

COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPTS

275th Session of the

Pacific Fishery Management Council

March 5-11, 2024

DoubleTree by Hilton Hotel Fresno Convention Center

2233 Ventura St., Fresno, CA 93721

In-Person Meeting

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 Summary.....	3
A. Call to Order.....	4
3. Agenda	4
B. Open Comment Period.....	5
1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items	5
C. Salmon Management	6
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report.....	6
2. Review of 2023 Fisheries and Summary of 2024 Stock Forecasts.....	8
3. Klamath Dam Removal Update.....	12
4. Klamath River Fall Chinook Workgroup Report and 2024 Management Options – Final Guidance.....	16
5. Identify Management Objectives and Preliminary Definition of 2024 Management Alternatives	26
6. Recommendations for 2024 Management Alternative Analysis	29
7. Further Direction for 2024 Management Alternatives	34
8. Further Direction for 2024 Management Alternatives	38
9. Adopt 2024 Management Alternatives for Public Review.....	47
10. Appoint Salmon Hearings Officers	53
D. Habitat Issues	54
1. Current Habitat Issues	54
E. Cross Fishery Management Plan (FMP).....	55
1. Council and Scientific and Statistical Committee Discussion.....	55
2. Office of National Marine Sanctuaries: Coral Restoration and Research Plan – Range of Alternatives and Preliminary Preferred Alternative.....	70
F. Groundfish Management.....	74
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report and Electronic Monitoring Update.....	74
2. Consideration of Additional California Quillback Rockfish Analyses and Adopt Rebuilding Analysis ..	78
3. Initial Stock Assessment Plan and Terms of Reference	89
4. Trawl Cost Recovery Annual Report	95
5. Implementation of the 2024 Pacific Whiting Fishery under the U.S./Canada Agreement.....	97

6.	Fixed Gear Marking and Entanglement Risk Reduction - Preliminary Preferred Alternative	99
7.	2025-26 Fisheries Analysis Update and Adopt California Quillback Rockfish Harvest Specifications and Rebuilding Parameters	106
8.	Inseason Adjustments – Final Action	117
G.	Pacific Halibut Management	121
1.	International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) Report	121
2.	Incidental Catch Recommendations: Options for Salmon Troll and Final Action on Recommendations for Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries	122
H.	Ecosystem Management	128
1.	California Current Ecosystem Status Report	128
2.	Fishery Ecosystem Plan Initiative 4 – Progress Review	130
3.	Climate and Communities Initiative Review and Prioritize Tasks	138
I.	Highly Migratory Species Management	141
1.	National Marine Fisheries Service Report	141
2.	International Management Activities	142
3.	Highly Migratory Species Roadmap – Final Planning	143
J.	Administrative Matters	161
1.	Approval of Council Meeting Record	161
2.	Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures	162
3.	Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning	165

Meeting Transcript Summary

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

A. Call to Order

3. Agenda

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] With that, we'll turn to the approval of the agenda. Dani Evenson.

Dani Evenson [00:00:06] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to make a motion that that Council adopt the March 2024 meeting agenda, as described in Agenda Item A.3.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:19] Okay. Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik [00:00:20] Second.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:21] Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. All right. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:00:28] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:28] Opposed? Abstentions? All right, the motion's passed unanimously. We now have an agenda.

B. Open Comment Period

1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items

No transcription for this agenda item.

C. Salmon Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] So that will take us then into Council discussion on this item. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:00:10] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. It's just a quick request for Council staff, perhaps. I thought that was an excellent PowerPoint we just saw and I'm wondering if that could be made available in the briefing book?

Pete Hassemer [00:00:24] Robin.

Robin Ehlke [00:00:28] Yes, we are working on that. Getting it ADA compliant and all of that was a challenge initially. So, we'll work with Steve to get that posted, but it may not be immediately.

Corey Ridings [00:00:41] Understood. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:44] Thank you. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:47] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I had the same question here on the sidelines. But I was also wondering, was the presentation provided to the STT and the SAS at any point yesterday? Was there any mention of this content.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:04] I'll look back to Robin for that one.

Robin Ehlke [00:01:06] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. This agenda item was provided to both the SAS in the SST. The focus was, though, mainly on the regulatory aspects under this agenda item and not necessarily the science report.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:23] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:01:27] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, that's my understanding as well, and the West Coast Region reports have been in the briefing book and available and just noting that it's nice when we get our Science Center reports to us here at the Council, but it is equally important that we make that information available to our advisors and our technical teams. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:52] Thank you. Further questions? Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:01:56] Thanks very much Mr. Vice-Chair. I just really wanted to thank Doctor Lindley for the presentation. In the Pacific Salmon Commission Forum we've been, in our Chinook Technical Committee, been looking at the change in maturation rates over time and the differences in fecundity that we're seeing relative to the changes in the size of fish at age and felt that that was really helpful and interesting to see how broad of area geographically and the different stocks that this type of these changes are occurring, and I just wanted to thank you for providing that.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:49] Thank you. Further questions, discussion on this agenda item? And not seeing that I'll turn back to Robin, excuse me, I think that completes our reports here?

Robin Ehlke [00:03:07] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, it does.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:11] All right, thank you. That will close out Agenda Item C.1.

2. Review of 2023 Fisheries and Summary of 2024 Stock Forecasts

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our public comment and will take us to Council discussion and action. I'll wait just a few seconds. I'm assuming it's going to flash up on the screen before us. And with that I'll look for any hands to initiate the discussion, just noting we will need a motion at some point on this agenda item. So, Mr. Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:00:33] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. If memory serves, the Council doesn't need to take any formal action, but just wanted to highlight that we heard that the two Washington coho stocks that were not rebuilt have reached the rebuilt criteria. It was a lot of work for the STT and the state and tribal staff to do those three rebuilding plans after those, the Snohomish and those two stocks fell into the overfished category. So just acknowledge that work again. I wasn't sure how long it would take to dig out of the hole that came with 2015 and the collapse of a lot of coho stocks around Washington, but it's a good thing to see. We've now rebuilt those three stocks.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:16] All right. Thank you. Further discussion? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:01:21] Given Marci's question, and I guess maybe this is a question for Council staff. I'm still fairly new so it's my ignorance. I was just wondering, does the Council have a specific formal process or specific guidance to our advisory bodies and committees in regards to when a report needs to be corrected? We heard the addendum, is that the normal, the guidance protocol to create an addendum to a report or an amended report? I'm just curious typically how, recognizing that there's a lot of technical work going on. There's bound to be mistakes here and there. Just didn't know if we did have a formal process.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:08] Thank you. I'll turn to Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:02:13] Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. And thank you for the question, Miss Kiefer. My top line message is we do not have a formal process, and that's because I don't really think one is needed. From time to time there are errors, and sometimes we'll let those go. Sometimes we will make the correction and repost something to the briefing book noting in the title that it is a corrected version. And I think that would be appropriate here.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:41] Thank you. Further questions? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:02:46] Yeah, since we're in Council discussion I want to thank Executive Director Burden for that. I certainly want to acknowledge how important these documents are to our public and they serve, they serve us well. We're constantly referring inquiries to the Council's web page and to this standing repository of the preseason documents, and we certainly appreciate you maintaining them and posting them. It's quite a service. We know how important these numbers are to a number of our management activities, both in the federal arena and stateside. I appreciate the dialogue that we had with Doctor O'Farrell and that they, I mean, this error kind of precipitated itself. We knew about it last year. Caught it in some places and maybe not in others. So, I think whatever outward action we can do to make sure that the posted documents are in fact as correct as they can be certainly will serve us into the future. So, I just want to thank you for making the effort.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:58] Thank you. Any further discussion here? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:04:05] Thank you very much Vice-Chair Hassemer. I do not have a motion, but I did want to touch on some of the public comments we received. These salmon meetings have grown

increasingly difficult for the Council and the stakeholders. And I'm speaking specifically now about the Sacramento fall Chinook. We as a Council have staked out positions through correspondence to federal and state agencies about the need to protect essential fish habitat because the number of adult Chinook we see out there is directly proportional to the habitat, the quality of the habitat that the adults return to and the spawning success they have. I've yet to see any correlation between escapement and production three years hence, but that's all we can focus on, right? So that's what we focus on, escapement. But we had large classes escape and produce relatively few adults. It's not because we didn't do our job. It's because the policies that govern water deliveries have elevated certain other interests with regard to use of the water. We've had several consecutive years of large scale failures of natural production on the upper Sacramento, and that was a consequence of a depletion of the cold water pool behind Shasta, and that was a choice. That was a choice made by water managers to deliver that water rather than hold it for the salmon. So, again there's not much we can do as a Council other than write our sternly worded letters, but I do believe, and I have had a discussion with Ryan Wulff about this, that NMFS also has an obligation to follow-up our sternly worded letters with specific measures that need to be taken by these agencies. Now, NMFS doesn't have the hammer with regard to the fall Chinook as it does with the winter Chinook, which is listed, or the spring Chinook, but still there is a bully pulpit there and I think the more attention we can draw to those agencies that are making those poor decisions, the better off we'll be. I don't know, I don't think it's... there's no magic bullet here, but I do want to thank John McManus and Barry Day for their comments, because here we are fighting over scraps and hoping to have a commercial season. People with businesses, whether they be in the commercial sector or the recreational sector, are failing because the salmon aren't there and it's not because of anything that those folks did. It's there...the faults don't lie in the fishery and the faults don't lie in the Council. So anyway, I just wanted to acknowledge those public comments and encourage the National Marine Fisheries Service to do what it can to go to bat on essential fish habitat, because that's the only thing that's going to bring the Sacramento Chinook back to its former glory when it used to average an abundance, the Sacramento index of a million fish a year over a 20-year period, and now, you know we're lucky to have 200,000 fish.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:47] Thank you. Further discussion? And I'm not seeing any. John North.

John North [00:07:57] Thank you, excuse me, thank you Chair. Just to speak to Miss Yaremko's comments. I think there is some other errors in the SAFE Report Appendix Tables that just collectively if, you know, we could get that report cleaned up and reposted I'd appreciate it, because it, right now in the appendix table it indicates there was some, due to a calendar week versus STAT week issue it indicates some fish harvested in a closed period that, you know, would like to get that cleaned up for the record. So, whatever we have to do to get there but...

Pete Hassemer [00:08:36] All right, then I suspect you'll make the STT or whoever needs to know aware of that? I see Robin shaking her head. So, and while I look for other discussion just a reminder, there is one motion we need on here to adopt ABCs and OFLs for Sacramento River fall Chinook, Klamath River fall Chinook and Willapa Bay natural coho so....as part of our action here today. Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:09:14] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have a motion prepared.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:21] Go ahead when you're ready.

Kyle Adicks [00:09:22] I move that the Council adopt the 2024 stock abundance forecast, acceptable biological catches, ABCs, and annual catch limits, ACLs, as presented in Agenda Item C.2, Supplemental Attachment 3, Preseason Report 1.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:40] All right. That language appears accurate and complete. Is that correct?

Kyle Adicks [00:09:45] It does, with the exception of the spelling of my last name. It only has one D.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:50] Thanks for that correction and I will look for a second on that. Seconded by John North. Please speak to your motion.

Kyle Adicks [00:10:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And as always, thanks to the STT and all the state, tribal, and federal staff that have done an amazing amount of work since the first of the year to get through the review document and the Preseason 1 document and get those to us. We've had some good discussion about how to make some corrections to the, to the review document. It doesn't affect any of the values in the preseason document that we're adopting here to my understanding. We've had these reviewed by the SSC, had their support. This is the first step in a long process over the next month and a half, but I believe this puts us in a good place to move forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:41] All right, thank you. Any questions for the maker of the motion? No questions for... Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:10:53] I had a question for Miss Bishop if that's acceptable?

Pete Hassemer [00:10:58] Please go ahead.

Phil Anderson [00:11:01] Susan, once this motion passes does that set in motion the BSIA determinations for these values that are included in the motion?

Susan Bishop [00:11:20] Thank you Mr. Anderson. I'm not sure that I understand the question. Is the question that this, given the testimony from the advisory bodies, including the SSC, would be considered, this information would be considered based on best available science?

Phil Anderson [00:11:38] Correct. It's my... and maybe I have it wrong, but it's my understanding that NMFS needs to make a BSIA determination on the abundance forecasts that are included in this motion. Is that not true?

Susan Bishop [00:12:00] I am not aware of a formal determination that we make, but the assessment by the STT and the SSC would provide that, the basis to make that determination.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:19] Okay. Thank you. Further questions for clarification on the motion? Not seeing any, any discussion on the motion? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:12:35] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just wanted to point out a few relevant bits of information provided to us today in both the review and the Pre-1 Documents relative to the status of California stocks. What we see is a mixed bag and just want to note that for the Council that for Sacramento in 2023 the preseason and projected spawners was 165,000 returning adults. Postseason, in fact, the return was only 133,000, although we did meet the minimum spawner escapement floor of 122,000, not by much. It's just noting that Klamath Fall we did meet the minimum escapement goal there as well of 40,700 natural area adults. Exceeded that by a little bit with 41,600 returns, although they did return with considerably better than what was projected to return, so that's good news. Looking to the upper Sac, escapements to this basin were very poor across the board for fall one spring run and winter run. Regarding spring run, only about 14 hundred returns, but only about a hundred of those were to natural area tributaries in the upper Sac. We heard a bit about winter run, and there was quite a bit of material provided to us in the NMFS Report. About, only 24 hundred or so spawning adults

returning and therefore producing the lower abundance forecast that we'll be working under this year. Moving to looks at abundance. The forecast for abundance of Klamath fall adults is 180,000 Chinook. That's improved over last year, although as noted, Klamath fall remain overfished as the 3-year geometric mean is still below the MSST. Sac fall, we're looking a little better compared to last year, but still in terms of historic abundance, as Mr. Gorelnik noted earlier, we are quite low at just over 200,000 fish. It's the second lowest forecast value on record following the fishery closures of 2008 and 2009. So overall there is perhaps some reason for optimism, but it's a bit a mixed bag. There is improvement on both target stocks from last season. We do have widespread and abundant precipitation that has occurred over California this winter and continuing in the spring, so hopefully we're starting to see the benefits of that. But all in all, there's still reason for precaution. So just wanted to thank the STT for its work here and for the work that lies ahead. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:23] Thank you. Further discussion on the motion? And not seeing any I will call a question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:16:36] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:37] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. And with that I'm going to look to Robin to see if we've completed our work on this agenda item?

Robin Ehlke [00:16:59] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I believe so. We've gone through the review document and the Pre-1 document. We've adopted the stock abundance forecasts for this year, the ABCs and the ACLs. We've talked about the stock status changes that were found in the 2023 review, so we'll follow-up with NMFS on that and move forward as needed on the action necessary. So, yes, I think with that, we've completed our work under this agenda item.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:36] Okay. Thank you.

3. Klamath Dam Removal Update

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] All right, that takes us to Council discussion and I believe that Marci had... want Brett Kormos to come up, and if he could.

Brett Kormos [00:00:12] Thank you Mr. Chairman, Council members. There were a couple of questions during discussion under this item that I would like to take a... make an effort at answering. One came from Miss Bishop. She was curious about the plans to monitor and assess the stock post dam removal. Mr. Simondet's presentation suggests that there won't be any monitoring on the main stem of the Klamath River through the reservoir reach and up to the state line. That's not, in fact, the truth. CDFW has been engaging in a significant amount of effort to coordinate among basin partners to ensure that the data, the requisite data for managing Council area fisheries, assessing the success of the restoration project, et cetera, is going to be obtained. And so, I just want to make clear that CDFW is under the understanding that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be contracting the Karuk Tribe to do a carcass survey for adults on the main stem Klamath River up to the state line. I can't speak for Oregon and what their plans are. I know that they're facing some significant challenges around funding to do the requisite monitoring in their particular part of the watershed, but California will have all of the bases covered, so to speak, when it comes to obtaining the requisite data that we've grown accustomed to and need to have in order to manage the Klamath River fall Chinook. That includes the tributaries in the reservoir reach and elsewhere. There are some tributaries where monitoring isn't currently planned, but those are not places where we expect to see meaningful returns, at least not in the near term. So, coverage is good in California in that regard, and I'm not sure where the confusion on that might be coming from, but that's the state of affairs as I understand it. And then Miss Evenson asked some questions about the hatchery program, and you might have to help me through that Dani. But I think one of your questions was about the smolt release and the idea that we might be marking but not tagging the fish? That's not the case either. Those fish will be marked and tagged at a rate of 25 percent consistent with our Constant Fractional Marking Program goals in all of the hatcheries of the state. There are fry being released. Those fish are part of our agreement with some of the signatories to the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement, and so the intent there, because this Fall Creek Hatchery is a very small facility, state of the art but small, and there is a great deal of consternation or concern about the reduction in overall production when you transition from Iron Gate to Fall Creek. The department agreed to, to the extent practicable, release fry as well early on in the rearing cycle. And that is required for us to do in order to make space for the smolts, and the yearlings, and the coho that ultimately will come behind them. So, I've taken a shot at covering the bases you asked to be covered, but please remind me if I missed something.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:56] Dani.

Dani Evenson [00:03:58] Thank you Mr. Chair. And thank you Brett for those responses. I was asking specifically about the fry releases and whether they're a taggable size? As I recall, and we don't... the slides are not posted so it's hard for me to go back and, and see the list, but I want to say there was 1.75 million fry released, being released and they weren't being tagged or marked, and I'm wondering how those will be evaluated or a small fraction that are going to be marked, how those will be evaluated recognizing that they probably have a different experience in the river and in the ocean than the larger sized fish being released.

Brett Kormos [00:04:51] Yeah, thank... thank you for the question Miss Evenson. So, yes, those fish are too small to mark or coded wire tag. However, CDFW has identified funding to collect tissues from the parental broodstock, and we will at least have the baseline information in order to employ PBT, Parental-Based Tagging, to assess the performance of those releases at least on the freshwater side. The

state of California is moving forward with a number of fry release strategies in a number of our hatcheries in the state and the funding has yet to catch up with the intent at this point in time, in particular, I think in the ocean fishery, although I'm not I'm not particularly qualified to speak about that now that I'm not in the marine region anymore. But, yes, we will have the requisite information and we'll at least be able to tell you how those fish performed in terms of hatchery returns and probably also in natural area returns.

Dani Evenson [00:06:00] Thank you for that. Very helpful.

Brett Kormos [00:06:02] You're welcome.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:03] Okay. Further questions for Brett? Susan Bishop.

Susan Bishop [00:06:12] Thank you Mr. Chair. Hello Mr. Kormos. I just had a question about... you said that the funding hadn't quite caught up with the intent or the need. What do you envision sort of that gap being between the ability to collect the samples and analyze them and the release of the fish? Were you able to collect PBT samples from the parental brood of the fish the will be going out later this spring?

Brett Kormos [00:06:43] Thank you for the question, Miss Bishop. Unfortunately, for this particular brood the tissues were not collected from the parental broodstock, however, they will be collected from henceforth, so those particular releases will be impossible to assess. Going forward we, like I said, we will be doing that and we'll have at least the foundation established in order to do that. When you ask about the gap, I assume you're talking about funding in particular, and the state is actively engaged in assessing what that ultimately is going to be. And it's, as you very well know, it's a problem that goes beyond the upper Klamath River. And so, we're in the process of developing those budgets and identifying funds. How successful we will be I cannot say, but being that I'm responsible for the monitoring and assessment on the Klamath and Trinity rivers, I can tell you that I will be making every effort to at least collect the tissues from the returning adults, even if we don't have the funds identified immediately to do the stock assessment that goes along with that so to process the tissues and start to look at, you know, those returns and understand which broods and which releases actually those fish belong to. So having those tissues in hand is a big deal in bridging the gap. And then identifying the funds to process those tissues and do the assessment is the second part.

Susan Bishop [00:08:30] Just one follow-up. So you, and you may not be the person to answer this because you were clear about the distinction of your responsibilities in the basin versus, say, the marine areas, but it sounds like there may be a clear plan going forward to sample in the freshwater areas, but that the plan to do a similar genetic sampling or PBT sampling in the ocean fishery may not be in place, and so if I understand the situation, we've transitioned some of the production from fish that would have been coded wire tagged in the hatchery to releases that will be PBT sampled but not coded wire tagged. So, there will be fewer tags released and the sampling in the ocean is primarily at least currently set up for coded wire tagging but may or may not be transitioned to PBT. Do I have that correct or I'm just curious if there's maybe a gap in the ocean section?

Brett Kormos [00:09:35] Thank you for the question, Miss Bishop. You're right, I'm not the right person to ask about the ocean side of this issue, but yes, on the freshwater side, that's, you know, those are the plans that are being made now, that's the intent. It's a bit of a mischaracterization to suggest that we've transitioned releases that would have otherwise been smolts to fry. I could agree with that characterization if we were talking about Iron Gate Hatchery and its persistence into the future, but that facility is gone now. So, this new program and the release strategies that are being employed are somewhat standalone or unique. Regarding the number of tags that are going to be released, that's

another funding issue. CDFW would very much like to mark and tag all of the smolts and yearlings that we release from the Chinook Program at Fall Creek Hatchery, and that's something that we're also looking into in terms of identifying future funds to facilitate that. But, not surprisingly, the dam removal project has required so much energy and effort to sort of cross this milestone of just getting the dams out of place, there's some catching up to do in my personal opinion, when it comes to how we plan to assess and monitor the fisheries going forward as a result of the changes in the hatchery program specifically. So full transparency there, but that's the state of affairs.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:19] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:11:22] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Just to build on Brett's remarks and perhaps answer some of the questions about the plans for monitoring in ocean fisheries. Last month the governor released a California Salmon Strategy, which describes 6 priorities and 71 different actions to build healthier, thriving salmon populations in California. And included in the detail of that strategy does include plans for enhanced monitoring of ocean fisheries. That would be in addition to the current monitoring work that we've undertaken for many years on coded wire tags. Our program has helped build that budget and those plans. We have two monitoring programs that we would propose would be augmented with additional resources to be able to collect tissue samples. We have monitoring programs in place that successfully at this time collect coded wire tags, and we'd just propose that in addition to tag collections that tissues would be another piece of information collected dockside. Most of you know we have a very comprehensive commercial monitoring program in coordination with Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission in California, where we've done very well to monitor and collect coded wire tags from approximately 20 percent of the commercial harvest across time and space, which is a pretty substantial undertaking in the state of California, and given the number of ports and the amount of geography. Perhaps even more challenging is our monitoring program that we undertake for recreational fisheries across California, the California Recreational Fishery Survey, which is a comprehensive krill census covering many fishing modes, many launch sites, shore-based angling, charter boat operations, et cetera. So, we've done our best over the past several months to build a very detailed description of what additional financial resources would be necessary to add in a tissue collection element to these monitoring programs, but we have certainly provided that and it is included generally speaking in the strategy, so I encourage you to have a look. And more details, more specifics are available in other documents, but that is a concerted effort that's been undertaken by the department's fisheries branch and hatchery operations over the past, I'd say six months. So, thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:29] Thank you Marci. Susan.

Susan Bishop [00:14:34] Just a follow-up for Miss Yaremko. Do you have a sense of the timeframe on that? So, the answer is very helpful and it sounds like you're working towards a plan to collect PBT samples from the Ocean Fisheries Project, but do you have a sense of when that may be put in place?

Marci Yaremko [00:14:57] I think I would respond very similarly to how Mr. Kormos responded to that. I'm not aware of funds having being added to my budget to do this just yet. It has been very clearly identified as a priority need and I think I can say with some confidence that we're not going to be able to implement a collection program, you know, with the snap of our fingers. It will be, you know, it will take some time. All I can really tell you is that, you know, it has been identified as a clear need and a clear priority. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:42] Okay. Thank you, Susan. Anyone else? All right, thanks Brett. With that, Robin, how are we doing on this agenda item?

Robin Ehlke [00:15:57] Thank you Mr. Chair. For this agenda item we've had a really good discussion

and a presentation regarding the Klamath Dam removal update, so I think we have completed all our work under this agenda item. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:11] Okay. Thank you Robin.

4. Klamath River Fall Chinook Workgroup Report and 2024 Management Options – Final Guidance

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] All right. And so, we are on C.4 from yesterday and so I'll turn to Robin to just refresh us on our duty this morning.

Robin Ehlke [00:00:11] Thank you Mr. Chair. This is Agenda Item C.4. Yesterday we went through the Workgroup reports. We've heard from the management entities and advisory bodies and provided the opportunity for public comment. Today we're asking the Council to wrap up this agenda item by having their discussion on everything they heard yesterday and potentially take final action on this, which would be to adopt management options for the 2024 fisheries relative to the Klamath River fall Chinook.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:49] Okay, with that I'll open the floor for Council discussion, action. However, you want to do it so, Marci Yaremko?

Marci Yaremko [00:01:04] I'm ready with a motion if that's the pleasure. But I also, you suggested discussion first, but I'll save my discussion for the motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:14] Okay, well, I'll look around and see if I can see a hand. And John North. John.

