while still meeting the necessary timeline.

Ms. Ames noted that the state implementation plans for barotrauma considerations could be moved to a later time, but the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) review of the GMT projection models that would be used in the biennial analysis needs to occur in June prior to the initiation of the analysis for the 2015-2016 specification process.

Mr. Wolford asked why the Council needed to be involved in the review of all the GMT modeling.

Ms. Ames replied that the SSC has reviewed a significant number of models and wanted to make sure the Council had a chance to consider the changes.

Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Roth noted the methodology review agenda item was about setting a process. If specific items needed to be reviewed, it would seem that would be part of the specifications agenda item.

Mr. Roth commented regarding his support for the cormorant issue in September. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has indicated they expect to issue the draft EIS in August and would follow with a 30 day comment period. This aligns with the SAS developing a draft letter for the Council in September.

Regarding the proposed June agenda (Supplemental Attachment 4), Ms. Culver summarized her understanding of the results of the agenda discussion. She stated that the shaded items on Thursday and Friday would remain on the agenda and suggested the midwater item be increased to 2 hours. On Saturday, the trawl trailing actions should be broadened to include revisiting PIE II for the date changes highlighted in the GAP statement, and a prioritization of trailing actions in general for September and beyond. Keep the seabird protection regulation item. Remove the methodology review process discussion and put the barotrauma discussion in September. On Sunday, the specifications and management process is going to include SSC comments on the GMT models for the 2015-2016 specifications, a check-in outline for Amendment 24 and the Tier 1 EIS, and a decision by the Council about whether we need a workgroup or other help for Amendment 24. On Monday, updating the List of Fisheries is moved under Ecosystem-Based Management and increased to 2 hours; and unmanaged forage fish protection is delayed to September. On Tuesday, keep the shaded CPS items and, under membership appointments, consider appointment of Amendment 24 Workgroup members if necessary.

Dr. McIsaac felt Ms. Culver's summary pretty well agreed with his own. However, with regard to trawl rationalization, he noted that September has been the time for the annual call for priorities and scoping. The action in June could just be a preview. Ms. Culver agreed.

[Council concluded this agenda item at 2:18 p.m. and adjourned the meeting]

Council Informational Session (4/6/2013; 8:50 a.m.)

This informal briefing was provided by staff to help with understanding various issues and objectives associated with the approval of the new Fishery Ecosystem Plan in Agenda Item H.1.

It is not part of the official Council meeting record. Mr. Mike Burner provided an overview of the session and Ms. Yvonne deReynier made a PowerPoint presentation entitled “Ecosystem Plan Development Team Draft Fishery Ecosystem Plan.”

[Council concluded the informational briefing at 9:09 a.m.]

C. Open Comment Period (4/6/2013; 8:20 a.m.)

C.1 Comments on Non-Agenda Items

C.1.a Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Mr. Anderson spoke to the intended plan by NMFS to merge the NW and SW Regions. He was concerned that in such a process the assistant regional administrator position and Salmon Management Division within the NWR might be lost. Given the level of complexity, responsibilities, and workload that the NWR deals with (he listed several different issues), he believes loss of the Salmon Management Division and Assistant Administrator, along with any other reductions in capability to stay on top of salmon management, could be very devastating. He would like to have the Council send a letter to NMFS expressing that concern and to reiterate the need to maintain the salmon management capabilities.

Mr. Lockhart stated that it would be timely to the decisions to have Council input, and it could be beneficial. In response to a question, he noted that the appropriations language only concerned consolidation of the regions and not the science centers. The decisions are up to headquarters and, as far as he knows, no decisions have been finalized.

C.1.b Public Comment

The following exhibits were provided in the briefing book.

- [Agenda Item C.1, Open Comment 1](#): Announcement for the Briefing and Screening of “Ocean Frontiers” Hosted by Green Fire Productions, Sunday April 7.
- [Agenda Item C.1, Supplemental Open Comment 2](#): Letter from Ocean Pacific Seafood Regarding the “Drift Net Swordfish Turtle Problem.”
- [Agenda Item C.1, Supplemental Open Comment 3](#): Fisheries Rebuilding Report by the Natural Resources Defense Council.
- [Agenda Item C.1, Supplemental Open Comment 4](#): Letter from Bill James on Behalf of Port San Luis Commercial Fishermen’s Association Regarding Requests for the Next Groundfish Spec Cycle 2015-2016.

C.1.c Council Discussion

Dr. McIsaac, Mr. Steve Williams, Mr. Sones, and Mr. Anderson elaborated on the importance of maintaining the NWR salmon management capabilities and not losing the Salmon Management Division.

Noting the Council’s support on this matter, Mr. Wolford, without objection, directed Dr. McIsaac to draft a letter to NMFS expressing the Council’s concern with the pending reorganization and to reiterate the need to maintain their salmon management capabilities.

D. Groundfish Management

D.1 National Marine Fisheries Service Report (4/6/2013; 1:01 p.m.)

D.1.a Agenda Item Overview

Ms. Kelly Ames presented the Agenda Item Overview.

D.1.b Regulatory Activities

Mr. Frank Lockhart presented the following exhibits:

- Agenda Item D.1.b, Attachment 1: *Federal Register* Notices Published since the last Council Meeting.
- Agenda Item D.1.b, Supplemental Attachment 2: March 28, 2013 *Federal Register* Notice: Final Rule Reconsideration of Allocation of Whiting for the Pacific Coast Groundfish Trawl Rationalization Program.
- Agenda Item D.1.b, Supplemental Attachment 3: Pacific Dawn LLC Filing, March 29, 2013.

Mr. Lockhart reviewed several current issues including 1) reregistration of shore-based first receiver site licenses by April 15; 2) completing the process for topping off accounts for various species in the IFQ fishery by May 15; 3) issuing final whiting allocations by May 15, depending on completion of the international whiting process; 4) providing halibut quotas by the end of next week; 5) completing the decision on surplus carryover amounts by May 15; 6) finishing processing of the cost recovery rule by early fall; 7) implementing the PIE II rule for 2014 which includes quota share trading for whiting; and 8) a final rule on chafing gear that will be effective this summer—not by May 15.

D.1.c Fisheries Science Center Activities

Dr. Michelle McClure presented Agenda Item D.1.c, Supplemental NMFS Science Center PowerPoint. Her overview included information on the economic data collection report, four ongoing bycatch reduction research projects (e.g., a rockfish excluder for the whiting fishery, experiments with cod end mesh size, and other work with halibut exclusion), and updates on the bottom trawl survey and other recent studies.

D.1.d Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

None.

D.1.e Public Comment

Mr. Kevin Dunn, Fisherman, Warrenton, Oregon: expressed concern about the problems caused by the late release of the halibut quota.

D.1.f Council Discussion

Mr. Williams asked if the Council could be given notice of information and decisions regarding changes in data collection programs resulting from implementation of the Federal sequester.

Mr. Lockhart responded that the decisions had to be made quickly. However, he will take this concern back to NMFS leadership. It may be possible to provide details of the actions at the CCC meeting and June Council meeting.

D.2 Status of the Rationalized Fishery (4/7/2013; 8:04 a.m.)

D.2.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Jim Seger noted this was an informational agenda item and presented the Agenda Item Overview.

D.2.b Annual Report for the At-Sea Co-Op

Mr. Dave Fraser presented the Annual Report for the At-Sea Co-Op found in:

- Agenda Item D.2.b, Attachment 1: Whiting Mothership Cooperative: An Amendment 20 Mothership Catcher Vessel Cooperative Report on the 2012 Pacific Whiting Fishery.
- Agenda Item D.2.b, Attachment 2: Pacific Whiting Conservation Cooperative Amendment 20 Catcher/Processor Cooperative Final Annual Report 2012.

D.2.c Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Dr. Sean Matson presented Agenda Item D.2.c, Supplemental NMFS Report: Annual Catch Report for the West Coast Groundfish, Shorebased IFQ Program in 2012.

Dayna Matthews presented Agenda Item D.2.c, NMFS Office of Law Enforcement Report: TRAT Compliance Summary, 2012.

Mr. Tommy Ancona presented Agenda Item D.2.c, Supplemental GAP Report.

D.2.d Public Comment

Agenda Item D.2.d, Public Comment: Fort Bragg – Central Coast Risk Pool Annual Summary Report 2012.

D.2.e Council Discussion

In response to questions about the status of the various trawl rationalization trailing actions, Mr. Seger pointed out that the Council website contained a listing of the status of the actions and the information was subsequently provided as Agenda Item D.2.a, Supplemental Attachment 1: PFMC Webpage – Trawl Rationalization (Amendment 20) and Intersector Allocation (Amendment 21) Trailing Actions.

D.3 Stock Complexes Assemblages (4/7/2013; 9:16 a.m.)

D.3.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. John DeVore presented the Agenda Item Overview and introduced Agenda Item D.3.a, Attachment 1: Initial proposal (Proposed Action, Alternatives and Considerations) for Restructuring Groundfish Stock Complexes.

Mr. John DeVore and Dr. Jason Cope presented Agenda Item D.3.a, Supplemental Agenda Item Overview PowerPoint.

D.3.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities (4/7/2013; 11:00 a.m.)

Dr. Owen Hamel presented Agenda Item D.3.b, Supplemental SSC Report (the final report was revised slightly to reflect his oral presentation).

Mr. Dan Erickson presented Agenda item D.3.b, Supplemental GMT Report.

Mr. Tommy Ancona presented Agenda Item D.3.b, Supplemental GAP Report.

D.3.c Public Comment (4/7/2013; 1:02 p.m.)

Mr. Seth Atkinson, Natural Resources Defense Council, San Francisco, California.

Mr. Dan Platt, Fisherman, Fort Bragg, California.

Mr. Gerry Richter, Fisherman, California.

Mr. Bill James, nearshore fisherman, Salem, Oregon.

D.3.d Council Action: Adopt a Range of Alternatives and if Possible, Preliminary Preferred Alternatives, for Stock Complexes Assemblages (4/7/2013; 1:15 p.m.)

Ms. Grebel stated that this issue is complex and the initial analysis doesn't have any catch specifics to determine the species that are problematic. Deciding on this issue will have implications on Amendment 24, which she believes is very important to obtaining a better season-setting process. She also had concerns that the specifications process could be thrown off with trying to deal with both the stock assessments and stock complexes. She didn't want one process to delay or further complicate matters. She cited several examples of problems that could be created if the decisions on modeling are delayed as we restructure all these complexes (e.g., new trawl/nontrawl allocations, revised trip limits in the tables or adding entirely new trip limits, new IFQs, loss of data quality as the stocks are more compartmentalized, and conflicts with the nearshore FMP). She recommended taking a narrower focus that looked only at the species or complexes that are not being addressed by stock assessments, such as other fish and elasmobranchs. She wants adequate information in June from which we can actually make an informed decision. The other complexes could be phased in at a later time.

Mr. Myer shared a lot of the same concerns as Ms. Grebel. He noted the need for a socio-economic analysis as recommended by the GAP to help prevent creating new problems like had occurred for the whiting fishery which, by fishing deeper, impacted more overfished species. He noted the potential for several meetings of the Groundfish Allocation Committees and other workload and cost problems.

Ms. Culver agreed with the previous speakers and stated that we need to recognize the issues here are going to take considerable time and effort. We need to prioritize those for the current specifications cycle and approach the whole list with deliberation. We do want to be compliant with National Standard 1, but we need to move forward thoughtfully, using the best data.

Ms. Culver moved and Mr. Lincoln seconded Motion 7 that the Council moves forward with:

- The consideration of restructuring of the stock complex assemblages and to provide additional analysis in June to consider a preliminary preferred alternative at that time.
 - In June, see the bar graphs for OFL component contribution compared to recent levels of removals.
 - Include options for how to manage species that are removed from complexes.

- In addition, approve the GMT recommendations of items 1-4 on page 6 of Agenda Item D.3.b, Supplemental GMT Report, which retains the range of alternatives found in Agenda Item D.3.a, Attachment 1.
- Task the Council Staff to evaluate a June/September and June/September/November process.
- Prioritize the other fish and slope rockfish complexes as a top priority, and other stock complexes as a lower priority.
- Include anticipated costs compared with status quo. Group alternatives of high priority together in the cost analysis.
- Include incorporating concepts in the GMT statement pages 3 and 4 (Agenda Item D.3.b, Supplemental GMT Report); background goals, and purpose and need.
- Request the SSC discuss priorities for improvements in data quality; relative to sampling data.
- Add the GAP Alternative for nearshore rockfish.
- Explore the use of West Coast Groundfish Observer Program and the NMFS trawl survey to evaluate catch ratios.

Ms. Culver stated she believes we do need to move forward with restructuring, and what has been provided in Attachment 1 is a great start. Prior to selecting a preliminary preferred alternative, she would like to see a discussion at the June meeting of a tradeoff for having the final action in September versus November from a process and completeness perspective. She thinks the GMT recommendations are sound and would hesitate to remove any alternatives. If we move forward for slope rockfish, for example, in June we could decide whether or not to keep shortraker in. She appreciates the GMT taking a step back to consider why we are doing this. Does it help us for management? She believes we need more background (along this line) added to Attachment 1. She would like the SSC to discuss priorities for sampling (as the budget for that is static or diminishing) to get a better sense of the priorities associated with the catch accounting, species composition, collection of biological samples, and assessed or non-assessed stocks. This would be helpful to prioritize our limited sampling staff. She believes there could be some benefit to looking at other data sources relative to structuring the complexes to guide as to which stocks would fit better together, that co-occur, and at what proportions.

In response to a question from Ms. Grebel, Ms. Culver stated that her motion recommends retaining the current range of alternatives (item 1 from the GMT report), but is not intended to limit further alternatives that might be analyzed for June.

Mr. Lockhart supported the effort and noted the bottom line is finding the best way to protect the stocks while allowing as much fishing opportunity as possible.

In clarification, Ms. Culver responded that she was not proposing to get rid of any alternatives at this point. All of the alternatives would be analyzed for June. This would assist in focusing the GMT and GAP, giving them a sense of our priorities, and confirming that we are not going to address everything, but rather prioritize what to move forward with in June. In response to Mr. Wolford, she also confirmed that the highest priority for June would be the other fish and slope rockfish complexes. Further consideration would be on the issue of final action in September rather than November.

Motion 7 carried unanimously.

D.4 Implementation of the 2013 Pacific Whiting Fishery under the U.S. – Canada Pacific Whiting Agreement (4/7/2013; 1:53 p.m.)

D.4.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. John DeVore presented the Agenda Item Overview and introduced Agenda Item D.4.a, Attachment 1: Executive Summary of Status of the Pacific hake (Whiting) stock in U.S. and Canadian Waters in 2013 (Full version Available on the Briefing Book Website and CD only).

D.4.b Joint Management Committee Report

Mr. Anderson and Mr. Lockhart presented Agenda Item D.4.b, JMC Report: March 19, 2013 Letter from the Joint Management Committee detailing their recommendations on the 2013 total allowable catch of Pacific Whiting.

D.4.c Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities.

Mr. Dan Erickson presented Agenda Item D.4.c, Supplemental GMT Report.
Mr. Tommy Ancona presented Agenda Item D.4.c, Supplemental GAP Report.
Agenda Item D.4.c, Supplemental NMFS Report.

D.4.d Public Comment (4/7/2013; 2:45 p.m.)

Mr. Dan Waldeck, Pacific Whiting Conservation Cooperative, Portland, Oregon.

