

DRAFT COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPTS
248th Session of the
Pacific Fishery Management Council
March 6-12, 2019
Hilton Vancouver Washington
301 W Sixth Street, Vancouver, WA 98660

Verbatim transcripts of the Pacific Fishery Management Council are prepared for reference and are limited to Council discussions during the Council Action portion of each agenda item. These transcripts are not reviewed and approved by the Council and are not intended to be part of the formal Council Meeting Record.

Contents

Meeting Transcript Summary3

A. Call to Order4

 4. Agenda4

B. Open Comment Period5

C. Administrative Matters6

 1. Marine Planning Update6

 2. Legislative (Cancelled)10

 3. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures11

 4. Approval of Council Meeting Record.....16

 5. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning.....17

D. Salmon Management34

 1. National Marine Fisheries Report.....34

 2. Review of Rebuilding Plans.....41

 3. Review of 2018 Fisheries and Summary of 2019 Stock Forecasts.....44

 4. Identify Management Objectives and Preliminary Definition of 2019 Management Alternatives46

 5. Recommendations for 2019 Management Alternative Analysis51

 6. Further Direction for 2019 Management Alternatives.....54

 7. Further Direction for 2019 Management Alternatives.....57

 8. Adopt 2019 Management Alternatives for Public Review60

 9. Appoint Salmon Hearing Officers65

E. Ecosystem Management67

 1. California Current Ecosystem and Integrated Assessment (IEA) Report and Science Review Topics67

 2. Climate and Communities Initiative Update.....70

 3. Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP) Five-Year Review83

F. Habitat93

1. Current Habitat Issues.....	93
G. Groundfish Management	94
1. National Marine Fisheries Report.....	94
2. Amendment 28 – Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) and Rockfish Conservation Area – Final Implementation.....	96
3. New Methodology Informing Sigma Values – Final Adoption.....	109
4. Omnibus Workload Planning Process Review and Project Prioritization	117
5. Inseason Adjustments – Final Action	133
6. Implementation of the 2019 Pacific Whiting Fishery Under the U.S./Canada Agreement	137
H. Pacific Halibut Management.....	138
1. Annual International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) Report	138
2. Incidental Catch Recommendations: Options for the Salmon Troll and Final Recommendations for Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries	147
I. Enforcement (Cancelled)	149
J. Highly Migratory Species Management	150
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report.....	150
2. Recommend International Management Activities	154
3. Drift Gillnet Performance Metrics Review	157
K. Coastal Pelagic Species Management (Cancelled).....	159

Meeting Transcript Summary

Verbatim transcripts of Council Actions are available on the Council website. The transcripts may be accessed at <http://www.pcouncil.org/council-operations/council-meetings/past-meetings/>.

A. Call to Order

4. Agenda

Phil Anderson: [00:00:02] You have that in front of you under agenda item A4. Chair would entertain a motion to approve the agenda and I would ask you to consider the recommendation that we are making to remove K1. Mr. Pollard.

Herb Pollard: [00:00:23] Thank you Chair Anderson. I would move to adopt the agenda from the 248th session of the PFMC as presented with the noted modification to strike item K1.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:37] We have a motion to approve our agenda with the modification to remove agenda item K1. Is there a second? Seconded by Pete Hassemer. Is there any discussion? Seeing none all those in favor say 'Aye'. Oops excuse me, Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:00:53] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I did have a question for NMFS relative to the proposed rule for anchovy?

Phil Anderson: [00:01:05] Is it pertinent to approving the agenda?

Michele Culver: [00:01:07] Well it's pertinent to striking K1 from the agenda.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:11] Okay go ahead.

Michele Culver: [00:01:13] Thanks. To, to what extent, assuming that the, the schedule that's laid out in the agreed to document before the court, to what extent would NMFS have the background documents and analysis available for the Council's review at the April meeting?

Phil Anderson: [00:01:49] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:01:51] Thank you Chair Anderson. Thank you Miss Culver. I can't speak to the exact dates or extent that we will have that information available. This is a very aggressive timeline as it is. We are cognizant of the fact that that proposed rule date is right before the start of the April meeting, so we will do everything in our power to provide as much of the background materials and analysis through the briefing book process as we can.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:24] Any other discussion on the motion to approve the agenda as modified? Seeing none all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:02:34] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:34] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries. We have an agenda for this meeting.

B. Open Comment Period

No transcript

C. Administrative Matters

1. Marine Planning Update

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] Okay. Questions and discussions around the presentation that Caren provided. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:00:12] Thanks. I don't have a question but did want to thank Dr. Braby for representing us through these different iterations of the West Coast Regional Planning Body, and I think she's done a fantastic job and should continue in that role as representing the Council. So the... I'll say marine spatial planning discussions within the State of Washington have continued but at a, at a I guess not generating as much excitement as they had previously, and it seems to be one of those issues where folks don't really get engaged or excited about something until there is an actual proposal for them to review and so it's, it's hard for some to get excited about planning and not knowing whether there will be a proposal and when that may come forward, so I appreciate Caren, you, engaging in these discussions as there have been a few proposals that have come up along the coast not necessarily off Washington but it's, it's great to be able to continue to have a placeholder for us to engage if nothing else.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:06] So I should have gotten this I think out of the presentation but, so in terms of the Council's ability to engage with the alliance, I didn't hear that we necessarily had a seat at the table so to speak, but how....well first of all I fully support Michele's suggestion for your continuation to represent us in these matters, but secondly on relative to the alliance what, what would that look like?

Caren Braby: [00:02:43] Thanks and maybe I wasn't particularly explicit in the presentation but we, we do have a seat at the table. The difference between the alliance and the regional planning body is that when it was the regional planning body it was prescribed who had a seat and now it's voluntary but we are certainly included within that family and, and we have....there's a bare bones Ocean Alliance website that everyone can Google and take a look at and we are included as one of the partners on there so it includes, it lists tribal entities, state governments, Federal governments and PFMC off on our own, in our own category.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:40] Is that something you're willing to continue to do or?

Caren Braby: [00:03:45] I am happy to continue to track it yes, and at this point part of the issue is, is funding and how that plays out, but as far as I understand there's funding through early next year and that should include any costs related to Council participation and annual meetings and so on and the rest of it is webinars, conference calls and just, just tracking and being part of the conversation which is, I'm happy to do.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:13] That's great news thank you. Any other discussion? Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley: [00:04:21] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Caren I have a question. Do you....where does this engage in the process? Is it after a site has been established and a lease has been given and then it engages or are you part of the process before?

Caren Braby: [00:04:41] So thank you for the question and I think that raises a couple of points that I definitely want to leave with the Council. One is that proposals for certain uses in Federal waters or state waters do not go to this alliance first. It is not the portal through which official requests for

permits or leases or anything like that goes but, and the Council's nexus there with, with space use should that affect fisheries should still come through the PFMC nexus, and so I would, I would invite our Federal partners to speak to that particularly, but what this alliance does for us is keeps fisheries elevated within a planning discussion that often focuses on other priorities, things like renewable energy and changing ocean conditions and local committee planning around you know seawalls or all of those kinds of discussions that are not specific to PFMC decision making, but when they do, when we're talking about things like renewable energy and footprints...those are projects that will come to the Council and formal pathways.

Phil Anderson: [00:06:11] Go ahead Bob.

Bob Dooley: [00:06:12] Just a follow up question and a comment. I don't know if you're aware of the Federal effort to come up with a big database and a tool to, actual sighting tool and are you working with them and then if not I've got a few comments on that?

Caren Braby: [00:06:32] Maybe. Why don't you describe it and make some comments that I would be happy.....

Bob Dooley: [00:06:42] If I may.

Phil Anderson: [00:06:44] Yes.

Bob Dooley: [00:06:45] Thank you. I was...I attended a meeting a few weeks ago. It was a webinar with some senior NOAA or NMFS staff, Paul Doremus and Laurel Bryant with the communications and a few other people that I can't remember their names right now because you're on the telephone and you pick it up, but they were talking about this very issue of siting and mapping and understanding the...what the uses of the ocean are and being able to use this tool that's being developed to, to actually make early determinations whether areas are really available or useful. It interested me so I reached out and, and had an invitation to go visit the lab in Beaufort, North Carolina which I did a couple weeks ago and spoke with a man named James Morris who's the head of this project, and it's unbelievably a powerful tool that they're developing but it's only as good as the data, and I was particularly interested in the fishing data, of course that goes into this, and I've, they have reached out to states, they've reached out...they do have a lot of data, a lot of economic data as well as overlaid on top of a myriad of things, you know traffic, other uses, military uses, but it's, it's an unbelievable tool. My take away from that, I spent about four hours there was that, we need to get involved in that. We're welcome to get involved in that to make sure the data is very, very robust because what they conveyed to me is this is the first stop for, for permitting. This is the go, no go right off the bat and if we have our data there represented I think that's very useful. We avoid a lot of conflict after the site's been already issued. This is before that. So I think it's an opportunity for us, a little, little over my head in you know over my pay grade but not so much. I mean I think we have an opportunity and I'd like to maybe take some time to share that with you at some point and maybe there are some there, there and I think there is, I think there really is. An example right now the the... what they showed me on the Pacific Coast they're using five years of fisheries data to, to actually show what's important to fisheries. Well, in the trawl sector it doesn't show much activity in the last few years in the RCA, so that would show on this map as being prime area to put a windfarm and we know that's not true, so they are very.....he was very receptive to maybe, you know other data as well, ancillary data people that you know that can be backed up, that historical data to put in there, so I think it behooves us to get involved with that. Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:09:58] Thanks. Go ahead Caren.

Caren Braby: [00:10:00] Yeah I would just, I would just ask Ryan from the Federal perspective if you know which portal this is. The main Federal data portal that I'm aware of is called the Marine Cadaster and this sounds like something different and something that I'm not aware of.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:17] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:10:20] Yeah I was feverishly trying to find it. I mean I know there is a data dot gov slash ocean but I'm not sure that this is the portal that you're talking about Bob although this is something I could easily take back and talk to James and the National Ocean Service who seem to be the lead if you met with them both.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:40] Yeah great thanks.

Bob Dooley: [00:10:43] Just added.....

Phil Anderson: [00:10:45] Bob.

Bob Dooley: [00:10:45] Thank you Mr. Chair. This is, it's called Aquamapper and it's called Ocean Reports, two different platforms. They're apparently going to roll this out officially in April, and he indicated that they are interested in doing presentations and it might be something that might be of value to the Council to understand what they're doing and how it applies and how we might be able to bolster the data that's being put into this system, so I think that it's, I think it's an opportunity. Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:11:20] Thanks Bob. Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:11:22] Thank you, very interesting Bob. One question and then maybe a comment and so maybe the comment first. This sounds like a might also be a good topic for a CCC discussion. Getting all the Regional Councils involved so I'll probably make that proposal to the, to the South Atlantic who's hosting this year's meeting to see about putting something like this on the agenda. My question was you mentioned sighting but you didn't...you mentioned wind farms, but so does this just energy sightings or what other types of projects are being, is this being applied to?

Bob Dooley: [00:11:59] Mr. Chairman, Mr. Tracy, I...to my knowledge it's two different portals. There's one that has to do with wind energy, energy uses and that, but the other one is actually for aquaculture and aqua farming and so it's all of the above. I do have a little bit of data on it but it's, you know something we could talk about but I think, I think it would be very valuable to get the full picture. Once again I started, my interest and this was a meeting with Paul Doremus and Laurel and they....James was on the phone and said geez come to....anybody's available come down and see it and I did and I think it's...there's some there, there.

Ryan Wulff: [00:12:44] OK thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:47] All right and maybe the links to those portals we could somehow get those in the place where public could have access to them. Is that possible? Kerry.

Kerry Griffin: [00:13:01] Yes thank you Mr. Chair. I'd be happy to follow up with Mr. Dooley and Dr. Braby to get those links available and I'm also curious about getting a little more information on how this relates to the West Coast oceans data portal and I noticed in Dr. Braby's presentation there's

an offshore project tracker tool, so I didn't find that yet but I think there's...should you know hopefully we can find some sort of melding and to make sure we understand how these all relate to each other. Thank you for bringing that up Mr. Dooley.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:38] Great. Anything further on this agenda item? Okay. Thanks very much Caren for bringing that to us and for your continued representation of our interest. We're gonna take.....oh yes.

Kerry Griffin: [00:14:00] I don't think there's any management entity or advisory body reports.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:15] Okay.

Kerry Griffin: [00:14:15] Just, well just for information.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:19] I don't see any. Is there any public comment on this item? Thank you Patricia. All right. Anything else on this agenda item? Okay.

2. Legislative (Cancelled)

3. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures

Phil Anderson: [00:00:02] On C 3. Why don't we do the, take them in order there? I just wanted to compliment Council staff for bringing forward the changes to the Council's operating procedures for our consideration and as well as the comments that we've received from our advisory panels and the public. Among those recommendations were a suggestion that we delay action on this until April to ensure that they've had a full vetting as well as giving us a chance to consider the input that we've received but what are the wishes of the Council? Mark Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:58] Thank you Chair Anderson. I do think the public ought to have an opportunity to review and weigh in. I think the other advisory subpanels who are not here at this meeting should have an opportunity to review and weigh in. I also think that the comments with regard to due process were, are should be, should be significantly, I mean they're significant and they're good comments we should incorporate something. I would note however that whatever due process might be necessary while something is investigated, for example a temporary suspension is a different kind of due process to, to remove someone, so I do think we should, whether it's, we should make explicit somewhere in the language that there'll be some process for people once there, once they've been accused so that's maybe something we can work on between now and April.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:58] Alright thank you Marc. Other comments? Herb Pollard.

Herb Pollard: [00:02:03] Thank you Chair Anderson. My thoughts are very, very similar. We did, though we've, these changes were in the briefing book. People have had a chance to look at them. We did get a really good suggestion on due process. I don't think the urgency would cause us to need to adopt them today if we can go out until April.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:25] Thanks Herb. Other comments? Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson: [00:02:28] Well, first of all thank you Mr. Chairman and everybody because I know I've spoken the last two meetings on the need for this as well, and I do think very much in mind with both Mr. Gorelnik and Mr. Pollard that it would be appropriate to give people some time to think about the comments that have come forward today and throughout this process. I am very appreciative of the fact that we are taking a hard look at this. I do have some concerns about the potential for allegations to be vetted on both sides and, and your comments to that, Marc I think would really, as we think about that, go a long way in that regard to making me feel comfortable that both parties have been heard and that we're not going to somehow, in some way shape or form in the future create a situation where we lose somebody in the process.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:32] Thanks Christa. Louis Zimm.

Louis Zimm: [00:03:40] Thank you Mr. Chair. I also support the comments that have been expressed around the table and what I want to make sure that we do is we keep our eyes on the prize which is the ability for us to actually bring in stakeholders. This is a stakeholder driven process. This is a process that is there for the stakeholders. This is a very rare process in government as you all know and I think we're all very proud of it. Many of the stakeholders come from different backgrounds. They may not have the same training as far as Toastmasters and such, certainly I don't, it's obvious, and I would want to be very careful that we didn't discourage people from coming in and contributing to the process. Having said that I was very impressed with the SSC and the bravery of the one female member that brought up their, their approach to having somebody of a different gender on the people that receive the complaints. So those are my two, my two viewpoints. Thank

you.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:20] Thanks Louis. Other comments? So sensing from around the table there's a desire to put any decision off until at least April. There's been a little bit of direction associated with the remarks that we've heard from the advisory panels and the public. Do you need further clarification on any of that either Chuck or Mike?

Mike Burner: [00:05:50] Thank you Mr. Chair. I guess just to be clear I would, does the Council want me to make any revisions to the drafts as you see them now before they go out for public review in April? I guess and particularly in regard to I heard some support for the SSC's recommended changes and some support from the changes we heard from Mr. Conroy in public testimony. The GMT also had some suggestions regarding posting a document and changes to our 30 day requirement for alternates, so I guess just to be clear what sort of document would you like to go out between now and April?

Phil Anderson: [00:06:22] Well given that there's, whatever there is, three weeks between now and April I'm not sure what is possible in terms of making those changes but...Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:06:38] Thank you, I guess, well I think we can, we can make those changes and put them in the advanced briefing book, whatever changes the Council desire. I guess I did have, maybe want to explore one of the comments a little bit and that was Mr. Conroy's discussion about violation of marine resource regulations and changing that to conviction and you know that it is something, convictions might take quite a while and can be, you know there's, there's a number of technicalities that can come into play in terms of whether somebody is convicted or not. I guess I would advocate for the Council or the Council Chair, Executive Director, or whoever ends up investigating an incident to have the ability to look at what evidence is presented and make a recommendation to the full Council based on, based on their judgment. You know just by way of example, perhaps the NFL might be a good example. They don't necessarily wait for a conviction before they suspend a player that where for example video evidence of abuse occurs and I think, I think that might be the situation that the Council would want to consider action if some situation like that occurred.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:15] Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:08:17] Yeah I don't know. Thank you Chair Anderson. I don't know if we can solve this between now and April. I think we're gonna have to discuss it further there, but if we're going to act without a conviction that's going to make this Council a finder of fact and increase the amount of process that is probably due to the accused, so we'll have to give that some more thought, but we have to keep in mind if we're going to act without a conviction that means we're gonna be sitting here as a court.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:58] Yeah I'm not, well I'm not sure if we're gonna be able to solve or address each of the concerns that's been raised between now and April. I am intrigued about the idea of a suspension as opposed to a removal. I have had some experience in dealing with, in particular sexual harassment charges, and having to make some changes in the workplace prior to any court finding of guilt or innocence so or, or the results of an internal investigation, so sometimes there is a need to take some action, but so this, the idea of the potential of a suspension in certain cases is of interest to me to have available to us. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley: [00:10:17] Thank you Mr. Chairman. It seems like this is gonna be a pretty big lift to

get done before the meeting I agree with that and I think I have some questions at the exact language that would be used and the end result and everyone's understanding to what we exactly changed, so I would suggest that maybe we have like a.... whenever this is brought forward, that we do a track change document that we can see what was and what is proposed and adjust at that time and I think that would make it a lot easier for us to make decisions. The other part about it is, some of this stuff is legal, you know that we could write language that maybe we can't, we can't defend or we can't, or we might not be ready for, for imposing, so I think this, I think it needs to be reviewed by, final language on those type of things need to be reviewed by some Council so that we know we're, we're not ,we're not doing something wrong. So I just would suggest that.

Phil Anderson: [00:11:31] So just in thinking about all this and the issues that have been brought up I would like to not try to set our sights on making a final decision in April but to the extent that this is what other Council members are thinking about, have some modifications made to the current document consistent with the recommendations that we've heard and at the same time allow some additional opportunity for public comment as well as for, and to ensure all of our advisory panels have had an opportunity to, to look at it and provide us comments and maybe have a, an eye on a potential adoption in June instead of trying to see if we're going to jam this through and get a well thought out decision in April. Is that a reasonable approach? Okay. Mike do you need further....I know we didn't give you, maybe the specific direction you were looking for?

Mike Burner: [00:12:44] Thank you Mr. Chair. We'll do our best. I, I think I would like to take advantage of the April session just to take it in front of some of the other advisory groups. I guess what I'm hearing around the table is perhaps just taking the document that is in strike out and underlines so you can see those changes, taking it essentially as written for this meeting to those groups in April. Think about some of the issues that have been around this table. Think about what we hear in April and maybe consider a revision for June for final action. Is that ballpark?

Phil Anderson: [00:13:12] I think so. The other thing I would recommend is that you know even if you have a one page bulleted summary of the additional comments we received from the SSC, the GMT and the public just so that people have the advantage of seeing the comments that we've received so far.

Mike Burner: [00:13:30] Good suggestion. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:33] Okay. Everybody alright with that? Okay so from there we'll move to our appointments and let's first consider the recommendations for two positions that came from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. One is their seat on the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team, and the second is their seat on the Groundfish Endangered Species Workgroup. So I will turn to Mr. Kern.

Chris Kern: [00:14:21] Thanks Mr. Chair. I move the Council appoint Mr. Greg Krutzikowsky to the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife seat on the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team, and appoint Mr. Patrick Mirick to the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife seat on the Groundfish Endangered Species Workgroup.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:36] Thank you. Seconded by Brad Pettinger. Any discussion? All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:14:45] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:45] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries unanimously. Let's next take up the vacancy relative to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife position on the Groundfish Management Team and I'll turn to Mr. Kormos.

Brett Kormos: [00:15:06] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I move the Council appoint Miss Caroline McKnight to the current California Department of Fish and Wildlife vacancy on the Groundfish Management Team.

Phil Anderson: [00:15:16] Thank you and that is seconded by Bob Dooley. Discussion? All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:15:24] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:15:24] Opposed no? Abstention? Motion carries unanimously. We will next consider the vacancy in the North in the National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center on the Salmon Technical Team, and I'll turn to Mr. Wulff.

Ryan Wulff: [00:15:53] Thank you Chair. I move the Council appoint Miss Melinda Rowse to the NMFS Northwest Fisheries Science Center seat on the Salmon Technical Team formerly held by Dr. Robert Kope.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:05] Thank you and that is seconded by Herb Pollard. Discussion? All those in favor say 'Aye'?

Council: [00:16:12] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:12] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries, and the last one is the vacancy on the Salmon Advisory Subpanel of the Washington Coastal Tribal Fishery seat and I'll turn to Mr. Oatman.

Joe Oatman: [00:16:31] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I move the Council appoint Mr. Jon Pink to the current Washington Coastal Tribal Fisheries vacancy on the Salmon Advisory Subpanel.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:43] Thank you and that's seconded by Kyle Adicks. Any discussion? All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:16:49] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:50] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries. Let me now turn to Mr. Burner and ask him if there is any further business we need to do under this agenda item. Before you respond to that question, it will be my intent, based on a recommendation from California Department of Fish and Wildlife to appoint Mr. Travis Buck to the Ecosystem Workgroup and name Mr. Kit Rosenberg, Sergeant Kit Rosenberg as an alternate on the Enforcement Consultants for the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife seat. Mr. Burner.

Mike Burner: [00:17:33] Thank you Mr. Chair. Those last two items button it up from my perspective. We will summarize the comments on the Council operating procedures and put those in the April review materials so that the public and some other advisory bodies have a chance to take a look at those and then look for further down the calendar for final approval there and we will get the process going on these new appointments. So thank you very much.

Phil Anderson: [00:17:55] Thank you.

4. Approval of Council Meeting Record

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] Believe the last matter that we were going to take up here before we adjourn for the day is the consideration of the approval of the November Council meeting record. Entertain a motion. Herb Pollard.

Herb Pollard: [00:00:24] Thank you Chair Anderson. I move that the Council adopt the meeting record for the two hundred and forty seventh session. The November 1 to 8 meeting of the Council in San Diego, California.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:42] Okay. We do have miraculously your motion already on the screen. Does that accurately reflect your motion?

Herb Pollard: [00:00:50] Yes it does.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:51] Is there a second? Seconded by Pete Hassemer. Any discussion? All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:01:00] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:00] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries. Trying to go slower Mr. Executive.... Any other business you would like us to take up today?

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:18] No Mr. Chair. I believe that, that's all the agenda business that we've got for today.

5. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] We're on C5 our future Council meeting agenda and workload planning item. We've had our reports from our advisory panels and teams and public comment so I turn it over to Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:00:17] Thank you Mr. Chair, so I'm just gonna briefly go over the changes in the Year-At-a Glance and then kind of focus in on April I'd like to get that solidified, the April quick reference, and then we'll bounce back to the Year-At-a Glance and talk about June and issues further out and make sure we've touched on all the topics that were brought up in the reports that we just heard and anything else that the Council wants to consider. So for the year to glance just to note that starting with CPS in April we've divided that into two, that anchovy business of into two issues, one hour of management process, an update on that in consideration for moving forward and then one specific to the response to litigation, the proposed rule that should be out at that time. For groundfish, we have changed the gear switching and sablefish area management in June from a range of alternatives to an update. Likewise for September, also change that to an update and then add a range of all....Change the FPA to range of alternatives in November and having preliminary preferred action in March. For HMS, we've added deep set buoy gear authorization, preliminary FMP language to September and final in November so this would be a follow on from assuming that we were able to complete final action on that in June. For salmon we've added....we've changed the schedule for the rebuilding plans such that Chinook is finalized in June and preliminary action on Coho is in June and then final action on Coho plans are in September. For ecosystem business we added climate and communities initiative final action in March 2020 and then for other we've added the Halibut workshop planning for April. I believe those are those are the things we have added. Again we've got some other things that we will be addressing based on the reports we heard and maybe another issue or two that I'll mention when we get to, get back to the Year-At-a Glance. For April specifically, again.....did you have a question?

Phil Anderson: [00:03:21] I did.

Chuck Tracy: [00:03:27] Okay.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:31] So Jim Seger and I did talk about SaMTAAC and when we thought we would have alternatives, and then when the Council might take action on a final preferred and it could well be that, that final decision gets pushed off to March, but I don't.... I don't want to I'm, I'm hesitant to get out in front of the SaMTAAC too far. While that, that may be what we end up doing I...you know we have we have, we have a SaMTAAC meeting coming up here, I think it's the third week of May, and one of the things that we'll be talking about is given that our process got slowed up a bit due to the government, partial government shutdown, we'll want to talk about our schedule, and so I'm not opposed to mapping out the potential that we wouldn't make a final decision until March, but I would like have an opportunity to circle back with the committee and talk about that and see what, what their thoughts are and when we give our report in June you know it will, it will include a suggested schedule for the Council's consideration.

Chuck Tracy: [00:05:01] Thank you and I think we've also heard a couple different recommendations from the reports we heard about the SaMTAAC schedule, so again I think we can have a more thorough discussion on that when we, after we get through the April agenda and get back to the Year-At-a Glance. So as far as April goes, again as I mentioned we have split the CPS northern anchovy agenda item into, into back into two items. One being just an update on the management process. Our Council process that we want to consider for changing our management

approach to the northern anchovy, and the second agenda item is just a dedicated agenda item to respond to the proposed rule that NMFS intends to publish as a response to the litigation, so we thought it.....we thought that that might you know kind of separate the issues a little bit. I recognize that they are very closely related, but so I'll be interested to see if that comports with the Council's thinking on that. I would recognize that there is some potential duplication in what might be said and certainly public comment might, might affect that scheduling as well but that that's how we approached it. We moved, we've moved the sardine assessment a day later, and as a result of that we've added another day of meeting time for the CPSAS and CPSMT on Friday. For Pacific halibut we added the workshop planning, a report on that. In the interim there'll be some discussion between the states and National Marine Fisheries Service and Council staff to talk about roles and responsibility and the intent of that, April will be to review that and to sort of identify a scope of the....the scope of the workshop. Then finally on, well not quite finally, on groundfish electronic monitoring G5 on Monday, because of the partial government shutdown National Marine Fisheries Service has been delayed in their discussions and policy development regarding third party transition plans, so we struck that from the, from that agenda item however we did leave that agenda item on so that there could be an update on progress on that issue as well as others and moving forward with the third party transition and data confidentiality, and just kind of get an update on where we're at with that. But because there will not be any third party transition business to be had we've.... we originally had the GEMPAC and GEMTAC scheduled to meet on Wednesday, April 10th and so we're suggesting that we remove that from the, remove their meeting from the April Council meeting. So those, those are the changes that we've....that are reflected here in this version of the agenda relative to what came out pre-season. So again we've got a number of issues so I'm now looking at Supplemental Attachment 5 that some of those are reflected in this April agenda. A couple of them aren't yet and might, might need to be or should be addressed. One of them on the on the second.....I'm looking at the second group, the items discussed during the current Council meeting, one of them was the Saltonstall-Kennedy project feedback session that was requested by a National Marine Fisheries Service and their contractor. This is a time sensitive issue that would have to be done in April if it was going to be done. It involves a short floor session, perhaps 15 minutes to a half an hour, and then an evening session that would focus on getting feedback from industry members, so I guess I'd like to see what the Council thinks about adding that in to the April agenda. I guess I will note that we've got, we are at five and half days although we've got a....theoretically we've got a half an hour on day two and we do have half a day on day last, anyway so the Saltonstall-Kennedy is one that I guess I'd be interested in hearing a little bit about. Maybe I'll stop there for a minute. There's a list of items, I mean there was quite a number of requests that came out in the advisory body reports, but if you'd like me to.....like I did kind of make a list of those. Most of those are beyond April though I believe, so maybe I'll just pause there and see what people want to think....what they think about the April agenda and if there's anything else that we need to consider for April. Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:11:31] Thank you Mr. Tracy. In regard to your initial.....your initial point about the Council meeting.....April Council meeting now being extended to five and a half days roughly and while we understand with regard to the timeline and process for NMFS rulemaking on anchovy, the States wondering if there can be time savings on that agenda item since the Council already has an agenda item reviewing long term anchovy management which to California seems like it should be the focus for the Council given the timeline of the rule. We're just wondering if it's warranted or beneficial to discuss the Federal rule and to spend two hours doing so after having discussed anchovy for three hours.

Chuck Tracy: [00:12:23] We've had a fair amount of discussion amongst Council staff about that as well. The anchovy items do tend to take up a lot of time and so I think that initially we had this....these items sort of combined and, but I, I, I wouldn't be a bit surprised if we spend five hours

on anchovies in April whether there one agenda item or not, but Ryan did you have a comment?

Ryan Wulff: [00:13:08] Yeah I have a couple of things on the April agenda but if you just want me to talk to that point I would agree with the statement raised by California. We will have outlined the overall timeline for anchovy. We will have an open public comment on that but a very short timeframe to turn that around into a final rule based on the court order so it's NMFS perspective that the bulk of Council time, however you want to break it down, should be focused on the separate agenda item of, of anchovy management and how you might want to take that going forward. Maybe I'll stop there just to that point I have other comments on the April agenda when you're ready.

Chuck Tracy: [00:13:52] I'm ready.

Ryan Wulff: [00:13:53] Okay. So thank you for raising that, like I said I agree with California on that point. I only have two other, actually three other points to make on the April agenda. Chuck you touched on the first one here and I appreciate again the Supplemental Attachment 5. Headquarters has made it very clear that they do want, would like a very short period of time to do the Saltonstall-Kennedy presentation. I think that could be only a 30 minute administrative item. If the Council would be okay with that and then I think that would be sufficient to cover what they plan to do in front of the Council and then of course we'd need to organize or allow for their evening session that they would like to do, and then a minor point we would also support the GMT and others that have said to just make the groundfish E3, I think salmon just an ROA at this meeting, but and finally per our letter that was sent in, our guidance on killer whales, I do want to revisit this issue because I don't see that on Supplemental Attachment 5 and we did put in a request and I know it was a while ago when Barry requested this but we would like at least probably an hour on the April agenda to talk, I don't know what you want to title it, Killer Whale Assessment, if you will to discuss scoping or setting up an ad hoc work group or whatever the Council wants to do to help engage in the planning and process for our re-initiation which would be again not targeted at 2019 salmon measures but a new biological opinion hopefully in time for 2020, and those are my only comments. Thanks.

Chuck Tracy: [00:15:55] Any other thoughts or comments about April agenda? Brad.

Brad Pettinger: [00:16:03] Yeah thank you Chuck. Dealing with the sigma issue, if I see there's a GMT report was talking about being on the June agenda. I also see that on the, the chart in the NMFS report. Is that early enough to get something done potentially to help us for the 21-22 spex cycle?

Chuck Tracy: [00:16:30] So I missed the topic.....

Brad Pettinger: [00:16:35] If we, if we look at the sigma effects expiration in June can we have something in place done by November in time for the spex cycle that will help us for the 21 22 harvest spex?

Chuck Tracy: [00:16:52] I'm sorry I'm not sure exactly....are you talking about the response to the sigma's or what is.....

Brad Pettinger: [00:16:56] Well I mean that the whole issue with risk right? How the Council's going to deal risk including P-star?

Chuck Tracy: [00:17:03] Okay so this is in response to the new sigma values.

Brad Pettinger: [00:17:05] Yeah, yeah, yeah, and so if we start looking at that in June could we

have something done to help us with the spex....the next spex cycle or will that be too late?

Chuck Tracy: [00:17:19] I don't I don't know if I can answer that question or I think it might be maybe, maybe John might be able to help us with that or National Marine Fisheries Service and what, what they think that.....

John DeVore: [00:17:38] Thank you Chuck. Brad. The P-star you know is a policy call by the Council and it's, it's fundamental....fundamentally part of the spex process. The sigma for groundfish anyway isn't going to be implemented until 2021, so it does make sense to include those considerations in the spex process directly.

Phil Anderson: [00:18:04] But, well the other thing that I saw on the GMT's report about what they were planning to do in April. I thought it included a discussion about that.....kind of about that overarching issue as well and so I, I was.....Karen can you help me with that?

Karen Palmigiano: [00:18:39] So the GMT spoke to it in our statement that we're going to provide the Council with more input, or the SSC is going to provide the Council with more input on their plans for applying new sigma's in the 21-22 harvest specifications and we're going to work with Owen over the next month. Not to speak for Ryan, but I as the lead on the harvest specifications for 21-22, that schedule I don't think is an issue for getting the new sigma things into the harvest specifications and getting things out on time.

Brad Pettinger: [00:19:15] I guess the reason I'm asking is it was my understanding that we had to have those numbers for the....in place for the November meeting and that those numbers need to be, need to be ran by Owen and I just wanna make sure when we're on schedule and those numbers are available for the spex at that meeting, so that's all and just make sure we're not overlooking something.

Chuck Tracy: [00:19:38] John do you have a comment on that?

John DeVore: [00:19:40] Yeah. The SSC is tentatively planning to discuss Sigma a little bit further in April and one thought was they could you know provide any further report to the Council on their Sigma deliberations under the science improvements report that's already on the April agenda. So that might be a good way to synchronize all of this.

Chuck Tracy: [00:20:07] Okay.

Phil Anderson: [00:20:09] That's good thanks.

Chuck Tracy: [00:20:12] Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:20:12] Thank you Mr. Tracy. I just want to add that California would support agenda-izing sigma review P-star items as early as possible. That's all.

Chuck Tracy: [00:20:24] Chris.

Chris Kern: [00:20:25] Thanks. If I could just ask a bit of a clarifying question on one of the items for halibut on the workshop planning? I think there was some discussion about a potential for a management entity coordination call sometime between now and then and just wanted to get that out as that's still intended to occur before that?

Chuck Tracy: [00:20:45] That's correct.

Chris Kern: [00:20:46] Thanks.

Phil Anderson: [00:20:47] So I thought, I don't see her, Robin I think was going to help coordinate that to make that happen and working with National Marine Fisheries Service I believe.

Chuck Tracy: [00:21:04] That's correct. We had a little discussion about that this morning at our morning meeting and Robin is going to be heading that up. Any other thoughts about April? So I guess what I've heard is some desire to fit in the Saltonstall-Kennedy feedback agenda item somewhere there. Adding an agenda item for about an hour on killer whale consultations scoping for 2020 implementation of the new biological opinion and then some discussion about the anchovy business of whether five hours is appropriate or whether the....you want to have one or two agenda items to cover that and I got....no go ahead.

Phil Anderson: [00:22:05] Well, I mean my thought is I would keep them separate. You know whether the three and two is right or wrong I don't know but that might also be a day to plug in the southern resident killer whale piece so that we have it early in the salmon sequencing of agenda items and it looked to me like there's enough...you know clarification seldom takes an hour and a half, and if there was a little bit of something less than five that that might be a place for the Southern resident killer whale piece and the other one candidate that I thought was, was on Sunday, the halibut workshop planning at two hours might be a little generous and so that might be a day to plug in the Saltonstall-Kennedy business.

Chuck Tracy: [00:23:09] Maybe just a touch on the Saltonstall-Kennedy. I guess I was hoping that we could get that earlier in the week when both the CPS and the salmon and groundfish folks were there to provide feedback and I think he's looking for industry feedback on that, so that was kind of my intent to try and get that in early. But I think we can probably, I think we can probably do that.

Phil Anderson: [00:23:37] Yeah. I don't. I'm not trying to tell you where to put it but I am....I do feel somewhat strong that the southern resident killer whales should be earlier rather than later of our salmon deliberations so that if there is any kind of assessment modeling whatever that we need...we think we need to do we've got that identified earlier rather than later.

Chuck Tracy: [00:24:03] Okay. Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:24:09] Thank you again Mr. Tracy. I have a question for National Marine Fisheries Service regarding the killer whale item that's being suggested and I don't know if this is appropriate or not at this point in time but I'm just curious if you Mr. Wulff if you're willing or able to sort of speculate on what kind of work might occur between now and then to prepare us for that item when it comes to make the most useful, you know, the best use of that time.

Ryan Wulff: [00:24:46] Yeah thank you Mr. Kormos. Just to reiterate again this item is to talk about how we can engage regarding kind of a longer term process so I mean we'll prepare, we can prepare some materials but again the hope at April is just to begin the scoping process, identify participants that might be part of ad hoc working group. It's not to go over substance of a killer whale assessment or a framework at this time. So that's...that's why we're only recommending an hour for this to set up a process that we could then look at both at that meeting and then as it might carry out through workload planning later on that week.

Chuck Tracy: [00:25:34] Brett.

[00:25:36] Thank you I.....Mr. Wulff I appreciate that. I, I must have missed some of the detail there so I appreciate your response.

Phil Anderson: [00:25:45] I guess the my.....I'm not, not, not speaking counter to that thought, I just.....and I'm not sure what NMFS is thinking about this but I don't think we can walk away and with a decision in April without having some sort of general sense of the prey base piece because I think if we do we are opening ourselves up and not in a good way. Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:26:28] And you're referring to the 2019 and the conversation we had earlier and yes so I don't think we need a separate agenda item for that discussion and we are planning to address that and to have that be wrapped into what is already one of the, you know the main salmon agenda items and it would happen early on in the week.

Phil Anderson: [00:26:46] Okay....I just didn't, well I was, I just didn't want to lose that or, or in the back and forth between you and Mr. Kormos forget that that was also a piece.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] Yes.

Chris Kern: [00:00:01] Thanks Mr. Chair. I guess as a question to NOAA as well, and this may be something down the road rather than for April given the timeline is the potential. So I guess I'll throw it on the table now for you to consider with the notion it's probably later than April but just in case, of having some folks come maybe as an afternoon or as an evening workshop to educate some of the Council folks on the biology and issues going on with southern residents. Given the agenda we have for April maybe that's not the time for it and also the putting something together and getting people there, that may be too short of notice, so maybe I shouldn't have brought it up a Year-At-a Glance but since the topic was up I was just going to mention and maybe get it on your radar to be thinking about it. I think it would be helpful at some point. I don't know that that means it's necessary to do in April though.

Ryan Wulff: [00:00:56] Thank you for that Mr. Kern and yes I'm....we're obviously going to be having conversations with that side of NMFS too, as soon as we leave here so we can take that into account and see where it might best be a fit.

Chris Kern: [00:01:08] Appreciate it.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:10] So I'm not sensing any more discussion here on the April agenda items. I think we've got our guidance in terms of Saltonstall-Kennedy and killer whales and I think we can manage to get that incorporated into the April agenda. So maybe I'll just stop right there. Let me ask Mike if he's got any concerns about this. Are you okay with that? Then why don't we move into the Year-At-a Glance and since we're talking about southern resident killer whales why don't we just start with that and see if we can deal with it, so if we have this agenda item, kind of first scoping of a process to deal with the consultation in April, I guess my first question to NMFS would be, you know, let's start working backwards from the end point, so if the intent is to have a new consultation in place for 2020 fisheries I guess when, when is the, when do you need recommendation, final recommendations from the Council in order to consider that, consider the Council's recommendations in that process? And then let's kind of work backwards through that to see what sort of meetings and deliberations are necessary.

Ryan Wulff: [00:02:37] Thank you Chuck. I appreciate the question although I think it's a little bit early to answer that at this point. I mean we've just announced we're reinitiating. We still need to start to look at this. I mean that's why we only want an agenda at April to look at process and how it might be structured, so that's what we're planning to come prepared to discuss in a few weeks, but I don't have the answer to that at this time.

Chuck Tracy: [00:03:00] So then I'm taking it there's not any recommendations for any additional meetings or you know putting this on the Council agenda in June, September, or November or I would assume that we would need something?

Ryan Wulff: [00:03:17] I mean we can add placeholders now to the Year-At-a Glance but we are gonna be prepared based on that discussion in April to then fill out the Year-At-a Glance based on how the Council reacted and what structure and process we put in place.

Chuck Tracy: [00:03:29] Okay. Okay well we'll just wait for April then and go from there. Okay so what else do we have to deal with Year-At-a Glance-wise I mean the first thing I'd like to deal with is 7.3 days in June and see if there is any, anything there that we can, we can take off or, or discuss. There is a number of shaded items there. I guess one of the, maybe I'll just start at the bottom with the allocation review procedures final so that there, there is a deadline for us to come up with a process to consider allocation reviews on all our FMP's based on NMFS policy directive, so I'm not sure if National Marine Fisheries Service has any comments on, on that, but our plan was to finalize that. We've got a preliminary action in April on that, so I think the deadline is in July. That shouldn't, I would hope that would not be a major agenda item. I think it should be pretty straightforward. I'm hoping to address it through adoption of a Council Operating Procedure. Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:05:41] Thank you Mr. Tracy. I just wanted to assert in looking at the June agenda and you know you've asked this question about prioritization perhaps specifically with things that are shaded there. I just want to take the opportunity to indicate our preference to prioritize, prioritize the omnibus item over the gear switching and sablefish area management item that we see there.

Chuck Tracy: [00:06:17] Okay. I think we did hear a little discussion earlier about the desire to hear back from the SAMTAAC on that although they won't be meeting until after the April meet, after the April meeting.

Phil Anderson: [00:06:32] My....I would envision the SAMTAAC agenda item to be short, 30 minutes or less. It would be a written report. We're still going to be in our, this discussion and in kind of analytical stage of the conversation and narrowing of alternatives hopefully from what we have right now, so I wouldn't expect any substantive, you know we're not going to be looking for any decisions or guidance, it's just going to be an update on our meeting that we have in May so it should be.....it's not going to occupy much time unless Jim gives me dirty looks from over there but I'm not seeing any.

Chuck Tracy: [00:07:28] So, so you know we had originally had this scheduled for a range of alternatives. I think we had 4 hours on there.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:35] I'm guessing 30 minutes for an update.

Chuck Tracy: [00:07:37] That, that will help a lot.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:40] Can I...Bob?

Bob Dooley: [00:07:41] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I agree with that assessment for sure. I think it's important that we keep both on the agenda because it's informative. Right now the SaMTAAC rating from the GMT is very high load and might, that might of workload, that might change when we narrow the alternatives it's really hard to tell where that's going until we go a little farther down the road, so I definitely agree with your assessment on that. I also think it's really important that, we've heard a lot of testimony here in this Council meeting about the omnibus and the importance of those prioritized items particularly the mothership. We had a lot of testimony on that and I think it's important that we give them guidance of when they might expect some action. So I think that, that should be included in this in the going forward. Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:33] Jim.

Jim Seger: [00:08:35] Thank you Mr. Chairman. With respect to the length of that agenda item, you know if we're going to give a kind of an update and an explanation of the alternatives and the SaMTAAC report I can imagine that taking 20 minutes or so to kind of do that. The question in my mind would be are you going to also be receiving reports from the GAP and the GMT? How is the Council action describe will you need to take public comment and if, if those are going to come under that item as well if it's not just an update with no Council action or something then I can see the time being extended beyond that, that 30 minute, 30 minute desire. And the other....with respect to Mr. Dooley's comment on the omnibus item keeping in mind that the this may be within what you said but that the, in terms of making progress on that item it's a matter of the support from the GMT and so forth and they've indicated that moving forward on the SaMTAAC will be taking all their time which, yeah...

Phil Anderson: [00:09:39] Yeah so I'm, I'm strongly advocating it not be listed as an action item. It's simply a report and that we confine, confine it.

Chuck Tracy: [00:10:00] Herb.

Herb Pollard: [00:10:00] Thank you Phil, Chuck. I just note that the flexibility in ACL management item's still on there, the GMT report suggested that not be on there but they also suggested that might be a place to discuss response to the sigma change, but there may be some adjustment there I don't know that's going to save time, but that was an advisory recommendation.