John North [00:01:24] Thank you Chair. Just some observations. But yesterday listened to the reports and testimony on this subject and I thought there were many good points brought up, but I do still feel like the system is going to be really dynamic for quite some time and therefore I'd prefer to like take this a year at a time and post-dam removal and see how things go. So, I'd also like to hear from the Yurok Tribe. So, trying to balance, you know, the testimony of Mr. Orcutt yesterday and the input and findings of the Workgroup. I'm kind of in the area of being supportive of like a 10 percent buffer on the maximum Klamath exploitation rate just for this year and then revisit it next year would be kind of where I'm at. Hopefully, then we'd have some additional information to work from and take it a year at a time.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:33] Thank you John. Anyone else? Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:43] Thanks Mr. Chair. Just another observation, and I'm on this one following up on something in the SSC report where they recommended the KRWG explore alternative methods of estimating capacity and because of opening new habitat and there was some discussion around that and maybe this is just to highlight, possibly everybody knows it, but I would point to some of the NMFS office, the Science Centers to lend a big hand there. In a past life I was part of, assigned to a technical recovery team for the Columbia Basin that NMFS put together, and we did that intrinsic potential habitat for the entire Columbia Basin. It's easy for me to say it's simple because somebody else did it, but with the GIS capabilities they had, and there's documentation of the process that was used to just take some stream width, stream gradient, habitat parameters or filters, put it into a GIS model and look at some densities of spawners and come up with that. So, there were questions. I had a chance to talk with Brett Kormos a little bit about that. That's been done a lot and the process is out there so I just suggest that look in that direction for what's been done in other areas and move forward with it.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:20] Okay, thank you Pete. Anyone else? Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman [00:04:20] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Just following a little bit along the lines of what

John North mentioned a moment ago. So yesterday we did get the written report from Hoopa Valley. We did not receive a report or verbal report from the Yurok. I've been trying to see where they might be at on... on this and conversations are still kind of to be had on that to kind of further understand what they may support. So that said, I thought it might be useful to have the Council consider, you know, what we did receive yesterday from Hoopa Valley. They laid out a view that they would support, kind of the status quo or the existing harvest control rule. That they do recognize that there are some uncertainties, you know, involved with all that's going on within the Klamath system, the different changes, opening up new habitat, the changes in hatchery production from one facility to the new one. And they are interested in making sure that as populations recolonize these upper areas that, you know, harvest, you know, allows for that. My takeaway from their report is that even at really low abundance levels they see a need, and rightfully so, to be able to harvest some fish, and so it's important, I think, to allow, you know, one or both tribes to be able to go, you know, go after what few fish that might be available at these low abundances. You know, lacking that opportunity, you know, having no fisheries means one is, you know, that they're not able to get even what little fish for food. They won't be able to maintain, you know, their cultural connections with the river and the fish, and their, you know, overall health and well-being, you know, kind of mirrors, you know, the resource, you know, the resource low abundance, you know, their health and well-being also is affected in the same manner. So that's really something that's important to me as I'm kind of thinking about and weighing, you know, how to move forward with this. I respect the kind of exchange I had with Mr. Kormos yesterday on, you know, what they laid out in their report and the recognition that, you know tribes, you know, they may choose to do something different, and I thought that there was an acknowledgment that maybe something like that could happen in this matter. So, kind of how we go about that? I'm still unclear as to, you know, what might be a path forward that might be able to achieve that where we still get conservation, added conservation at the low end, and ensuring that at the high end of the control rule that provides for, you know, additional fish to the spawning grounds. What I have heard from Yurok is that regarding their participation in the Workgroup they seem to be inclined on, you know, maybe allowing, you know, additional fish at the low end where you might restrict harvest, if not allow harvest to occur at certain levels. And they are supportive of trying to make sure that fish can make it up to the upper areas to spawn. So, I think with that, that's I guess some comment that I would like to lay out for the Council's consideration. I recognize that CDF and W, you know, has a motion ready and so I want to, so you know, as this thing moves forward that if there's some way to enable tribes to have some really minimal harvest at the low end consistent with the FMEP, I think that would be a good place to get to. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:44] Thank you Joe. Okay. And Susan Bishop.

Susan Bishop [00:09:58] Thank you Mr. Chair. I would just make the observation yesterday that we also had some discussion about kind of the importance of the trade-offs so the desire for the additional conservation, but also the recognition that that has impacts on the fisheries. And so, wanting to know what is the benefit to conservation and for example, the additional number of fish into the river versus what is the impact on the fisheries? I admit I asked several questions yesterday trying to focus on what does this mean for 2024 since that's the year directly in front of us, but I felt like I didn't necessarily, I don't have all the information at hand. So I very much appreciated the Workgroup's presentation, and CDF and W's presentation about the different control rules and generally what that would mean in sort of qualitative graphics of what it would mean from one control rule to the next alternative, but I don't really feel like I got the information that might be helpful in what that specifically would mean between, say, the alternatives that are being... we might discuss today on the floor between, say, the strict plain vanilla, so to speak, application of de minimis and the proposal from CDF and W as an example. So having a little bit more information on specifically what that would mean and concrete trade-offs and maybe what that would mean for additional fish or not available to the tribe would be helpful to me. I know we're trying to close this agenda item out. There may be other ways to explore getting that

information.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:35] Thank you Susan. Okay. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:11:43] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I did want to respond to Miss Bishop's comment. I'm going to try to do so in a way that doesn't get out in front of you all, but there are a few ways that I think we could go about this. So, one is to close this out with one option, with one set of guidance regarding Klamath harvest options. The other is to say we're not ready to do one and try to wrap this into C.5 and C.6. And so, I don't know if this is what you're thinking about Susan, but I think there is a process where we can say, 'do you want more information'? We can start to roll this into some of the more traditional salmon season iteration that we go through. The other is to say 'let's decide here and now' and then set this aside and move forward, move forward in our traditional manner. So, I feel like I'm jumbling my words here, but I feel like we can roll... if there's more than one thing that you want to see we can roll that into C.6 I believe.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:49] Thank you Merrick. Some clarity maybe from Marci?

Marci Yaremko [00:12:51] On that point, no. I don't understand how that would work. I believe that we need to set or determine the allowable escapement, or sorry exploitation rate, which may be lower than what the HCR currently prescribes, which is 25 percent. We have the ability to apply a precautionary buffer, which is what I would propose we do in the face of uncertainty and in the face of a radically changing river environment. I would, in light of Mr. North's comments, propose that this buffer be applicable for one year. What we are talking about is a one year decision to be used in management for the 2024 cycle and not beyond. We'll be back at this discussion next year. That proposal is wholly in line with our ability, in any case, to apply precaution to what might be authorized under existing Harvest Control Rule. I realize there's a lot of uncertainty. We keep hearing talk about de minimis fisheries and about the HCR itself, but what I'd be talking about is proposing a precautionary buffer. It would not change the... it would not alter the HCR in any way. We're not able to do that here and now. That would require a plan amendment based on the discussions that we've had with NMFS on the sidelines. But I think in the face of the events with dam removal, precaution is warranted, and we've heard an awful lot about the changing circumstances and the uncertainties involved and this Council has a strong tradition and history of considering circumstances and states of nature. And when we need to give the fish a little help, we take the action to do so. So, in terms of making a decision on this later in a future agenda item, I think, defeats the purpose. I understood that from the Situation Summary that we need to make a decision now if we are intending to direct the STT to model to a different allowable exploitation rate on adult Klamath fish, so that would be my intention here and now. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:38] Thank you Marci. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:15:38] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to kind of reiterate what we heard from Mr. North. I'm coming from a perspective of how I would be kind of screening any particular option, and really my focus, as we've heard from Mr. North and Marci is I do agree. I think our focus should be 2024. And the fact that my focus will be because we already have a projected popu... you know we're already projected in '24 to be in that low category, so I am not going to be quite so interested in what exploitation rate looks like at the high end because that's not going to be applicable in '24. And so just to kind of articulate where I'm going to be focused relative to an option, I just wanted to state that.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:33] Thank you Sharon. Anyone else? Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman [00:16:40] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. So, as we've been having this additional discussion I have received some word from both the Yurok and Hoopa Valley that they would support status quo for 2024. I just want to update the table on that.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:00] Thank you Joe. All right. Susan Bishop.

Susan Bishop [00:17:05] Thank you Mr. Chair. Responding to Merrick's suggestion and the good points that Marci and others have made around the table, I do recall, and not wanting to put more process on this, I do recall several years ago we had a situation with regard to Sacramento fall Chinook where there was admittedly from NMFS some rather vague language with regard to the spawner objective. I think we gave the Council guidance that they should adopt an exploit, or a escapement goal target somewhere around the upper range. And the Council provided guidance to look at what the different alternatives or different fishing regime alternatives would look like at 150, 170 and 180, figuring that that sort of captured what that would meet that intent. So, one option, and I haven't given this a lot of thought, but maybe to save some time and combine it with the fact we're going to be giving guidance to the STT for a model run today, would be to look at the outcome of the alternatives that we adopt today against the status quo, the CDF and W alternative, and with the proposal from Oregon, which are rather close. That should give us the ability to look at what the actual impacts of those different alternatives are. It's just an option. I, you know, all of the things that are being proposed at the table would meet NMFS's guidance, so I'm not trying to meddle here. It's just a suggestion for a way forward and to provide us some additional information that at least, I think, might be helpful.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:53] Okay. Thank you Susan. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:19:02] I'm trying to understand this dialogue here and I'm still learning a lot about salmon, but it strikes me that we're talking about, we have a motion that's coming and that would result in a few options. And there's a discussion that may turn to a place where we would have more options than that. And this gets me to a point where I start to wonder if Michael O'Farrell might come to the table and tell us what is possible from the STT's perspective and if that would help the Council to consider what... what's being debated here.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:39] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:19:39] Just to clarify, the motion does not include multiple options. The motion would provide direction to the STT to model to a lower exploitation rate than what is allowed per the NMFS guidance and per the Harvest Control Rule. The allowable exploitation rate for 2024 fisheries as defined by the HCR is 25 percent. My motion, if we get to it, would propose that we reduce that allowable exploitation rate down to 20 percent. In other words, providing a precautionary buffer this year only to what the maximum is that would be allowed under the existing FMP framework. I understand there is a lot of confusion created unfortunately by the way the alternatives in the Workgroup report were characterized. We are not able to amend the Harvest Control Rule itself as part of this action here today. We are limited to considering buffers on what the allowable exploitation rate is here and now today. So yes, we are in a situation where we are in a de minimis fishery context in 2024. We are at the lower end of the curve. We're not at the lowest end. The 25 percent allowable exploitation rate is in fact higher than some. I mean, you can go further lower on the curve and in no way would this motion intend to change that or presuppose or predecide what allowable exploitation would buffer might be considered for future years. But the HCR is a part of the FMP and it determines each year what our allowable exploitation is based on the forecast abundance. So, yeah, we're at the lower end, we're not at the lowest end, but in no way would what I'm proposing affect future decision-making, just to be clear. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:04] Okay. Thank you Marci. All right, Mike, did you have anything to add to this?

Michael O'Farrell [00:22:21] Thank you Mr. Chair. I don't have much to add to it. I guess, I think, I was called up here to address whether we could do something like this where there's different allowable exploitation rates for Klamath fall Chinook that are consistent with some of what's been discussed here. It's hard to...yeah... it's, I think it could result in quite a bit more work on the STT's part, and that we would have a suite of ocean alternatives that would be reflective of a 20 percent ER, one that might be reflective of a 25 percent ER, and one something else, I don't know, whatever the Council asks for. I think that that would have to be the case because of the way we partition tribal and non-tribal harvest within the KOHM to achieve 50/50 sharing. I would like to talk to other members of the STT about this to make sure that I'm thinking about this correctly, but that's my initial thought at this point.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:49] Okay, thank you. Okay. Okay. All right. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:00] With that, I'd propose a motion for the Council's consideration. Oh, not the talking points, just the motion please. Thank you. Just at the very top. Thank you. Okay. I move the Council adopt a 20 percent precautionary buffer on the 2024 allowable exploitation rate for Klamath fall Chinook. Applying this buffer has the effect of reducing the maximum allowable exploitation rate of 25 percent specified in the 2024 NMFS Guidance Letter, Agenda Item C.5.b, Supplemental NMFS Report 1, March 2024, down to a maximum allowable of 20 percent, which would be used for preseason development of management alternatives for 2024. Approve the Draft Klamath River fall Chinook Ad Hoc Workgroup Terms Of Reference as final.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:15] Okay Marci. The language is accurate?

Marci Yaremko [00:01:18] Yes, it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:18] Okay. I'm looking for a second? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Thank you Marc. Please speak to your motion Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:01:23] Sure, thank you. As I mentioned earlier, the intent of this motion is to buffer against uncertainty in the face of a dramatically changing river environment. A 20 percent reduction in the allowable exploitation rate for 2024 would fall between Workgroup report Option 2a, which is the 10 percent reduction, and Workgroup report Option 2b, which is a 25 percent reduction. So, the buffer that would be implemented by this motion is within that range of options put forward to us for consideration today. Again, this is not changing the Harvest Control Rule, this is only applying a precautionary buffer to the max allowable exploitation that comes out of the Harvest Control Rule in the FMP. The Klamath fall run stock has been overfished since 2018. Adding to that, we learned yesterday from the Workgroup's updated stock recruit analysis that the stock has experienced a significant decline in productivity over the last 20 years compared to the last stock recruit analysis that was done in 2005, or in 2005. As one astute Council member described it to me this morning, 'we have to provide more fish to stay the same'. Now, during the preseason planning process, it is a critical time to ensure that we provide added conservation benefit and protections for the stock as it is responding to rapidly changing environmental conditions in response to removal of Klamath River dams. Last month, the California Fish and Game Commission adopted new freshwater fishing regulations in the newly available habitat in the upper reaches, which will restrict or prohibit fishing in the upper reaches near term. One of the major goals of the Lower Klamath Project is to restore anadromous fish to the Klamath River basin upstream of the current Iron Gate Dam, and to allow volitional access to over 400 river miles of habitat upstream in California and Oregon. Adding more spawners to the system by reducing the allowable exploitation rate will serve to contribute and to hasten increased abundance of future

Klamath fall Chinook salmon populations. It will also aid repopulation and recovery by adding spawners to both old and newly created habitat. Although we'll be taking up the NMFS Guidance Letter in the next agenda item today, I think it's important that the Council reflect on and consider the recommendations that NMFS makes to us regarding the allowable exploitation rate on the stock. Due to the low abundance forecast in 2024, fisheries are managed under the de minimis portion of the Harvest Control Rule, which allows for some fishing opportunity, and in year '24 that amount is up to 25 percent exploitation. Yes, we are at low abundance, but enough that the HCR allows exploitation, and the intent of the motion is to acknowledge that. We aren't proposing to eliminate exploitation or bring exploitation to zero. As the guidance letter describes, the Council may recommend lower exploitation rates as needed to address uncertainties or other year specific circumstances. We're in those circumstances right now this year. The FMP requires the Council to consider a number of factors in setting an allowable de minimis exploitation rate, which are also outlined in the guidance letter. The poor stock status, the pattern of low escapements, the higher than anticipated exploitation rates in recent years, an extended period of poor environmental conditions, and the low 2024 forecasts are cause for significant concern in 2024, and that's dam removal aside. So, in addition to the factors just described, the overfished status, a new and more pessimistic view of stock productivity, and the outlook for the stock in '24, the guidance reiterates that a precautionary approach is warranted and underscores the need to carefully consider the factors described in the FMP in setting the exploitation rate, including consideration of the alternatives recommended by the Workgroup. I want to make sure we don't lose an important point that came out of yesterday's discussion about the Workgroup's future work. Although we expect their next steps may focus on content beyond exploitation rates or Harvest Control Rule reductions, the eight alternatives may serve as a menu of sorts for consideration in the future. It's also wholly possible that in response to the changing circumstances over the next year or over the interim period where repopulation of new habitat is occurring, additional buffers or harvest control alternatives might need to be developed and considered. The decision on a reduction to the allowable exploitation rate for 2024 is something we can and will evaluate again next year and beyond, allowing us to consider new information on changing conditions as it becomes available. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:02] Okay. Thank you Marci. Questions for the motion maker or discussion on the motion? Oh, Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:07:18] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you, Marci, for this motion. My question relates to what we heard earlier in the day about the tribes' preference for status quo. And I'm wondering how what you are suggesting and proposing will be able to provide for the tribes? Thank you.

Marci Yaremko [00:07:45] Thank you Corey for the question. So, the allowable exploitation rate on adult Klamath River fall Chinook does apply to ocean and inriver fisheries. The Harvest Control Rule as currently defined allows harvest, even at low abundance, acknowledging that there are harvest, there are harvest needs that should be accounted for. Nothing in this motion changes that. Certainly, as Brett acknowledged yesterday, tribes are sovereign nations and have their own ability to decide for themselves what harvest is appropriate, given their knowledge and understanding of the circumstances. That said, I think, you know, this Council has a strong history of acknowledging when there is a need for additional precaution beyond what a Harvest Control Rule might suggest is a maximum allowable. So, in terms of tribal opportunities, I do not, you know, I mean, they've expressed a desire to continue to harvest and nothing in this motion would preclude them from doing so. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:28] Thank you Corey. Anyone else? Susan Bishop.

Susan Bishop [00:09:33] Thank you Mr. Chair. I would like to follow-up on that just very quickly. I heard clearly what California is saying about the support for the tribal harvest, but I am a little bit concerned in terms of the mechanics of how we generally implement these, the exploitation rate on

Klamath, and that is that, you know, by law, the harvestable surplus is split in half between the tribes and the state, and so I guess it would help to have a little clarity if you have a lower exploitation rate, it seems like that would lower the level of harvest available and so it would have some impact on both the tribal and the non-tribal fishery. Again, I don't have the information in front of me with regard to the different alternatives that have been discussed around the table this morning, but it seems like it might have some impact, even if it's a very small impact. So, I don't want to, I didn't want to let that go by exactly... I understand the broader statement that California has made, but I didn't want to let the mechanics, which can be important in terms of what the folks here and in the public are seeing as the model output.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:46] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:10:49] Thanks Mr. Chair. I guess just to respond to that. I certainly acknowledge the point that on paper it would appear some amount of reduction would likely appear in terms of the 50/50 sharing in the allocations that occur flowing from the allowable exploitation rate decision. I guess I'd just acknowledge that, you know again, that the tribes are able to make their own decisions in light of what comes out in the final Pre-3 analysis. We've seen tribal harvests occur both below and above those projected harvest amounts. So, you know, again the tribal sovereign nations are, you know, they hold themselves to their own standards based on their understanding of stock status and what their needs are, and I don't intend to provide any influence on that their determinations looking forward. So, I understand the paper exercise, but what happens in practice is often very different.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:19] Thank you Marci. Okay. John North.

John North [00:12:25] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just given the input from Joe's report from the Hoopa and Yurok tribes and for maintaining status quo on the allowable maximum exploitation rate, and then California's motion to apply the 20 percent buffer for precautionary purposes, and then Oregon's position as I previously stated, I wonder if there isn't like room for a compromise. Maybe at a 15 percent buffer for 2024 only? I think that would result in a 21.25 ER, and we'll just set it for this year and... and move on.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:17] Okay. Is that an amendment to that motion?

John North [00:13:22] Well, I do...

Brad Pettinger [00:13:24] You're floating it.

John North [00:13:25] I'm a little new at this but I have an amendment available if needed and I...

Brad Pettinger [00:13:32] Okay. Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman [00:13:38] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. And thanks for that suggestion, John. I think from my perspective, where the two respective tribes are... is they fully support status quo, and so I'm not too sure that moving from a 20 to 15 addresses their need. So maybe that might not be necessary. So, I think relative to the motion, I appreciate, you know, the comments and questions that Susan and Corey provided in responses, and the responses Marci provided in return. So, it's my perspective that, you know, should this motion pass that the two tribes will likely approach, you know, the 2024 season setting and planning their fisheries as they may. So, with that, I probably would not be supportive of the motion. I think it's fair to say that the tribes certainly support the needs of the fish. They will make decisions that are in the best interests of the fish because when they make decisions that are in the best interests of the fish, they're making decisions in the best interests of themselves and their needs. And

so, I would respectfully vote no on the motion. So, thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:36] Thank you Joe. Okay. Well, without seeing any other hands I'm going to call for the question. Oh, I'm going to call for the question unless... just to clarify, John, your... do you have something to, a substitute motion or something to put forward here before I move forward?

John North [00:16:12] Thank you Chair. I think I would like to propose an amendment to the motion or...

Brad Pettinger [00:16:20] Are you going to change this Harvest Control Rule?

John North [00:16:37] No, simply as presented on the screen, I would just propose a slight modification to the motion from California that would modify the buffer percentage from 20 percent to 15 percent.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:56] Okay. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:17:03] Thanks Mr. Chairman. Just as a question of procedure here. Mr. Oliver, it strikes me that this fundamentally would change the motion and I'm wondering if it's best done as a substitute or as an amendment?

Chris Oliver [00:17:13] Well, a substitute motion is an amendment in itself. I think it's maybe six of one, half a dozen of another here.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:26] Okay. John, however, you want to... I'm with you.

John North [00:17:38] Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm not quite sure what I'm supposed to do right now. It sounds like I could either resubmit it as a alternative motion or...

Brad Pettinger [00:17:49] I move to amend the motion.

John North [00:17:55] Oh, thank you Mr. Chair. So, I move to amend the motion submitted by California to modify the buffer percentage for the Klamath River fall Chinook for the calendar year 2024 to apply a buffer percentage on the maximum allowable exploitation rate of 15 percent.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:24] Okay. Is that language on the screen accurate?

John North [00:18:29] Yes, it is. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:30] I'm looking for a second. Seconded by Christa Svensson. Thank you Christa. Please speak to your motion, or amendment John.

John North [00:18:40] Thank you Mr. Chair. I think this has been a good discussion. I just... I feel like some additional information moving forward will be beneficial, and for this year I think a 15 percent is somewhere in the ballpark where we'll provide possibly some benefit and then we can revisit it. I do appreciate California's position but I also appreciate the tribes' position and my own thoughts were a little less than where California was, so I just thought this was a reasonable compromise.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:28] Okay. Thank you John. Discussion on the amendment? Okay, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

John North [00:19:42] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:43] Opposed?

Phil Anderson [00:19:49] No.

Marci Yaremko [00:19:50] No.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:51] Abstentions?

Susan Bishop [00:19:51] Abstain.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:55] Abstention's from National Marine Fisheries Service. Thank you Susan. Okay, the amendment fails. All right. Okay, we're back to the original motion on the floor. And so further discussion? I'm not seeing any so I will call for the question. All those in favor of the amendment signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:20:14] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:16] Opposed? Abstentions?

Susan Bishop [00:20:19] NMFS Abstains.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:22] Thank you Susan. All right, the motion passes. Joe.

Joe Oatman [00:20:26] I voted no.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:27] Oh I'm sorry.

Joe Oatman [00:20:28] I just wanted to correct that for the record. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:29] Very good. All right, the motion passes. So, with that, okay. Robin, how are we doing?

Robin Ehlke [00:20:43] Thank you Mr. Chair. For this agenda item the Council has adopted a buffer for the allowable exploitation rate. The buffer is 20 percent, which means the STT will work through the week using a allowable exploitation rate of 20 percent as we move through developing the alternatives for the week, so that will help them have clarity on how they should model. So, with all of that said, you have also, I'll note that in the first motion the Terms Of Reference will be adopted as final. The Workgroup did not have any edits to that so that's just a administrative checkpoint, if you will. So, we got that done too. So, with that you've done your work under this agenda item. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:37] Okay. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:21:40] I'm sorry. There's a third item that I did not cover in any of my talking points pertaining to direction to the Workgroup on future work, so I just wanted to take the opportunity to touch on that. I know some other comments have been made around the room, but didn't include it in my discussion on the motion, kind of off topic for that. But just want to send the note to the Workgroup to continue the good work they've been doing. Appreciate the suggestions that we heard from the SSC that the Workgroup should explore alternative methods of estimating capacity in the newly available habitat upstream of the dams, which could lead to interim methods to develop

escapement targets for the near or medium term. Want to also acknowledge the Workgroup summary slide on future work. At the end of their presentation yesterday that they could continue work on stock recruit analyses and examine changes to the conservation objective and or the Harvest Control Rule as part of a future FMP amendment process that was something that they've been thinking about. And also considering other forecast tools, management frameworks or management objectives that might be possible. We had some conversation about habitat indicators and forecasting, and I just encourage the group to evaluate what might be possible there. It sounds like they were open to exploring that and that nothing was really off the table at this point. I want to acknowledge the SSC's comments commending the group for its work to revisit older work with contemporary data. That's really exciting and we'll look forward to learning whether some or some of the other earlier management measures for Klamath fall Chinook, such as for example, the Klamath Control Zone might be relooked at as well. So again, just want to support the continued work of the group and appreciate what they've given us to date. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:24:00] Okay. Thank you Marci. Robin.