D.4.e Council Action: Consider any Necessary Action for Implementation of the 2013 Pacific Whiting Fishery

Ms. Kirchner moved and Mr. Feldner seconded Motion 8 to adopt the recommendations as shown in Agenda Item D.4.c, Supplemental GMT Report for Pacific whiting set-asides of 2,500 mt to accommodate Pacific whiting mortality in research and pink shrimp fisheries.

Ms. Kirchner stated that she believes the GMT gave us their best estimate of what the whiting mortality would be in the research and pink shrimp fisheries. She noted that we do have increased whiting availability, but also that the shrimp fishery greatly reduced their bycatch with a change in the grid space on their bycatch reduction devices (reduction from 1.25 inches to 0.75 inches).

Motion 8 carried unanimously.

D.5 Consider Barotrauma Device Mortality Rates (4/8/2013; 8:05 a.m.)

D.5.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. John DeVore provided the Agenda Item Overview.

D.5.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Mr. John Budrick presented Agenda Item D.5.b, GMT Report: Groundfish Management Team Report on Proposed Discard Mortality for Cowcod, Canary Rockfish, and Yelloweye Rockfish Released Using Descending Devices in the Recreational Fishery (PowerPoint).

Dr. Selina Heppell presented Agenda Item D.5.b, REVISED Supplemental SSC Report.
Ms. Heather Reed and Ms. Lynn Mattes presented Agenda Item D.5.b, Supplemental GMT Report 2.
Mr. Tommy Ancona presented Agenda Item D.5.b, Supplemental GAP Report.
Ms. Michele Culver presented Agenda Item D.5.b, Supplemental WDFW Report.
Ms. Gway Kirchner presented Agenda Item D.5.b, Supplemental ODFW Report.
Ms. Joanna Grebel presented Agenda Item D.5.b, Supplemental CDFW Report.

D.5.c Public Comment (4/8/2013; 9:21 a.m.)

Mr. Ken Franke, Sportfishing Association of California, San Diego, California presented Agenda Item D.5.c, Supplemental Public Comment PowerPoint.
Mr. John Holloway, Recreational Fishing Alliance, Portland, Oregon.
Mr. Jim Martin, Pure Fishing, Oregon.
Mr. Jeff Richards, Coastside Fishing Club, San Carlos, California.
Mr. Bob Ingles, Golden Gate Fisherman's Association, Hayward, California.
Mr. Louis Zimm, San Diego, California.
Mr. Mark Cedergreen, Westport Charter Boat Association, Westport, Washington.
Mr. Tom Marking, McKinleyville, California.

D.5.d Council Action: Discussion and Guidance on Application of Bycatch Mortality Rates Associated with Barotrauma Reduction Devices in Groundfish Fisheries

Ms. Grebel emphasized that while we've heard a lot about "giving credits," it is really about using the best available data rather than using higher mortality rates than are actually occurring.

Mr. Lockhart acknowledged all the good work that has been done with the use of the descending devices and the evidence that shows the mortality is less than the present estimates. However, he still has a problem with exactly how to credit that reduction for future use. He would like more discussion at the GMT and SSC level on the implementation. He would also like further refinement on the confidence level of the work.

Mr. Wolford noted that, in addition to the field studies that form the basis of the GMT report, there is a slew of laboratory work that establishes the theoretical basis of this work. That work includes confirming the fish can see when they are returned, and that they can feed and reproduce. The lab work has also shown that the success rates are dependent on the species. We need to focus on a few constraining species and confirm the mortality rates for those. There is also the issue of how often the information should be updated. Finally, we need to change the behavior on the water and that is where the benefit is critical—to be accepted in the fishing community.

Ms. Culver moved and Mr. Lincoln seconded Motion 10 that the Council approve the revised discard mortality rates for cowcod, canary, and yelloweye rockfish as shown in Agenda Item D.5.b, Supplemental GMT Report, Table 7 on Page 14 with the 90 percent confidence interval as shown in that table; except for the depth bin for "greater than 50 fathoms," change to "50-100 fathoms" and include an additional depth bin of greater than 100 fathoms and assign a mortality rate of 100 percent.

Ms. Culver stated that she agreed with the comments expressed by other Council members as well as the advisory bodies and the states in support of moving forward with these changes. For the last several years, especially with the advent of the non-retention fisheries back in about 2000, the momentum has been building among the recreational fisherman to increase release survivability. The common comment we hear expressed in the recreational fishery is concern over the associated wastage resulting from the mandatory release. This falls in line with the MSA requirement to reduce bycatch and bycatch mortality. However, putting this in perspective, our actions are only applying to a small amount of discarded fish, just three species—cowcod, canary, and yelloweye rockfish. Also, it only applies to the release of fish with descending devices, which currently is not 100 percent. Ms. Culver recommended the SSC review the states' implementation plans and the calculation of the confidence intervals for these different alternatives. The action today does not preclude us from updating this information in the future as new information becomes available. This is a good first step and, given the amount of fish involved here, even if we are a bit off on the percentage, it shouldn't affect the status of the stock and does represent the best available science as we have it in front of us today.

Mr. Pollard supported the motion, but noted that the information in the tables is for 100 percent use of descending devices. It will be important to include consideration of the actual compliance level of the fishermen when assigning a mortality credit.

Ms. Culver agreed and stated her motion does not assume 100 percent compliance. The rates would only apply to those using descending devices. The three states are in the process of determining that percentage.

Mr. Wolford moved and Mr. Brizendine seconded Amendment 1 to Motion 10 to strike the following wording in the motion: "Except for the depth bin for greater than 50 fathoms, change to 50-100 fathoms and include an additional depth bin of greater than 100 fathoms and assign a mortality rate of 100 percent."

Mr. Wolford stated that there is a large body of science on barotrauma and part of it identifies where the fish suffer the real physiological damage. It is generally agreed that the physiological damage occurs as the fish come through the upper two atmospheres. There is no theoretical basis to assume 100 percent mortality at greater depths. He believes the GMT is right to assume a somewhat higher, but far less than 100 percent mortality, below 50 fathoms. He noted that there has been data from Hawaii for depths of 400 fathoms where the fish do survive.

Ms. Culver said she appreciates Mr. Wolford's comments. However, her understanding was that, in the studies examined by the GMT, there were 4 cowcod and 26 proxy species that were caught between 50 and 100 fathoms that were used to assign the 45 percent. We did not have any fish in those studies examined by the GMT from depths greater than 100 fathoms. Her proposal uses the science that the GMT has available and is precautionary for depths greater than 100 fathoms. In the future, as we are able to review new or additional data, those rates can be corrected and revised. Given the information reviewed thus far, she is not comfortable with using the same rates below 100 fathoms and does not support the amendment.

Mr. Lockhart stated that given the data reviewed, he believes the original motion appropriately adds the additional depth bin with 100 percent mortality below 100 fathoms.

Mr. Wolford agreed that we should operate under the best available science and, at present, there isn't any science that suggests 100 percent mortality is the right number. There is a good body of science that suggests the most damage is done in the last two atmospheres and suggests that the mortality rate at the higher depths is not too much different from that above 50 fathoms. Therefore, he believes the best available science does not support a 100 percent mortality rate at depths greater than 100 fathoms.

Mr. Lincoln stated his appreciation for Mr. Wolford's knowledge on this topic. However, he believes it is important to be cognizant of the GMT's careful selection of information and studies used to make their recommendations, and the SSC's review of that data. He does not believe it appropriate to substitute his judgment for that of the GMT and SSC. He does not support the amendment.

Ms. Kirchner stated that she believes it is important to have information in hand from which to make a decision rather than basing the decision on suggestions of what the rates might be. It's a relatively easy process to change the rates when new information is in hand. She is not comfortable with the amendment.

Mr. Wolford stated that the amendment does rely on the GMT statement for the mortality rate at greater than 50 fathoms. He is not substituting his judgment for that of the GMT and SSC. To use another number is substituting the Council's judgment for that of the GMT. Ms. Grebel agreed and noted that new data could come in at any time to change the mortality rates.

Mr. Lockhart stated that he understood the argument for sticking with the GMT recommendation, but also noted that there is a lot of management expertise within the Council and it is not inappropriate to be more precautionary when there is uncertainty in the mortality rate estimates.

Amendment 1 failed (Ms. Kirchner, Mr. Myer, Ms. Culver, Mr. Feldner, Mr. Sones, Mr. Ortman, Mr. Lincoln, and Mr. Lockhart voted no).

Mr. Wolford moved and Mr. Crabbe seconded Amendment 2 to Motion 10 to replace 90 percent in the 50 fathom depth bin with a 75 percent confidence interval.

Mr. Wolford stated that the way the numbers were derived came as a series of choices where each time the more conservative approach was taken to get to the final point estimate. Given that, to go to a 90 percent confidence level is a pretty big step. What's driving him to be comfortable with a lower confidence interval is in the table in the presentation by Mr. Budrick. He showed that the impacts we are likely to have (from the Oregon studies) are only a few percent less, and that the implications for doing this aren't that big. The likelihood for adversely affecting the rebuilding rate is very low. Based on that, he is comfortable with the lower interval. He believes we would not affect the status of the fishery to do this, and the benefit for motivating the fishing public can be significantly enhanced by going to this confidence interval.

Mr. Lockhart stated it is important to recognize that this is a first step on where we are going for descending device mortality and it is a judgment call. He is more confident with the higher confidence interval.

Ms. Culver agreed with Mr. Lockhart and noted this is in line with the GMT recommendations to be more precautionary at this point.

Mr. Wolford had a different understanding of the GMT recommendation.

In clarifying the GMT statement, Ms. Lynn Mattes stated that the GMT left the choice of confidence intervals up to the Council's discretion.

Amendment 2 failed (Mr. Ortmann, Mr. Lockhart, Ms. Culver, Ms. Kirchner, Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Feldner, Mr. Myer, and Mr. Sones voted no).

Mr. Lockhart asked staff what the effect of the motion would be on inseason management for this biennium and its use in stock assessments.

Mr. DeVore stated that before implementing a change in mortality rates in recreational fisheries, we would probably need an evaluation of the implementation plans by the appropriate bodies. Once that was completed, we could go back retroactively to make adjustments.

Ms. Culver responded that she would expect the SSC would review the state implementation plans and bring any concerns to the Council's attention for potential revision. Washington would apply the revisions retrospectively when they have data on the compliance rates and other critical estimates.

Ms. Kirchner replied that ODFW has been collecting the necessary information for nearly a year now and are prepared to implement the new rates when they are adopted.

Ms. Grebel stated that California's implementation would be similar to that of Washington—applied retrospectively.

Motion 10 carried unanimously.

D.6 Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Synthesis Report and Request for Proposals (4/8/2013; 11:26 a.m.)

D.6.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Kerry Griffin provided the Agenda Item Overview and introduced Agenda Item D.6.a, Attachment 1: Request for Proposals (RFP) to Modify Essential Fish Habitat for Pacific Coast Groundfish.

D.6.b NMFS Synthesis Report

Drs. Michelle McClure, Waldo Wakefield and Ole Sheldon provided the NMFS Synthesis Report in PowerPoint (Agenda Item D.6.b, Supplemental NMFS PowerPoint). This presentation contained information from:

- Agenda Item D.6.b, NFMS Synthesis Report: Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Synthesis Report.
- Agenda Item D.6.b, Supplemental NMFS Report: User Guide and Conclusions: Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Synthesis Report.
- Agenda Item D.6.b, Supplemental NMFS Synthesis Report 2: APPENDICES to NMFS Groundfish EFH Synthesis Report.

D.6.c Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities (4/8/2013; 1:16 p.m.)

Dr. Selina Heppell presented Agenda Item D.6.c, Supplemental SSC Report.
 Mr. Brad Pettinger presented Agenda Item D.6.c, Supplemental EFHRC Report.
 Mr. Joel Kawahara presented Agenda Item D.6.c, Supplemental HC Report.
 Mr. Rob Jones presented Agenda Item D.6.c, Supplemental GMT Report.
 Mr. Tommy Ancona presented Agenda Item D.6.c, Supplemental GAP Report.

D.6.d Public Comment

Mr. Craig Helms, Ocean Conservancy, Santa Barbara, California.
 Dr. Geoff Shester and Mr. Mike Levine, Oceana, Monterey, California; presented Agenda Item D.6.b, Supplemental Public Comment (Oceana PowerPoint).
 Mr. Seth Atkinson, Natural Resources Defense Council, San Francisco, California.
 Agenda Item D.6.d, Public Comment 1.
 Agenda Item D.6.d, Public Comment 2.
 Agenda Item D.6.d, Supplemental Public Comment 3.

D.6.e Council Action: Discussion and Guidance on Groundfish EFH Review Synthesis Report and Initiate Phase 2 of the Review by Approving the Request for Proposals to Modify Groundfish EFH

Ms. Culver expressed appreciation for the work the Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) has done on the Synthesis Report and considers it ready for Council approval. Regarding the revised request for proposals (RFP), she expressed concern over how we would handle some of the information and evaluations requested by the Essential Fish Habitat Review Committee (EFHRC) that would require confidential information. Ms. Culver noted that in the 2006 effort, the states used confidential logbook information to ascertain the impact of the proposals on the fishing activities. The reports they provided then protected confidentiality. They could possibly do the same again, but would need to know the questions well in advance and would not be able to provide it by September. She wondered if NMFS had thought about that evaluation piece of this effort.

Mr. Lockhart thought something similar to the 2006 effort could be used here, but not by September. Perhaps the EFHRC would do their review and exclude any items that use confidential data. Then, after the proposals are received, we could work with the states to come up with a process to deliver it to the EFHRC. The EFHRC could report back on that incremental piece of information at the November meeting.

Mr. Wolford asked if the previous analyses using the confidential data had been a big effort.

Ms. Culver responded that it was a moderate level of effort, depending on the number of proposals. Ms. Kirchner noted that they have one staff person to do the Geographic Information System work, and it could be a substantial work load. She couldn't commit to a November deadline. Ms. Grebel also could not commit to the November timing for California.

Mr. Griffin agreed that this was a difficult proposition and might require work to the extent possible by the states and observer program to provide important pieces by November, but would need to continue beyond November as well. The decision in November would just be whether or not to accept the proposal for further analysis.

Ms. Culver stated that they were supportive of EFH and proposals coming forward through the Council process. However, their preference is to do them within the department, and perhaps we could partner with NMFS staff in terms of efficiency. She liked Mr. Griffin's suggestion. If our action in November would just be to decide whether or not to accept the proposal, based on level of completeness relative to the RFP application, the effects on the communities and fisheries would be covered under the subsequent NEPA process. The EFHRC could focus its review for November on that determination.

In response to a question from Mr. Wolford, Mr. Griffin confirmed that the EFHRC might also develop its own proposal, or help coordinate an amalgam of proposals. The Council task in November would not be to select a winning proposal, but to generate information, ideas, and changes that could be implemented pending further consideration and analysis.

Dr. McIsaac noted that, regarding the Synthesis Report, the SSC has not completed its review of the appendices. The Council could still adopt it with the consideration of the SSC completing its review.

Mr. Lockhart moved and Mr. Pollard seconded Motion 11 to direct the NWFSC to finish the Synthesis Report, taking into account the recommendations by the EFHRC in paragraph 1a, b, and c (Page 1 of Agenda Item D.6.c, Supplemental EFHRC Report) and that they consider any advice received from the SSC after their review of the Appendix; and that this Synthesis Report and any future SSC comments be made available on the Council's website.

Mr. Lockhart stated he believes the work of the NWFSC and EFHRC has identified a large volume of new information that is available to us and, most importantly, to the people working on proposals. This effort meets the requirements for the five-year EFH review. We are in a good position to develop proposals and move forward.

Motion 11 carried unanimously.