Chuck Tracy: [00:10:27] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:10:29] Thank you. It seems like we're diving into their groundfish shaded areas here so I agree with Phil I do think just an update for the SaMTAAC but for the gear switching report, and I agree with Herb but I was going to note that as well for moving the flexibility in ACL management, also in the GMT report was moving the midwater trawl EFP out of June to September, which we would support as well as I believe the NMFS report and consistent with California's report moving the CTA regions out of June to a later date. That's what I have for groundfish.

Chuck Tracy: [00:11:14] Moves midwater trawl to September and CCA to some future date. I guess I will point out that right now we've got the omnibus project to be determined. We've got a two hour time slot for that in June. I believe that has been supplanted by the omnibus, the four out of five omnibus agenda items and I think you know a number of the groundfish issues should be coordinated and under that agenda item so you know CCA non-trawl, RCA's, whiting business all kind of need to

be considered under that agenda item so I guess first of all I would expect that you should see that, see an omnibus or a groundfish workload planning or however you want to characterize it not only in June but in September and November and then again in either March or April of next year. So I guess maybe one question is, is does 2 hours sound like the right amount of time to discuss that each and every Council meeting or is that, could that be trimmed back a little bit?

Phil Anderson: [00:12:53] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:12:56] Yeah. I think you could probably trim that back a little bit.

Chuck Tracy: [00:13:02] Okay maybe set that for an hour and see how it goes on the first, first go round and then maybe change that as we keep moving forward.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:19] Did you want to just keep focused on the groundfish pieces or?

Chuck Tracy: [00:13:25] Well I'd say why not until we wrestle them to the ground and then we can move on.

Brett Kormos: [00:13:33] Thank you Mr. Tracy. Going back to the RCA line changes and spex effective in January 2020, excuse me 2021. The question is what is the plan for addressing those line changes? The NMFS report suggests a November 2020 timeline for FPA on RCA lines. How will the GMT and States and NMFS complete the spex analysis if we don't consider RCA line adjustments in that process?

Chuck Tracy: [00:14:04] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:14:05] Yeah. Thank you Mr. Kormos. So NMFS supports changes to the RCA that turn on or off RCA lines that are already in regulation, but any changes that would open new areas or substantially modify the lines would be outside the scope of what could occur in the specifications process, or put another way, you know we can't open areas that have been closed since 2002-2003 in the spex process. We can do routine adjustments in open areas recently fished and modify coordinates that define RCA's.

Chuck Tracy: [00:14:50] Pete.

Pete Hassemer: [00:14:52] Thanks Chuck. Just a follow up on that. I know on the omnibus procedure and our action under G4 we prioritized four things. I would just note that two of those four seemed a little higher priority than non-trawl RCA and the mothership sector allocation. Both of those we adopted the GAP recommendation, and part of their recommendation was to get those on the year and Year-At-a Glance, and I understand that the late night work of refining this but maybe in April the Year-At-a Glance might reflect those because we, we already take, took action to say they should be on there. There are other items on that omnibus list. The NMFS list recognizes the non-trawl RCA modification but doesn't highlight that mothership sector allocation. I bring that up because when we get to April and we have another two hours and we're discussing Year-At-a Glance, the size of those shaded boxes they get filled in with things and when we get to June in our omnibus procedure we're, we're losing space to address what we have already identified as high priority issues, so maybe at this point the request would be just to see if there's, we can fit those things in the Year-At-a Glance that we see in April so we start setting aside, recognize that we have to get some time for those specifically those to the non-trawl RCA and the mothership sector allocation specifically because that, that was our recommendation under G4 that we get them on the schedule.

Chuck Tracy: [00:16:53] Well I'll just make one comment on that and while I think there is some merit there. I guess I would point out that it's not just a matter of finding time on the Council's agenda but also finding time on GMT's agenda, the folks that do the analysis and you know whether it's realistic to put something on the agenda where we don't have the manpower to you know provide the reports then I think that's something else we have to take into consideration.

Pete Hassemer: [00:17:27] And thanks and I respect that, that this the schedules are heavy and the GMT needs to look at that. I'm just thinking of our long term vision as we approach so it doesn't show up then we tend not to think about things. Thanks.

Chuck Tracy: [00:17:45] I believe that was the point of the omnibus being....

Phil Anderson: [00:17:47] Bob.

Bob Dooley: [00:17:53] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a comment there. There was talk about combining the non-trawl RCA decision and the CCA and it'd be nice to have some input on that when we do make that decision of, does that really add to the workload or does it make it complimentary and make it easier for us to make those decisions and then kind of maybe a little off track but I hope not, is I'm concerned about the opening of the RCA's and reflecting what Ryan had talked about a little bit ago that it could be a big process to do that and I would, I would.....in the back of my mind I'm thinking for a better term 'price of admission' to do this could be some monitoring oversight and we could get everybody all dressed up for the ball, but because of the scale of the operations that can't afford high skill monitoring such as observers and stuff we, we've done nothing, and so I think it needs to be considered of what we may be requiring for the price, better term 'price of admission' to gain access to these RCA areas by non-trawl and what we may require of them for, for oversight and monitoring and if they can afford it if it's doable, so I and I'm not a proponent of one size fits all at all, but I think it needs to be considered in the big picture because we have a lot on the menu here. If we develop a program for them to enter it and it has a condition that isn't tenable, we've done nothing, so that's just a thought in my mind and maybe I have it wrong and I could use some advice to be stand to be corrected if that's okay so thank you.

Chuck Tracy: [00:19:54] So I think we're, we're making some progress on June. You know I kind of want to keep, you know keep focused on June first. We talked about you know having stuff show up on the agenda further out which I think is fine but, and I know that in April we're going to hear, you know we might hear back from the SSC on the sigma and risk business that might affect how we, how we utilize that the time that's already scheduled for flexibility and ACL management, so I guess I'm inclined to leave that, leave something, a placeholder there that's shaded. I think we're getting closer to something that we could at least present as you know something that can fit on one piece of paper in April as far as the draft June but maybe we should move on and see if there's any other issues in CPS or HMS or elsewhere anybody has something to talk about.

Phil Anderson: [00:21:03] Rich.

Rich Lincoln: [00:21:03] Thank you Chair. Well I'll dip into the HMS piece a little bit. Maybe try to thread together some of the different things that we've heard. So we've had...we know from the discussions here this week that we, as a result of the shutdown, that there had been some delays in some of the team's work on the performance metrics and we, I think we've kind of confirmed in our discussions that certainly making sure that we get to the NFEA and the deep set buoy gear authorization as a high priority, and then we've also had a pretty significant discussion this week on

the issue of hard caps. I think, I think a general sense from the Council that we do want to take that up, so the question there is what's the appropriate timing? And we've had some recommendations from California that it would make sense to delay that to March. It seems like a long time to me but there are factors there that need to be considered. Then there's the questions of priorities of the things that are on HMS agenda. So when I think about comparing say the priority of when we take up a discussion of the hard caps versus when we take up a new discussion on scoping short set long line for me, it's like well I'd like to see the Council conclude its business on, on discussing where we, where we are, where we go with hard caps, so I guess I would have a kind of a threading the needle recommendation that perhaps we should let the team focus in June on performance metrics and deep set buoy gear authorization and then consider putting both the scoping of short set long line and an initial discussion on the hard caps in November when we are again in California and have folks in the same place. The team raised the question about, well, if we're going to do some analysis on hard caps without knowing kind of where some of those decisions are it's going to be difficult, but if we have a discussion in, if we have the discussion in November, talked about some of those contingencies and then the team was going to do some work over the winter presumably it would have some information about that to incorporate and perhaps in some analysis, so that's just one idea.

Chuck Tracy: [00:23:33] Let me be....make sure I've got your comments correct, so you're recommending moving shallow set long line scoping to November and also adding a hard cap agenda item in November?

Rich Lincoln: [00:23:50] Right.

Phil Anderson: [00:23:53] Thoughts about that? Christa.

Christa Svensson: [00:23:53] Yeah. I, I'm in agreement with much of what Mr. Lincoln has said and thank you both for letting me speak but I, I guess and this is partially being new to the process. I am in favor of continuing forward with deep set buoy gear. I know we had a robust conversation about that at the November meeting and not wanting to get that off track and we at that point had postponed the scoping to the June meeting and I continue to hear from California positive in terms of what they think will be the timeframe for, for the deep set, or excuse me the drift gillnet fishery in terms of the possibility of having changes there which really leads me from, from a prosecuting a fishery that is currently underutilized and for providing folks in the general public other commercial alternatives, the ability to, to look at other alternatives and I think that's what scoping is about, so I, I would prefer to keep it in June if at all possible but I, I do defer to the rest of the folks on the Council who have been here longer if there is a reason why it does make more sense in terms of threading the needle.

Chuck Tracy: [00:25:41] Louis.

Louis Zimm: [00:25:41] Thank you very much Chuck. I do agree with my colleague that informing and scoping alternatives to these various ways to access a swordfish resource is important and I'm not quite clear how much time would be taken up in an actually scoping these alternatives like for instance shallow set long line, so I would like to be informed about it if, if possible and so I'm not quite sure the resources that we need to call upon to do so and I'd like to know that before I made a decision. Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:00:02] Yeah thank you. To that point you know I, it's at least my understanding that Council staff has been corresponding with Western Pacific Council staff to prepare scoping materials

and I do think also from a NMFS perspective we would be prepared to start this discussion in June. I don't see any causal link with other, in fact I think it's actually more relevant if we're talking about these other swordfish issues to have that conversation there and I don't think there's any problem like this Council has said over the last two meetings to have buoy gear be at the beginning of the meeting followed by the shallow set long line scoping in the same meeting in June, especially in San Diego which is considerable ease for the stakeholders that have already been planning and expecting to come in and talk to the Council, so that's my comments. Thanks.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:10] Michael Clarke.

Michael Clarke: [00:01:12] Thanks Chuck. I guess my, my, my, my preference would be to at the June meeting try and combine the discussion of the drift gillnet performance metrics and the discussion of the hard caps. But I think you know I think I could certainly support Rich's proposal the move, move, move at least the, the drift gillnet hard cap discussion to November. I certainly, I think it's important for participants in this fishery to get a better understanding of the, the lay of the land with regard to what the future looks like before, certainly before March of 2020.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:48] Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:01:50] Thank you Mr. Tracy. I just, I just want to reassert California's position on the drift gillnet item. We feel that it's critical that it's, that it stays on the June agenda.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:59] The drift gillnet performance metrics?

Brett Kormos: [00:02:04] That's correct. Maybe I'm getting confused. I'm sorry I'm a little out of my depth on some of this stuff.

Chuck Tracy: [00:02:12] So....?

Phil Anderson: [00:02:13] Brett was that comment directed toward that performance metrics?

Brett Kormos: [00:02:17] Yes it was I'm sorry.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:18] No that's alright. Okay.

Chuck Tracy: [00:02:22] Rich.

Rich Lincoln: [00:02:23] Thanks just maybe just one quick follow up. You know part of my thinking about the short set long line scoping topic is that one of the key purposes of that discussion is to decide in fact whether the Council chooses to move forward or not with authors....you know subsequent discussions about authorizing that gear. So, I mean for me, that's a pretty significant discussion. We know that there is an awful lot of interest and emotion around that topic from all different angles, from the fishery participants to the general public, and so I think that's a fairly significant discussion, both making sure that we get the scoping done thoroughly so that we can make an informed decision but also considering that we're going to need sufficient time on the agenda to actually have that kind of discussion and decide whether or not we're going to move forward, so I don't know what....I don't know what that looks like but I have to say that I've got some reservations about whether that picture fits with where we are right now even notwithstanding some of the comments Ryan made about work that may have already been done. I don't know that... I don't want to get to that point where we scope and we have some unanswered questions and then if they, if that

was the case I certainly would be then recommending that we delay a decision about whether we move forward or not, so....

Chuck Tracy: [00:04:01] Well let me make this suggestion that we leave it on the June agenda as a shaded item. We come back in April and see if we've...what the status of the information is in terms of ripeness for scoping. We do have, it is a five hour agenda item. We've put a lot of time for that so I think we've got adequate, well be nice if that was enough. I'm not sure it will be, but anyway that will give people a chance to you know consider this further and see where we go from there.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:49] Chris.

Chris Kern: [00:04:53] Thanks Mr. Chair. I just though was gonna, not on the shallow set issue but ODFW is also supportive of getting the drift gillnet discussion on the agenda, the hard gap discussion and so November seems to make sense location wise but we're supportive of that too.

Chuck Tracy: [00:05:15] I think we could put a shaded agenda item for drift gillnet hard caps in November and then we can as we go forward through the year we can see where if, if that's where it ultimately lands or needs to be moved around a little bit. Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:05:31] Thank you Chuck. I support your proposed way forward here. I do think it's helpful to keep shallow set on the Year-At-a Glance or on the June agenda as it is, but I do think we should revisit this in April. I'm happy to have that discussion on our part but there's another concern I just wanted to make sure the Council didn't forget about, you know, it is, we raised, we will know by April if we are going to have the ability to have an economic analysis on buoy gear, for that authorization in time for the June meeting and I think that might be relevant to this overall discussion too.

Chuck Tracy: [00:06:12] Very true. Any other FMP or any other HMS business or....

Christa Svensson: [00:06:23] Can I ask one more question just with regard to the yellowfin response? I didn't know when we need to have that response in by but is that something that can be moved or is that something that really does need to be addressed at the June meeting?

Chuck Tracy: [00:06:40] I'm not sure of the answer that. It is shaded so I assume that there is some potential to move it but maybe National Marine Fisheries Service has some insight on the timeline for addressing that overfishing concern.

Ryan Wulff: [00:06:54] Well yeah, I mean I think there needs to be Council action by November on that for the timeline so it can be a very short agenda item, but we would need to have something in June notice and come, in case there was Council direction for us to do any analysis, to come back in September, and we will also have an update at that point from the IATTC Scientific Advisory Committee. We'll have an update on stock status too by the June meeting. So....

Chuck Tracy: [00:07:24] Is there a possibility that that after receiving that update assessment that we will not need to be making comments on yellow fin overfishing?

Ryan Wulff: [00:07:36] There's always a possibility.

Chuck Tracy: [00:07:38] I understand it was very close to the threshold there.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:47] Will there be more information in April about that or not?

Ryan Wulff: [00:07:50] No. The SAG is in May.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:52] Okay.

Chuck Tracy: [00:07:57] So it sounds like we need to leave that on there for something. We have it scheduled for two hours right now. I don't know if that's, that seems like that might be a bit much.

Ryan Wulff: [00:08:08] That might be but, you might be able to trim that but I do think it's important to have a notice as an individual agenda item just in case.

Chuck Tracy: [00:08:15] All right any other HMS issues? Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:22] Well I would just note as everyone else I'm sure recognizes the breadth of topics that we have on HMS in June is about as big as I've seen and it'd be easy to underestimate the amount of time it's going to take to work through them because I think it would be easy to underestimate the number of members of the public that are going to want to weigh in.

Chuck Tracy: [00:08:55] We have two full days scheduled for HMS in June right now.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:59] Right and that's why we have a seven and a half day meeting which is part of the problem that we're trying to address.

Chuck Tracy: [00:09:05] That's right.

Phil Anderson: [00:09:08] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:09:10] Yeah. Just a quick one on HMS I forgot to note. I mean you've already got it here but there's been some recommendations from the management team and NMFS and California and reflective of our discussion on EFP's and extending those, so I think you've already captured that here but just a reminder that we would probably need to do that in June.

Chuck Tracy: [00:09:30] Okay.

Phil Anderson: [00:09:34] So we can talk about this again in April, but I have serious concerns we're taking on more than we can handle in one meeting and accomplish all the rest of the things that we have on this agenda and I'll just leave it there.

Chuck Tracy: [00:09:55] Okay. Sounds like we're winding down on HMS for now unless somebody wants to take the bull by the horns and move one of those agenda items out at this point. If not, is there any CPS business? We've got a mackerel assessment and biennial management measures, standard business there and some business on management category review and stock assessment cycle review. I think the management category review I think has some relationship to what we're planning to do in April regarding the central subpopulation of northern anchovy, our management approach there. I don't know if that deserves a....it's own agenda item you know separate from, from working with CSNA but that has been scheduled it's not, it's not a shaded item so if there's any thoughts about anything in the CPS world that that might be one. Seeing none I guess not seeing any proposals to change that at this point, we can, we'll have some more feedback from the CPS folks in April at any, in any event so we can tackle that then. So at this point I'm kind of thinking we're

covered the June agenda about as well as we can so...Mike you have a comment?

Mike Burner: [00:11:45] Yeah. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Chuck. Just one thought, if we could step back to groundfish for a second. We have two hours planned for stock assessment approval. We'll just have the one star panel for cabezon completed in time for June so one consideration might be to either shorten that down or postpone the cabezon assessment approval till September. I don't think that causes any wrinkles in the groundfish process but that would be an option.

Chuck Tracy: [00:12:11] That's a very attractive thought. Does anybody have any problem with that? Okay. We'll bounce it on make sure it's okay with the SSC in April, but that sounds like a good, a good plan. Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:12:29] Thank you Mr. Tracy. Back to the HMS item and you know Mr. Anderson's comments around the workload there, it's, it seems prudent to just point out or remind the Council that the HMS Management Team is also currently down to two members, so I don't know if that presents challenges given all of the things that need to be dealt with there but....

Chuck Tracy: [00:12:58] Good.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:59] Well I mean I think it's an important observation, and having some consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the HMS Team between now and April seems like it would be a good thing to do so we can ensure when we leave April that we have something in June that can actually be accomplished.

Chuck Tracy: [00:13:30] Yeah, again you know it's the same comment as we had under groundfish was that even if we have time on the Council's agenda we may not have capacity to generate materials and that. So.....Chris?

Chris Kern: [00:13:50] Well I had question on another species section if that's appropriate and I guess just a question first. On the rebuilding plan for salmon that we currently have scheduled for June, I notice we, we had the final four Chinook and a note for a preliminary in Coho, and so I think maybe the first question I should ask is, I assume we do need a preliminary look at Coho before we go into September and consider....or uh September and consider anything final? And so that item really does need to be scheduled in June for....on behalf of the Coho part?

Chuck Tracy: [00:14:30] Yes.

Chris Kern: [00:14:31] Okay. I was toying with the notion of could the Chinook plans be rolled to September in the interest of time, but if we already have to do Coho as a preview adding on the Chinook piece shouldn't be a significant piece of the timeline? That's, that's why I was asking.

Chuck Tracy: [00:14:49] Yeah I think that's, I think that's what we'd like to do. I think it also spreads the workload out for our staff so they don't get a whole bunch of stuff in September and then they're trying to deal with southern resident killer whale issues. Okay. Rich.

Rich Lincoln: [00:15:04] Thanks and this isn't a June topic it's just a little bit of housekeeping it seems like on the ecosystem area that we might have tasked the team to come back in September with, with some information on some additional objectives and the FEP review and I just didn't see that on the schedule.

Chuck Tracy: [00:15:23] Yeah that's correct. I did want to touch on that, that I think we do need to add that in. Oversight on our part. Well I think kind of winding down here on June I guess. If there is, if there is any other low hanging fruit in September through March, any comments or discussion on that? My list of items from the advisory body and management entity reports, I think everything's been touched on here. So I think I'm, in terms of the agenda planning, if anybody has anything else on that I'd like to hear it now and then if not we can move into a couple of other workload issues. Okay I guess for, for one the SSC report had a number of workload items that they were proposing. I just want to check and see if there's any, if anybody has any problems with that or wants to address anything in there but I think I'll just leave it at that for now. If not I did want to touch on another ecosystem issue and that is the establishment of the core team which we got direction to do which includes members of the Ecosystem Work Group, Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel, NMFS Council staff and somebody from the Science Center or IEA team so I guess I'm envisioning that to be some type of an ad hoc work group, oh and it also includes the CSI Season, so I think the direction was for the Council leadership to take a stab at that. Phil did you have any thoughts on that?

Phil Anderson: [00:17:50] Yeah I just, and I was mindful of comments from, made from California to keep this group down to a relatively small number of folks. So my thinking was from the work group Yvonne and Corey Niles from the EAS, Gway Kirchner and Corey Riding, three CSI folks, Rich, John Ugoretz and Caren Braby and then from the IEA and I don't know whether we need two. I would need some guidance around that, but Toby or Chris or both were the people we were thinking about.

Chuck Tracy: [00:18:53] I also had a thought that I think the instruction was IEA or the science center staff and I also thought maybe Dan Holland might be a candidate but we should probably coordinate with, with the Science Center folks on that, we'd make a decision there.

Phil Anderson: [00:19:13] And then was there a Council staff person?

Chuck Tracy: [00:19:18] There will be.

Phil Anderson: [00:19:20] Okay.

Chuck Tracy: [00:19:23] But they're not sure who that's gonna be yet.

Phil Anderson: [00:19:25] With the understanding we need to check with a couple folks does that sound like a reasonable population of that group? Yeah okay.

Chuck Tracy: [00:19:35] Okay, I think that's about all I've got on my, my radar screen for this agenda item. Does anybody have any other workload issues or anything else we need to be thinking about between now and April? Okay Mr. Chairman.

Phil Anderson: [00:19:59] Alright. Well that takes us to the end of our meeting agenda if there's nothing else to come before Council I'd entertain a motion to adjourn.

Bob Dooley: [00:20:10] So moved.

Phil Anderson: [00:20:12] Moved by Bob Dooley. Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Don't everybody jump in at the same time. All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:20:16] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:20:17] Safe travels.

D. Salmon Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Report

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] So that takes us to Council discussion. So, go ahead. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:07] Thank you Chair Anderson. I just want a few comments on the southern resident killer whale topic. I know we'll get into it more in later agenda items. The reason that I had asked whether the reconsultation will consider other aspects of salmon abundance that might be made available to that southern resident killer whale stock is that, at least with regard to the Sacramento Fall, the abundance is far, far below that system's ability to produce fish. I took a look at, I think it was pre-season one report which reports 36 years worth of salmon abundance in the Sacramento system. The first 24 years we had 10 years of over a million fish and only 2 years below 500,000. I think the average over those 24 years in terms of the index was around 900,000 fish. If you look at the last 12 years we didn't have a single year over a million fish, in fact we had nine years below 500,000 fish. So when it comes to providing at least for the Sacramento River stock, when it comes to providing some salmon for that southern resident killer whale, the biggest problem we have is the lack of production in that system. When I look at the ocean harvest over the last four or five years I think we're looking at a hundred thousand fish or less, even if we were to shut down ocean fishers, ocean fisheries entirely. So the biggest, I mean the number of fish taken out of the ocean in both the troll and the sport fisheries pales in comparison to what we're missing from the lack of production owing to inland, inland conditions, so that's, that is one point I wanted to make. The other point I wanted to make is that while though three stocks were listed in the NMFS letter, there are numerous other Council managed stocks that are higher on the priority list and I would expect the SAS and subsequently the Council to consider all of those stocks when it comes to considering the southern resident killer whale and I would expect the considerations to be listed in order. The priority of those stocks, and I will note that the, at least in terms of the two California stocks that are listed in the letter, they're way down the list as opposed to other stocks of greater importance. So those are my comments.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:00] Thank you. Pete Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer: [00:03:02] Thank you Mr. Chair. I think probably very similar comments to what Mr. Gorelnik just made. I appreciate in the NMFS report the focus on some habitat actions as a long term fix for this. I just want to point out from a Snake River perspective on whether it's the Council and biological diversities priority list or the NMFS list of priority stocks, I think they're about the same but the number nine stock out of all of those is Snake River Spring Chinook. It's not a Council managed stock so one might wonder how that fits into the picture and I would just note as was stated for California stocks the low levels of production for the Snake River stocks. The wild fish that could be producing somewhere in the range of 60 to 90,000 adults returning the Columbia River, this year's forecast is less than 10,000. For the hatchery stocks, this hatchery system was designed to return somewhere in the range of 200 to 600,000 adult Chinook to the mouth of the Columbia River and hatchery production levels have actually been at the design capacity to do that, but this year the forecast is for substantially less than 50,000 of those fish to get to the Columbia River mouth. That's not even backing those fish out into the Salish Sea or the Puget Sound area to see how many fish might swim through there and be available, so increasing the productivity of those stocks, while they don't contribute to the Council fisheries would provide substantial resources to southern resident killer whales and maybe take the pressure off of some of those other stocks, so in the long term perspective, actions in the fresh water, whether it's in the rearing habitat or the migration corridor that increase survival, increase abundance there, have a direct benefit to the Council managed fisheries, so

again I, I, I acknowledge that NMFS is looking at the habitat aspects and strongly encourage them to do that and, and look at places like the Snake River even though they, they're not Council managed fish resources there, they do have an indirect effect on the Council managed fisheries. Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:44] Chris Kern.

Chris Kern: [00:05:46] Thanks Mr. Chair. I have lots of questions and lots of things to talk about but I'm not going to try and go there in the interest of efficiency, but as we contemplate some of the things, first of all I agree with the prior points largely as well, but just thinking about the process as we go towards the discussion of whether it be workshop or other things, I have lots of thoughts on those kinds of processes so are we anticipating engaging on those things during this week possibly, I mean obviously we may be talking about how actions we're considering may affect consultation or the population of killer whales itself. Are we intending to engage at some other level about a more detailed discussion or do we know?

Phil Anderson: [00:06:40] Can...may, maybe I have a thought about that but I need to express it in maybe two different ways. The....you know the.....Barry identified the three pieces and two of those are, are directly related to our process and their short term long term, so 2019 I'm looking at the letter, talked about the three stocks that were included in the list of priority prey stock framework and after identifying those three stocks said you'd like the Council's participation between now and the April meeting to help us understand the potential impact of proposed Council fisheries on the draft priority southern resident killer whale prey stocks. So I'm going to, I'm going to circle back to yours Chris in a moment, so my, one of my questions is, is that request for us to engage our STT and other experts that we have to allow us to assess the effect of the fisheries on the prey base that are associated with those three stocks or is it trying to assess the impacts on the prey base for all of the stocks that are on the priority prey, that are in the priority prey stock framework?

Barry Thom: [00:08:20] Thank you Mr. Chairman. In response to that direct question it would be for the for the Council and STT to work on the priority prey stocks that interact with Council fisheries, so it's more than the three but less than the entirety of the list of priority stocks that are in the list, and so that's where I think we go and work and identify....we've been doing some work to make it clear and confirm that list of those stocks that are actually potentially impacted with Council fisheries.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:50] Okay, so one of the things that I was thinking about was that with that understanding we could, we could ask the STT to work with the appropriate NMFS staff and bring this back on, on when, when we go about making our decisions on our alternatives that we're sending out for public review to also have clarity on the task for the STT and what those stocks are, that the second piece is that I was thinking about that is directly related to your thoughts Chris were, so you look at their, their letter and their long term and they're, you know they're asking that we develop a long term approach as soon as practicable and then they go through some discussion about wanting to have us address that in our future agenda planning agenda item at this meeting and in preparation for having a further discussion in April that might spell out some of the actions that would take place that would further that, that work as I understand it, so I would also propose that we have that discussion consistent with what.....I would propose that we have that discussion before we leave our salmon, last salmon agenda item. We can also include it in the workload planning, but you know to the extent that we could identify a small group of folks to work on some sort of a draft framework that could come back to the Council in April for how that process and the timeline might get put together I think would be really useful so that we don't just put it on the April agenda and then hope it gets done or that we have something to look at, so rather than try to make that, make that up right now, I'd ask the,

the state folks, it's windy up here by the way, if the state folks could get together and think about that a little bit with their, with the appropriate NOAA folks, if it's Jeremy or whomever that person is, and maybe you could have something that you could bring back to us to talk about before we leave the last agenda item at this meeting and see what additional work may need to be done to flush that idea out so we have something concrete to look at in April. So that's, that's how I was thinking about this, just again we've all just had less than 24 hours to look at this letter and try to understand what the expectation is. Chris.

Chris Kern: [00:11:49] Thanks and so I'll try and keep this quick but that, the fact that we've just found this out as part of the reason that I want to make sure we have time to discuss it. I'm seeing, you know you've obviously been, Mr. Chair involved in the task force. I participated in the joint Canada and U.S. workshop several years ago as well as one of the work groups on the task force, so I feel like I'm fairly up on most of the issue. I'm pretty confident most of the folks in the family Council aren't unless they're in Washington and have participated in those other things. So I'm concerned about our ability to get the folks that we work through, our advisory bodies as well as our technical staffs to some degree, up to speed on the things they need to understand as we move down some kind of a process in order to do it well. I'm not questioning the need to do it. A case in point is the priority stock list. I understand it was put together for a very specific need and purpose I think relative to the task force operations. I was at the August meeting of the task force work group when it was rolled out and pointed out a technical issue that I thought needed to be addressed and to my knowledge still hasn't been addressed, and that's.... I'm on the southern range of the discussion points that have occurred so far, but I'm, I'm thinking that the folks in the room, that's not intended to be a nitpick, the people are very busy and it's not a huge issue but I'm confident the folks from California and maybe Idaho are going to need to understand what's in that priority stock list and how it was derived and how it should be used rather than just drop it to the technical team, and I know that's not maybe the suggestion, and expect them to run with it. They could certainly do that but I think other folks need to develop some comfort with the background materials on those as we assign those out so we're all on the same page, and how do we do that and make sure we can do it in time? That's kind of where my head was at with the question and happy to participate in some side conversations this week and see if we can put a framework together for how to, how to roll those out, but that's the reason I asked the question is those kinds of concerns.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:53] Yeah thanks Chris. I agree with all of those thoughts. My thought on the priority list relative to 19, 2019 was just so we have some clarity on what the, what, what the, what the request is here for 2019. There'll be a further discussion in the longer term about the priority list itself and how they are prioritized and all the rest of that, that's yet to come but not something we would be doing in time to respond to this short term obligation I think that we have relative to southern resident killer whales and what NOAA's asking of us. Barry.

Barry Thom: [00:14:38] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah a couple, couple of pieces I wanted to point out. One, our staff will be available to help with the advisory panels this week to help explain both the killer whale side and the fishery side, so we will be available to help that along as much as possible moving forward. I also on the priority stock list itself, there are two issues related to that, one is the list of actual stocks on the piece of paper and whether or not that is all encompassing or not or which of those stocks interact with Council fisheries. The second component, which I think is probably a little more flexible, is the prioritization of those stocks and I think it's more important for us to understand the impacts of the Council fisheries on the appropriate stocks and less about the prioritization of those stocks up and down the page.

Phil Anderson: [00:15:28] Okay. Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:15:32] Thank you Mr. Chairman. First of all I want to thank Chris for his comments. I certainly am trepidatious about our ability to get up to speed and contribute meaningfully to developing a framework between now and the end of this meeting. I'm not saying no I'm just saying I'm a little unsure about that at the moment. Second of all I just would like a little bit more clarity about the request to understand potential impacts to these priority stocks. What exactly are we do we mean by that? Is it, is that simply our typical fishery assessment and how the activities under the FMP are going to ultimately impact those stocks or does that mean something different? I'm not sure I understand what's being asked for there?

Phil Anderson: [00:16:30] Barry.

Barry Thom: [00:16:33] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'll take a, I'll take a stab at this. The staff behind me can come grab me. So it should be this, what I would describe as, as the standard fishery impacts, so it's basically looking at the reduction in ocean abundance of those stocks from the Council fishery action, so from my understand that wouldn't be necessarily different than what you would understand from normal, the FRAM modeling efforts of, of how those fisheries actually changed the ocean abundance and different components over the, over the life of those fisheries as they're enacted.

Phil Anderson: [00:17:18] Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:17:18] Thank you Mr. Chairman. So business as usual per say or are we evaluating how ocean abundance is reduced beyond summer fisheries which is what we typically do during this process. We're not usually forecasting abundance of these stocks into the Winter, Spring or Summer of the following year, and as I note from the letter those seem to be sensitive times in....times specifically.

Phil Anderson: [00:17:54] Barry.

Barry Thom: [00:17:55] Yeah thank you Mr. Chairman thank you Mr. Kormos. I think that is a, I think that is an open question of, of understanding what information could be made available over what timeframe and I think that is worthy of discussion over what level of analysis can be conducted between now and April which I agree, you know given we're already underway, what can be provided in terms of the impacts of the fisheries on the ocean abundance? I think in the future I think that is one of the challenges is understanding for the full lifecycle of the fish how a Summer fishery may impact ocean abundance in the Winter when the whales are present in different areas of the coast and that may be more of an analysis and consideration as you look at the risk analysis framework and a longer term approach. I don't know if those, the type of modeling is even possible to do in a robust way between now and April, but that is I think part of the dynamic that people understand is that it's, the fisheries have different impacts in different areas in relation to where the whales are geographically, seasonally up and down the coast and that's, that's a part we're trying to just really understand each of the specific fisheries and the specific stocks.

Phil Anderson: [00:19:10] Kyle.

Kyle Adicks: [00:19:11] Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Kormos kind of asked my question. I heard the desire to direct the STT to work with NMFS to understand fishery effects on the priority stocks. I guess I know the STT's really good at identifying fishery impacts on stocks. Are there stocks where we don't think we have the tools in place to do what you're asking for this year, or similarly to Mr. Kormos's question, is it the fishery modeling we're already doing and just making sure that everyone

understands what we're doing?

Phil Anderson: [00:19:46] Barry.

Barry Thom: [00:19:46] Yeah thank you Mr. Chair, and I am, I'm not sure I am probably the person to ask, we can get information back I think in terms of are there stocks where we wouldn't have that, the right level of modelling available at least for 2019.

Phil Anderson: [00:20:00] I guess the, the other, the missing piece for me that..... I mean we could....I Think we can identify what the, what the effects and the removals on these, on the various stocks that's being asked of us to look at, what those are, but the fundamental, more fundamental question to me is, is the ocean abundance of Chinook sufficient to meet the metabolic needs of southern resident killer whales and what is that, and if we're well above that and we take some small fraction of that total amount, does that pose some sort of a issue or, for southern resident killer whales meeting their metabolic needs. So I mean you have to put it in context of the, are the remove, the removals compared to what, what the total abundance is and how that relates to the needs of southern resident killer whales. If you're going to at the end of the day ask yourself whether the fisheries that the Council is considering, you know poses some sort of additional risk to the animals. Barry.

Barry Thom: [00:21:12] Thank you Mr. Chairman and clearly you've been reading ahead in the homework of the risk analysis framework. So and I haven't, I didn't, I didn't want to get into too much of a technical discussion, but I do think it's important, what I was just thinking about, is that one of the important factors that we're looking at, at least the draft risk analysis framework right now, is looking at different, different levels of abundance both in the ocean and in coastal fisheries and are there threshold levels, or sort of risk levels where if you go below a total ocean abundance of X that is when you would want to ensure the protection of killer whales moving forward, where in high abundance years or when we have robust abundance the impact on fisheries are negligible in relation to that overall abundance and you may not have to take action. So that's the adaptive management framework. At least one idea with that moving forward, and I think you can do that at various levels so you can do it at a coarse level of a total ocean abundance of X and what those thresholds are but that, even that may set a, even in the mid-range you may want to have a trigger says, even if ocean abundance is, actually you may want to check on specific stocks and whether specific stocks that are high priority or very important may have an effect that you would also potentially want to address. We have seen an effect in looking at the data where in certain cases where ocean abundance is, our fishery abundance is low, the fisheries impacts, and I'm not pointing out Council fisheries, because I can't actually point to that right now, where the fishery impacts are high in proportion to that total abundance, so they are having a higher impact in those low abundance years and I think that's the part of how do you guard against that sort of the fisheries themselves aren't having a undue impact in those bad years where they're high risk for, for killer whales moving forward. The other part of that risk analysis framework that actually has some benefits and gets to I think one of Mr. Gorelnik's issues is, is that it allows you across the landscape to complete actions that actually improve the abundance of Chinook and avoid the need to do anything else on the landscape, so if we are making progress on habitat actions on the landscape, if we are making progress even in the short term on potentially hatchery increases and other things like that, if you can get the abundance up above that threshold level that's good and it wouldn't require or would require either less change or no change in terms of the fisheries management side of it.

Phil Anderson: [00:23:41] So here's the two.....let me go back to these two things if I can just to see if this is a reasonable thing, approach. One, I'm not asking for you guys to complete the framework, so on what we do in the future, but if there's some sort of a rough outline that could be developed so

that we can have a discussion around it in April, that's more what I was talking about so I may have overstated what I was actually thinking about, but the more immediate issue to me is making sure that when we leave here we have an understanding of what we're asking in terms of the STT and the modelers so that when we get to April and we're making our decisions that we have the right information in front of us and that, and that we don't wait till then to go 'oh wait a minute that's not what we wanted, we also want X, Y and Z', and that's what I want to avoid so if there's the discussion amongst the right NOAA folks that are here and the STT folks and the modelers and whomever else needs to be a part of that conversation so that we make sure we have clarity on what is expected and to ensure that we can deliver what you're asking along with delivering all the other products that we need for our process to adopt regulations at the end of the.. in April. Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:25:13] Thank you and I guess just to get to touch on your first point about when the state's and feds get together to talk about the sort of long term planning process just to include Council staff, either you know my or Mike's level or Robin or somebody would need to be involved as well.

Phil Anderson: [00:25:29] Absolutely. Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman: [00:25:32] Thank you Mr. Chair and likewise if we could have some tribal involvement in those discussions.

Phil Anderson: [00:25:37] Certainly. I didn't mean to exclude, when I was thinking STT and modelers I'm thinking tribal, state, Federal, staff, the whole whomever those folks are. So further discussion on this item understanding we'll have a lot more. Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:25:58] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just take this opportunity to make one more comment similar to, well teeing off of the comments that Vice Chairman Gorelnik made and that is I want us all to make sure we're reflecting on our rebuilding plan process here as we're considering this new issue for at least Council area fisheries and the guidance that we received today. I think we've pretty well established to this point that fishing is not the cause of the stock decline at least in recent times and to, to take that another step forward, because of the kinds of ESA constraints that we are facing in our mixed stock fisheries year in and year out in our recent history, we're not enjoying the kinds of abundances or, excuse me, we're not enjoying the kinds of exploitation rates that we used to enjoy in prosecuting Council area fisheries, again due to the ESA stuff that as it applies to mixed stock fisheries and salmon in general, and so here we're discussing adding yet another layer of ESA limitation to Council area fishery prosecution for a species that's not salmon which is an interesting and new concept in the world that I live in, but it's just important to remember that, at least as far as I'm concerned, that the abundances that we used to enjoy pre ESA sort of ratcheting down and the fishing that's occurred since that time are not the causes for the ultimate decline of these stocks in all likelihood, and so I appreciate your comments about addressing habitat issues and water operations et cetera across the landscape but often times fisheries become the first knob to turn and they're often times the easiest knob to turn and I'm going to be very cognizant of that going forward as we continue to discuss and plan around this problem.

Phil Anderson: [00:28:09] Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley: [00:28:12] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just have a question for clarification. We've been, at least my interpretation here, is we've been focused on directed salmon fisheries and how that might interact with this and the southern killer whale deal and I, I am, I'm wondering what other fisheries will be impacted by this, this reconsultation. Are you going to be digging into groundfish

and the bycatch and stuff you know recreational fisheries other than salmon directed and what's the scope of it just so people have an idea of how deep this is going?

Phil Anderson: [00:28:50] Barry.

Barry Thom: [00:28:50] Thanks Mr. Chairman. Thanks Mr. Dooley. I think that is a valid question. I think that probably as a, especially for this long term process in terms of how, how we construct the analysis and need for action of the other fisheries and in terms of related to bycatch or other factors in terms of how fisheries are managed should be a part of that overall analysis because I think there is a, you know whether it's bycatch mortality or shaker mortality in a directed salmon fisheries themselves or bycatch and groundfish fishers or others, it's all part of the overall impact on salmon abundance or so it definitely needs to be entered. I think as you to help design a process in terms of what, what are the effects of those, but at this point we have not defined the scope of that consultation or the proposed action within that consultation at this point.

Bob Dooley: [00:29:38] Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:29:43] Okay good discussion. We'll look forward to more. Probably a lot more. It's twelve thirty. We're gonna take our lunch break.

2. Review of Rebuilding Plans

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:00] So I...we've heard that the reports. We've been provided the schedule by the STT. Let me go to Phil for some comment.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:09] You were probably going to say what I was going to say. Appreciated the report from, in particular the STT and the schedule that they provided us in their report looks reasonable to me in terms of in the different schedule between several of the different rebuilding plans in terms of their readiness for public review, and I think it's consistent with meeting our deadlines relative to our fishery management plan, and so I would simply support the schedule that was provided to us by the STT in their report.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:54] Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:00:59] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I think I'm going to direct this question to Robin first and if she needs to go for Dr. O'Farrell for assistance and that's fine, but I... looking at the schedule I note that it looks like we're considering April as the point at which we would send the Klamath and Sacramento plans out for public review. Are we anticipating, given the sort of the crunch time between the March and April meeting, are we anticipating being able to have that ready for the advance briefing book?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:01:37] Robin.

Robin Ehlke: [00:01:38] Thank you. Yes we are. I've talked with the STT Chair about that and whether or not we could in fact do that. Some of that work had already begun prior to the government shutdown and not to say that the schedules aren't really busy right now, but miracles do happen and we do plan on submitting the Chinook salmon rebuilding plans by the March 15th advance briefing book deadline and that those should include both the timeframes for rebuilt estimates and the economic analysis that goes with that, so that is our plan.

Brett Kormos: [00:02:24] Fantastic. Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:02:33] Kyle.

Kyle Adicks: [00:02:33] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I also support the schedule the STT has laid out. I wanted to thank the STT and all the state and tribal staff and have worked on the Coho plans in Washington over the past months. Wondering if it would make sense for the Council to send some sort of letter to the co-managers that have been involved, sort of outlining the schedule. We can't push this schedule back anymore and meet the FMP requirements but want to make sure that all the tribes that have been involved know that this is the schedule we're trying to meet to meet all of those requirements and invite their continued engagement.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:12] It makes a lot of sense. Is there agreement around the table that the schedule set forth in the Salmon Technical Team report is the schedule we want to proceed on? Any...is there any further discussion or someone feel like we need a written motion in order to do this? Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:37] I don't feel like we need a motion to, to do that. I did have one other comment on a slightly different topic whenever you're ready.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:50] Why don't you go ahead.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:50] Okay. Relative to the Habitat Committee, and I don't know what the situation is with the rebuilding plans to the south, but in terms of the Coho plans my recollection of what has been done in the past is that the development of the rebuilding plans amongst the co-managers in working with the STT, the state and the tribes have a lot of information relative to the habitat issues associated with those river systems, and I was assuming that, that those particulars relative to habitat and any restoration recommendations or habitat protection efforts that would be included in the rebuilding plans would be specified by the state and tribes in the development of that plan, and I, I was just concerned that we were duplicating those efforts by having the Habitat Committee do something in addition to that, and I certainly don't have a problem with the Habitat Committee reviewing the habitat components or the rebuilding plans, but I was concerned that it sounded like we may be asking them to do something in addition or duplicative of what the state and tribes were doing in the development of the plan, and I just wanted to put that concern out there.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:39] Brett.

Kyle Adicks: [00:05:45] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Following up on Chair Anderson's comments. I think it varies a little between the three Coho plans. The Queets plan make some pretty specific habitat related recommendations. The Strait of Juan De Fuca plan I think actually asked the Habitat Committee to review the reasons, identified some problems, asked them to kind of dive in a little deeper and I don't recall if the Snohomish has something similar so there is a little difference there. Don't know if that affects what we, how we direct the Habitat Committee but there was that request in the Strait of Juan De Fuca plan.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:21] Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:06:28] Thank you Mr. Vice Chairman. I would just note that at least for the Sacramento and the Klamath River plans there will be interest in having the Habitat Committee pursue some of the investigations that have already been done further and also investigate some things that the STT wasn't able to.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:52] Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:06:53] Thank you. Yeah to that point, you know the salmon FMP does have sort of a two step process in terms of looking at overfished stocks. The first being the STT's role in determining the cause and, and determining the rebuilding timeframes and those sorts of things, the....basically the initial compliance with Magnuson Act and then following up on that, the plan specifies that the Council may direct the Habitat Committee to work on, to work with other entities Federal, state, local, tribal experts to review the status of EFH and as appropriate provide recommendations for restoration enhancement, so that, that's kind of the second step. That was....there's been, there has been a fair amount of work both in the Chinook plans and the Coho plans I think to sort of lay out some of those habitat issues, but again just so I think we've kind of made the point that, that may be more appropriate to follow through and in a second step rather than you know encumbering the initial rebuilding plans with that information, and again we have a certain timeline to comply with, with those initial requirements and so that was the idea behind structuring the FMP recommendations that way so, so based on that I think you know the process that I think we've contemplated is once the, the STT plans are if not completed at least well in hand, then at that time the Council could consider directing further work on the habitat related issues and I don't think that step has been taken yet.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:09:01] Further comments? I have a question. With rebuilding plans on the agenda, the Chinook ones in June and the Coho potentially in September. Is there going to be a need to bring the advisory Subpanel in for those purposes?