Robin Ehlke [00:24:05] Thank you Mr. Chair. I did just want to add that just for food for thought as we work through this week and before we get to workload planning, the next time the Workgroup is scheduled to be in front of you, I want to say is November and so you may want to hear from them again. I mean they have a lot of work to do and I'm sure they'll be busy, but just think about that. And then the other thing that came up through the discussions was this idea, you know, that the Workgroup is limiting their work for the most part to remain within the realms of the FMP and to, and well, I guess, what I wanted to say is if the Council thinks it's best, or at least to, you know, think about this a little bit more because at the long term that this, these interim measures might be in place, that maybe it is something to consider in the sense of amending the FMP even with these interim measures if indeed these measures are going to be something that are going to be in place for, you know, ten years or so. I just wanted to put that bug in your ear, if you will. There is a lot to think about. We have a lot of work to do, but those were just a couple of things that the Council may just want to keep in mind as we continue with the work on this. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:29] Thank you Robin. I just... anything else before I close C.4 out? All right.

5. Identify Management Objectives and Preliminary Definition of 2024 Management Alternatives

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] We'll go to our salmon suite. All right. Sorry about that Joe. I just....when you're behind you want to catch up so... all righty... anyway, Joe, please.

Joe Oatman [00:00:15] Thank you Mr. Chair. I think we do have a motion for the treaty troll. And maybe I'll wait a second until that pops up on the screen?

Brad Pettinger [00:00:26] Please, yeah.

Joe Oatman [00:00:28] Okay, thank you. So, I move the Council adopt for STT analysis the following initial treaty troll salmon management measures. For Alternative 1: 45,000 Chinook and 47,500 coho. For Alternative 2: 40,000 Chinook and 37,500 coho. And Alternative 3: 35,000 Chinook and 27,500 coho. The alternatives consist of a May 1 to June 30 Chinook directed fishery and an all species fishery starting on July 1 until end of the season, that to be determined. Treaty troll tribes are engaging in discussions on this and attempting to reach agreement. The Chinook quota should be evenly split between the two time periods.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:33] Okay. Thank you Joe. Is the language on the screen accurate?

Joe Oatman [00:01:37] It is Mr. Chair.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:38] Okay. Looking for a second? Seconded by Kyle Adicks. Thank you Kyle. Please speak to your motion Joe.

Joe Oatman [00:01:45] Thank you. So, the 2024 projected abundance of salmon coho stocks and their corresponding management objectives determine how much fish can be available for the tribal treaty troll fisheries, among other fisheries. This is a challenging process to figure out the initial Chinook and coho management measures to propose for this fishery. It involved discussions in the north of Falcon process between the tribes as well as with WDFW that requires careful consideration. And I thank the Council for accommodating this additional time to allow these discussions to occur today. So as a result of these discussions and on behalf of the treaty tribes, I provide these initial alternatives for STT analysis.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:37] Thank you Joe. Questions for Joe or discussion on the motion? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:02:44] Thank you Mr. Chairman. So, Joe, just for clarity, when you say treaty troll tribes are engaging in discussions on this and attempting to reach agreement, are you referencing what the date would be for the end of the season? The TBD?

Joe Oatman [00:03:02] Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you Miss Kiefer. Yes, that refers to the end of season date and the discussions that are ongoing to determine that.

Sharon Kiefer [00:03:11] Thank you for the clarification.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:13] Thank you Sharon. Okay, anyone else? I'm not seeing any hands so I'll call for the motion. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:03:23] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:23] Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. All right. Robin, how are we doing here?

Robin Ehlke [00:03:50] Thank you Mr. Chair. I think we still need our non-treaty motions.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:54] Okay, make sure. Kyle.

Kyle Adicks [00:03:58] Thank you Mr. Chair. I do have a motion for the non-tribal fisheries. I move that the Council adopt for Salmon Technical Team compilation and analysis the proposed initial salmon management alternatives for the 2024 non-Indian ocean fisheries as developed by the Salmon Advisory Subpanel and described in the Agenda Item C.5.e, Supplemental SAS Report 1, March 7, 2024 with the following modification. On Page 3, the third sentence in the bottom section, replaced "east of the Megler Astoria Bridge" with "east of Tongue Point, Oregon".

Brad Pettinger [00:04:36] Thank you Kyle. Is the language accurate?

Kyle Adicks [00:04:37] Yes.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:38] Okay, second? Seconded by Phil Anderson. Thank you Phil. Kyle, speak to motion as appropriate.

Kyle Adicks [00:04:44] Thanks to the SAS for the work they put in over the weeks and days leading up to this to bring us the package they did this morning. A lot of coordination required there between a lot of people. The modification was just an oversight that Mr. North pointed out earlier. We moved this line a year or two ago and just it got switched back to the old language in the initial document. As Mr. Oatman said, there'll be a lot of work this week and in the coming weeks as we craft this range of alternatives and then try to find a final package in April, and a lot of meetings to go one with inside fisheries to make sure we meet that long list of objectives we saw earlier today by the end of the process.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:26] Okay, very good. Discussion? Questions? All right. I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:05:34] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:35] Opposed, no? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Okay, going down the coast to Oregon. John.

John North [00:05:46] Thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to thank all the SAS members and staff that have worked on these initial alternatives and thank you for getting them in on time even though we were dealing with rather limited information. And for Oregon I think the alternatives, you know, our first brush going into the initial modeling and it does include, at least on the recreational side, more Chinook opportunity than last year. And that was something that we had heard at our industry group meeting earlier this month. And, however, I anticipate these alternatives will require some modifications as we move forward and identify the most limiting stocks, but it gives us some place to start. So, thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:43] Okay (off-mic)....

Marci Yaremko [00:06:44] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I also want to thank the SAS for their work. It

was a long night, SAS and STT both. Just to note, there are a lot of kinks that we are working out with regard to the new framework. We're learning this as we go so we're very grateful for the iterative process here as we continue to work through the refinement of the alternatives. We'll be needing to make adjustments to language as we go, and so anyway we've got work ahead of us but I really appreciate the effort overnight. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:23] Okay, thank you Marci. Okay. Robin, how are we doing?

Robin Ehlke [00:07:31] We're doing fine Mr. Chair. Thank you. I think you've worked yourself through this agenda item. You'll recall in the morning we heard reports on the Pacific Salmon Commission. We've heard from NMFS. We've had tribal reports from the Colville Tribe and the Columbia River Tribes as long as the joint report between the Washington tribes and WDFW. The SAS has... gave us a first package, so the STT will work through the night to get that information back to you as soon as possible. And I understand California's comments about the iterative process and the new language and we'll kind of work on getting that language in the packages as we go along. It might be an easier way rather than asking for guidance on every little dot of the eye and tee, but we'll let you know where we're finding need for those things for sure. So, I think with that, Mr. Chair, we've wrapped up our work under agenda item C. 5.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:39] Okay. Thank you Robin.

6. Recommendations for 2024 Management Alternative Analysis

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] So Council action, discussion potentially. Butch. Yes Butch?

Butch Smith [00:00:05] Is this discussion or questions?

Brad Pettinger [00:00:12] Discussion.

Butch Smith [00:00:18] Okay. I guess I better... thank you Mr. Chair. I do have a question for Marci. And if you can't answer it, I don't want to put you the spot, I can certainly talk to one of your salmon team to get educated on California salmon, but knowing how important it is to get those, some of the strongest genetic fish back that get up into the spawning beds, you know, after going through oceans and wherever they travel to is really important, especially in times of need, and I was just wondering if California has run size updates? So you have a date where you have an expected portion of your run to get to be there to make, you know, be accounted and then if it's behind you don't fish, if it's ahead, you can fish, kind of guaranteeing that you have the right amount of fish before you go fish it. It's easy to do in the river. It's not easy to do in the ocean, obviously, but I know we depend on that in the Columbia River after a certain day we have a run size update to make sure we either have to back off or we can liberalize. And I just I don't need an answer now, Marci, if you can, I don't want to put you on the spot, but if you have, I would like to be educated on that if you had some time because that seems like, you know, it adds more certainty to the uncertainty of what's going on with, you know, with the Sacramento system. So, anyway, it's just a question. It's not... I'm trying to pose any Washington methods on California, it's just a question I have for education purposes. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Marci Yaremko [00:02:07] Sure. Thank you Mr. Chair. And thank you Butch for the question. I'm going to call up Kandice Morgenstern with our ocean salmon project to provide an answer for us. Thank you.

Kandice Morgenstern [00:02:24] Yes, thanks Miss Yaremko. Thank you, Butch, for the question. I think what I'm gathering from your explanation of how things are working in the Columbia River is that you have some sort of inseason knowledge of abundance that will guide whether or not to proceed or back off. And all of our abundance modeling that we do is based on the inriver run size so fish get back to... I mean we do do ocean monitoring, like a lot, big ocean monitoring program, but we need to know the inriver run size, eventual inriver run size to be able to then figure out what our ocean abundance was.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:06] Butch.

Butch Smith [00:03:07] I think maybe I confused you a little bit. It's run size update in the rivers. So, you have a point in your river that you have a count of fish. You have a way to count them. Then you would go up or down based on time and area and how many fish passed a point of your expectations. So, say on September 15th you expected 60 percent of the run to go by, by this point would be a little more confident in what your predictor was, and then you would let, you know, you could decide whether you had enough fish passed so you could have a fisheries or not. I mean, I just wondered if California has that method? That's...

Kandice Morgenstern [00:03:52] We don't in place currently, but I'm thinking about how maybe that could be implemented and for the various surveys, both the Central Valley and the Klamath Trinity Basin, if they could provide those types of run size updates, and then that would be responsive to whether or not to proceed or put limitations on involve ocean fisheries, right? Not necess...you know,

you couldn't do that for summer fisheries. So it would be, it would have to be a big, coordinated effort. And the other complication I potentially see that is we from year to year I'm noticing, we're noticing more variation in run timing. And so, abundance could seem to be low but it could just be that they're just not there yet. It's just so dependent on flow, so I don't know. It's an interesting thought experiment.

Butch Smith [00:04:47] Thank you Mr. Chair. And I appreciate that and I don't want to tie up the Council's time with... but certainly I'd be willing to talk to you or we have, you know, great people that could really exchange some ideas, but thank you Mr. Chair I won't...

Brad Pettinger [00:05:02] Thank you Butch. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:02] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Butch. Yeah, we're certainly interested in exchanging ideas. Be very interested in hearing more, but I think Kandice is correct in emphasizing that the fishery planning that we're primarily doing here for ocean fisheries occurs in summertime and escapement monitoring for the fall run doesn't commence until the fall so our fisheries have already been largely prosecuted. So, again, we look forward to hearing more, but I think that's the short answer. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:44] Thanks Marci. All right. Anyone else? Are you ready to give Council direction to the STT? All right. I'm sorry, the Tribes. Joe, do you have anything for us?

Joe Oatman [00:06:05] Thank you Mr. Chair. I don't have any further guidance for the STT.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:10] Okay, thank you. Okay, going looking at Washington, Kyle.

Kyle Adicks [00:06:17] Thank you Mr. Chair. I do have some guidance which we should be able to see on the screen in just a second. So, management guidance relative to Agenda Item C.6.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 8th, 2024, implement the following changes. On Table 1 for the north of Falcon commercial alternatives on Page 3 for the U.S. Canada border to Cape Falcon summer season and Alternative 2, change Chinook landing and possession limit for July 1 through 10 from 80 to 60. And then on Table 2, the north of Falcon recreational management alternatives on page 14 for the Queets River to Leadbetter Point or Westport subarea, I should have also put this is Alternative 2 for this change, replace no Chinook retention June 30th through July 30th on Fridays or Saturdays with no Chinook retention on Fridays and Saturdays during July, and add possession of Chinook salmon is illegal when Chinook retention is prohibited in the area. That's actually not a change to what was modeled, it's just trying to clarify that it's the Fridays and Saturdays in July and leave some of the extraneous dates out of that. And then the possession of Chinook salmon is illegal when Chinook retention is prohibited, it's just a thing we've put in in the past when we've had a regulation like this for enforcement so that boats aren't transiting through the area with Chinook and there be some question about where they were actually caught. The troll changes just to lower that trip limit during that first more than week long period that starts the season in July.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:59] Thank you Kyle. Doctor O'Farrell, you got that? Okay. I'll turn to Oregon and John North. John.

John North [00:08:08] Thank you Mr. Chair. Oregon does have some preliminary guidance at this time. And okay... it's up there. Regarding both commercial and recreational management alternatives, and this is in regard to Agenda Item C.6.a, Supplemental STT Report dated March 8, 2024. First on the commercial side on Table 1, commercial management alternatives on Page 5 for the Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain area, under Alternative 3 at the end of the regulation specifications section, please add the following language, which is, "Beginning October 1 open shoreward of the 40 fathom

regulatory line", see 5f. And then for our recreational alternatives on Table 2 on Page 17 for the Cape Falcon to Oregon California border, specifically on the mark-selective coho fishery under Alternative 1, replace the mark-selective coho quota of 60,000 with 50,000. Under Alternative 2, replace the mark-selective coho quota of 50,000 with 45,000. Also under Alternative 2, replace the first reference to 'same as Alternate 1' with two subsections, the first of which is Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain open 7 days per week for the period from June 22nd to July 31, all salmon, two salmon per day. All retained coho must be marked with heeled adipose fin clip. For the period from August 1 through 18, all salmon except Chinook two salmon per day. All retained coho must be marked with the heeled adipose fin clip. See minimum size limits, see gear restrictions and definitions. And the second subsection would be for Humbug Mountain to the Oregon California border open 7 days a week for the period June 22 through August 18, all salmon, two salmon per day. All retained coho must be marked with a healed adipose fin clip. See minimum size limits and see gear restrictions and definitions. And then in our Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain area regarding the non-mark-selective coho fishery, under Alternative 1, replace the September non-mark-selective quota of 35,000 with 30,000. And under Alternative 2, replace the September non-mark-selective coho quota of 30,000 with 27,500. And I think that completes.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:52] Okay.

John North [00:10:56] Yeah, that's it.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:56] Okay, thanks John. Got that Mike? Perfect. All right, I'll turn to California. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:11:05] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Excuse me. Working from Agenda Item C.6.a, Supplemental STT Report 1 dated March 8th, 2024. I want to point you to page 24 and in particular under Sacramento River fall Chinook, the three alternatives that are shown, I want to propose some changes to Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 as follows: Alternative 1, and this is on that river recreational impacts line. Under the column that says "Spawner objective or other comparative standard as noted", include "The Sacramento River Fall Chinook recreational allocation of 9.2% of the total allowable harvest", so that would be for Alternative 1. Then for Alternative 2 include the Sacramento River fall Chinook recreational allocation of 50% of the total allowable harvest. Alternative 3 would remain status quo. If I may speak to this guidance?

Brad Pettinger [00:12:48] Please.

Marci Yaremko [00:12:48] Thank you. So, what we see currently shown in Table 5 of the report, the river recreational impacts to Sac fall range from 27,601 in Alt 1 to 29,000 in Alt 3. We also, in looking at the ocean impacts, and that's commercial and recreational combined, range from 16,800 to 9,500 and all three, so greater projected impacts in river recreational fisheries than in ocean fisheries. Historically, as we heard from some of the testimony, the average allocation to the river recreational fishery is 14 percent of the total inriver run of Sacramento fall Chinook. Traditionally, for most years I should say, Sac fall are not constraining in the first round of model runs. This year's a little different. We have a very low forecast of Sacramento fall Chinook and with the NMFS guidance to set the escapement goal to 180,000 or higher, the result of that placeholder, 14 percent of the total inriver run, results in a much higher river allocation than we typically would see in our fisheries planning process. We heard Mr. Stone bring up the constraints of SR, of Sac fall back in 2018. In that year, as he had up on the screen, by Council guidance we implemented a California ocean versus river sharing arrangement of 85 percent to ocean and 15 percent to the inriver fisheries. For this year what we'd like to do is to display a range of ocean versus inriver allocations. In Alternative 1 recommending the 9.2 percent river share. This is now what the historical average is of the realized harvest of inriver Sac fall versus the ocean harvest Sac fall. Alt 2, 50/50 sharing between river and ocean fisheries just to reflect a middle allocation. And

then for Alt 3 we would continue to allow those river fisheries, that allocation that's the default in the model of the 14 percent. And that right now shows at 29,000 fish for the fishery, inriver fishery. Maybe I'll stop there.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:10] Okay Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:16:10] Questions?

Brad Pettinger [00:16:11] Yeah, questions for Marci? Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:16:20] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you Marci. Just to clarify, the text on the screen says 25, Page 25. I thought I heard you reference Page 24. I believe you meant 24, but I just want to be sure we're all clear.

Marci Yaremko [00:16:39] Table 5. The copy I'm looking at says 24, page 24. So just to...

Brad Pettinger [00:16:49] All right. Good catch.

Marci Yaremko [00:16:50] Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:51] Okay. Questions for Marci? All right. Further discussion? Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:17:07] This isn't guidance. I just thought it might be worthwhile just to point out that in our salmon management plan we have overall fishery objectives listed under 5.1 on page 15. And the third one is, "Maintain ocean salmon fishing seasons supporting the continuance of established recreational and commercial fisheries while meeting salmon harvest allocation objectives among ocean and inside recreational and commercial fisheries that are fair and equitable". And that's been a... I feel like there's been some suggestion that we just look at ocean fisheries and are blind to inside fisheries, and that just isn't the case. It isn't... we at the very outset of developing our salmon management plan back in, I think it was 1977, and have further refined these objectives. And I think we're all very cognizant of, yes, our regulations are to the ocean fisheries, but when we set those we are doing it to the best of our ability to meet our conservation objectives as well as considering the inside outside allocation implications of our decisions. That's all.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:52] Thank you Phil. Anyone else? Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:18:58] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Just a few other notes on some of the other language that's in development within the package. As we mentioned yesterday, this is California's first year in prosecuting inseason management and weekly landing limits in the commercial fishery. I want to appreciate or acknowledge the work of the STT and assistance from several of our co-managers as we build this tool and appreciate the long night that was spent last night designing weekly landing limits with input from our commercial SAS representative. Just to point out, the weekly landing limits that are specified in Alternatives 1 and 2 are extremely low, which is ultimately a function of too few fish. But this first round of alternatives is just to get an illustration and a starting point, and we have the opportunity to make adjustments to that weekly landing limit in subsequent runs. Speaking to the testimony that was offered today by Larry Phillips. We are interested in seeking an alternative that likewise looks at similar restrictions in the recreational fishery via the use of inseason management in some form in order to prevent a scenario where recreational harvests would vastly exceed preseason expectations. This is all to say that, you know, I don't want to lose sight that at the end of the day once we've completed all of our modeling exercises, we could be still in the same situation and closures are still, you know, a very real possibility. But given the level of public and industry interests, we are

staying on track to develop a full range of potential alternatives and opportunities and just want to acknowledge the public comment. There's an awful lot of it in the briefing book, as well as testimony that we heard today. We appreciate this input as we continue to build our alternatives and looking forward to our final decision-making in April. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:49] Thank you Marci. Anyone else? Okay, Robin, back to you.

Robin Ehlke [00:22:01] Thank you Mr. Chair. You finished your work under this agenda item. We'll see you tomorrow.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:08] Okay. All righty. Well thanks everyone.

7. Further Direction for 2024 Management Alternatives

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Well that will conclude public comment and takes us to Council action. So, I'll open the floor up for discussion. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:00:12] Thank you very much Chair Pettinger. I don't have any guidance at this time. I think that'll be coming from Marci Yaremko. But I did want to address some of the comments we heard during our public testimony. And the common thread was we have a water issue we don't have a fishery problem. We're in this fix. So, I think all those folks who took the time to provide their input through public comment, I would suggest if you haven't already testified to the State Water Resources Control Board, that is where your emphasis should be. We can't do anything here at the Council to increase water flows and improve habitat. We've written our share of sternly worded letters and that's really all we're empowered to do. But if you are in the Central Valley and you're worried about water flows for salmon, then go to the State Water Resources Control Board and let them know that because they're the body that can make a difference here. I also want to address... we've heard a number of comments about fish being taken from the river to the ocean. This relates to the notion that 15 percent of the escapement belongs to the river. Based upon that number, 82 percent of the fish would be in the river and only 8 percent would be available for ocean harvest, and I don't think anyone genuinely thinks that is a fair allocation of fishing privileges. We here in the Council operate under the Magnuson-Stevenson, Magnuson-Stevens Act, federal law, and that term allocation is a defined term, and it means the assignment of fishing privileges among user groups or individuals. We do that between states. We do that between sport and commercial. And we're basically doing that here between ocean and river. And so, I think, I think it's, we need to be fair to the river. We need to be fair to the ocean. I don't know that in 18 percent for the ocean and 82 for the river, I don't know anyone here who would think that is fair. We need to be fair and equitable. We don't know where we're going to end up. We don't know if we're going to have salmon seasons this year, but we have a process to reach that conclusion. And I want to thank the SAS and all the stakeholders who provided input to the process. But I just want to make clear when you hear someone say we're taking fish from the river, we're trying to rectify this 18 to 82 sharing that some folks think ought to be in place.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:16] Thank you Marc. Further discussion before we go to recommendations? All right. Okay with that I'll turn to the tribes. Joe, do you have anything for us?

Joe Oatman [00:03:35] Thank you Mr. Chair. At this time, I don't have any additional guidance to offer for the treaty troll options.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:41] Okay.

Joe Oatman [00:03:41] Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:42] Very good. Thank you. I'll turn to Kyle Adicks and Washington. Kyle.

Kyle Adicks [00:03:47] Thank you Mr. Chair. We'll be continuing co-manager discussions north of Falcon over the next, through today and tomorrow. I don't have any recommendations today. I likely will on C.8 tomorrow.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:00] Okay. John North. John.

John North [00:04:04] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, Oregon does have some additional guidance today. And there we have it on the screen. So, our guidance for today. Thank you for making the font bigger.

Under Agenda Item C.7.a, Supplemental STT Report dated March 9th, 2024, we would like to implement the following changes, which include on Table 1 under ODFW commercial management alternatives on Page 5 in the Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain area. For Alternative 1: Replace March 15th through May 31 with March 15th through 31, April 16th through May 29. Under Alternative 2: Replace March 15th through May 31 with March 15th through 31 and April 16th through 30 and May 27 through 31, and remove July 25th through 31. Under Alternative 3: Replace March 15th through May 31 with March 15th through March 31. And then remove June 11th through 30. Moving on to the recreational Table 2 for the Cape, and that's on page 17, for the Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain area. Under Alternative 3: Replace March 15th through June 21 with March 15th through July 31. And under the Cape Falcon to Oregon California border section on Page 18 under Alternative 3: Replace the paragraph that begins "open seven days per week all salmon except Chinook" with the following two subsections, "Cape Falcon the Humbug Mountain open seven days per week for the period of June 29 through July 31, all salmon, two salmon per day. All retained coho must be marked with a healed adipose fin clip. For the period of August 1 through 25, all salmon except Chinook, two salmon per day, all retained coho must be marked with a healed adipose fin clip. See minimum size limits and gear restrictions and definitions". And in the second subarea Humbug Mountain to the Oregon California border. "Open seven days per week for the period June 29th through August 25, all salmon, two salmon per day. All retained coho must be marked with the healed adipose fin clip. See minimum size limit. See gear restrictions and definitions". And that's our guidance.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:32] Okay, thank you John. And then turn to California. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:06:40] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Alrighty. Speaking from Agenda Item C.7.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 8th, 2024, implement the following changes. This is to Table 1, the California commercial alternatives beginning on Page 6. The California KMZ. Alternative 1: Replace the 2,500 Chinook quota with a 7,000 Chinook quota. Remove the term "Landing and possession limit of 25 Chinook per vessel per landing week", and replace that language with, quote, "Harvest limits and landing and possession limits will be determined by CDFW and provided in the next supplemental STT report", end quote. Alternative 2: Remove same as Alternative 1 and replace with June 1st through the earlier of June 30th or 5,000 Chinook quota. For the Fort Bragg area. Alternative 1: Remove quote, "Same quota landing and gear restrictions and definitions as the Oregon California border to Humboldt South Jetty, or California KMZ", and replace that with quote "June 1 through 10 or attainment of the harvest limit". Then add regulatory language stating that harvest limit and landing and possession limits will be determined by CDFW and provided in the next Supplemental STT Report. For Alternative 2 Fort Bragg: Remove June 1 through 4, or the attainment of a 2,000 fish Chinook harvest limit and replace with June 1 through 8, or attainment of the harvest limit. Remove landing and possession limit of 15 Chinook per vessel for the open period and replace that with harvest limit and landing and position limits will be determined by CDFW and provided in the next supplemental STT Report. Moving to... scroll please, thank you... to San Francisco, thank you. Alternative 1: Implement the same changes as displayed in the Fort Bragg Management Area for Alternative 1. For Alternative 2: Implement the same changes as displayed in the Fort Bragg Management Area for Alternative 2. For the Monterey area from Pigeon Point to the U.S. Mexico border. Alternative 1: Implement the same changes as displayed in the Fort Bragg Management Area for Alternative 1. Alternative 2: Implement the same changes as displayed in the Fort Bragg Management Area for Alternative 2. Moving to the recreational management alternatives in Table 2, California begins on page 19. For the California KMZ. Alternative 1: Remove May 25th through 28th. Add June 6 through 9. Replace July 4 through 7 with July 3 through 7. Add August 1 through 4. Alternative 2: Replace July 4th through 10th with July 4 through 7. Add August 1 through 4 and add August 29 through 31. For the Fort Bragg area. Alternative 1: Remove May 25th through 28th. Add June 6 through 9. Replace July 4 through 7 with July 3 through 7, and add August 1 through 4. Alternative 2: Replace July 4 through 10 with July 4 through 7. Add August 1 through 4. Add August

29th through 31st. In San Francisco. Alt 1: Remove May 25th through 28th. Add June 6th through 9th. Replace July 4 through 7 with July 3 through 7. Add August 1 through 4. Alternative 2: Replace July 4 through 10 with July 4 through 7. Add August 1 through 4. Add August 29th through 31st. For Monterey. Alternative 1: Remove May 4 through 7. Remove May 25 through 28. Add June 6th through 9. Replace July 4 through 7 with July 3 through 7. Add August 1 through 4. Alternative 2: Replace July 4 through 10 with July 4 through 7. Add August 1 through 4 and add August 29 through 31st.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:53] Okay, thank you Marci. and Doctor O'Farrell any questions before she gets that. Okay, thumbs up. Very good. Thank you Marci. Please.