Mr. Lockhart moved and Mr. Lincoln seconded Motion 12 that the Council adopt the RFP in Agenda Item D.6.a, Attachment 1 (Request for Proposals to Modify Pacific Coast Groundfish EHF, which reflects changes made at the September 2012 Council Meeting); and release the RFP, initiating Phase II of the five-year review process.

Ms. Culver stated that, as it now stands, the EFHRC would not be able to evaluate the effects of proposals on fishing or loss of revenue and suggested that we might need to amend the motion. Mr. Griffin noted that there was language in the RFP that did not require a proposal be disqualified if it did not answer all of the EFHRC's requested information. The Council concurred that no amendment was required.

Motion 12 carried unanimously.

Mr. Lockhart moved and Mr. Lincoln seconded Motion 13 that the Council request the completed Synthesis Report, and any other information, should be made publically available and the RFP issued by May 1, and that all proposals are submitted to the Council by July 31.

Motion 13 carried unanimously.

D.7 Trawl Rationalization Trailing Actions – Electronic Monitoring Regulatory Process (4/9/2013; 1:00 p.m.)

D.7.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Jim Seger presented the Agenda Item Overview and Introduced:

- Agenda Item D.7.a, Attachment 1: Terms of Reference for the Pacific Council Workshop on Electronic Monitoring for Vessels participating in the Groundfish Trawl Catch Shares Program.
- Agenda Item D.7.a, Attachment 2: Trawl Rationalization Goals and Objectives and Provisions for Tracking and Monitoring.

D.7.b Electronic Monitoring Workshop Report

Mr. Jim Seger presented Agenda Item D.7.b, EM Workshop Report: Trawl Catch Share Program Electronic Monitoring Workshop Report.

Dr. Michelle McClure provided more information from the NWFSC regarding the Biological Opinion.

D.7.c Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission Report

Mr. Dave Colpo and Mr. Randy Fisher presented Agenda Item D.7.c, PSMFC Report 1: Electronic Monitoring Program: Review of the 2012 Season and Agenda Item D.7.c, PSMFC Report 2: Electronic Monitoring Program: Plan for the 2013 Season.

D.7.d Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Dr. Selina Heppell presented Agenda Item D.7.d, Supplemental SSC Report.

Mr. Dan Erickson presented Agenda Item D.7.d, Supplemental GMT Report.

Mr. Tommy Ancona presented Agenda Item D.7.d, Supplemental GAP Report.

Mr. Dayna Matthews presented Agenda Item D.7.d, Supplemental EC report.

Mr. Frank Lockhart, NMFS; presented oral comments concerning the process for considering electronic monitoring and considerations for under what conditions we would be comfortable with electronic monitoring versus observers.

Ms. Michele Culver, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW); presented oral information regarding the WDFW perspective on electronic monitoring and the importance of accountability in the fishery and workload issues.

Ms. Joanna Grebel, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW); presented oral information regarding the CDFW perspective on electronic monitoring.

D.7.e Public Comment

Agenda Item D.7.e, Supplemental Public Comment.

Mr. Brent Paine and Mr. Bob Dooley, United Catcher Boats, Seattle, Washington.

Mr. Seth Atkinson, Natural Resources Defense Council, San Francisco, California.

Mr. Pete Leipzig, Fisherman's Marketing Association, McKinleyville, California.

Mr. Brad Pettinger, Oregon Trawl Association, Brookings, Oregon.

Mr. Steve Bodnar, Coos Bay Trawlers Association, Coos Bay, Oregon.

Mr. Kevin Dunn, Fisherman, Astoria, Oregon.

D.7.f Council Action: Discussion and Guidance on Electronic Monitoring Issues (4/9/2013; 4:14 p.m.)

Ms. Lowman moved and Ms. Kirchner seconded Motion 19 that the Council:

1. Confirm that the primary focus of integration of electronic monitoring (EM) into trawl catch share monitoring is to address compliance monitoring needs.
2. Adopt the regulatory objectives contained in the Agenda Item D.7.b EM Workshop report as modified by the recommendations in the Agenda Item D7.d Supplemental GAP Report.
3. Direct the Council staff to work with Federal and state agencies to develop a white paper that would identify monitoring performance standards and other requirements that EM proposals would have to meet.
4. Develop an initial scoping package that would include the strawman proposals contained in the EM Workshop reports as initial EM alternatives (splitting pot and longline as recommended in the Supplemental GAP Report), as well as an option of electronic monitoring participation agreements, the information resulting from the information requests in the report as available, and an initial list of the issues and tradeoffs that will need to be addressed.

Ms. Lowman stated that our monitoring program needs to be a combination of observers as necessary to meet our stock assessment and other science needs, as well as trying to provide for alternative tools to meet some of the compliance monitoring needs. She thinks we have made a good start with the regulatory objectives that came out of the workshop, as modified by the GAP. She expects this would be refined or added to through a scoping process. There is work to do to understand our standards and monitoring requirements that any proposal would have to address. That is the purpose of the whitepaper in the motion which would come back to the Council for further refinement. The initial scoping package would be developed to include the strawmen that are contained in the workshop reports. The pot and longline fisheries are different enough that it will be helpful to split them into two. We discussed some different ways to have participation

agreements, but the step in item 3 will also provide an opportunity for some other creative ways that might come out of the scoping process. We have a beginning on the list of information requests to include in the scoping. Whatever information is available needs to be part of that scoping package.

Ms. Culver asked who would develop the scoping package—the Council staff with the state and Federal agencies, or just through the normal Council process with the whole Council involved?

Ms. Lowman responded that it would be the Council staff with assistance from the Federal and state agencies, and sent out for people to consider and provide comments.

Ms. Culver moved and Mr. Lincoln seconded Amendment 1 to Motion 19 to delay the development of the initial scoping package until item 3 is completed; and, as part of the scoping package, the strawman proposals could be considered, but there might be things that come out of the whitepaper that we might want to have as a different starting point, rather than those proposals.

Mr. Lockhart presumed the motion meant that scoping activity could continue, but it should be informed by item 3 and not completed until the whitepaper is completed.

Ms. Culver agreed, but noted that we may want to tweak those a bit or have different proposals, depending on what we come up with in the whitepaper. In response to additional questions, Ms. Culver attempted to further clarify her motion. She believes the whitepaper, with our performance standards and some sideboards of what the Council might do, needs to go forward before further scoping and public input. She stated that the scoping session should be delayed until after June. She was not speaking to whether or not the whitepaper is completed for June.

Amendment 1 carried unanimously.

Mr. Lockhart spoke to the meaning of “compliance monitoring needs” in item 1 of the motion. He noted that could be very broadly defined and wondered if there was a need to narrow it down to help guide drafting of the whitepaper.

Ms. Lowman stated that “compliance monitoring needs” are what we need in order to be sure that we have catch accounting, that we can enforce the regulations we create.

Mr. Lockhart spoke to the last part of item 3 regarding standards that EM proposals would have to meet. This seems to be setting up a process in which overall compliance monitoring is the goal, then having monitoring performance standards developed, and then an EM proposal process would be created. Who develops the proposals?

Ms. Lowman suggested that perhaps alternatives could be substituted for proposals.

Regarding item 3, Ms. Grebel wondered how Ms. Lowman saw that playing out with regard to which staff takes the lead, meetings, edits, etc.

Ms. Lowman responded that her thinking was the Council staff would take the lead. They would work informally through email and calls with different groups, but there would not be a workgroup.

Mr. Myer moved and Ms. Culver seconded Amendment 2 to Motion 19 to strike the word “needs” and insert “to achieve individual accountability of catch and bycatch.”

Mr. Myer stated that after the discussion about what compliance monitoring meant, he looked at the trawl rationalization goals and objectives in Attachment 2. The words in the motion come directly from that attachment. Any further clarity would hopefully come out of the whitepaper.

Amendment 2 carried unanimously. Motion 19, as amended, carried unanimously.

Ms. Lowman moved and Ms. Kirchner seconded Motion 20 that the Council:

1. Forward the recommendations from the EM Workshop found on page vi of the Workshop report.
2. Request NMFS and Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) work together to determine what should be included in “total catch” for catch accounting purposes and provide this information to the Council as well to assure that consistent definitions are used during the 2013 study.

Ms. Lowman stated that there were some good suggestions from the workshop and it is worth forwarding those. However, as noted by GMT, GAP, and the SSC, we do need to determine what we mean by “total catch” so that it is consistent.

Ms. Culver had concerns about item 2 and thought it should be resolved through the whitepaper.

Ms. Kirchner agreed, but noted that the PSMFC study would be starting soon, prior to the completion of the whitepaper. She did not see this directive as defining what total catch is from here forward through all our processes. Rather, it is direction for the study so that we can compare observer data and EM data that comes from the study.

Dr. Hanson was also uncomfortable with item 2. PSMFC is not a regulatory agency and does not have a role in setting regulations. However, PSMFC can provide expertise on technical matters such as various camera angles and can clarify what can and cannot be seen.

Ms. Lowman said the intent of this is to be consistent with what the observers are doing and accounting as catch is the same as what is counted as catch on the camera. She was open to an amendment for clarity if that would help.

Ms. Culver stated she would be more comfortable if the PSMFC study would be consistent with NFMS’ definition of total catch in the observer program to make comparisons possible.

Ms. Culver moved and Ms. Grebel seconded Amendment 1 to Motion 20 to change item 2 by striking the original language and replacing it with “*PSMFC conform to the NFMS definition of “total catch” for catch accounting purposes in this study.*”

Mr. Lockhart thought it should be clear that this was just for the 2013 study.

Dr. Hanson moved and Mr. Pollard seconded a substitute Amendment (Amendment 2 to Motion 20) that item 2 be changed to read: "Request PSMFC conforms to NMFS definition of "total catch" for catch accounting for purposes of this study to the maximum extent practicable."

Dr. Hanson said he was a little sensitive when the Council directs the states or the Commission to do something. He prefers to use request. PSMFC fully intends to comply.

Ms. Kirchner asked if NMFS does have a definition of catch.

Dr. McClure responded that she is not aware of what the definition is. However, the observer program is exemplary in its defining of protocols and she will check on it and get back to Council staff.

Amendment 2 (Substitute for Amendment 1) passed (Ms. Culver, Mr. Myer, and Mr. Lincoln voted no). Motion 20, as amended, carried unanimously.

Ms. Lowman moved and Ms. Kirchner seconded Motion 21 that the Council:

1. Move forward the process and schedule shown on page vii of the Workshop report recognizing that attainment of the schedule will be dependent on budget and workload considerations with the following changes: have the performance standards whitepaper at the June 2013 meeting; move full scoping to September 2013. Scoping to begin in the summer of 2014; this would push the other items described in the table to the selection of a FPA to November 2015.
2. Request that NMFS NW Region evaluate the implications on staff workload and ability to address other important trailing action needs should an out of cycle "EFP" avenue be explored to begin to allow testing EM usage without an observer prior to completion of the full regulatory package.
3. Explore the relative budget implications and other costs/benefits relative to having a workgroup be appointed with the characteristics described in recommendations of the GAP and the Enforcement Consultants (EC), or to have a subgroup of the GAP be tasked with the responsibilities that would be assigned to the workgroup.

Ms. Lowman stated that regarding the first item, she was aware of the desire to move forward as rapidly as possible. Regarding the second bullet, we heard interest that if the field studies are promising, we might explore using an out of cycle EFP to allow testing prior to completion of the full program. This would depend on the workload created for NMFS and would not want to slow down other important parts of the trailing actions. Regarding item 3, while she is aware of budget issues, she believes it is important to have the right expertise available to ensure timely progress. She wants to make sure that a small part of the GAP could provide the needed expertise.

Ms. Grebel expressed concern with the Council staff's ability to meet the June 2013 deadline for the whitepaper, given the national fisheries conference in Washington, DC, which will be facilitated by the staff in May.

Dr. McIsaac agreed with that concern and asked that the Council discuss the issue further under Agenda Item B.7.

Mr. Crabbe said he believes all the flexibility you need is already available in the motion ("dependent on budget and workload considerations"). It is just sending the message that we would like to move forward as soon as possible.

Ms. Culver stated that the first motion took care of moving forward with the industry as quickly as possible. She believes the performance standards will take longer to develop than the time between now and the June meeting. Also, the process to approve the standards will likely take more than one meeting. She suggests a two-meeting process using the September and November Council meetings. Once we have those performance standards defined and hold discussions with some industry members and stake holders, we could hear from them whether they still support EM as one of their highest priorities, now that they know what performance standards have to be met and how much it might cost, and whether they will be able to see the benefits of cost reduction that they are anticipating. It would be good to get that feedback before we say yes, for sure, we want to go forward with scoping and developing alternatives and following the rest of the process outlined here. I would see the September-November schedule for the whitepaper on the performance standards and move the scoping session on EM to begin either in June or September of 2014.

Ms. Culver moved and Mr. Lockhart seconded Amendment 1 to Motion 21: regarding item 1, strike out "*have the performance standards whitepaper at the June 2013 meeting; move full scoping to Sept 2013*"; replace with "*whitepaper on performance standards considered in draft at the Sept 2013 meeting; finalized at the November 2013 meeting. Scoping to begin in the summer of 2014; this would push the other items described in the table to the selection of a FPA to November 2015.*"

Ms. Culver said we've heard the message clearly that this is important for industry and represents a priority for them. However, there are other priority trailing issues waiting to be processed as well. This week we've heard from the GAP on other new priority issues which include the widow quota share allocation and the removal of the Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA) boundaries. She was not sure just where industry would rank the EM program. At the March Council meeting, we had considerable discussion about looking ahead at the 2015-2016 specification cycle and completion of the Amendment 24 Tier 1 EIS. I also think that we need to have some information from field studies or EFPs that help us set priorities about the development of EM alternatives, and for which sectors or which portions of the fishery. We're really not going to have the results of those studies or EFPs until this later time frame. While I think it's good to allow NMFS to allow EFPs to potentially continue as they're developing the full regulatory package, I want some information up front. I believe we're actually getting a request from the industry that they want an exemption to observer coverage. They want an EFP for the entire industry right now to be exempt from observer coverage and to have the flexibility to take either an observer or a camera. I think that before the Council decides we want that to

happen, we need to have some data, some science, some insurance that we're going to be able to achieve this individual accountability of catch and bycatch. Even with my proposed revised schedule, it is still ambitious because there are a lot of issues and nuances that we will need to consider in building this package.

[Council adjourned for the evening at 5:18 p.m. and reconvened on 4/10/2013 at 8:08 a.m.]

Responding to a question of clarification by Mr. Crabbe, Ms. Culver stated that she was trying to put together a realistic schedule that would not give the public a higher expectation of how fast this might be done. However, the motion does not preclude moving faster if that turns out to be possible. She has heard that funds may be available for the Council to hire someone to work on this, which might speed things up.

Mr. Lockhart noted that the normal rulemaking process for developing these kind of equipment-based rules could take two years after the Council decision. Also, no decisions have been made yet on a new person to work on this. However, a request is being worked on and he was unsure of when it would be acted on.

In further discussion concerning the timetable, Mr. Seger indicated that he thought the staff could have a fairly substantial preliminary draft of the whitepaper for the Council to review in June. Other questions were explored with regard to various ways and timing for moving the program forward. Mr. Crabbe thought the amendment gave the message that the Council was not going to move forward as quickly as possible and opposed the amendment. Ms. Lowman also spoke in opposition to the amendment, particularly with regard to scoping not beginning until the summer of 2014.