Chuck Tracy: [00:09:22] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I think that would be appropriate. I mean they are the advisors and these rebuilding plans will affect them directly, so yes I believe we're planning on that in terms of our meeting planning arrangements and those sorts of things.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:09:41] Thank you. Any further discussion on this agenda item? Robin do we have adequate direction here?

Robin Ehlke: [00:09:52] I think so. Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. The Council has looked at the schedule the STT put forward and thought that that was a good path to follow, so we'll do that and we'll also look to send a Council letter to the co-managers with that schedule so that everyone is aware the path we're going to follow.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:10:18] Great. Thank you. Is there anything further on this agenda item D2 the rebuilding plans? All right. Thank you for making quick work of that agenda item and getting us back on schedule. I'll now hand the gavel to Chair Anderson.

3. Review of 2018 Fisheries and Summary of 2019 Stock Forecasts

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] Okay that takes us to Council action. Review and discuss any relevant fishery information. We also in our action is to adopt the 2019 abundance forecasts, annual catch limits, and act on any relevant conservation objectives or status determinations. So dealing with the acceptable biologic catches in overfishing limits. We have a SSC endorsement of those that are found on table 5 in preseason report 1. Maybe we could take that up. So we need to, again we just, we need to adopt those 2019 stock abundance forecast, ABC's and ACL's. Brett Kormos.

Brett Kormos: [00:01:05] Thank you Mr. Chairman and I sense that you're looking for a motion here?

Phil Anderson: [00:01:08] That would be correct.

Brett Kormos: [00:01:13] I move that we adopt the acceptable biological catches and overfishing limits as outlined in agenda item D.3.a Supplemental STT Report 1.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:39] Before I ask for a second, I think I can do this, Robin does that contain the appropriate actions?

Robin Ehlke: [00:01:56] I guess I was curious if overfishing limits was the right word. When I look up and I see the ABC's and the ACL's, if overfishing limits is what you mean by ACL's?

Phil Anderson: [00:02:13] I think so with that....Chuck Tracy.

Chuck Tracy: [00:02:21] Thank you. I guess I would point out that it's the responsibility of the SSC to make the recommendations for, for these reference points to the Council, not the STT, and I believe they have done so. My suggestion is that you might want to change that.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:47] So I think our action needs to indicate that we're adopting the 2019 stock abundance forecast, ABC's and ACL's consistent with the recommendations of the SSC. Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:03:06] My apologies. I'd like to modify my motion please.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:14] How about withdrawing it and then we'll start over. How about that?

Brett Kormos: [00:03:17] Okay. I'd like to withdraw my motion and create a new one.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:21] Okay good. I know you're just trying to help and I really do appreciate it.

Brett Kormos: [00:03:24] That's why I wanted to do this ahead of time. I just knew I would step in it.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:33] Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:03:35] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I move to adopt the 2019 stock abundance forecast, ABC's and ACL's as outlined in agenda item, in agenda item D.3.a Supplemental SSC Report 1. I'm still thinking that's STT Report 1.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:02] Okay. The Supplemental SSC Report is indeed D.3.a so you have that correct. Does the language on the screen accurately reflect your motion?

Brett Kormos: [00:04:19] Yes. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:21] Thank you. Is here a second? Seconded by Kyle Adicks. Is there any discussion on the motion? Okay all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:04:27] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:27] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries. Robin I don't believe we have any conservation objectives or status determinations that are needed is that correct?

Robin Ehlke: [00:04:52] That's correct and I say that with a smile.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:54] Yes. Okay. Robin then relative to this agenda item do...have we done, taken the necessary action?

Robin Ehlke: [00:05:03] Yes. Thank you Mr. Chair. We have the SSC endorsement and we have the motion and that does complete this action.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:10] Thank you very much.

4. Identify Management Objectives and Preliminary Definition of 2019 Management Alternatives

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] So that takes us to our Council action. This is the first step of many as we work toward refining our management measures for the 2019 fishing season, and I think I would first ask if there are any general comments any of that Council members wish to make before we start? Okay. Joe I would like to call on you and ask for the tribal report in motion?

Joe Oatman: [00:00:43] Thank you Mr. Chairman. So we have submitted an item under this agenda item D.4a. It is the Supplemental Tribal Report 3. So if I could I'd like to go ahead and go through a motion that we have prepared, thereafter if I could spend a little bit of time going over some of the details from that tribal report that we have.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:15] That would be perfect. Thank you.

Joe Oatman: [00:01:17] Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, and Sandra if you could display the motion that we've prepared. I move the Council adopt for STT analysis, the proposed initial salmon management alternatives for the 2019 tribal ocean fisheries as described in agenda item D.4.a Supplemental Tribal Report 3, March 8, 2019 with one exception. The middle option for Coho should be 55,000 instead of 45,000 and if I may.....

Phil Anderson: [00:01:58] Okay. The language on the screen accurately reflects your motion?

Joe Oatman: [00:02:01] It does Mr. Chairman.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:02] Yes and is there a second? Kyle Adicks. Go ahead Joe and speak to your motion please.

Joe Oatman: [00:02:08] Okay. Thank you, so I'd like to go over in summary detail the Tribal Report 3. So I'll do it in two parts. I'll deal with the genetic piece first and then follow up with the Coho. So the treaty troll ocean options for Chinook are for option one, 45,000 Chinook with a 50/50 split between the May-June Chinook directed fishery and the July- September all species fishery. Option two is for 35,000 Chinook with a 50 50 split between May-June Chinook directed fishery and the July-September all species fishery, and then the third option is for 25,000 Chinook with a 50/50 split between the May-June Chinook directed fishery and the July-September all species fishery. Now for the treaty ocean, treaty troll ocean options for Coho during the July-September all species of fishery are under option one, 65,000 Coho. Option two as identified here in the motion, this is a correction, it would be 55,000 Coho, and then for option three that would be for 35,000 Coho and there are other parts to the Tribal Report 3 which I will not go into but those would deal with the minimum length as well as other restrictions that would be associated with these alternatives.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:05] Very good. Thank you Joe and we do have your Tribal Supplemental Report 3 and it's online too for those who wish to look at it, and thanks for that description of your motion. Is there discussion on the motion? I don't see any we'll go ahead and call for the question all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:04:31] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:31] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries. I'm going to go ahead

and, and work from north to south on the non-indian side and start with Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks: [00:04:52] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I believe.....yes Sandra has some language for the screen. I move that the Council adopt for STT compilation and analysis the proposed initial salmon management alternatives for the 2019 non-indian ocean fisheries from Cape Falcon to the U.S./Canada border as developed by the SAS and described in the agenda item D.4.a Supplemental SAS Report 1 March 8th, 2019 with the modifications described by the SAS during their presentation.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:21] Thank you and the language on the screen accurately reflects your motion?

Kyle Adicks: [00:05:26] Yes.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:26] Is there a second? Rich Lincoln. Speak to your motion?

Kyle Adicks: [00:05:32] Thanks Mr. Chairman. Thanks to the SAS for the work they've done over the past couple days to put together this initial package. I might just come back and touch on the modifications before we send the team away just to make sure that was clear what the SAS did modify. I'd like to send this away for the team to analyze and see where it puts us on their various conservation objectives.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:57] Okay. Further discussion on this motion? Seeing none. Call for the question all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:06:09] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:06:09] Opposed no? Abstention? Motion carries unanimously. We'll move to the South to Oregon and Chris Kern.

Chris Kern: [00:06:19] Thanks. Give Sandra a moment. Okay. I move the Council adopt for STT compilation analysis the proposed initial salmon management alternatives for the Oregon 2019 non-indian ocean fisheries as developed by the SAS and described an agenda item D.4.a Supplemental SAS Report 1, March 8th, 2019.

Phil Anderson: [00:06:45] Language on the screen accurately reflects your motion?

Chris Kern: [00:06:48] Yes.

Phil Anderson: [00:06:48] Is there is second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Go ahead and speak to your motion.

Chris Kern: [00:06:54] As Kyle said we've got a start and so we'll see where this puts us on some things there's a lot of things still to discuss several of which we've talked about today and some others from yesterday. I think it probably an appropriate time for me to mention that Oregon has some fisheries that start on March 15th under last year's rules that may require in-season modification before we leave here this week. Not at a place to do that yet but I anticipate that's a potential action that may be need to be done. So we'll be looking to do that later in the week as needed.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:26] And thanks for keeping your eye on that. Just further discussion on the motion? All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:07:37] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:37] Opposed No? Abstentions? Motion carries unanimously and Mr. Kormos.

Brett Kormos: [00:07:43] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have a motion here. It's only very slightly modified from what Sandra's put up on the screen. I move the Council tentatively adopt for STT collation and analysis the proposed initial salmon management alternatives for the 2019 commercial and recreational ocean fisheries in the area from the Oregon California border to the U.S. Mexico border as presented in agenda item D.4.a SAS report dated March, 8th including the commercial and recreational requirements, definitions, restrictions or exceptions with the following modifications, in the recreational fishery on page 16 in alternative three for both the Fort Bragg management zone and the San Francisco management zone, I would like to replace May 25th through October 31 with April 6 through October 31.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:51] Thank you. I believe the language on the screen accurately reflects your motion?

Brett Kormos: [00:08:58] Yes.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:59] Is there a second? Seconded by Bob Dooley. Go ahead and speak to your motion please.

Brett Kormos: [00:09:04] Thank you Mr. Chairman. As everyone else has stated I think that we have a good starting point here but also including my modifications as, as we discussed with our SAS sport representative. The, the intention of the later starting date for both of these management zones was in an effort to meet the 180,000 spawner escapement objective as outlined in the National Marine Fisheries Service guidance letter, however I feel that it is premature to cut that date given the fact that removing April from one alternative ultimately may require we remove it from all three, and it's my intention to see where we land relative to that spawner escapement objective with identical starting dates across all three alternatives as a starting point. We may ultimately need to discuss this guidance and the implications there within with NMFS as we proceed through the week. Also I'll just note that as with Mr. Kern and the State of Oregon, California also has an April commercial opener that is not in these alternatives presented here and that will also ultimately require some in-season action, however given this situation that I've just described plus that plus the early start date that Oregon has on the books at this point, I expect that discussion to happen sometime later on down the road but before we leave.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:46] Great. Thank you Brett. Discussion on Brett's motion? Okay all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:10:54] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:54] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries unanimously. As you obviously can see that one of our other considerations here is the need for potential need for in-season action on salmon fisheries opening prior to May 1 and I believe both Mr. Kern and Mr.

Kormos spoke to that and their intention to have dialogue and deliberations about the potential for that need and come back with to the Council prior to the time that we conclude our meeting, so I think that, that is the way we will deal with that one. Also we had some discussion about the need to ensure that we have a full understanding of the effects of our alternatives as it pertains to the prey base for southern resident killer whales, and I wanted to ask Ryan Wulff if he had some thoughts about potential direction to the STT to fulfill that desire that we have to ensure that we can fully consider our regulations on the prey base piece and sorry if I took you by surprise.

Ryan Wulff: [00:12:33] No that's okay. Thank you Chair. Yeah, so you know we've been considering the feedback that we got from the Council discussion on Thursday regarding southern resident killer whales and in particular one of our requests and I do think it would be helpful to direct the STT to work with our staff leads here over this week prior to the initial management measures going out to public review, in particular on kind of three key areas. I think the first would be to have them discuss the list of priority prey stocks and potentially eliminate any that, that are not relevant or not contributing to Council fisheries. Second they could work together to report the appropriate fishery mortality estimates for assessing the effects of each of these alternatives, and then finally potentially resulting with an additional table for inclusion in the Preseason 2 Report, that would include these, each alternatives effects on the remaining priority stocks and I think if we were able to at least have those meetings, have those discussions with the STT, I think that would facilitate the analysis that we would need in order to move forward with 2019 management measures and the relevant ESA centers will need to meet.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:06] Thanks Ryan and I had the opportunity to talk with you and NMFS staff here at the break and I'm certainly supportive of the proposal to have the STT meet with the National Marine Fisheries Service leads on the topic of modeling and looking at those three areas. I would also like for them to come back to us before the conclusion of our meeting to understand exactly what it is that they concluded in terms of what information would be provided to us and if there's, and if there's an opportunity to do that before we get to our final decision at the end of this meeting that'd be terrific, so but I certainly support that proposal and obviously the STT members, their representatives from the tribes and the states along with National Marine Fisheries Service, that if there is additional expertise that are working here at this meeting that can help with, with addressing that, I would encourage that discussion to include the other experts that we have here as part of this process.

Ryan Wulff: [00:15:31] Of course.

Phil Anderson: [00:15:32] Mark Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:15:35] Thank you Chair Anderson. I've got a question for Mr. Wulff. Just a point of clarification, which stocks would, are you suggesting that the STT look at? Would it be any of the stocks that are Council managed or the three listed stocks in the guidance letter?

Ryan Wulff: [00:15:55] Actually we'd have them look at all of the stocks that are on our priority killer whale prey list that's on the attachment that's, I mean it's a link I think in our killer whale guidance letter so it would be broader than just those three. It's from that table if you recall.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:16:15] Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:17] And I think the other thing I will be interested in is, you know what, what is the appropriate metric to report, you know how to report the impact on the prey base. What is the most useful metric, an informative metric to do that would be part of that discussion.

Ryan Wulff: [00:16:35] That's correct. And we wanted to leave some flexibility for them to have that discussion and come back with the appropriate metric.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:40] Okay. Is there any concerns around the table from my colleagues on that, providing that direction to the STT relative to the southern resident killer whale prey base issue? No? Okay. All right. Relative to agenda item D4 let me turn....oh....I know what we need to do. Is there any additional things that we do, need to do relative to the identification of management objectives Robin?

Robin Ehlke: [00:17:20] I think we've covered just about everything relative to the management objectives. The only thing that's on my list which is probably on yours is perhaps direction about the GSI proposal.

Phil Anderson: [00:17:34] That wasn't on my list but it, it should have been. So the, the management objectives that were put forth in the guidance letter as well as the report from the co-managers in the North of Falcon area so that those are the management objectives we would move forward with and plan around. Is that, is that a fair assumption?

Robin Ehlke: [00:18:01] Yes Mr. Chairman.

Phil Anderson: [00:18:02] Okay. So let me then turn back to that issue associated with the GSI work and I, I will need some help there. Brett Kormos.

Brett Kormos: [00:18:13] Thank you Mr. Chairman. It's my expectation and really my plan for myself and my SAS representatives to discuss this issue that those, should we decide to move forward, some GSI non retention fisheries may be added to subsequent packages, however at this time we're not prepared to plug that in and we may very well not ultimately do that which is why at this point I'm not adding it.

Phil Anderson: [00:18:47] Okay. Good. All right. Robin let me go back one more time and ask if I have overlooked anything that we need to do to complete this first step.

Robin Ehlke: [00:19:01] Mr. Chairman I think that we have covered everything that we've needed to do under this agenda item. We've heard from the Federal entity, from the states, from the tribes and from our advisory bodies as well, so I think we've concluded that part of the Council action.

Phil Anderson: [00:19:26] Okay. Let me turn to the Executive Director and ask him if there's other business that we need to conduct here today before we recess for the day?

Chuck Tracy: [00:19:38] Thank you Mr. Chair. I believe not, not in regards to the salmon world I don't think we're prepared to move anything up from tomorrow, so I think we're just we're on schedule, we're a little bit ahead of schedule today.

5. Recommendations for 2019 Management Alternative Analysis

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] Okay that concludes public comment and maybe I'll ask our STT folks to come, at least Dr. O'Farrell to come back up. I don't know why but I have a feeling there's gonna be some changes suggested to our package. So we'll reverse the order here and start in the south first and Mr. Kormos.

Brett Kormos: [00:00:28] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yes I do have some changes. I'll be speaking from a agenda item D.5.a Supplemental STT Report, dated March 9th, 2019. I'd like to implement the following changes please. In the commercial troll management alternatives, beginning with the California KMZ. For all of the alternatives there, replace the language 'open seven days per week' with 'open five days per week' Friday through Tuesday. For the July quotas replace July 31 with July 30. For the August quotas....

Phil Anderson: [00:01:27] Slow....just a little slower. Go ahead. Sorry.

Brett Kormos: [00:01:33] For the August quotas replace August 1 with August 2 and replace August 29 with August 31. In alternative one specifically add the language 'landing and possession limit of 20 Chinook per vessel per day'. Adjust the Chinook size limit to twenty seven inches. In alternative two replace all quota values with 3,500 Chinook. Add the language 'landing and possession limit of 25 Chinook per vessel per day', and adjust the Chinook minimum size limit to twenty seven inches. In alternative three, replace all quota values with 6,000 Chinook, and add the language 'landing and possession limit of 30 Chinook per vessel per day'. Moving to the south to Fort Bragg, beginning in alternative one. Remove August 1 to 29 and September 1 to 30, add May 1 to 15, June 1 to 30, and July 11 to 31. Adjust the Chinook minimum size limit to twenty seven inches. Replace the sentence that states 'all salmon caught in the area prior to September 1 must be landed and offloaded no later than eleven fifty nine p.m. August 30th' with, 'all salmon caught in the area must be landed and offloaded no later than eleven fifty-nine p.m. August 5'. In the sentence that states 'during September all fish must be landed north of Point Arena' remove during September. I'm going to pause there just to make sure that, just to notify the STT and everyone here that I certainly plan to share all of this specific language after the fact too so it's clear because there's a lot here and I realize that. So moving on to alternative two. Replace May 1 to 31 with May 10 to 31. Replace June 1 to 30 with June 1 to 20. Replace July 1 to 31 with July 11 to 31 and adjust the Chinook minimum size limit to twenty seven inches. In the sentence that states 'all salmon caught in the area prior to September 1 must be landed and offloaded no later than eleven fifty nine p.m. August 30' remove prior to September 1. In the sentence that states 'during September all fish must be landed north of Point Arena' remove during September. Moving on to alternative three, remove September 1 to 30. Add June 11 to 30 and replace July 1 to 31 with July 11 to 31, and again in the sentence that states 'all salmon caught in the area prior to September 1 must be landed and offloaded no later than eleven fifty nine p.m. August 30', remove prior to September 1, and remove the sentence that states 'during September all fish must be landed north of Point Arena'. Moving south to San Francisco, in alternative one, replace May 1 to 31 with May 1 to 20. Replace July 1 to 31 with July 11 to 31. In the sentence that states 'during September all fish must be landed south of Point Arena' replace September with May, June and July. Moving to alternative two, add May 10 to 31, June 1 to 30, and July 11 to 31. In the sentence that states 'during September all fish must be landed south of Point Arena' replace September with May, June, July and August. In alternative three, remove September 1 to 30. October 1 to 4 and October 7 to 11. Replace June 15 to 30 with June 11 to 30. Replace July 16 to 31 with July 11 to 31. Replace August 1 to 15 with August 1 to 29. Remove the sentence that states 'during September all fish must be landed south of Point Arena'. In the sentence that states 'all salmon caught in the area prior to September 1 must be landed and offloaded no later than eleven fifty nine p.m. August 30, remove prior to September 1.

Moving south again to Monterey, in all of the alternatives in the sentence that states 'all salmon caught in the area must be landed and offloaded no later than eleven fifty nine p.m.', replace the dates with August 5. In alternative one add July 11 to 31. In alternative two add July 11 to 31. In alternative three replace May 1 to 17 with 1 to, uh excuse me, with May 1 to 31. Replace June 17 to 30 with June 11 to 30. Add July 11 to 31. Moving on to recreational management measures in Monterey, in alternative two, replace April 6 to August 11 with April 6 to August 18. In alternative three replace April 6 to July 6 with April 6 to August 11. And finally moving on to table five, page one under Sacramento River Fall Chinook minimum spawner objectives, in alternative one adjust the Sacramento River Fall Chinook minimum adult escapement to 151,000. In alternative two again adjust the Sacramento River Fall Chinook minimum adult escapement to 151,000, and in alternative three adjust the Sacramento River Fall Chinook minimum adult escapement to 180,000. And that is all.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:25] Thanks Brett, and I know you got this written up for folks and I know you guys were trying to keep up with taking notes but we'll have hard copies for folks. Robin could I ask what's, how would we go about getting what Brett just identified as changes, how can we make sure the public and the SAS and others have that access to that.

Robin Ehlke: [00:10:58] We can do it two different ways. Typically Sandra will e-mail it to myself and the STT chair, and if you wanted I could make that a supplemental document to this agenda item as we close business today if that's helpful?

Phil Anderson: [00:11:15] Think that would be helpful.

Robin Ehlke: [00:11:16] Sure.

Phil Anderson: [00:11:17] Thank you, and of course holds true with the other pieces we're about to hear as well. Thanks very much for doing that. Okay we'll move up to Oregon and Chris Kern.

Chris Kern: [00:11:29] Thanks Mr. Chair. I get the easy job today I don't have any proposed changes but I will speak, today anyway, I will speak to Mr. Kormos guidance on the spawner escapement goals for Sacramento and we concur with that recommendation as guidance to the team. Other than that I don't have any changes to propose at the moment.

Phil Anderson: [00:11:51] All right. Thanks Chris. And moving on up to Washington and Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks: [00:11:58] Thank you Mr. Chair. I also have some written guidance for the STT for changes. Again referring to agenda item D.5.a Supplemental STT Report 1, March 9th, 2019. For alternative one for non-indian Fisheries north of Falcon, reduce the Coho TAC to 220,000 and adjust all corresponding sub quotas accordingly. Also in alternative one change the starting date for the recreational fisheries in Neah Bay and La Push sub areas to June 15th. For alternative two reduce the Coho TAC to 205,000 and adjust all corresponding sub quotas accordingly. Also change the starting date for the recreational fishery in the Westport sub area to June 29th, and for alternative three reduce the Coho TAC to 150,000 and adjust all corresponding sub quotas accordingly. I might just add the changes to all three Coho quotas here, the biggest change is to the lower alternative. That's reflected of some ongoing discussions with the Washington co-managers and the desire to have a low alternative that given the recent poor Coho returns is a little more precautionary approach, the desire to have that in one of the alternatives so those discussions will be ongoing through this week.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:21] Great thanks. Questions of Kyle? Okay and let me turn to Joe Oatman and

ask if there's any changes to the treaty troll proposal.

Joe Oatman: [00:13:37] Thank you Mr. Chair. So there is no change for the ocean troll options. This is reflected in the table three in the supplemental SSC Report 1 before us.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:51] Okay thank you Joe. Is there any other guidance that Council members wish to provide to the team relative to this, to our package we have? No? Okay. All right. Robin am I correct in that this concludes our work on this agenda item for now?

Robin Ehlke: [00:14:20] Yes Mr. Chairman. The STT will work to get those adjustments into an updated STT report. We should have that out tomorrow and we'll see the Council again tomorrow on the agenda as well.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:35] Okay great.

6. Further Direction for 2019 Management Alternatives

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] So we'll go to further guidance and I'm going to again start in the South and call on Brett Kormos.

Brett Kormos: [00:00:13] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I will be reading slowly from agenda item D.6.a Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 10, 2019. I would ask that the team implement the following changes beginning on page 17 with the recreational management alternatives in the California KMZ, beginning with alternative one, replace the season dates May 18 to September 2nd with May 25 to September 8. In alternative two, replace the season dates May 23 to September 2nd with May 25 to September 4. Moving down to the Fort Bragg management zone, in alternative one replace April 6 to November 10 with April 27 to November 10. In alternative two replace April 6 to October 31 with April 27 to October 31 and in alternative three replace April 6 to October 31 with April 27 to October 31. Moving South again to the San Francisco management zone, starting with alternative one, replace the season dates April 6 to November 10 with April 27 to November 10. In alternative two replace the season dates April 6 to October 31 with April 27 to October 31. Moving over to alternative three, replace the season dates with April 6 to October 31, excuse me April 6 to October 31 with April 27 to October 31, and finally moving South once more to the Monterey area, in alternative two, replace the season dates April 6 to August 18 with April 6 to August 24, and in moving over to alternative three, replace the season dates April 6 to August 11 with April 6 to August 18, and that is all.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:42] Thank you Brett. Michael and you get those?

Mike O'Farrell: [00:03:47] Yes I did.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:48] Okay. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:55] Thank you very much Chair Anderson. Brett, it's my understanding that the reason for the changes, at least in San Francisco, were to reduce our impact rate on the winter Chinook which was in alternative one which was standing at fifteen point nine to get it down to fifteen point seven is that right?

Brett Kormos: [00:04:22] At least in alternative one, yes.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:27] Okay but if we make, if we need a closure in April in alternative one it means closures in all the other alternatives.

Brett Kormos: [00:04:41] Once we take season action, inseason action, that will be a requirement across the alternatives in an individual management zone. At this point in time we're just asking the team to model these changes and there, the potential exists to change them yet again depending on the results and further deliberation by the SAS.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:05] Okay, and what was the reason for changing the dates in Fort Bragg since my understanding is we don't model any winter Chinook impacts in that area?

Brett Kormos: [00:05:31] I'm thinking. I think I'll start by answering it with.....you've caught me at a disadvantage. I'm trying to remember exactly why did that?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:54] It might be just for consistency of regulations on the coast.

Brett Kormos: [00:05:58] Thank you very much for helping me with that. Yes there, there is an enforcement consideration and you, and it just happened to slip my mind as I'm sitting here.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:12] Always my pleasure to help.

Brett Kormos: [00:06:13] Thank you for putting me on the spot.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:14] So I not only give you the question but the answer.

Phil Anderson: [00:06:18] Do you guys want to go in the back of the room and have this conversation? (laughter).

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:21] No, so is this an opportunity for discussion?

Phil Anderson: [00:06:28] It's your opportunity to ask questions of Mr. Kormos.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:32] Okay I don't have any further questions at this time.

Phil Anderson: [00:06:36] Okay. Chris Kern.

Chris Kern: [00:06:42] Thanks Mr. Chair. I think Sandra has it written. There we go. Probably simpler than it reads. Page 19 for the recreational fishery in the bottom of Table 2 it's actually in the footnote C.5. I believe, relative to rollover language for the South of Falcon Coho fishery, we're just fixing an error here and so where it reads 'Marked Coho remaining from the Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain recreational marked selective Coho quota may be transferred', I need to strike 'Humbug Mountain' and replace it with 'Oregon, California border' because the fishery actually affects that whole area, we just missed that in the first round.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:33] Is that clear?

Chris Kern: [00:07:34] So and at this time that's what I have.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:38] Alright. Questions of Chris? Alright we'll move on up to Washington and Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks: [00:07:49] Thank you Mr. Chair. So I have some guidance for the team again referencing agenda item D.6.a Supplemental STT Report 1, March 10th for non-indian fisheries North of Falcon alternative 1, reduce Coho TAC to 205,000 and adjust all corresponding sub quotas accordingly. For alternative two, reduce Coho TAC to 190,000 and adjust all corresponding sub quotas accordingly, and for alternative three, reduce Coho TAC to 100,000. Distribute the coho TAC as follows, for Neah Bay recreational 4,370. For La Push recreational 1,090. For Westport recreational 15,540, and for Columbia River recreational 73,400. For commercial troll 5,600, and in alternative three for the commercial troll fishery in the May 1 through June 25th time period, add 'in the area between the Queets River and Leadbetter Point the landing and possession limit is 200 Chinook per vessel per open period'. I'll just add in my comments as I gave guidance yesterday I mentioned that we were looking at some more precautionary approaches for the low alternative. This reflects further development of that. I'll also note that this distribution of the TAC does deviate from the FMP. If we move forward with this I'll be notifying the Council that it would have to be under emergency action then and explaining why.

Phil Anderson: [00:09:35] Alright thanks Kyle. Questions of Kyle? Okay thanks. I'll turn to Joe Oatman for any modifications in the treaty troll alternatives.

Joe Oatman: [00:09:50] Thank you Mr. Chairman. So there are no changes to the ocean treaty troll options. That is reflected in the table three from the supplemental SST Report 1 located on pages 20, 21.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:08] Thank you Joe. Is there any other guidance that the Council would like to give to the team? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:10:17] Thank you Chair Anderson. What I would like to see from the team, if they would indulge me, would be take the season options that are already in agenda item D.6.a Supplemental STT Report 1 dated today and make only one change, and that one change would be in alternative one, recreational Monterey area, change it from April 6 to September 2nd to April 6 to August 25.

Phil Anderson: [00:11:13] So I cannot recall an instance where we have had direction from the, from California or any state for that matter where the direction has differed between the state and other Council members, so I'm trying to figure out, or I would encourage at least some dialogue between Mr. Kormos and Mr. Gorelnik to ensure that we have, to the extent that we can have the same consistent direction to the team so we're not creating a fourth alternative and I'm, so I just would like a little bit of discussion around that point. Marc.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:12:17] Let me, let me withdraw the work rather withdraw the request as a Council request to the team. Let's go forward with the guidance that Mr. Kormos has offered, however, I would like to see, even if not in an official document, I would like to see what that does as an alternative means of addressing the winter Chinook issue we have as opposed to losing three weeks on most of the coast of California.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:49] I would, I would recommend again that you discuss that with Mr. Kormos, and if there is work to be done to take a look at that off line, that you do that, but I would ask that the two of you talk about that off line and if there's, there'll be an opportunity for subsequent direction to the team and if we want to make a change to what Mr. Kormos proposed based on those conversations we can do that at that time.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:13:22] That's perfect.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:23] Alright. Mr. Kormos.

Brett Kormos: [00:13:28] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I promise not to draw this out any further, however I just want to make sure that everybody in the room is clear on the fact that this guidance that I offered today was developed in absolute coordination with the members of the Salmon Advisory Subpanel responsible for these decisions and so I am happy to discuss this further with Mr. Gorelnik now and for the rest of the week and that's all I have to say.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:01] Thank you. Any other discussion on this agenda item for we adjourn for the evening and we'll of course be talking about salmon some more for this meeting is over. Alright sounds good.

7. Further Direction for 2019 Management Alternatives

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] Takes this to our Council deliberation which is to consider further guidance to the team as needed. I think I'll start in the south again. Brett Kormos.

Brett Kormos: [00:00:21] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'll be reading from agenda item D.7.a Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 11, 2019. Beginning with the commercial troll management alternatives on page 6. In the California Klamath Management Zone in alternative one, replace the July and August quota values with 2,000 Chinook. In alternative two replace all quota values with 3,000 Chinook. Moving South to Fort Bragg, in alternative one strike the May 1 to 15 fishery and replace July 11 to 31 with July 13 to 31. In alternative two, replace the May 10 to 31 dates with May 17 to 31. And in, and then moving to the August period, replace August 1 to 29 with August 1 to 28. Moving South again to the San Francisco area. In alternative one replace May 1 to 20 with May 1 to 31 and then replace July 11 to 31 with July 13 to 31. Moving over to alternative two, replace May 10 to 31 with May 17 to 31 and replace August 1 to 29 with August 1 to 28, in addition replace September 1 to 30 with September 1 to 15 and strike the fall area target zone fishery. Moving south once more to Monterey, in alternative one replace July 11 to 31 with July 13 to 31 and then in both alternatives 1 and 2 in the sentence that states 'all salmon must be landed in California' replace 'in California' with 'South of Point Arena'. Moving on to recreational management alternatives beginning on page 17, beginning in the Fort Bragg management zone. In alternative one replace April 27 to November 10 with April 13 to October 31. Moving over to alternative two replace April 27 to October 31 with April 13 to October 31, and moving over to alternative three, replace April 27 to October 31 with April 13 to May 31 and then June 22nd to September 30. Moving South to San Francisco, in alternative one replace April 27 to November 10 with April 13 to October 31. In alternative two, replace April 27 to October 31 with April 13 to October 31. Moving over to alternative three replace April 27 to October 31 with April 13 to May 31 and June 22nd to September 30. And last moving South once more to Monterey, in alternative one replace April 6 to September 2 with April 6 to August 28, and in alternative two replace April 6 to August 24 with April 6 to August 22 and that's all.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:09] Thanks Brett. Questions of Brett? Alright we'll move up the coast to Oregon. Chris Kern.

Chris Kern: [00:07:23] Thanks Mr. Chair. Okay. Working off of agenda item D.7.a Supplemental STT Report 1 for the commercial troll management alternatives on page four, Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain, in alternative one, replace April 15 through 30 with April 20 through 30, and in the Humbug Mountain to Oregon California border, Oregon KMZ on page five, also in alternative one replace April 15 through 30 with April 20 through 30. Moving into the recreational alternatives on page 16 for the area Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain, in alternative two, for the marked selective Coho fishery replace the marked Coho quota of 85,000 with 80,000, and staying within alternative two for the non marked selective Coho fishery, replace the non marked selective Coho quota of 10,000 with 8,000, and change the language that says 'Open each Friday through Sunday' to 'Open each Friday and Saturday' and that's it.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:52] Questions for Chris? Okay up to you Kyle.

Kyle Adicks: [00:09:00] Thank you Mr. Chairman and thanks for reversing the order. I made a slight revision to the guidance after the SAS report. So also working from agenda item D.7.a Supplemental STT Report 1, March 11th guidance for STT analysis for fisheries, non-indian fisheries north of Falcon, for alternative one on page two for the May 1st through June 30th troll fishery, reduce the sub area Chinook cap between the U.S./Canada border and the Queets River from 6,825 to 4,825. Reduce

the sub area Chinook cap between Cape Falcon and Leadbetter Point from 5,780 to 3,780. On page three for the July 1 through September 30th troll fishery, remove the clause 'no more than 5100 Chinook may be caught in the area between the U.S./Canada border and the Queets River'. For alternative three, on page two for the May 1 through June 30 troll fishery, change the sub area Chinook cap between the U.S./Canada border and the Queets River from 4,100 to 3,550. Change the sub area Chinook cap between the Cape Falcon to Leadbetter Point from 3,200 to 3,000, and on page three for the July 1 the September 24 troll fishery, change the landing and possession limit for, from 50 to 10 marked Coho per vessel per open period, and then on page three I'll read this guidance and then we might discuss a little how best to put this into the package, but revise the sentence on vessels fishing north of Leadbetter Point to read 'Vessels fishing or in possession of salmon while fishing north of Leadbetter Point must land and deliver all species in a Washington port and must possess a Washington troll license. For delivery to Washington ports south of Leadbetter point, vessels must notify the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife at 3 6 0-2 4 9 -1 2 1 5 prior to crossing the Leadbetter Point line with area fished, total Chinook, Coho and halibut catch aboard and destination with approximate time of delivery. During any single trip, only one side of the Leadbetter line may be fished'. So maybe just to walk through the reasoning behind all of, all of all of this really quickly, for alternative one, the changes to those caps, and those caps are based on recent distribution of catch in the troll fishery, the reductions in those areas are targeted to reduce impacts on some Puget Sound stocks. For alternative three, the changes to the caps are just corrections. They were calculated wrong in the original modeling, so these do follow the recent years average distribution of the catch. The change to the Coho vessel landing limit was missed when we reduced the Coho quota, so it's just to give a lower option there at a lower quota. And then we heard the SAS request for this, for the Leadbetter Point line. It's a little different than our other alternatives because this is listed across all three alternatives the way it's displayed here, so I'm not sure if we're best to try to stick it into one alternative or to do something different.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:25] My recommendation would be to put it in one of the three alternatives, I don't think it matters which one but...

Kyle Adicks: [00:12:32] So if the team can find a way to pull that language out of the boilerplate language across all three and show this in one and the existing language in two and three I think that would cover it.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:49] Okay. Questions of Kyle? Alright. Over to Joe....oh, yes Scott McGrew.

Scott McGrew: [00:13:00] Thanks Mr. Chairman. I just noted that in other parts of the regulation there is an option to contact the Coast Guard via VHF radio. That might be an alternative there if you don't have cellular service and you need to get in touch with WDFW. Just for Kyle's consideration.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:21] Alright. There's good cell phone service at the Leadbetter line but you'll think, thanks for bringing that up. Any other questions or comments for Kyle. Alright over to Joe Oatman. Are there any changes to the treaty troll alternatives?

Joe Oatman: [00:13:42] Mr. Chairman there are no changes to the treaty troll options so they remain unchanged from what's in table three of the supplemental report.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:51] Great thank you. Is there any other guidance Council wishes to give the team? Okay Dr. O'Farrell do you have any questions about the guidance?

Michael O'Farrell: [00:14:08] No Mr. Chairman I think we've got it.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:10] Alright. Thank you very much. Robin does it finish our business under this agenda item?

Robin Ehlke: [00:14:20] Yes Mr. Chairman it does.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:22] Okay thank you very much.

8. Adopt 2019 Management Alternatives for Public Review

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] So that takes us to our Council action. I would ask indulgence from my colleagues I'd like to provide a few remarks about southern resident killer whales before we get into the business of motions. I've been on the Governor's Southern Resident Killer Whale Task Force this last year and which is a fairly large group of individuals. Butch Smith is also on that and it's been a pretty intense process of looking at the status of these animals and causes for their decline. I don't think there's any question in my mind that they're in peril with 75 animals that remain in the population is the lowest number since 1984, but that's some perspective there were 98 in 1995. In addition recent observations of several of the individuals, multiple individuals within that population by NOAA scientists and private experts indicate that they suffer from malnutrition. Governor Inslee's task force has been working over the last year to document the causes of the decline, obviously in cooperation with a lot of help from entities outside the task force including NOAA fisheries, and looking for potential measures to mitigate those factors. Pollution in the marine environment, noise disturbance from vessel traffic and lack of prey are the principal factors believed to be the cause of the decline of this population. The task force recommended a number of actions to address all three of those factors. The Governor proposed a number of pieces of legislation that were built off one or more of the task force recommendations. The Washington State Legislature is currently considering the legislation that was proposed by Governor Inslee to address those issues. In addition the Nonfederal Pacific Salmon Commissioners are seeking funding for hatchery production to augment the prey base of southern resident killer whales that is linked with the most recent agreement between the United States and Canada on Pacific salmon that I mentioned a few days ago. Fishery managers in Canada and the United States are being asked to carefully consider the needs of southern resident killer whales in developing their 2019 and future management strategies and structures. In my view it will be important for the Pacific Council to understand the impacts on the relative prey base associated with the needs of southern resident killer whales and the 2019 management measures that are adopted by the Council in April. The impacts on the relative total, totality of the prey base is an important distinction from simply looking at the projected catch and or quota numbers in understanding the impact of Council area managed fisheries will have on the prey base. Natural mortality estimates and the proportion of fish from key stocks, that's pronounced primary stocks that will remain in the ecosystem are all important factors to, to consider when evaluating the impact of fisheries on the available prey base. I believe it will be important for the Council to have a general understanding of these factors when they consider the final package of fishery regulations for Council managed fisheries in April, and while I understand from the response that we got from the Salmon Technical Team it is not currently within their plan to give us and provide us some of that information, I would urge us to if that, if, if to, to find the resources to provide that general, that type of information to us and I would appreciate before we leave this topic today to have a least a little bit of dialogue between the management entities, in particular NOAA fisheries on how we might go about ensuring that we have an understanding of the impact on the prey base before we make our final decision in April. Thanks for indulging me to provide those remarks. So if there's nothing further let's go ahead and get to the business of adopting our proposed 19 ocean salmon fishery management alternatives for public review, and as we know if we have any that of all of our alternatives that deviate from the fishery management plan in a manner that would require an emergency rule we need to identify that at this time. So I'll, think I'll start from north and move south this morning and I'll turn to Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks: [00:06:01] Thank you Mr. Chairman. For non-indian commercial and recreational fisheries in the area north of Cape Falcon, I move to adopt for public review the alternatives as presented an agenda item D.8.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, March 12th, 2019.

Phil Anderson: [00:06:26] Thank you Kyle. Is there a second? Seconded by Rich Lincoln. Any

discussion on this motion? Would you like to speak to your motion Kyle?

Kyle Adicks: [00:06:38] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thanks to the STT as always for all of their work this week. As we heard in their report this morning there's still three stocks that aren't meeting management objectives in all of the alternatives. For Lower Columbia tules we made some changes yesterday that as I said were targeted for Puget Sound stocks, that changed the tule rate a little bit but I'm confident with the tools and the alternatives and other changes to fisheries we'll be able to get to a package that meets that. For interior Fraser Coho, similar situation, we do have an alternative that meets that. We will also be looking at inside fisheries in conjunction with ocean fisheries to meet that obligation, and for Hood Canal Coho, all three of the alternatives are currently exceeding but changes to inside fisheries from last year are expected to get us there on that one. As I said on Sunday I believe, the changes to alternative three were deviations from the framework management plan and would require an emergency deviation, so I thought I would just walk through the criteria for doing that. Agenda item D.4 Attachment 2 has those criteria. The Council is required to consider proposals for emergency changes at the March meeting and decide whether or not a specific issue appears to meet all the applicable criteria. Those, there are five criteria. Criteria one is that the issue was not anticipated or addressed in the salmon plan or that an error was made. This issue was not caused by an error. The recent poor status of many Washington Coho stocks has presented circumstances not anticipated by the FMP, although 2019 forecast for key Coho stocks caught in Council fisheries are much improved, there is a need to consider an alternative that is more precautionary for Coho management. Because the recreational fishery north the Falcon is more dependent on Coho than the commercial fishery, alternative three allocates a larger share to the recreational fishery than is prescribed by the FMP. Because the recreational fishery focuses on hatchery stocks returning to the Columbia River, alternative three also allocates a larger share to the recreational fishery in the Columbia River area to allow analysis of fishery options that are potentially more focused on those stocks. Criteria two is that waiting for a plan amendment to be implemented would have substantial adverse biological or economic consequences. If regulations that allocate Coho differently than as prescribed by the FMP are not considered, there could be significant economic consequences to the ports and communities of the Columbia River, Westport, La Push, and Neah Bay. Alternative three is being considered to allow consideration of alternate allocations of harvest that optimize harvest of hatchery Coho while minimizing the risk to rebuilding Coho stocks. Criteria three, in the case of allocation issues the affected user representatives support the proposed emergency action. Commercial troll and recreational fishery representatives were involved in developing all three alternatives before the Council today. Their assistance was critical to the development of these alternatives and there is full support from them for these alternatives including an alternative that deviates from strict adherence to the FMP. Criteria four is that the action is necessary to meet FMP objectives. The structure of the alternative and the potential deviation from the strict terms of the FMP will allow consideration of fishery structures that optimize harvest while meeting conservation goals and thereby more fully meet FMP objectives, and finally criteria five is that if the action is taken, long term yield from the stock complex will not be decreased. These alternatives will not decrease long term yield. The potential deviation from the FMP allocation guidelines in alternative three is intended to optimize harvest while meeting conservation objectives and promoting rebuilding of stocks. It would reallocate not increase allowable harvest. So I think that this alternative meets the...(phone ringer)...meets the criteria for a deviation from the FMP. I don't know if our final fishery package in April will require a deviation but we want to have that option out there for consideration.

Phil Anderson: [00:11:01] Thank you Kyle. Discussion on the motion? Go ahead and call for the question, all those in favor signify by saying 'Aye'.

Council: [00:11:14] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:11:15] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries unanimously. Let me pause just a minute before I go to Oregon. We now have two mornings of donuts in the queue for the April meeting (laughter) and it will be important for Mr. Oatman to coordinate with John to make sure that we don't have them all come on the same day. So we'll now go to Oregon and Chris Kern.

Chris Kern: [00:11:48] Thanks Mr. Chair. For commercial and recreational fisheries from Cape Falcon to the Oregon California border, I move to adopt for review the alternatives as presented an agenda item D.8.a Supplemental STT Report one, dated March 12th, 2019.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:08] Thank you Chris. Language on the screen accurately reflects your motion?

Chris Kern: [00:12:13] Yes it does.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:16] Is there a second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Go ahead and speak to your motion please.

Chris Kern: [00:12:21] Well just briefly. It's, as usual along week with a lot of hard work going into it both by the advisors and the team and everybody else so I'd just like to thank them for all that work and we'll get this going down the road and come back in April and do it again.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:36] Thanks Chris. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:12:42] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:42] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries unanimously. Mr. Kormos.