Marci Yaremko [00:12:02] Yeah, if I may. Just a couple of... I know that was a lot of numbers and changes and alterations. Just want to speak to what it is expected to do. So right now, as we've discussed, California's moving to an inseason method of managing and monitoring our fisheries. And I just want to acknowledge the hard work that has gone on, continued to go on this week and appreciate the input working with NMFS, Council staff, and our other partner agencies to explore different methods to reach our end goal, which is to cap the harvest in the commercial sector to its projections. The changes proposed here in the commercial fishery in Alternative 1 show that move to inseason management that's outlined in the coastal Chinook framework that was adopted by the Council back in November. In the framework method we are going to be evaluating and implementing harvest limits and weekly landing limits that are reflective of the harvest model output of the all-stock harvest, so those outputs from the Sacramento Harvest Model and the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model and the estimate of projected effort, we'll be working to review those harvest model results and then apply the appropriate harvest limit and weekly landing limit that will come forward in the next iteration of the STT report. So, we appreciate your patience as we work through the fine tuning of this language, and that's why you see the request to replace the prior language and put a placeholder in there so that we can continue to work to refine that language and provide it to you in a more complete form in the next iteration. In the recreational sector, you'll note that Alternatives 1 and 2 add a slight increase in fishing opportunity, which reflects the guidance yesterday to adjust the inriver and ocean share of the Sacramento fall impacts in California by implementing that range of sharing arrangements on the Sac fall stock. It did free up some impacts to be included in ocean season alternatives. Also want to just acknowledge the work with Oregon to maintain that historic ratio of sharing with regard to Sac fall impacts. Normally we are not constrained by this stock, but just appreciate the collaboration with industry reps across the border and the hard work and acknowledging that Oregon's proposed modifications here likewise respect that 80/20 traditional sharing arrangement. So, thanks for that and we will be back with more details in the next iteration. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:29] Okay. Thank you Marci. All right, any further discussion before I go to Robin? John North.

John North [00:15:37] Thank you Mr. Chair. I kind of missed my window there, but I just wanted to thank the STT and the Salmon Advisory Panel for their work producing these alternatives through the week here. Very much appreciated. The guidance that Oregon provided today along with what we did yesterday is just trying to get us a little closer to our management objectives. And as Miss Yaremko mentioned, trying to further align with recent average oceans splits between the states for Sacramento fall Chinook. Unfortunately though for Oregon, that required significant cuts to the troll fleet and just wanted to acknowledge that so...

Brad Pettinger [00:16:17] Thanks John. All right. Seeing no further hands, Robin. Oh, I'm sorry Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:16:27] Thank you Mr. Chair. One other thing I'd just take the opportunity to note. This morning, we learned that we now have preliminary information on impacts to SONCC coho and

just wanted to flag that we'll be working through that process of needing to evaluate the forecasted impacts for 2024 fisheries. That work just started this afternoon so that potentially is another constraint that we may be looking to need to integrate into the alternatives as we move along. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:07] Okay, thank you. All right. I'm taking one more scan. Make sure I'm not missing anybody. Okay, Robin.

Robin Ehlke [00:17:15] Thank you Mr. Chair. You have provided guidance to the STT. They will work to get that analyzed and return to you tomorrow afternoon. So that concludes your work under this agenda item. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:29] Okay. Thank you Robin.

8. Further Direction for 2024 Management Alternatives

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Well that takes us to Council action. I'll open the floor for discussion if needed. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:00:13] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I wanted to follow up on Tom Marking's comment. I think he has an excellent point. We have the benefit of looking back and seeing what we've done in previous seasons, and it's sort of to see what distributions have been, say, between states and between sectors, and I don't recall and I'm looking back at past salmon seasons seeing such a disproportionate share of those Klamath fish between the Oregon and the California portions of the KMZ. So, I just wanted to agree with Tom on that. And I think that that uneven, rather unusual distribution of fish here, I realize this is not final, that, you know, we're going to work on it between now and April, and at the April meeting we'll get input from folks at the hearing and have a chance to smooth off the rough edges in April, but I think that Tom makes a larger point about how these fish are being distributed. We have a tough year and the burdens probably need to be shared equally.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:33] Okay, thanks Marc. Anyone else? Okay. All right, I'll look to the tribes. Joe, do you have any guidance for us?

Joe Oatman [00:01:43] Thank you Mr. Chair. And so, at this time I do not have any guidance to offer to what is reflected in Table 3 on the 2024 Treaty Indian troll management alternatives for ocean fisheries and that's located on page 24 of the D.8.a, Supplement STT Report 1. So, no guidance to offer to that. But I do have some guidance that I wanted to offer for the Klamath River fall Chinook?

Brad Pettinger [00:02:27] Okay.

Joe Oatman [00:02:29] So I am providing the following guidance for STT analysis on the following initial salmon management measures for Klamath River fall Chinook for inriver tribal fisheries. And the guidance is to maximize tribal harvest of adult Klamath River fall Chinook for the buffered 2024 harvest control rule, in parentheses, as approved under Agenda Item C.4, and 50/50 tribal non-tribal sharing. So the... the matter here is, this is guidance that was patterned off of guidance that we provided for the 2023 season to try and help address the harvest sharing of Klamath River fall Chinook between tribal and non-tribal fisheries. The intent is to align this with the action that the Council took earlier in this meeting to buffer the 2024 harvest control rule by setting a maximum allowable exploitation rate of 20 percent. So, for the tribes this guidance attempts to strike a balance between conservation and harvest. As co-managers the Hoopa Valley Tribe and Yurok Tribe desire to, 1: Provide for federally recognized tribal harvest and harvest share. 2: To contribute fish to the identified minimum tribal subsistence and ceremonial needs. And 3: to address conservation issues associated with the projected natural spawning escapement per application of the 2024 forecast and the 2024 harvest control rule. So, with that, I wanted to offer that guidance at this point and I also recognize that CDF and W will have some similar information to share regarding the non-tribal side as well.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:46] Okay, thank you Joe. Okay, looking to Washington. Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:04:50] Thank you Mr. Chair. I, too, have some guidance, which we should see on the screen momentarily.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:00] I'm sorry. Susan.

Susan Bishop [00:05:02] Thank you Mr. Chair. I just had one question for Joe, a clarification on

something?

Brad Pettinger [00:05:08] Okay.

Susan Bishop [00:05:08] On page 24 of the Agenda Item C.8.a, Supplemental STT Report. The language there, July 1 through season end date of no later than September 30th with the parentheses TBD. And I know this is totally consistent with what was proposed yesterday and adopted by the Council, but I just wanted to clarify. My understanding is that the season that the tribes are discussing is between basically September 15th and September 30th. And so the way that the model works, that's basically a block of time in the way the model treats it so it should be similar between the three, among the three alternatives.

Joe Oatman [00:05:56] Yes, that would be correct. That they're considering at this point to have the season end date be no later than September 30th for all three. Did that address your question?

Susan Bishop [00:06:16] Just one other point of clarification that the... so we aren't talking about an end date that would be, for example, in June. It's really sort of focused on that two week period between September 15th and September 30th?

Joe Oatman [00:06:35] I'm trying to see, I apologize. Trying to see if I'm tracking here. So, for the alternatives for the TBD. So, the issue that the tribes are working on is that period, September 15th to September 30th to try and come to some resolution on that at some point in this process.

Susan Bishop [00:06:58] Thank you Joe. I'm sorry I'm not being all that clear, but I am just verifying that the model itself will be, that would treat sort of those, the impacts during that two week period similarly as opposed to other time periods within the model should the end date be in a different block of time.

Joe Oatman [00:07:20] That would be my understanding is that's how it would be treated, yeah.

Susan Bishop [00:07:23] Thank you.

Joe Oatman [00:07:24] Okay.

Susan Bishop [00:07:24] Thank you to the Council.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:25] Okay, thank you Susan. All right. And now, Kyle, I believe we're ready for you.

Kyle Adicks [00:07:36] Thank you again Mr. Chair. I'll be speaking to changes relative to Agenda Item C.8.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 10th, 2024. Implement the following changes. In Table 1 for the north of Falcon commercial management alternatives beginning on Page 1. In Alternative 1: Change the overall non-Indian coho TAC from 110,000 to 105,000, and adjust the commercial quotas consistent with the new TAC. For the U.S. Canada border to Cape Falcon summer season on Page 3, for Alternative 3: Change the dates to July 1 through the earlier of September 22nd or attainment of the quota. For Table 2, The north of Falcon recreational management alternatives beginning on page 14. Again, in Alternative 1: Change the overall non-Indian TAC for coho from 110,000 to 105,000, and adjust the recreational quota and subarea quotas consistent with that new TAC. Then area by area for the U.S. Canada border to Cape Alava-Neah Bay subarea. In Alternative 1: Change the Chinook subarea guideline to 9,780. For Alternative 2: Change the guideline to 8,970. For Alternative 3: Change the guideline to 8,280 and change the dates to June 22nd through earlier of September 22nd or attainment

of the quota. For the La Push subarea. Alternative 1: Change the Chinook guideline to 1,700. Alternative 2: Change the guideline to 1,550. Alternative 3: Change the Chinook subarea guideline to 1,440 and change the dates to June 22nd through earlier of September 22nd or attainment of the quota. For the Westport subarea. Alternative 1: Change the Chinook guideline to 18,060. Alternative 2: Change the guideline to 16,580. Alternative 3: Change the guideline to 15,300 and change the dates to June 30th through earlier of September 22nd or attainment of the quota. And finally, for the Columbia River subarea, change the Chinook subarea guideline to 12,960. Alternative 2: Change the guideline to 11,009 hundred. Alternative 3: Change the guideline to 10,980 and change dates to June 29th through earlier of September 22nd or attainment of the quota. So, the first change there was to just bring the higher coho alternative quota down. It just narrows the range a little bit for the alternatives we're considering. All the alternatives, all the fisheries include a earlier closure date for the ocean fisheries north of Falcon in Alternative 3, a September 22nd date. And that's just to consider whether an earlier closure date would provide any extra protection to Washington coastal stocks as we move through fishery planning and the changes to the subarea guidelines. Those guidelines aren't defined in the FMP, they're either calculated by the STT every year based on recent year averages. Sometimes we see a year drop out of the data set that makes those percentages swing quite a bit, and we saw that this year so this is just bumping the guidelines back a little closer to what we saw last year between ports. I'm just trying to provide some stability there for our fisheries and coastal communities. And that's... while I'm still talking, we did hear about a couple of bolded coho values in the current fisheries plans. One in Puget Sound, Snohomish, and one on the coast, Quileute. We recognize that we've got work to do with inside Puget Sound and coastal terminal fisheries to make sure we have a complete set of fisheries that meets our objectives by the end of the process. Ocean fisheries are a relatively small piece of the exploitation on both of those stocks and we've been talking particularly with coastal co-managers this week about talking about our terminal fisheries and making sure we're somewhere by April that meets our objectives. Not on the tables today, but we also have a lot of work to do with Puget Sound Chinook as we move through the next month. So, thank you Mr. Chair. That's all I had.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:52] Okay, thanks Kyle. Doctor O'Farrell, are you good back there? Okay. Okay I'll do the Bishop pause here before I go to Oregon. Okay, John North.

John North [00:12:10] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah, Oregon does have some additional guidance today both recreational and commercial. And so, regarding... I'll be speaking to Agenda Item C.8.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 10th, 2024. We're looking for the following changes, which on Table 1 for ODFW commercial management alternatives on Page 5. For Cape Falcon the Humbug Mountain under Alternative 1 and 2: Remove March 15 through 31. And under Alternative 3: Remove March 15... Oh I'm sorry. Under all three alternatives remove March 15 to 31. Wow. And for Humbug Mountain to the Oregon California border, the Oregon KMZ. Under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2: Replace March 15th through April 30 with April 16 through 30. And under Alternative 3: Replace March 15 through 31 with closed and remove the next line, same as Alternative 1. And on Table 2, for Humbug Mountain to the Oregon California border, Oregon KMZ, page 19 of the recreational management alternatives underneath Alternative 3: Replace the dates listed for Humbug Mountain to the Oregon California border, Oregon KMZ, with May 16th through August 25th, and replace the paragraph that begins with "open seven days per week" with the language "open seven days per week, all salmon except coho, except as listed above for the mark-selective coho fishery from Cape Falcon to the Oregon California border June 29th through August 25th. 2 salmon per day. All retained coho must be marked with a healed adipose fin clip. See minimum size limit. See gear restrictions and definitions". And today's guidance on the commercial alternatives primarily reflects the new model outputs which corrected an oversight I believe and added significant Sacramento fall Chinook impacts to the March Oregon troll fisheries so we had to make corresponding adjustments there. And then also the guidance on the recreational fishery corrects a previous oversight and on one of the alternatives and hopefully clarifies the regulation better.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:37] Thanks John. Okay. I'll turn to California and Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:14:46] Thank you Mr. Chair. I do have some guidance. Oop, there we go. All right. Speaking to Agenda Item C.8.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 10th, 2024, implement the following changes. Beginning on Page 6 for the commercial management alternatives. The California KMZ. Alternative 1: Replace the 7,000 Chinook quota with a 1,000 Chinook quota. Alternative 2: Replace the 5,000 Chinook quota with the 5,500 Chinook quota. Moving to Fort Bragg. Replace June 1 through 10 with June 1 through 5, and June 8 through 12. Alternative 2: Replace June 1 through 8 with June 1 through 7. San Francisco. Replace June, Alternative 1: Replace June 1 through 10 with June 1 through 5. June 8 through 12th. Add for the area from Point Reyes to Point San Pedro, which is the fall area target zone, September 1 through 30th. Add October 1 through 7, October 1 through 4 and October 7 through 11. And add the regulatory language that all salmon caught in this area must be landed between Point Arena and Pigeon Point, which is the San Francisco management area. Alternative 2: Replace June 1 through 8 with June 1 through 7. For the Monterey area. Alternative 1: Replace June 1 through 10 with June 1 through 5 and June 8 through 12. Alternative 2: Replace June 1 through 8 with June 1 through 7. Moving to Table 2. The recreational Management Alternatives beginning on page 19. The California KMZ. In Alternative 1: Replace June 6 through 9 with June 5 through 9. Replace August 1 through 4 with August 1 through 6. Remove August 29 through 31. Add the regulatory language as follows, "inseason action may be taken to close open days when total harvest is approaching a statewide harvest guideline of 10,000 Chinook". Remove September 1st through October 15th. Replace with September 1 through 3 and September 27 through 29, and replace with October 18 through 20. Add regulatory language "inseason action may be taken to close open days when total harvest is approaching a statewide harvest guideline of 5,000 Chinook". Then Alternative 2: Add regulatory language, "inseason action may be taken to close open days when total harvest is approaching a statewide harvest guideline of 6,500 Chinook". For the Fort Bragg area, implement the same changes as displayed for the California KMZ in Alternative 1. Alternative 2: Implement the same changes as displayed for the California KMZ in Alternative 2. Moving to San Francisco. Alt 1: Implement the same changes as displayed for the California KMZ in Alt 1. Alt 2: Implement the same changes as displayed for the California KMZ in Alternative 2. Moving to Monterey. Alt 1: implement the same changes as displayed for the California KMZ in Alt 1. And Alt 2: Implement the same changes as displayed for the California KMZ in Alt 2. Moving to Table 5. These are the projected key stock escapements or management criteria for the ocean fishery alternatives. Looking at page 26, speaking to the California River recreational fishery share. In Alternative 1: Adjust the Klamath River recreational fishery share such that the maximum allowable exploitation rate of 20 percent is achieved and the projected natural area spawner escapement equals 36,511. And if I may pause a second, I need to clarify something. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair. There's one correction needed to the language on the screen.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:42] Okay.

Marci Yaremko [00:20:42] Right now it says Alternative 1. Here in Table 5 I believe this should read "all alternatives". Thank you. Instead of "Alternative 1".

Brad Pettinger [00:21:06] Okay. You good?

Marci Yaremko [00:21:08] Yes, thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:09] All right.

Marci Yaremko [00:21:10] And I have some talking points if now is appropriate?

Brad Pettinger [00:21:13] It is.

Marci Yaremko [00:21:14] Okay. Thank you. All right. A lot of changes here for California. We had quite a breakthrough day this morning. I'd just like to give you a few highlights of what these changes reflect and the discussions that were had. First, I'd just like to, since it's on the screen right now, regarding the adjustment to the California River recreational fishery share. This guidance is intended to work in tandem with the guidance we heard earlier from the tribes to maximize the harvest in the non-tribal river fisheries which will allow the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the Yurok the full access to their 50 percent. The escapement floor as a result of the allowable exploitation rate that the Council guidance was earlier this week to set that allowable rate at 20 percent in 2024 down from 25 percent results in that new floor value of 36,511. So, this guidance would just put that remaining non-tribal harvest in the river recreational fishery to allow the tribes full access to their 50 percent. Moving to the recreational fishery alternatives and the changes made today. I just want to compliment our SAS on the work this morning to develop a management strategy that will offer, as was suggested by public comments heard throughout the week as well as in the briefing book, that would offer an alternative with some precautionary and de minimis recreational fishery opportunities that could be accommodated within the allowable impacts. A lot's come together over the past few days and I just want to speak a bit to the features of what was put up on the screen here, if you might scroll up please, just a little. Thank you. Sure. A little further. Other way. Okay, so I'll use the California KMZ Alt 1 language as the point for discussion. What you see here now, this is of course the amendments that are being made to existing language in the package, but what's being designed here is a strategy of having a series of 3-day openers that are spaced about three weeks apart in all California recreational fisheries from the KMZ southward. These 3-day openers would work, and these are prior to September 1, these three, each of these series of openers would operate with a harvest guideline of 10,000 Chinook such that we would prosecute the first open period of 3 days, which would be 3 or 4 days now in June, it would give us time to stop and count the accrued harvest in the recreational fishery. The next open period would then come in early July. And then an open period in early August as shown on the screen. And with each of those successive openers we would be counting accrual of the harvest guideline and then utilizing an ability to take inseason management action to determine if there was enough remaining harvest guideline to prosecute the next open period. We've heard loudly from a number of our constituencies that we need to ensure that any recreational fishery is prosecuted with a large degree of precaution. And we certainly want to prevent any sort of runaway opportunity in a recreational fishery just as we would for a commercial fishery. So that's the strategy here, is to short openers, stop and count, determine if we can proceed with the next opener. So, this is the first time that we would be considering this approach and we feel like we've done quite a bit to evaluate appropriate harvest guideline of 10,000 Chinook for the pre-September 1 fisheries. Looking to the fall. Same strategies employed in this alternative for post-September 1 fisheries where we'd have three very short openers September 1 through 3, September 27 through 29, and October 18 through 20, and those would operate under against a 5,000 Chinook quota. Fall fisheries, of course we are not attempting to model to impacts, but again we would want to employ quite a bit of precaution even in a credit card fishery to prevent racking up a large credit card bill or large accrual of impacts that would hit against us next season. The 10,000 Chinook quota, just a note on that, and again this is the most, Alternative 1, the most generous of the alternatives for fishing. That, of course is a mixed stock or all-stock limit that would include both adult fish, jackfish, all stocks. And looking at the all-stock projection which is what was utilized to give us an idea on how to set this harvest guideline, certainly would ensure that we would maintain harvest within the projected impacts that are shown in the table, and Sacramento fall, of course, is the constraining stock. So that's how that would work. One thing that I just want to emphasize, I've received this question a number of times, excuse me, what happens when you attain a harvest guideline of 10,000 Chinook? And I just want to explain that the point of the measure is to ensure that we stay within our projected impacts for the fishery. There wouldn't be an action taken immediately that says, okay you've now caught 10,001 fish so the fishery is closed. The strategy would be to prosecute these short openers, stop and count, and

then determine if available fish were left against that harvest guideline to prosecute the remaining short openers that would be scheduled. So hopefully that explains what the proposal is here. We appreciate, again, all of the work of SAS, STT, co-managing agencies that have helped us work through this proposal in order to build in adequate safeguards that would be of interest if we were to prosecute recreational fishery. Moving to the commercial if I may? If you can scroll up just a little bit. A couple things of note here. I just want to highlight that the alternatives for Arena south highlight that... well, they all include only time in June. What you see here in alternative 1 that replaces June 1 through 10 with June 1 through 5 and 8 through 12, what we've heard from the SAS is priority for the dates in the month of June. And again, these dates carry down all the way to the Monterey area. They again would be employing the coastal Chinook framework that we've discussed in detail over the past several months that would involve a trip limit and that we would, that trip limit amount is going... you'll see the amount, you know, that amount is going to need to adjust with the alternatives and also through to final action based on the proposed season dates. So, one thing I'd add is that we will employ that same strategy with regard to the trip limit management. If you look at these June dates where we would fish the first period June 1 through 5 within, and then evaluate the catch and then ascertain if inseason action would be necessary to reduce the trip limit that was proposed for that next open period in June. Just a flag, I think we will probably be looking to add some time between now and final action. Right now, these two open periods are quite close together and we've discussed with the SAS the need for some time to stop and count and then proceed with an inseason action and the notice requirements and we certainly want to give the fleet adequate notice in order to be able to comply with the next open period and the new trip limit. So, we'll be working on that between now and final action so that we can make sure that we've given ourselves a much, enough administrative time so that we take the appropriate steps as needed. There's also an addition in the San Francisco area that I just want to talk a little bit about. The fall area target zone. This is not something that's been in any of the prior alternatives that's coming at the request of the SAS to add time in September and October. Traditionally the fall area target zone is an area that has been open only in the month of October. The proposal is to add fishing opportunity in this area in September as well, and just to describe a little more fully. The fall area target zone is a small subarea within the larger San Francisco management area. So, the proposal is that fishing would be conducted in the fall area target zone but that landing would be allowed throughout that entirety of the San Francisco area. So, you see the regulatory language proposal here to specify that landings would be allowed throughout that area. We'd like this alternative to be included among the range for consideration as we leave March, but acknowledge that some work needs to be done to determine if the coastal Chinook framework applies here in the fall fisheries. This is the only fall fishery for commercial that would be proposed. Again, this is more of a placeholder. Just acknowledging that there are some things to explore here that we'd like to kind of keep within the range for now. Let's see. Give me just a second here please. Oh, let's talk a bit about Table 5 and SONCC. I think Doctor O'Farrell described these additions to the packet this go round. I think I made a brief mention of this yesterday that we've now received new fresh water inputs and just want to acknowledge that in two of the alternatives in Table 5 that they do not come below the 16 percent allowable exploitation rate for the Trinity natural. Excuse me, again we received the values late in the week and we have discussed with the co-managers, which include Hoopa Valley Tribe and Yurok and Oregon, that we'll plan to have discussions once we leave this March meeting about how to best share this exploitation rate between the user groups. So, our plan is to leave the meeting showing that we will exceed or that we are projected to exceed the allowable exploitation rate of 16 percent but we do intend to, how do you say, make headway between now and April. This is the first time that we've needed to work through this issue. And again, getting the inputs kind of midway through the process just signals to us that we need to get together and meet up between now and April and so that is, that's the plan. Anyway, thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:37:38] Okay. Thanks Marci. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:37:42] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I just have a couple of questions. I guess we

have quotas both for the troll and the sport fisheries, but I guess in the... and that's an all Chinook quota, so I think in the analysis we'll see how that translates into, into Klamath and Sacramento fall. Is that right?

Marci Yaremko [00:38:04] Thank you Mr. Gorelnik. I'm going to give this a shot and then I may ask Kandice to come up and fill in any holes in my explanation. But the season dates, you're talking recreational I would assume, and that for the season dates that are shown are what was modeled for the impacts. The intent with the quotas do, are intended to serve the purpose that we've long identified we need to serve, which is to keep the catches within the projected impacts. Of course with a mixed stock fishery there's not clear certainty what that stock composition is likely to be. We do know that there's a high component, especially more recently, of Mokelumne origin fish. But again, the stock composition can differ. We did use a model called the all-stock model or?

Kandice Morganstern [00:39:13] ...(off-mic)... The all-stock harvest...

Marci Yaremko [00:39:15] Yes, thank you. And maybe I will ask Kandice to come up and say a few words about it and some of the assumptions that we made considering the output from this model.