Mr. Myer moved and Ms. Culver seconded to amend Amendment 1 (Amendment 1a to Motion 21) by striking the last sentence in Amendment 1, which reads as follows: "*Scoping to begin in the summer of 2014; this would push the other items described in the table to the selection of a FPA to November 2015.*"

Mr. Myer stated that it seems like the problem with the amendment is just the part about what's going to happen after the November meeting, how we move forward, and that we are not going to move fast enough.

Ms. Culver said the real purpose of the amendment was to make sure we had sufficient time to develop the performance standards, which is captured in the first sentence. In November we can have the discussion of where we go from there. She supports the amendment.

Mr. Lockhart clarified that he did not think approval of the whitepaper had to be more than a one-meeting process, which could occur in September. Further discussion clarified that the result of the motion and amendments would be to have scoping start in September. The whitepaper would be well-developed at that point, but whether or not it was actually adopted would not prevent starting the scoping in September.

Amendment 1a carried unanimously.

Council discussion further clarified that the Council would not have to have the final performance standards before scoping could begin.

Ms. Culver stated that as we set the Council agenda for June and September, we can talk about if we are ready for scoping. Ms. Lowman agreed, but said she also thought we talked about having a check-in in June to see how the whitepaper is progressing and to answer any pertinent questions. We can discuss that further under agenda planning.

Amendment 1 to Motion 21, as amended by Amendment 1a, carried unanimously.

Mr. Lockhart asked for clarity on what people envision could be happening on the water with the observer program in 2014-2015 in regard to item 2 in the motion.

Ms. Lowman replied that the observer program would still be in place as it currently exists with the possible exception of some small test programs, if they could be developed under an out-of-cycle EFP. That EFP would be reviewed by the Council.

Motion 21, as amended, carried unanimously.

Some Council members provided comments on some of their thoughts or concerns about how the program might work out in the long-run, including whether or not it would result in cost savings.

D.8 Consideration of Inseason Adjustments (4/10/2013; 9:24 a.m.)

D.8.a Agenda Item Overview

Ms. Kelly Ames provided the Agenda Item Overview.

D.8.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Ms. Michele Culver presented Agenda Item D.8.b, Supplemental WDFW Report.

Mr. Frank Lockhart advised the Council that NMFS will not be implementing the inseason action requested at the April Council meeting to change the trawl RCA in Period 2.

Mr. Dan Erickson presented Agenda Item D.8.b, Supplemental GMT Report.

Mr. Tommy Ancona presented Agenda Item D.8.b, Supplemental GAP Report – as amended to indicate the proposed change in the RCA would provide approximately \$814,000 in increased landing revenue.

D.8.c Public Comment

Mr. Rod Moore, Westcoast Seafood Processors Association, Portland, Oregon.

Mr. Jeff Lackey, F/V Miss Sue, Newport, Oregon.

D.8.d Council Action: Adopt Recommendations for Adjustments to 2013 Groundfish Fisheries

Ms. Culver moved and Mr. Lincoln seconded Motion 22 that the Council adopt the inseason adjustments contained in the WDFW recommendations (Agenda Item D.8.b, Supplemental

WDFW Report, April 2013) which are to adopt Federal regulations that conform with Washington recreational fisheries, specifically:

Between the U.S./Canada border and 48°10' N. latitude (Cape Alava) (Washington Marine Area 4):

1. Adopt a minimum size limit of 18 inches for cabezon and reduce the daily bag limit from two per angler per day to one per angler per day.
2. Reduce the minimum size limit for lingcod from 24 inches to 22 inches.

Ms. Culver stated that the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission recently took the action proposed in this motion which will go into effect on May 1. By this motion, she is asking NMFS to adopt consistent regulations and to also have the same effective date.

Motion 22 carried unanimously.

Mr. Myer moved and Ms. Kirchner seconded Motion 23 that the Council adopt the GAP recommendation shown in Agenda Item D.8.b, Supplemental GAP Report, April 2013, on page 2. Those recommendations are to make changes to the trawl RCA boundaries north of 40°10' N. lat. to 48°10' N. lat. through the remainder of 2014 beginning in period 6 of 2013. Specifically:

Period	Shoreward	Seaward
2013: Period 6	100 fathoms	150 fathoms
2014: Periods 1-6	100 fathoms	150 fathoms

Mr. Myer stated that his motion was essentially the same motion that was passed at the last Council meeting. It will allow NMFS to move the action through its formal rulemaking procedures with adequate time for public comment and the increased landing revenues are still a significant amount of money for the fleet.

Motion 23 carried unanimously.

E. Salmon Management

E.1 Tentative Adoption of 2013 Ocean Salmon Management Measures for Analysis (4/6/2013; 1:54 p.m.)

E.1.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Mike Burner presented the Agenda Item Overview and introduced the following reference materials:

- *Preseason Report II: Proposed Alternatives and Environmental Assessment – Part 2 for 2013 Ocean Salmon Fishery Regulations* (mailed prior to the hearings and available at meetings).
- Agenda Item E.1.a, Attachment 1: Emergency Changes to the Salmon FMP.

- Agenda Item E.1.a, Attachment 2: FR 97-22094: Policy Guidelines for the Use of Emergency Rules.

E.1.b Update on Estimated Impacts of March 2013 Alternatives

Dr. Robert Kope reviewed some updates to the stock impact estimates in Preseason Report II based on recent modeling.

E.1.c Summary of Public Hearings

Mr. Rich Lincoln presented Agenda Item E.1.c, Supplemental Public Hearing Report 1 (Westport).

Mr. Jeff Feldner presented Agenda Item E.1.c, Supplemental Public Hearing Report 2 (Coos Bay).

Mr. David Crabbe presented Agenda Item E.1.c, Supplemental Public Hearing Report 3 (Eureka).

E.1.d Recommendations of the U.S. Section of the Pacific Salmon Commission

Mr. David Bedford updated the Council regarding actions of the U.S. Section of the Pacific Salmon Commission. He stated that the only new information since the March briefing was that the Chinook Technical Committee delivered the abundance indices that will apply to the 2013 season. Dr. Kope has already provided you with the impacts of these changes in his report.

E.1.e Recommendations of the North of Cape Falcon Forum

Mr. Phil Anderson reported that significant progress has been made in the North of Falcon Forum, but some issues remain. He is cautiously optimistic that they will come up with a package that will complement the Council's work by the end of the week. Mr. Steve Williams agreed that they were near concurrence in a plan when they left the last meeting and there is primarily some shaping of the fisheries yet to do.

E.1.f Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Mr. David Sones introduced the tribal spokespersons.

Mr. Mike Orcutt presented Agenda Item E.1.f, Supplemental Hoopa Valley Tribe Report.

Mr. Dave Hillemeier presented Agenda Item E.1.f, Supplemental Yurok Tribal Comments.

Mr. Stuart Ellis, Mr. Herb Jackson, Mr. Wilbur Slockish Jr., Mr. Bruce Jim, and Mr. Chris Williams presented Agenda Item E.1.f, Supplemental CRITFC Tribal Report and the Snake River Fall Chinook PowerPoint.

Mr. Phil Anderson presented information regarding actions in the North of Falcon Forum. He noted that conservation of mid-Hood Canal Chinook (a small stock of about 250 fish) is one of the management objectives adopted by the Council. As of the last impact modeling we were at a 12.3 percent exploitation rate, and we need to get to 12.0 percent. It will be necessary to close a lot of fisheries to reduce the exploitation rate to 12.0 percent, so we are looking at several possibilities, including making some subarea management changes to deal with it. Mr. Anderson also noted other instances where a reduction and equitable sharing of impacts is being worked on, including Thompson Coho, lower Columbia River Tule, and the Chehalis Chinook stock where a Gray's

Harbor Control Zone will be used to limit fisheries when the fish are returning into the river.

Mr. Steve Williams concurred in the need to iron out the complex problems with our partners north of Falcon. To the south he identified comments about caution with the Klamath stock. He expressed his appreciation for the good cooperation among parties working on these contentious issues.

Ms. Yaremko echoed Mr. Williams comments and expressed appreciation for how well the advisory body representatives are working together to resolve any issues.

Mr. Tim Roth complimented the parties for the process this year, especially North of Falcon, considering the number of parties that are working together in managing the fisheries.

Lt. David Anderson presented Agenda Item E.1.f, Supplemental EC Report.

Mr. Butch Smith presented Agenda Item E.1.f, Supplemental SAS Report: Proposed Salmon Management Measures for Tentative Adoption (April 6, 2013). Mr. Jim Olson, Mr. Paul Heikkila, and Mr. Aaron Newman presented the commercial options; Mr. Steve Watrous, Mr. Mike Sorenson, Mr. Richard Heap, and Mr. Marc Gorelnik presented the recreational options.

E.1.g Public Comment

No comment at the meeting. The briefing book contained the following comments.

Agenda Item E.1.g, Public Comment, Letter from Mr. Steve Godin.

Agenda Item E.1.g, Supplemental Public Comment 2.

Agenda Item E.1.g, Supplemental Public Comment 3.

Agenda Item E.1.g, Supplemental Public Comment 4, Email to PFMC from Coastside Fishing Club dated March 21, 2013.

E.1.h Council Action: Adopt Tentative 2013 Ocean Salmon Management Measures for Analysis (4/6/2013; 3:47 p.m.)

Referencing Agenda Item E.1.h, Supplemental Tribal Statement, Mr. Sones moved and Mr. Pollard seconded Motion 3: Adopt for the tentative Treaty Indian ocean troll fishery management and for analysis by the Salmon Technical Team, a Chinook quota of 52,500 and a coho quota of 47,500; the fisheries to consist of a May/June Chinook-only fishery and a July/August/September all species fishery. The Chinook will be split 26,250 in May/June and 26,250 in July-September. Any Chinook remaining from the May/June fishery may be transferred on an impact-neutral basis to the July-September fishery.

Mr. Sones noted that there were still concerns with some of the Chinook and coho numbers which involve inside fisheries, but the coastal tribes are comfortable to move this forward at this time.

Motion 3 carried unanimously.

Mr. Anderson moved and Mr. Lincoln seconded Motion 4 to adopt for STT collation and analysis, the tentative non-Indian commercial and recreational fisheries North of Cape Falcon as presented in Agenda Item E.1.f, Supplemental SAS Report, with the following modifications on Page 7, U.S./Canada border to Queets River: replace May 10-12 with May 11-12; May 17-19 with May 18-19; and June 15-28 with June 22-28.

Mr. Anderson explained that the reason for the change in the season dates was to ensure that the fishery would stay within its 8,000 Chinook quota and not require quota from any other season.

Motion 4 carried unanimously.

Mr. Steve Williams moved and Mr. Feldner seconded Motion 5 to adopt tentative commercial and recreational alternatives for Cape Falcon to the OR/CA border as contained in Agenda Item E.1.f, Supplemental SAS Report, including the appropriate requirements, definitions, restrictions, or exceptions.

Mr. Williams said that they have pared down the options, and this motion will give us the opportunity to see what amount of work remains to achieve the appropriate level of caution.

Motion 5 carried unanimously.

Mr. Williams offered guidance to the STT to model the impacts for Option 1 as found in the footnote on page 10 in Table 7 of Preseason Report 2. Further, he asked for confirmation that work was ongoing regarding the effort to consider alternatives for part d under C.5 in the recreational measures, which concerns determination of significant impacts in inseason transfers. Mr. Turner confirmed that they were still working on how best to include and word this consideration, and it would most likely not be as a regulation.

Ms. Yaremko moved and Mr. Crabbe seconded Motion 6 to adopt tentative commercial and recreational alternatives for the area from the OR/CA border to the U.S./Mexico border as presented in Agenda Item E.1.f, Supplemental SAS Report.

Motion 6 carried unanimously.

Dr. Kope pointed out that the recreational seasons in the San Francisco and Monterey areas in June and July contain five-day openings and two-day closures. He noted that the STT had expressed a concern for these short duration closures that are under time/area management rather than quota management. These short closures may not dampen the effort in proportion to the number of days closed per month, and the modeling likely underestimates the catch.

E.2 Clarify Council Direction on 2013 Management Measures (4/7/2013; 2:50 p.m.)

E.2.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Mike Burner presented the Agenda Item Overview.

E.2.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Dr. Robert Kope presented Agenda Item E.2.b, Supplemental STT Report: Preliminary Analysis of Tentative 2013 Ocean Salmon Fishery Management Measures.

Mr. Bob Turner presented information relating to Agenda Item E.2.b, Supplemental NMFS Report: Draft Letter regarding the language as shown in Preseason Report II, Table 2, Section c.5.d, Alternative III.

Mr. Butch Smith provided SAS comments regarding the Draft Letter.

E.2.c Public Comment

None.

E.2.d Council Guidance and Direction

[All changes recommended below are in reference to the tentatively-adopted management measures in Agenda Item E.2.b, Supplemental STT Report.]

Mr. Anderson provided information regarding the work occurring in the North of Falcon process and recommended two changes to the management alternatives:

1. On page 1 – change the overall non-Indian total allowable catch (TAC) to 89,000 coho marked with a healed adipose fin clip (marked).
2. On page 7 (to help meet the conservation objective for mid-Hood Canal Chinook) – maintain the current overall non-Indian 88,000 TAC, split 50/50 per sport and commercial fisheries, but add harvest guidelines for the area north of the Queets River. The commercial troll Chinook quota north of the Queets River will be managed using an overall harvest guideline of 14,800 fish. The May/June timeframe will be managed under a harvest guideline of 8,000 fish with the balance used in the later summer timeframe. Any fish remaining in the quota from the May/June fishery would be available to add to the later fishery quota. This approach should result in the same reduction of impacts to mid-Hood Canal Chinook as if we had reduced the quota to 75,000 while resulting in higher commercial and recreational quotas. The salmon framework management plan allows for subarea quotas to protect weak stocks.

Mr. Sones stated the tribes have proposed no changes at this time.

Mr. Williams stated he had only one change for the alternatives which concerns the Lower Columbia natural (LCN) coho and addresses some issues of inside and outside fisheries. He recommended that on page 8, under Cape Falcon to OR/CA border, the language would read “July 1 through earlier of July 31 or a landed catch of 10,500 marked coho.”

Ms. Yaremko provided the following guidance to help reduce the impact rates for the commercial and recreational seasons on the age-4 Klamath and Sacramento River runs and to better align the commercial seasons:

1. Page 3 -
 - a. Horse Mt. to Point Arena (Fort Bragg): change May 14-31 to May 22-31; June 1-8 and 23-30 to June 1-8 and 21-30.
 - b. Pt. Arena to Pigeon Point (San Francisco): change Jun 1-8 and 23-30 to June 1-8 and 21-30.
 - c. Pigeon Point to U.S./Mexico Border (Monterey): change Jun 1-10 and 21-30 to June 1-8 and 21-30.
2. Page 9 - Pigeon Point to U.S./Mexico Border (Monterey): remove the 20 inch size limit after July 31.

Mr. Turner recommended accepting the language under Alternative III on page 10 for describing actions under C.5.d regarding inseason changes in mark-selective fisheries.

E.3 Salmon Amendment 18 – Essential Fish Habitat Revisions (4/8/2013; 2:51 p.m.)

E.3.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Kerry Griffin provided the Agenda Item Overview.

E.3.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Mr. John Stadler presented Agenda Item E.3.b, NMFS Report: EFH and ESA Section 10 (j) issues; and Agenda Item E.3.b, Supplemental NMFS Report 2: Additional Alternatives for Consideration.

Mr. Joel Kawahara presented Agenda Item E.3.b, Supplemental HC Report.

E.3.c Public Comment

Mr. Paul Alexander, Commercial Troller, Salem, Oregon.