Brett Kormos: [00:12:54] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I move to adopt for STT coalition, analysis and public review, the salmon management measures for the 2019 commercial and recreational ocean fisheries in the area from the Oregon California border to the U.S. Mexico border as presented in agenda item D.8.a Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 12th, 2019, including the commercial and recreational requirements, definitions, restrictions or exceptions with the following change. For the Klamath River Fall Chinook minimum natural area adult escapement, the Klamath River recreational fisheries share in table five on page twenty two, in alternatives 1 and 2 I'd ask the STT to adjust the Klamath River recreational fishery share such, such that the projected natural area adult spawner escapement equals 40,700, and in alternative three adjust the Klamath River recreational fishery share such that the projected natural area adult spawner escapement equals 45,000.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:17] Thanks Brett. The language on the screen accurately reflect your motion?

Brett Kormos: [00:14:23] Yes it does.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:24] Is there a second? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Go ahead and speak to your motion please.

Brett Kormos: [00:14:31] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'll just say first I think that these three alternatives appropriately reflect the spirit of the, at least the March salmon process here at the Council in that we have a range of alternatives that go from less to more conservative, which is appropriate for a public review given that two of the target stocks in California are both still

overfished. Last I will just say I'd like to thank the SAS and the STT, in addition to my, many of my fellow Council members for their hard work, their input and their collaboration throughout the week.

Phil Anderson: [00:15:19] Thank you Brett. Is there further discussion on the motion? Seeing none all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:15:26] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:15:27] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries unanimously. Mr. Oatman. Treaty troll.

Joe Oatman: [00:15:36] Thank you Mr. Chairman. For the tribal ocean fisheries in the area north of Cape Falcon, I move to adopt for public review the alternatives as presented in agenda item D.8.a Supplemental STT Report 1, table three, dated March 12th, 2019.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:02] Thanks Joe. Language on the screen accurately reflects your motion?

Joe Oatman: [00:16:08] Yes it does Mr. Chairman.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:09] Is there a second? Seconded by Kyle Adicks. Go ahead and speak to your motion if you wish.

Joe Oatman: [00:16:14] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would also like to state for the record the tribes and state are just beginning the north the Falcon planning process in which we will evaluate the total impacts of all proposed fisheries on coastal Puget Sound and Columbia Rivers.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:33] Thank you Joe. Is there discussion on the motion? Go ahead and call for the question, all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:16:42] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:42] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries unanimously. Back over to you Robin is there any other action we need to take to complete this agenda item? Apparently there is. Mr. Wulff.

[00:17:03] Thank you. I did just want to return to the killer whale issue if that's okay with you.

Phil Anderson: [00:17:08] Absolutely.

Ryan Wulff: [00:17:09]prior to closing this out. I appreciate your comments, the comments made by the Chair. I completely agree with Phil and with everything he said in his remarks, in particular it is going to be very important for NMFS and for the Council to have a general understanding of the factors and the impacts of these measures on killer whales before taking final action, but I do want to take this time to thank the Salmon Technical Team for their work with us this week and they've been extremely helpful. We've had a number of discussions with them, I think this table and crosswalk will help us as we prepare for the upcoming April meeting. So NMFS plans to take this report along with the pre-season two report that comes out and other sources of information to further our assessment and on the potential impacts of the alternatives on killer whales and we will look forward to reporting back to the Council at the April meeting and, and working with the management entities as appropriate in order to have that for us before we take final action. Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:18:27] Thanks Ryan and I, if I may, I think it's important and I would encourage the management entities including the tribes that have a particular interest in this analysis to collaborate with National Marine Fisheries Service in this effort so that when we get to April there has been that kind of collaborative work and understanding of what the product is that comes back to us. Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:19:01] Thank you and one more thing I forgot, but just to note here since it was only raised on the first day and I don't think we've revisited since then, but I do want to flag it before we get into workload planning, that there was also a proposal to look at a process for a longer term mitigation as we reinitiate consultation and to get Council input and work with others so I'll be raising that again when we get to workload planning.

Phil Anderson: [00:19:27] Great. Thank you Ryan. Thanks for catching that topic. Okay so now are, is there any additional work that the Council needs to do to complete our activities on the management alternatives for this meeting?

Robin Ehlke: [00:19:48] I think the Council has completed the action under this agenda item. We've adopted three alternatives for public review for the 2019 ocean salmon seasons for recreational and commercial fisheries and we have a tribal proposal as well. I guess the only thing I would add is as we scrub these alternatives and get them ready to be posted, if there are minor adjustments that the STT might have to make, just clarify the intention we would be able to do that.

Phil Anderson: [00:20:26] I believe there's concurrence around the table that the STT has that flexibility and the Council staff as well. Thanks. Okay thanks very much and thanks to everyone who helped put this package together and we'll look forward to taking the next steps when we get to our April meeting, and I know there's a lot of other steps between now and then that others will be taking. So that completes our salmon management agenda items for the meeting.

9. Appoint Salmon Hearing Officers

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] Alright then the Council action is to appoint the hearings officers for the three hearings that are listed on agenda item D. 9 Attachment 1. I'll start in the north this time with Washington and Kyle.

Kyle Adicks: [00:00:18] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I will serve as the hearing officer for the Westport hearing.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:25] Are there any other Washington Council members planning to join. I'm in Washington D.C. that day. I'd really rather be there with you guys, but National Marine Fisheries Service do you know yet Ryan who would be coming to that?

Ryan Wulff: [00:00:41] Who...the Westport one?

Phil Anderson: [00:00:42] Yes sir.

Ryan Wulff: [00:00:42] Yeah Jeremy Jording.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:42] Jeremy Jording. United States Coast Guard?

Scott McGrew: [00:00:47] That would be me.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:48] Scott McGrew. Alright, moving down to Oregon. Chris.

Chris Kern: [00:00:57] Mr. Chair I'll be the hearing officer.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:01] National Marine Fisheries Service?

Ryan Wulff: [00:01:04] Peggy Monday.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:05] Peggy Mundy. U.S. Coast Guard?

Scott McGrew: [00:01:07] Lieutenant Melanie Collier.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:11] Lieutenant Melanie Collier?

Scott McGrew: [00:01:12] Correct.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:17] Thank you and to California and Brett.

Brett Kormos: [00:01:22] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I, I will be the hearing officer.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:26] National Marine Fisheries Service?

Ryan Wulff: [00:01:28] Again Peggy Mundy.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:29] Peggy Mundy. And U.S. Coast Guard?

Scott McGrew: [00:01:32] And that will be me.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:33] That will be Lieutenant Commander Scott McGrew. I did get your rank right didn't I?

Scott McGrew: [00:01:39] Correct.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:42] Alright. Robin how are we doing on this agenda item?

Robin Ehlke: [00:01:49] Thank you Mr. Chairman. You made quick work of that. It looks like we have filled all the gaps for all three of our salmon hearings coming up in March.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:58] Okay thank you very much.

E. Ecosystem Management

1. California Current Ecosystem and Integrated Assessment (IEA) Report and Science Review Topics

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:00] I think that concludes public comment, which brings us to Council discussion to consider the report and to consider review topics for 2019, and I know that the, seems somewhat of a target rich environment and turns of topics but I'm just going to open the floor for Council discussion. Frank.

Frank Lockhart: [00:00:35] I know it's a bit self-serving being the NOAA person and providing praise to NOAA staff but in any case I'm gonna do it. I continue to think that they have just done a marvelous job not only kind of in the report itself but how they go about it. They received significant comments from all of, well sometimes all of the advisory bodies it seems like, and it seems like they have really taken it to heart in their attempt to make improvements all along the line, and I guess this year more than other years it seems like I'm beginning to have some ideas of how the Council may actually be able to kind of use some of this information and explore ideas. The two questions that I asked, one was on the whale entanglements, it seems like if they nail down that relationship it seems like we could have a targeted outreach program to kind of potentially reduce whale entanglements, and I won't go into the other ideas, but it seems like it's already a valuable tool, not only to us but as we saw from Anna Weinstein that it might be useful to the members of the public as well. So I'll just say you know, thank you. I think it's a great tool. I hope it continues as well and I think it's going to become an increasingly valuable tool for us.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:02:00] I agree with everything you said Frank. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley: [00:02:09] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I just had a comment. It struck me when Noah Oppenheim's comment of that they now use endpoints to, rather than VMS data to, to determine bottom contact, and I think, think it's good to use endpoints but I think it's important to use VMS data because to draw a straight line between the two endpoints doesn't come close to representing what a tow is, and I think we may as.... if this is ever used in a fine scale type of analysis, that data is important so I don't know I'm, if that's coming through clear but it's, it's important to have the VMS to understand the shape of the tow. I mean you could end up hauling back right where you set and you wouldn't have a line at all so you wouldn't know anything other than where the boat was at that time so unless...and I couldn't find any data looking through it, of where that was specifically said they don't use the VMS or whether they do use VMS or endpoints, so I didn't know where he particularly got that.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:21] Thanks Bob. Well let's try to come up with a list of topics. We've heard there was a very specific recommendation from the SSC. We've heard more information on algal blooms. More information on California, so does someone want to put together....put forward a list? Caren.

Caren Braby: [00:03:50] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and I'm not volunteering for that.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:53] Are you sure?

Caren Braby: [00:03:55] To that end I think that we have had in past years a fairly diffuse set of praise and suggested edits for the IEA team to consider for the next year and each year they have

brought back improvements, told us what those improvements were, what they could do, what they couldn't do, and so I would just say that we've had some really thoughtful reports from our management teams and advisory bodies and that we forward those wholesale as a package to the IEA team for them to kind of work with and do as they have done in past years and kind of integrate those into their list of future improvements and you know have a running list from us. I don't want to call it an omnibus but I want to have it be an ongoing list of, of improvements that they can select from as data become available and analyses become available to fill those needs.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:02] That's a good idea. You might want to give them, if we have, if we have priorities we might want to put those forward as well.

Caren Braby: [00:05:09] Agreed.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:09] Caren.

Caren Braby: [00:05:09] And to continue. Thank you. I'm not going to repeat my interest in domoic acid in particular but I, I'm sorry. I'm, I'm good. I want to stop.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:42] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:44] There was a mention of specific recommendations in the SSC's report, well the EWG has a set of bullets that weren't read into the record when they gave their report but they're fairly specific and so I'm assuming that the direction that Caren is suggesting that we take here includes all of those comments as well.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:09] Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:06:10] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair I guess I will, will note that we do sort of have an annual process where the SSC subcommittee meets with the team in I believe September or prior to the September meeting. They make note that they may need a little more help from their HMS and salmon subcommittees as well, based on some of their, some of their recommendations at any rate. I don't know who that leaves out of the SSC but in any event I think just recognizing that the, that that process is ongoing and that the presumably they would be taking these recommendations to that meeting and that's kind of I think where that business gets, gets incorporated into the IEA work plan. I don't know if Kit might have some more insight into that or not but.....

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:58] Kit do you have any insight?

Kit Dahl: [00:07:03] Mr. Vice Chair and Executive Director. I have I had a conversation with Miss Uros (?), Toby and Chris earlier and I did, I did offer to kind of facilitate their consideration by perhaps in some way extracting and compiling the comments from the advisory body reports. What they have done in the past and specifically in relation to when we went through the indicators initiative a couple years ago was to compile and reflect how they responded to those recommendations in a section in the appendix portion of their report and that is in there, so we had a discussion about trying to sort of do that consistently in terms of feedback annually from advisory bodies and so that advisory bodies could be...there, there would be some more explicit way of them knowing how and whether the IA team has taken up and addressed their comments. You know there may be some that are great ideas but they can't do them and so if they, if there's a mechanism to get the feedback so the advisory bodies know that their comments have been considered, and I think just picking up on Mr. Tracy's comment, certainly this can.... the IEA team in terms of their interactions

with the SSC could bring forward you know ideas that originate from the Council discussion in terms of development or refinement of future indicators. I think we have this process to allow the Council if they choose to provide guidance at this meeting in terms of what particular indicators the IEA team has asked the SSC to review the, the basis for I guess, or the science underlying it, and as you know the SSC identified a couple of things in their report, so I would assume that with your assent that the SSC would proceed forward and review those two proposed indicators. I guess it's up to you if you want to take any other based on advisory body comments or anywhere, anything else to, to recommend to the SSC and or the IEA that there are other indicators that the SSC should take up for reviewing and providing feedback on.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:10:14] Well I think the suggestion was to take all of the advisory body and management body reports and forward them on and see what they can do. I've also heard from both California and Oregon a desire to dig a deeper dive and more comprehensive dive into algal blooms and domoic acid. Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:35] I thought I heard Kit offer to take what was contained in all the reports that we got and synthesize those and put them into a single document and then work with the authors for next years report.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:10:51] Okay yeah, that's correct. Any, any further discussion on this agenda item? Brad.

Brad Pettinger: [00:11:02] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. On page 37 of the, of the presentation that Chris and Toby showed us earlier. I thought it was very interesting, there was a delineation of the graph of when the FRAM survey started as far as the inputs and so would be, it was very helpful knowing that because it kind of gives you a clearer picture of what's going on as far as the survey but also the general sense of the inputs into, into this process. It's nice, I'd be good to have acknowledgement when things, inputs do change, so we have know how consistent those inputs are through the years as we go forward. So it's good if the team would identify when those happen and so that it gives a clearer picture of what we're looking at.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:11:53] Okay. Thank you. Any further comments? Kit are we.....do you have what you need to go forward.

Kit Dahl: [00:12:08] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair I think, I think we do and some guidance from you all so.....

Marc Gorelnik: [00:12:15] All right thank you very much. Well I think that concludes agenda item E1.

2. Climate and Communities Initiative Update

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:00] That concludes public comment and it brings us to our action which is to review progress, provide guidance on future work including scenario planning topics. We have some recommendations in terms of process from the work group. They've asked us to recommend a single topic. Is that about right Kit? What we need to do?

Kit Dahl: [00:00:32] Mr. Vice Chair. Yeah I think that would be one task or piece of guidance. The other is maybe any guidance around the formation of this core team that the EWG has identified. The suggestion being that it is composed of part or all of the EWG plus requisite expertise and perhaps participation by people from some of the other advisory bodies. Specifically there was discussion of the, the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel and I guess I just also mention because it was referenced in the EWG report and touched on in public comment, you know this support for also getting some expertise related to the scenario planning methodology and whether that includes meeting facilitation and that kind of thing. I think that's something probably that the Executive Director and so on can work on behind the scenes, but as long as the Council is not opposed to looking for those resources, no I don't think you have to figure out who and who it's going to be and who's going to provide it but I just mention that.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:02:13] Thank you Kit. John.

John Ugoretz: [00:02:16] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and yeah thanks Kit for that summary and I've had a few thoughts moving through here. I do support the idea of developing a small, 10 or less person core group that would plan and focus and further refine the whole idea who could then come back to the Council to lay out the process and tell us you know how the broader input will be collected because I do feel as some of the comments were made that you definitely need broad input when you're actually doing this scenario planning. You don't necessarily need it while you're developing the process and, and what's going to happen. I did, I did have to touch on the, the one report talking about the 'wrap it' suggestion as, as connected. They're certainly parallel processes. There's a lot of modeling exercises going on. I think as the CSI report mentioned, back at our last meeting that scenario planning isn't really about modeling and coming up with a scientific answer to what will happen in the future. It's much more about looking at potential things that are likely to happen in the future and a variety of potential future states, and then developing responses to those just in case. And then finally the CPS Advisory Subpanel's sort of question about you know how fisheries will be able to react to these changing states, I think that's exactly what I hope the scenario planning gets us to, that, that would be an output is recommendations on potential future management that would allow flexibility in fisheries to react. So you know all of that said I do think the Ecosystem Workgroup has done an amazing job. There were lots of hurdles over the winter to overcome. They got great input from the teams and I think we're ready to sort of push this to the next step.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:34] Thanks John. Frank.

Frank Lockhart: [00:04:39] I forget whose idea it was to bring Yvonne back, but I do have a couple of questions for her. I'm still struggling with a couple of the concepts, so I guess...thank you. I guess the first one is the mosaic. The.... I have similar concerns with Mr. Waldeck, what he was saying, what the GAP was discussing that, that might create such a broad process that we're not able to make progress, and I'm just wondering if you could, if you could give me a little bit more information on how you would see that regional mosaic process moving forward and kind of meeting the schedule and the process that is envisioned by the Ecosystem Workgroup.

Yvonne DeReynier: [00:05:34] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and Mr. Lockhart. So we agree that would probably be, probably be sort of a bigger picture topic and we were thinking that it might be more constrained by geography rather than by, you know a particular species, so please do not choose the entire California Current as your region but if you were to say choose a, you know a port area that might help you learn something about how fisheries interact in one port and then what you learn from that could be applied to your work coastwide, so the thinking was restricting it geographically rather than by species. And I would say that we know you fairly well and we were concerned that if we just proposed single species that you would then say well why don't we combine a couple of these into a multi species proposal, so we provided the regional mosaic to give you some sort of direction for that.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:47] Frank.

Frank Lockhart: [00:06:48] And then just because a few other reports mixed it up in my mind. I just wanted to confirm, the core team members, are they primarily kind of technically inclined folks rather than kind of a full range of the stakeholders for the process?

Yvonne DeReynier: [00:07:13] Yeah thank you for that question. While I was listening to the conversation I thought of an analogy which is if you think of the core team as more like a management or technical team for providing background information and then the stakeholder group would be like a, it's similar as Gway Kirchner mentioned to the sort of large group that got together for the workshop last May. Maybe some Council members, some advisory body members, members of the public who might be unable to serve on a full time team but maybe are interested in the Council process, so that would be sort of where the, you know the larger process would happen.

Frank Lockhart: [00:07:53] Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:07:55] Caren did you have your hand up?

Caren Braby: [00:07:58] Yes. Thank you. I'm following up on Frank's questions about the mosaics because you said something that I didn't expect you to say so I'm going to dig into it which is don't pick the whole Cal... don't pick the whole coast, don't pick the whole region, but the way that I first read this was you have a bunch of you know regions within the Council geography and each of those might look different from the others based on the species, based in port composition, all of those things and what you're suggesting is if we're taking one topic it would be one subregion. In the description in the second paragraph and I'm, I'm sorry to get into the weeds here but it says we would envision having two to four scenarios per region. What does that mean? Because we're talking about scenario planning and this is a scenario and so what is two to four scenarios per region mean within that?

Yvonne DeReynier: [00:09:05] That means that we submitted this book for the briefing book deadline in early February and we gained wisdom over the month that followed and realized that it would be impossible to do this process with something so broad.

Caren Braby: [00:09:21] Roger that.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:09:26] John.

John Ugoretz: [00:09:28] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and thank you for the clarification there. I also share Caren's feeling that it.... I wouldn't necessarily cut out the entire California Current from scenario planning personally. I would however want a smaller group of people to look at this with

experts in scenario planning advising us to develop the final topic and if that's bound by geographic range fine, but it may not be. And then I also, I think I have a different view of what this core team would be than what you just expressed. I do not see it as technical experts. I see this as we are needing to come up with one, the final detailed topic and to the process to gain that advice from a broader group of people and I think what we need is sort of Council oversight and Ecosystem Workgroup membership and maybe some Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel membership to really be a, a planning core team that will push this through so that we actually make progress on, on getting to the scenario planning exercise later in the year.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:10:57] Caren did you have you're.....

[00:10:58] I think so. Yes. In this Supplemental Report 2 on process looking at the Gant chart on page 3. There's, I think that, that generally speaking the timeline schedule that you've put together is a great starting point so it's not any pushback on that but there's one line that, that I'm curious about which is the core team meets to review background material and identify drivers of change, and in thinking about, in thinking about the starting point for the Council's activity and, and scenario planning and the Council being a group of managers and fishers and ecosystem folks who don't necessarily have the scientific expertise on identifying the drivers of change, I think of the starting point as being, we've defined that there is change, what do we do with that change in terms of management systems and response and so I'm just.... what of what I just said is inconsistent with, with this line, does that fit with this line or am I am I misinterpreting what you're meaning here?

Yvonne DeReynier: [00:12:32] Well I don't know. Pardon me Dr. Brady. So our sense from our discussions was that the primary drivers of change in fisheries management are fish abundance and distribution. And so we, and when you begin the scenario planning process you want to begin with identifying some drivers of change and we wanted to at least be clear up front that we think those are the two biggies for the Council to think about going forward, and then there will certainly be others, you know sort of depending on where warming may occur or if you want to talk about more or less variability in climate or if you want to talk about social change, but whatever driver you think about it should at least include abundance and or distribution.

Caren Braby: [00:13:31] Great. Thank You.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:13:31] You're good Caren?

Caren Braby: [00:13:34] I'm good.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:13:37] Further comments around the table? I think I've, what I've heard from the workgroup as you'd like us to select a topic and then we can develop a core team around it. I think that I think I heard a different approach from you John that we develop a core group to define the topic. Is that correct?

John Ugoretz: [00:14:02] Almost. I actually think that...I've heard a lot about this, the, the overarching topic of stock shifting, stock availability shifting and how that impacts fishing communities. I think the, which specific stocks you look at and which specific geographic region you look at might need some further work but I'm not hearing a lot of other good ideas for a broad scenario planning topic, and so I think we could select that topic to then task this core team to further refine and develop to come up with the final planning topic that would be used in the scenario planning exercise.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:14:53] So in shorthand you're talking about the mosaic topic that needs more definition.

John Ugoretz: [00:14:59] Yes and the reason I'm, I'm hedging on the word mosaic is I didn't quite understand it in the Ecosystem Workgroup Report. I think I can latch on to the topic of stock availability shifting and I think that is something that will happen with climate change and we see it happen all the time and it will probably, you know have bigger impacts.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:15:23] Pete.

Pete Hassemer: [00:15:26] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and I think at this point I would echo what John just said with respect to the process. I've been thinking more about the topic as we went through. Obviously there's been a lot of work done by a lot of individuals and groups in formulating thoughts on this. As I look through it and what John just mentioned and Yvonne just reinforced, the EWG's focus on fish distribution and abundance. We've seen that in the HMSMT team report talking about distribution. It's in several other reports. I would just note it's part of our record. The public comment we received from Ocean Conservancy, Nature Conservancy, Wild Oceans and NRDC, that group letter talks about shifting stocks and changing temperature but they talk about scenarios that predict large shifts in distribution. And lastly I think taking that approach and it links very directly to the CCE report we just heard, there was a new section in there, if I can just look back real quickly here, one of the tables was about shifting groundfish availability differs by port, so taking that approach and I'm avoiding using the word 'mosaic' because I didn't understand that either, but I think looking at changes in distribution and then picking up some environmental drivers, see how that environmental drivers change distribution and how that might change our thinking about fisheries and what happens, it is the way to go. That, that would be topic I would support.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:17:36] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:17:38] I would like to go after Caren.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:17:41] Caren, please.

Caren Braby: [00:17:45] So thank you. I, I like where this discussion is going and it really resonates with me. I think that the way that Yvonne characterized the drivers of change, the two biggies are distributional change and productivity change and if you separate those two, productivity change with no distribution change is something that we deal with at the Council level all the time with stock assessments and modulating fisheries take in quotas related to how those are changing over time, but what we don't have a good way of getting our heads around is if stocks just kind of like move or appear, and so to me that is something that is likely and that is likely to cause management challenges in the future and it could happen overnight like it has with Pacific cod in the North Pacific, so it could be that it's not this gradual change but that there is some threshold, some tipping point, something happens and all of a sudden there's a drastic absence or appearance of a stock that is very challenging for us to deal with and so I like the idea of that as being a focus and I don't understand regional mosaics either, and I think that that's all okay. I think that if we pick the part of that, that I think we're resonating with, we want this to be across FMP's is what I'm hearing and that's what I like about that, that concept, whatever it actually means is that we're not just looking at one species in one FMP but we're looking at the interaction of multiple species across FMP's and how drastic changes might then present a challenge, and the goal from my perspective is that we are identifying management barriers that we can then say what do we do about this barrier? How do we create flexibility around, through, over and under that barrier in order to create continuity of fisheries, continuity of economics and

protect the resource. So in sum I like where we're going. I think the core team description of a little bit of EAS, a little bit of EWG, a little bit of Council, maybe Council staff, some core team like that to be a planning entity to move this forward between now and September. It's sounding like a really good tractable approach to move forward with.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:20:26] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:20:28] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. So before I reach for my bottle of Excedrin here. I'm hearing some coalescing around a direction here but I'm not hearing that it has got the degree of definition that I think we need and my suggestion and I'd be looking for some volunteers that I, that we typically tend to look to, is to bring something back to the Council that is something we can look at with, you know in bullet form or whatever you would like, I would like you and you know I would, if the three of you don't know who you are I'll, I would be happy to let you know who you are, and and I think including Yvonne and we've got some key members of the public that have been really engaged and supportive of this effort and I'm, a couple of which testified a little bit ago, and if there could just be a little bit of a huddle up and some definition to the conversation so we know we have a record of where it is we're going. It's not that, you know we can work into the night, it's quarter after 5 and I'm just not thinking that if we try to bring this to closure tonight that we're going to have a good solid understanding around the table as well as all of the folks that are helping us with this the way we're going. So that would be my suggestion Mr. Vice Chair is to how to move from where we are now to a point where we have a decision and I see one of the three is raising their hand.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:22:27] Let me just...before I go...Caren. So are you suggesting that this group put together these bullet points, bring it back to us at this meeting and then we would take action on those?

Phil Anderson: [00:22:40] Correct. Yeah, and you know if it's...I don't think it's a big task. I think they're, They're a lot better at it than certainly I am and I think they could pull something together fairly quickly and have some synergy and consensus around where we're headed here and then put that back in front of the Council and whether you could do that in time for, even if we delayed our start a little bit 8:15 or tomorrow if that's something that could be brought back for us to look at in the morning if that's, I don't want to put too big a burden on this but that was what I had in mind.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:23:22] I think that's very wise. Caren.

Caren Braby: [00:23:25] I wanted to ask for.....I don't have a response to that exactly other than if I'm one of the three I'm willing to serve at your pleasure and then I did want to talk about the facilitation issues specifically and get any response to that discussion because in my mind I think that we could greatly benefit from facilitation both in advising the core team, the Council on the process for running scenario planning as well as facilitation of workshops or interviews or whatever is the, the substance of the scenario planning and so that is my perspective and, and, and I'd like to hear whether that's where the Council is comfortable or if there are other ideas on how to do that.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:24:28] Can we get a nod of.....what, what is the Council's pleasure? Does that make sense to have that facilitation? John.

John Ugoretz: [00:24:35] I'm sorry Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:24:36] No go.

John Ugoretz: [00:24:37] Okay. Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I, I would echo that and frankly I do not think we can succeed without skilled external facilitation and process support for this. As I think Yvonne said, a Council has not yet undertaken scenario planning anywhere and frankly there are woefully limited fisheries.....(coughing)....that's alright.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:25:13] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:25:14] I totally agree with that John. I was, I'm, my, the first thing that pops into my head though is what do we have in terms of financial resources to support that kind of an effort?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:25:31] Rich.

Rich Lincoln: [00:25:33] Well thank you Vice Chair. Just to, just to kind of follow up on that comment. When I had the opportunity to attend the RAP meeting in December to think about how to think about how this scenario planning might connect in some way to some of the climate modeling and things going on these topical areas that we heard about. The NOAA's National Climate Coordinator was there, Roger Griffiths. Some of you may have bumped into him before. He's actually expressed some fairly direct interest in supporting the Council, I think both financially and helping with this idea of helping the, potentially helping the Council get some expert facilitation, so I mean I think that would be, if the Chair was suggesting the novel idea that we actually create a motion on this to move this ahead I think that would probably, you know something about that would probably be part of it, but I think the resources are there and we haven't discussed it but I and I don't.....Chuck it might be helpful for you to update us on where some, some of the funding proposals are that, that you guys had put together but I know that there are some, there's some sources of help out there additionally.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:26:59] Chuck and then Frank.

Chuck Tracy: [00:27:00] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Well we had applied for some headquarters funding, temp, temp funding for this particular project. I suspect that whole process is the awarding process we had thought might be concluded by now but obviously the partial shutdown has undoubtedly affected that so we don't really know where we're at there. That being said you know I think the last time we had this topic on the Council floor I kind of made the case that you know if we were serious about this that we should be prepared to go ahead and commit the resources whether we got the funding or not, so I think it sounds, it seems like the Council's very interested in this and willing to go that way. I guess I would say that this is not a bad year for, for us to spend some of our own resources on this. It is the last year of our grant and we do have some money that we can get an extension into next year but it wouldn't hurt to spend down a little bit of that. You know if we needed to hire a contractor or something like that I think we could, I think we could fit that within this year's budget. We've, we've, at least in terms of our contracting line, we've made some adjustments in how we budget for that. We often don't spend what we budget for things like working economic analysis for some of our groundfish things. I know we budget a fair amount and Ed Water's a pretty efficient man and gets things done pretty cheaply so we don't always spend that so, so we've started to adjust how we, what we actually budget for that, so to the extent that you, that, that would be considered a savings I guess, that might be looked at that way, but a, but I think there's, I think we're in reasonably good shape. We also, a thing I didn't mention is that with the appropriations bills, we did get a bump up in our PPA line item. We haven't exactly seen how much that's going to be, and again we're hoping to get some of that news that the CCC meeting which was canceled. Maybe we'll get an update at the end of March on that but, but we are expecting some increase in our base funding, so.....

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:04] Frank.

Frank Lockhart: [00:00:06] I think between Rich and Chuck they said almost everything I was going to say but I'll just, as far as the point of asking for their expertise I think that's a given. If the Council were to ask for that that would, that would happen. With regards to the budget one of the many impacts of the furlough as was mentioned by Chuck is that budgets aren't solidified quite yet, but again as Rich said there's, there's a lot of interest and there is definitely a possibility that funding could be found to support this, but it's, it's too preliminary to commit to that.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:43] Bob.

Bob Dooley: [00:00:43] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I just, the comment I have is that I'm a little concerned that we're on the, on the bus to somewhere but not exactly where and I think we could, you know it, it could be a lot of work for not a big deliverable and I, I don't know I see the Council as being very adaptive to change as we go along. We're looking at a bigger change at the end and I think one of the deliverables I would like to see of this is how it defines some of the policies and regulatory things that are missing that we....tools that we don't have in our toolbox to deal with a change like if a whole new fishery emerges coming from Mexico say to speak, or if our whiting fishery skips Canada and goes right into Alaska, how do we...what do we do? You know I mean it was we're talking about changing the survey thing and so those are, those are policy things that we've got to think about is how do we deal with that internally in the much less inner, inner coastal like fish that are below 40° 10' all of a sudden become above 40° 10' and what do we do with that? How do we, how do we not cause major disruptions in our, in our, our economics in regions you know, how do we deal with that, and I think some of those to.... some of those.....that's the things I look at we should be thinking about is how do we deal with those particular things as opposed to just the big picture of things move a little bit or that so I would really like to have, get a handle on what the deliverables are, what we're looking for because you know if you don't know where you're going any road gets you there and that's, that's the....I'd like to know what I'm trying to achieve here.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:02:34] John. Rich.

Rich Lincoln: [00:02:36] Thanks Vice Chair. Just in response to those comments Bob which I think are good ones and I think John might have reflected this in an earlier comment. Those are exactly the kinds of things that those of us that have been thinking about this are thinking about the exercise to exactly help frame up the kind of plausible future conditions that make you ask and answer those questions what, what could the Council do under a different set of circumstances and if it doesn't have the tools right now to do it what kind of tools or different policies might it need and rather than wait till something happens to react to it. If we could have an efficient and thoughtful exercise now as a future-ing exercise to really help guide us it might, I think those of us.....it's a bit of a leap of faith because we have to do a good job with the process, but on the other hand with a little bit of thoughtful process and being efficient with it, it could give us a very kind of deliberate way to ask and answer some questions that would allow the Council to position itself in the future to really address some fundamentally different conditions that it might not be prepared to deal with right now.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:00] Well Phil offered a suggestion which I thought was a good one which would be to have a group, gang of three, to come back to us in the morning with something specific and in writing that the Council could hopefully then take action on. Does that make sense to folks? Phil go ahead.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:26] So just....the three were Rich, John and Caren so if there's any confusion

about that, but I wanted to make sure that they worked with Yvonne and you know I'm thinking in particular Gway and Corey could be part of that conversation so that when we, they bring something back we've got some consensus about where we're going because we're going to need all of them to get there.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:01] Frank and then Kit.

Frank Lockhart: [00:05:03] So just confirming so the general idea is that they would come back with a motion or at least some sort of guidance statement that would be the next step?

Phil Anderson: [00:05:12] Yes. So we can have a record of what it is we decided because right now I'm, we're, we're talking about what we want to do, so short answer yes.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:24] Kit.

Kit Dahl: [00:05:27] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I'm probably getting above my station here but I was thinking along this same lines as Mr. Anderson initially proposed this, this idea I think is very good to try and get some specifics down in writing, but I was thinking and in particular and with regard to the composition of this core group in terms of just the timing. Another option would be maybe to come back under like memberships and appointments if, and that would perhaps give the opportunity to act not only to identify the potential composition but reach out to people and agencies and so on that, and confirm that potential people would be able to participate. So that's a suggestion but I think if, if you're comfortable with coming back in the morning with a proposal that's, that's fine too.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:40] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:06:41] Well that would go further than I had in mind in term....I think talking about the, the expertise that we would want to have on the core group is fine, but I would not want to try to make decisions about who at this meeting. I think that's give us a little bit of time to work through that and maybe in April we do that I don't know, but I would not recommend that that's not part of my thought to go that far.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:07:17] All right. Do we have general agreement that we'll revisit this in the morning? Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:24] I'm sorry to interrupt you but just does that give enough time to do what you need to? I am getting head nods because I think we're close I think?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:07:33] All right great. Well I think then that means we'll adjourn this agenda item until the morning. Are there anything we need to take up on this agenda item that cannot wait until the morning when we hopefully come back for our conclusion? I don't hear anything. So with that I'm going to pass the gavel back.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:04] So we're just....what we're doing here just from a procedural perspective, we're just recessing for the evening and we're going to come back to this and pick this item up first thing in the morning. Do you need any....can we go ahead with our regular scheduled 8 o'clock start or? Yes. Yes. Okay. All right. Great. (BREAK FOR THE EVENING)

Marc Gorelnik: [00:08:24] Thank you Chair Anderson. When we were last here we were in Council

discussion on agenda item E2 Climate and Communities Initiative Update, and I think that there was a group of folks who were going to work on something to allow the Council to come to conclusion on this agenda item, so I'll open the floor and see if someone has something to offer. Caren Braby.

Caren Braby: [00:09:01] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:09:02] Enthusiastic.

Caren Braby: [00:09:06] Yes. I would love to offer a motion on moving forward and I believe Sandra has a motion. True teamwork here and you see it in front of you on the screen per the direction and discussion of the Council yesterday. A small group of us got together and drafted this concept for Council decision making today. I will read it. I move that the Council adopt the scenario planning topic of shifting stock availability including shifting distribution across species FMP's and communities across the West Coast. This topic will be further refined by the Scenario Planning Core Team described below. Desired outcome of scenario planning process. Scenario planning process will define the tools, products and processes necessary to react to potential future states. The Council Chair will appoint a core team as soon as possible. This core team will perform specific tasks listed below and provide oversight for the duration of the scenario planning process. The core team will include the Ecosystem Working Group, two to three members, the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel, two to three members, the CSI team, three of us, Council staff, one person, the IEA Fisheries Science Center member, one person. The Council will task the core team to meet and collaboratively perform the following tasks. Work with Council staff and outside funders to secure funding for the process. Select scenario planning facilitation and advisory support to assist with the process. Refine the scenario planning topic. Identify data information and additional expertise needed. Develop scenario planning process which may include workshops, meetings, reports Council touch points, facilitation, community outreach, engagement, etc. Identify scenario planning process participants. Define timeline to complete scenario planning by March 2020. Refine the desired outcome of scenario planning process. The core team will provide an update on the scenario planning tasks at the September 2019 meeting and ask for a final decision from Council on details of the scenario planning process.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:12:09] Does the text on the screen accurately reflect your motion?

Caren Braby: [00:12:14] It does.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:12:16] And is there a second to the motion? John Ugoretz. Would you care to speak to your motion?

Caren Braby: [00:12:22] I would. Thank you. So as, as we just discussed yesterday we really appreciate the work of the Ecosystem Working Team and bringing a lot of material to the table for us to consider and the advice from all of the management team and advisory bodies. We heard a lot about great topics to work on. Some thoughts about how to move forward with a planning team and this motion integrates all of that input and thinking, it identifies an area of interest for working on a topic that is not a single species, is not a single place on the coast, but is a multi FMP complex. Look at all of the things that the Council does and all of the communities that the Council embraces and, and represents and trying to understand how major shifts in our resources are going to force us to make management changes in the future and be prepared for making those management changes. So the topic is very broad, it needs refinement but in this motion we've accounted for that by developing a core team that can do that refinement. We've set a goal of the planning process which reflects that description I just gave. It's, it's intended to bring tools and thinking and products and processes back

so that we can make sure that our management framework is ready to be flexible and deal with adaptation that's going to be necessary in the future. The team is comprised of, of Ecosystem Working Group folks, Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel folks, these are our teams that have been thinking about these issues very intently but bringing the technical expertise together with Council members and Council staff, we feel this is a nimble team that can work in the interim between March, right now and next September. Kind of build both a technical approach and a policy approach that will refine all the information that we've gotten so far into an implementable plan come September. So we've laid out the various tasks. It includes bringing capacity to the problem identifying outside funding, inside funding, bringing in professional expertise to help with building that scenario planning process. We've heard a lot about interest in leaning on other processes that have come before ours, but we recognize that we're forging into new territory. There are not a lot of examples of fisheries management scenario planning and so we want that, we want that professional guidance on the process in particular. And I think, I think that's about all I really want to point out at this time, so thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:15:52] Thank you Caren. Are there questions for maker of the motion? Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:16:03] Thank you I guess just as a point of clarity I guess I would note that the Council cannot receive funding from outside sources, that all our funding must come from National Marine Fisheries Service, so to that first point there just to be clear the secured funding will not be coming to the Council. We are.....our money is secured in one way only.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:16:27] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:38] A question on the next to the last point under these, under the tasks that define timeline to complete scenario planning by March 2020. Could you explain that please?

Caren Braby: [00:17:01] Yes. Thank you. So right now we have laid out a plan for what the core team will do between now and September which is dig into the planning and refinement and details of the topic and, and the process to move forward. Between September and March then would be the scenario planning process that would be a series of meetings, workshops, interviews, some combination of activities that have not yet been defined that would then come to fruition and we would report back to the Council in March 2020 with that product in hand.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:17:49] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:17:52] Thanks that makes sense. I wanted to propose an amendment?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:17:59] Go ahead.

Phil Anderson: [00:17:59] And I don't have it in writing. Surprise, surprise. Relative to the first task. Work with Council staff, the amendment would have that read, 'Work with Council staff to identify funding for the process'.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:30] Does that amendment read as you wish?

Phil Anderson: [00:18:32] Yes.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:32] Is there a second the amendment? Seconded by Bob Dooley. Please speak to your amendment.

Phil Anderson: [00:18:39] Just in response to the concern that Chuck raised relative to the Council's authority under the Magnuson Act to quote 'secure funding from outside sources', I just wanted this to be clear that what the team was going to do is to work with Council staff to simply identify funding.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:19:08] Any....John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz: [00:19:11] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and thank you Phil for the amendment. I, I can support the amendment, however our intent was not just to identify funding sources but to actually ensure that the funding was in place regardless of who it comes to or, or, or you know where it goes. We, we were emphasizing secure because the EWG had already worked to identify potential sources. We want to make sure that in the very near future that the Council knows that there's money in place to support this process, so I....as long as you're okay with that intent then then I can support the amendment.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:20:04] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:20:04] Well maybe. I, you know I think the authority of this team to secure funding, I mean that would suggest that this group has some sort of authority to contract with, just to secure funding through you know some, and that's part of what I'm reacting to. I don't think it is within the purview of this group to secure funding. I think it is within this group's purview to identify the funding, bring that back to the Council and with the appropriate communication with the entities that are....entity or funding source but with the Council that's how that would work, so in September you're gonna.... you would come back and here, here we've, we've identified some sources that can fund this and here they are. That's....but, but the group itself does not have the authority to secure that funding through some sort of agreement outside of this Council. That was my, one of my concerns with the way this was.....

Marc Gorelnik: [00:21:27] Caren.

Caren Braby: [00:21:27] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and thanks for that explanation Phil. I think that there is an issue to work out which is not the language of securing the funding or identifying the funding but the work that would be done in the interim between now and September, and part of the work that is intended through this motion is that facility....expert facilitation is identified and hired and is in place, to help with the planning process so that that is part of the work that is done between now and September. So whether it is Council staff that is securing the funding and hiring and contracting, the intent of this motion is to get that work done before coming back to the Council.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:22:15] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:22:17] Thank you for that clarification. I think in our discussion yesterday our Executive Director identified some funds that are, we currently have within the Council's accounts that could be used for this purpose and so I think with this discussion and clarification that should the Council adopt this motion that as part of that there, we are authorizing the use of funds from the sources that the Executive Director spoke to yesterday to complete the work that's identified within the motion.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:23:02] I think that's implicit in the next bullet in fact in selecting the facilitation. Rich Lincoln.

Rich Lincoln: [00:23:09] Thanks Vice Chair. I don't, I don't want to belabor this point but I would not want the Council to take an action this morning that would impede external collaborators from seeking and securing funding between now and September that would be helpful to support the implementation of a plan that the core team is going to design for us so..... The only reason I raise that Phil is the, the way you spoke to that is that first, it made it sound like the team would have to come back to the Council in order to take advantage of that kind of opportunity and I don't think that was probably your intent but I just want to make sure that we don't set something in motion that creates a speed bump that there's, you know there's some opportunities out there and some interest in collaboration that we talked about yesterday.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:24:08] I've got a question for Chuck. Since we cannot take outside funding and since those outside collaborators are not really subject to the Council process, it seems to me they could do what they need to do on the out outside the Council process to get their funding and provide the facilitation help but not funding to this project. Is that right?

Chuck Tracy: [00:24:31] Thank you. Well you are correct that, you know that outside entities we don't control what they spend their money on. We had a Nature Conservancy and I think EDF sponsored a workshop in May relative to this issue, so those sorts of things. I don't think there's anything that precludes things like that from occurring. They can take the advice of the, of the committee in terms of what processes are being contemplated. As far as facilitation, I guess I would, I'm not sure, I think that is probably something if it's going to kind of facilitate a Council process I think I would be more comfortable if that was actually contracted through, through Council funds if it's if it's actually facilitating a Council process. You know if it, if it's facilitating a workshop meeting that somebody else is doing, that, that's something different, but in terms of carrying through the whole, the whole process I think that would be more appropriate to be Council funded.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:26:02] Is a further discussion on the amendment? Not seeing any I'll call the question all those in favor of the amendment say 'aye'.

Council: [00:26:10] Aye.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:26:11] Opposed No? Extensions? The amendment passes unanimously. We're back to the main motion. Is there further discussion on the main motion? Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley: [00:26:27] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Just a question, it is.....I'm a little conflicted here about who actually hires the outside consultant? If the Council was paying for it, are you the approval process directly in contract with them directly and actually vet them to make sure that there is somebody that we would normally hire or is this done outside and here, here's the bill?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:26:52] Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:26:52] Thank you. Well you know as the Council wishes I mean you, you are certainly....if you want your level involvement is up to you. I mean typically the Council staff usually is responsible for vetting and you know soliciting contract, contractors and hiring them directly. If that's acceptable with the Council we can go that way? If you want to have some more control in it, that'd be up to you to provide that direction.

Bob Dooley: [00:27:25] Clarify my questions Vice Chair thank you. No I wasn't referring to whether the Council would approve it. I'm really referring to whether Council staff, you Executive Director approving it because you're the one who's paying the bill and have to know who you're hiring and

have to do the contractual work so if the committee comes forward with here, here's the bill. That's not what we're doing right? You're going to approve that before?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:27:55] Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:27:56] Mr. Vice Chair thank you. No, we would not accept a bill from the committee.