Kandice Morganstern [00:39:38] Yes, thank you Miss Yaremko, Thank you Mr. Gorelnik. I think I would benefit from hearing the question one more time.

Marc Gorelnik [00:39:47] So my question is, well, it's an observation first that both the troll and the sport fisheries are operating under an all-Chinook quota. And I guess, especially given the large number of Mokelumne fish out there, up to half that have been caught recently. Up to half the harvest has been Mokelumne fish, I'm wondering when we get the analysis of these seasons, are we going to see how this quota translates into Sacramento fall fish and translates into Klamath fall fish?

Kandice Morganstern [00:40:22] So.....

Marc Gorelnik [00:40:22] We're not assuming these are all Sacramento fall fish that in that 10,000.

Kandice Morganstern [00:40:30] Right? Yes, thank you Mr. Gorelnik. Yes, so what comes from the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model and the Sacramento Harvest Model is what we call an all-stock forecast amount. So basically, although they're single stock models, it does make an attempt to forecast what the overall harvest will be of that mixed stock fishery, including Mokelumne or other Central Valley Chinook as well. So, it is included as part of that all-stock forecast number, which we do our model runs, we get the all-stock harvest projection and then we'll evaluate that and base our harvest limit quota harvest guideline, whichever term you prefer to use that, to set our amount of fish that we intend to catch for the season.

Marc Gorelnik [00:41:19] I think what I heard is that when the model gets run, including the output of the all-stock model, that we'll see how that translates into Sacramento fall and Klamath fall fish. It's not just going to be 10,000, for example, Sacramento fish in the output of the model.

Kandice Morganstern [00:41:40] Correct. It's not projecting just those single stocks. It's projecting the mixed stock harvest.

Marc Gorelnik [00:41:47] Yeah, that answered my question. Thank you.

Kandice Morganstern [00:41:49] Okay.

Marc Gorelnik [00:41:49] I just wanted to make sure that even though we have an all-Chinook quota, we're going to see what it means with regard to the individual stocks.

Kandice Morganstern [00:41:58] Yeah, we do that postseason analysis.

Brad Pettinger [00:42:00] Thank you. Marc.

Marc Gorelnik [00:42:04] And I have a further question. I just want to make sure I read this correctly. In the... for fall fisheries, right now I think with the guidance the troll fishery has 38 days in the fall fishery, and I'm not sure what the quota would be because I guess we have to see what the output of the model is. And the sport fishery has 9 days in the fall fishery with a 5,000 fish quota. Is that right?

Marci Yaremko [00:42:40] Thank you Mr. Chair. That, as I was explaining earlier, we're putting that September fishery out acknowledging that we don't have other ways to define that at this time, but the interest was in pursuing some opportunity in only the fall area target zone in the month of September in addition to the month of October. And maybe if I may call George Bradshaw up to elaborate?

Brad Pettinger [00:43:23] George.

George Bradshaw [00:43:27] Thank you Chair and Marc. The proposal that we're moving forward specifically first off for the commercial is to go review and see if the framework concept applies to the fall fishery, right? And you know the concept that we were to believe is that there was, you know, overperformances and there's a reason and a rationale to try to make sure that, you know, catch and catch rates and catch numbers match what the models forecasting. You know fall fisheries aren't forecasted. Their realized impacts later coming off the top of the next year's assumed abundance, referred to as credit card fisheries. The reason why we put forward on the commercial side of that real small area, which had been referred to as the Fats target area, it's between Point Reyes and Point Pinos is because it has, or Point Pedro anyways, it limits the impact to the stocks of concern that this framework was for, right? It takes away opportunity from where those stocks typically would be present. You know and I think that there should be some analysis looked at and potentially ran going into next process in April to see if there is any data that we could find that shows a safety net there or not. I would assume, you know, the commercial fleet is going to have to make decisions of if they want to use a credit card mostly on Sacramento stocks, that's going to have to go. And I think the difference is, Marc, between the commercial what we have on paper and the recreational on paper, recreational has a broader area where there is that concern of impacting the stock of concern, the coastal Chinook that, you know, required the framework and, at least in my vision and why I put forward what I did for the commercial side, is to limit at all extent, right? That impact to that stock of concern, which is the coastals.

Marc Gorelnik [00:45:35] All right. Thank you. I just to be clear, I don't object to that at all. I think we should get as much opportunity as possible for everybody that we can do conservatively. It just I'll note that fall area fisheries also probably where 99 percent of the sport fishery is at that time of year as well,.

George Bradshaw [00:45:51] For sure. And it might be something to consider, I don't know, I mean on a broader scale for recreational as well. I don't know if, you know data, and like I said or Miss Yaremko alluded to, you know, the proposal that I wanted to make sure was on the books for the commercial is so that it could be looked into. See if there's an application there that needed to be for the framework or not, you know, so they could lead on to more discussion between the agencies and industry.

Marc Gorelnik [00:46:18] Thank you.

George Bradshaw [00:46:19] Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:46:22] Thanks Marc. Anyone else? All right. Okay Robin.

Robin Ehlke [00:46:33] Thank you Mr. Chair. Under this agenda item you have provided guidance from all of the states as well as the tribes and so the STT will go and run that analysis. I will note that we, the salmon agenda item is scheduled back first thing tomorrow morning and there's a good chance that we'll want to delay that just to give the STT time to produce their report and everyone to develop their guidance as needed, given that it is our final shot at the 2024 seasons coming out of March.

Brad Pettinger [00:47:12] Okay.

Robin Ehlke [00:47:13] Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:47:13] Very good. With that, that concludes C.8.

9. Adopt 2024 Management Alternatives for Public Review

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] So that completes our reports and the public comment. Takes us to Council discussion and action. And at some point, we will need motions for these, but I will look around and see if anybody wants to start the discussion? Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:00:19] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I did not have any questions for Mr. Oatman on the statement from the Quinault Indian Nation, but wanted to thank him for bringing that statement. I wanted to make a couple comments on it. There were attempts to communicate with co-managers last summer prior to the inseason action we took in the ocean north of Falcon. For whatever reason those attempts fell short and we've had a lot of discussions with the coastal co-managers since then about how to improve that communication, setting some schedules and things for making sure everybody was on board. I wanted to thank Joe for the role he's played in putting together some thoughts on paper on that one too. But it'll be a continuing discussion for the co-managers through April and into the summer in the future to make sure we're doing a better job on inseason communication.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:12] Thank you Kyle. Any further discussion? And I don't see any, if we're ready for any motions? Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:01:33] Thank you again Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:38] All right. I'm sure it'll appear here before us soon.

Kyle Adicks [00:01:43] I move to adopt for public review the alternatives for non-Indian commercial and recreational fisheries in the area north of Cape Falcon as presented in Agenda Item C.9.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 11th, 2024.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:58] Thank you. That language looks accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Kyle Adicks [00:02:01] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:02] Seconded by Phil Anderson. Please speak to your motion.

Kyle Adicks [00:02:06] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think I started the week this way, but again a huge thanks to the SAS and the STT. I don't know a group that works harder than the STT and all the state and tribal and federal staff that support them during the March and April Council meetings. An amazing amount of work they get done, late nights and early mornings to get all the information analyzed and turned around back to the Council so we can make decisions and get to today where we put a packet out for public review with these three alternatives. As I said yesterday and we heard again this morning in the STT Report, we do have two coho stocks in Washington, the Snohomish and the Quileute that are not meeting their objectives within the, in any of the alternatives. This is the start of our process in Washington to talk about inside fisheries and we'll be making changes to fisheries and marine and freshwater areas outside of the Council to make sure that we have a package that will meet those objectives when we get to the April meeting. We also have a lot of work to do with Puget Sound Chinook that will consume a lot of our time as we move towards April. And I get to kick that process off Wednesday. We have a big public meeting back in Olympia to talk primarily about Puget Sound fisheries. We have our first big co-manager meeting post this meeting on Thursday. And Friday, Mr. Oatman and I will be meeting with our Canadian colleagues on the PST Southern Panel to exchange information on abundances and statuses for coho in Washington and B.C. and exchange some preliminary fishery information. So, a lot to happen in the next month but thanks to everybody that got

us to this point.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:47] All right, thank you. First, I'll look around, see if there are any questions regarding the motion for clarification? I'm not seeing any. Any discussion on the motion? I'm not seeing any discussion. I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:04:05] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:06] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Maybe we can move down the coast. John North.

John North [00:04:22] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Oregon does have a motion today. I'll try it without my glasses this time. I move to adopt for public review the alternatives for non-Indian commercial and recreational fisheries in the area from Cape Falcon south to the Oregon California border as presented in Agenda Item C.9.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 11th, 2024.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:50] Thank you. That does look complete and accurate. Do you agree?

John North [00:04:53] I agree.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:55] Thank you. Is there a second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Please speak to your motion.

John North [00:05:01] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Although we have more work ahead of us to meet the various conservation objectives, I think this set of alternatives gets us closer thanks to the hard work of the SAS and STT, the Council staff, my fellow managers, and my colleagues at ODFW, and I thank all of you for your hard work. I appreciated the sincere testimony we had all week from our tribal representatives and from the public also. Unfortunately though, the salmon situation this year required more tough decisions, which I hope isn't becoming the norm. But I look forward to seeing you all in Seattle and we'll continue our work.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:49] Thank you. First, again, I'll look around to see if there are any questions on the motion? Seeing no questions. Any discussion on the motion? No discussion. I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:06:06] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:07] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you John. I'll turn to Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:06:22] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do you have a motion for California. I move to adopt for public review the alternatives for non-Indian commercial and recreational fisheries for the area from the Oregon California border to the U.S. Mexico border as presented in Agenda Item C.9.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 11th, 2024, with the following amendments. To Table 1. Commercial troll alternatives in the Point Arena the Pigeon Point cell, which is the San Francisco area. In the subarea from Point Reyes to Point San Pedro, which is the fall area target zone. In alternative 1: strike September 1 through 30 and replace with September 2 through 6, 9 through 13, 16 through 20, 23 to 27, and September 30th. Add, "or attainment of the 7,500 Chinook harvest limit, which would apply across the proposed September and October dates". And add "landing and possession limit of 40 Chinook per vessel per landing week".

Pete Hassemer [00:07:57] Thank you. That looks accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Marci Yaremko [00:08:03] Yes, but there was one typographical change needed at the very top of the motion. "For the area from the area from", so it should just be, "for the area from". Great. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:38] All right, now that looks good.

Marci Yaremko [00:08:40] Yes it does. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:41] All right. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

Marci Yaremko [00:08:48] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think I'll speak first to the alternatives generally that are provided in the range. Two of the three alternatives would authorize short ocean salmon seasons and dates and establish harvest limits for both commercial and sport fishing off California in 2024. And the third alternative would close the ocean fisheries off California for a second consecutive year. In response to poor river and ocean conditions, key California stocks are forecast to have 2024 abundance levels that are well below average. Consequently, as we've been discussing all week, the options that have been developed that do authorize some fishing are very precautionary. They are de minimis opportunities, but they are designed with a great degree of caution and serve to prevent us from exceeding our projections, and that's very important this year with the low abundance levels that we're working with. The commercial alternatives propose a very limited number of small quota fisheries and also would require vessel-based trip limits that would apply in each open period. And this is consistent with the biological opinion for coastal Chinook and this is our first time applying the framework and we've done a lot of work this week to get to this point where we have employed the framework and developed alternatives. For recreational fishing, the alternatives would authorize up to 7 short open fishing periods ranging from 4 to 6 days in length beginning in June and running through October. The scheduled dates would not be guaranteed, and as I described yesterday would be subject to two different total harvest limits, one for pre-September fisheries and then one limit for the post-September fisheries or the fall fisheries. And when catches approach either of those limits, inseason action would be taken to Council remaining days. So, there are no guarantees that the scheduled dates will actually be prosecuted. Inseason management, both in terms of harvest limits and trip limits, are new concepts for us in management of commercial and recreational ocean salmon fisheries, but use of these tools is really important, particularly this year, to ensure that our catches stay within preseason projections and given the low abundance forecasts. I turn now to discuss the text you see on the screen that makes a modification to the language in the packet relating to Alternative 1 in the San Francisco area for our commercial troll fishery. I mentioned yesterday that we were talking about the viability of an alternative for a very small commercial fishery in the month of September, where we would use different geography than just the entirety of the San Francisco area. The fall area target zone is a fishery that occurs in the month of October, but is limited both to the north and south so that the entirety of the San Francisco area isn't open. That target zone is also included in the winter run biological opinion and does authorize this fishery and the, you know, with specific date limits. So, I appreciate the discussion I had last night with National Marine Fisheries about being able to apply these specific boundary areas for use in a September fishery, which is not something that we've ever proposed doing before. It's a precautionary approach. The goal in this case is to prevent or reduce the likelihood of encounters on California coastal Chinook, which might be found in the more northerly part of the San Francisco management area. So, the advice would be that if we were to prosecute this fishery, we limit it only to this small zone within the greater San Francisco management area. So, in discussions last night I did get confirmation from National Marine Fisheries Service that we would be able to use that geography in this case. We've never done it before in the month of September so there was some question about that when we left discussion yesterday. So, with that, we'd like to go ahead and maintain this alternative

but then modify the dates that we listed yesterday. Again, we didn't get into this level of detail when we were formulating the idea yesterday with the alternatives, but we would replace the dates that showed open of September 1 through 30 and then they would be these short weekly openers, and that as per the other areas where there are commercial seasons proposed, it would include a harvest limit for this fall fishery of 7,500 Chinook, which would apply across any of those open dates in September and October. Additionally, a per vessel trip limit of 40 Chinook per vessel per landing week would be added. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:32] Thank you Marci. Any questions regarding the motion? Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:15:40] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thanks, Marci, for that great report and explanation, I appreciate it and the motion. A question I had. You mentioned when you spoke about it about anticipated attainment or something to that language, but then it says in the motion "or attainment". And so those are two different things and I'm curious how, have you thought about the approach to that? Are you going to look at the rate of attainment that's happening on an ongoing basis and anticipate the attainment, or are you going to wait for the number to be reached and then put the brakes on? So just a clarification.

Marci Yaremko [00:16:24] Thank you Mr. Dooley. So, this manner of catch tracking we will be operating under this harvest limit. We now will also have the addition of the per vessel trip limit of 40 fish per landing week. The provisions allow in that open period the vessel to make, you know, one or more landings not to exceed 40 Chinook. There's also a 24 hour offload requirement so that a landing could happen the next day after the open period. The requirements also, and this applies everywhere, new this year is the addition of a 24 hour submission requirement to California's electronic fish ticket system, which will allow for timely tracking of catches inseason. When we project that attainment of the 7,500 Chinook limit might be near, and this goes for any proposed quota fishery that is included in the package, we would be working with our agency partners and in particular National Marine Fisheries Service on the potential need for an inseason action, and this is consistent with how both other northerly salmon fisheries have operated for many years utilizing inseason management tools as well as other California fisheries where we do the same thing, and then project how much more fishing that is scheduled could occur, and if trip limit reductions are an option, anyway we'd tailor the inseason management action based on the circumstances that we have at hand. So that would either be, you know, completion of the the season because we've attained the quota or possibly a reduction to the established trip limit.

Bob Dooley [00:18:44] Thank you for the clarification. I appreciate it.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:47] Further questions? Seeing no questions, any discussion on the motion? Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:18:55] Yeah, thank you. I guess first off I'll just kind of echo the appreciation of all the work of the SAS and the STT, and all the state and tribal managers in getting to our three alternatives today, but I did want to speak here because I know it's been another difficult year for salmon stocks. And really, as Marci noted, not just this year, but I think over the past couple of years we've kind of implemented some significant and difficult changes in our salmon management and just wanted to really thank the Department of California Department of Fish and Wildlife for their constructive collaboration and hard work over these challenging issues. So just wanted to express that. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:36] Thank you Ryan. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:19:39] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I'm going to of course vote for the, for

the motion that I seconded, but I just did want to note that for the fall fisheries we have different quotas in the troll and sport, 7,500 versus 5,000 fish, and this proposal has 30 days for the commercial fleet to remove 7,500 fish and 9 days for the sport to reduce, to remove 5,000 fish. So, I think between now and April we'll have some discussions about that to try to smooth off the rough edges.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:20] Thank you. Further discussion? Seeing no hands I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:20:28] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:29] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci. And now I look to Joe Oatman for any tribal motions.

Joe Oatman [00:20:46] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'll wait one second till it's displayed on the screen. Thank you. So, for the tribal motion. So, for tribal ocean fisheries in the area north of Cape Falcon, I move to adopt for public review the alternatives as presented in Agenda Item C.9.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, Table 3, which is dated March 11th, 2024.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:28] And that looks accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Joe Oatman [00:21:32] It does, Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:33] Thank you. I'll look for a second to the motion? Seconded by Kyle Adicks. Please speak to your motion.

Joe Oatman [00:21:39] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So, the tribes feel their alternatives represent a reasonable range of quota options for treaty troll that are mindful of management objectives of Chinook and coho salmon stocks in light of their 2024 projected abundances. I would also like to state for the record the tribes and state are just beginning the north of Falcon planning process in which they will evaluate the total impacts of all proposed fisheries on coastal Puget Sound and Columbia River stocks. In navigating this process, the state and tribes have some difficult decisions in front of them as they reach agreement on management measures that meet the management objectives for all relevant stocks. For this coming season the co-managers will also be working through north of Falcon to make improvements to management that facilitates inseason discussions. I'd also like to express my appreciation for all the work that the co-managers have done over the course of the week, the state of Washington, the tribes, as well as all the work that that STT and others, such as SAS has put into this week it's very much appreciated. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:01] Thank you Joe. I'll look around and see if there are any questions regarding the motion first? Seeing no questions. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:23:19] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:19] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Joe. Robin, what's next?

Robin Ehlke [00:23:36] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. It looks like we have a pretty good package in front of us. We have both the tribal and the WDFW motions and ODFW. California gave us a motion with some few changes, but the STT will incorporate that change into their final packet. You'll see that in the Preseason 2 Report that will be available before we get to the April meeting. So, we'll incorporate

all those changes. And with that I think we've done our work under salmon here at this March meeting and I just again, like everyone said, I have to thank the teams and the Council for putting together those teams. The commitment that it takes from the states and the tribes and the NMFS to provide the people that can dedicate their work to these things that we do makes all the difference. So, I want to say thank you all for that. And we've done our work under this. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:36] All right, thank you. That will close out this agenda item.

10. Appoint Salmon Hearings Officers

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] We have no other reports. The Attachment 1, the table is in the briefing book and there's no public comment so I will look around for discussion and confirmation. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:00:14] I plan to join Kyle at the hearing in Westport.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:20] All right. Phil will be joining Kyle. Any further discussion? Comments? Confirmation that what's on here is accurate? I'm seeing head nods. Anything else to do Robin?

Robin Ehlke [00:00:42] Nope. That's it. Thank you very much.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:45] All right, with that we have the hearing officers appointed and we will close this agenda item.

D. Habitat Issues

1. Current Habitat Issues

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That takes care of public comment, which brings us to Council action which is before you on the screen. So, I'll open the floor for any discussion as needed. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:00:18] Thanks Mr. Chair. This is actually a question, I think, for Council staff. Noting the recommendation that the Habitat Committee made about a possible meeting webinar format to be I guess sampled in June. That as I read it sounds like a good idea, but curious how that fits into sort of the larger Council planning or finances or anything like that? So just looking for a little advice or recommendations from staff.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:47] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:00:51] Yes, thank you Miss Ridings for the question. We haven't had a chance to really discuss this internally. I think the broader context is that with our increasing availability and familiarity with webinars, we have a lot of meetings and we have a lot of other work to do in addition to hosting meetings. And so, we need to be very diligent and deliberate about what meetings we schedule when, and while this on its face sounds like a good idea, it will take quite a bit of time that I think goes unseen by this Council to file FR Notices, put together agendas, put together the technology to host the meeting, that takes away from our ability to do other things. So, we'll discuss it and consider it internally and if it looks like that's the best route, we're happy to do it. If not, we're happy to continue the conversation with the Habitat Committee or others about how to best organize their meetings.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:49] Okay. Thank you Corey. Thank you Merrick. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:01:54] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. Corey beat me to my question but it does, it seems to me like it would appreciate staff looking into it. It seems like it would alleviate some of the workload on, you know, at the meetings. But hearing Mr. Burden that it takes considerations but, yeah, just voicing support for and gratitude for you looking into it. I bet it would pay off to think closely about their idea.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:20] Okay. Thank you Corey. Anyone else? Okay. Kerry, how are we doing?

Kerry Griffin [00:02:29] I think you're doing pretty well. There were no actions recommended or taken up by the Council under this. No letters or anything and so if there's no other guidance from the Council, I think that concludes your business for this agenda item.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:45] All right. Very good. Thank you.

E. Cross Fishery Management Plan (FMP)

1. Council and Scientific and Statistical Committee Discussion

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] All right, thanks. Thanks for that overview there. I think we're going to have members of the SSC leadership come up to the table here. We've got Doctor Dan Holland, Vice-Chair Doctor Jason Schaffler. We've got, excuse me, the Salmon Subcommittee Chair, Mr. Alan Byrne, and the Groundfish Subcommittee Chair, Doctor John Field. And one additional person.....(laughter)....excuse me. Wasn't on my cheat sheet here, Cameron Speir with the economics. So good. So, thank you all for coming here today and just before I turn it back to Executive Director Burden here, as I looked around, I've never sat in the seat where you are right now and face the Council, and the only thing going through my mind is in your eyes this must look like one of those congressional inquisitions that you see on T.V. or your internet news feed that could be very bad. That's not what it is. As Executive Burden said, this is a discussion to get to a common understanding so we can relax a little bit there and I'm going to turn it back to Executive Burden then to start things off.

Merrick Burden [00:01:35] Okay, thank you Vice-Chairman Hassemer. Well, to start things off I would say we are in a March meeting which is a salmon-centric meeting, and so I believe the... I'll look first at Alan as the Salmon Subcommittee Chair and invite you to reflect upon some of the challenges that we've discussed over the last couple of years starting in the fall with the methodology process and the SSC's role and then some of the discussions we've had at this time of year, and some of the things that we have been trying to reconcile, at least during my tenure here as Executive Director. If you could offer your thoughts, I think that would be a great way to get the conversation going.