E.3.d Council Action: Further Consideration of Alternatives for Revision of Salmon EFH in Amendment 18

Mr. Griffin clarified that the action before the Council today was to adopt a revised suite of alternatives for review and development of a draft EA. The final preferred alternative would then likely be adopted in September from among the alternatives adopted here.

Mr. Turner moved and Mr. Anderson seconded Motion 14 to adopt the amended suite of alternatives contained in Agenda Item E.3.b, Supplemental NMFS Report 2, including changes as reflected from the September 2012 Council Meeting, and including new alternatives 2A, 2B, and 6E.

Mr. Turner stated that NMFS periodically has a request or an initiative to re-establish a population in an area where it has been extirpated. Typically it is controversial within the community, and one way to reduce the controversy is to re-establish the population without listing it by using the 10j process. The reason for including alternatives 2A, 2B, and 6E is to be consistent with the ESA policy directive by not adding EFH to that area where the experimental population is being established while still allowing recognition of the Council's long-term objective to reconsider the EFH every five years.

Motion 14 carried unanimously.

Ms. Lowman and Mr. Griffin concurred that any action on the future timeline for completing the EFH review process would be handled under the Council meeting planning agenda item.

E.4 Final Action on 2013 Management Measures (4/10/2013; 1:43 p.m.)

E.4.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Mike Burner presented the Agenda Item Overview.

E.4.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Dr. Robert Kope presented Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report: STT Analysis of Tentative Ocean Salmon Fishery Management Measures.

Mr. Wilbur Slockish, Jr., with Mr. Bruce Jim and Mr. Herb Jackson presented Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental CRITFC Tribal Report.

Mr. David Sones presented Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental Tribal Report 2.

Mr. Bob Turner presented Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental NMFS Report.

E.4.c Public Comment

Mr. Joel Kawahara, Salmon Troller, Quilcene, Washington.

E.4.d Council Action: Adopt Final Management Measures for 2013 Ocean Salmon Fisheries

Mr. Sones moved and Mr. Pollard seconded Motion 25 that the following management structure be adopted by the Council for the 2013 Treaty Indian ocean salmon troll fisheries: The Treaty Indian ocean troll fishery would have a quota of:

- 52,500 Chinook
- 47,500 coho.

The overall Chinook quota would be divided into a 26,250-Chinook sub-quota for the May 1 through June 30 Chinook only fishery and a 26,250-Chinook sub-quota for the all species fishery in the time period of July 1 through September 15. The Treaty troll fishery would close upon the projected attainment of either of the Chinook or coho quota. Any Chinook remaining from the May/June Chinook only fishery may be transferred on an impact neutral basis to the July-September all species fishery. Other applicable regulations are shown in Table 3 of Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report: Analysis of Tentative 2013 Ocean Salmon Fishery Management Measures, April 10, 2013.

Mr. Sones said he believes this motion, which came after much hard work, reflects fair numbers for each of our parties.

Motion 25 carried unanimously.

Mr. Anderson pointed out that on page 12 there were three N/A's referenced by Dr. Kope. The first one was for Skokomish Chinook with a ceiling exploitation rate of 50 percent. Currently we are at a 50.7 percent rate and, as he indicated to Mr. Turner, the co-managers are committed to work to finalize that number below that target. For Puyallup Chinook, we have now achieved the ceiling of 50 percent. For Nisqually Chinook, we are at 55.9 percent rate and have met our conservation objective for that stock. On page 15, Dr. Kope referenced the interior Fraser coho. We have now made the necessary changes to achieve the 10.0 percent conservation goal. Finally, relative to Hood Canal coho, we are now within our conservation objective of 45.0 percent.

Mr. Anderson spoke to the issue raised by Mr. Turner in his letter regarding the exploitation rate on lower Columbia River tules. The analysis is not complete and more work still needs to be done. However, as Mr. Williams and I have discussed, if we take the preseason exploitation rate estimate and look at the component that is in the ocean fisheries, we have been a minimum of a

half-of-a-percent and up to two percent below what we expected. This is because the quotas haven't been attained in the ocean and we can be certain we will be under. In looking for a means to achieve a precautionary approach, we have built in a little buffer to guard against a post season analysis that indicates we have actually been over. He and Mr. Williams have discussed not rolling unused portions of that exploitation rate from the ocean to the in-river fishery. When the ocean season is done, if there is a residual portion of the quota remaining, we would not transfer that to the in-river fishery unless the remaining quota is over two percent.

Mr. Anderson moved and Mr. Williams seconded Motion 26 to adopt the season structures, size limits, quotas and other management measures for the commercial and recreational non-Indian fisheries North of Cape Falcon for submission to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce as shown in Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report, dated April 10, 2013, including the commercial and recreational requirements, definitions, restrictions, or exceptions. With the following modifications:

- Recreational fishery in the Neah Bay/La Push sub region (Page 7) –from the US/Can border to Queets River, change “May 11-12” to “May 10-11”; and change “May 18-19” to “May 17-18.”

Mr. Anderson expressed appreciation for all people involved in the hard work of completing this product.

Mr. Turner moved and Mr. Anderson seconded Amendment 1 to Motion 26 for Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report, April 10, 2013, Table 2, Section C.5.d, second sentence to read: *“To remain consistent with preseason projected impacts of the fishery, any inseason action shall consider, if significant, the differences between observed and preseason forecasted mark rates.”*

Mr. Turner noted that following the Council meeting, his draft letter clarifying “significance” with regard to inseason changes (C.5.d) will be finalized and submitted to the Council.

Amendment 1 carried unanimously. Motion 26, as amended, carried unanimously.

Mr. Williams thanked advisory body members and others for their hard work and cooperative efforts to complete this task. He noted his discussions with Mr. Anderson concerning a buffer for Columbia River tules and Mr. Turner's statements about inseason management and staying within the guidelines to maintain the fishery. He also referred to the importance of cooperation with the Columbia River treaty tribes.

Mr. Williams moved and Mr. Feldner seconded Motion 27 for the Council to adopt the management measures and quotas for the commercial and recreational non-Indian salmon fisheries from Cape Falcon south to the Oregon/California border as shown in Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report: “Analysis of Tentative 2013 Ocean Salmon Fishery Management Measures,” dated April 10, 2013, including the commercial and recreational requirements, definitions, restrictions, or exceptions.

Mr. Williams stated that the management measures proposed for his area met all of the FMP conservation objectives and ESA requirements. The fisheries will provide substantial economic benefits to the recreational and commercial fisheries and the communities they support.

Mr. Turner and others noted that the proposed regulations south of Cape Falcon should also include the amended language for section C.5.d provided in the adoption of proposed regulations north of Cape Falcon.

Mr. Turner moved and Mr. Pollard seconded Amendment 1 to Motion 27 for Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report, April 10, 2013, Table 2, Section C.5.d, second sentence, to read: *“To remain consistent with preseason projected impacts of the fishery, any inseason action shall consider, if significant, the differences between observed and preseason forecasted mark rates.”*

Amendment 1 carried unanimously. Motion 27, as amended, carried unanimously.

Ms. Yaremko moved and Mr. Crabbe seconded Motion 28 to adopt the season structures, size limits, quotas, and other management measures for the commercial and recreational non-Indian fisheries from the OR/CA border to the US/Mexico border for submission to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce as shown in Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report, dated April 10, 2013, including the commercial and recreational requirements, definitions, restrictions, or exceptions, with the following modifications:

- For the commercial fishery in the OR/CA Border to Humboldt South Jetty (California Klamath management zone) Area on page 2, modify the dates of July 1 through earlier of July 31 to July 15 through earlier of July 31.
- Include the following changes in Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental STT Report, April 10, 2013, Table 2, Section C.5.d., second sentence to read: To remain consistent with preseason projected impacts of the fishery, any inseason action shall consider, if significant, the differences between observed and preseason forecasted mark rates.

Ms. Yaremko echoed the earlier remarks on the excellent collaboration and communication among the managers, advisors, and the public, especially with regard to sharing Klamath impacts and the need for a precautionary approach to our fall fisheries. She noted that this is also the first time since 1986 that there will be commercial opportunity in the Klamath management zone during the summer months. These are small fisheries and CDFW will be elevating the sampling and enforcement for tracking to ensure that conservation goals are not exceeded. She noted additional opportunity in the Fort Bragg area and in some other areas. With regard to the recreational fisheries, our advisors did work on a suite of seasons to provide significant opportunity in all areas while protecting the winter run.

Motion 28 carried unanimously.

E.5 Methodology Review Process and Preliminary Topic Selection for 2013 (4/10/2013; 3:01 p.m.)

E.5.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Mike Burner presented the Agenda Item Overview.

E.5.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Mr. Larry LaVoy presented Agenda Item E.5.b, Supplemental MEW Report.
Dr. Robert Kope presented Agenda Item E.5.b, Supplemental STT Report.
Mr. Pete Lawson presented Agenda Item E.5.b, REVISED Supplemental SSC Report.
Mr. Richard Heap presented Agenda Item E.5.b, Supplemental SAS Report.
Mr. David Sones presented Agenda Item E.5.b, Supplemental Tribal Report.

E.5.c Public Comment

None.

E.5.d Council Guidance on Potential Methodologies to Review in 2013

Mr. Williams stated that they would be ready with the necessary information to move ahead with the review for the three topics which involve ODFW (Yaquina River marine survival rate index, lower Columbia River coho matrix control rules, and conservation objectives for southern Oregon coastal Chinook).

Mr. Anderson recommended that in the future the SSC, Model Evaluation Workgroup (MEW), and STT get together and provide one report on methodology review rather than three separate ones to go through and see where the differences are. Also, he needed a clear understanding of which topics listed in April can reasonably be expected to be included as final topics in September for full SSC review in October. He asked Mr. Lavoy if the MEW would be able to handle the items which they were identified for in the SSC report.

Mr. Lavoy said the items on the SSC list were a rewording of the items on the MEW list. He expected the MEW would make progress on all of the items, but would not likely complete preparation on the Chinook Fishery Regulation Assessment Model base period. They should make good progress on the bias in coho mark rates, develop ideas on incorporating recent year data and a new look at the legal/sublegal encounter rate data, and certainly have something on the visual studio manual for September. We would know at the September meeting which items were ready for a progress report, but not a potential change in the model for 2014.

Mr. Anderson stated that for the two items which have a primary WDFW role, we can commit to making progress on that between now and September. However, they may not be ready for SSC review. He thinks they can commit to working with Oregon to have the LCN coho control rule ready for the SSC October review meeting. He recommended that the MEW prioritize the ones they can make progress on and not spread their effort over all of the issues.

Ms. Yaremko asked if NMFS would have staff to do both the forecast methodology task for Sacramento fall Chinook and the task to reevaluate the harvest control rules for winter run.

Mr. Tuner responded that they could commit to the second task, but would need to check further in regard to the first.

Ms. Yaremko commented on the structure of workshops with regard to the winter run and California Coastal Chinook.

Ms. Lowman summarized the guidance to the MEW as focusing on fewer projects to allow completion of the most important ones, rather than spreading themselves too thin by trying to cover all of the topics.

Ms. Yarenko added that we send a request for NMFS to revisit the Sacramento winter run control rule as noted in the SAS report.

Mr. Wolford suggested adding a timeframe to the request of providing a report by the September Council meeting.

E.6 Council Guidance on Columbia Basin Situation Assessment (4/10/2013; 4:01 p.m.)

E.6.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Mike Burner presented the Agenda Item Overview and Agenda Item E.6.a, Attachment 1: December 11, 2012 letter from Mr. Barry A. Thom regarding the Columbia Basin Assessment.

E.6.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Mr. Barry Thom provided information regarding the Columbia Basin Assessment.

Ms. Irene Martin presented Agenda Item E.6.b, Supplemental SAS Report.

Agenda Item E.6.b, Supplemental HC Report.

E.6.c Public Comment

None.

E.6.d Council Guidance and Discussion

Mr. Williams suggested that as the Executive Director prepare for his interview concerning the Columbia Basin Assessment, he take into consideration the SAS and HC Reports. In particular, there is good information in the SAS report, especially for the predation issues.

Mr. Roth stated that the two committees who have submitted responses provide good information to draw on. He also noted that the Columbia River Treaty renegotiation may play an important role in the long-term management of flow and spill.

Mr. Anderson stated that when you get the results of the assessment, it is most important what you do with it. Coordinating actions toward a common goal are extremely important. If the assessment will help guide that common effort, then the assessment could be beneficial.

Mr. Williams commented on the issue of adequate funding and prioritization of projects that will be a challenge to make any results useful.

Dr. McIsaac stated he will do his best toward forwarding the input of the Council to the assessment.

F. Habitat

F.1 Current Habitat Issues (4/7/2013; 3:41 p.m.)

F.1.a Agenda Item Overview

Ms. Jennifer Gilden presented the Agenda Item Overview and introduced Agenda Item F.1.a, Attachment 1: Council Letter to the Department of the Interior (Klamath River).

F.1.b Report of the Habitat Committee

Mr. Joel Kawahara presented Agenda Item F.1.b, Supplemental HC Report.

F.1.c Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Ms. Irene Martin and Mr. Dave Hillemeier presented Agenda Item F.1.c, Supplemental SAS Report and Agenda Item F.1.c, Supplemental SAS Report 2.

Mr. Hillemeier presented tribal comments from the Yurok Tribe for the supplemental flows for the Klamath River.

Mr. George Kautsky presented tribal comments from the Hoopa Tribe for the supplemental flows for the Klamath River.

F.1.d Public Comments

None.

F.1.e Council Action: Consider Habitat Committee Recommendations

Ms. Yaremko moved and Mr. Brizendine seconded Motion 9 to adopt the letter in Agenda Item F.1.a Attachment 1: Council Letter to the Department of the Interior; and direct Council staff to adjust the language to a more “positive tone.”

Ms. Yaremko stated that the letter sends an important message to the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) to release water to prevent a fish kill. In it, she would like to formally recognize the actions the BOR took last year to provide flows at a crucial time to prevent a fish kill. We have heard from the HC and others that the flow forecast for the coming year is considerably less optimistic than in 2012, and this letter could be more important than last year. As noted by the HC, the forecast return for Klamath would be the second largest on record and near the record high of 2012. In addition, the age-4 year class could be even greater than the previous year. She also supported the need to recommend a permanent and comprehensive flow plan and thanked the HC and others for their thorough and in-depth discussion of these issues.

Mr. Williams clarified that Ms. Yaremko’s motion would include the correction in the HC Report (39,000 acre-feet versus 48,000 acre-feet) and expressed his support for the letter.

Mr. Roth expressed his support for the letter and agreed on the positive tone suggested by Ms. Yaremko and in maintaining cooperation with the BOR.

Motion 9 carried unanimously.

Mr. Williams spoke in support of the opportunity and recommendation by the HC to draft a Council letter to the Northwest Power Planning Council recommending potential amendments to their fish and wildlife program for consideration at the June Council meeting. He noted that there is a great deal of sensitivity around the issues involved in such a letter, but thought it was worth considering.

Mr. Ortmann recognized the sensitivity with regards to the spill issues that Mr. Williams was alluding to and believes that a letter could be drafted that would be acceptable to most parties.

Mr. Roth noted that the amendment process for the fish and wildlife program would only just be beginning by the July deadline. The process would go on for some time and require coordination with future Council meetings. He supported having the HC attempt to draft an initial letter for the June Briefing Book. Mr. Anderson requested that if a letter is drafted, that it be available at least two weeks in advance of the meeting so he could be sure to coordinate with his Power Council members.