Bob Dooley: [00:28:02] Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:28:03] Any further discussion on the main motion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles: [00:28:07] On that point Bob. I would just point out that the exchange between Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Lockhart yesterday and I'm sure the core team will work this out but I think we have a NOAA facilitator. I think that, that the NOAA climate office has a facilitation, what we talked more about in the ecosystem group, so I think, I don't think, I don't see the, what you worried about Bob being an issue. I think, I think, well the point being I think they trust the core team will work it out and there are offers from government to help with the facilitation.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:28:40] Any further discussion on the motion? I don't see any I'll call the question all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:28:47] Aye.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:28:48] Opposed No? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Dr. Dahl how are we on this agenda item?

Kit Dahl: [00:29:04] I think we're good. So you just passed this motion that gives some pretty clear direction over the next few months, so I assume that Council staff will work with the identified groups that, to determine the individuals that will serve on this core team and obviously we'll keep the Council apprised.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:29:33] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:29:33] Just one to thank the group, the small group that worked on this last night and brought this forward to us. Thank you very much.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:29:42] Any further, any last thoughts on this agenda item before we close it out and move to E3 which is where we're supposed to start this morning. All right. Well let's move on to agenda item E3.

3. Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP) Five-Year Review

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:00] That concludes public comment and takes us to a Council discussion and action. The Council action as summarized on the screen there, to review goals and objectives and an outline of proposed FEP revisions, provide guidance on future work and schedule for the five year review. We've gotten a number of recommendations. Some are at odds with each other. So let me open the floor to discuss our Council action. John.

John Ugoretz: [00:00:38] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and I think a lot of good thought went into this and I was appreciative to see the comments from the various advisory bodies. In, in my opinion the, the path laid out by the Ecosystem Work Group is very sound and it recognizes the level of work they have for other issues not the least of which is the Climate and Communities Initiative, so I'm supportive of essentially this vision update, looking at the vision and goals and objectives and importantly some of the recommendations about making those goals and objectives more actionable and measurable. And then I'm also supportive of not waiting five years to do a more significant review of this document. I feel like having the Ecosystem Workgroup come back in a year from now after the goal and objective update and vision update and recommending more significant changes based on public comment would be appropriate.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:01:56] Thanks John. Caren.

Caren Braby: [00:02:01] Thanks. I also, I like the, the path of the EWG has laid out. I may be thinking about a slightly slower timeline and thinking about workload and how this will intersect with the Climate and Communities Initiative process but not speaking to the timeline yet, I think that the vision and goals and objectives is a good place to start and, and I appreciate all the thinking and focusing on that first, and I agree with it. Where I'm struggling and I'm not sure that we're ready to act on today is how to incorporate climate and how to incorporate ecosystem level goals specifically, and so I am not comfortable taking the draft chapter 1 and putting that out for public comment at this time, right, so in thinking about what I would want to see before putting that out there I'd want to point to something like the North Pacific's ecosystem level goals or something that's tangible that we could say here with integration of these into the Council's goals and objectives, then we go out to public comment and so I'm thinking of another step in in the interim, so having a draft that's actually a draft that incorporates more ecosystem level goals, points to climate specifically, if we can do that today great, but I'm afraid that might be a little bit more than we have the ability to do around the Council table and putting that out for public comment so it's just adding one kind of interim step in there, and I'll hold my comments for any additional comments for now. I'd like to hear more discussion.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:09] Great. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:04:10] Thanks. I had a similar thought to what Caren expressed and I don't know, it just in struggling with what exactly is it that we are sending out for public review and what does that document look like because we have a lot of documents here and a lot of work that the EWG has done to look at what has been done in other regions by other Councils, but we also have some suggestions from our different advisory bodies about some specific objectives to consider adding to the FEP and I'm thinking it would be wonderful if Dr. Dahl could potentially produce a summary document that kind of captures what's in the documents that are in front of us here. So I'm thinking a document that summarizes the EWG Report 1 that kind of lists out here the different regions, different FEP goals and objectives that other regional Councils have looked at. Here's, you know a couple bullet points of feedback that we heard from our advisory bodies on specific objectives that they would like the Council to consider as well as our vision statement and goals and objectives together,

so here's, here's kind of what we have currently, here's the advice and considerations that have been brought to us as we move forward in doing a potential vision review or, or vision update I think is how it's being characterized. A couple other things I wanted to offer is I know all of the advisory bodies have really focused on the Climate and Communities Initiative as, and that was the agenda item just prior to this one. I guess I don't want the Council to also lose sight of the sablefish initiative that we have out there so climate and communities is the most recent one, but we also do have the sablefish initiative that the Council had approved and we're hoping to get an update on from Doctor Heltic at some point, so I do think that continuing to move forward on both of those initiatives is, is a good priority for the Council. And I guess I just want to take a step back and some of you have heard me express my, my love for strategic planning, my love for all things planning and I guess I want to characterize that it's not where I necessarily see the need to update the vision goals and objectives, because I think they're in any way limiting or hindering the Council's actions and what we've been able to achieve with the FEP, so I guess I'm, I personally don't see a need to update them for a specific purpose because I don't think they've stopped us from considering any and all of the ideas that have been brought forward, so what I do see the value in is in having a Council discussion about the vision goals and objectives. So my....the value I see in strategic planning is not necessarily the document you end up with in the end, it's the conversations you have to get there and it's the discussions of finding out what exactly is important to our stakeholders, to our fisheries, to our Council members and developing that vision statement goals and objectives together, and that's what I think would be valuable in this process is having that Council discussion about where do we want to go with the fishery ecosystem plan, but what do we want to do? How can we make this most useful?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:08:44] Thank you Michele. Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:08:46] Thank you. A couple points you brought up, the sablefish initiative. That one was a casualty of the, or most recent update was a casualty of the partial government shutdown, so maybe we can work through with the Science Center and NMFS to address where that might show up under workload planning. But my other question was you mentioned having Dr. Dahl possibly put together a summary of the statements and the various proposed action so, for what, I guess for exactly what purpose for consideration under this agenda item or for a future meeting, so what's the schedule and what exactly is the intended purpose of that?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:09:34] Michelle.

Michele Culver: [00:09:35] Thanks. So the intended purpose is, is to have something tangible to send out for public review rather than have all of these multiple documents go out. If there were a way to summarize the information here to have something that's more succinct.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:10:02] Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:10:02] So, so that would be the action under this, that's a guidance under this agenda item? So, so that, that would be some, so that would not be... a, there'd be some alternatives there, some options under those that we'd seek further public input on.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:10:24] John.

John Ugoretz: [00:10:25] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and thanks Michelle and Caren for those comments. I think all three of us are on the same page in regard to we don't have something right today that we can put out there for public review, absolutely. I, I do not agree with having Council staff try to summarize the various things that are out there right now. I think there is a lot of voices

that we've heard in terms of what the goals and objectives might end up looking like, and I personally would prefer to put that back on the Ecosystem Workgroup to look at their draft. Look at the comments that come in, have come in already and prepare something that between now and say September the public and other teams could look at, comment on and then they bring the Council a final version for our discussion, which I appreciate your comments about that, I think it is our discussion that matters and that we would then review and discuss and approve the vision and goals and objectives in September. But I don't think right now we're ready to have someone summarize the options.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:11:43] Caren.

Caren Braby: [00:11:45] Thank you. I agree with asking the Ecosystem Working Group to take a stab at incorporating comments from the management teams and the advisory Subpanels in addressing the desire to incorporate ecosystem and climate goals into the current draft, chapter one. That is one, you know one step to take maybe with a cafeteria style plan way of looking at potential goals that could be included and have, drive that discussion. I, I still feel like that's a process that I want to have happen between now and September and then have teams, advisory subpanels comment on it at the September meeting and then go out to public comment, and so I just wanted to clarify that, that's my desired process and maybe that's consistent with what John just said, but I wanted to confirm.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:12:58] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:58] Well at the risk of exposing my lack of understanding about all things ecosystem plan related. I, you know I'm looking at, you know I'm thinking to the recommendations that the EWG had for us and Yvonne, those are contained in their second report and there's four bullets there. The second bullet which is sending out the draft vision statement, purpose statement, goals and objectives as potentially modified in our discussion here today, and then I'm hearing that well we really don't, we really don't have a document that, that where you can, I mean we have the larger document that those things are in, but do we have a document that's specific to those, those elements, and.....and if we knew then what I'm hearing from the EWG is that is what they're suggesting that we send out for public review and comment. So the conversation around the table here is a little bit confusing frankly to me, that if the suggestion is we don't have that document to take, to potentially take action on today to send out for public review, then and if that is what we ultimately want to do then pulling together a document, a singular document that we're asking public review on for those specific elements makes perfect sense to me, so I'm not sure where that ties into any of the things that other Council members have expressed here in the discussion but that's where I'm not understanding where it is we're going and whether or not we are suggesting to do something that is different than the EWG recommended.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:15:04] Caren and then I'll go to Rich.

Caren Braby: [00:15:07] It may be worth asking the EWG specifically but what, what I'm looking at in their Report 1 is a draft chapter 1 which contains the vision and draft goals and objectives and a suggestion that we modify that today in some way if we desire to go out to public comment today and, and my suggestion is that I am not comfortable with the draft as it stands today and I want additional reflection of the team and advisory subpanel comments that we've had specifically incorporating ecosystem level goals more fully into the draft and climate specifically into the draft but that draft chapter 1 is what I'm looking at as being the document that's in bullet 2 in their supplementary report, and so what, what I would like to see is that we insert that step between now and September of asking the Ecosystem Working Group to revise what's in Report 1 as Chapter 1 to incorporate more

ecosystem level goals and objectives, incorporate climate, reflect the comments we....bring it back to the Council in September, bring it back to the management teams and the advisory bodies for review and adopt something and send it out for review.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:16:36] Rich.

Rich Lincoln: [00:16:40] I'll defer to Phil. My comments were going to be largely the same that we have a chapter in front of us but we've heard a lot of comments both from the advisory committees but also the public that has provided this concept of there could be something more there and in terms of ecosystem level objectives that might be a little bit more quantifiable. We wouldn't be able to incorporate those today and if we want to have a thoughtful discussion about goals and objectives to discuss in the future, how those kinds of objectives might be used to support our management activities across management plans, it seems like having some time for the team to come back and say 'Here are some options about how those kinds of objectives that we've heard testimony about might be included in the plan' for us then to consider to send out to public review seems like would be a logical thing to do.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:17:39] Just to clarify so you're suggesting that the group, workgroup make some modifications, bring it back to the Council and then it would go for public review?

Rich Lincoln: [00:17:49] Basically what Caren described yes.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:17:50] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:17:53] Oh I just want to thank my colleague there Dr. Braby for helping straighten me out. Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:03] Further comments? I think we've gotten some guidance. Some direction. Do you have any comments on that John?

John Ugoretz: [00:18:14] Well, I have motion.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:16] You have motion?

John Ugoretz: [00:18:18] Yeah which is based on I think what we've discussed.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:21] All right. I think we're ready for that.

John Ugoretz: [00:18:30] Thank you. I move that the Council direct the Ecosystem Workgroup to update the fishery ecosystem plan as follows: One, update the vision and purpose goals and objectives as described in the EWG Report, including the addition of ecosystem level outcome oriented goals that particularly focus on the ecosystem within the context of a changing climate as described in the Ecosystem Workgroup Report. Consider public and advisory body comments on this update and present revisions to the Council for review and approval at the Council's September 2019 meeting, and three review the FEP in detail and recommend comprehensive FEP update alternatives for review at the Council's March 2020 meeting, based on revisions to the vision statement purpose statement goals and objectives. Information generated during the pursuit of the Climate and Communities Initiative and information on the current and potential future uses of the FEP.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:19:32] Does that, does the text on the screen accurately represent your motion?

John Ugoretz: [00:19:38] Thank you it does.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:19:39] Is there a second? Wait.

Frank Lockhart: [00:19:41] There's just a minor typo. The fishery ecosystem plan in the parentheses is EFP it should be FEP.

John Ugoretz: [00:19:54] Oops. Thank You.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:19:55] Those acronyms can run together. Is it correct now?

John Ugoretz: [00:19:59] Thank you it is.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:20:00] Do I have a second? Seconded by Richard Lincoln. Speak your motion?

John Ugoretz: [00:20:07] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I think as the discussion we just have notes that we've got a good draft by the Ecosystem Workgroup for some of this, but we've already received fairly significant input and comment on it, and I feel that the Ecosystem Workgroup should revise what they've done so far considering that comment, and then either, you know through a webinar or some other process get additional public and advisory body comment on it as well as comments from the advisory bodies at the September meeting so that the Council can have a full discussion about that particular section of the plan, and as Phil was questioning the more broad review of the fishery ecosystem plan needs to reflect that decision, and so while we do have a functional document right now, the changes to that broader document will need to consider how the goals and objectives do or do not change and so that I would see a more complete FEP review and revision after we've finalized that and thought about it in, in March. Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:21:32] Are there questions for makers....for the maker of the motion? Caren.

Caren Braby: [00:21:36] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Thanks for the motion. I want to ask about number 3 in particular and your previous question of Yvonne about red line document and what I would support in number 3 is a planning discussion about how you would approach FEP updates, not necessarily a red line document of what we currently have as the FEP and my question is what do you see as the product for number 3 in March of 2020?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:22:18] John.

John Ugoretz: [00:22:19] Thank you Mr. Vice Chairman and thank you Dr. Braby for that question and absolutely, my number 3, I had hoped by saying 'update alternatives' was that this was methods by which to update the FEP not the specific red line to the current FEP.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:22:43] Any other questions for the maker? Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:22:48] Thanks John. I had a similar question about item number 2. So we have a different advisory body statements, some which have specific recommendations for new objectives, and I'm wondering with number 2 where we would have the EWG go through all of those reports and statements and then present revisions to the Council, and are you thinking that there would just be one revised set of objectives for the Council to consider or would the EWG be able to bring alternatives to the Council so in some cases there are specific objectives that an advisory group is recommending be

added. Are you asking the EWG to just come up with one and add it or how, how would that document look and what would the Council's action be?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:24:07] John.

John Ugoretz: [00:24:08] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and thank you Miss Culver for that. My expectation is that the current comments and input that the EWG has in front of them would be considered in number 1 and that they would then revise and provide a recommended set of goals and objectives as number 2. My expectation would be that, that comes out at bare minimum in the advance briefing book so that all of the advisory bodies can see how their input was incorporated and if the advisory bodies have additional comments provide them to the Council in September so that the Council can discuss, as we talked about whether or not the goals and objectives of sort of reflect our desire for an FEP.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:25:02] Michele did you have anything? A follow up there?

Michele Culver: [00:25:04] Thank you. So I guess I, I'm, I'm struggling with how this is different than what we have here today. So we have the EWG did, did the work, looked at what other regional Councils have done, presented their Report 1 in the briefing book that all of the advisory bodies reviewed. They came back to us with some specific objectives that they wanted to see modified or added and now here we are and I feel like we're just going to be repeating that process in September, again there would be some additional modifications based on what we heard today but there would also be, you know the opportunity for advisory bodies to then make additional comments or suggestions if they didn't quite like what the EWG came up with or incorporated based on what they suggested today. So I'm, I'm struggling a little bit with that and, and I guess I'll, I'll just kind of reiterate, my thought initially was to take what we have today and send that out for public review and then in September we would hear back from the EWG and the advisory bodies on some specific modifications, just kind of move us a little bit further down toward getting one set of vision goals and objectives that could then go out. Instead I see in September from this motion we would just, we'd end up with all of these documents again.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:27:19] John.

John Ugoretz: [00:27:20] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and I do not feel we have a actionable set of information that could be sent out for public review today and therefore I am kicking this back to the team to review the input they received at this meeting and come up with something more concrete, more specific that will receive public review prior to the September meeting either before the briefing book or between the briefing book deadline and the meeting, and then we will adopt and accept that at September and not be at the same place we are at today.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:00] Caren.

Caren Braby: [00:00:01] Thank you. I, I, I agree that the recommendations we've heard about the current draft are fairly large shifts in what those goals and objectives would be and I would like to have our public comment draft reflect more what we've heard from our management teams and advisory bodies and the public comment today than reflect the draft that we have in the briefing book, and so the additional iteration of revision and comment I think will get us much closer to the draft that I would feel comfortable saying, 'We're revising the FEP, here's Chapter 1'. Now I feel like given the comment and the discussion we've had today it's much closer to the original version of the FEP and I want it shifted a little bit further down the road before I feel it will represent the Council's desire to

change it and revise it and put out a new document.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:01:15] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:17] What I'm uncomfortable with about this motion is number 2 and specifically the words 'on this update' because the way I interpret that is we're asking them to go back consider what we've heard today and public comment and our AP's and revise it and also consistent with the discussion around the table and that's fine, and yes the public and the advisory bodies will have an opportunity to comment on that document in September, but I think it's unfair to ask the EWG to consider the public and advisory comments on their update prior to the September meeting. That doesn't make....we're not going to get the advisory group comments and public comments on their updated version until the September meeting, so I'm good with everything on this motion except the words 'on this update'. So 'consider the public and advisory board to comments' is great on the present version but I am not comfortable with asking them to also do it on the update which they're not going to get in time to react to. I think it's unfair.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:02:39] Are you considering putting your concerns in the form of an amendment?

Phil Anderson: [00:02:44] I'm considering it.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:02:48] I guess we've clearly moved into Council discussion here so Michele and then Rich and then Herb.

Michele Culver: [00:02:56] Thanks. I would move to amend the motion.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:03] Okay.

Michele Culver: [00:03:04] In item number 2, I would strike the words 'on this update' and insert between 'present' and 'revisions' insert the word 'alternative'. So the motion would, the revised amended motion would read 'consider public and advisory body comments and present alternative revisions to the Council for review'.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:50] Michele does that read accurately on the screen, your amendment?

Michele Culver: [00:03:54] I think so.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:55] Okay I think so too. Is there a second? Seconded by Phil. Speak your amendment as necessary.

Michele Culver: [00:04:02] Yes thanks. I, I think Phil covered on this update and the rationale there. My intent with inserting 'alternative' is that we are not necessarily just presented with one set of objectives as we were today, but that we have some alternatives to consider based on the advisory body reports that the Council could then choose to add that objective or not or modification of it, et cetera.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:33] Thank you. Are there questions for, for Michele on her amendment? Rich Lincoln.

Rich Lincoln: [00:04:42] Thanks. Not to belabor it but is it fair to say that with the amendment that there are aspects of 1 and 2 that are somewhat duplicative, I mean we're...we're basically asking the

team to update this chapter based on their consideration of testimony. I guess there's nothing that conflicts between those two, but yeah I think, I think that the idea of presenting the team flexibility to have alternatives might be useful because there might be, there might be some conflicting ways to look at objectives including the level of detail so that might, might get us farther down the road in September.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:25] And Sandra, Phil seconded that motion just for your information. Is there...Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:05:33] Thanks so just as an example to address Rich's question. I would view number 1 as updating what they presented to us in report 1 with what we've all heard but then number 2, I'm just gonna use the CPSAS report as an example. CPSAS report had suggested that the Council specifically look at objectives for implementing ecosystem based fishery management, and so how that objective is worded, there might be a couple of options or alternatives for the Council to consider, rather than just give us one set of language to implement that objective, there might be a couple of different ways to get there.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:34] Further discussion on the amendment? Not seeing any I'll call the question. All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:06:41] Aye.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:43] Opposed no? Abstentions? The amendment passes unanimously. We're now back to the main motion as amended and Herb you had your hand up did you....

Herb Pollard: [00:06:59] I don't...you know I initially had my hand up to support the logic of Mr. Ugoretz's original motion and I don't think that's appropriate now with the amendment. Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:07:12] Pete.

Pete Hassemer: [00:07:13] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Just a process related question. Will there be an opportunity at some point to provide guidance? If this motion were to pass it sets out a plan of action, but some further guidance or would there be a chance for that after the motion is made or voted on?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:07:44] Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:07:45] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair, Mr. Hassemer. Yes I think there's an opportunity for the Council to provide additional guidance. I'm not sure what exactly you're talking about but you know whether it's in terms of guidance to the team in terms of process or timing or what but there is always an opportunity for additional guidance or additional motions.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:08:11] Any further discussion? Caren.

Caren Braby: [00:08:14] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. To Pete's point, I would like to have more discussion about the FEP update beyond steps 1 and 2, so the work that would be done between September and next March on presenting a plan, and I'm happy to do that after voting on this motion or having that discussion now.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:08:38] Alright. Pete.

Pete Hassemer: [00:08:38] Thank you and the intent of guidance is not to do on the floor editing with respect to language and what might be in there but to capture it in a general sense.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:08:54] All right thank you Pete. Further discussion on this motion? Not seeing any I'll call the question all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:09:03] Aye.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:09:03] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion passes unanimously. Further discussion? Caren.

Caren Braby: [00:09:14] Thank you. So specifically I'm very interested in thinking about the FEP as being very much served by the work that's put in to the annual California Current Ecosystem Report and not wanting to duplicate effort in that work by the science centers and the teams and everyone else who's reviewing and reacting to that report with detail that's in the FEP and so part of what I'm hoping to, to learn in a planning discussion about FEP updates is how we can remove workload and content that isn't necessary or is better served by the annual effort which is significant in putting together the California Current Report and so I'll flag that now as something that I am interested in and want to hear more about because I don't think that we need to have all of the information in both places, and I think we're better served by choosing where information comes to us and picking one place where it comes to us, but there is likely information in the FEP currently that describes the ecosystem that is important for context that isn't changing on a monthly or annual basis that would be good to have.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:10:53] Further discussion on this agenda item? Pete.

Pete Hassemer: [00:10:58] Thank you. Mr. Vice Chair. Now maybe just the thoughts, some guidance that's running through my head and what's resonating in my head is something that Michele had said and I hope I interpreted it correctly, is the value of this as a discussion about the plan and what we're doing and personally I feel we've jumped over some important things. If we're just capturing, it's very important to capture the public comment, the advisory body, the management team comments, but to just ask them to incorporate that without expressing what our desired outcome is or vision, so my guidance and whether or not the Council body as a whole agrees with it, is to number one, in the vision look carefully at that and make sure it expresses the outcome we desire. What's.... we haven't given any direction on how to update the vision statement right now. As I read that a lot of it I agree with, but my guidance is number one, there are prescriptive things in there like, excuse me I've got to....have to read the words again, includes adequate habitat protections, that's an action we do through other things so I, I would just advise them to look at prescriptive and more importantly in the vision statement for me nowhere does it mention fishing or fishing communities, and I think in the ecosystem plan that's this cross FMEP document it should reference that the NOAA's EBFM road map recognizes those things, and so without editing you can add in things that our vision is for a healthy ecosystem that supports fishing and fishing communities that are, and there's all kinds of adjectives you could put in there, viable, it's worthwhile to go fishing, sustainable, but maybe more importantly related to the ecosystem, resilient, resilient in the face of ecosystem changes, so for me that's what the vision statement is, is this needs to recognize sustainable and resilient fishing communities and fisheries through this regime of climate shift. So that, that's one thing, look carefully at that. I think it's important that we express what we expect, expect it to do and maybe more minor-ly then on the goals and objectives we heard a wide range of comments about they should be actionable and measurable versus the other extreme is outcome oriented, where do you want to be? So the

guidance is for the group that is updating this to think about the form that those goals and objectives take and do they express some outcome that we wish to achieve and then some objective, some step to get there, or are they all just actionable? So sorry for taking up your time but those are my thoughts.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:14:33] I think those are good thoughts. I think....I don't know if we need a motion on that but I think both Caren and Pete have offered some specific advice to the work group as they go forward and undertake the work between now and September, so is there general agreement around the table around in terms of the content and the focus as I think I think we have that? Are there, is there any further discussion on this agenda item? Any input, further input to the work group? Kit, how are we doing?

Kit Dahl: [00:15:14] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Well you've given extensive and quite specific guidance I think on this item and in summary we'll be looking forward to having the EWG bring back something in September for further discussion and input from interested parties and Council further discussion leading to perhaps putting out a proposal for public review.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:15:47] Thanks Kit. Anything further on this agenda item from around the table? With that I will hand the gavel back to our chair.

Phil Anderson: [00:15:58] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. We may be working from a different sheet of music here but I'm happy to provide a 15 minute break and then I'll be handing the gavel back to you for D2.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:16:13] Oh that's correct.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:15] Let's take a 15 minute break. We'll be back in about 10:25.

F. Habitat

1. Current Habitat Issues

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] That concludes public comment. Takes us to our Council action which is to consider the Habitat Committee's report recommendations. We had the remarks provided by Pete Hassemer. Are there are other comments around the table regarding the Habitat Committee's report? Okay. So that'll, we'll look forward to the Habitat Committee's report in this agenda item in April and we'll move on to groundfish management.

G. Groundfish Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Report

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:00] That will move us into Council action which is to discuss the NMFS report, some of which we had, but let's have some during the formal discussion session. Anyone like to offer any discussion here? Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:00:20] Yeah thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Just want to go back to the NMFS supplemental report 2 and say some words of thanks to Aja and her crew for the coordination on the trawl logbook regulatory item. CDFW has been working behind the scenes with them to make sure that there is a smooth implementation and that we have effective dates that align such that there is a requirement that's in effect that works for NMFS. CDFW provided an informational item on this situation back at the November meeting. Our situation stateside with trawl logbooks and data collection and retention and confidentiality requirements kind of put us in a situation where the information that we were collecting by law was not something the state was using and is just being provided for use in the Federal process and we'd like it to be rightfully owned and retained in-house by NMFS for use in the Federal management process, so believe will be, you know this will allow that outcome to occur. We're working on outreach with the fleet to make sure there's a clear understanding of the procedures. Coincidentally the state regulation that required the log book was a rule that took effect in 1989 and in fact the log book form that the state was requiring by law looked nothing like the trawl log of today, so really the requirement to submit the specific information that is on the form today was not really a state requirement in the first place because the rule only referred to the old 1989 log book form, so hopefully this cleanup will allow the data to get to where it needs to be, so just want to say thanks for that. We had some brief discussion on the Cal Cod outer boundary rulemaking item and the response from Executive Director Tracy that this is something for our future meeting planning discussion since that was a grayscale item on the Year-At-a Glance, and I understand that, you know at this time NMFS doesn't have a, a primary staffer assigned to that rulemaking. I just want to reiterate that this is an item that was....there's several CDFW reports back in the record on this and we'll refer to them in agenda planning. We had some discussion on this in delegation this morning and the GAP wasn't aware of this but they are very concerned about losing the opportunity to change that outer boundary since we did not have the opportunity in the specifications process so we'll just look forward to hearing more on that in agenda planning, but they weren't aware about that item not being on the list, and I think part of the, the... you know they didn't have a lot of discussion in the GAP on it because it sounds like NMFS didn't come to the GAP to provide them an overview like you just gave us on this list of rulemaking actions, so I understand that NMFS staff got here a little bit late in the game for this meeting and weren't able to come and brief them on it, but I, I'm hopeful that we'll hear a report from the GAP in agenda planning on this item since they will be discussing it now that they're aware of it, so anyway thanks and we'll look forward to more.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:28] Aja.

Aja Szumylo: [00:04:28] Thank you Miss Yaremko and Mr. Chair, or Mr. Vice Chair, excuse Me. Yeah I just want to highlight this isn't just a NMFS staff workload issue. This is also a coordination with Council staff issue, so it's about us jointly blocking out our time to work through this agenda item or, yeah, and I know that we've put it on the agenda already but we need to be mindful about adding items to the agenda considering what we're going to discuss with omnibus later on and considering the longer term trajectory of workload over the course of the next year, so yeah I'm just

putting that out there for us to discuss later when we get to workload planning. Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:03] Thanks Aja. Further discussion around the table? Maggie.

Maggie Sommer: [00:05:12] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair just thought I'd offer for the Council's information that the State of Oregon does not plan any changes to our trawl log book requirements, so we anticipate continuing status quo with those. Thanks.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:31] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:34] I just wanted to express my appreciation to NMFS for bringing this report forward and my sympathies and understanding for having to go through not just the shutdown but planning for two shutdowns. In my former life I had to plan for shutdowns of a relatively large agency with 83 hatcheries full of fish and I, you have my sympathy for just the planning alone and the trips to plan for it let alone the effects of losing 10 percent of your year from the shutdown is a huge undertaking and appreciate all the thinking that has gone into how to work your way out of the hole that was dug for you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:31] Further discussion? Maggie.

Maggie Sommer: [00:06:37] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. I just wanted to circle back briefly to the one touch reporting project which I think certainly is of a lot of interest to all of us. I would just want to reiterate that interest and leave it to the National Marine Fisheries Service's discretion on the best way to inform us about that project at the April meeting. Thanks.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:07:04] All right I'm looking around the table and I don't see any more hands so I'll turn to Todd and see how we're doing on agenda item G1.

Todd Phillips: [00:07:12] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. We have covered all the items and I believe we are complete with this particular agenda.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:07:20] Great. Anything else before we close out this agenda item? All right.

2. Amendment 28 – Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) and Rockfish Conservation Area – Final Implementation

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:01] Let me turn to Kerry to get us focused on Council discussion.

Kerry Griffin: [00:00:09] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. You are on Council action now and as a reminder the tasks at hand are to approve the amended Fishery Management Plan language with any edits or recommendations as the Council wishes. Also consider and approve the FMP appendices with the same caveats. Correct any EFH conservation area configurations that need to be corrected and then adopt the draft Council operating procedure 22 for public review. Those are your tasks at hand.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:55] All right thanks for that Kerry. To the extent possible it would be helpful to keep these discussion items discreet and I don't know when exactly we'll have motions ready but if we can have, you know if we can have our discussion now and then come back from lunch and have motions if we're ready for them at that time that would be terrific. So let me open the floor for Council discussion on these four items. Is there Council discussion on these four items? Maggie. Okay.

Maggie Sommers: [00:01:41] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. I just wanted to start off and say there's, there's a lot here. I felt like we had really gotten through the EFH amendments and this, this is a good final step that I really appreciate the thought that all our advisory body members and the public have put into reviewing the materials that were available in the advanced briefing book. I know we have had some challenges with our ability to review the appendices which were only available recently and I think we'll probably have some more discussion on that, but I did just want to kind of give a very big picture. Thanks to everybody and to recognize all the work that went into this whole process and we've had a couple suggestions today and this is something I'm going to be following up on for a kind of postmortem process to make sure to gather all the collective wisdom and the lessons learned and use that to inform the next process, so I just wanted to maybe put that out there at first because that will factor into my thinking about how we approach these changes to the FMP and the COP.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:02] Thanks for that. Michele do you have something? It's hard for me to figure out sometimes when people are ready to raise their hands. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:03:28] Sure we have a few minutes before noon. I guess just to, to offer a few thoughts. I wasn't sure, thank you Mr. Vice Chairman, if you were kind of taking these in order or at this point just asking for general comment, so I have some comments I would like to offer on the FMP appendices which is the second item.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:53] I was sort of hoping to keep it organized if we had a lot of comments but it appears that we don't have a lot of comments so you can speak to any of those for you wish.

Michele Culver: [00:04:02] Thank you. So I appreciate the walk through of how the appendices relate to and satisfy the requirements for EFH in the FMP and I had some thoughts to offer specific to Appendix D which are the non fishing impacts and my understanding of how Appendix D could be used, is used, is that it's used by, for example by NMFS staff in EFH consultations and it's in the form of guidelines to developers or project proponents as to, here are some guidelines, actions that the developer could take to minimize adverse impacts to EFH, and then these guidelines then, depending on the type of proposed activity in Appendix D is organized by proposed activity, could then form the basis of initiating that consultation. So with that I will say that there is a brief introductory description of these guidelines, are a short menu of actions that could help developers avoid, minimize and mitigate for impacts of these activities on EFH. Doesn't really provide any description about how this

document may be used or might guide EFH consultations and then the different guidelines are very brief and start with verbs, actions, but don't necessarily in some cases connect as to the why or the how and so in multiple places in Appendix D when one of the guidelines is to secure water rights. It's, it's a good thing for developers if they're acquiring property to also acquire water rights for that property, well that is a good thing. That would probably be something that a developer should consider but it doesn't then tie back to, well how does this avoid minimize adverse impacts to EFH. It just has acquire water rights, so I guess just some general comment that I think it, it would be helpful to kind of make the connections of the proposed conservation measures to how they may protect EFH or mitigate for EFH impacts, and I don't.....there are a lot of bulleted items in Appendix D but maybe even just something up front that can kind of characterize that for all of them. So that was just a suggestion.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:07:36] Thanks Michele. Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:07:41] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Just a couple of general comments and observations about this agenda item today. First I think the project work team and Council staff and NMFS really did a fantastic job helping us through what we need to do today, and I am very willing to give them the flexibility that they are asking for here in terms of wrapping up the final analyses and making sure that our final goal is kept in mind, that we keep things on track with the timeline so that we can get all of the materials submitted for secretarial review by June. The shutdown definitely impeded the plans a little bit and I think this remarkable body of work, it's really tough to speed up a timeline when you lose 40 days so I think the approach that's being recommended here and has been supported by our advisors and their review here today in their reports unanimously supports the priority that we wrap this up and get the FMP language and appendices up on time. So I want to thank the advisers for their understanding and maybe we didn't have as thorough a review of all of the, you know nuts and bolts as we might have wanted, but it's certainly sufficient I think for purposes here. There's been so much done. We know what's left to do and I'm very comfortable with the approach. Regarding COP 22, I like the recommendations that we've heard to postpone action on that for now. I'm looking forward to a more lengthy review by our other advisory bodies since this COP will affect their EFH reviews as well, and there are very different processes that have been used for the other FMP's so I look forward to their thoughts on how we flesh this out a little more clearly. I want to thank Tom Rudolf and Oceana for their comments and their explicit reference to the need to maintain something specific regarding HAPC's since that was not a component of the draft COP 22 language that was in front of us here at the beginning of this meeting. I think it is important to retain some language on HAPC review, a flexible HAPC review process to allow for emerging needs, but I also concur with the Habitat Committee's recommendation that possibly the, some of the prescriptions are, are not, not quite needed in the FMP language, so I think that's all I have to say. I do appreciate, you know the continued hard work of all involved and I look forward to staying on track. Thanks.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:11:21] Thanks Marci. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:11:24] Thanks. So maybe as a follow up to your comments Marci, a question and maybe I'll direct it to, to NMFS and Council staff and I also want to weigh in, I don't know, but we've had a couple of advisory bodies suggest that the references to COP 22 that are in the FMP be removed and they've had some suggested ways on how to do that, so just a question of.....I see Kerry wanting to answer, so just a question of how that may affect our ability to meet the FMP requirements and meet the timeline.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:12:14] Kerry.

Kerry Griffin: [00:12:17] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Ms. Culver. That is a good comment. When I first read that recommendation to remove reference to, to the COP from that FMP text I thought no, no that's a mistake. I'm sure that all sorts of, there are all sorts of references to other COP's, so I searched the whole FMP and there aren't any, so the reason that was in there was because as part of Council's final action was you wanted to take most of the process stuff out of the FMP and put it elsewhere, either a COP or an appendix or something like that, so I wanted to try to create that link, but, but that said I don't think that, I don't think that there's any harm in removing the, you know, the references to COP 22. Like I said there aren't any others that I found in the groundfish FMP so.....

Marc Gorelnik: [00:13:19] Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:13:20] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. Wanted to return to a question that Marci had asked on the ODFW report about a recommendation of revision in section 6.2 of the language from bottom trawling to certain types of fishing. I apologize for not having that answer right away. I have recalled with some assistance, that that language actually came from the proposed revisions in the original Attachment 1, in underlined text under section 6.2.4 where it referred to...now I have too many things open here, but it used that phrase 'was to certain types of fishing' and so my, the intent of my recommendation to use that above it in section 6.2 which is the introduction to that section was just to standardize those references. I also see, would note that the Project Team Report in its recommended revisions and Project Team Report 1 to section 6.2.4 has revised that language from certain types of fishing to certain fishing gear or methods. So I guess overall I just wanted to step back and reiterate that it was not my goal in ODFW's proposed changes to make any policy change but just to do some language cleanup, standardize it and bring it in line with the intent of EFH provisions, so if there is a preference for phrasing there that Council members would like to see I'm happy to incorporate that.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:15:11] Thanks Maggie. Further discussion on any of these Council actions? I don't see any and I don't want to prematurely ask for any motions but if someone does have a motion it could be entertained now or after lunch, whichever is your preference. It's 11:51. What I'm sensing is that there's no urgency to move forward right now with a motion. It's 11:51. What if we were to come back at one o'clock and see if there's any further discussion that bubbled to the top during lunch and then we'll entertain motions to, on each of the actions we have before us and this agenda item is that reasonable? All right, so it's 11:52 now and why don't we plan on being back at one o'clock. (LUNCH BREAK). When we were last together we were talking about agenda item G2 and I think we had exhausted our Council discussion, but before we entertain any motions let me see if there is any additional discussion to be had on this? And I do not see any so hopefully somebody has a motion. Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:16:56] Thank you Vice Chair Gorelnik. I would love to offer a motion. Sandra motion one please. I move that Council approve the revisions to the groundfish FMP as shown in G2 Attachment 1, March 2019 with additional changes as proposed in the following March 2019 reports. G.2.a Project Team Report 1, with the modifications to section 7.4 in G.2.a Supplemental GMT Report 1. G.2.a Supplemental ODFW Report 1, except in number 1 replace the proposed addition 'certain types of fishing' with 'certain fishing gear or methods'. In number 3 do not include the underlined phrase 'with bottom contact gear' and do not use number 4. G.2.a Supplemental Revised Habitat Committee Report 1 including the attachment, except in the list of habitat objectives on page 3, replace 'all managed species and life stages' with 'all groundfish FMP species and life stages', noting that in the same list the fifth bullet should be split to begin a sixth bullet with 'conduct scientific research', remove references to COP 22 in the FMP as described in, Sandra would you please strike the word 'V'. G.2.a Supplemental GAP Report 1, in addition approve the FMP

appendices and allow Council staff with the support of the project team to further update the FMP and appendices consistent with EFH regulations and Council recommendations. Additional public input regarding corrections to the appendices should be directed to Council staff no later than Monday, March 25th, 2019. The FMP and appendices would then be submitted for secretarial review without further review by the Council.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:19:05] Maggie does the text on the screen accurately reflect your motion?

Maggie Sommers: [00:19:10] It does. Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:19:11] Is there a second, second? Seconded by Brad Pettinger. Please speak to your motion?

Maggie Sommers: [00:19:19] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I want to appreciate all the thoughtful review and hard work on making some suggestions for improvement here by the Habitat Committee, the Groundfish Management Team, the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel and members of the public. What's reflected here in the motion is a compilation of comments from all of the above and the revisions referenced in the motion are additive. Where they are, where they conflicted I selected the one I believed was best and indicated that. An example of that is the specification that the GMT's modifications to section 7.4 should be used instead of the project team's suggestion, otherwise they're, they're complementary and the intent of many of the changes such as replacing 'bottom trawl' with 'bottom contact gear' phrasing throughout is to improve the consistency of terminology throughout these sections of the FMP and I do want to provide the Council staff or the project team leeway to make additional minor edits for that purpose or to clean up the language as necessary, acknowledging that it has been challenging to follow the many strikeout and underlined versions of recommendations that we received. On a couple specific items, the Habitat Committee recommended the addition of habitat objectives and priority habitats to the FMP to the habitat framework section. I understand that these items were very important references throughout the Amendment 28 process and I think articulating them in the FMP will make them more easily discovery and accessible and give some more prominence. We had a little bit of Council discussion earlier. Our questions on the Habitat Committee Report about the revisions to EFH objectives that the Habitat Committee was suggesting that made some modifications from the objectives as they were articulated in the Amendment 19 process, I do want to support those changes and recognize that the Habitat Committee as our habitat experts and I'm comfortable relying on their expertise and recommendations here for these revised objectives which the Council has seen at least in September 2015, so they're not coming in new at this process and the objectives are introduced by the phrase 'The Council should consider the following habitat objectives' as we are considering EFH revisions and minimization measures and that word is a good description of what I intend the Council to do with them during EFH reviews to consider those objectives. It's not prescriptive but it does identify some important habitat goals that we'll take into account. One particular note. I did make a change in the motion to.....from the phrase 'all managed species and life stages' in that list of objectives in the Habitat Committee's report, to all 'Groundfish FMP state species and life stages' and that is simply to clarify that the intent here is that they are focused on FMP.....or we are, in this context, are focused on FMP species rather than all managed species which could be subject to misinterpretation. I do want to speak to the HAPC process. It is included in this report by the my.....sorry in this motion, by the inclusion of the Habitat Committee's recommendations and that includes the first sentence of the interim process for designating Habitat Areas of Particular Concern, again it's my understanding that the Council can choose to review any EFH element in between a full review but the Habitat Areas of Particular Concern is, this is an issue that is I think different in nature than other elements of EFH and certainly different in the greater amount of public attention it has received, an interest in seeing at least a reference to that remaining in

there and the Habitat Committee has given us a good example of a good reason for us, the Council potentially wanting to consider an interim HAPC designation, again noting that HAPC designations are used by the National Marine Fisheries Service when they conduct EFH consultations on activities that may adversely affect EFH on non fishing activities with other entities and they do give, put a special focus on HAPC's in that process, and so it's important from that perspective and so I am very supportive of retaining it here. On the appendices again noting that they're, they're very comprehensive and the goal of revisions to the appendices is to include what the Council asked for with our previous Amendment 28 actions. They're mostly complete and we noted earlier they're mostly descriptive in nature. We do, we did receive information earlier that we do need to see the appendices completed on a near-term timeframe in order for the National Marine Fisheries Service to submit, or for these to be submitted for secretarial review and approval without delaying the implementation of the EFH and RCA changes for January 1st, 2020, and yet there needs to be some flexibility to complete that work, so I would emphasize the importance of making the corrections that have already been identified. For example the omission of marine mining from the Appendix D list of non fishing effects and possibly looking into the expansion of submarine cables to include communications cables, and I know that there may be more individuals who are willing and well positioned to take a good thorough look at those appendices and provide some input on things that might be missing or incorrect in the drafts, and the motion specifies that, that input should go through Council staff with a deadline of March 25th and that was, that deadline is intended to keep approval, development and approval of the appendices on schedule. I believe with that I, that will conclude my remarks.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:26:21] Okay before we start discussion I'll see if there are any questions for the maker of the motion? I'm not seeing any. I'll open, open this up for discussion on the motion. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:26:39] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and thank you Maggie. I just wanted to voice my support for the motion. I think it's very comprehensive and fulfills the Council's requirements relative to protecting and minimizing impacts, adverse impacts to essential fish habitat for groundfish, and I fully support moving forward with the FMP proposed amendments and the process laid out here to incorporate some additional minor edits to the FMP appendices by this specified deadline.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:27:20] Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:27:21] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. Thank you very much for those remarks Michele. I realized I also had meant to just specify that the motion does reference the revised Habitat Committee report. There was an earlier vision of the Habitat Committee report that had one of the habitat objectives struck out that was not intended to be, so in this motion it does include all of the objectives in the report as revised.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:27:51] Great. Further discussion on this motion? Seeing none I'll call the question all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:28:00] Aye.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:28:00] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion passes unanimously. Thanks. Thanks for that Maggie, and Kerry before I entertain any other motion, we have four items for Council action, do you think we've adequately taken care of the first two?

Kerry Griffin: [00:28:20] Yes sir. I think it does take care of the first two, the FMP language and the appendices.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:28:28] Terrific. Thanks. All right we have two other items on our action list and at this time I'll....since we've exhausted discussion I'm hoping there's a motion. Oh Maggie to the rescue.

Maggie Sommers: [00:00:00] Thank you Vice Chair Gorelnik. I would like to offer a motion. If you don't mind I will take them out of order. I have a motion on draft COP 22.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:09] That's fine.