Alan Byrne [00:02:18] Okay. Well, those of you who don't know, I am going to retire this year so I can pretty much say whatever I want.....(laughter).... No, we'll start. Starting with the salmon methodology. As you mentioned in your remarks, it's kind of a, it's kind of a conundrum in some respects because the SSC is charged with being the review body in a way and having the final say on approving the methodologies or approving, you know, whether something is up to scientific standards. It meets the... it kind of meets the scientific smell test. However, the methodology review meeting also includes the Salmon Technical Team and the MEW for good reasons, because very often they are the ones that are requesting a review of a methodology, or if they're not requesting a review of methodology, they are the ones that would have to implement the new methodology. So, in the case when the SST is coming to proposing a new methodology, it kind of creates a kind of a fox in the henhouse situation where the STT is both requesting, is actually asking or proposing a new methodology, which in my mind should preclude them from reviewing it. I mean, they can definitely have their opinions of it, and they definitely, because they're they are bringing it forward they have probably a very good reason why it's an improvement and most of the times we agree with it. But I think some of the... maybe where the friction occurred maybe in the last couple of years is I think the SSC has viewed its role as the final decision-maker on technical, the technical merit of the review, and I think sometimes that line gets blurred. And when in the course of a meeting the SSC has a kind of, if any of you have sat in on the SSC meeting, we kind of have a way of handling topics and reviewing topics, and that may be a little different than the way the STT does things and the way the MEW does things. So, when it comes to a methodology review, sometimes there's a little bit of clashing because there's maybe different expectations by different members of different subcommittees about how the meetings should proceed. But at the end of the day, it's the SSC that is supposed to weigh-in on whether this methodology is technically sound and is an improvement on the way we're doing things. So, the SSC, quite frankly, views it as we're the ones that are supposed to make the decision. And we allow input from other members of the public and of other subcommittees, but the final decision is and discussion is amongst the SSC, and that's how we view it, and I think it's laid out in some of the Council Operating Procedures and the FMPs is that's what our charge is and that's why we view things the way

we are. If we're wrong on that you should let us know, but we, you know... and so I'll kind of leave it at that. And as far as, you know, the choosing of the topics, that's kind of developed jointly. But again, the FM... I think of the Council Operating Procedure and my read of it's pretty clear that's it's the SSC that determines what the topics are, but we've never really strictly adhered to that. So maybe if... it may be worth looking at that COP and maybe revising it to reflect the way we do things instead of ignoring what's in print. I don't think there's anything that's a deal breaker, but sometimes some feathers get ruffled. But we usually unruffle them because we all like each other at the end of the day. So that's how the review process goes and that's done in October of every year so if a new methodology is approved, it can be used by the STT or whatever other agency is providing, let's say a forecast methodology is providing the forecast can incorporate for the next salmon cycle, which brings us to this meeting. The forecast and Pre-1 in ocean fisheries, these are very large documents as you well know. There's a lot of information in them. The STT usually gets them out at the last minute and it's probably not fault of their own because they rely on other agencies and other staff that are not, that don't answer to you to provide the information that goes into that report. So, we often have inadequate time, as we said in our statement earlier today, to review those documents. And some of the discussions we've had is that maybe we should just focus on like the three major stocks that we have to provide the acceptable catches for, like the Klamath River fall, the Sacramento fall and the Willapa Bay, focus on those at the March meeting. The STT has been good about getting us a preliminary draft of those three stocks before the main report comes out, and then if the Council wants us to really go through a thorough review of those documents, we could defer it then report to you in April rather than in March. And I don't know how that would work but, you know, basically our... when we talk about that agenda item, we tend to focus just on those three stocks I mentioned, and then we typically highlight some of the maybe red flags are coming up like stocks that are approaching overfishing or stocks that are still, that are under rebuilding plans that haven't quite gotten to rebuilt status and Doctor O'Farrell always kind of highlights the same thing, so we're kind of redundant. That's just some thoughts about the Preseason 1. It's very hard to give a thorough review to, you know, a several hundred page document when you get it one day, one working day or less than one working day before a Council meeting starts. Basically, all we can do is we have some dedicated members that take it upon themselves to work on the weekend and go through some of the tables and we catch what we can. We probably miss things too. So that was just one thought that some members of our committee thought maybe we can, instead of doing this in March, maybe we can do a thorough review and report to you in April. And, you know right now, just one more final comment is that in addition to... you know the last few years salmon has been more of a back burner issue in certain ways. I remember when I first started the SSC the salmon agenda items took up more time than the groundfish, and it's been a long time since that happened. But, you know, there is some potential into the future that, you know, the workload and the amount of time the Council will spend on salmon will increase, you know, you're seeing with the dam removal in the Klamath River there's going to have to be a lot of re-analysis of that stock just simply because there's 400 miles more of habitat. We've made some subcommittee reports, and I alluded to this in our, our statement on C.4 that some of these status determination criteria, reference points that we use to manage could benefit from a reanalysis because many of them were done with very old data. And, you know, that Klamath River was, report was kind of an eye opener that, you know, how much productivity has changed in just, you know, basically 35 years and some of our other important salmon stocks, some of those reference points are based on data that's even older than that. And if that's to be undertaken someone's got to do the work. The SSC, like I said, is a review body, but we have to review it and so a workgroup has to be set up so that that will increase workload for probably the STT in addition to some of the other interested parties to do that work because it's going to take more than just Council participants, it's going to take agencies and tribal members that have the expertise to help with that endeavor.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:24] Okay, thanks Alan. Anybody else want to offer anything? Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:12:32] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm in a similar situation as Alan. I don't have

a lot of time left so I can say whatever I want... (laughter)... I don't have to worry of whether Miss Quan's going to recommend me for reappointment so I guess the first thing I would... I have a lot of things to say about this, but let me see if I can put them into some categories and make them as short as possible. First, I think this conversation is long overdue. I think there has been friction, for lack of better words, between the SSC on salmon matters and the STT and the Model Evaluation Group, and I think it's... I've seen it reoccurring on a more frequent basis over the past 3 or 4 years than I did prior to that. So, it's a good, good conversation to have, and I, if we're going to, if we're going to get some value out of it, it shouldn't end here today. My second thought is we kind of created this monster for ourselves, you know? I mean, we have... it's not a monster. We created this situation where we have different groups with overlapping, you know, authorities and responsibilities, so it shouldn't be surprising I suppose that we're going to run into these kinds of, we would run into this situation at some point in time. And the Model Evaluation Group needs to coordinate with the STT, the STT needs to coordinate with the SSC and vice versa, and we set up a process here that relied on collaboration. And if you don't have that collaboration, then this model is doomed to fail, I think. My third thought, or observation I guess, isn't anything all that new but, you know, salmon is a unique group of species and stocks that we're managing. There's a lot of the expertise and the information that comes from the states and the tribes, much more so than any of the other species that are in our other four FMPs. And beyond that, we have stocks that are listed in our FMP that have international exceptions because of their overlap with the Pacific Salmon Commission, or they have exceptions due to U.S. v Washington. And so... and there's a lot of expertise in the Pacific Salmon Commission that reviews a lot of the... some of the same information that we're reviewing here. My fourth category is listening to Alan, his perspective seemed pretty black and white, and I don't know that it's that black and white. And I probably need to go and review the, the COPs when it comes to picking the topics for methodology reviews...(Audio interruption)... that's interesting....

Butch Smith [00:16:33] It's the new guy.

Phil Anderson [00:16:46] Yeah.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:49] Donuts.

Phil Anderson [00:16:49] Because I thought the Council picked the topics for methodology review and then they handed it off and through our process of engaging the M.E.W., the MEW and the SST and then to the SSC, the SSC sets up it's timeframes in which they want to hear from the MEW and the STT so then when they do their review and come out with their perspective and opinion to the Council, generally that happens in November, then we take action on the recommendation that comes from the SSC. But the work leading up to the SSC by the MEW and the STT is invaluable and frankly the SSC isn't going to be in a position to review anything without their input. And I believe that their opinion, they being the MEW and the STT, should be viewed as value added to the SSC. So, my last category. I asked about BSIA here a little earlier when we were talking about adopting the forecasts that were in Pre-1 because I remember distinctly Chuck Tracy and I going to Montlake to visit with Doctor Rick Methot about the West Coast Regional Framework to determine BSIA and appealing to him that salmon is a different animal and we get our preseason forecasts generally 4 to 6 weeks before we have to make a decision on our seasons. And those forecasts are done by a multiple entities, both state and tribal, that are brought into this process, and to have all of those reviewed and have a BSI determination made, not only by the SSC but subsequently by NOAA in the timeframe that we have isn't realistic. The methods by which those forecasts are made are something that certainly is to me in my mind is, are things that ought to be reviewed by our science body. But the... and we also know that the forecast methodol... the data and the thought... I was reluctant to use the word methodology in that context, but we know that they are changing their, they change from whether it's every year or as they learn more about the performance of those forecasts. If you have a stock that's overforecasting, you look at why that is and

you need to make an adjustment, just as we did with the OPI here last year. But that is going on all the time by the people that are doing the forecasts. So, the bottom line here I think is that we need to get our... we need to continue this conversation. We need to get back to the point where we're viewing this as a collaborative approach to getting the work done, not taking away the role of the SSC, but maybe clarifying it. I don't think Alan is that far off in terms of what their responsibility is. It's what... are they expected to listen to the other perspectives that come forward in a methodology review that might come from the MEW or the STT or from other expertise that we have? And I would say, yes, they are to listen to those, but at the end of the day in the methodology review, the SSC is the one that's going to come back to the Council and make a recommendation on whether or not we're going to use it for our management decisions. So, I talked too long. I'll stop there but I appreciate the opportunity to share some thoughts.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:02] Thank you Phil. Any others want to share some thoughts on this subject? Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:22:10] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Phil made a lot of the points I wanted to make and sort of package them up in categories better than I would have done, so thanks for those comments, Phil. I wanted to respond to one of the points we heard was about what does the operating procedure say about methodology review for salmon? And I don't think it's clear from that the Council is sort of saying, 'okay, these are good things to preliminary consider for a methodology review' and then formally adopting that list in September, but I think that's critical because the Council members who represent the agencies who are doing a lot of the work that has to be done over the summer for methodology review are prioritizing that work and deciding is this something, is this a priority to assign staff to go do and have something ready for September to put into a pretty short process to get to the SSC and go through that by November. So, I agree that somewhere we should probably consider clarification if that's the intention is that the SSC, the STT, the MEW, bring ideas forward and the Council is saying 'okay these are the ideas we want to assign our staff to go try to get done over the summer', then we should probably talk about that.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:33] Thank you Kyle. I'm going to look carefully around. Any other observations or discussions on the salmon? Alan.

Alan Byrne [00:23:48] Yeah, just one. I'd like to follow-up. Is it Kyle? I'm sorry. Yeah, especially those points are real important. One of the things that the salmon subcommittee has struggled with is, you know, what... obviously, we've reviewed some of the forecasts, especially some of the... like the OPI and the Sacramento index, some of them maybe a long time ago, but there's a whole host of forecasts in that report that we've never reviewed and we're not sure whether we're supposed to review it. So, if you guys could kind of maybe help us clarify it. And secondly, if we are going to... if you do want to review some of those forecasts, like you said, many of them are generated by states and or tribes or in cooperation with each other and they're not quite part of the Council process. So, they feed into it so it's up to, I guess, the Council members. If Washington Fish and Wildlife is responsible for forecasting coho X, that the Council member from Washington needs to get a hold of that group and let them know that, yes, this is important for the Council process. We need you to prepare for a methodology review. And that would make the process go a lot smoother because, quite frankly, I don't know who's responsible for most of these forecasts and I don't think anybody does because individual names are not identified, it's just the agencies.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:33] Thank you. Take a moment here and look around. Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman [00:25:47] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Appreciate a lot of the comments that both Phil and Kyle provided a moment ago. I think from my perspective, you know, it does seem pretty clear

that the SSC, you know, is pretty distinct and different from the other salmon advisory bodies, you know, in that they are specifically listed in the MSA as being charged with advising the Council on Best Scientific Information Available, as well as I think one of the points that Alan was raising on, you know, kind of how you go about that work. And so, I think one of the other elements here to consider, you know, how we addressed is, you know, like the conflict of interest where I understand that from the SSC how they address that. If there is something that's being brought to them that if it does involve a SSC member or their agency, that person has to recuse themselves given it could raise some implications relative to conflict of interest. And so, for the other advisory bodies, you know, the extent that something like that may happen, I think that too is an important consideration that we need to think about in terms of kind of clarifying the roles and responsibilities for the SSC and how that relates to the salmon management work that we do.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:32] Thank you Joe. Further hands here? I'm not seeing any right now. I'm going to turn to Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:27:46] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. Well, if that's all that we had on salmon, at least for the moment, I would suggest we turn the page and focus on groundfish and pause here for a second. I know WDFW wanted to switch seats from salmon to groundfish. While they're doing that there were a few items I made note of in the Situation Summary. And I guess I'm, I'll invite anyone of the SSC leadership to speak. I find myself staring at John as the interim or maybe permanently appointed Groundfish Subcommittee Chair. So, there are a few things that I made note of in the Situation Summary. You know the stock identification process, a few other matters related to data-moderate assessments, and then one of the things that I heard the SSC talking about earlier this week, I believe that was yesterday, was just the workload involved in being an SSC Groundfish Subcommittee member. A lot of that is wrapped up in STAR Panels and things of that nature. So, I guess I'll defer to you to see how you want to introduce the SSC's perspective on this and start the conversation.

John Field [00:29:10] Thank you Director Burden. Yes, we had an opportunity to talk a little bit about this. I am, for better or for worse, your Groundfish Subcommittee Chair for the near future. What I would report is that one thing we have thought would be very helpful moving forward is being this Subcommittee Chair is not a trivial amount of work. I don't want to do it forever. So, what we have decided to move forward with is having a sort of Vice-Chair for the Groundfish Subcommittee and trying to implement a two-year rotation on that burden, kind of comparable to what we do for the full SSC Committee Chair and Vice-Chair. So, Doctor Cheryl Barnes has agreed to be the Groundfish Subcommittee Vice-Chair and the entire Groundfish Subcommittee has agreed to try and do a bit more, help chair-specific methodology review or committee meetings just to spread out that burden quite a bit, because I think that Doctor Budrick took a lot of responsibility on himself when he was the Groundfish Subcommittee Chair and I think in probably moving forward be better to spread that workload out. In addition, we're hoping to think about ways that we can be a little more efficient and kind of reduce the overall workload. There's a lot of subcommittee meetings, a lot of methodology reviews, perhaps some of these could be streamlined, perhaps some aren't necessary, perhaps some could be incorporated into full SSC subcommittee meetings. So we've got some ideas there. I'm not exactly sure what we think is the best for the stock definition process. I think we're speaking to that a little bit in our future meeting planning statement putting some options out there. With respect to data-moderate assessments, I think it was broadly recognized over the last couple of cycles that those assessments take about as much review as full benchmark assessments. Maybe a little bit of rethinking about the best way to create more efficiencies in getting assessment throughput is warranted in light of that, particularly if some of those assessments end up just requiring full benchmark assessments in the next cycle or the cycle after that as well. So, perhaps the choice of species was not optimal when we first initiated that. It's created a little more work as well. The stock definition process, as we come up with more and more stock delineations for the nearshore species, as well is going to create additional

workload. It's workload not only for the SSC, but it's also additional workload for the Science Centers. I know that both the review process and the process of developing these assessments is greater now than it was 10, 20 years ago by a lot. And the resources are, you know, not as great as, as they were that long ago. So, one solution that we would like to see more of is to do more stock assessment updates. The hope is that as stock assessments, as the time series available to inform the assessments gets longer, we might be able to make more frequent use of updates and so we've, our assessment prioritization statement will speak to that a little bit more. And probably more interactions with the Council. I think one regret we had during the last assessment cycle is the inability to schedule one of the previous evening review sessions that we used to have with the Council to kind of go over the assessments and have an opportunity to take questions and discuss some of the results in light of previous assessments or surprises that people might have thought and kind of get a head start on getting an understanding of what was really driving changes that might have been present in the model, which even though it takes up a bit of time, in retrospect perhaps it might not have taken up... it might have been a time effective thing to do just in light of having some conversations about why some of the results that did happen, happened. I know that speaking to, you know, the ability to develop assessments, and the Northwest Center is working on a report that I believe will be available in April that will speak more to the Science Center side of things and the additional workload as well as a number of assessments, so that's probably something that could be discussed more with the Science Centers in April, but I think it affects both the SSC and the Science Centers with respect to the level of detail and scrutiny that are going into stock assessments and stock assessment reviews in the current era. Maybe that is a good place to stop and see if there's any other questions?

Pete Hassemer [00:34:12] Thank you. I'm going to look around. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:34:17] So I'm fairly new and I've not had the opportunity to experience perhaps that kind of evening pre-meeting to kind of informally review with the Council and allow questions. Just administratively, actually, I guess, a question for the Executive Director. Does that type of interaction require the same types of public notice as the rest of the formal Council and formal committee meetings?

Merrick Burden [00:34:47] Well let's see. Thanks for the question. Just in terms of the, the model that Mr. Field is speaking to, where we would have an evening session during a Council meeting, that's all wrapped up in the same notice. Oftentimes they're not noticed if it's somebody else doing the meeting. We'll just say, feel free to use the GAP room, for example, tomorrow evening. So, we're usually amenable to that, but we're also conscious that a lot of our staff work really long hours and sometimes they're working til 10 or 11 at night and there's no one to help put those together and I think, if I recall correctly, that might have been what happened last time. But we're generally open to doing that sort of thing.

Pete Hassemer [00:35:31] Okay, thank you. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:35:34] I don't know that this is necessarily a question for Doctor Field, but an observation. I was thinking back to the November SSC Report on workload planning, and the last two pages have all of the workshops and meetings for 2024 and beyond. It's two pages long. There are 13 workshops proposed and 9 of those are groundfish items, which is a lot of work. And this is supposed to be our, we don't even really call it the off-year anymore, but 9 workshops in one year is going to be a lot for anybody, and it's not just our SSC folks, but when there's groundfish that also involves 1 or 2 members of the GAP, 1 or 2 members of the GMT, as well as Council staff having to help support that. All of the items on that list are important to somebody. We may need to streamline or prioritize. Like we were having at the Committee of the Whole meeting, what is the have to versus the want to, or the shall versus the may, because it is looking like once a month there's a Groundfish Subcommittee meeting which is a lot of workload because this is not all of... this is not all of youse full time job. You

have other parts to your job, so I wanted to just acknowledge that, that it's a pretty ambitious schedule what's out there already and how do we work with that?

Pete Hassemer [00:37:01] Thank you Lynn. John, please.

John Field [00:37:07] Thank you Miss Mattes, members of the Council. I'll say just very briefly that the table's a little shorter this time around, but it's still probably too long and we're working on it and any help and guidance that the Council can provide about what they perceive as the more important versus the less important workshops and meetings would be welcome. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:37:31] Thanks. Further observations? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:37:37] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. This is a question for Doctor Field. Thanks for being here. My question, you mentioned when you were talking about data-moderate stock assessments you said the choice of species was not optimal. I guess the first part of my question is what species were you talking about?

John Field [00:37:57] Thank you Miss Ridings. I think in retrospect it may have been that choosing species that... part of the rationale for choosing the species that were chosen or the species that were ranked as highly vulnerable based on a productivity susceptibility analysis, a vulnerability analysis, and it may have been that it would have made more sense to try and do benchmarks of those species early on. Part of the problem is there wasn't enough data at the time to do benchmarks for those species. But in order to better refine and understand the process, I think there was a little bit of logic that said, let's do species that we think we have enough data to do and understand reliably using this new modeling approach, and let's also do species that might be highly vulnerable and might have some non-trivial conservation concerns. It might have been wise in retrospect to focus a little more on the former, not the latter. I'm drifting into policy and value judgment territory here and I'm not really feeling that comfortable about it so probably I should have just kept my damn mouth shut, but there we go. I'm trying my best to answer your question honestly.

Pete Hassemer [00:39:16] All right. Thank you. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:39:21] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Thanks Doctor Field. I haven't sent you an email by mistake lately. I just wanted to, to react to your comment about the lack of having the evening session on stock assessments and I agree with you. I found those really valuable and an opportunity to dig into the details a little bit and having the opportunity to do that, or not having the opportunity to do that I think takes, takes away from our ability to do our job up here and really have a fuller understanding of what went into the assessment and a chance to ask some of those questions. So, I just, I wanted to agree with you so...

Pete Hassemer [00:40:13] Thank you. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:00:00] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Thanks SSC also. Just reactions. Lots of thoughts coming on. But first of all, thanks for all the hard work, and, John, I heard the message from you. The Groundfish Subcommittee was not that you want to do less work, but you're still giving it as much effort as you can and spreading out the work and so a couple... well, first, yeah, I agree on the evening sessions and not having those spilled over and cost hours of discussion on California quillback and others, which could have been answered. But so, I will say, you know, give an inch take a mile. Those evening sessions were a compromise back from the day when we actually had that discussion during the normal Council meeting and I hope I would, you know, asking for the moon, ask staff to figure out how to do that again and bring it into the normal course of business. And maybe it is just the top few stocks that

seem to be raising the most concern. Why can't we have those Q and As as part of the agenda? I think it would be worth the time. And again, we spent much time talking about California quillback in particular in not the most constructive places to do that. But John, I'm just gonna, one question for you. Yeah, if we're going to have to prioritize the Groundfish Subcommittee's time, the STAR Panel time, all of that, it does take good dialogue about benefits and costs, tradeoffs, and all that. And you mentioned something, more interaction between, between the SSC and the Council in your opening statement, so just wondering how you thought that might happen or if you don't have any ideas, but yeah, just how do we do that better?

John Field [00:01:44] Thank you Mr. Niles. I don't have any terribly clear ideas, but this seems like a good start.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:56] Okay, thank you. I'll look around for further hands. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:02:02] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you for this discussion. I was wondering maybe you could weigh-in on your views on the value of the Pre-assessment Data Workshops that have really been given a lot of attention, a lot of outreach efforts to ensure that folks are aware of what data is available and an opportunity to discuss that somewhat informally and make sure that we're turning over all of the rocks in terms of available data. At least from CDFW's perspective, those opportunities have really been fantastic. So, I don't know if you have thoughts about how we ensure that we're covering all the possible stocks that we might assess using any method in those workshops or maybe any more frontloading that, ideas similar to that, that we might do to start things off earlier and with a shared understanding of our approach so.

John Field [00:03:12] Thank you Miss Yaremko. Yes, I think there's definitely we recognize the value of the Pre-assessment Data Workshops. Those are typically done once the species being assessed have been chosen. And those I think do provide an opportunity to hear, to get members of the GAP, of the GMT, of the fishing community, and the stock assessment team along with the relevant members of the SSC together and talk about what data exists, what data can we chase down? What other things might people be seeing on the ground that may or may not be helpful in trying to put an assessment together? So, we do talk about this a little bit more in the report on the process review from the last assessment cycle and I think we've made some revisions to the Terms Of Reference in response to some of the things we heard during that meeting, and I think it has been a struggle to get enough participation there. I think there is a tendency for the participation to ramp up after we've seen less than favorable result rather than as we're trying to build a model and put the information together, so I would hope that we can kind of switch, turn that around a little bit and have greater participation early on and come up with better assessment products.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:33] All right, thank you. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:04:36] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I'm going to go back a year and put my old GMT hat on, I guess. When I first started in this process, I was told by the Chair of the SSC at the time that the SSC doesn't do things, we review things. Which I understand that is the role. It also set a tone of that we weren't working together, we were working opposite. And just wanted to acknowledge that over the last five, eight years or so I've seen that relationship change where it's not so much adversarial between the GMT and the SSC, it's much more collaborative. When there's been joint sessions, it's not necessarily the SSC around the table and the GMT to the back, a couple of GMT members are set at the table and actually part of the discussion. It may seem like a little thing, but I think that overall is helping things run a little bit smoother as we go through this process that we're working together. Yeah, the SSC's job is to review what the GMT has done, but there's ways to go about it that makes it a little more efficient and a little more helpful and just wanted to acknowledge that the current membership of

the SSC has been very collaborative in that approach, at least as of a year ago when I was still in the GMT. And I just think that collaborative approach, and I think Mr. Anderson was sort of speaking about it with the model review team on the salmon side too, is a good idea. So just thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:12] Thank you Lynn. Looking around here as people contemplate this if there's any other observations? Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:25] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. It was yesterday in the SSC room we were talking about the workload and how there's... it's an overabundance, I guess, of NMFS employees on the SSC and how hard it is to get somebody outside of government work on the SSC. And I'm kind of curious if you've... what you see how it would be possible to get a diversity of folks on there and is that possible given the workload we have or are you trying... do you think we... are we overburdening you with too much work, number one I guess. And is there a way we could get there, get to a point where we could see more participation from folks outside of agencies? And what we can do to make that better for you all.

Dan Holland [00:07:24] I can go with that, I guess. Thank you for the question, Chair Pettinger. You know I think that the issue sort of differs depending on what kind of a SSC member you're looking for. It is not maybe as hard to find an SSC member that can serve, you know on the HMS Committee for example, which never meets, or even economics as you get into some of the other subcommittees that meet a little more often, CPS and salmon, the workload gets higher. And when you get to groundfish, that's where the problem I think really becomes a real problem, because there's just, you know, to ask somebody in academic for...usually most of the people that are, that are not coming from an agency are academics and they're not getting, they're not getting paid for this and they're not getting any real credit for it from their universities typically, and so there's only a certain amount of time that they're willing to put into it I think. I don't know what the solution to that is, but it gets harder and harder to attract people like that when you, when you have an increasing workload. So, I don't know what the solution is that, but it is a particular problem I think to attract people to serve on the SSC and to serve on the Groundfish Subcommittee, probably less so for some of the others.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:11] Thank you. Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:09:15] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I owe you another thank you Mr. Vice-Chair because I forgot to the last time I spoke. Well, from my perspective, you know, you guys do some awesome work for this Council, and there's no doubt about recognizing that and I truly appreciate it. And with my degree from Ilwaco University I probably shouldn't even be in the same room as you guys sometimes, and I recognize that. But I've kind of noticed one thing that has evolved over the last 10 or 12 years, just by natural, I think, evolution that groundfish management is a complicated issue. There's no doubt about that. But the one complaint that I hear that... and I don't know how this is fixed or how we can better do this, but the constituents, the people that we serve around here have a real hard time discerning the information that you guys do, and I'm certainly one of those at time to time, but I have the resources to go ask the questions and I do that, but I'm wondering if there's a translation process that we might look at, and I'm not saying dumb down the science, but maybe we can translate a little bit, I don't want to say eighth grade English, but I mean translate a little bit at a level where the normal person or even people that... I've heard from people that represent groundfish industries are having a struggle to sort some of the information that you guys, the great work you do, there's no doubt about it, but if there's a way to translate that a little bit better. Jessi Doerpinghaus, I kid her too for me to translate in crayon, but anyway, I certainly think that would help this process a lot if that would be possible. It's not a criticism. I think it's just evolved over a long period of time. It didn't happen overnight, I'm not saying it did, but maybe you could think about something like that in the future as we move forward. But I want to thank you for what you guys do. So, thank you Mr. Chair, Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:52] John.

John Field [00:11:54] Thank you Mr. Smith. Yeah, we did talk about that at the process review from the last assessment cycle a little bit as well and we did hear from a number of members of the public about something similar. And I think our response is we do want to hear from you, and particularly we would like to hear early on when there's still time to maybe do something differently if there is a reason to or a basis to. So, the Pre-assessment Data Workshops, the evening sessions that may be a little bit late but that's another opportunity. The STAR Panel review panels themselves, members of the public are welcome. We have public comment every day. And then there are some efforts to try and increase, you know, awareness of what language we're speaking when it doesn't sound English whatsoever. Jason Cope, Doctor Jason Cope at the Northwest Center has had a weekly kind of call-in show, I guess I would call it, where they talk about different stock assessment related things and try and just explain to people what the models are doing, how we're using the data, and give people a better understanding of what's going on. I know there's MREP, the Marine Resource Education Program is more kind of a deeper dive into speaking the language of both the assessments and the Council process for stakeholders. So, I think there's a few things out there, but maybe the, you know, the language barrier might be growing faster than the resources to overcome it. I would hope it's the other way around.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:23] Thanks. Let me look around here. I'll see if anybody has anything to add. And I'm seeing tired hands that can't be raised so I'm going to look to Executive Burden again.