Ms. Lowman concluded it was Council consensus to have the HC draft the letter for June and asked if there was further guidance for the HC.

Mr. Ortmann asked that the draft not go beyond the information concerning spill levels (i.e., not include ocean research and ecosystem matters) and appreciates the sensitivity to have an advance review of the letter.

Mr. Williams responded with concern that there were other issues that would be appropriate beyond the flow issues and would like to have a broader view of the draft.

Mr. Lincoln noted that while Mr. Ortmann requested limiting the letter and avoiding marine research, he thought the Council should be able to include other issues raised by the advisory bodies. Mr. Ortmann did not disagree.

[Council concluded this agenda item at 4:36 p.m. and went into Closed Executive Session to complete the day.]

Closed Executive Session

This session is closed to all except Council members, their designees, and other designated by the Council Chair to discuss litigation and personnel matters.

G. Pacific Halibut Management

G.1 Final Incidental Catch Recommendations for Salmon Troll and Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries (4/8/2013; 3:22 p.m.)

G.1.a Agenda Item Overview

Ms. Kelly Ames provided the Agenda Item Overview.

G.1.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Mr. Tommy Ancona presented Agenda Item G.1.b, Supplemental GAP Report.
DRAFT Council Meeting Minutes
April 2013 (218th Meeting)

Mr. Paul Heikkila, Mr. Jim Olson and Mr. Aaron Newman presented Agenda Item G.1.b, Supplemental SAS Report.

G.1.c Public Comment

Mr. Joel Kawahara, Salmon Troller, Quilcene, Washington.
Agenda Item G.1.c, Public Comment.
Agenda Item G.1.c, Supplemental Public Comment 2.

G.1.d Council Action: Adopt Final Incidental Catch Recommendations for 2013 and April 2014

Mr. Williams moved and Mr. Anderson seconded Motion 15 to adopt the recommendations of the SAS contained in Agenda Item G.1.b, Supplemental SAS Report dated April 2013, as the final incidental halibut landing restriction recommendations for the 2013 commercial salmon troll fisheries.

Mr. Williams stated that last year, with what would now be the status quo landing limit, we exceeded our allowable catch. This slightly more conservative approach in the motion for 2013 should keep us within our allocation and also, possibly, tends to spread that catch out north to south. Given the discussion this week and unanimous support of the SAS and states, there appears to be good reason for supporting this decision.

Mr. Anderson spoke in support of the motion, but noted it was a difficult negotiation. If you stand in the Washington trollers' shoes, the landing limit from 1999 through 2011 was 35 fish and now under this motion it is 15 fish—a big drop. He expressed appreciation for the willingness of the Washington trollers to look at this change. He noted we will have some landing restrictions north of the Queets River on the Chinook allocation that will have a negative effect on the incidental catch of halibut and the change from one halibut per three, instead of four Chinook, will help with that. He is also mindful that we are adding a month of retention to the south of Falcon area (April 2014) which is another reason for a lower landing limit.

Pertaining to the Washington Trollers Association recommendation for an allocation of 1,500 lbs for the incidental fishery in April 2014, Ms. Yaremko asked when would it be the appropriate time to make that determination.

Ms. Ames responded that it would be appropriate now.

Mr. Anderson stated his understanding that the action today would apply to the period of May 1, 2013-April 2014. If, during the International Pacific Halibut Commission determination in January, the quota went down significantly, then in March 2014 we could entertain changing our decision today relative to April 2014 regulations, but, absent a significant change in the quota, this decision would carry us through April 2014.

In response to a question from Ms. Yaremko, the Council had a discussion to further clarify its halibut management.

Mr. Anderson moved and Mr. Feldner seconded an amendment to Motion 15 to strike “2013” and insert “beginning May 1, 2013 through April 30, 2014.”

Amendment 1 carried unanimously. Motion 15, as amended, carried unanimously.

Mr. Anderson moved and Mr. Williams seconded Motion 16 to adopt Option 1 in Agenda Item G.1, Situation Summary, as final recommendations for 2013 landing limits for halibut harvest in the fixed gear primary sablefish fishery north of Pt. Chehalis. It reads: Beginning May 1, restrict incidental halibut possession and landings to 75 lbs (dressed weight) of halibut for every 1,000 lbs (dressed weight) of sablefish landed and up to two additional halibut may be possessed or landed in excess of the 75 lbs per 1,000 lb ratio per landing.

Mr. Anderson stated that this year they have an allocation of 21,410 pounds, which is very similar to last year when they only landed 4,400 pounds. There were some licensing problems last year which should be resolved, and this motion represents only a modest increase of incidental harvest limitations. We will be monitoring the incidental halibut harvest and if there is a need for a closure, we are prepared to notify NMFS and to enact state regulations to that effect.

Motion 16 carried unanimously.

Mr. Anderson moved and Mr. Williams seconded Motion 17 that the Council adopt April 1, 2014 to be the season start date for the incidental retention of halibut in the primary sablefish fishery north of Pt. Chehalis.

Mr. Anderson stated that there are sablefish fisheries that occur in the month of April and based on the conservative ratios set in the previous motion, it should allow incidental retention during the sablefish fishery north of Pt. Chehalis.

Motion 17 carried unanimously.

H. Ecosystem Based Management

H.1 Final Fishery Ecosystem Plan (4/9/2013; 8:05 a.m.)

H.1.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Mike Burner Presented the Agenda Item Overview and introduced:

- Agenda Item H.1.a, Attachment 1: Public Review Draft Pacific Coast Fishery Ecosystem Plan for the U.S. Portion of the California Current Large Marine Ecosystem.
- Agenda Item H.1.a, Attachment 2: Public Review Draft Ecosystem Initiatives Appendix to the Pacific Coast Ecosystem Plan.

H.1.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Mr. Kurt Hughes presented Agenda Item H.1.b, Supplemental HMSMT Report.

Ms. Lorna Wargo presented Agenda Item H.1.b, CPSMT Report.

Dr. Selina Heppell presented Agenda Item H.1.b, Supplemental SSC Report.

Mr. Paul Dye presented Agenda Item H.1.b, Supplemental EAS Report.

Mr. Corey Niles presented Agenda Item H.1.b, Supplemental GMT Report.

Mr. Joel Kawahara presented Agenda Item H.1.b, Habitat Committee Report.

Ms. Yvonne deReynier answered questions concerning proposed edits to the language in the Advisory Body reports.

H.1.c Public Comment (4/9/2013; 8:52 a.m.)

Mr. Steve Marx, PEW Charitable Trusts, Portland Oregon.

Ms. Andrea Treece, Earthjustice, San Francisco, California.

Mr. Tom Calvanese, Port Orford, Oregon.

Mr. Lyf Gildersleeve, Flying Fish Company, Portland, Oregon.

Mr. Greg Helms, Ocean Conservancy, Santa Barbara, California.

Mr. Jay Withcott, textbook author, Portland, Oregon—read Agenda Item H.1.c, Supplemental Public Comment 5.

Mr. Dave Lacey, South Coast Tours, Gold Beach, Oregon.

Ms. Anna Weinstein, National Audubon Society, Emeryville, California.

Mr. Paul Engelmeyer, Audubon Society of Portland, Yachats, Oregon.

Mr. Seth Atkinson, Natural Resources Defense Council, San Francisco, California.

Ms. Diane Pleschner-Steele, California Wetfish Producers Association, Bullard, California.

Ms. Tara Gallagher, Portland, Oregon—presented Agenda Item H.1.c, Supplemental Public Comment 6: Letter from Prof. Scott Baker.

Mr. Norman Ritchie, Association of Northwest Steelheaders, Portland, Oregon.

Ms. Pamela Gromen, Wild Oceans, Leesburg, Virginia.

Mr. Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Group, Portland, Oregon.

Mr. Ben Enticknap, Oceana, Portland, Oregon.

Mr. Mark Sherwood, Native Fish Society, Oregon City, Oregon—presented Agenda Item H.1.c, Supplemental Public Comment 3: Letter from Native Fish Society.

Mr. Kevin Scribner, Kooskooskie Fish, Portland, Oregon.

Agenda Item H.1.c, Public Comment.

Agenda Item H.1.c, Supplemental Public Comment 2.

Agenda Item H.1.c, Supplemental Public comment 4: Letter from Mid-Coast Watershed Council.

H.1.d Council Action: Adopt Final Pacific Coast Fishery Ecosystem Plan (4/9/2013; 10:56 a.m.)

Mr. Roth made some opening comments concerning his agency's and the HC's strong support for the Fishery Ecosystem Plan. This plan will help us maintain a healthy ecosystem well into the future.

Ms. Culver moved and Ms. Kirchner seconded Motion 18, as provided in Agenda Item H.1.d, Supplemental WDFW Motion, which directs the Council to:

1. Adopt the final Pacific Coast Fishery Ecosystem Plan, including the process described in Section 1.3, except that the Council would consider Ecosystem matters during its March meeting and provide flexibility to the Ecosystem Plan Development Team to consider and incorporate edits to the Plan as suggested by the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel (pages 3-5), HMS Management Team, and CPS Management Team for chapters 3, 4 and 6 (pages 1-2).

2. Adopt the final Ecosystem Initiatives Appendix, and periodically revisit the Ecosystem Initiatives to revise, add to, or prioritize the list of initiatives in odd years, beginning with 2015.
3. Review and consider the List of Fisheries separately from the ecosystem Initiatives.
4. Move forward with Initiative 1, and form an ad hoc committee comprised of one representative from each of the following entities: NMFS Northwest Region; NMFS Southwest Region; coastal treaty tribes; states of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. Representatives for this ad hoc committee could be forwarded to the Council Chair for appointment consideration.
5. Working from the flow chart on Figure A.1 on page A-8 and Table A.2 on page A-10 of the Ecosystem Initiatives Appendix, the charge of the ad hoc committee would be to use this preliminary summary of select lower trophic level species in the CCE as an initial starting point to address the first four questions, and the following:
 - a. Build on the assessment, started by the Ecosystem Plan Development Team (EPDT), of the likelihood of fisheries developing to harvest those unmanaged species on the preliminary list—for example, consider whether these species are harvested elsewhere or whether markets exist for them; and
 - b. Brainstorm on whether there are general gear restrictions or prohibitions that could be used to restrict harvest of these unmanaged species; and
 - c. Develop recommendations for a proposed Council process for moving forward with Initiative 1 and identify next steps
 - d. Ad hoc committee would report back to the Council later this year with a more definitive timeline to be discussed under future Council agenda planning and workload (Agenda Item B.7)
6. As the Council moves forward with development and consideration of Amendment 24 to the Groundfish FMP, request the SSC Ecosystem Subcommittee consider how we might build upon this effort to move forward on Initiative 9 as another Council priority.

Ms. Culver commended the EPDT, Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel (EAS), other advisory bodies, and public who reviewed the Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP) and worked to make this an informative, useful, and quality product for the Council. She looks forward to the annual report and the integrated ecosystem assessment and believes we have a great starting point for a living document for all the FMPs. She noted that the List of Fisheries is a good first step (currently scheduled in June) and that the states need to work on that with NMFS. She stated that Initiative 1 is important and rises to the top of the priorities, but also sees all nine initiatives as useful. She expressed concern about the Council workload and the need to look realistically at how to accomplish Initiative 1 and the other priorities. That is why she proposed an ad-hoc committee be formed to consider the workload and priorities for the initiatives. She believes Initiative 9 will be very important for groundfish management and Amendment 24.

Mr. Lockhart asked why the ad hoc committee did not include any scientific staff.

Ms. Culver responded that her decision was based on the limited Council budget and keeping the core group small. They could build on the considerable work done by the EPDT. However, that is not to preclude NMFS from providing additional persons with scientific expertise if they would wish to attend the meetings.

Mr. Lockhart asked if the intention of the motion would be to dissolve the EPDT?

Ms. Culver responded that was her intention, as she thought that was the course of action followed with most of our FMPs. The Council would need to have a discussion regarding what advisory bodies we need in the future and consider the budget implications.

Mr. Burner noted that the Council's June motion from last year assigned some work for the EPDT to report on later this year. He presumed that the Council would still want the EPDT to complete those reports, at least for the June meeting. He also noted it would likely be difficult to assemble the ad hoc committee prior to the next Council meeting and suggested that it might be most expeditious to form the ad hoc group no earlier than the June Council meeting.

Ms. Culver responded that the intent of item 4 in her motion would be for the agencies to forward the names of proposed committee members to the Council Chair and he could confirm the appointments without the need to do it at a Council meeting. The intent of item 5d is that the Council would discuss and determine, under agenda planning (B.7), the best time for the ad hoc committee to begin work and report to the Council.

Dr. McIsaac stated that he did not think the ad hoc committee could commence work prior to the June meeting, given the limited time to the June briefing book deadline, staff workload, and the national conference we are hosting in May.

Ms. Culver responded to some clarifying questions on the motion by Mr. Bonham. She stated that she made specific reference to Section 1.3 so that everyone was aware they were adopting the schedule put forth by Ms. deReynier with the annual review at the March meeting. Regarding the plan reviews, the annual review in March would be for the FEP while the review in odd years would be for the initiatives appendix.

With regard to the List of Fisheries that would be brought up in June, Mr. Wolford wondered if that would include the issue about saury and if the list would be permissive or prohibitive under item 3.

Ms. Culver responded that the motion was not intended to prescribe or limit discussion in June regarding the List of Fisheries. Agenda Item B.7 would be the time to determine the actual agenda.

In summarizing, Dr. McIsaac noted the previous evolution of plan development teams to management teams and stated that he presumed the motion would not dissolve the EPDT or EAS, that the EPDT would make its reports to the Council in June, and finality on the budget issues and ad hoc committee could be discussed under B.7.

Mr. Bonham expressed support for the action, but also concern about the workload that this new plan will create and recommended the Council focus on the ability to achieve great things, but in a strategic way.

Mr. Lincoln noted the comments in the public testimony for developing specific indicators for long-term forage fish assessment and he wondered if that could simply be handled by science center input.

Mr. Lockhart responded that he would pass on those comments to the science centers and report back at a future council meeting.

Motion 18 carried unanimously.

Coastal Pelagic Species Management

I.1 Sardine Harvest Parameters Workshop Report (4/10/2013; 10:01 a.m.)

I.1.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Kerry Griffin provided the Agenda Item Overview and outlined Agenda Item I.1.a, Attachment 1: Terms of Reference.

I.1.b Report overview and Description

Dr. Andre Punt presented:

- Agenda Item I.1.b, Attachment 1: Report of the Pacific Sardine Harvest Parameters Workshop, February 2013.
- Agenda Item I.1.b, Attachment 2: Initial Analyses Related to Evaluating Parameter Value Choices for Pacific Sardine.
- Agenda Item I.1.b, Attachment 3: Table 4.2.5-1 from CPS FMP Control Rule Options.
- Agenda Item I.1.b, Supplemental Attachment 4: Initial Analysis Related to Evaluating Parameter Value Choices for Pacific Sardine Additional Sensitivity Analyses.

I.1.c Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Dr. Selina Heppell presented Agenda Item I.1.c, Supplemental SSC Report.

Ms. Lorna Wargo presented Agenda Item I.1.c, Supplemental CPSMT Report.

Mr. Mike Okoniewski presented Agenda Item I.1.c, Supplemental CPSAS Report.

I.1.d Public Comment

Mr. Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Group, Portland Oregon.

Mr. Steve Marx, PEW Charitable Trusts, Portland, Oregon.

Ms. Diane Pleschner-Steele, California Wetfish Producers Association, Bullard, California.

Mr. Geoff Shester, Oceana, San Francisco, California.