Maggie Sommers: [00:00:10] Thank you. Sandra motion number two please. I move the Council number one, approve COP 22 with revisions proposed below for further review. Two, initiate an Amendment 28 postmortem by requesting the EFH project team to consider how to conduct a survey of all interested individuals to gather the lessons learned and recommendations for EFH review procedures. The project team should report back to the Council with plans for such a survey in June. Three, develop groundfish EFH review guidelines after receiving the postmortem survey feedback and prior to initiating the next full EFH review. We'll scroll through the draft Council Operating Procedure 22. I will just read through it as I am proposing. The purpose to guide the Council's review and modification of essential fish habitat provisions and FMP's including identification and description of the EFH fishing and non fishing impacts, recommended conservation measures, Habitat Areas of Particular Concern and other provisions of EFH. One, to ensure that the EFH provisions, sorry objectives, number one, to ensure that the EFH provisions in the Council's FMP are consistent with the best scientific information available. Number two, to ensure a transparent and efficient science based process for review of new information and consideration of any potential changes to EFH provisions. The EFH periodic review process, no more than five years after completing a review and any modifications of an FMP's EFH provisions, the Council should initiate a new review. The Council may conduct a review of some EFH elements such as Habitat Areas of Particular Concern in the interim period, however changes to HAPC or other EFH elements in between full EFH reviews will only be contemplated in unusual cases in which notable harm might result by inaction. The review should include the evaluation of published and unpublished scientific literature and reports, information from interested parties and previously unavailable or inaccessible data. The Council will identify the appropriate Council and or National Marine Fisheries Service staff leads to coordinate the review working with subject area experts, Council advisory bodies and others to complete a review consistent with Federal regulatory guidance at 50 CFR 600 Subpart J. In determining the scope and schedule of the review the Council should consider recommendations from prior reviews, clearly identify the purpose and measurable objectives for the review and habitat conservation objectives for any amendments to EFH and solicit input from its advisory bodies and the public. As appropriate the review may be scoped in two phases. In the first phase the project leads and subject matter experts, i.e. Federal or state agencies, tribes, and academia will conduct a thorough review of the best available scientific information on the EFH provisions contained in a particular FMP. Based on this review and considering input from its advisory bodies and the public, the Council may embark on a second phase in which changes to EFH provisions for that FMP as well as commensurate minimization measures are considered for Council adoption. Prior to initiating a review the Council should adopt a process and schedule for both the review phase and if necessary, the second phase in which changes to EFH provisions are considered. The process and schedule will contain details such as key participants and steps relevant to the subject FMP.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:59] Okay thank you Maggie. Does the language on the screen accurately reflect your motion? Kerry.

Kerry Griffin: [00:04:08] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Miss Sommer I have a clarifying question. At the top of the motion, it says 'I move to approve COP 22 with revisions', and I wanted to clarify if that is intended to be adopt for public review with these revisions or approve as final with those revisions?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:29] Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:04:29] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Thanks Kerry for the question. The intent was not to approve as final. It was to adopt for public review and I will speak more to what I envision in terms of review speaking to it.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:47] All right. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Michele. Please speak to your motion.

Maggie Sommers: [00:04:54] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. There's been, I know a lot of discussion among those who are really interested in groundfish EFH reviews about what level of detail should be in the FMP and in COP 22. We did receive a draft revision of COP 22 that removed a lot of the groundfish specific detail and revised it so that it would apply to all fishery management plans and that is reflected in the text of the COP I'm proposing below here, I'll speak to the specific changes in just a moment. I do want to really focus on the postmortem process. We have heard, again we've heard that recommended by some folks who were really very much involved in the Amendment 28 process and I think it's a great opportunity to get a lot of input about what worked really well in this process, what didn't and how to help us design an efficient and effective process for the next EFH review, so I am very supportive of not developing more specifics on a groundfish EFH review process until we receive that information. I am suggesting that a good way to start that postmortem would be to ask the project team to think about how to conduct a survey that would enable individuals to provide us their opinion on those lessons learned. We did have some discussion on whether we should just ask advisory bodies to give us reports with their consensus opinions or not and I think that there are probably, there is a wide range of individual input that we would benefit from seeing and some of that detail might be lost in just advisory body consensus opinions. I would note that the advisory bodies will, will certainly have a role in what the Council does with input received through this postmortem and through individual surveys. My vision is that we would take that input and then develop it into some guidelines for groundfish EFH review processes and we would be doing that with some additional review and input at that point by our advisory bodies and the public, so I'm not intending to exclude advisory bodies but I do think that the first step would be an individual survey and I would like to just leave that to the project team and the National Marine Fisheries Service to do some first thinking about how to conduct that, and again the number three in here is just to, to signal that what we intend to do with that is as I just said to take that input to do any further thinking and consulting with our advisory bodies and use that to inform our development of EFH review guidelines before we get into the next groundfish process. The COP language proposed here is showing changes from the version that was in the briefing book. All the changes are highlighted in yellow. I think we lost, I'm sorry the underlining on some of the insertions. Okay well the changes are highlighted in yellow. I did incorporate the recommendations made by the GMT to this language and the gist of some, some things I heard and a lot of conversations here about really the importance of defining measurable objectives and making sure that's a big part of the process, so I mean just go through some of these specifically. If you would scroll up a little bit Sandra. Okay, I wanted to emphasize the, the foundational role of science in an EFH review with a modification to objective number two and then scrolling down to the first yellow highlighted part in the EFH review process, this again is inserting a reference to the option to conduct an interim review of some EFH elements such as HAPC's but with some language that is intended to indicate that we are not going to do that lightly. That's something that we would be weighing in balance with all of our other priorities and workloads, and so something

we would probably just choose to prioritize and take on if there were a potential harm that would result from not doing so. Scrolling down then to the next yellow section I'm talking about measurable objectives for the review and habitat conservation objectives to any amendments to EFH. Again those are recommendations from the GMT. As they reminded us they have been recommending measurable objectives over a long period of time and I know the Habitat Committee has as well. The addition of, and the public there is just to articulate that, again that is something that we always consider but wanted to make it clear in here. The addition of the example of Federal and state agency, tribes and academia is just a little bit of clarifying there as are the remainder of the highlighted edits in the second to last paragraph and then a final paragraph, this is again just a statement that the Council will, will put together all of the process details, all of the key elements that we think should be features of an EFH review process along with the details of schedule and who will be involved and prior to beginning a new review, so and that references what I talked to about are, we can consider developing that after receiving the postmortem input. So with that I will conclude my remarks. I'll note that I noticed halfway through that the, what's showing on screen does not show what was the strikeouts, so what I proposed deleting from the version of the COP 22 that was in the briefing book, if folks are interested in that I can go through those or we can maybe switch to a different view on screen, but what is up there is what I am proposing be adopted and back to Kerry's question, this, I am proposing we, we approve this, this is not final adoption, but approval for further review and I don't, this has not been seen yet by the other FMP management teams or advisory subpanels and we are now proposing that it apply to their FMP's so I suspect this might be a multi-step iterative review process. I'm not envisioning this as we put it out once for public review and then are ready to adopt it. I think we may hear some comments from our other advisory bodies and the public that we will want to consider and use for further modifications. Thanks.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:12:50] Thank you Maggie. Are there questions for Maggie on her motion? Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:12:57] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and thank you Maggie for your detailed motion and thoughts on how to proceed here. I may have missed this in your description of how the pieces fit together but regarding the postmortem it looks like you are wanting to task the project team to report back to the Council with some preliminary plans on how to conduct the survey at our June meeting. Are you proposing that that be an agenda item or are you wanting it to, I mean are you expecting materials back from them? I'm just thinking about June as this overarching crunch deadline for making sure we get all of the content up and out for secretarial review so I was hoping maybe you can elaborate on that piece.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:13:54] Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:13:55] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. Thanks for that question Marci. I was envisioning perhaps just a brief report back to us on what some initial discussions had yielded in terms of a, an approach for conducting a survey. I was not expecting any materials or you know a developed survey for our review at that time. I also would be happy to entertain a longer timeframe for that than June if there is Council interest in delaying that so that we don't delay other things.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:14:41] Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:14:42] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Yes I guess we should have that discussion when we get to discussion under the motion or we're still on? So I do have another question?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:14:56] Alright. Go ahead with your question.

Marci Yaremko: [00:14:57] Okay thanks. So on the actual COP and the revisions that you've proposed, it sounds like you don't have a firm feeling yet on the timeline for when the Council would finalize the COP. We're going to just move forward presumably with public review today and take input, but regarding this postmortem are you expecting to use information from the postmortem in shaping the COP or is that a completely separate piece of work?

Maggie Sommers: [00:15:40] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. I am envisioning that as completely separate, so the COP would you know again remain.... at this point my vision is that the COP remains applicable to all FMP's, and then what we do with the results of the postmortem and the feedback we get via that route would be specific to groundfish, and so I'm envisioning developing a separate set of groundfish EFH review guidelines and I am, we can see if that term needs to be different in the future but something that would guide our work during the next groundfish EFH review process which may not need to be in a Council operating procedure, it could be perhaps the terms of reference or some kind of document that consolidates what we determined to be the approach we want to take to a groundfish EFH review and use that for our next groundfish EFH review process, so separate than the COP 22 that we're looking at here in both process and timeline.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:17:03] Further questions for the maker of the motion. Aja.

Aja Szumylo: [00:17:09] Thank you Vice Chair Gorelnik. Yeah I'd like to speak in support of Maggie's motion as well. I do think we should use the opportunity to try to, and yeah this is specific to the postmortem, to try to capture some of the, you know the development and process considerations that, that occurred when we were coming up with Amendment 28. I came in late in the process and am certainly only seeing the last bits of it but it would be nice to gather input from people while it's still fresh in people's minds about how to do this in a really good way the next time around which will probably creep up on us faster than we're expecting. There are obviously pretty big workload concerns with coming up with a, with a postmortem and analysis to feed into things, so you know if the Council is supportive of going forward with this I'd like to just make sure that we build it into our larger workload planning for the groundfish FMP overall and make sure to balance it with, with staff time for other, other actions that we're considering. So as long as everyone's amenable to building it into the overall workload structure and planning for it very carefully then I'm supportive of it.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:16] Further questions for the maker of the motion? Well we can open this up to a broader discussion now if necessary. Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:18:27] Yes. Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Thank you Aja. With regard to the first question I had a June deadline. Do you have input, and I guess I should be asking Kerry as well, do you have input on that date? Is there a change to that language that you would prefer?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:47] Aja.

Aja Szumylo: [00:18:49] Just for clarification a change of the language about, or the language in the motion about, or relative to the June deadline overall? Is there language in the motion that's specific to June?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:59] Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:19:00] Thank you. Yes the item two references that the project team should report back to the Council with plans for such a survey in June. Are you are you comfortable with that?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:19:10] Aja

Aja Szumylo: [00:19:11] I am. I would like to reserve time for, for NMFS staff and for Council staff trying to rush through finalizing those documents for actually putting the rulemaking in place for that so June might be aggressive, yeah that's a very good point, thank you for catching that, and I look to the project team to start thinking about....yeah if there's a way to just remove that term right now and then come up with a better date in workload planning that would help, but leading up to June there's a crunch for obviously Council staff and the rest of the project team putting together the submission for the amendment and internally on the NMFS end of things, doing all the portions of the rulemaking that we need to put together so that does make June challenging.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:19:55] Kerry do you have any thoughts on that?

Kerry Griffin: [00:19:58] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I agree with Aja on that. My thinking was that if it stayed June we'd probably get something that is maybe not super detailed. As I'm reading this it sounds like the motion asked for sort of your first shot at like how this might look maybe what some of the questions might be, not sort of a final survey or anything like that, so I guess if it did stay June it's probably safe to say that you know we don't, we have some pretty pressing priorities, we could come up with something but it might not be, you know super robust, so yeah.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:02] Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:00:04] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Following that discussion I would offer an amendment to the motion.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:11] Alright.

Marci Yaremko: [00:00:12] Strike the phrase 'in June' from item two. That completes my amendments.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:31] Right. Is the wording of your extensive amendment correct on the screen?

Marci Yaremko: [00:00:40] Yes it is. Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:42] Alright is there a second? Seconded by Bob Dooley. Do you want to speak to your motion?

Marci Yaremko: [00:00:47] I don't think that's necessary. Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:49] Alright is there any discussion on the motion, on the amendment? I'll call the question all those in favor of the amendment signify by saying 'Aye'.

Council: [00:00:59] Aye.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:59] Opposed no? Abstentions? The amendment passes unanimously. We're now back to the main motion as amended and I'll entertain further discussion? I'm not seeing any further discussion so I'll call the question on the main motion as amended, as amended. All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:01:19] Aye.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:01:22] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion is amended passes unanimously. And Kerry I think that ticks off number four on our list. Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:37] Thank you Sandra could you put the motion back up there real quick and scroll down. I just, I just want....all the way down, so I just wanted to point out the phrase in here in that paragraph that 'based on this review and considering input from advisory bodies the public, the Council may embark on a second phase in which changes to EFH provisions for that FMP' and then, 'as well as commiserate minimum, minimization measures'. I don't think that's a real, real clear what that's referring to, I think it's referring to fishing and non fishing effects and measures to minimize the adverse effects on EFH, but I'm not.....I don't think that's real clear so I, maybe I would just ask that you provide staff the flexibility to clarify that, that phrase or maybe any other thing that needs to be clarified if that's alright with the Council?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:02:39] As long as our parliamentarian doesn't have any objection and as long as the Council is okay with it. So that's further guidance. Okay, so is that acceptable as further guidance to staff and I'm seeing nods around the table. Does that address your concern Chuck?

Chuck Tracy: [00:03:07] Yes thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:08] Okay. So Kerry I think we've ticked off one, two and four on that list is that correct?

Kerry Griffin: [00:03:21] Yes sir that's correct. That would leave number three.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:03:21] Leave number three, and so I see Maggie's got her hand up already. Go ahead Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:03:25] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. Sandra motion number three please. I move to amend a prior motion regarding agenda item F3 from April, 2018. Add a second bullet under subject area one, Alternative 1 A collaborative that reads as follows, with Arago reef expanded slightly from alternative 1 A such that it closes all of the EEZ between the northern, western and southern boundaries as shown in agenda item G.2.a, NMFS Report 1, March, 2019. I have provided the original motion this is proposing to amend for reference on screen and I would look to your discretion Mr. Vice Chair on whether I should read any of that or not.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:24] Well I think what I would do is I would look around the table to see if anyone needs to have it read. I think your language is pretty clear. It refers right back to the NMFS report. I don't see the need to read all that language, so going back to your motion does that read correctly on the screen?

Maggie Sommers: [00:04:46] Would you scroll back up to the top please Sandra? Yes it does.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:50] Alright. Is there a second? Seconded by Michele. Please speak to your motion.

Maggie Sommers: [00:04:59] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. This is the issue that we had raised last Fall, looking at the Arago reef EFH conservation area which is closed to groundfish bottom trawling. This

area, the boundaries of this area were originally defined I think based on some habitat mapping and as it turned out the shoreward boundary of this area was, was aligned for most of its length with the EE...the shoreward boundary of the EEZ but not the entire way, and we had looked into the potential to make a minor adjustment to have the, the whole length of the shoreward boundary of the CFH conservation area follow the EEZ state waters line for simplicity for ease of compliance and enforcement. We had support for that from the collaborative that proposed it and heard no opposition from trawlers who fish in the area and so we are proposing, I'm proposing this amendment to make that change. Thanks.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:15] Thank you for that Maggie. It's been moved and seconded. Are there questions for the Maker? Louis Zimm.

Louis Zimm: [00:06:21] Yeah thank you Vice Chair. Maggie, EEZ I get confused between the Federal EEZ 200 miles and the state waters. Is that the term that you use for your state waters, or is it EEZ?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:37] Maggie?

Maggie Sommers: [00:06:38] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. Thank you Louis. No we call our state waters, state waters or the territorial sea. Here I'm referring to the EEZ as in the meaning the exclusive economic zone beginning at the three mile state waters line and going out to 200. Sorry for the....

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:58] That's the inner boundary of the EEZ.

Maggie Sommers: [00:07:00] That's right.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:07:03] Are there are further questions for Maggie on this motion? Is there any discussion on this motion? Alright I'll call the question. All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:07:18] Aye.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:07:18] Opposed no? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Turn back to Kerry to see how we're doing on this agenda item.

Kerry Griffin: [00:07:36] Yes. Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I believe that completes your business under this agenda item and if you will I'll do a just quick summary of the actions that you took and the expectations. I don't see any other hands raised or anything so maybe I'll just move forward with that at least for now. So in the three motions that were approved the, the direction to the project team and the, which includes National Marine Fisheries Service and Council staff, we will make the changes to the FMP text as described in the motion and in the supplemental reports and get that finalized, and then with regard to the appendices we will finalize those as well. Thank you for your flexibility in allowing the team and the science center to get those finalized and ready for transmittal and secretarial approval. You adopted a, or you approved a revised COP 22. The specificity in the language was very helpful, so that will be considered out for public review and the Council will have to schedule the meeting that you want to have it come back around for final approval. The, the team will develop plans for a survey at a future meeting to be determined and so we'll put that together. I don't know if it'll be June or September or maybe November but sometime before too long we'll come back with some ideas and plans for how a survey might work, and then the fix to the Arago reef issue, to button up the, the small sliver of open area within the EEZ. So those are the actions that are encompassed from the motions that you heard. I think that pretty much captures it although it's a, there's a, there's a

lot of meat, there's a lot of work that has been done and still to be done but I think those are the basic elements. So what we'll do at this point is move towards regulatory deeming by the Executive Director and I'm assuming that the, that the FMP text changes and the appendices would also go through you know a pretty robust review process at the Council and NMFS levels before getting ready to transmit from us to NMFS and then for NMFS to move forward with secretarial approval. Did I miss anything?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:10:27] I'm not sure. I'm going to look around the table and see if anyone has any questions or comments either on Kerry's summary or on anything else having to do with this agenda item. I think he must have done an excellent job summarizing.

Kerry Griffin: [00:10:45] Thank you very much. I was just reminded that, we did mention this before, but we are happy to take informal individual guidance and corrections and on the appendices for the next couple of weeks, I think the 25th was the date that we put out there. Anything I receive I'll share with NMFS and vice versa. So I did miss one thing.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:11:10] But you caught it yourself.

Kerry Griffin: [00:11:12] Well she caught it for me.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:11:14] Alright well thanks very much. That concludes our business on this agenda item and I'm pleased to hand the gavel back to chair Anderson.

3. New Methodology Informing Sigma Values – Final Adoption

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] Takes us to our Council action which is to consider adopting the new sigma values endorsed by the SSC for groundfish and coastal pelagic species. Certainly would entertain any discussion around the points that were brought up either by the public or in our reports. You know there was some reference, maybe I could ask Aja if there are thoughts from National Marine Fisheries Service. I think there's a recognition that in some cases these new sigma values and the corresponding effects on ACL's is going to restrict some of the fishing opportunities. Is there are there any phase-in options available to us? The, the GMT had in their report some, some initial thoughts about how some measures that might help mitigate the effect, so if you have any thoughts in that regard.

Aja Szumylo: [00:01:15] Sure. Thank you Mr. Chairman. So I want to say first the SSC's endorsing these new sigma values and so I think it's our obligation to adopt them. I'm supportive of adopting them at this Council meeting. I see some practical risks to delaying adopting in terms of the assessments that are coming up so you know we're jumping into the assessment cycle for groundfish right now. We've got the sardine assessment coming up before that. John mentioned, you know the possibility of going back and having to rerun things after we adopt them later, so you know I don't, I don't see any practical benefit and I actually see it generating a lot more work for us to, to rerun things later on if we choose to adopt this at a later meeting, and I agree that we have a lot of work to do to understand the implications of the sigma values across all of our, our ABC values, so how, you know how we build that uncertainty between that scientific uncertainty into setting the ABC's. The Council's job isn't to control that SSC determination. It's to use the best scientific information available and then use all the tools that are available to us to mitigate those impacts on the fishing industry, and so I agree very much with the GMT statements about you know trying to focus on mitigation going forward. The, the GMT report and the GAP report both mentioned phase-in approaches, and so it's, I want to clarify it's not a phase in of applying these new sigma values, it's, there's a provision in the National Standard One Guideline revisions that allow the SSC to recommend phased reductions in the ABC over a time period, and so the guidelines have some pretty strict....well the guidelines describe the Council developing a provision to allow the SSC to recommend phase reductions over a period of three years overfishing is prevented to reduce short term negative economic impacts of fishing communities, and so in that case an example is, if a sigma value suggests a 15 percent decrease to a stock's ABC as necessary then the Council could, you know knock the ABC down by, or the SCC could recommend that the Council set ABC's that reduce over that, that full 15 percent range over the course of a three year period instead of, instead of taking that hit all in one year. No other Councils have used that phase-in approach before, it's, it was again a new provision that came up to a National Standard One Guideline revision 2016, and so we'd have to work with headquarters some and work internally to think about how to work that into the system for groundfish specifications and I think there was, you know other things that we'd have to think about for CPS obviously since the specifications for sardines are coming online a lot sooner, but at least for groundfish we have a little bit more time to think about how to build those things into the FMP for the next biennium. Headquarters is working on draft guidelines for those phase-in provisions in particular. They're not out yet and they talk about two different approaches to this. One is to actually build in an FMP provision where the Council dictates how, how the SSC should apply....like the conditions under which the SSC should apply the phase-in provision, so the Council could say, like an example of this is, the Council could say we would only accept phase-in, phase-in ABC reduction recommendations for stocks that are highly attained and have X percent of a, of a reduction over, in the ABC based on this new information, so that's, that's an example of how the Council might structure and a provision in the FMP that we could use for future bienniums, So this question as it come up again. The guidelines also say that the SSC can on a case by, or with proper justification recommend ABC's that

differ from the control rule calculation, so there is, there is, already latitude in the act and doesn't require the Council for, to develop specific guidelines on how to, on what the SSC should do for that recommendation, there is already to provision there that we can use to, or that the SSC can use to make a recommendation that's different than what the strict formula of P-star sigma dictates. In that case I have some examples from New England where the SSC used economic justification for recommending something different than the, than the ABC control rule so I can point to those. But you know I think it may be worth, since we have enough time to think about it, thinking about some rules around the phase-in provisions for the future. On the note of P-star, I wanted to come back to that quickly. P-star is the Council's ABC control rule, the Council's tolerance for risk in setting an ABC and the risk of overfishing. I was around in New England when they developed the ABC control rules, or I think I was working at the Mid-Atlantic Council, Atlantic Council at that point, when they were developing the ABC control rules for their fisheries and it's a, it's a big undertaking it's not nothing, and so I'm a little, and you know while I do take the point that that is an area that P-star does deserve consideration in the long term, I think that, that might be a big lift in the spex cycle, and you know before we get into things for CPS so I have some concerns about P-star and looking there. I do think we should look at it holistically, look at all the sources of uncertainty holistically in the long term but in terms of fixing things for the immediate problem for specifications this time I think that the phase-in approaches may be a little bit better. I also wanted to note the Council has on its Year-At-a-Glance a placeholder for flexibility in ACL management and I think that might be intended to more generally focus on using the National Standard One Guideline provisions that came out 2016, I'm not sure and I wasn't around when you guys added that to the agenda for future year, so if there, you know if there was an intention to focus energy on one or the other National Standard One Guideline provisions, I've heard carryover raised a number of times this might be a better area to focus that effort to focusing on developing these phase-in provisions in time for specifications and in time for sardine spex, so if, again if there was a like a mental staff placeholder or a, you know any other kind of placeholder with that agenda item. I see a huge need here to think about things in this arena, instead I will stop there. I said a lot of things. So take some questions if anyone has them.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:54] Thanks Aja. If we take action on modifying the sigma values consistent with the SSC recommendation there is a separate internal process within National Marine Fisheries Service to determine whether or not it's the best scientific information available, can you give us a sense of how long that process might take and would you be prepared to report back to us when that process is complete and you've made such a determination?

Aja Szumylo: [00:08:25] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I don't know how long that process will take. I'm only familiar with playing through that process in the context of stock assessments and so this, you know this is a different consideration. I'd have to go back and check to see how long that determination takes, but yes absolutely I'll find out that information and get back to you guys. I have to yeah, scurry around and contact some folks at headquarters for that.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:50] And I won't claim that I captured everything that you said about you know some of the additional work that might be done, but to the extent that that, any information that could help to GMT in their deliberations as they have, I think they offered to do in their, at the April meeting and then following that if, if that could be done that would be appreciated.

Aja Szumylo: [00:09:22] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Absolutely. I'm happy to, yeah and again I think it's, a, it's not fun trailblazing on these new National Standard One provisions but, but I think there will be a lot of support because we are trailblazing so.

Phil Anderson: [00:09:36] Thank you. Further discussion? Michele Culver.

Michele Culver: [00:09:43] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have a motion to offer. I move that the Council adopt the new sigma values for groundfish and coastal pelagic species stocks as recommended by the SSC in agenda item G.3.a Supplemental SSC Report 1. This includes the updated baseline sigma values and the recommended increase in sigma due to stock assessment age. Additionally request that the Northwest and Southwest Fisheries Science Centers groundfish stock assessors work with others as appropriate to further explore and develop methods for improved sigma baseline and age increase values that may be stock specific, stock category specific, or related to groups of stocks with similar life history parameters. The intent would be to explore and develop these refined methods for SSC and Council consideration preferably prior to the selection of priority groundfish stocks for the 2023, 2024 assessment cycle.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:58] Thank you Michele and I believe the verbiage on the screen accurately reflects your motion?

Michele Culver: [00:11:06] Yes it does.

Phil Anderson: [00:11:06] Thank you very much. Is there a second? Seconded by Rich Lincoln. Care to speak to your motion?

Michele Culver: [00:11:13] Yes. Thank you. To be clear I am recommending that the Council adopt the new sigma values as presented by the SSC for use with the upcoming assessments. So this would be effective immediately for the new assessments for both groundfish and CPS. As explained in the SSC report, and as we've had presented to us, this and according to the SSC represents the best available science and they're recommending its use for both groundfish and CPS. I believe we had clarification that the first assessment it would be used for would likely be the sardine assessment that is coming up and then the groundfish assessments that the Council would be considering for 2021. In addition to that I'm requesting, and again this is characterized as a request, science center staff workloads notwithstanding, that they do take a look at whether there is a way to improve the sigma baseline and the age increase values further, and through the discussion we had with Dr. Field, I noted that in some cases perhaps they looked across stocks, certainly in general the higher the number of assessments that you're looking at but you're lumping together, the lower the uncertainty you have in the, in the result, but if there is in particular specific stocks or stock categories or stocks that share similar life history characteristics that they are comfortable with perhaps not applying the average to, I certainly would favor looking at that. I thought I also heard that one of the considerations by the SSC was perhaps the complexity involved in having multiple sigma values. I guess the, the Council is pretty comfortable with complexity and it relates to groundfish management, so you know to, to the, as long as the stat team and it knows which sigma values are appropriate that would be applied, and I think the Council could probably work through having multiple sigma values if, if there was good reason to do so.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:07] Thanks Michele. Discussion on the motion? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko: [00:14:13] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Michele for the motion. I'm still kind of unsure what I'm going to do. I think I will reluctantly in some ways support it, not seeing another pathway forward. My concerns are primarily with process. This is an agenda item in groundfish. This action affects CPS assessments. In fact one that is right around the corner in front of us in April. I'm not sure how that happened. I also understand that there are things I don't understand about how that happened so, but it is a little bit of a, I think a difficult thing to just overlook that CPS folks were not involved in this discussion, but again it doesn't really I think matter much. We have advice here that

we basically have to take. I will say that I believe the new values represent better available science. I do believe that the two pieces of sigma that now are being incorporated together, that is an improvement. I want to thank the GMT for coining the term 'staleness penalty', so that's something we can look forward to in the future. I think that is the right way to go about approaching our application of sigma, so I do support the numbers, which is what we are adopting here for that reason. I have significant concerns with the one size fits all. Particularly the fact that it was acknowledged that there are differences that I think the graphical display of how different the sigma's are and that, I think it was useful to learn that they did look at trying to lump species by life history and that lumping didn't work very well, so I do like the part of the motion here that encourages further exploration about what lumpings might be appropriate. I think that's, that's a great idea for future work and hope that can better inform future decisions for us. With regard to CPS though I, I'm really struggling with the fact that the, the authors deliberately did not include CPS in that analysis and here we are going ahead and essentially using it, and I guess I'm, I'm struggling too with, you know, part of the response being well it's okay because it's, essentially CPS will be getting the windfall by applying the average information from the groundfish assessments. I, I agree with Geoff Shester's remarks that this application of sigma to CPS is, you know an average that severely underestimates the uncertainty in CPS, so I, I'm struggling but I'll get there, and I guess that, that's about all I can say. Our delegation had a robust discussion on this. There was concern about just the base increases in sigma to cat one, two and three across the board, that they're, you know, they're noting that these sigmas are, are more, you know apply greater uncertainty buffers and there is a consequence reduction to ABC values. I think the GMT did a very nice job in laying that out in a very practical sense for us to look at for some important stocks for us, so I thank them for spending the time to do that. That's about it. Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:18:38] Thanks Marci. Further discussion? Louise Zimm.

Louis Zimm: [00:18:42] Thank you Mr. Chair and thank you Ms. Culver for your very thoughtful motion and I very much agree with the second paragraph, that is definitely the way to go, however I, I still am not yet quite converted over to the first paragraph and so I need help and I'll tell you why. There's a couple of things, 'staleness penalty' has already been taken into account. You may remember our struggle with scorpion fish where we found that the assessment was seven years old and thus we changed categories on it because of the staleness and that we had to shut down the fishery for four months. I believe it was for two years. I think we just came out of that, so staleness is taken into account and then the other thing that bothers me besides the aforementioned Vermillion situation is, is, is the sardine thing. This cuts both ways. If, because we use the rockfish examples, science figures and we actually do apply it to sardine, what happens if this sardine comes very close to being overfished, but because of this decision we make, is over the 50,000 ton line and we do not declare it overfished. You know this is an important change, so we have to look at it both ways, not just for how it helps us as far as making a more accurate decision but, but also the implications of what this decision will make. So I'm still struggling and searching and I think that the people around the room here can help me with this. Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:20:53] Further discussion on the motion? Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman: [00:20:57] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think from a tribal perspective we certainly have some concerns relative to these changes in sigma values, the methodology that's been used to compute them as well as the scaling penalty that would be applied to a species as these assessments get older. So in order to assess how the new methods that were endorsed by the SSC will affect treaty fisheries. We were very much supportive of what was reflected in the GMT report with respect to delaying adopting these until June. You know I think from our perspective you know the economic impact as those may relate to the treaty fishery seem to be pretty significant, and this moving forward section of

the GMT report that we thought would be an appropriate way to try and deal with this matter, so I think with respect to what's there in the motion, it doesn't appear that that would satisfy or address those concerns that the tribes would have with respect to this, and so I wanted to share that as comment.

Phil Anderson: [00:22:25] Thanks Joe. Brad.

Brad Pettinger: [00:22:27] Please. Thank you Mr. Chair. I think it's a, this is an innovative way I think the SSC has found to raise the trawl quota statement by lowering the quota but not my preferred way to do it. I think that we're kind of stuck here in the sense that I don't think it's an issue as far as overfishing these stocks. It's the rules we got, it's what we have to go by. I'm going to support this motion. I do have some concerns as far as what the vessel caps in the trawl fishery because we have so many stocks that aren't even coming close to the attainment, the vessel caps gonna go down relative to whatever happens here as far as the overall quota. I'm worried about workload as far as the science center because it sounds like they have a whole bunch more work ahead of them in the future. I think we do need to look at the P-star as far as a look at the risk or how this Council wants to look at risk, and so, but I'm, it's gonna be kind of tough going back and talking to folks about why we're doing this, and I think if you look at our record as a Council if you look at the shape of our stocks, you know I think the rockfish stocks average about 60 percent of the virgin spawning biomass, and so it's, it's not like we have a bad track record, we have a great track record but we're in this box. We got to do it. Move forward with this and I hope we navigate as best we can in the future.

Phil Anderson: [00:24:13] Thanks Brad. Other comments? Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley: [00:24:19] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Michele I think it's a very good motion I would support it for sure. I'm a little, I agree with you I think that I would say we're not using best available science by picking a one size fits all approach and taking the, I guess the easy way out. We should be, we should be using all the information we can gain on this. It's going to be a cut. I also noticed lacking in your motion is some type of phased in approach, and I, I appreciate Aja's clarification on how that might be attained and I would, I mean it's going to be, it potentially is a big burden to some fisheries. It's going to affect communities and affect fishermen and I think we need to consider that, so if there's a vehicle to soften the blow over time, a three year approach, I, I definitely would support that as something to add to this but I don't know exactly how to do it. So thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] Thanks Bob. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:00:05] Thanks. So just a couple of thoughts I guess. The intent of a my motion is not to preclude any further consideration of a phase-in approach, and certainly there would also be available to the Council to take into consideration as a matter of policy but the impacts to fisheries, treaty fisheries and non treaty fisheries and the potential impacts to communities as a result. In selection of some of our P-star and in setting our annual catch limit, I do think that, my understanding of the phase-in approach is that, that needs to be explored a little bit further. I'm not sure that it's something that is available to us to implement right now given the way that our FMP is written in the harvest control rule that is there, so it may require an amendment to the FMP that could potentially go along with consideration of the spex, but right now I don't think that, that tool is readily available to us, but certainly my motion wouldn't preclude the future consideration of that, and then I did also want to address a little bit on the staleness factor. I recognize this agenda item is focused on sigma and sigma is one method to account for scientific uncertainty and I'll just say through my work on the Management Strategy Advisory Board for halibut there is a different way of accounting for scientific uncertainty in the halibut stock assessment and I understand there's a different approach that's used in

the whiting stock assessment through the JMC process as well, where sigma is not used to characterize scientific uncertainty. So there are other methods out there other than using sigma. I think given the, the number of stocks that are in our groundfish FMP and the number of assessments that we do and the fairly quick turnaround that we have for runs, model runs to look at model sensitivities during a star panel meeting. The, certainly the methodologies used for the halibut and the whiting stock assessments would not facilitate that, that quick turnaround in rerunning the model and producing results the next day for consideration by the star panel, so I think there are other methods that are out there that are certainly worth exploring and considering. I think our Science Centers staff are well aware of those other methods and certainly my, the intent of my motion is not to preclude their further exploration and consideration of those as well.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:26] Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:03:27] Thanks Mr. Chair. Michele thank you for the motion I do support it. Just wanted to offer a couple additional thoughts. You know with the SSC's endorsement of this, I, you know I think we are in a position to adopt the new sigma values right now. I agree with the interest in exploring a phase-in but it was my understanding based on Aja's input earlier that it's not phasing in application of the new sigma values, it would be phasing in a resultant reduction in the ABC and we can potentially explore that more as we get into our spex discussions for the next cycle, but I certainly recognize the impacts that this will have on some of our fisheries based on the information presented by the GMT. Want to really thank the GMT and NMFS for the willingness they have expressed in exploring some of the factors related to this phase-in consideration of P-star values and other items that the GMT referred to in their report, and just say I'm looking forward to that. Finally I also really appreciate your second part here Michele. I guess I want to differ from the way that Bob Dooley characterized it a little bit ago. I think that the new sigmas are the best currently available information but maybe not the best potential science and so exploring some that can be tailored more specifically to individual stocks or groupings of stocks that better reflect the uncertainty associated with the, the OFL's for those stocks is something that I also would like to see worked on. I guess and I do have one final, final comment which is also I share the, the concerns that Marci raised about the fact that this will apply to coastal pelagic species stocks and yet it is only being discussed here as a groundfish item and just hope that if we come back to a situation like this again we can maybe address it in more of a joint matter, manner so that they're aware of it as well. Thanks.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:58] Thanks Maggie. Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:06:00] Thank you. To your last point, so this just arrived on the March agenda during the course of the November, the week of November, it was in the SSC statement. In their statement they did make reference to their workshop reviewing this. That the CPS subcommittee would, would attend, and so we should have picked up on that but we didn't. If we had I, I'm not sure what we, I think, I mean I'm not sure how we would have done things differently, maybe have included this on, on the, in a webinar prior to this meeting, giving them an opportunity to write a statement, I don't know if that would have sufficed, but the other alternative I suppose would have been having it in April, but that is something we should have noted and we will not let that happen again.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:03] I just have just a couple of remarks. I appreciate the motion. I thought it was well, well-constructed and hits the important points. I really feel like this has been rushed. It just, I mean it was mentioned in an SSC report in November and here we are in March in a place where we've been given no choice but to adopt it essentially, and that doesn't feel very good to me but it is what it is. I am, setting aside the issue of coastal plastics which Marci spoke to and I agree with her

remarks, this one size fits all in the groundfish world doesn't make me feel very good either. If our current sigma values that were adopted a number of years ago were so bad why do we, why did we go from nine overfished species to two? So I, I don't, I don't see any evidence frankly that our current sigma values to, to quantify scientific uncertainty is being reflected in the relative health of our groundfish stocks, so I'm, I very much appreciate the second paragraph in the motion which, and I understand it's a lot of work but the impacts of doing this one size fits all across all species within the groundfish world is significant and it as, as Maggie said this is our current best scientific information available but it doesn't mean we can't further refine it and make it better which is I, which is what I hope we do. Any other discussion on the motion? Herb Pollard.

Herb Pollard: [00:09:17] Thank you Chair Anderson. I also am uncomfortable with the speed with which this is moving for the same reasons you are. The application to CPS, the, the history as you say, in the past ten years we have seen increases in groundfish populations. The staleness penalty appears to me to assume decreases in stocks and there's, you know and I see that it was built on pre-2009 population trends in some cases, and even in this motion I see a paragraph one that says adopt a new sigma values and paragraph two that suggests maybe we can find something better, but I also respect the SSC's expertise here and their recommendations and, but I fear unexpected unforeseen consequences in the future with this approach but I don't have a better idea right now.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:49] Thanks Herb. Any other comments? Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman: [00:10:56] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Again you know for the concerns that the tribe has with moving forward as what's reflected on the, on the motion and not certain as to how might try and deal with this matter that the tribes have, but one of the considerations that I'd like to put on the table if we may is whether we could include some language in the motion, even in paragraph two that says something along the lines that, that we would revisit P-star based on, based on an economic analysis of impacts to treaty fisheries. I'm not too sure if that kind of fit within one of the responses that you had Michele but wanted to see if that is something that could be done.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:05] If I could, my, my suggestion Joe that I'd ask you to consider is the GMT's report, in their last paragraph in the GMT's report they identified a number of, well I think three, I think three different next steps and looking at P-star values was one of those, and so we could follow potentially, we could follow this motion with a motion that, that was endorsing the recommendations of the Groundfish Management Team as a way to get at your particular issue and it would be broader than just, it would include the treaty fisheries of course but it would be a broader application of looking at that question. That would.....okay, further discussion on this motion? Seeing none we'll call for the question all those in favor signify by saying 'Aye'.

Council: [00:13:11] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:11] Opposed no?

Louis Zimm: [00:13:13] No.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:14] Abstentions? Motion carries. Okay we, we did, as we all are aware of, we had some, several recommendations in terms of next steps that both were and I think in part included in the motion that we just passed, but there may be several others associated with the flexibility of, of implementing the reductions over some period of time as well as the recommendation I believe, I have to pull it up here quickly, that was in the Groundfish Management Team report that was on the last page of their report under 'Moving Forward' and giving the nod I guess from the Council that we

would like them to move forward with those, exploration of those items. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:14:19] Thank you. I, I, I don't disagree with anything that is in the GMT report and their recommendations to further explore as we go through the 20, 21, 22 spex cycle. I'm having a hard time with these years, it just seemed so far off and yet they're not. But I did consider addressing those in my motion. I guess I had a question of whether or not P-stars and those types of things were available to us in, under this agenda item and how it was noticed, which was focused on the sigma values but didn't speak to anything about P-stars or how it may affect stocks or the application of sigma to stocks and so I'll just say that, that was the question that I had?

Phil Anderson: [00:15:25] I think you're right it was not, and I think what the GMT was asking for is the flexibility and the direction to work on those types of matters between when they get to their April meeting and potentially come back to us maybe even in June, I think I read in there, with, with any recommendations that they may have, so it isn't, I'm not suggesting that we do something relative P-star at this meeting, but would encourage the GMT to move forward in exploring those areas of mitigative alternatives that they mentioned in their report which would I think also include the issue that Joe brought to the table. Alright let me turn back to John and ask him if we have any additional action under this agenda item needed.

John DeVore: [00:16:23] Thank you Mr. Chair. Council members you did adopt the sigma values that were recommended by the SSC which was the primary action here. Further you did provide guidance for the science centers to consider more refined sigma methodologies that pay attention to life history groupings and other types of stock groupings. I did have a very quick consult with Dr. Hamel regarding that and given the advance notice here he was confident that they'd, in the time, in the three year timeframe that was part of that motion, that you know they could they could look at that so I don't see any problems with that, so, and you also had a very good discussion about the mitigating this and different ways we can advance our thinking in our P-star sigma framework, so I think with that we are prepared to you know at least advance our CPS and groundfish specifications using these new sigmas and then further we have some direction on things to think about to refine that, that framework, so with that I'd say you have completed the action here.

Phil Anderson: [00:17:50] Thank you John. We have one more item to deal with today which is our, we're going to hear back from the Salmon Technical Team on their work and potential changes to the alternatives that we identified yesterday. We've got a considerable number of people that need to switch seats and get in the room. It's 4:15, so we're gonna, but before I do this before we, we're gonna take a 15 minute break here and allow time for that to occur.

4. Omnibus Workload Planning Process Review and Project Prioritization

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:01] That concludes our public comment and that takes us to Council action. We have two items on that list and is there a preference around the table on what order we take them otherwise I'm going to start with number two. So let's, let's talk about prioritizing these new management measures that are listed in the team's report. The team has provided some, listed some items as priority although it's not likely they can handle all of them at the same time, the GAP has narrowed that list somewhat and we received considerable public comment on a limited number of items on that list, so I'll start with Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:00:56] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I was actually raising my hand to answer your....

Marc Gorelnik: [00:01:00] You were?

Michele Culver: [00:01:00] I was raising my hand to answer your question?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:01:03] Okay. Oh go ahead.

Michele Culver: [00:01:05]and I was actually going to suggest that we start with the process.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:01:10] Okay if that's your preference that's what we'll do. So we'll start then with number one revisions to COP 9 and would you like to address that?

Michele Culver: [00:01:24] Yes thank you. I'll start the discussion and maybe get a sense of what other Council members are thinking. So I will say that I had similar reactions I think to the proposal for the new process that perhaps the GMT and GAP members had as well based on, on our discussions and, and that is struggling to find a way to add another agenda item to every Council meeting and at the same time I guess also understanding that items do come up at every Council meeting regardless of whether there's a dedicated agenda item and in some cases those are presented during open public comment or they find an agenda item that it could potentially fit under, and I'll say for the most part those seem to be emerging, maybe urgent issues and at least in our delegation meeting this morning we had a discussion about how there may be some who, who have issues or ideas that they would like the Council to consider but they're not necessarily urgent and so they don't really bring them up under open public comment and they're not something that needs to be put in place right now so they don't bring them up under inseason and there didn't seem to be a place for them to, to bring that up other than perhaps through the spex process, which is what we have now which is part of, I, my understanding of the GMT's problem statement of then if they don't get into the spex because they need more focused analysis then they go on this list, you know at least for the next 18 months to two years until we take a look at it. So I have heard from at least a couple of folks and it seemed like the GMT and GAP were in agreement to perhaps give this a try and see how it goes and see if we, you know actually if it becomes unwieldy that we get too many proposals and it takes more Council floor time, then that is something that we could potentially address under the future workload agenda item as to whether or not we want to schedule that for the next Council meeting or if it would be better to maybe skip a meeting and put it off, so I'm certainly willing to, to give it a shot.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:46] Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:04:47] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair and thanks Michele. I had very similar thinking and heard very similar things from folks in our Oregon delegation meeting this morning that

it would be a much more transparent process and for them to understand when to bring forward new items and would give us an opportunity to consider them holistically and in the bigger picture and make some decisions about when and how to address those, so I would support the approach you just described of giving it a try and then if it turns into really more than we expected and more than we find manageable we can revisit that, that approach.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:37] Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:05:39] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I am not against the idea of trying something. I'm willing to do that. I guess I have a few thoughts about it though just generally speaking. I feel like we do an awful lot of planning and particularly in groundfish and I realize why, I mean we have a lot of needs, a lot of priorities and a lot of interest, but I'd rather us spend more time doing and less time planning overall. I feel like we have an agenda planning process in place. I understand that the GMT has some concerns with how effective that process is for them and I, I understand that, you know there are some concerns that by the very end of the meeting Council members, you know they're tapped out and it's very difficult to put a lot of energy into thinking about how best to prioritize everything that we've heard all week long across all of our FMP's and all of our discussions and that consequently you know the groundfish, you know workload list and their list of expected statements and those items, sometimes we, we don't spend a lot of time on that though I think we appreciate getting it and knowing where their efforts are expected to be looking toward the next meeting, so I feel like our current process and how we deal with these issues and agenda-izing and making decisions across FMP's, right now it's fair across FMP's and that we all use the same vehicle and workload planning to, to set our agenda for the next meeting and future meetings, so I guess those are my overarching kind of concerns with the idea of having yet another standing agenda item on just groundfish planning following the NMFS report for every meeting and taking approximately an hour out of our very busy packed agenda already each meeting, but I, I am not, you know, I mean maybe this will, this experiment will prove successful and that maybe this is a better pathway forward. So I'm not, you know I'm okay with trying it but I guess I, I am, I'm not I guess all that optimistic, but anyway thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:08:26] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:28] Yeah thanks Mr. Vice Chair. I, I'd be way out of character if I was arguing for more planning but I think spending our time when we do our addressing planning and doing it in the most effective way is of interest. I will say I struggle with our workload planning process as it's currently set up where we try to do all of it at once on the last day and some of the folks around the table who have staff that are particularly interested in one or more of the FMP's, are texting you or emailing you as we're having the discussion, I find that difficult. So to break out the, maybe, maybe or at least one of the two more of the more complex agenda or planning, workload planning FMP's that we have and address it separately when groundfish is on our agenda and when we have the requisite staff that are key to our success in groundfish here to me makes a lot of sense and while I understand that it would, will add some amount of time to that agenda item that we have, I think it will also remove some time that we spend on the last day in terms of workload planning, so I'm not saying it's a, we're gonna add 10 here and lose 10 here, it may not be a direct tradeoff but I think there will be some efficiencies in our workload planning agenda item at the end of the meeting that we do, so I am in favor of giving this a try and making sure that we have a review in a year to assess how it's working before we make it maybe more permanent but I think it's worth giving it a try.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:11:00] Aja.