Merrick Burden [00:13:40] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. We do have a few more minutes so if there are other topics that folks wanted to raise beyond the groundfish and salmon questions, I think there is some time. Otherwise, we do have a Chair's reception this evening and we can adjourn early.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:02] Go ahead Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:14:03] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just wanted to build a little bit on Butch's excellent question there and the answer we received and put this out as sort of a broad question to the SSC. I think that it is difficult to understand a lot of materials that are both going in and coming out of the SSC, and thinking about just my experience being in the room as a member of the public and trying to understand a lot of the science myself, which is so deeply challenging, and I'm wondering if there has been discussion in the SSC at different points from different members about how to increase that, even beyond sort of one pagers or documents Butch mentioned, you know, for example, the SSC is relatively homogenous in terms of background and representation and I'm just curious if these conversations have come up and if there's ways to make the materials and the information more accessible to a wider range of folks.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:14] Anyone want to tackle that?

Alan Byrne [00:15:18] Go ahead I'll take a crack at it and you can throw stuff at me. I hear what you're saying. I mean I like... when we write statements, I've been known to tell the SSC we need to write like an Ernest Hemingway novel so people understand it. I succeed sometimes. But the problem is we're the Scientific and Statistical Subcommittee, we deal with technical scientific issues and two plus two is four and we can't make it five because someone might understand it better. So that's part of the problem, is that the subject material, our discussions have to be at this level, whereas a lot of the public doesn't understand that language, they don't speak that language and not that they're stupid, they don't speak that language. You know I don't know how to wire a house, but the electrician doesn't know what I'm talking about. So, we both have to... when he talks to me about how to wire in my house, he has to kind of come down to my level or explain it in terms that I understand. And when we talk amongst ourselves, we kind of know what we're talking about most of the time, but when we go out to the public we have

to speak differently, and that's where the challenge is. And it's hard for us maybe to do that because our reports to you have to be the way they are to meet the scientific mustard, so to speak. But I can see the need for, like Butch said, of taking those reports and somehow making it more understandable to the general public. And that I don't know how to do that in the context of the meeting we have. We usually have a lot of work and it takes us a long time to produce these technical reports that were read to you, and then to take that and go that step further and make a more user friendly version of it, for lack of a better word, that would take a lot more time. I don't know whether that's something we can do after the meeting or let Council staff. I don't know the process, but the problem is we have to talk the way we talk amongst ourselves otherwise we don't cut the mustard. And that's a problem with technical subjects. It's not just fish it's, you know, talk to an astrophysicist.

John Field [00:17:58] Thank you. I might try and follow-up a little and just acknowledge that we probably could do a little better. You know, I think Alan's reflected sort of that how we struggle to balance those things, but I also do think that it's true that a little push to do that better. You know we have a public comment period. Come in and ask us what we meant when we said, you know, whatever we might have said on a certain thing. I think we've been discussing better opportunities to have public comment periods that get in front of things before we talk about them instead of after we might have gone through and made it whatever recommendations we are going to make, and that might be something that helps the process. So, I think it's not front and foremost of our mind. It's on our mind. It probably could be higher on the list of what we're trying to do.

Dan Holland [00:18:53] Yeah, I just wanted to ask for a little bit of clarification on your comment and the one from Butch as well, as in terms of are we talking primarily about the technical reports that are coming out of the subcommittees or the statements, the SSC statements themselves? So, the SSC statements we generally we spent a lot of time on them to try and make them as concise and non-ambiguous as possible. And we do make an effort to try and make them as untechnical as possible and avoid jargon and technical terms. We put stuff that is more technical into the notes where it's really probably more relevant to the technical teams that, whether we're doing a, you know, a sufficient job there or not, you know as you know, everyone on SSC is a scientist, although some of us are just economists... (laughter)... And so, you know, maybe we're the... we at least provide that diversity there to say we don't understand some of the terminology that the groundfish people are using, somewhat of a filter. But, yeah, so a little clarification there if where the problems lie would be helpful too.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:15] All right. Anybody want to respond to that or... Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:20:26] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm certainly not speaking on behalf of anyone except for myself here, so I'll just get us started and maybe others can jump in. I'll say I very much appreciate the statements that come out of the SSC. The fact that there, as mentioned, is a lot of thoughtfulness put into them to make them readable and understandable, I think, is obvious. Again, if you compare what goes into what goes out, that's pretty clear. I just kind of reiterate, I think that, you know, it's just an ongoing goal to make those as digestible and understandable as possible. And of course, I can't remember what they told us in high school writing, but it was, you know, if you're writing for the public right to an eighth grade level or something like that. So just keeping that in mind as it continues to go forward. In my mind it's also a little bit more general though in terms of, you know, how discussions are had, vocabulary and words that are used during meetings to the extent that there can be pauses, checks-in with the public about sort of... is there a group understanding about what's happening with some of the items. And, you know again, some of the materials even going in it would be helpful, I think, especially for the really complex ones or the ones where there's a lot of data. If you're coming in and you're new to the process especially, or you're trying to learn how a specific FMP works because they are so different, and if there's, you know, any chance for explanation there. And again, I don't see this as necessarily, as you said Doctor Byrne, you know, two plus two is just four. There are

words that need to be used and words mean things, but just going the little extra bit to help the public and Council members understand what's going on I think is worth it so.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:22] Thanks. Butch.

Butch Smith [00:22:23] Yeah, I totally agree with Councilman, Councilperson Riding on what she just said that, and I don't know how we do that, but if we can start the conversation, and I understand it's complicated and it's probably, you know, just not with your group. The other groundfish people that get, that write these same documents, if there was a way to, you know, translate them a little better to the eighth grade English and take away some of the letters behind the numbers. You know, I did great in math until we started adding ABCs behind the numbers. But I think that, you know, I just think it's an issue that hopefully at some point in time we can improve a little better. You know, the classic example is write a book report and some of us went to that right back of that page where that little summary was and wrote off of that till we got caught, but that might be, you know, something that, you know, that little summary thing that goes along with it. And I know it's... I don't want to add any more time to your valuable time, but just it's... I know it's the one thing that's been brought up to me the most since I've been a Councilperson is the translation of those documents to the, you know, industry representatives...not just... the people that work in the industry are having, you know, some struggles too. So anyway, I appreciate it and, and once again thank you. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:05] Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:24:09] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think I would echo the prior comments made and maybe use an example from just our last agenda item. I want to say that I very much appreciate it when I see remarks and statements that reflect to me that the SSC did some deep thinking, some critical thinking, and maybe had a light bulb moment or something that caught their attention. And then they took the time to articulate it, even just in a simple statement in your report. The recommendations that you provided us today on future work of the Klamath River Workgroup. You just made a simple statement but it's incredibly useful, and it's the type of thing that we can really grab on to and say, 'yeah, you know, this body spent some time to think about what additional work can be done and how other salmon stocks might also benefit from similar work that we've reviewed here today'. So I just want to highlight how valuable that is and maybe, you know, kind of on the contrary side, what isn't as helpful is kind of a reiteration of, we followed the TOR, we followed the protocol. Okay, but that doesn't leave me at least feeling with feeling a lot of comfort that the result makes a lot of common sense or that, you know, withstood, you know, scrutiny or critical thinking. So, I would just use that as an example and just appreciate those opportunities that you have taken in some instances to provide us little nuggets like that. It certainly help us make decisions and make... or provide advice to other advisory bodies. So, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:21] Thanks. Look around here for any other response. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:26:30] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I think one of the things too, it's certainly translation of your technical approach is important, but I think, and this is probably very much a shared responsibility between the Council and their committees and advisory bodies, is to be able to relay to the public what does it mean? How does... what outcome is going to be reflective of that particular technical recommendation? And that's not all on you because there's policy involved in that discussion as well. And I know sometimes we've been kind of hit up sometimes where people walking away from, okay if MSY is this and that and okay that's the assessment, but what does that mean to me? And I think maybe that's something where we can all reflect on in terms of how do we also help guide that discussion and interpretation in terms of what outcomes, because that at the end of the day is the Council making that decision, and I think sometimes folks don't quite understand there's an outcome related to that

particular technical recommendation. So, I think that's something all of us can help with.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:59] Thank you Sharon. Look around. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:28:04] I wonder if I could circle back to the salmon piece one more time before we conclude and just thinking about what Doctor Byrne said and some of the thoughts I expressed. I'm wondering if you think it might be helpful if we had a discussion, and I'm thinking I would probably start with your Salmon Subcommittee Chair and probably Chair from the STT, and maybe somebody from the MEW along with the Council staff, and just kind of take a look at the COPs that speak to your responsibilities and see whether or not there might be any recommendations forthcoming for refining those, just to make sure there's clarity on roles and responsibilities without, at least from my perspective, losing that collaboration theme that I think's important to getting to a good decision. I wondered what your thoughts on something like that as a way to take this conversation and move it forward?

Alan Byrne [00:29:25] Sure. Yeah, I've read the COP. I haven't read it in a couple of years and my COP is pretty marked up, so I do think it would benefit from more eyes than just mine looking at it and maybe doing some edits or revisions or rewrites. It's always good in my mind when a document that's supposed to guide how committees or organizations work get revisited over time. I mean I don't know how old that is, but I'm guessing it's probably 20 years or more. I don't ever remember it being revised and I started on the SSC I think in 1997 so it's probably due. It's not a very long, I think, if I remember one page or two pages so, yeah, it would I think benefit. I think that's a good idea.

Phil Anderson [00:30:28] Thanks. I really appreciate your willingness to take a look at that and have that discussion. And I don't know what my colleagues around the table think, but if that would be a reasonable next step on that topic, maybe we could ask the Executive Director to take that on.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:47] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:30:49] I appreciate the exchange and the suggestion Mr. Anderson. I would just say just remaining consistent with the intent of this discussion, let us, the staff, sort of absorb that for a little while and then we can pick it back up under workload planning and propose at that time officially, if that makes sense at that time?

Pete Hassemer [00:31:10] All right, thanks. And we do discuss COPs as part of our second to last agenda item so it's an opportunity there. Further discussion, observations? Corey Ridings I see you trying to raise your hand. Go ahead.

Corey Ridings [00:31:29] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm a little worried, given that it appears I'm the one standing between all of us and our evening beverage. But it was just having this moment with everyone here and having a good opportunity to ask questions so I want to thank Council staff and the SSC again for hosting this agenda item. Curious if we could hear some insights about the process for inclusion of indigenous knowledge? We're talking a little bit earlier about vocabulary or words or concepts that we're using, but western science is the dominant tradition here, but we have tribal co-managers that are an important part of this process, so I'm curious about how the SSC views the inclusion of those bodies of knowledge in our scientific advice and how that's communicated to the Council and the public?

Jason Shaffler [00:32:33] Thank you Miss Riding. Yeah, I'm Jason Shaffler and in my day job I work for the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe. I'm also a member of the Cherokee Nation so I see this in my community. I see this working for a tribe. I see this is a difficult topic. It's one that has to be addressed. There's not any... I guess I can't offer any silver bullets for how that should get addressed. It's certainly an evolving conversation on how indigenous knowledge becomes incorporated into our processes. I

think a lot of it relies on increased outreach to tribal communities just to understand their perspective and work that into our processes, work that into comment processes, as well as working that into the science. It's something that is improving and it's going to continue to improve, but it has to be an evolving process that we all work together to really affect change. And, you know, one of the other things that I would add to that, it's also the fishing communities, like Butch has mentioned. At least where we're at in Auburn, Washington, there is a large immigrant population that does fish on many of our stocks. And you know this right here is a real compliment to WDFW that they run a krill survey on the Green River, and one of their krill survey technicians took the time and his own initiative to translate their survey into Ukrainian and Russian. That increased the cooperation among that community immensely. So, it's a lot of these just working at it and continually seeing where can we make those changes? Where can we continue to bring other communities into this process so that it is a diverse process and it's not just people like us sitting here in the room.

Pete Hassemer [00:35:03] Thank you. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:35:08] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Along those lines, I think, you know, we hear constantly that fishermen's knowledge, traditional knowledge that's in place, they're on the water a lot and see things and continually at different points put their feelings forward and their thoughts forward and feel like they're not, they're ignored as well, so I put them in the same category as that. And I think we should be working to that end of incorporating the knowledge words to the science process, because it's data that we have that's there, it might not be as in the same format, but it's valuable. Kind of reflecting on what Butch said earlier and others, Corey. Fishermen speak fishermen. When I got on the Council here it was really a big change to not speak fishermen. So, you know, it's what we do and it's a different format here. And I don't do a great job but I think I learned part of it. I think when we do that, when we come to the middle and understand each other, build trust, build understanding, we have a better result. When people... when the soup's made and everybody had a hand in it, at the end of the day it might not be great soup but everybody will taste it and say, it's not that bad. But when it's just given to you and that's the perception, maybe not the reality, then it's a different story. So, I know John, I know you've been very active in MREP and several of you have, Cameron, you too. We try to do that, try to get it down to where the people that come there can understand it and you guys do a great job at that when you come and present of getting it to a, not dumbing it down so to speak, but making it more understandable because there's a lot of really deep knowledge that's exchanged. But I think that's what we need to focus on that a little bit and try to get it... when we communicate it builds trust, it builds understanding, it gets us to a better spot. So, I'm hoping that the words that were said today on the floor that we can work together to get there because you feel much better when you're part of the process as opposed to being a recipient of the process. So anyhow, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:37:58] Thank you. And looking around, it's getting late so I'm going to turn it back to Executive Director Burden here for a summary.

Merrick Burden [00:38:11] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I just want to, I guess, first thank everyone for this discussion. I hope you've all gotten some value out of this. I think it's been worthwhile and, I think, as John said, I think this is a good start. So, I don't know there's much of a summary Mr. Vice-Chairman, other than to say I think we've successfully talked about a couple of matters related to salmon processes and groundfish processes, communication, different forms of information, including traditional knowledge. All of that is good stuff. So, it does sound like we'll take up one matter at least under our workload planning and COPs on day last. Otherwise, I'll just express my thanks again, and I think that does it.

Pete Hassemer [00:38:57] All right, thank you. Well that completes our work. And again, I thank the SSC for their coming up here and being with us today. So, thanks again. And with that, that'll close out

this agenda item and I'm going to pass the gavel to our Chair to close out the day.

2. Office of National Marine Sanctuaries: Coral Restoration and Research Plan – Range of Alternatives and Preliminary Preferred Alternative

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports and our public comment, takes us to Council discussion and action. And I'm hoping our action before us will pop up on the screen. There it is. So, with that, I'd like to get started on some discussion on the matter and then see at some point if we get to a motion, but I'll look for the hand. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:00:35] Thank you. I'll get us started. I want to recognize the public comment that we've heard, and like I spoke to under the second NMFS report, the stage that we're at we're not at final action. We believe there's still a conversation to be had and I am hoping that if the Council is amenable to pulling in those revised areas that that gives us some time to talk more with the fishing industry between March and June. I'm not sure if all of the folks that gave testimony have had an opportunity to look at those new maps to think about whether excluding those shallower depths gets at some of the concerns. I hear the concerns and I certainly understand the overall desire is for no closure. I'm hoping that we can continue discussing between now and June, and I'm hoping that those proposed smaller areas are a bite of the apple that we could look at. So, I wanted to recognize the testimony. Certainly, I understand the concerns and I'm hoping that because we're not taking final action today that we have some more time to keep looking at things. Ultimately, we started off with a much bigger ask. There were ten areas and two sanctuaries. We are down to three areas and one sanctuary. We would like to keep things on the table to give us some more time to talk and see if there's refinement that can continue to address the concerns of the fishing industry.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:03] Thank you. Further discussion? I'm not seeing any. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:02:21] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think I'm talking too much today. I'm really concerned that we don't have an adequate representation of the fishing effort and the dependence on that area by our local fishers in that area and I think it really needs to be. We need to be going into this with eyes wide open, particularly as Mr. Bradshaw said in public testimony, this is a really critical time and it is an extinction event. I agree with him. So, I think we need to really take that into account. I think maybe now's not the time to be doing that, but at least let's go into it with eyes wide open. I don't believe from what I know that those heat maps adequately represent the effort because it just includes observer data, and we do have VMS data and we have that and it can, we can understand a much better picture of that effort. So, I'm cautious about moving forward with this at all and at this time but I think we got to, you know, do our due diligence and that's one portion of it I think needs to be taken care of. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:36] Thank you Bob. Phil Anderson then Lynn Mattes.

Phil Anderson [00:03:48] I have yet to be convinced that the sinking of the dry dock is a reason to restrict commercial fishing in other areas or in that area. I think the effort of trying to restore coral habitats where we have evidence that effort is needed is well founded, but in this case there's this direct linkage that's been made between the sinking of the dry dock and the reason to go about closing areas off to a fishing fleet that is struggling about as mightily as anything I ever witnessed in my 30 years here. I won't voice my objection if there are additional conversations to be had to find a solution that does not adversely affect the fishery, but if one comes forward that is going to affect, adversely affect the fishery, I'll be voting no.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:30] Thank you. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:05:34] Thank you Vice-Chair. To what Mr. Dooley was talking about with the additional data, I know this item comes back up in front of us in June. Given everything else that's on NMFS and Council staff workload, would we have any new information by June to incorporate the VMS type data that Mr. Dooley and others have talked about.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:02] Thank you. Jessi.

Jessi Doerpinghaus [00:06:07] Vice-Chair Hassemer, Miss Mattes and other Council members. There, you know, I think people had brought up logbook data. We only have one logbook data, so that's another source I know people have been interested in, but you're talking again about a very small amount that we wouldn't really be able to show because it's a portion of California with logbook so limited data there. And... and with regards to VMS, there's a lot of issues that could come. Yes, any directed groundfish boat has to have VMS on board if they're in federal waters, but we're not able to tell, I mean there are some assumptions you can make in telling if somebody is transiting or potentially laying out gear, but there's a lot of uncertainties that come with that and also matching it. You know, there could be boats with multiple declarations so we're not sure what fisheries they're participating in. So, while VMS data is there, I do want to caution that the, while the observer coverage is absolutely uncertain and we have very low coverage, VMS might not also provide us with the best picture because it could just be vessels transiting through the area. So, there's a lot of uncertainties that I would just caution about. Whether or not we could get something together by June, I think that's a conversation that we'd have to have with NMFS and Office of Law Enforcement on whether or not we could pull that together by the June briefing book. And I don't know if Miss Kent has anything else.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:37] Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:07:39] Thank you. Just to add a little bit more detail. Certainly, we're happy to explore that with Council staff. I will just say, you know, if you haven't spent a lot of time looking into the declaration regulations, you know, the VMS system is paired with declarations, but in the non-trawl fleet we do allow vessels to have more than one declaration at a time. So, it'll be, I think, very challenging to understand who is intending to do what in that area and I am concerned that we'll pick up a bunch of people that aren't going to be excluded by this action because they're not bottom contact fishermen. I am not saying it's not worthy of looking into, but I think it'll be really challenging to try to tease that out, because right now the declaration system is built on what do we need to know about who is doing what and if there's not any restriction in place right now, you know, we could be pulling together people that aren't otherwise going to be impacted and it'll be challenging to sort of assess what that data is telling us. So, I think, you know, we are committed to working with Council staff to see if there's something there to bring forward, but I'm not sure that it's a silver bullet to address some of those issues and so I wanted to share that at this point.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:50] Thank you. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:08:52] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. And I really appreciate all the discussion and comments we've received today. I feel like a lot of progress was made at this meeting. I do not feel like we are ready to make a decision, but I feel like we are ready to move forward with a range of options to be analyzed and looked at more closely between now and June and I think we can develop some of those answers. Hopefully, the right groups and right people can provide us with more information in June to make a decision. I think I have a motion for this, but if we're done with discussion I would like to ask for a pause before I make a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:37] I'm going to look around. We've had quite a bit of discussion. There was some new stuff. Is the Council amenable to that taking five minutes to make sure we get the right

motion? I'm seeing some head nods so let's take a five minute break and come back here. Thanks.....(BREAK)..... All right, thank you all. Let me look around here and see if there's any further discussion or... I know there's been work on a motion if we're ready for that.

John Ugoretz [00:10:17] I'm ready if it can go up. And thank you for the break time. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I move the Council adopt the range of alternatives described in Agenda Item E.2, Attachment 1, with the modifications described in Agenda Item E.2.a, Supplemental EC Report 1.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:47] Thank you. That language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Is that correct?

John Ugoretz [00:10:53] It is.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:53] All right. I will look for a second. Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

John Ugoretz [00:11:00] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I agree with the Habitat Committee that a complete range of alternatives is needed to make an informed decision, and I appreciate the efforts made at this meeting to find a compromise that is responsive to at least some of the public comment received. I'm proposing this new range, which would replace the original larger range, to help move us forward. And the new range being the original Sur Ridge and the modified versions for the other two areas. It's important to note also that a no-action alternative is always included in the range, and I do support that as being part of the range. I do not recommend selecting a Preliminary Preferred Alternative at this time. I feel strongly that we should get a better understanding of potential impacts, especially with the newly developed compromise alternatives and a more complete analysis of the options. I'm also keenly aware of the concerns raised regarding enforceability and ability to comply with potential boundaries. It will be important when selecting a final alternative to have fully developed options in front of us with known latitude longitude coordinates for waypoints, and if at all possible, straight line north, south, east, west boundaries. I look forward to seeing the analysis of this range of alternatives and any additional information in June to help the Council choose a preferred alternative to recommend at that time.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:30] Thank you. Are there questions for clarification to the maker of the motion? I'm not seeing any questions. Discussion on the motion? I'm not seeing any hands for discussion so I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:12:52] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:53] Opposed, no? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. And with that I'm going to look over to Jessi to see if there is further action needed on this agenda item?

Jessi Doerpinghaus [00:13:14] Vice-Chair Hassemer. Nope, you have adopted a range of alternatives and have forgone selecting a Preliminary Preferred Alternative at this meeting. We will take this range back with the modifications provided by the EC with the National Marine Fisheries Service new areas for Alternative 1. And with the Council's allowance that Council staff be able to work with NMFS staff and the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries and OLE to make sure that we have, you know, meet the intent of the EC report to kind of design those polygons. Just want to kind of make sure that's okay with y'all. The only thing left on the Council action is if you did have any guidance on the FMP edits, they're not needed at this time, but did just want to flag that as the last part of the Council action.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:07] Thank you for that reminder. I think if I'm remembering the right FMP

changes they were not very extensive. And it does not appear there's any guidance at this time. I'll look around and I'm not seeing any hands for any further discussion or anything so I think that will close out this agenda item.

F. Groundfish Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report and Electronic Monitoring Update

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That concludes our public comment. This was the NMFS Report on the end Electronic Monitoring Update for Groundfish. So, the Council action is discussion and comment as appropriate. See if there are any hands. Anybody has anything to offer? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:21] Thank you Vice-Chair. This is just hopefully a quick question that I didn't get out earlier when the region was giving the report. Just was wondering if you could give us an update on the next time you're going to update us on what's going on with the Take Reduction Team process? I would appreciate that. Thank you.