Agenda Item I.1.d, Supplemental Public Comment letter from Ryan Kapp.

Agenda Item I.1.d, Supplemental Public Comment 2 Comments by Richard Parrish.

**I.1.e Council Action: Consider Changes to Sardine Harvest Control Rule Parameters
(4/10/2013; 1:20 p.m.)**

Mr. Crabbe moved and Mr. Brizendine seconded Motion 24 that the Council adopt recommendations for further model runs and additional analyses as practicable, including those listed in the Agenda Item I.1.c, Supplemental CPSMT Report, and the additional recommended analyses in the Supplemental CPSAS Report I.1.c with a priority regarding the Temperature-Recruitment Index, with the goal of providing a report in June.

Mr. Crabbe stated that there has been a lot of good work done, but there is still a ways to go. His motion is intended to capture the outcomes of the workshop and the questions from the advisory bodies that will bring back the additional needed information, focused on the Temperature Recruitment Index. In June we can evaluate where we are with the new data.

Mr. Williams wondered if Mr. Crabbe would expand on what he meant by “additional analyses as practicable.”

Mr. Crabbe stated that for the two advisory bodies that commented, there was a broad list of requests and recommendations. Dr. Punt indicated that most of them were doable. He would leave it up to Dr. Punt as to what was doable in a short period of time and to omit those which were not, while making sure to focus on the Temperature Recruitment Index. Dr. Punt and his student would deliver the report to the Council.

Dr. McIsaac noted from the CPSMT report that the Management Strategy Evaluation isn't listed as a task for immediate assignment. Would there be further information on the modeling progress in the fall or would that be in limbo for an undefined time?

Mr. Crabbe responded that he would expect further information in the fall and intends to solicit additional guidance on those other issues after this motion is voted on.

Motion 24 carried unanimously.

Mr. Crabbe provided some additional proposed guidance on screen for the Council to consider as follows:

- Regarding the Distribution parameter, there is no new information that warrants a change from the current value of 87 percent. Suggest that the CPSMT continues to monitor research and any new information that may be worth investigating in the future.
- Regarding the Management Strategy Evaluation, the Workshop and advisory bodies agreed that the ecosystem models currently available are not sufficiently developed to base a management strategy evaluation on.
- Endorse the SSC's recommendation to use a sardine biomass estimate representing the start of the fishing season for setting harvest specifications.

Mr. Williams asked if information (e.g., sea surface temperatures) was brought back to the Council in June, could it be used in preparations for the 2014 harvest season.

Mr. Griffin said that there was uncertainty as to what the analysis and report from the workshop would provide, but there was discussion over whether or not the Temperature Recruitment Index could be ready before the 2014 fishing season. His answer was “maybe.” We would need to hear the report in June and discuss it with General Counsel and NMFS SWR to determine the process at that time. In June we would have a better idea whether that would be doable.

Ms. Culver expressed uncertainty about how the third item (endorse SSC’s recommendation regarding the biomass estimate at the start of the season) comes into play, given we will discuss changing the starting date of the season on tomorrow’s agenda. She recommended not providing that guidance today and wait until after the discussion tomorrow. Mr. Crabbe agreed and the Council concurred on removing that as guidance.

Mr. Williams stated that he would like to use the information to guide the season as soon as possible, depending on the results in June.

Regarding the close correlation of sea surface temperature to sardine recruitment, Ms. Culver thought it would be helpful if the SSC were to look at the results of the additional model runs that look at Scripps, using a three-year average, as well as looking at CalCOFI data, and the three-year average versus an annual number. The purpose would be to get some sense of how much better one is than the other.

Ms. Yaremko expressed appreciation for having scientists from previous analyses working on this effort and Dr .Punt’s offer to put it in a user friendly format. She is encouraged by the comments of the CPSAS on issues that can’t be tackled on this go-around, such as the distribution term and the question of two stocks, which will likely be picked up on the next effort. She liked the flexibility of this motion and looks forward to hearing more in June.

Mr. Helvey noted that there may be further issues to resolve in using this new information that can be discussed in June.

I.2 Shifting Sardine Harvest Start Date (4/11/2013; 11:15 a.m.)

I.2.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Kerry Griffin presented the Agenda Item Overview.

I.2.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Ms. Lorna Wargo and Mr. Mike Okoniewski answered questions regarding Agenda Item I.2.b, CPSMT/CPSAS Report.

Ms. Lorna Wargo presented Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental CPSMT Report.

Mr. Mike Okoniewski presented Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental CPSAS Report.

Dr. Selina Heppell presented Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental SSC Report.

I.2.c Public Comment

Mr. Whit Sheard, Oceana, Portland, Oregon.

Ms. Diane Pleschner-Steele, California Wetfish Producers Association, Bullard, California.

I.2.d Council Action: Consider Initiating Process to Shift the Start of the Sardine Fishery

Mr. Williams moved and Ms. Culver seconded Motion 32 for the Council to initiate the process to shift the start of the sardine fishery from January 1 to July 1, as recommended by the CPSMT (Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental CPSMT Report), the CPSAS (Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental CPSAS Report), and the SSC (Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental SSC Report) with final action in June 2013. Direct the CPSMT to report at the June 2013 Council meeting with a proposed implementation process and schedule, and identify remaining considerations or issues.

Mr. Williams stated, regarding the process, that we have nearly full concurrence in support of this change. The biggest thing in support of this change is the potential improvement in science issues that we have addressed. Under the current start date, there were problems in getting the data analyzed for the NW Aerial Sardine Survey and the NOAA acoustic trawl to use for the stock assessment. Moving the start to July will alleviate this problem. There may be other efficiencies that come up as this moves forward, such as combining the mackerel and sardine Stock Assessment Review Panels.

Mr. Helvey asked, if we move this forward will this fit under the March Council meeting?

Dr. McIsaac replied yes, it shouldn't be a constraint. It would mean the stock assessment would have to be done sometime in January or December. He presumed all of these considerations could be presented for your decision in June.

Ms. Yaremko noted that moving the start date will provide the added benefit of being able to use the full stock assessment for the 2014-2015 season. This makes her feel good about the change. One downside which makes her have some hesitation pertains to that period of January 1-June 30 of 2014 and using the update that includes only catch data. While the team and CPSAS contemplated this, we will be using an update assessment that will use even less data than we are used to. She would ask that the team, subpanel, or Stock Assessment Team identify additional concerns with management during this six month period that they be presented in the June meeting report. Also, regarding timing, in the table they are looking at April and it may be necessary to look at March instead. The team should fully vet that issue.

Motion 32 carried unanimously.

Regarding the recommendation to use a sardine biomass estimate representing the start of the fishing season for setting harvest specifications as discussed yesterday, Mr. Crabbe provided the following guidance: The Council endorses the recommendation to use a sardine biomass estimate representing the start of the fishing season for setting harvest specifications. The Council concurred that this was additional guidance under Agenda Item I.1.

J. Enforcement Issues

J.1. Regulations for Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) Declarations (4/11/2013; 10:26 a.m.)

J.1.a Agenda Item Overview

Mr. Jim Seger provided the Agenda Item Overview and introduced:

- Agenda Item J.1.a, Attachment 1: Vessel Monitoring Program: Revisions of the Enhanced Mobile Transmitter Unit (E-MTU) Reimbursement Program.
- Agenda Item J.1.a, Attachment 2: Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) Situation and Possible Solutions.
- Agenda Item J.1.a, Attachment 3: NMFS HMS Report for the March 2013 Council Meeting – Excerpt.

Mr. Dayna Mathews provided clarifying remarks regarding Attachment 3.

J.1.b Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies and Management Entities

Mr. Mark Helvey provided information regarding the Tuna Vessels VMS regulations.

Mr. Dayna Matthews presented Agenda Item J.1.b, Supplemental EC Report.

Ms. Susan Chambers presented Agenda Item J.1.b, Supplemental GAP and SAS Report.

J.1.c Public Comment

None.

J.1.d Council Action: Consider Policy Process for Advancing VMS Declaration Regulations and Select Alternatives, as Appropriate

Mr. Williams moved and Ms. Culver seconded Motion 31 that the Council accepts the recommendations contained in the Supplemental EC report.

Mr. Seger stated that based on the proposed action, the staff would flesh out the EC option for the groundfish FMP for final Council action. Mr. Williams agreed.

Ms. Culver moved and Ms. Lowman seconded Amendment 1 to Motion 31 to ask that the EC also explore and discuss whether additional declarations for other fisheries need to be added to the list and bring their recommendations to the June Council meeting.

Amendment 1 to Motion 31 carried unanimously.

Motion 31, as amended, carried unanimously.

In response to a question by Mr. Helvey, there was concurrence that the VMS HMS discussion would be appropriate under B.7 and for placement on the June agenda.

ADJOURN

The Council adjourned on April 11 at 2:18 p.m.

Dorothy Lowman
Council Chair

Date

Motion 6: Adopt tentative commercial and recreational alternatives for the area from the OR/CA border to the U.S./Mexico border as presented in Agenda Item E.1.f, Supplemental SAS Report.

Moved by: Marci Yaremko Seconded by: David Crabbe
Motion 6 carried unanimously.

Motion 7: Council moves forward with:

- the consideration of restructuring of the stock complex assemblages and to provide additional analysis in June to consider of a preliminary preferred alternative at that time
 - In June, see the bar graphs for OFL component contribution compared to recent levels of removals
 - Include options for how to manage species that are removed from complexes
- In addition approve the GMT recommendations of items 1-4 on page 6 of Agenda Item D.3.b, Supplemental GMT report which retains the range of alternatives found in Agenda Item D.3.a, Attachment 1.
- Task the Council Staff to evaluate a June/September and June/September/November process.
- Prioritize the other Fish and Slope rockfish complexes as a top priority, and other stock complexes as a lower priority
- Include anticipated costs compared with status quo. Group alternatives of high priority together in cost analysis.
- Include incorporating concepts in GMT statement pages 3 & 4 (Agenda Item D.3.b, Supplemental GMT Report); background goals and purpose & need.
- Request the SSC discuss priorities for improvements in data quality; relative to sampling data
- Add the GAP Alternative for Nearshore rockfish.
- Explore the use of WCGOP and NMFS Trawl survey to evaluate catch ratios.

Moved by: Michele Culver Seconded by: Rich Lincoln
Motion 7 carried unanimously.

Motion 8: Adopt the recommendations for set-asides of 2,500 mt to accommodate for Pacific whiting mortality in research and pink shrimp fisheries; as shown in Agenda Item D.4.c, Supplemental GMT Report.

Moved by: Gway Kirchner Seconded by: Jeff Feldner
Motion 8 carried unanimously.

Motion 9: Adopt the letter in Agenda Item F.1.a Attachment 1: Council Letter to the Department of the Interior; and direct Council staff to adjust the language to a more “positive tone.”

Moved by: Marci Yaremko Seconded by: Buzz Brizendine
Motion 9 carried unanimously.

Motion 10: Approve the revised discard mortality rates for cowcod, canary, and yelloweye rockfish as shown in Agenda Item D.5.b, Supplemental GMT Report, Table 7 on Page 14 with the 90 percent confidence interval as shown in that table; except for the depth bin for “greater than 50 fathoms,” change to “50-100 fathoms” and include an additional depth bin of greater than 100 fathoms and assign a mortality rate of 100 percent.

Moved by: Michele Culver Seconded by: Rich Lincoln

Amndmnt 1: Strike the following wording in the motion: “Except for the depth bin for greater than 50 fathoms, change to 50-100 fathoms and include an additional depth bin of greater than 100 fathoms and assign a mortality rate of 100 percent.”

Moved By: Dan Wolford Seconded by: Buzz Brizendine
Amendment 1 failed (Ms Kirchner, Mr. Myer, Ms. Culver, Mr. Feldner, Mr. Sones, Mr. Ortmann, Mr. Lincoln, and Mr. Lockhart voted no).

Amndmnt 2: Replace 90 percent in the 50 fathom depth bin with a 75 percent confidence interval.

Moved By: Dan Wolford Seconded by: David Crabbe
Amendment 2 failed (Mr. Ortmann, Mr. Lockhart, Ms. Culver, Ms. Kirchner, Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Feldner, Mr. Myer, and Mr. Sones voted no).
Motion 10 carried unanimously.

Motion 11: Council to direct NMFS NWFSC to finish the Synthesis Report, taking into account the recommendation by the EFHRC in paragraph 1a, b, and c (Page 1 of Agenda Item D.6.c, Supplemental EFHRC Report) and consider any advice received from the SSC after their review of the Appendix. This Synthesis Report and future SSC comments will be made available on the Council’s website.

Moved by: Frank Lockhart Seconded by: Herb Pollard
Motion 11 carried unanimously.

Motion 12: Adopt the RFP in Agenda Item D.6.a, Attachment 1 (Request for Proposals to Modify Pacific Coast Groundfish EHF reflecting changes made at the 9/2012 PFMC Meeting 9/25/2012); and release the RFP initiating Phase II of the five-year review process.

Moved by: Frank Lockhart Seconded by: Rich Lincoln
Motion 12 carried unanimously.

Motion 13: Council request that the completed Synthesis Report, and any other information, should be made publically available and the RFP issued by May 1, and that all proposals are submitted to the Council by July 31.

Moved by: Frank Lockhart Seconded by: Rich Lincoln
Motion 13 carried unanimously.

Motion 14: Adopt the amended suite of alternatives contained in Agenda Item E.3.b, Supplemental NMFS Report 2, including changes as reflected from the September 2012 Council Meeting, and including new alternatives 2A, 2B, and 6E.

Moved by: Bob Turner Seconded by: Phil Anderson
Motion 14 carried unanimously.

Motion 15: Adopt the recommendations of the SAS contained in Agenda Item G.1.b, Supplemental SAS Report dated April 2013, as the final incidental halibut landing restriction recommendations for the 2013 commercial salmon troll fisheries.

Moved by: Steve Williams Seconded by: Phil Anderson

Amndmnt 1: Strike “2013” and insert “beginning May 1, 2013 through April 30, 2014.”

Moved By: Phil Anderson Seconded by: Jeff Feldner
Amendment 1 carried unanimously. Motion 15, as amended, carried unanimously.

Motion 16: Adopt Option 1 in Agenda Item G.1, Situation Summary, as final recommendations for 2013 landing limits on halibut harvest in the fixed gear primary sablefish fishery north of Pt. Chehalis which reads: Beginning May 1, restrict incidental halibut possession and landings to 75 lbs (dressed weight) of halibut for every 1,000 lbs (dressed weight) of sablefish landed and up to two additional halibut may be possessed or landed in excess of the 75 lbs per 1,000 lb ratio per landing.

Moved by: Phil Anderson Seconded by: Steve Williams
Motion 16 carried unanimously.

Motion 17: Adopts April 1, 2014 to be the season start date for the incidental retention of halibut in the primary sablefish fishery north of Pt. Chehalis.

Moved by: Phil Anderson Seconded by: Steve Williams
Motion 17 carried unanimously.

Motion 18: Council to:
1. Adopt the final Pacific Coast Fishery Ecosystem Plan, including the process described in Section 1.3, except that the Council would consider Ecosystem matters during its March meeting and provide flexibility to the Ecosystem Plan

Development Team to consider and incorporate edits to the Plan as suggested by the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel (pages 3-5), HMS Management Team, and CPS Management Team for chapters 3, 4, and 6 (pages 1-2).