Aja Szumylo: [00:11:02] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I'd like to thank the GMT for its efforts on preparing a workload plan. I'm actually very in favor of it. I don't think we have anything to lose by trying to create some order in this process, so I think we should give it a try and I think we should give it a try for more than just one year. I think it's going to take, you know running this past the next specification cycle for us to see whether it works and so yeah I'm definitely in favor of checking in and assessing whether or not we need to setup that item at each upcoming meeting and trying to be flexible around this new process we create, but I do think we need to try it and stick with it for, for a little bit to see how it goes. I really like the table that the GMT put together to kind of couch the expected workload concerns for each item. I hope that as people bring forward items that we continue to update that table and keep that list going that way. I think that's a really good display of that information for the public. I also really, I like giving the public a clear spot for them, for them to bring forward items for us to make the process user friendly. I think you know, I think it gives, the GMT mentioned in their report you know a chance for equity in the process and allowing different constituents to come forward and know when to come forward and how to come forward, so I really am in favor of that, and the GAP report described it well, you know concerns are raised, scattered across a number of agenda items, Michele you've referred to this too, I think you know channeling it is helpful and avoiding that scattering seems really worthwhile and it like it might save floor time in the long term. And then I also finally like the idea of coming back in March and giving you know a gut check to what's coming for the next year. So overall I'm in support of it. I don't see why we shouldn't try. We should absolutely try something for a little while and give it a go.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:13:01] Thanks Aja. Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:13:03] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Well I don't know if anybody struggles more with workload planning than, for the Council than I do, but, but I certainly do and you know I recognize in particular how difficult groundfish workload planning is and has been and the, you know the lack of success I guess with keeping the groundfish workload planning document updated and garnering interest and discussion on day last with that document to the point where the last two or three where I don't know how many few Council meetings that we haven't even bothered to distribute it on day last, and you know I, I must admit when I first you know heard that GMT's idea was kind of going oh my goodness you know, this can't possibly work, but, but as I've looked at what they've developed and thought about it more I too have sort of come around to thinking that we, you know this could be a, could be a beneficial attempt or process. I do like what they've done with, with the sorting through all the proposals and categorizing them and providing something for us to look at. I do still have some concerns about the nuts and bolts of you know doing this every meeting and when we do it during the, during the course of the week and how this fits in with the spex, both the spex timing and the workload associated with that, so I'll just maybe express a couple of thoughts I've had about that, that, so I guess, I guess one is the every, every meeting aspect of this, I wonder if there's, in particular for the March and April time frame are very close together, so I'm not, I'm not sure how much more... for example if we go through the process here today how likely it is that there is gonna be a lot of benefit to going through this exercise with the briefing book deadline later this week for April, so I'm wondering about maybe just doing this once in either March or April. I guess I will point out that in the old days March used to be a groundfish free meeting. I know that that's not in favor now but, but I think that might be something to consider maybe just doing this in April or I guess also because workload planning tends to be, we try and just focus on the April meeting during the March workload planning agenda item just so we can get that turned around quickly and again will be filing the FR notice you know, like I don't know, sometimes it's the day after the March meeting. So I guess I'd like to put that out there as something for the Council to consider. Also the spex, you know as the workload increases during the course of the, you know especially the latter portion of the spex process, that also concerns me that you know I'm not sure how much, well I just wonder if there's not

some workload relief that we might achieve by considering not doing this every meeting during the, during the spex year, I mean that was the whole point of the original, you know the previous process which was basically an every other year sort of process and while I do believe that you know as often as things come up that it's, that there's potential value in doing something on a more frequent basis or not delaying this or not making this a every other year process. I'm not sure that again that every meeting during that time frame is going to be that, I'm not sure how much effort or you know sort of quality discussion time may be available for us during that process so, but again I think it's worth, I think it's worth giving a try and I agree with Miss Szumylo that you know a one year trial probably isn't, isn't adequate, so I'm willing to obviously do what the Council wishes but I think it's, I think it's worth taking a look at and I don't know if, I don't have any problem with revising the COP 9 to, to memorialize that. We can always change later if we decide we don't like it, so I'm okay with that too.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:37] Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley: [00:18:38] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I agree with Chuck's notes. I had the same thoughts about the flexibility in scheduling this every meeting. I think that actually taking this is as a separate part particularly focused on groundfish, that could help the end of the planning at the end of the, at the end of the meeting and it could help it a lot because groundfish items taken without overall prioritization tend to land there and we're prioritizing and competing with other, other..... well I think it just, I think it might help us to focus on it to understand what, what should go forward and what needs to kind of be a little slower track. So I don't necessarily agree totally with Marci although I appreciate her comments on that. I would, I would hope we build flexibility into saying something like three out of five meetings a year, something we'd deal with this so that there's, it isn't prescriptive that we have to do it every meeting, some, can give us a way out of it the first year to deal with the April, March and you know different meetings it might conflict, it doesn't preclude us from doing it every time but at least give us some flexibility to back off a bit, so that's, but I'm very supportive of it. I think it's a good idea.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:20:08] Thanks Bob. Further discussion on the first Council action? Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:20:16] Thanks Vice Chair Gorelnik. Maybe just offer something along the nuts and bolts category, but as we were talking about this I was thinking how much I have appreciated the NMFS spreadsheet of ongoing projects and the expected timeline of them and that, that might be good in the context of evaluating a list of priorities we haven't yet tackled and prioritized. So I guess I would just encourage at this point Council staff and the GMT to consider whether something like that would be doable and a valuable part of this process as we develop it. Sorry if that wasn't specific enough I meant particularly to illustrate the projects that the GMT is currently working on analyzing. Thanks.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:21:17] Further discussion on our first Council action? We have some recommendations in the GMT Report 3 and it seems like around the table there's a general agreement although perhaps not at every meeting. I don't know if we need a motion here but we certainly need to decide whether the sense of the Council is in every meeting as in the GMT report or not every meeting as in the GMT report. I've heard a suggestion from Bob that perhaps it be three of five. Chuck mentioned may not need to do it in both March and April, have to choose one of them, so in order to complete this item I think we need a little more guidance to staff. Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:22:11] Well I would agree with what Chuck and we pry we don't need to do it in both March and April. I do, I would at least to get started here, I would advocate that we do it at the rest of the meetings. We can I guess pick between March and April for next year but I would, my

thinking would be that we do it in four out of the five meetings that we have each year skipping either March or April.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:22:46] Okay. Dr. Seger help me. Are we done?

Jim Seger: [00:22:57] Yes I think you have, It sounds like a guidance here to go ahead with the GMT report recommendations which are also in the GAP. Come back with a COP 9 revision which will be revisable in the future if need be, and within that COP 9 there'll be some mention of flexibility that it might not happen at every meeting which is something I imagine you can also address at the end of every meeting when you're doing your workload planning, make revisions there as needed as well.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:23:32] Terrific thanks very much. Is there any further discussion on our first Council action under this agenda item? Not seeing any I'll now turn to the second Council action that is to prioritize the management measures listed by the team, and as I mentioned before we've got, we've had considerable public comment to help us prioritize those items. We've, we've also had recommendations from the GAP on how to prioritize those items. So let me look around the table and see who wants to kick off our discussion. Aja.

Aja Szumylo: [00:24:20] So unfortunately I have to sort this out as the wet blanket on things, and I definitely like to thank everyone who came forward with public testimony today, but I do need to make it how clear, very clear how stacked with work we are for the upcoming year. I said it earlier in the meeting, we are, in our post shutdown world, we're trying to work through actions again first that keep people fishing, second that meet our statutory and litigation obligations and then on the backlog of actions that the Council has already taken final action on in the past. That workload alone is consuming all of my staff time right now and to try to make that point clear again I'll go through what we're, what we're trying to accomplish by the end of 2019. So we have three amendments, the follow on actions, Amendment 28 and blackgill that we're working on internally. Three regulatory amendments with VMM, the seabird action and the salmon action, and then that doesn't even include the inseason actions that we end up doing at every Council meeting, and so I'm bringing all that up not to be dramatic about what we're doing but I need to drive home the point that we have a lot to get through and there are a lot of very important concerns raised today, but until we get through some of what we have going on we can't pick up new things. It's not just my staff that is drawn into the workload considerations that I just talked through, general counsel is drawn in, permit staff, internally our OLE staff that tries to help us develop this, it's, it's challenging to simultaneously do that work and shepherd new actions through the Council process, so we try to balance those things and when we don't get the chance to focus on actions while the Council is developing them they fall behind in the future and that's why we have the backlog that we have today. So once we get through some of the backlog it will be easier to pick up new things and you know all of that staff time that I have devoted to the past actions will be freed up for all these future things, but I do need a little breathing room to get through some of those things. The Council also has some pretty significant things planned for 2020 and so we spent a lot of time yesterday talking about sigma, how, how significant that's going to be for considering specifications for the next biennium. It's going to take a lot of GMT time and effort to really think about how to reduce the impacts of the actual specifications numbers on industry, and so we will have a lot of effort from our, our collective group driven into that process this year. That all plays out through the catch limits, how the catch limits come about all play out through the management measures and then that doesn't even include all the, the new measures that we might think about cramming into the specifications process, so again consider that specifications alone is going to be big this year. It's not, it's not a nothing lift. It's lift for everybody. Beyond that in the Year-At-a Glance we've already added SaMTAAC and the Cal Cod action and the GMT said in their statement the SaMTAAC action is pretty big. It is consuming, it's already consuming a lot of GMT

time and effort, it's consuming Council member time and effort, NMFS staff time and effort, and then we also have the Cal Cod action on the agenda as well, and the Council needs to plan staff time for that, NMFS also needs to plan staff time for that, so in my view between specifications, SAMTAAC and Cal Cod we've already picked our set of items that we're going to start working through for the next year. That might not be the Council's desire. We do have to do specifications. The other items are choices that the Council has to make for prioritizing things, so what I'm saying is that if, if the list of things that's already there is what the Council desires and it's great, but if we want to pick up something else something has to fall off that list for now. As we get through this year we can, from the NMFS perspective, pick up new actions but we're very full up right now, and so I just want to make sure that people weigh those concerns when thinking about that future workload.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:00] Thank you Aja. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:00:04] I just had a question. Given those comments as well, maybe for Mr. Tracy as to when omnibus is scheduled on our Year-At-a Glance or the next time we would be talking about if we identify priorities here which, which priorities move forward prior to others.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:32] Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:00:33] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair, Miss Culver. Well we are embarking on a new omnibus process and schedule here so I'm not, I'm not quite sure how to answer that. I guess and that kind of maybe, maybe I will answer your question with a question of my own and you know and so we, we've got a list of topics here and they're divided into some categories like, you know should be considered for the spex, or prioritize once new, new research is here, so, and so you know I guess my question is you know what, what exactly are we adopting here? Is it just a list of things and what category they go into or are we trying to actually schedule, potentially schedule something under this agenda item, or is this just, you know is this just the list of things we need to consider and then we tackle this under workload planning or do we actually decide to move ahead with projects under, under this, under this process? So I'll pause there and maybe go back to your original question, when's it scheduled? You know under the old process we were supposed to take it up in June of last year, so you know under the old process it wouldn't be, you know well we've kind of pushed it off, and so I suppose you know at anytime the Council wants to make a dedicated effort to scheduling this it would, you know appear on a future agenda as the Council wishes.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:02:35] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:35] I guess my, my thoughts would, would be that, I find my, again I appreciate the great work the GMT and the GAP did in bringing this list forward. I find myself in agreement with what they are proposing. I think the, the items under the, I think Marci counted them, there were six for inclusion in the 21-22 management measure cycle. I would want the GMT to do some further thinking about that in terms of what the workload ramifications are with those six and come back at the appropriate time, if that's in June or whenever that is, with, with, with some information that would help us decide which ones of those we thought were appropriate and or doable. In talking with Jesse off line it sounded like from her perspective some of those were largely housekeeping types of things that could be done with relatively little additional work but there are others that probably don't fall in that category. I think the ones, and then there are ones that were prioritized once additional actions were completed, new research or SaMTAAC reports or whatever those, those other types of things and so I think we can, you know set those aside for the moment while that additional work is done and then that to me leaves the ones that are prioritized, and I think having a, certainly and taking into consideration their remarks that we got from Aja, prioritize, well

exactly what does that mean and, and having an understanding of the workload associated with those that have that label, then would enable us to make some, at least some preliminary decisions in terms of what order we would take, we would attempt to take those on in the timeline in which we might begin that work in consideration of the full plate that the, that we have placed on Council staff in National Marine Fisheries staff, so that's just a bit of a brain dump on how I was thinking about what we would do if the Council thought that this list that the GMT and the GAP brought to us was properly sequential and put together.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:32] Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:05:34] Thank you Mr. Vice Chairman. I have a motion to offer on the priority items. I move that the Council adopt the recommendations in G.4.a Supplemental GAP Report 1 with the clarification that the scope of the mothership utilization issue would include the third item that had been stricken in the supplemental public comment report and include flexibility to consider other alternatives that could also address these issues. I would also include the additional items identified in G.4.a Supplemental GMT Report 4 and Supplemental EC Report 1 on the omnibus list but not as priorities at this time.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:30] Does the motion read as you wish on the screen?

Michele Culver: [00:06:33] Yes.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:34] Is there a second? Seconded by Maggie. Please speak to your motion.

Michele Culver: [00:06:39] Yes thank you. I appreciate all of the discussion that has occurred and the multiple reports and the, the work that went into producing those on the part of the GMT and the GAP and there seemed to be a good agreement between the GMT and the GAP reports relative to the priorities. I did also see in the GAP report however that they had a couple of additional priorities that I think warrant further exploration and consideration by the Council. Those include the examination of the, well they certainly, they agreed on the non trawl RCA modifications in both the GMT and the GAP. I think the GAP then also added the trawl and non trawl amendment 21 allocations, looking at Lingcod south of forty ten as, as an example and a place to start but perhaps through the Council's discussion we may identify other items, so I'll just say in general it is difficult to look at one species in isolation when we talk about allocation because depending on the outcome of those discussions there's typically other stocks that are going to be caught in in conjunction with that one. The, the GAP I thought also had added the Platt/Emley EFP moving forward which was not on the GMT's list. This is something that the Council has had before us a few times now and I do think it's, it's worth moving that one forward, and then the GAP also had some additional items that they commented on and so I didn't want to lose sight of consideration of those items as well, which also included the new item from the GMT that the item 17. Specific to the mothership utilization issue, I do appreciate the, the discussions that have happened and the difficulty it is to reach unanimous consent, I guess on the part of, of all of the participants in the, in the mothership sector. I do think that there could also be some ideas and alternatives to address these issues that may be even some minor modifications of the three that are presented to us. As we heard during public testimony and Council member questions, we did have quite a few questions about exactly what the requirements would be and not all of that is necessarily spelled out in the public comment. So I do think having some flexibility to consider some other alternatives, other ideas, to address these same issues is worthy of more discussion. I will also say that Chairman Anderson spoke to under the EC report a little bit more background on that item. I'm not including it as a priority at this time but I do think that the issue has been raised here. There was also some question about whether or not there had been exploration of other ways to potentially

address this issue that may not require a change to the Federal regulations, I would certainly be interested in doing that further exploration, so I am recommending that we place it on the omnibus list so we don't lose track of it and then perhaps do a little bit more exploration in the meantime.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:11:07] Thank you Michele. Are there questions for the maker of the motion? Aja.

Aja Szumylo: [00:11:15] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Michele I, so I'm not totally clear on what this motion does. So the beginning portion of the motion moves that the Council adopt the recommendations in the Supplemental GAP Report and expands the scope of the mothership item, but does that mean your intent is that we start to place these items on the agenda or just are you setting up a prioritization structure where at the first available opportunity we'll pick one of those items up off of the list?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:11:45] Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:11:47] Yes thank you it's the latter, which I thought is what was described as the Council action under number two, so when we move forward and, and how quickly, I guess to add to that, I would also appreciate a better understanding of the Council's budget situation. We did not have a Budget Committee meeting here in March but we will have one in April, and I think as part of deciding which one of these items we may move forward with and what the timing of that may be, it would also be helpful to know what our resources are that are available to help us with that.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:12:34] Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:12:34] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Thank you Michele for your answer to the last question, which prompts I guess a question in my mind. I just want to make sure I'm understanding the plans forward. I think the GAP statement under its, first under its header about prioritization is that they recommend that the omnibus items move forward for prioritization through the most expedient vehicle available, so as I read that recommendation it wouldn't necessarily preclude moving forward as a stand a....on a stand alone items or through specifications process or through another vehicle that might be appropriate, so I took your motion to, because you're endorsing the GAP's recommendations here, I presume that your motion included that kind of flexibility with regard to agendas.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:13:41] Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:13:41] Yes thank you and, and I guess again assuming that those discussions will also come forward as part of the Council's discussions on groundfish specifications in which items may fit there, may not fit there, but then for those items that may take a little bit more time to flesh out and maybe stand alone items, again I would like to have a better understanding of what the Council's resources are. I understand, we had a report from Mr. Tracy that there could be some funds that may be available. I did note that we also used a portion of those funds to set up another workgroup I think yesterday, so getting a good understanding and status of what funding's available would certainly be helpful to me.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:14:43] Further questions of Michele on her motion? Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley: [00:14:49] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I, the question I have is this would not preclude the future of the SaMTAAC once it's decided what if it's a, you know if we decide to prioritize

SAMTAAC can it, this doesn't preclude it from doing that. Is that my understanding this?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:15:06] Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:15:08] Thanks. I guess my understanding of the, the reports that we received from the GMT and the GAP was that they weren't entirely sure how to treat the SaMTAAC because it is already on the Council's Year-At-a Glance, but what there seemed to be some general agreement on was that the Council has yet to receive a, a detailed report on the status of the SaMTAAC discussion, so there was I think a one page report that was presented in November. We have a meeting that's tentatively scheduled with the intent of bringing forward a more comprehensive report in June. Sounded like there was general agreement to get that report first before deciding what the next steps are for SAMTAAC, which I would certainly support us then considering how that fits in with these other items.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:16:10] Does that answer your question Bob?

Bob Dooley: [00:16:12] It does thank you very much.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:16:14] Any further questions for Michele discussion on the motion? Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:16:21] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I'd like to offer an amendment.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:16:25] All right.

Marci Yaremko: [00:16:29] Thank you. Strike the, in the last sentence, strike the phrase 'and Supplemental EC Report 1'. That concludes my amendment.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:16:58] That concludes your amendment? Does that language read correctly?

Marci Yaremko: [00:17:04] Yes. Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:17:04] Is there a second?

Bob Dooley: [00:17:05] I'll second it.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:17:05] Bob Dooley seconds. Please speak your amendment.

Marci Yaremko: [00:17:11] Yeah thank you. So in the interchange that we had with the EC on this topic I mean I appreciate that this is a new need that has been identified and that folks are going to plan to further explore this issue. I can appreciate that looking at regulations is part of that exploration, however I feel like this is a late breaking addition that came to us here in the course of this meeting. I don't think it even received any review from advisory bodies, so procedurally I have some concerns with just deciding to add it here and now without having it go through the rigor I guess of the other identified items. I think more importantly I feel like this request just isn't ripe. I feel like a little more homework could and should have been done before bringing it to the Council for a possible solution. The reason I say that is we've dealt with similar issues in California for many, many years and hearing a description of what the circumstances are in this case, I would wonder if one appropriate possible path forward would be for the municipal agency, whether its harbor district or city, to contract with the renderer or the company that is doing the reduction of, of the fish product contract with that company for their service, to render the fish product and turn it into fertilizer that

would then be used by the municipality for public use either as you know fertilizer for landscaping for public areas or what have you. I know in California we've, we've run into these situations frequently where there is the potential for the sale of sport caught fish. It's, it's come up particularly in operations where there are business interests that are looking to perform services such as vacuum sealing and canning of sport caught fish and the way those arrangements are made is that there is a payment that takes place between the person with the fish and the, the business for the service that the business is providing, so whether it be freezing, canning, rendering what have you, it's, it allows via contract or through some other means the ability to avoid the sale of sport caught fish or any product thereof. So I would just encourage I think that we spend a little more time investigating this issue before quickly, hastily adding that item to our omnibus list here and now. Thanks.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:20:42] Are there questions for Marci on the amendment? Discussion on the amendment? Herb.

Herb Pollard: [00:20:52] Thank you Vice Chair and thank you Marci and I really agree with what, you know it was a surprise, I don't think any anyone had had a chance to see or discuss this and certainly we're, we're all aware of, as you say you pay for processing. If for example you catch a fish and take it to a restaurant and have them cook it for you, you pay them for the processing, somebody is making some money on that sport caught fish, but it's paying for the processing and if somebody is collecting awful, that's been thrown away and then processing it and recovering their costs or processing through sale of that product, I don't see that as selling sport caught fish, and the reason for the law is to keep somebody from hook and line fishing and making profit and the person who has caught that fish hook and line is not making a profit, they're throwing something away that then becomes a public nuisance if it isn't taken and processed and if the people that are taking and processing that recover their costs, so I think there's, there's room for more thought and that might be out, you know it's an interpretation rather than a violation of my view, so thank you.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:22:19] Further discussion on the motion? Louis Zimm.

Louis Zimm: [00:22:23] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair and I want to thank you very much Marci for your cogent synopsis of the situation and informative as to California. I think that the best thing to do in my opinion is, is to, to wait for more examination in this. At this time I cannot see any route that the Council could take to ameliorate this situation so I will be supporting the amendment as it stands.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:22:55] Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:22:57] Thank you. Just for clarification I did want to add that this, this is an item that was discussed and, and brought to the attention and received a quite a bit of discussion in some cases. I would also say I guess that I, I agree with Mr. Pollard relative to what should constitute sale of recreationally caught fish, however the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement does not agree and I appreciate Miss Yaremko's suggestion of the contracting, but again our understanding from NOAA OLE is that that would be a violation of Federal regulations.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:23:55] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:23:56] I appreciate the discussion. I don't agree with removing this. It's not a priority as under this motion gives this. It is an issue, it's a real issue. I agree with Mr. Pollard in terms of what the intent of the law is, however as Michele said NOAA Office of Law Enforcement and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife police believe that this would be a violation of the law and we're simply trying to figure out a way to address a very serious issue with a change, a potential

change in the Federal regulations and then corresponding change in state regulations, so I'll be voting against the amendment.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:24:49] Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:24:49] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. I have similar thoughts. I will also vote against the amendment. I appreciate the concerns he raised and, and I agree with many of them. I also agree with what Phil just said but in my mind the key factor is that the omnibus list is the place for us to keep track of items that we're considering, I'm not opposed to that. I would not prioritize it at this time and while it is on the list and not prioritized I would encourage the Enforcement Consultants to work as a group or individually with the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement as, as necessary to explore whether there are alternative pathways such as a limited exemption that could achieve the goal and that would also allow the states should they choose to, to allow this activity. Thanks.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:00] Brad.

Brad Pettinger: [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Thank you for the motion Marci but I am going to vote against it. I think that this is a bigger issue than just what's happening I think in Westport, and I just, myself I was thinking of some of the things that were right in front that there has been probably something that should have been done in the past that's happening, so I've had a good conversation with the OLE in the back room and I think they have some, a game plan on how to deal with it potentially, and I like the idea that get on the list and let's address it when it's, when it's, when it's time is do and so anyway.....

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:43] Further discussion on the amendment? Seeing none I'll call the question, all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:00:54] Aye.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:54] Opposed No?

Council: [00:00:56] No.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:57] I think we need a recall, a roll call vote Mr. Tracy.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:01] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Craig I'll be working from voting sheet number one. Council members as I call your name please indicate your, your vote. Herb Pollard.

Herb Pollard: [00:01:17] No. Yes. I'm sorry. My, my mistake. Yeah.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:26] Yes.

Herb Pollard: [00:01:27] I'm vote, I voted in favor of the amendment. Yes. Sorry.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:32] Thank you. Miss Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo: [00:01:33] No.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:33] Mr. Zimm.

Louis Zimm: [00:01:37] Yes.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:41] Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger: [00:01:42] No.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:43] Rich Lincoln.

Rich Lincoln: [00:01:45] No.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:46] Michelle Culver.

Michele Culver: [00:01:48] No.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:50] Maggie Sommer.

Maggie Sommers: [00:01:51] No.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:54] Mr. Dooley.

Bob Dooley: [00:01:55] No.

Chuck Tracy: [00:01:59] Mr. Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer: [00:02:00] Yes.

Chuck Tracy: [00:02:04] Miss Svensson.

Christa Svensson: [00:02:04] No.

Chuck Tracy: [00:02:07] Miss Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko: [00:02:08] Yes.

Chuck Tracy: [00:02:11] Mr. Anderson.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:15] No.

Chuck Tracy: [00:02:15] Vice chair we have four in favor and eight opposed. The motion for the amendment fails.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:02:24] Thank you very much Chuck. We're back to the main motion unamended. Is there further discussion on the main motion? Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:02:38] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I will be supporting the main motion. I just want to say a few words about it and the activities that we've undertaken in this agenda item. First I want to very much thank the GAP for their work here in prioritizing from among a list of their own priorities. They reduced the priority list down to four and did the work we asked of them. The GAP is by design comprised of representatives from our West Coast groundfish interests and in the short list of their recommendations, everyone is leaving something behind and unprioritized on that list that

they wanted. The IFQ sector has items that aren't rising to the top. The non trawl sector has items that aren't rising to the top and the recreational sector as well, so I appreciate their efforts here and I take their recommendations seriously and completely without reservation. I've been thinking about omnibus and what the Council's goal should be here. I appreciate a lot of the sidebar discussions that I know I've had with Aja since she's come on about what omnibus is and what it is supposed to do and what we want out of it. This is our opportunity to make sure that sectors equitably are evaluated and given opportunities and I see this list as the GAP's advice on what items are likely to provide the greatest good for the greatest number of West Coast interests. So there should be something, a little something here for everyone. I appreciate the GMT's thoughts on what the best pathway forward is on all of these items and I will say that with regard particularly to the trawl and non trawl RCA items that they prioritized as well, I'm a little worried about the plans to potentially sever this from spex. I, I completely understand the, the rationale that the GMT offered in terms of why it is, this is going to be a monumental undertaking to look top to bottom at our trawl RCA's and what the future holds with regard to modifying them. That's gonna be no small lift on the part of all of us to evaluate those impacts and benefits. I am concerned with the idea of that being pulled out of spex and then having it fall on a timeline that is behind spex so I, I'd like to dig a little deeper about how we're going to do that because I feel like either it's got to go right in front of spex or in tandem with spex because the use of RCA lines is a fundamental tool right now in our tool box with regard to managing all of our fisheries including inseason management. I'm not wanting to jeopardize the ability to use modification of RCA lines as an inseason management measure. Right now you know I think back to the last two years and we took action in our California recreational fishery to bring fisheries in to slow the attainment of overfished Yelloweye, but the benefit of being able to move those RCA lines in inseason was that it avoided us from having to take actions to close fisheries. It allowed them to continue to operate but just under you know different depth constraints, so in this discussion about how we address, you know RCA lines, I'm just, I want to make sure that we don't, that we think this through and make sure that, you know we are thinking about spex and how spex has always worked for us and the tools that we have in the tool box and those analyses that we've been doing each biennium. The GMT with their six items that they mentioned as going into potentially being scoped for spex plus then the RCA line item, I just want to note that in my mind this omnibus agenda item is not scoping for spex itself. We will commence with our spex process soon and we will be calling for folks to provide us with recommended modifications for the biennial specifications in that agenda item, so I'm a little concerned about the blurring of lines here with the six items that are potentially identified as appropriate for spex. So that's just one of the things that's kind of weighing on me here as we proceed with omnibus. I think one thing that really struck me about all of the public testimony that we heard today and that I see in this list of items and particularly the priority items, is that the issue of under attainment is what is the common thread across all of the sectors and across all of the testimony. I feel like that discussion is very important to us and really you can wrap up the priority list of omnibus items and couch them all as, you know if you were to roll them up and put them simply, the goal is to find ways to improve our under attainment, whether it means evaluating inner sector relationships or RCA lines or using gears that avoid Yelloweye so that we have different bycatch rates, so I feel like that's the common element and I feel like that's you know what the GAP is telling us in recommending these priority items that we, that we are looking at here today. Bill James, Barbara Emily, thank you for your testimony. I know we're a long way from home and the open access sector that you represent. There are a lot of people that share your voice and that you are only two people here with us today, but I know how many hundreds you represent, so thank you for your testimony. Dan Wolford, thank you for your remarks. I appreciate that you're looking across sectors and I feel like the advice that was provided in support of the Emley/Platt EFP item, you know those ropes you've been through them so thank you for your support on that. So again whether we're talking recreational, commercial, non trawl, trawl, I feel like the priorities that the GAP has provided us is a really good list for us moving forward.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:10:48] Thank you Marci. Is there further discussion on the main motion? Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:10:53] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. I support the motion. Also just had a couple brief remarks. I do want to second Marci's thanks to the GAP and the GMT. They get a lot of work on this and it was really helpful to our understanding of these issues and of their relative priority. Also your articulation of the issue of under attainment I think I found to be useful and that certainly makes sense to me. It's an issue of I think the socioeconomic benefits and the benefits to fishing communities and that is the type of item that comes to us for these challenging decisions under omnibus whereas more conservation focused topics come up under other processes. You know I do support these, I do want to note that there are four priorities in the GAP list and that sounds like four more than NMFS can take on, do want to acknowledge Aja's comments on workload both NMFS, and the Council and GMT and we're making our priority choices today but we will have some difficult decisions in front of us as we determine when and how to address those and in what order. The question of the SaMTAAC process was raised and you know my opinion is that we have already prioritized that, we are in the middle of an ongoing process and I am not envisioning any of this as disrupting that. I think we certainly, as we get to a little farther along in that process and receive a report at the June meeting of where SaMTAAC is and perhaps what narrowing of the scope of the alternatives that were put forth in draft form, we probably will have a better handle on the amount of workload associated with that and how that might fit into our big picture of prioritization and movement on some of these issues. I did want to note the, I appreciate the GMT'S addition of the item on Sablefish harvest specifications change, looking at going to a coastwide ACL with ACT's, I think that will be very valuable to, to look into it at some point. It's not identified here as a priority but just as I was thinking about the SaMTAAC process and Sablefish related issues, there's certainly a connection there and I appreciate them bringing that forward, and then specifically on the four items the GAP identified as priorities, I just wanted to speak to a couple that have really been, you know risen to the top for me, one of those is the non trawl RCA, we've had a lot of good discussion and comments about the importance of looking into adjusting that to allow more access and increase the utilization of the non trawl sectors and opportunity for those fisheries, so I am very supportive of that and then also the mothership whiting sector issues, you know we've had a lot of public testimony, not just today but at other meetings, but I do want to thank everybody who came to provide us with your, your examples and your insights today. I think it helped us understand what the problem is and the, the importance of the situation and looking into solutions to address the problem that we have heard from the sector and in particular that some of the catcher vessel representatives described to us today is, is very important to me, so again thanks for coming and I, with that conclude my remarks and.....

Marc Gorelnik: [00:14:42] Thank you very much Maggie. Are there further comments? Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:45] Yeah. Thanks Mr. Vice Chair, just a couple. There's a reference in the GAP report, and I'm speaking to the mothership utilization issue and there's a reference I think to the, to the public testimony that was provided back in November that came out of the meeting of the majority of the mothership sector interests, and in the motion it says it would include the third item, and I just want to ensure that I understand what the third item is and I believe it is the provision, the potential provision that would allow vessels to operate both as motherships and catcher processors in the same year provided they, that that CP would obtain a mothership before being able to do so, and I just wanted to ask the maker of the motion if that is the third item that is referenced in the motion?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:15:55] Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:15:56] Yes. Thank you, and the, the reference to the supplemental public comment report is the supplemental public comment that was submitted under this agenda item from the mothership sector that referenced the two items that referenced all three items from their previous report and that there were, there was revised thinking about the third item relative to consensus and they had stricken it in the supplemental public comment report, and so yes this motion would retain that item, which is to allow CP's to harvest a mothership sector quota provided they had a mothership permit.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:49] Not harvest but process.

Michele Culver: [00:16:50] Process yes. Thanks.

Phil Anderson: [00:16:52] And just one other quick comment I know it's late, at least relative to people that want to eat lunch. I just would express a little bit of concern, I'm not, it's not rised to the point where I'm going to vote against it, but the inclusion of the flexibility to consider other alternatives really opens the door wider than what I would otherwise have liked. I think Brent's comments about the stability of the industry and us not doing something that destabilizes the mothership fishery and all of the, I mean it's one of those balloon things you push someplace and something else comes out somewhere else that you didn't intend, so while I don't want to preclude any good thinking about how to address the utilization issue, at the same time I don't, I've got some concern about opening up the door so wide that we just cause a big food fight is going to lead to a solution.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:04] Further discussion on the motion? I'm looking twice I don't see any hands, so then I'll call the question. All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:18:18] Aye.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:18] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries unanimously. I will turn to Dr. Seger and see if, how we're doing here?

Jim Seger: [00:18:32] Yes Mr. Chairman I think that completes your action. You have a new process you're going to try out for a while to be looking at these priorities at every meeting, or at least looking at progress and providing public an opportunity to and a place to make for the recommendations and then you have the motion just passed on priorities. I think you're done.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:18:55] Thanks further discussion on this agenda item? Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:19:00] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Well at the risk of sending us into a little a little bit more overtime, I did want to recognize the GMT for the work they did. This is a very illustrative of their dedication and their willingness to put in extra time but mostly I want to recognize the outgoing Chair Lynn Mattes who really showed the leadership to the GMT and, and is responsible for a lot of the good work they do and their dedication and thorough reports and this is just another example of how they just dove right into something that was, you know not really on their radar screen and just did a bang up job and really I think has helped the Council a lot, but mostly you know this isn't the only example of that, so Lynn thank you very much for your time as chair and I guess that concludes my remarks. (APPLAUSE)

Marc Gorelnik: [00:20:06] Thanks for those comments. Any further discussion on this agenda item before we break for lunch? Seeing none we'll break for lunch. I have 12:20. Let's be back in our seats

at 1:20.

5. Inseason Adjustments – Final Action

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:00] That concludes public comment and takes us to Council discussion and action and if the Chair will indulge me I'd like to pass the gavel to the Chair.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:15] Thank you. So that as the Vice Chair said that it does take us to Council action on inseason adjustments. We've got the GMT's recommendations along with the GAP's recommendations and testimony from the public to consider in this so I will look to my colleagues around the table for a motion. Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:00:39] Thank you Mr. Chair. If I may first I'm, I'm hoping I might ask a question of NMFS in response to the last dialog we just had.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:51] Certainly.

Marci Yaremko: [00:00:51] Earlier we heard from Caroline McKnight that probably the soonest we would have any 2019 data available for analysis might be September. I just am hoping to hear from you, is that the information that you're looking for us to evaluate to bring back for consideration for action on a Lingcod bag limit increase. Is it that 2019 current year data that's of interest?

Phil Anderson: [00:01:26] Aja.

Aja Szumylo: [00:01:27] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thanks Miss Yarem...Yaremko, excuse me. So we'd be looking at any, we'd need to look at any new information that wasn't available at the time that the initial decision was made to set the bag limit at one fish. So yes certainly you know the September information if that was available then would be helpful, but I think the way that we're evaluating some of the inseasons here, you know new information that came in towards the end of 2018 or, yeah, again any other information that wasn't in hand at the time that we made the decision is that the one fish bag limit could come into play in action.

Marci Yaremko: [00:02:04] Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:06] Other discussion around the table? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:02:11] Thank you Chair Anderson. I don't know that I really want to offer a motion or even an amendment to a motion because I'm not sure if Council guidance to the team requires a motion. I do want to say that the current regulations that were arrived at through the spex process were based on incomplete 2018 data. While more data is always better, my feeling is if we wait until September we may not see regulations until October leaving not much of 2019 left to enjoy what might otherwise, you know be a two fish bag limit. I think it would behoove the Council to learn at least what an updated projections would look like based on a complete set of 2018 data which was not available during the spex process. I'm not prejudging whether that means we would then in April go to a two fish bag limit, but I do think if we don't have that information we would not be able to even have the opportunity to make that selection. We do know that the attainment in 2018 was lower than projected and so it would not be surprising to see that 2019 and 20 projected harvests in the non trawl sector drop as well. Based on the incomplete data in 2018, the attainment with the 2 fish bag limit was 83 percent and I, I'm not sure that if we knew it was 83 percent back during the spex process whether we would have necessarily gone with a one fish bag and especially given as, as was, has been pointed out, there's hundreds of tons stranded sitting out there. One of the more legitimate concerns is that the 2020 attainment is where we were pushing up against 100 percent. I

think as, as Dan said if we reach that attainment we would be point six tons over the harvest guideline, so to the extent we have an opportunity for a two fish bag limit, it's much safer in 2019 than it might be in 2020, it may end up being safe in both years we don't know, but if we wait till the end of 2019 to go to a two fish bag limit we may end up with a two fish bag limit for a couple of months and then back to one fish, so again I look to the Chair or the Executive Director whether I need to do this by motion or not, but I would, I certainly would hope the Council would task the team with at least updating the projections with the data that's already in hand and we can look at that in April and then make a decision to do something or not.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:25] So my suggestion, at least as one of the next steps in response to that. In the team's report they, they cite one consideration is to reconsider at a later Council meeting. I don't know what the later Council meeting means in terms of what meeting they are talking about but if there is an opportunity to further examine the circumstances relative to the lingcod bag limit in California by looking at the, perhaps some additional data that they haven't had an opportunity to look at yet. When could the team look at that data and when might we then hear from them in terms of a, a analysis on whether moving to a two fish bag limit makes sense or not, and I would ask if there's a GMT member that would like to volunteer to come up and expand on that point in their report a little bit. So I see Caroline coming whether she wants to or not.

Caroline McKnight: [00:06:41] Third time's a charm. Thank you. So we could certainly provide updated projected impacts with the complete 2018 data by April. What I was referencing to previously when we were talking about the report and I received the question about later or subsequent Council meetings, it was in reference to providing updates to 2019 catch, so hope that clarifies it.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:12] Thank you for that clarification. So would it, maybe a question is was it the intent of the GMT to update the information with the completed 2018 catch stream and then perhaps provide us some additional information on lingcod in April.

Caroline McKnight: [00:07:34] Thank you for the question. I think the intent, we, we were under the impression we were looking at 19 data and that's why the, the statement reflected later Council meetings for this year, but from hearing from this discussion there was comfo... comfort level from NMFS that we could use the updated 18 data and have that in April. That is an, an option.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:56] Okay thank you very much.

Caroline McKnight: [00:07:59] Okay thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:00] Let me turn back to Mr. Gorelnik. If, if the understanding that and understanding that, that information could be provided back to the Council in April and if there was concurrence around the table to have, to ask the GMT to do that would that meet your?

Marc Gorelnik: [00:08:19] Thank you Chair Anderson I think yes it would cause then the Council would be able in April to then make an informed decision on whether an inseason change could be made then or should be made later in the year.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:35] Okay. Let me look around the table to my colleagues and see if there's any objection to providing that direction to the GMT. I'm not seeing any so Todd if we could note that and GMT folks that are listening to this. Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:08:54] Yes. Thank you Mr. Chair. I guess I would ask that maybe we, the Council provide a little bit of latitude to see who will be providing the data and bringing it forward, it might in fact be CDFW and it might be provided to the Council say in a supplemental report for the briefing book in advance of the April meeting. That would probably be the best path forward, but, so if you could just afford us that latitude we'll take care of it.

Phil Anderson: [00:09:23] Yeah I think the California Department of Fish and Wildlife representative on the GMT and obviously your agency can provide the information through the appropriate conduit and get it back to us. Marc.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:09:40] And I just wanna emphasize I'm not prejudging whether the change should be made, I just think that we may get some information that will point us one direction or the other.

Phil Anderson: [00:09:52] Okay, so we do have series I believe of four recommendations at least that were contained in the GMT report, so Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:10:06] Yeah. Thank you Mr. Chair. I would move the inseason adjustment recommendations as identified in the supplemental GAP Report, agenda G.5.a.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:37] Okay we have a motion that's on the screen. Does it accurately reflect your motion?

Marci Yaremko: [00:10:41] Yes it does. Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:42] Is there a second? Seconded by Bob Dooley. Speak to your motion as you wish.

Marci Yaremko: [00:10:48] Thank you Mr. Chair, and I want to shout out to our California delegation folks that assisted us in the preparation of our analysis and gave us some ideas and worked with us in advance starting with the November meeting. I want to thank National Marine Fisheries Service for having some discussions with us between November and March even though they were off work for quite a big chunk of that time. This is a heavy lift from a lot of folks and I want to acknowledge the analytical work that was done by the GMT in support of these recommendations. Also note in the GMT's report they had eleven inseason requests and I know it took them quite a bit of time to work through each of those and make some determinations about whether information was adequate or not to move forward with those, and so I think summing it up and looking at the recommended adjustments provided by the GAP, these recommendations all support some slow up increases that have been closely examined by the GMT and the GAP and should provide some improved opportunities for California recreational and commercial fisheries in 2019 but also should keep us within our harvest limits.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:17] Great. Thanks very much Marci. Is there discussion on the motion? I just had a question just because I'm challenged. Does the crosswalk between what's in the GAP report and the GMT report, we got everything included with that? Yeah thanks. Alright. Any further discussion on this motion? Okay we'll call for the question, all those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:12:41] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:42] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries unanimously. Over to you

Todd in terms of an update on where we are in this agenda item.

Todd Phillips: [00:12:55] Yes Mr. Chair I believe you, you've completed your agenda items. I just want to confirm that you have completed, or you provided one, one motion and you also have directed or requested that updated lingcod projections based on complete 2018 data be presented at the April 2019 meeting and that would come through the appropriate conduit, be it CDF and W or the GMT.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:22] Great. Thanks very much.

6. Implementation of the 2019 Pacific Whiting Fishery Under the U.S./Canada Agreement

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] Takes us to any Council decisions. We already established the fifteen hundred metric ton set aside for the 2019 Pink Shrimp and research and other recommended by GMT so I don't think we have to do anything there, so I don't think any action is necessary but if anyone has any discussion on the agenda item before we leave it now is your time. Alright thanks very much and thanks Frank.

H. Pacific Halibut Management

1. Annual International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) Report

Phil Anderson: [00:00:02] That concludes public comment on this agenda item. Takes us to our discussion. I think the, there, there are at least two items perhaps that we could have some discussion on, one is whether or not we want to provide any thoughts or recommendations back to the IPHC regarding the season structure for the directed fishery and then the second one is having to do with the workshop and any, number one do we support having it and two, some sort of a planning approach working with National Marine Fisheries Service to make it happen in the event that we think that's a good idea. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:01:06] Thanks. I did have a question for Mr. Lockhart. Perhaps you could describe for us what the status is of the recommended or the IPHC commercial fishery dates that are in IPHC regulations and what the status of that is relative to being published in NMFS regulations?