2. Adopt the final Ecosystem Initiatives Appendix, and periodically revisit the Ecosystem Initiatives to revise, add to, or prioritize the list of initiatives in odd years, beginning with 2015.
3. Review and consider the List of Fisheries separately from the ecosystem Initiatives.
4. Move forward with Initiative 1, and form an ad hoc committee comprised of one representative from each of the following entities: NMFS Northwest Region; NMFS Southwest Region; coastal treaty tribes; states of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. Representatives for this ad hoc committee could be forwarded to the Council Chair for appointment consideration.
5. Working from the flow chart on Figure A.1 on page A-8 and Table A.2 on page A-10 of the Ecosystem Initiatives Appendix, the charge of the ad hoc committee would be to use this preliminary summary of select lower trophic level species in the CCE as an initial starting point to address the first four questions, and the following:
 - a. Build on the assessment, started by the EPDT, of the likelihood of fisheries developing to harvest those unmanaged species on the preliminary list—for example, consider whether these species are harvested elsewhere or whether markets exist for them; and
 - b. Brainstorm on whether there are general gear restrictions or prohibitions that could be used to restrict harvest of these unmanaged species; and
 - c. Develop recommendations for a proposed Council process for moving forward with Initiative 1 and identify next steps
 - d. Ad hoc committee would report back to the Council later this year with a more definitive timeline to be discussed under future Council agenda planning and workload (Agenda Item B.7)
6. As the Council moves forward with development and consideration of Amendment 24 to the Groundfish FMP, request the SSC Ecosystem Subcommittee consider how we might build upon this effort to move forward on Initiative 9 as another Council priority.

Moved by: Michele Culver
Motion 18 carried unanimously.

Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

Motion 19: Council to:

1. Confirm that the primary focus of integration of EM into trawl catch share monitoring is to address compliance monitoring needs.

2. Adopt the regulatory objectives contained in the Agenda Item D.7.b EM Workshop report as modified by the recommendations in the Agenda Item D.7.d Supplemental GAP Report.

3. Direct the Council staff to work with federal and state agencies to develop a white paper that would identify monitoring performance standards and other requirements that EM proposals would have to meet.

4. Develop an initial scoping package that would include the strawman proposals contained in the EM Workshop reports as initial EM alternatives (splitting pot and longline as recommended in the Supplemental GAP Report), as well as an option of electronic monitoring participation agreements, the information resulting from the information requests in the report as available, and an initial list of the issues and tradeoffs that will need to be addressed.

Moved by: Dorothy Lowman Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

Amndmnt 1: Delay the development of the initial scoping package until item 3 is completed; and, as part of the scoping package, the strawman proposals could be considered, but there might be things that come out of the whitepaper that could be different than those proposals.

Moved By: Michele Culver Seconded by: Rich Lincoln
Amendment 1 carried unanimously.

Amndmnt 2: Strike the word “needs” and insert “*to achieve individual accountability of catch and bycatch.*”

Moved By: Dale Myer Seconded by: Michele Culver
Amendment 2 carried unanimously. Motion 19, as amended, carried unanimously.

Motion 20: Council to:

1. Forward the recommendations from the EM Workshop found on page vi of the Workshop report.
2. Request NMFS and PSMFC work together to determine what should be included in “total catch” for catch accounting purposes and provide this information to the Council as well to assure that consistent definitions are used during the 2013 study.

Moved by: Dorothy Lowman Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

Amndmnt 1: Change item 2 by striking the original language and replace it with “*PSMFC conform to the NFMS definition of “total catch” for catch accounting purposes in this study.*”

Moved By: Michele Culver Seconded by: Joanna Grebel
Amendment 1 was not voted on.

Amndmnt 2: As a substitute to Amendment 1: for item two: *“Request PSMFC conform to NMFS definition of “total catch” for catch accounting for purposes of this study to the maximum extent practicable.”*

Moved By: Dave Hanson Seconded by: Herb Pollard
Amendment 2 carried (Ms. Culver, Mr. Myer, and Mr. Lincoln voted no).
Motion 20, as amended, carried unanimously.

Motion 21: Council:

1. Move forward the process and schedule shown on page vii of the Workshop Report, recognizing that attainment of the schedule will be dependent on budget and workload considerations with the following changes: have the performance standards WP at the June 2013 meeting; move full scoping to September 2013. Scoping to begin in the summer of 2014; this would push the other items described in the table to the selection of a FPA to November 2015.
2. Request that NMFS NW Region evaluate the implications on staff workload and ability to address other important trailing action needs should an out of cycle “EFP” avenue be explored to begin to allow testing EM usage without an observer prior to completion of the full regulatory package.
3. Explore the relative budget implications and other costs/benefits relative to having a workgroup be appointed with the characteristics described in recommendations of the GAP and the EC, or to have a subgroup of the GAP be tasked with the responsibilities that would be assigned to the workgroup.

Moved by: Dorothy Lowman Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

Amndmnt 1: Under item 1, strike out *“have the performance standards WP at the June 2013 meeting; move full scoping to Sept 2013.”* Replace with *“whitepaper on performance standards considered in draft at the Sept 2013 meeting; finalized at November 2013 meeting. Scoping to begin in the summer of 2014; this would push the other items described in the table to the selection of a FPA to November 2015.”*

Moved By: Michele Culver Seconded by: Frank Lockhart

Amdmnt 1a: To strike *“Scoping to begin in the summer of 2014; this would push the other items described in the table to the selection of a FPA to Nov 2015.”*

Moved By: Dale Myer Seconded by: Michele Culver
Amendment 1a carried unanimously. Amendment 1, as amended, carried unanimously. Motion 21, as amended, carried unanimously.

Motion 22: Adopt the inseason adjustments in the recommendations of WDFW (Agenda Item D.8.b, Supplemental WDFW Report, April 2013). Those recommendations are to adopt Federal regulations that conform with Washington recreational fisheries, specifically:

Between the U.S./Canada border and 48°10' N. lat. (Cape Alava) (Washington Marine Area 4):

1. Adopt a minimum size of 18 inches for cabezon and reduce the daily bag limit from two per angler per day to one per angler per day.
2. Reduce the minimum size limit for lingcod from 24 inches to 22 inches.

Moved By: Michele Culver Seconded by: Rich Lincoln

Motion 22 carried unanimously.

Motion 23: Adopt the GAP recommendation shown in Agenda Item D.8.b, Supplemental GAP Report, April 2013, page 2. Those recommendations are to make changes to the trawl RCA boundaries north of 40°10' N. lat. to 48°10' N. lat. through the remainder of 2014 beginning in Period 6 of 2013. Specifically:

Period	Shoreward	Seaward
2013: Period 6	100 fathoms	150 fathoms
2014: Periods 1-6	100 fathoms	150 fathoms

Moved By: Dale Myer Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

Motion 23 carried unanimously.

Motion 24: Adopt recommendations for further model runs and additional analyses as practicable, including those listed in the Supplemental CPSMT Report I.1.c, and the additional recommended analyses in the Supplemental CPSAS Report I.1.c with a priority regarding the Temperature-Recruitment Index, with the goal of providing a report in June.

Moved by: David Crabbe Seconded by: Buzz Brizendine

Motion 24 carried unanimously.

Motion 25: Adopt the following 2013 management structure for the Treaty Indian ocean salmon troll fisheries: The Treaty Indian ocean troll fishery would have a quota of:

- 52,500 Chinook
- 47,500 coho.

The overall chinook quota would be divided into a 26,250-Chinook sub-quota for the May 1 through June 30 Chinook only fishery and a 26,250-Chinook sub-quota

terms of process and environmental analysis—without reducing the quality of either. In addition, there are strong connections between the environmental questions NEPA raises and the analytical methods being advanced under ecosystem based fisheries management, as we have been raising under the Council’s consideration of Amendment 24 and ecosystem related agenda items (Agenda Item H.1.c, Supplemental GMT Report). Recognizing those connections and better integrating NEPA with MSA-focused analysis could be a way for Congress to support continued progress toward ecosystem based fisheries management and align staff and scientific resources with the highest conservation needs. The perception of many seems to be the opposite--i.e. that proposed changes to NEPA are necessarily motivated by a desire to pay less attention of environmental impacts and conservation.

§ We also think that Congress could learn from our west coast examples of rebuilding. Congress added the rebuilding provisions to the law in 1996 with certain policy goals in mind. Feedback from the Council’s experience could help Congress’ deliberations on whether those goals are being met. The results we have seen could be counter to expectations. For instance, with petrale sole the rebuilding projections showed the most long-term yield was expected by rebuilding using the standard F_{MSY} harvest rate, which was the slowest rebuilding alternative considered by the Council. This was counter to expectations and the widely held assumption that rebuilding “as short as possible” produces the most yield and economic benefit overall. In short, we believe Congress could change the law with a standard that more directly focuses on balancing the trade- off between short term economic consequences and long term yield and other impacts to the fishery and ecosystem without imposing overly formulaic constraints on the Councils.

§ Carryover in the Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) program is another area where questions about interpretations of the MSA have arisen. Consideration of carryover has been focused on the risk that issuing carryover might lead to an annual catch limit (ACL) overage despite everyone agreeing that such an overage would not raise a biological concern. More generally, this interpretation is one where we have questioned the emphasis of annual catch over the expected outcome over a multi-year period.

· Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental GAP Report, on Page 1, the 1, 2, & 5 bullet, and the last bullet on Page 2:

§ Flexible Annual Catch Limits (ACL) management. The GAP is concerned that current ACL management is too stringent to accomplish the intent of optimum yield (OY) management. There is too much precaution in deciding the ACL specification. ACLs should be managed to better meet the goal of OY attainment, the socioeconomic objectives of the MSA, and to minimize fishery instability. The concept of long term averaging or multi-year ACLs will better enable implementation of the carry-over provisions in the fishery management plan (FMP). This conceptual change will have no biological consequence to our long-lived groundfish stocks.

- § Eliminate the 10-year rebuilding rule and provide more consideration of community needs for stocks that must be rebuilt in a longer time period. The 10-year rule, where stock rebuilding must occur within 10 years if possible, leads to an awkward and discontinuous policy that disrupts fisheries for little conservation gain. For example, if a stock can rebuild in 9.9 years but at a cost of closing all fisheries, this becomes a mandate even if the economic disruption is greatly lessened with an 11-year rebuilding plan. This is illogical and potentially disastrous for fishing-dependent communities.
- § Streamline the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and MSA processes. While the 2006 reauthorization of the MSA seemingly made streamlining the NEPA and MSA processes a mandate, NMFS has not addressed this. We still have an inefficient process where there are two administrative tracks to satisfy NEPA and MSA process mandates. This unnecessarily delays implementation of regulations and ties up NMFS and Council resources that could be used to make progress on other important initiatives. Specifically, it makes sense to use the regional fishery management council process, which is designed to engage the public before decisions are made, as a substitute to the notice and comment rulemaking required in the NEPA process. This would not compromise the quality of analysis required by NEPA. Council decisions are widely noticed to the public to solicit maximum input before decisions are made.
- § Maintain the positive aspects of the MSA. The GAP believes there are many mandates and aspects of the MSA that should not be changed. Decisions on allocation and on how to rationalize fisheries should continue to be made at the regional level and not be subject to top-down mandates. Catch share programs and formal allocations provide stability in fisheries management. National initiatives to sunset catch share programs or formal allocations are bad ideas. The aspects of the MSA establishing regional control in decision-making work very well and allow tailoring of fisheries management according to regional needs. Changing this aspect of the MSA will compromise the positive foundation of the MSA and will lead to disastrous consequences.
- Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental CPSAS Report:
 - § Members of the Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel (CPSAS) discussed priorities for consideration in Magnuson Act (MSA) reauthorization discussions. Any changes to existing MSA mandates should be accompanied by full analysis of what appropriate funding levels need to be to carry out the intention of such mandates. These should include but not be limited to adequate research funding, for NOAA Fisheries-sponsored as well as cooperative research. In addition, regional fishery management council operations must be funded at appropriate levels to achieve the directives and objectives of the re-authorized MSA. We also emphasize the need to develop more collaborative research opportunities and collaborative management.
- Agenda Item B.4.c, Supplemental HC Report: approve both, but in the second bullet replace “needs” with “should be”

- § Develop a new term, other than “overfishing,” for when a run is depressed for reasons not related to fishing; and for the “overfishing” reports required when a stock is “overfished” for three years in a row.
- § The HC agrees with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Assistant Administrator Sam Rauch, in his comments to the House Committee on Natural Resources, that ecosystem, habitat, and climate change ~~needs~~ should be incorporated into stock assessments and management decisions.]

Moved by: Michele Culver Seconded by: Rich Lincoln

Amndmnt 1: Add bullet 3 from the GAP Report to the list as shown on Page 1: Clarify rebuilding policy. There is an unwritten NMFS policy that once a rebuilding plan is adopted, it must be maintained until the biomass target is reached, even in the case when a new assessment representing the best available science indicates the stock was never overfished, or the stock is in the precautionary zone and subject to the harvest control rules in the FMP (e.g., the 40-10 rule). Changes in rebuilding rules could also clarify this policy.

Moved By: Steve Williams Seconded by: Jeff Feldner
 Amendment 1 carried (Ms. Culver, Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Ortmann voted no).

Amndmnt 2: Add to the list of recommendations, the seventh bullet in Agenda Item B.4.d, Supplemental SSC report: The term “Ecosystem Component” should be defined more clearly.

Moved By: Marci Yaremko Seconded by: Buzz Brizendine
 Amendment 2 carried (Mr. Ortmann, Ms. Lowman, Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Myer, and Ms. Culver voted no).

Amndmnt 3: to strike “*NS, and regs.*” from the original motion.

Moved By: Rich Lincoln Seconded by: Dave Ortmann
 Amendment 3 carried unanimously. Motion 29, as amended, carried unanimously.

Motion 30: Adopt Agenda Item B.4.b, Supplemental Legislative Committee Report, and strike “*Forage Fish*” from the header and replace with “*List of Fisheries.*”

Moved by: Ms. Yaremko Seconded by: David Crabbe

Amndmnt 1: strike “*Adopt*” and replace with “*accept.*”

Moved By: Rich Lincoln Seconded by: Michele Culver
 Amendment 1 carried unanimously. Motion 30, as amended, carried unanimously.

Motion 31: Council accepts the recommendations contained in Agenda Item J.1.b, Supplemental EC Report.

Moved by: Steve Williams Seconded by: Michele Culver

Amndmnt 1: The EC also explore and discuss whether additional declarations for other fisheries need to be added to the list and bring their recommendations at the June Council meeting.

Moved By: Michele Culver Seconded by: Dorothy Lowman
Amendment 1 carried unanimously. Motion 31, as amended, carried unanimously.

Motion 32: Council to initiate the process to shift the start of the sardine fishery from January 1 to July 1 as recommended by the CPSMT (Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental CPSMT Report); the CPSAS (Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental CPSAS Report); and the SSC (Agenda Item I.2.b, Supplemental SSC Report) with final action in June 2013. Direct the CPSMT to report at the June 2013 Council meeting with a proposed implementation process and schedule, and identify remaining considerations or issues.

Moved by: Steve Williams Seconded by: Michele Culver
Motion 32 carried unanimously.

Motion 33: Approve as final, Agenda Item B.5.a, Attachment 1: Draft Minutes 216th Session of the Pacific Fishery Management Council (November 2012).

Moved by: Dave Ortmann Seconded by: Herb Pollard

Motion 33 carried unanimously.

Motion 34: Appoint Dr. Tim Sippel to National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center Seat on the Highly Migratory Species Management Team, replacing Dr. Suzanne Kohin, and to appoint Dr. Ian Taylor to the National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center Seat on the Groundfish Management Team replacing Dr. Jason Kope.

Moved by Mark Helvey Seconded by: David Sones
Motion 34 carried unanimously.