Phil Anderson: [00:01:37] Go ahead Frank.

Frank Lockhart: [00:01:40] Thank you Mr. Chairman. The status is that it's very close to being published in very final rule, and the, it ideally it would be in place before Friday because that's when the season starts, so it's at the very final stages.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:04] Go ahead Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:02:05] Thanks, so I guess with regard to that then what, what would be the ability to, to revise it at this point given it's in that final rule, so I'm trying to get a sense of the, the, the NMFS, the domestic process I guess separate from the, the IPHC in inseason process that Steve Keith mentioned.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:34] Go ahead Frank.

Frank Lockhart: [00:02:35] And thank you for the question. I think we've, we talked about the furlough and impacts of the furlough and one of those impacts is there's a lot of rules making it through the system right now and so I think our opinion is that it might actually be counterproductive to try to make changes at this stage, and just kind of unknown impacts of that, and if I may just expand on that a little bit, we have heard from Steve Keith that the IPHC has a process that they can go ahead and make changes. We think that would be the more straightforward way to move forward on this if the Council wanted to make that recommendation and within NMFS we've had some further discussions on what if anything we have to do. I think we, it's still under discussion but we don't necessarily think we would have to do anything in the Federal Register, but we are still talking about whether it makes sense to maybe do something to remove any confusion that might exist, so we're still considering that but to make changes at this late stage to that rule package where it is in the process might delay things beyond Friday and so we're concerned about that.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:07] Go ahead Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:04:08] Thanks, and so just for clarity to expand a bit on the potential impacts of delaying that rule, so my understanding is that rule is for all directed commercial fisheries in Alaska as well as 2A that are scheduled to open on March 15th and for 2A that would also include the tribal

fisheries, that opening date for them as well. Is that correct?

Frank Lockhart: [00:04:38] That is correct it's not just a 2A rule.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:43] Yeah I you know I think I've, I've learned a lot more about the rule making procedure for halibut regulations in the last couple of three days than I care to know, but you know the, the commission transmits recommendations to both the Department of State and Commerce simultaneously and then looks for providing concurrence with those and I think as Frank said that process is well down the road and, and, which has led me to think that maybe a better way is if the Council was so inclined to make our thoughts known to the Halibut Commission about, about the, the addition of the second day in the first opening and, and building off the comments we heard from our Groundfish Advisory Panel, members of the public as well as around this table, and, and hope that the commission would, would recognize and acknowledge those concerns and, and make a change. Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:06:09] Thanks Mr. Chair and following up on that, just, just confirming or looking for confirmation from Frank that no further, if that occurred then no further Federal rulemaking would be required.

Frank Lockhart: [00:06:27] Again things are moving. There's, there's more discussions to be had here but yes what I, what I have been told is that the action that the IPHC would take via their inseason process would be sufficient to remove that date.

Maggie Sommers: [00:06:46] Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:06:50] I'm just going to offer Mr. Keith, and you don't have to, but if you have any comments that you wish to share with us on this particular topic feel, please feel free to do so.

Steve Keith: [00:07:05] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yeah just on the, on the process the, the way it works with the treaty is that we submit the recommended, recommended regulations to the two governments and it's up to them to accept them and implement them, and the Department of State has accepted the regulations for 2019 on behalf of the US government so that, that horse is outside, out of the barn, and in terms of rulemaking the typical process is that the Alaska region takes the lead on publishing the IPHC regs in the Federal Register and that's what Mr. Lockhart is alluding to that it's well underway, that process and their object is to get that published before next Friday so that the quota fisheries up north can, can open on time, and then the Western Region takes the lead on publishing the Pacific Council's catch share plan and the Federal regulations and that, that goes, that takes a little bit longer because it goes through a regular rulemaking process and, and as you know the catch share plan simply refers to the commission setting opening dates and the fishing period limits.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:31] So can, could we assume that the Halibut Commission leadership, the staff would consider seriously our input on the dates that have been put out there in regulation.

Steve Keith: [00:08:52] Yes Mr. Chairman I can tell you that we will seriously consider the feedback that we have received and will receive.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:59] Alright. Thank you very much. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:09:06] Thanks so I did have a question on the, on the process on there and so I'll just ask for thoughts about this but just wondered whether it would be helpful to draft a fairly brief

letter to IPHC, but that includes the reports that we received here from the GAP and EC if that is what was thought in, in terms of the next steps.

Phil Anderson: [00:09:50] Well that was my thought. I don't know who, who are you asking that question of?

Michele Culver: [00:09:54] I just asked. I said I'd appreciate feedback from Council members on that.

Phil Anderson: [00:09:59] Oh okay.

Michele Culver: [00:10:02] It would include you.

Phil Anderson: [00:10:04] Oh well. Well I think it would be a good idea for us to make our thoughts known and include the input we receive from our Enforcement Consultants and Groundfish Advisory Panel. Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:10:22] Thanks Mr. Chair. I would agree that a letter is a good idea. I received quite a lot of very strong feedback from Oregon halibut fishermen and some processors and every one of them expressed concerns about the fact that two back-to-back 10 hour openers would worsen the safety risks rather than improve them and they gave numerous examples of how and why that would occur. They also raised concerns about fairness and the fact that this could potentially affect boats fishing from different ports, boats of different sizes with different amounts of gear, just differently across the fleet. Concerns about reducing the value of landed catch as the GAP referred to and a number of other concerns and I will share with the Council that ODFW has already expressed to IPHC our recommendation that an opener not be held on June 27th and I would encourage us to make the same recommendation as a Council.

Phil Anderson: [00:11:36] Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:11:38] Yeah thank you Mr. Chair. I would certainly support that. I did hear from two of our small handful of directed halibut participants and their question to me was is this a typo? And then their next question is, do I have to deliver my halibut or my sablefish that I would prefer to keep on board? What do I do? Do I have to have all my fish off, off the boat to go back out? So just a, a huge number of questions and of course I have no answers. So I guess I would support the suggestion on, on the letter. I think it would also be helpful that we suggested in the event that our recommendation is not taken or somehow we convey that if, if the fishery does proceed with that second day that we're going to need some significant help with responding to these inquiries and what advice we're expected to be providing to our fishermen and how we would communicate it to them. I don't know if some sort of FAQ or some sort of mailer to the directed participants might be appropriate but I'm thinking about the outreach that needs to happen I think either way.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:09] Okay so just kind of summarizing what I've heard. There's a, I'm hearing agreement around the table to send a letter to the IPHC regarding the directed halibut fishery and specifically recommending that they remove this June 27th as part of the schedule that we cite. We summarize the concerns that we have identified around this table as well as those that are contained in the Enforcement Consultants and the GAP as appropriate and we can attach those to the letter. I'm, I'm struggling around that one about, well if you choose not to do this, if you choose to leave the June 27th date in then we're going to need help answering questions, I mean I don't quarrel with that. I really don't even want them to consider doing it though leaving it in there so, but whatever they do I

would, the other point I would make is that we would request a quick determination of eliminating June 27th from the schedule and then any, and then recommend to them that they make every effort to communicate that decision to the fleet. So something along those lines in terms of the content of the letter. Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:14:52] Yeah thank you. I think requesting, clearly requesting that they contact their list of known participants either way is something that we can ask for.

Phil Anderson: [00:15:05] So I would also ask if there's the Council indulgence to allow the staff to prepare the letter. I don't know the, whether you could get something back to us before this meeting concludes or not, and if that doesn't sound reasonable then giving us the latitude...either work through our quick response process which I'm, would be less excited about than if you'd be willing to give us the latitude to formulate the letter in the manner in which I've described and go ahead and get it sent off. Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:15:49] Thank you Mr. Chair. Well I would prefer the latter, just from a more workload standpoint. I think the direction is pretty straightforward. I don't think the issues are too complicated. I guess I would ask for one, maybe one little clarification on, on the request to IPHC to remove the date if, if it would be, or maybe it maybe it's a question to Mr. Keith whether it'd be helpful to specify that, that occur through the IPHC inseason action mechanism?

Phil Anderson: [00:16:24] Yeah, yeah I think that would be good. Okay. Alright. I think we have clarity on where we're headed on that one. Right? Okay so a workshop. I know I expressed at least initially that I thought the issues associated with roles and responsibilities of the management entities versus the structure of the fishery were, in my mind at least, I was putting those in two different compartments, but and, and I know that was, well those issues were included in the outline that Frank provided and Kayleigh summarized for us but Frank.

Frank Lockhart: [00:17:11] I was just going to suggest rather than going through point by point and discussing everything, under the workload part of the report there's, there's a sentence in that second paragraph and basically says we recommend that leadership from the management partners work quickly after the Council meeting to develop a plan to execute the workshop. Seems to me that's probably the best way forward and I'm not exactly sure how that should be done, if it's just an agreement for NMFS to work with Council staff to make that happen or if, or if there has to be an ad hoc group created or whatever that is so, but it seems to me that's the easiest way to kind of make significant progress on this quickly without talking for two hours here so.....

Phil Anderson: [00:17:58] Yeah I'd prefer that didn't happen but I would just is, would it be fair of me to request that the state representatives, Council staff, and NMFS huddle up and maybe provide us just some sort of an outline of a plan to get that done when we get to the workload planning piece on our own day last just so that we're all on the same page when we leave here in terms of what happens next. Is that a fair request?

Frank Lockhart: [00:18:40] We're fine.

Phil Anderson: [00:18:40] Alright. Okay. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:18:45] Thanks. So I guess just for clarification Frank are you talking about following up quickly to get the, the coordinating meeting going, the coordinating discussion? That would be the ones that would kind of flesh out the plan a little bit more for the workshop?

Phil Anderson: [00:19:09] Go ahead Frank.

Frank Lockhart: [00:19:10] Yes I guess I, an initial meeting to kind of flesh out how we're going to meet further to talk about the details of the coordinating meetings as you're, you're talking about it so I don't envision this is just one quick meeting, that it's to be some other discussions with among the managers and to move forward, and then eventually getting to talking about the design of the actual public workshop.

Phil Anderson: [00:19:41] Okay well can we leave that to you guys to sort out and come back on Tuesday before we leave or do you want to have more discussion now? Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:19:52] I had a different question.

Phil Anderson: [00:19:53] Go ahead. Are we done, are we good on that piece? Okay go ahead.

Michele Culver: [00:19:59] I, I had a question just on the, on the timing. So the timing of the workshop seemed to be June or July so that we could have the presentation of the summary for the September Council meeting, and have something for the IPHC meeting in November and I just wanted to get a sense of, maybe ask Steve Keith while he's here just if that timing would work? So I understand the IPHC Commissioners also have a workshop typically in late September which is when they prepare for the interim meeting, but maybe just looking for a head nod that if the Council were to convey its recommendations to IPHC in time for the interim meeting if that was sufficient?

Phil Anderson: [00:21:06] Steve. Come on, come on up please.

Steve Keith: [00:21:15] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yes, we will, the commission endorsed the idea of a workshop should it take place and we're, we will do whatever we need to, to support the workshop and whenever the workshop takes place. During the summer would work best for our process as well so we'd have something before the end of our meeting.

Phil Anderson: [00:21:37] Okay. Thanks very much Steve. Anything else around the table in this topic before we leave it? Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:21:53] Thanks Mr. Chair. Think I'll just stick with a couple short things here. One is that I wanted to acknowledge both the GAP's request to have, to participate in the public workshop when we talk about the structure of this fishery and also just share with the Council that I was reminded and I think we are all well aware that the GAP doesn't necessarily represent the whole range of directed non tribal halibut fishermen, so we will certainly make an effort to reach out to folks who may not be represented by the GAP but would be, you know good to engage in this workshop. I also wanted to acknowledge that I heard in Mr. Pettis's public comment a recommendation for a license moratorium and control date while the decision about how this fishery is going to be managed in the future plays out, and I just wanted to, I guess suggest that we kind of keep that in mind and give that some consideration. I appreciate his concerns about big effort shift into this fishery and how that might affect future management of it so that might be something we keep in mind as we're thinking about planning for our halibut management activities this year, workshop and otherwise.

Phil Anderson: [00:23:31] Thanks Maggie. Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:23:33] Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm just hoping maybe Chuck can give us an idea

of what the budget is for this workshop. We have the advice here from National Marine Fisheries Service that the scope be expanded to include recreational and incidental participants in the fishery. The GAP's expressed interest in attending. I know I've heard from my small handful of directed participants that they're interested in attending and I know we're planning to talk about these things off line in an ad hoc group, but it would help me if I knew now what funding is available to send participants and what, you know how big an undertaking we're planning here, how many days? Anticipated size or number of attendees? What, what can we afford?

Phil Anderson: [00:24:33] Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:24:34] Thank you Mr. Chair, Miss Yaremko. I'm not sure I'm gonna have a real good answer for you on that. I might be able to give you a couple of examples that might give you some context. You know since we haven't really started the planning process to know what we're getting into here you know and, you know I think a really big, really big workshop I think we had a few years ago was kind of a kickoff to the electronic monitoring business and we had, we did request and receive some funding for that and I think it was somewhere in the neighborhood of about \$25,000. That was a pretty big deal and that involved a lot of people and bringing, you know people in from outside and quite a number of participants so I would guess that's probably, you know that, that's probably a high end of what we're talking about here. On the low end again I think you know it depends on how many days and how many people we really want. I don't know that I've heard enough here to, you know make a good guess as to what that might be or how that might compare with what, what I just mentioned but you know I would guess it'd probably be pretty hard to get by for less than, I don't know, probably ten thousand or something, so I would guess something, something in that range, ten to twenty five, but that's just totally off, off my, off the cuff.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] So Marci I appreciate you bringing that piece of the NMFS proposal to my attention. It is my view that if we open this up and discuss all things halibut, the chances of us having anything definitive regarding our directed fishery to provide to the halibut commission by their interim meeting is somewhat, somewhere less than zero. While I appreciate the, the addition of topics like halibut management through the Council and advisory body process, and while that would include other fisheries sectors beyond the directed fishery, I would not recommend we try to take all that on at once in a workshop. I think if we're going to make any kind of significant progress on looking at alternative management structures to this fishery we've got to be really focused, and I, you know I'm not precluding the opportunity to address those things later if that's what we want to do, but I really would advocate that we keep this narrow, I mean first of all the discussion around the roles and responsibilities is one thing, but once we get, go to the piece dealing with structuring the fishery, I think we've got to be really focused here. We're not, we're not going to have, we're not going to have anything, and as you saw in the note that I included the quote from the halibut commission, the quote in my report where if we don't give them something then they will proceed under their authority and I think this is our chance and we need to make the best of it that we can. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:02:13] Thanks. I agree and was just noting in the letter that they sent us that's Attachment 3 that was here toward the end of January. With regard to this issue that they are proposing a joint meeting to discuss the changes to the management structure and I guess to me one of the key questions that the Council needs to address is whether or not we want this fishery to continue to be managed by IPHC or the Council and depending on the answer to that question we may structure the agenda for the workshop differently, so there may be proposals that we would consider, you know if we, side boards if you will, if the fishery were to be continued to be managed under IPHC, and they were pretty clear in this letter that of the list of items that we provided to them that were of concern to the Council, that there were really only two that pertained to the management

scope of the commission and that the commission would consider to be relevant and those would be the longer term economic stability and the timing of the fishery, our decisions that the commission would make, and so kind of these other items, such as the bycatch of yelloweye and potential conflicts with the recreational fishery and those are items that are more of relevance to the Council and of interest to the Council. Those items currently are in the NMFS report relative to workshop topics, and so I, I guess I think I, I agree with, with what you said and that we, we do need to be careful and we do need to be clear about if there are any side boards on the scope of discussion so that, so that the workshop is as productive as possible and I do think part of that is making that decision and I'm not sure what the timing of that decision is and, and what steps it will take to, to get to there, so if the timing of that decision is something we wanted to have done in June prior to the workshop or if that's something we want to have that which makes the most sense to me, at a minimum it should be something in September but then that's again after the workshop has happened.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:20] Marci.

Marci Yaremko: [00:05:22] Thank you. I guess what I'm learning from this discussion and from the comments we've received in writing is that there is a lot of variation in the expectations of this workshop and hearing from Mr. Tracy that his idea of this upper end is \$25,000, doing some pretty quick and dirty math, we're talking participation by 25, 35 people, so I'm trying to figure out so that we don't, I think we'll continue to have folks out in the audience with incorrect expectations about what we're planning here. We should make some decisions about narrowing the scope and narrowing the participation. I'm looking at the GAP's recommendation for tribal, state and Federal fishery management, enforcement, the GMT, Wickop, and then the GAP too as well and I think we're well over the threshold of 25 people, so I'm, I'm struggling on how to narrow the focus and keep everybody happy now that we've kind of created an expectation of a, of a workshop that would delve deeper into some of the proposed alternatives like those suggested by the GAP in their prior statements, so I'm kind of at a loss on what to do and how to do it but I do think that we owe it to folks to make clear what our intentions are.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:28] Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:07:29] Thanks Mr. Chair. Thanks Marci. I very much agree with your comment that I think there are really widely differing expectations of what this workshop is going to be. You know anything from an investigation of what would the implications be of a longer opening with, without other major changes to the structure of the fishery which I think is what this concept started as last Fall, to I think there are some expectations now that this is the place to talk about every option for managing this fishery and do we go IFQ, or incidental or a combination or something different and everyone should be there and the latter strikes me as probably not something we're going to get to at, at one workshop on this, overwhelming in scope and also duplicative of our normal process. It seems to kind of prejudge an assumption that we as a Council are going to decide that yes we will, I suppose not, sorry I was going to say that we will take on management of this fishery and do all of the scoping and analysis and decision making for those ourselves, I suppose alternatively there could be expectations that we hear input on and consider all the alternatives and then make recommendations to the IPHC which doesn't sound like the right way to go, so I think in my remarks here all I'm doing is illustrating my own confusion about the potential scope of a workshop so I'll stop now but maybe offer a suggestion that we put some thought into that and could perhaps, would coming back under workload planning be a worthwhile approach to this when we maybe have, have taken what we've heard today and pulled together our thoughts on when we're going to make that decision or have that discussion on roles and responsibilities and what the scope of this workshop should really be?

Phil Anderson: [00:09:52] I, that could be a good, good way to go. What I, at least what I'm, a little bit of what I'm taking away from this conversation is and I'm kind of going back to my compartmentalizing between roles and responsibilities and what we're doing with the workshop because I think as Michele said one is going to inform the other. So let me just, as long as we're making this up on the fly, if we, if we made it a decision that we wanted to move forward with a small, with whatever that means, a small group of people to talk about roles and responsibilities and try to come back to the Council with a recommendation from that and come back to the Council with a recommendation, I'm going to suggest that we would do that in June that we would come back with that recommendation. At the April meeting, so giving ourselves time to think about this scope business of the, of the workshop, that we could scope out some and provide some more definition and outline to, to the workshop itself, understanding that, that what, what we end up doing on the role and responsibility piece might influence what we do, but rather than trying to jam all this into this week and workload planning and all that, which might work. If we did it this other way maybe too, let's, let's figure out how we're going to deal with the roles and responsibility question because to me that's a management entity discussion.

Maggie Sommers: [00:11:57] Yes.

Phil Anderson: [00:11:59] And, and then from there give ourselves a little bit of time to scope out what we're doing with the workshop and have that conversation in April. Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:12:16] Thanks Mr. Chair. That is a far better suggestion. Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:21] Okay Frank.

Frank Lockhart: [00:12:23] One point of clarification. I agree with that, but earlier you mentioned coming back at workload planning so I'm assuming that is just coming, you wanted a description of how we're gonna proceed or what exactly is coming back?

Phil Anderson: [00:12:36] That has since been tossed in the garbage can.

Frank Lockhart: [00:12:39] Thank you.

Phil Anderson: [00:12:42] It was, it seemed like a good idea a half hour ago but not now so we wouldn't be doing anything on this thing under workload planning other than talking about how to agenda-ize the conversation in April about the workshop and we can think about that some more too before we lock that down. Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:13:05] Okay Thank you. So I just want to make sure I'm keeping up with you. You know so, so we did have our original assignment to come back under workload planning at this meeting and that was to the states and NMFS and Council staff to come, what my notes say here, to look at a planning process and so I'm just wondering if I just instead of say come back at workload planning, say come back to workload planning in April with kind of the, after those parties meet and come back with a recommendation in April. Is that?

Phil Anderson: [00:13:45] I think that's consistent with.....so on the workshop piece, we'd come back and talk about that in April.

Chuck Tracy: [00:13:53] Yeah.

Phil Anderson: [00:13:56] Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:13:57] Yes but I don't think that should be under workload planning. We have a halibut agenda item in April. I think it should come under the halibut agenda item in April, the results of the thought of moving forward with the workshop and what I'm thinking is that we could potentially even just have a conference call with NMFS and the states and Council staff on and then circulate perhaps a draft report that we could present in April under that agenda item on our thoughts.

Phil Anderson: [00:14:29] Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:14:30] Yeah thanks. I see the merit in that in that it's sort of a separate agenda item. It appears on the GAP and on everybody's agenda so that they know specifically what, what the task is so I think that's good. I'm not sure that final options for the salmon troll incidental retention is the right agenda item so I guess I'm, I think if we want to do that I think we should establish a separate halibut agenda item for that in April.

Phil Anderson: [00:15:01] We'll look forward to you doing that. Okay. Do we kind of have game plan here at least to move forward a little bit slower than we had originally thought? Okay well that was fun.

2. Incidental Catch Recommendations: Options for the Salmon Troll and Final Recommendations for Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries

Phil Anderson: [00:00:00] That concludes public comment on this agenda item and brings us to our action. There are two, one is to adopt the incidental catch allowances in the incidental, in the Sablefish Fishery North of Point Chehalis. Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:00:27] Thanks Mr. Chair. I could offer a motion for number two number.

Phil Anderson: [00:00:35] For number two? For the salmon troll fishery? Please do.

Maggie Sommers: [00:00:37] Why thank you. Shall I just say it. Okay. I move the Council adopt for public review the range of options. Well there we go. I move the Council adopt for public review, would you please change that 'a' to 'the', range of options for halibut landing restrictions in the 2019 salmon troll fishery beginning May 1st and for April 1st through 30th, 2020 as presented an agenda item H.2.a Supplemental SAS Report 1.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:41] Thank you. The verbiage on the screen accurately reflects your motion?

Maggie Sommers: [00:01:46] It does. Thanks.

Phil Anderson: [00:01:47] And is there a second? By Christa Svensson. Would you like to speak to your motion?

Maggie Sommers: [00:01:55] Thanks Mr. Chair and I just wanted to thank the SAS for their development of this range of alternatives noting that they, alternative one is one halibut per two Chinook except one halibut maybe landed without meeting the ratio requirement and no more than 25 halibut per trip, and the other alternatives differ only in the total number of halibut allowed per trip. Alternative two allows 35 and alternative 3 would allow 15. This is a good range of alternatives to go forward for public review and Council decision making in April.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:35] Thank you very much. Is there discussion on the motion? Seeing none will call for the question. All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:02:44] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:44] Opposed no? Abstention? Motion carries. I think that took care of two of the three which leaves the incidental allowance in the commercial Sablefish Fishery North of Point Chehalis. Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:03:04] Thanks. I move the Council adopt final halibut landing restrictions for the fixed gear Sablefish fishery North of Point Chehalis from April 1 to October 31, 2019.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:24] Slow down.

Michele Culver: [00:03:26] I'm sorry. I'm reading the sentence in the Council action.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:30] I know and Sandra's trying to type it as fast as you're talking.

Chuck Tracy: [00:03:33] And she caught, caught up.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:38] And she did. She caught up yes.

Michele Culver: [00:03:43] Yep.....as presented in agenda item H2 A supplemental GAP report 1.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:50] Thank you. Language on the screen accurately reflects your motion?

Michele Culver: [00:03:55] Yes.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:56] Would you like to speak to your motion?

Michele Culver: [00:03:59] Yes. Just briefly.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:01] Oh excuse me. I was going too fast. Is there a second? Rich Lincoln seconds. Now speak to your motion please.

Michele Culver: [00:04:08] Yes just briefly thank you. The, the resulting 2A quota for this year results in an increase to the maximum amount for the incidental Sablefish fishery to 70,000 pounds and the ratio that is proposed by the GAP is consistent with the ratio that we went to inseason in 2018 and is certainly appropriate given the increase in quota for this fishery.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:43] Thank you is there discussion on the motion? All those in favor say 'Aye'.

Council: [00:04:49] Aye.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:49] Opposed no? Abstentions? Motion carries unanimously. Robin do we have any other business to take care of under this agenda item?

Robin Ehlke: [00:05:00] Thank you Mr. Chairman. The three items listed here have all been completed.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:06] Thank you very much. That'll complete this agenda item and take us to what I believe, well I know is the last agenda item of the day.

I. Enforcement (Cancelled)

J. Highly Migratory Species Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:00] That concludes public comment which brings us to discussion on agenda item J1. So I will look around the table and see if there's any discussion to be had on some pretty significant issues that were raised during the presentations and comments. Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:00:22] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Yeah I wanted to respond to the discussion to the Washington Report on hard caps as well as since we heard a number of issues related to it in public comment, so I wanted to be clear under this part of the agenda item under Council discussion NMFS perspective, and then I may turn over if it's okay with you to General Counsel maybe to address Michele's last point, but to be clear from NMFS perspective, you know when we look at the rule and I appreciated Mr. Burke's testimony. He may not be an attorney but I think our attorneys agree with him. The court did not vacate NMFS withdrawal of the proposed regulations. It remanded the decision to NMFS and so therefore there are currently no proposed regulations that can be implemented by going directly to final rule and I think that's consistent with what Miss Culver said. The court left open the possibility NMFS could re-propose the regs and ultimately finalize them as drafted, however the court explicitly declined to order NMFS to promulgate the proposed regulations as is. The court only found that the negative determination exceeded NMFS authority under the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the APA because of a procedural failure, not based on the substantive basis of the negative determination. The court did not address whether a negative determination after consultation was permissible. It specifically noted that it was not deciding that question thus leaving it open. Moreover in the remedy section the court noted that the statute allows NMFS to revise the proposed regulations after the public comment period suggesting that NMFS could take future action and implying that future action was consultation. It's true the court did hold that NMFS did not consult with the Council regarding potential revisions thus suggesting that NMFS never finished consultation and it does not opine on whether NMFS initiated any type of consultation. I'd like to remind the Council again following our original June 2017 letter where we notified the Council of this determination. We submitted a report also in September 2018 under the Swordfish Management and Monitoring Plan agenda item that again suggested that the Council could revise its proposed hard caps regulations if it wanted to. So in closing I think it's clear from our letter that NMFS concern about hard caps is relative to the economic effects of the duration and geographic extent of the potential drift gillnet fishery closures. The Council could address these concerns if it wishes and it could set up a future discussion on this through workload planning on a future Council agenda item. So that concludes just an overall clarification from NMFS on where we believe we are with the court order, and where we are for Council discussion and action. Now the latter question I do want to turn over Michele's point of whether or not if the Council does not take subsequent action, whether or not the previous action stands and what that would mean and I'll turn to Judson.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:09] Judson.

Judson Feder: [00:04:14] Yes thank you. The, the previous, the previous action could be viewed as standing but the fisheries service has made a determination that it's unable to implement that recommendation as written for the reasons explained, particularly because of information uncovered during the comment period on the proposed rule leading to this determination that implementation as written would violate National Standard 7 and so therefore with direction from the court the fisheries service has reached out again to the, to the Council to engage in consultation and its, it is conceivable I think that if after, after additional consultation with the Council and additional and now economic analysis and building an administrative record that supports a Council recommendation that could be

the same recommendation or a revised recommendation. I, I believe it is conceivable that the Council, that the fishery service could move forward and, and approve the original proposal as proposed. I think it's probably more likely that that the fisheries service would approve a revised proposal.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:37] Phil.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:39] Yeah thanks Mr. Vice Chair. I was looking around the table and I was remembering the process that the Council went through to get to the point where they adopted the motion to put the hard caps in place on the....I believe there's nine different species that the hard caps applied, and as I looked around the table I realized that there's a relatively small number of us around the table that were part of that decision. A lot of, there's a number of new faces since the Council made that decision, and so I think, well my guess is that when most of us are engaged in a protracted deliberation on a very difficult issue and you come to a decision you have a fair amount of ownership in that decision and seeing it through to implementation, and so my guess is that those of us who were part of that, that really have that ownership in this issue and, and perhaps some of you that are around the table that weren't part of that maybe you don't feel that same sense of ownership in your, in the decision. I might be wrong but, I'm not going to attempt to debate the legal issues here, it would be inappropriate and I don't have the expertise to do that. What I will say is I take, I take the disapproval of a Council decision by National Marine Fisheries Service very seriously because of the, of the process and that we all go through and the public participates in, in our decision making and when we go through that and we arrive at a decision and it gets passed to National Marine Fisheries Service for review and implementation and they disapprove it, that's a serious matter in my opinion. I think when Mr. Wulff talks about it being a procedural violation and it wasn't....the court was not questioning their decision based on the merits. I don't know that I quarrel with that, but a procedural, procedural violation is also a serious matter and, and if, if it's allowed to stand and isn't challenged, I don't....that's wrong, and so the fact that, that procedural violation was challenged was warranted in my opinion. More, to me more importantly is what are we going to do now? And my concern, it may be unwarranted, but my concern is because we've had a fairly significant change in the people that are sitting around this table that you may think that the rule was wrong and if we do nothing it'll go away, problem over, and that's the piece that causes me the most concern for the integrity of our process and our Council. So it is because, primarily because of that factor that I will be urging my colleagues around this table to reinstate the consultation part on this rule and consider the court's findings. Consider National Marine Fisheries Service decision on the merits and if, and, and take that next step and whatever the outcome of that is if we choose to resubmit it or we choose to change it or we choose to leave it alone, I will support whatever that decision is. I'll participate in the, I suspect in the discussion on the decision but whatever the Council's decision is I'll support it, but what I will, will stand fast against is, is stepping away from this and just letting it die a natural death. That would be I think from a precedential perspective on the deliberations and decision making of this Council a huge mistake.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:11:16] Thanks for that Phil. Are there further, further discussion on this agenda item? Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:11:27] Thanks. I did want to add a couple of comments in response to the public comment that we received and I did want to clarify that Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife joined, filed an amicus brief on this lawsuit because of the, the procedural foul and not because we disagree with National Marine Fisheries Service a determination necessarily and their new economic analyses, but because of the way that it was done and so I would urge other Council members not to focus on this being the DGN hard cap issue which you may or may not necessarily view as a priority for the area or the group that you represent, but it's more of a process consideration of there could be a

time of where there is an issue that you really do care about and we had about four years of Council discussion and deliberations on this. We had the Sustainable Fisheries Division Manager in the Council seat who voted in favor of this motion. We had NMFS determine that it was consistent with Magnuson and file a proposed rule and then unilaterally they decided to withdraw it and have a negative determination without coming back to the Council first and asking if we would like to make revisions to the rule, so I'll, I'll say if it had been on another issue other than DGN hard caps, Washington Fish and Wildlife would feel the same way relative to how the process occurred. Thanks.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:14:00] Further comments around the table? I'm not seeing any but I would....uh John I looked you once and you didn't have your hand up so.

John Ugoretz: [00:14:12] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I will wave more frantically. I appreciate the comments by Washington Fish and Wildlife and the Chair and I do agree that this Council made a decision on hard caps. I have never once heard this Council nor any of its members back down from that decision. I do however question the timing of this Council discussing the same issue again after the longtime that this Council put into making it because of changes that have occurred and are continuing to occur in the drift gillnet fishery. I have made this point multiple times on the floor before that the state of California is actively working to transition drift gillnet fisherman to other gear types. That change will change the playing field for bycatch in that fishery. We will know as of January 1st, 2020 how many fishermen are voluntarily transitioning out of drift gillnet fishing. That could be one hundred percent, and if 100 percent of the fishermen decide to voluntarily transition out then we have no need to discuss this issue at all. So I would propose that yes, the Council should continue to be very vigilant about this topic, however I do not feel we should discuss it before the first of the year.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:15:55] Michele.

Michele Culver: [00:15:57] Thanks. I don't disagree at all with Mr. Ugoretz on the Council needs to carefully consider the timing of this when it wants to schedule its further discussion. I will say that I do believe that the Council should, should be clear on what the regulations are that will pertain to the drift gillnet fishery should it continue. So if I'm a drift gillnet permit holder and I'm being asked whether I want to be bought out of the fishery, I want to know what the regulations are going to be if I choose not to be bought out and that is going to weigh on my decision of whether or not I choose to accept the buyout or choose to keep my permit and I think it's, it's only fair for us to be clear to those fishermen what they can expect in the way of regulations if they choose not to sell their permit.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:17:24] Further comments around the table? I think, I think Michele raises a legitimate point that if you are a drift gillnet fisherman, whether to participate or not may depend upon what the Council may or may not do. I think that's a fair point to be made. I'm not someone who was on the Council, I'm one of the new faces that that the Chair referred to, so I don't necessarily have any ownership over that decision but I do think from an institutional perspective the Council, which has had undertaken a robust lengthy public process needs to defend its, it's, it's, you know that process which was far more robust than, than the public comment period and undertaken by NMFS. I'm not saying whether I agree or disagree with that decision, but I do think we need to defend our process here. Any other comments on this agenda item? I don't see any. Kit how are we doing?

Kit Dahl: [00:18:38] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Well you certainly had of fulsome discussion on this issue and I take by the lack of comment on the description of the range of alternatives for deep set buoy gear that you agree that those are an accurate reflection of your action in November and I think on that basis that NMFS will proceed to prepare the analysis for you to take final action in June.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:19:13] Great and I think we do need to, I guess at workload plan planning talk about the extending EFP's in view of the EIS process. Chuck.

Chuck Tracy: [00:19:24] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair I guess I would just make, make note that this is not an action item and that any recommendations that come out of the Council ought to occur under future workload planning, so the assumption that the just because the Council didn't comment on the deep-set buoy gear, I don't think we can quite make that determination here. If the Council wants to further that discussion, they would have to schedule something, an action item or determine if there already is one, what the action under that item might be.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:19:59] Anything further on this agenda item? I will now hand the gavel back to the Chair who might offer us a break.

2. Recommend International Management Activities

Phil Anderson: [00:00:01] That concludes public comment on this agenda item and brings us to Council discussion. Considering the input we've had on albacore and bluefin tuna. Any recommendations on U.S. positions at the upcoming international forums as appropriate. Silence doesn't really bother me, so if you're waiting for me to.....Christa.

Christa Svensson: [00:00:40] I guess I have one question. We did have a recommendation about sending somebody to the bluefin MSE workshop and normally I would bring that up in April, but seeing as we don't have HMS on the agenda I guess I'm asking now if it's an appropriate time to talk about that?

Phil Anderson: [00:01:09] Yes it is so would you like to speak to that?

Christa Svensson: [00:01:16] Well I think in hearing Mr. Fricke's report I would be inclined to continue to encourage that industry participate, whether it's albacore, bluefin, whiting, sablefish, and I know I'm dragging a lot of folks in here but I do think that stakeholder participation in the MSE process is important and I personally would like to see us continue to support industry as they maneuver through this process, so that would be my, my comments and my thoughts on where I am right now on that recommendation would be to just support sending somebody to participate in the bluefin workshop.

Phil Anderson: [00:02:08] I think as Dr. DiNardo indicated our, relative the MSE process that's within for Pacific whiting, we have a, we have a contingent I believe of seven advisory panel members that are part of the U.S./Canada treaty implementation team that are, are very involved in the MSE process and I think the same with, a little different situation with halibut in the IPHC, but we have a fairly significant contingent that are participating in that, that also includes both industry as well as Michele Culver's on that MSE piece for halibut. So Chuck do you have, in terms of sending someone to the MSE process for bluefin tuna? I didn't, I didn't recall when that was.

Chuck Tracy: [00:03:11] I think Mr. Chair. So when the, when the workshop is the week of Labor Day so I believe it or no, no, no I'm sorry no that's the.....

Phil Anderson: [00:03:23] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:03:28] Yeah thank you that's the joint working group that's Labor Day. It's May 20th and 21st in San Diego with the bluefin MSE.

Chuck Tracy: [00:03:34] So, so I, do we have a process for doing that I think, I don't think we've had a discussion about that, but I think in terms of, you know do we have funds for it? I think we do. I'm not sure what think what you're asking.

Phil Anderson: [00:03:57] Well you know, the obviously the, the cost of having someone go to San Diego is significantly different than Japan and I just didn't know what the provisions were in the budget so, Louis Zimm.

Louis Zimm: [00:04:12] Thank you Mr. Chair. It was my intent to attend that meeting whether I was supported by the Council or not, so because it is in my hometown and of very great interest to my fleet.

Phil Anderson: [00:04:43] Dave could you come up and I assume you talked about this, I think you had that in your report and were you looking for financial support from the Council?

Dave Rudie: [00:04:57] For this meeting it's not necessary. I live in San Diego also. I'll hang out with Louis and we'll learn about MSE for bluefin in San Diego. For future meetings if they're international we'd need support for industry to go.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:11] Alright, so I think we're good there and any information that you can bring back to us from that meeting would be appreciated. Alright, does that satisfy your interest there Christa?

Christa Svensson: [00:05:24] Perfectly and, and with regard to the other two I am aware we do have current industry and other support. I just would like to make it clear that I'm in favor of it for MSE in general as a, as a position.

Phil Anderson: [00:05:38] Great. Thank you. Any other discussion on this agenda item? Pete Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer: [00:05:46] Thanks Mr. Chair. Just a question. I had seen in the advisory subpanel report the request, or seeking support to go to 425 metric tons Pacific bluefin in 2019. It may be a question for NMFS. This risks or process in doing that, is it advantageous for the Council to support that in any way?

Phil Anderson: [00:06:20] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff: [00:06:23] Thank you Chair Anderson. Thank you Pete. Well I think from our perspective you know we just closed the public comment period on this. As you've heard from folks coming here we've had similar things that come in through the formal notice and comment rulemaking process. We also did highlight this so if the Council does want to give us any feedback or positions here we are going to take that into consideration along with the public comment received along with the comments by the advisory subpanel and look at the tradeoffs and concerns that they raise regarding how we might manage the limit and so that this would be the appropriate time to do so if the Council wanted to make input.

Phil Anderson: [00:07:12] Okay thank you. Pete.

Pete Hassemer: [00:07:15] Thanks Mr. Chair. I guess I would support NMFS exploring that and if necessary taking that position forward into the international meetings. I think our prior discussion or action on this was the 300 metric ton limit and if that was, if I'm remembering it correctly, if that was reached then 2 metric ton landing limit until 425 was reached, based on the report from Dr. DiNardo the abundance of Pacific bluefin and what's happening there, it would seem advantageous for the fleet to be able to go after the four.....fish up to 425 metric tons, the annual limit in one year without restrictions and it is a two year 630 metric ton cap, so just lending my support to, to that request by the advisory subpanel.

Phil Anderson: [00:08:28] Okay thanks Pete. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz: [00:08:32] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes in regards to the, the overall first year limit, I

think I could support adding the 30 metric tons that we had left over from the prior year that carries over, that seems sensible. I would caution shooting for a higher target in the first year because then in the second year if they catch that 425 we would have a lower limit available for the second year. It seems more logical to be cautious the first year and then if there is an overabundance of tuna available that the second year they might have the ability to catch those fish.

Phil Anderson: [00:09:20] Okay. Thank you John. So I'm, I'm, we have two ways to go here. We've had an expression of a perspective from Mr. Hassemer as well from Mr. Ugoretz. Mr. Wulff is listening to those perspectives. We can leave it at that unless there are others who wish to express perspectives or if we want to take an official position as a Council in terms of a recommendation to NMFS that we would need to do that by a motion, so not, if, if you want to leave it where it is and Mr. Wulff heard those two different kind of perspectives and, and call it good, I'll go ahead and ask Kit if we're done with this agenda item but I don't want to, or close an opportunity for a motion if there is one to come before the Council. Okay so Kit how are we doing on this agenda item?

Kit Dahl: [00:10:29] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah I think based on what we've heard today you've probably covered what you need to cover and I expect when we come back in June perhaps there'll be more opportunity leading into the northern committee meeting in September which I think would be a focus of interest to develop more additional comments related to potential actions that, that or the committee may take relative to bluefin and perhaps albacore so I think you've received a lot of information. You've had some discussion. I think we're good.

Phil Anderson: [00:11:14] Good. Thank you very much. Okay we'll close out this agenda item.

3. Drift Gillnet Performance Metrics Review

Marc Gorelnik: [00:00:00] That concludes public comment and takes us to Council action, which is to review performance metrics for bycatch species and a proposed process for potential bycatch reduction measures. John.

John Ugoretz: [00:00:15] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. And you know I, I look back at the lengthy discussion we had on this prior to tasking the management team with bringing something back and I've actually gone back and reviewed some of that before this meeting so I could catch myself up on where we were, what we were thinking and what we discussed. I, I found some of the public comment interesting. Yes, this Council spent a significant amount of time developing the initial performance metrics and yes we have reviewed those metrics annually since. What we discussed last time and what I still feel is that a single point in time look is not getting us the answer we were trying to get at and suggesting that this Council would not review a measure we have spent a lot of time developing is really inconsistent with what we do all the time. That's, that's what we do, we spent a lot of time making decisions and then we review those decisions and decide if we need to change them in the future. Clearly the Council felt that the regression tree method provided us a new and better scientific way to look at bycatch and we recommended that the team move forward with that for a purpose to change it from this single point estimate of bycatch to look at a different way to go. We don't have their full answer on that yet but we have a good start and I think that our discussion in June will be much better informed to make a decision about whether we change anything or not and whether we add species or remove species or do something different. So in general I appreciate the, the discussion and hope that we have a thorough review of this in June.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:02:20] Thanks John. Further discussion? Corey.

Corey Niles: [00:02:29] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair and thanks John. Just a few, few thoughts bouncing around in my head right now and but looking forward to June is maybe the main point and I'll confine my comments to that. I was, I'll request to the extent the team, you know to the extent practicable if the team could focus on the question of incentives that Dr. Stohs responded to my question on. I think, I think that is the point there and if he can, I think I understood what he was saying but if he and the team could explain a little bit more in their June product how they think their approaches are affecting incentives that would be appreciated, because, speaking on that note there is concern among the public about species being on or off the list and I guess, I guess it wasn't until our discussions this morning that there's really, we are not talking about not estimating bycatch for species we've got, we have two different methods, or many different methods probably for estimating bycatch but we're not talking about ignoring estimates of bycatch, the NMFS observer program is going to do that, so what the difference is, is estimating bycatch versus setting a performance metric which it implies we want the fleet to maybe do something different because we're going to estimate bycatch, NMFS is going to estimate bycatch for everything, so I am really, I'm curious on what the team can, can add to this. How, how do we tell if the fleet is behaving any differently because I think that's the goal to get them to not do harm where they were they don't need to and that entails knowing whether what they're doing is, is helping or if as Dr. Stohs was implying maybe it's just random again, so I'm really interested in what insights can be brought on that, on those questions in June.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:04:27] Thank you Corey. Further discussion around the table? Maggie.

Maggie Sommers: [00:04:36] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. Appreciate the team's work and look forward to the additional information that we can anticipate from them in June. I did just want to follow up on,

on one maybe relatively minor in this context, note in the team's report about considering DGN bycatch mortality as a share of the total human caused mortality and that, that should be something we consider before deciding whether to undertake bycatch reduction measures and I will say my initial response to that is that doesn't, that doesn't resonate with me. I think that is bringing in an element that is well beyond our, certainly our control, but probably also our knowledge and ability to know what the total mortality is, so I just wanted to note my maybe disagreement with that statement in the team's report.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:05:38] Thanks for that Maggie. I think seeing some nodding around the table. Any further discussion on J3? I'm not seeing any. I'm going to turn to Kit and see how we're doing.

Kit Dahl: [00:05:56] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I think you've provided some guidance to the team in those last two comments. As you heard they've been thinking about various methodologies including adapting the regression tree methodology to this reporting of performance metrics and you'll expect to hear more from them in June and some specific results and I'm sure they'll take into account the guidance that's been provided here.

Marc Gorelnik: [00:06:35] Alright. Anything further on this agenda item before I return the gavel to Chair Anderson?

K. Coastal Pelagic Species Management (Cancelled)