Ryan Wulff [00:00:42] Yeah, through the Vice-Chair, thank you Miss Mattes for the question. Yes, we anticipate to have a update on the scope of the TRT at the April Council meeting under this agenda item. We'll be able to present there and I believe we'll also have a representative from our Protected Resources Department going over the process further, not just the scope of it but also the process going forward and answering any questions on that process too at the April Council meeting.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:10] Thank you. That was very helpful.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:13] Further discussion? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:01:15] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Just a few comments on quillback. I think that in past meetings there's been a lot of unhappiness about the recent assessment, but I think what you're hearing is that industry and anglers are anxious to be part of the solution to help collect the data. And I know that NMFS is working on that now And I would just urge NMFS to the extent it's possible to redouble its efforts and as well as folks in the community to redouble their efforts too so that we can collect an adequate data set to have a solid assessment in 2025. And I just wanted to comment about there was a comment during public comment about what the Council needs to do, and unfortunately the Council doesn't have an army of people to go out and do assessments, we rely upon the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Science Centers to do that so I think NMFS and the Science Centers are getting support from the community to help make good data available. So, I just wanted to mention that.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:34] Further discussion, comment? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:02:39] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Good discussion. Very clear interest on the part of the community to aid in research efforts. I just want to flag, at least with regard to the CCFRP operation that there's a report in the briefing book describing it, Merit just described further. It's been... it's worked very well. I just want to emphasize that the origin of that project was to collect information inside and outside of MPAs, so now we're seeing kind of a different focus to the work. That's great when we can accomplish multiple objectives in research, but I would just caution that sometimes when research projects get really big and involve a large number of vessels, it requires a substantial amount of research set-aside, which is a federal term, but on the stateside, you know, we... we likewise have to authorize take limits, and the more efforts, the more ports, the more participation, you know, the amount of fish is still limited. So, I just want to put that out there and just make clear that ultimately sometimes there are allocative decisions involved there where we have such a small pod of fish that we need to share across research and then across incidental needs and other directed fisheries. So, I just kind of put that on the radar that that is something that we keep in the back of our minds and certainly there... we have permits out there to take quillback, in particular, and we're glad to see those permits

are utilizing the authorizations that are provided therein. I just want to caution that it's not an unlimited opportunity. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:54] Thank you Marci. Further? Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:04:59] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I just wanted to make a few remarks and have a request of, from probably from Craig Russell. What I interpreted him to say was that the Science Center was really interested in trying to get to do some outreach to the communities and understand and get some perspectives on data collection and where the priorities were and that they had gone down a path that led into some federal bureaucratic red tape that caused them to take a step back and rethink, retool how they were going to go about that outreach. That's what I heard from him and they're still in the process of doing that. And so, I'm hoping that they will be having some dialogue with the state about how they intend to do that and make sure it's a collaborative approach to the extent that it needs to be. And my request is perhaps to have him come back in April and give us some additional information after they've had a chance to think about how they're going to retool their approach to achieve their objective.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:38] All right, thank you. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:06:42] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I just wanted to acknowledge all the great work that NMFS is doing in light of some of the comments we heard. NMFS can always do better, we can always do better, but the Council process is hugely valuable because it is such an important vehicle to continue improving and providing that input to NMFS on how they do better. I just wanted to thank the Science Center staff and the work that they do, and that they have been largely responsive to this Council as has CDF and W. I appreciated hearing about the meetings even though there was red tape. That's going to happen. It's a reality and appreciate the update and would second Phil's request to come back and keep hearing about those to make sure that they're happening and that the Council can provide input around that. I have a suggestion which I think is guidance but wanted to put it out to the Council, which is to request a joint report from NMFS, CDF and W and Council staff that describes the historical and current biological data collection enterprise for nearshore groundfish in California, and to share that report with the Council. My thinking behind that is just that it's been very difficult for members of the public to understand the full California nearshore data collection enterprise, and hence the public's ability to understand how this collection connects with fisheries management and conservation of important fish species. And when I say the public, I'm including myself in that. The major cuts to quillback we're looking at this year and next are a reminder that data collection, processing, communication, or any combination of those are critically important for sustainable fisheries and that the careful and meaningful prioritization of that data collection, because as much as we'd like we don't live in a world of endless resources, must be done transparently and with accountability. I think this ends up being especially true when we're trying to manage and conserve long lived species. My hopes for this suggestion would be that the report can help shed light for the Council and for the public on what our current nearshore data enterprise looks like and that that understanding can be part of a platform for improvement and making sure we're getting the data we need. We've heard multiple times that industry is waiting, wanting and ready, and I'm incredibly grateful for that work on all sides for all folks who are involved, and I think a report like this could help inform that in the future and also help NMFS, the state, and this Council better understand how and where data is coming and better prioritize it in the future.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:31] Thank you. I'll look around and see if there's any further guidance that there were, well, guidance, discussion, a couple of things we heard. The request from Mr. Anderson about NMFS coming back in April talking about some of the data collection and collaboration, and that's something I think we can take up in workload planning to where to fit that in and if it works. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:10:05] Yeah, I thought maybe we wouldn't be getting to this topic until later agenda items this week, but I'm just going to go ahead and kick off some conversation on the future of our nearshore rockfish stocks, nearshore stocks under the Federal Fishery Management Plan. As I understand, the phase 2 effort on stock definitions, as well as we get into discussions on stock complexes and managing to species specific limits, we also will be taking up the concept of perhaps removing the nearshore species from the federal fishery management plan and returning them to state jurisdiction. Many of the nearshore stocks live, over 90 percent of their population is entirely within state waters. You think about species like cabezon, like greenling, the shallow nearshore rockfish, very few of those fish venture into federal waters. We've been working a long time to develop our rules across state and federal waters lines for consistency, for ease of the public and enforcement, and to share allowable harvests across state jurisdictional lines working with our co-managers that have shared these stocks. Those relationships are, have worked very well and yet at the same time I think we're running into some cases where, you know, the state is needing to go on its own to establish rules pertaining to particular nearshore stocks, such is the case with quillback in California, we have been taking steps to establish state regulations entirely within nearshore waters that apply to the take in retention of both commercial nearshore groundfish, and coming soon recreational groundfish. So, I just want to make sure that with regard to discussions on taking deep dive looks at data collection protocols and data needed for stock assessments, I just want to make sure that we're not putting the cart before the horse here. I think there is more discussion to come this week on, under other agenda items, but I think I'm reluctant to go too far at this time in going all in on nearshore data collection priorities. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:04] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:13:07] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And just in response to Miss Ridings guidance. I guess I have a request, and that is I hear your desire for more information about biological data collection in the nearshore environment. As with any workload that's being asked of either our staff or others, I'd prefer if we took that up more formally under a workload planning agenda item. That allows us to consider everything in context of the broader workload. But I think having a marker down that you're curious about that and interested in that is very helpful, because that allow us to have conversations with our counterparts about what we can do, who's the best agency to do so, and things of that nature. So that would be my request is that, I don't think it's too dissimilar from Miss Yaremko, which is you've put down a marker and can we please take this up formally at a later time, hopefully day last.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:08] Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:14:12] Yeah thanks. I wanted to let a few of the guidance and comments out before responding kind of to each one. So, I'll have to kind of take in order of what I heard. Marc, I hear your points and want to also note that what we hear in public comment NMFS is not deaf to that, right? We are going to try to do everything we can to get the best available data, and as Phil aforementioned, possible within the resources we have for the potential upcoming assessment. And we're committed to that both at a region and a center level and I think you heard that. Marci raised some good points too. I think this probably will be relevant also to the broader spex discussion but you do have to take into account, right? Some collaboration with the state on many fronts here, but also pay attention to how much you, how much mortality shall we say, is available for research as opposed to potential harvest, right? Those are all good points to keep in mind as we go forward. And I would also... to Marc's point in the public comment, I think not just working with the anglers that we've heard, the communities that we've heard, but working with the state is a critical area of collaboration on this too, and NMFS is committed to that. Phil, to your point, I think that's a very good request so I have, through the magic of wireless technology, I can speak on behalf of Craig Russell and the Centers here that they are willing to come back in April and fulfill the request that you put forward. And then to Corey's point, and then

given the points Marci raised and that Merrick raised, from a NMFS perspective, we're happy to do that and present that. I think Merrick makes the point too, right? It's also worth taking into account in the gamut of workload planning. And then to Marci's point too, I mean, there's ways to graph that. I mean, I get where you're going with the stock definitions and the related discussion, but it's possible that some of this information I think that Miss Ridings is requesting could be relevant to the scoping discussion on that as the aspects of whether you defer to certain species within the FMP and nearshore or otherwise, just have a management and a science implication to some extent. So, this could all be discussed again when we touch on this in forthcoming agenda items. But that's at least my initial response to some of the comments and questions that NMFS got.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:46] All right, thank you Ryan. Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:16:53] Yeah... and thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I respect and recognize all that's been talked about here, but maybe just a little bit of cold water. We don't want to study these communities out of business and out of an existence. I'd just like to keep that in mind when we're talking about doing these things that are more long term than... than maybe what this needs to be. Sometimes you gotta roll your sleeves up and jump in the, the flooded basement to clean it out and it can't wait two years or three years. So, I just want to throw that out there that, you know, we got communities that are going to be hurting from our decision and I think we should recognize that, and I'm sure we do. But I just wanted to say that I just don't want to... best thing to do in government is to keep studying something and pretty soon 20 years later you have an outcome and I don't think we... I'm not suggesting it would take that long, but I think we need to get to work on on this issue and figure out just what happened if anything happened. So, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:18] Thank you. Further discussion on this? I'm not seeing any hands. Todd, for a wrap-up.

Todd Phillips [00:18:28] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. You have heard from all of the agencies, including Doctor Caren Braby from the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. And you've had some public comment as well as a vigorous discussion. I would say that you have completed your tasks under F.1.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:45] All right, thank you. With that we'll close out this agenda item.

2. Consideration of Additional California Quillback Rockfish Analyses and Adopt Rebuilding Analysis

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That concludes our public comment, takes us into Council discussion and action. And that is, excuse me while I pull up one of my screens here. Got two things here that are a little bit different but interrelated on this important topic, review the additional analyses that were done, we have the SSC report pertaining to that, provide any guidance and next steps you have. And then secondly, to adopt the California Quillback Rockfish Rebuilding Analysis. So, if it makes any sense on this to maybe work sequentially through that and let's talk about the additional analysis that was done and any guidance before we get to the rebuilding analysis, but we are not bound by that. So, I stalled and gave you a little time to look whose hand is going to go up here first. Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:20] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I know if I lived in Crescent City I'd be voting for Mayor Inscore because I'm pretty impressed at how you represent your community. I do live 25 miles north of you however and so I'm very familiar with the community. And I'd just like to say that we're not taking this lightly. I mean you talk about turning over stones, we've been doing a bunch of that, and I don't think we're... we're not done turning over stones but there's certain things we have to be done in a timely manner and there's this clock ticking and we're going to have to do, at some point in time we're gonna pull the trigger in moving forward what we have. I'm very pleased to hear what the survey work that's going to be done off of Crescent City. I think that people are gonna be surprised about how much fish there is off Crescent City. That reef complex is many square miles. I haven't fished there myself but I've talked to a lot of fishermen from Brookings who go down there and impressive would be saying the least, and so I'm excited to hear what might come out of that, but that's not going to do us any good for '25. So, there's limited things we can do here. I think that, I'd like to have a sidebar before we do get too far into this, but I don't want to close off potentially what might, could happen, but I think it's very narrow and but we, I don't want to say I feel your pain... it sounds like crap... but I mean I get it. I think everybody in this room gets it. If we had an option to not go forward what we're gonna do, I don't think it would happen, but we have rules and there's just no...there's very few off ramps here for us and so... but I really support what you're doing with the survey work? I hope, I'd like to talk to you more about that, but this is not an easy day for any of us up here, so I'd just like to say that. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:31] Thank you. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:03:34] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer and thanks for those comments, Brad. I just want to remind everyone, not that it will make a difference in the last step we have to take under this action, but an economic analysis was done as a consequence of these closures and excluding durable expenditures, rods, reels, boats, motors, just the cost of the trips is 58 million dollars annually with a multiplier effect of 146 million dollars. This is a very large chunk of the economic activity associated with the fisheries that we manage and I'm not going to get into any detail on the assessment. I think we covered that rather thoroughly in past meetings and I don't want to retread that ground. But I do want to say on the topic of the analysis, further analysis done by the SSC, I was a little disappointed. I thought that the purpose of the additional workshop or meeting was to dig into some of the issues, to take those into account for purposes of determining whether the assessment was going to be, should be used for the purposes we're going to be using here for here today. And I think what I've heard, both during the meeting and in the written documents since, is essentially the same reasons expressed in November by the SSC as to why those cannot be taken into account. So that's sort of water under the bridge, but I don't think that that January meeting accomplished what I thought the Council wanted to see accomplished.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:33] Thank you Marc. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:05:38] Yeah, well thanks Mr. Vice-Chair and I may be hesitant to ask this because the Chair, I think, led us off bigger picture and I think I'm in line with what I think I understand what he's saying. But on Marc's point, and I can just ask this to the wind at this point, but I'm wondering why Informational Report 2 was not included under the materials for this agenda item? And I'm not thinking there was any reason for that, but it was also... it responds very, written by the Science Centers to what Marc just brought up. And I'm going to... this is going to sound maybe, I don't, again at the risk of coming off wrong, I think this is my eighth or ninth groundfish cycle. I have a bachelor's degree in population biology. I still don't know exactly what they're talking about most of the time. It's very complicated, but I've gone through it enough that I think I'm following along of what they're saying, and they did give a thorough... I was able to listen remotely to what the review Marc just mentioned and it's hard to know how thoroughly they've thought about these issues if you haven't been there and heard their... and we heard from Butch and others about how hard it is to follow their, the technical language. So I just wanted... that Informational Report 2 does address these, many of these issues head-on and ideally it would have been... and hope people, if people haven't read it is directly relevant. I'll stop. I'll have more thoughts. But just on that first point about the review, the additional analyses and that to me was, again it was a pretty thorough document that did address these issues and just wanted to acknowledge that.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:29] Thank you. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:07:33] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And actually I... my line of question is going to go along down the rebuilding analysis and similar to what we heard from some of our constituents, just because I've not been through this process before. My question is, my understanding is there's a plan for a new status assessment for quillback in 2025, I believe, is what I have heard? So, with the outcome of that, whatever it is, how responsive is the rebuilding analysis? Meaning, you know, revision, right turn, left turn, oops we're way off or no we're still, that rebuilding analysis is still consistent with the 2025 stock assessment? I just would like someone maybe to give me a little more process information relative to rebuilding analysis versus when a new stock assessment comes along?

Pete Hassemer [00:08:42] I'm going to toss that to Executive Director Burden here.

Merrick Burden [00:08:47] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. Thank you for the question, Sharon. And just in response, I think it's helpful to first make the connection between the rebuilding analysis and the stock assessment. So, the rebuilding analysis builds off of the stock assessment. The next assessment that is done, presuming it passes SSC muster, will now replace the current one as the best scientific information available. And if there is still a need for a rebuilding analysis, there would be a new one that builds off of that. The next assessment may determine that it's not actually overfished, and then we would not have the need for that rebuilding analysis. So, it's essentially what's the best available science? The next assessment presumably would be that. And then any rebuilding analysis that's necessary would build from that document or that bit of analysis.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:43] Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:46] I should add that we explored what we call a green light red light scenario where if next year, say '25, it was declared in great and good shape we still would have to play out the next two years at the lower numbers before we can implement the higher numbers. So, there's no way to implement it faster. And we've explored that and it was deemed that we couldn't do that so under the way the law is written. So just to fill you in on what our path looks like forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:22] Thank you. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:10:26] Yeah, thanks. Merrick, what Merrick said is correct. But I do think, Brad, I would add in a slight addendum to what you said, because it is possible. I think we did a mid-biennium change for cowcod and shortbelly. I think there is something, it's just out of typical process and will require workload planning and a whole number of other decisions. But if the '25 assessment shows it is not overfished there is potentially a process for a mid-biennium change.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:03] Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:11:05] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just want to make some general comments and respond to a few things I've heard around the table. First, I'd like to just recognize that because of the outcome and the resultant impact that this is having on California communities, and it is extreme, I just want to say thank you and share my appreciation for the input from Doctor Maunder and Doctor Hilborn. Very much out of process in how we normally do things to review this particular type of data-moderate. I feel that the special meeting was very valuable and that it is collectively allowing us to reflect back on this particular species, this particular assessment type, and really kind of do some lessons learned from it. And I think those are valuable and those allow us to grow as Council and benefit the process overall. The outcome, however, is the same. I'm not reading that there is no different recommendation from the SSC, and I have no doubt that every rock has been turned over at this point and it is difficult to accept that. But I do want to just draw some attention to what was in their report similar to what Corey was touching on that there is some benefits that I did read that being constrained by the TORs is something they did identify in looking for flexibility and I think that that is important. And I would hope that that kind of recognition or statement for needing flexibility would extend beyond data-moderates to all assessment types moving forward. So, I think that it's opened some dialogue for us and it's allowed us to look at things differently moving forward. In addition to one very important bullet in that report that talked about updating or providing more information about how fixed or pre-specified parameters and how they fit to the data could be better described, and I think that's crucial in aiding, you know, or reducing the confusion for us trying to cope with all this information and process it ourselves, for not just how the assessments work but what it means for the real world application. So, I just wanted to take a minute to look at what good is going to come from the special meeting. But I want to pivot just a little bit to what we talk about and we talk about BSIA and this is the best information in front of us, and we talk about what is the risk to overfishing and what is uncertain and what is not, and what is not uncertain at all is that this is having a devastating impact to our coastal communities, economically, jobs, it's got a ripple effect that we are hearing through, you know, not just 105 comments in this briefing book, but me, my staff are inundated with phone calls and emails and inquiries from all sides. We hear it, we know it, we understand it, and we feel it, and there is no uncertainty with that. And so, I agree with some comments you made, Mr. Niles, about I don't think this is how I envisioned or intended we were going to use a data-moderate assessment when we started this in 2021. I view this largely as a situational problem where stock definition intersected with a brand new type of assessment with maybe not the best species to put forward for it. All situational, no... nothing that was anyone's intended fault here. I commend the Stat Teams, the Science Centers, they did their job. They did their job right. They've done their job well and we have turned over every rock I know undoubtedly. But I just think that it's important to acknowledge what is uncertain and what is not in this situation currently. And I'll stop there for now. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:14] Thank you. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:15:19] Yeah, I know it's late and, but we've got a couple decisions to make here. I guess first I would just like to thank the effort, the willingness and the effort that the groundfish, the SSC Groundfish Subcommittee made in scheduling that additional meeting. I also wanted to thank

Doctor Maunder and Hilborn for their willingness to step out of their, well, step out a little bit in the science community and raise the issues that they did. I'm sure that wasn't an easy decision for them, or I suspect it wasn't. I think the Informational Report 2 that Corey referenced contained a lot of informative information. I read the Groundfish Subcommittee's report. There is one sentence in the conclusion that stands out to me that the discussions based on the presentations from Doctor Maunder and Hilborn did not raise new information that had either not been considered by the Subcommittee or the SSC in past reviews and that the approach did follow, the Stat Team did follow the Terms Of Reference. And I think Caroline's use of the word situational is accurate. We find ourselves in a situation here, I don't know how you define, could better define between being between a rock and a hard place, but this is it. I think the most important thing for me coming out of all of this is to see if we can fulfill Steve Huber's greatest wish, and that is that we marshal every effort and resource that we have to try to get the additional data on this stock to better inform the full assessment that we've got planned so that we can ensure that as we go forward we're making our management decisions based on our best effort and understanding that, at least from my perspective, that these data-moderate assessments we've got to be careful how we use them in the future.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:23] Thank you Phil. Further comments? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:18:30] Thank you Vice-Chair. Caroline and Phil stole a little bit of what I was going to say with the thanks and turning over all the rocks. We've put the Stat Team on this through the ringer as we've gone through this. They have done a lot of work as has an additional meeting, additional workshop for the Groundfish Subcommittee of the SSC. So, first off I wanted to thank them for all of that effort. And my actual question is one for NMFS, and I'm sorry Mr. Wulff, I didn't give you a heads up. Given the letter in Attachment 2 that states that quillback is overfished, if we as a Council did not adopt the California quillback rebuilding analysis, what would NMFS's next steps, or what would the following steps for NMFS be if the Council didn't take action on this today?

Ryan Wulff [00:19:27] Thank you, through the Vice-Chair. Thank you for the question. Yeah, it is a little sticky to some extent, right? Where Miss McKnight kind of highlighted we're in a little bit of a situational issue here where given the stock definitions process the rebuilding clock does technically give you until December 2025, right? For us, not just you, for the Council and NMFS to have a rebuilding plan in place. But I think the answer to your question is twofold, right? We have an assessment now that's BSIA and if we don't adopt the rebuilding analysis here, then we failed to provide guidance to the GMT and the Council staff to start analyzing alternative rebuilding strategies and therefore we'd be unable to complete our specifications, analytical work for all of the sectors impacted by quillback throughout the spex process. And that would most likely also delay adoption of the entire spex package. And we're in this because the biennial specification structure for groundfish necessitates frontloading the rebuilding plan, right? And the rebuilding analysis, because it has to be in place from before January 1 of 2026, which is in the middle of the spex process. So not only does that lead, by not adopting the rebuilding analysis now, kind of our inability to potentially move forward with anything related to quillback on the current spex package. It also impacts the ability to put the rebuilding plan into the spex package, which basically puts us down a path towards either disapproval or partial disapproval of any of FMP amendment package. Which then gets you into either counts more time back to the Council to revise it consistent with the BSIA, or NMFS has to do it on its own through a secretarial amendment. All of that has implications for spex on the water in January 1, 2025 for potentially all sectors. It has workload implications for NMFS. I don't want to go into all this because really the bottom line for NMFS is that is not what we want to do. It is NMFS solid position that we prefer to work in conjunction with the Council on these on all of these fronts.

Lynn Mattes [00:22:03] Thank you Mr. Wulff. That was helpful.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:09] All right. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:22:12] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I don't want to cut off conversation here but I do have a motion when the time is right. I just wanted to put that out.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:24] All right, thanks for that. I'm just going to make sure. Let me just cover a couple things and we can at the end of this I'll ask Executive Director Burden and Marlene to summarize, but I did hear I thought a little bit of guidance on next steps related to the assessment. Things about, it was in the reports and I think Caroline McKnight brought this up constrained by the TOR and that might be something to be looked at in the future. The use of fixed or pre-specified parameters in the assessment and paraphrasing what was talked about, mentioned about data collection, marshaling all the efforts we have to get the data that's necessary. So, I'd just want to highlight there were a couple of those points there. Corey, go ahead. Niles.

Corey Niles [00:23:22] Thank you. Yeah, and I think I was maybe withholding some comments for a motion, but, and this process is very difficult to follow, but I think in my mind Pete those questions come up tomorrow under F.3 when we talk about the stock assessment plan for 2025 and maybe just one, I guess since I'm... one of my comments would be I think, and I think several people have kind of alluded to it about data-moderate assessments, the desired next step would be to move to a full assessment before reacting. And I guess if there was any if, and I don't think we heard it really explicitly today, but what we're hearing, I think, from our science community, and I wasn't part of the last agenda item so they might have said it there, but if there was enough data to do the full assessment now in 2024 and do it off-cycle, yes, there would be consequences to our process for that. But I think this Council would, it would probably maybe not unanimous, but a strong vote to let's move off-cycle and do that full assessment as quickly as we can. But a long way of saying, I think those issues you brought up are good ones, but they're going to get into the F.3 agenda item. And then we've heard a lot about the needs of the fishing communities. I'm not going to look that far ahead in the agenda and alphabet soup too, that's where we start to talk about the needs of the fishing community. So, I just, you triggered some of my comments than I think, but it's hard to follow where we talk about certain things where but tomorrow during the stock assessment those, I think those are very important things to talk about. And the flexibility in the Terms Of Reference that Caroline mentioned, those come tomorrow.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:02] All right. Thank you, and thank you for the reminder that, you know, as I said, these are interrelated things and maybe the guidance here foreshadows some of what we talk about tomorrow. So, I will look back across the table then to Corey Ridings if you're ready with a motion?

Corey Ridings [00:25:32] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Council staff. I move the Council adopt the 2023 rebuilding analysis for California quillback rockfish, Agenda Item F.2, Attachment 1 with Appendix B removed.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:56] That language on the screen looks accurate and complete. Do you agree? Thank you. Is there a second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Please speak to your motion.

Corey Ridings [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just will quickly speak to the language about Appendix B. Removal of Appendix B is consistent with the Council's previous action on the OFL, and as I understand will save analytical time for the GMT before F.7 later this week. So, for those that might be wondering, that's why that was included. We heard a little bit about this earlier from Mr. Wulff, but NMFS notified the Council via a letter in December that quillback rockfish off of California is overfished and per the National Standard 1 guidelines, the Council has 15 months to develop a rebuilding plan and to submit that to the agency for review. This is not optional. It is mandated by law. If we're going to meet that deadline then we need to approve a rebuilding plan at this meeting. We need

to do that or NMFS will be legally obligated to move forward with that and the consequent rebuilding plan. As Mr. Wulff spoke to earlier, I would rather be at the table for that and be part of that discussion and not be part of it and have that move forward as an independent secretarial amendment. Further delay would also jeopardize season setting for other stocks that are important to various fisheries and may be especially critical given the status of other stocks in the groundfish FMP and other FMPs. And the rebuilding analysis is BSIA as determined by the SSC. The SSC reviewed the additional public comment that was provided on the floor during the November meeting, and as the Council requested, and as while there was good and useful suggestions for the future assessment identified, which I'm not totally surprised given it was Doctor Hillborn's and Doctor Maunder and they're both experienced fishery scientists, the Groundfish Subcommittee and the SSC did not find scientific merit to reject the 2021 stock assessment or the 2023 rebuilding analysis. In November, some might remember that I did not support this additional analysis. I think that it sent the wrong message to some of our stakeholders that the assessment and required rebuilding might be rejected when all of the evidence and process pointed to the contrary. This is not to say that I don't think that there is a place for additional analysis when results indicate harm to fishing industry and communities. In this case, however, we had a stock assessment that was already in use, had gone through multiple SSC reviews, and has more data and less uncertainty than many other assessments we are actively managing under. There are also approaches we can use to minimize the bias created by doing so in our overall management process, but we don't use them yet. The stock assessment, this analysis stemmed from is data-moderate. We've heard a little bit about issues around those and ways that we might rethink how we use those moving forward, which is good because over half the species this Council sets limits for are done with data-moderate and data-limited methods. I'd also like to note some equity issues that came up as part of this. Doctor Hilborn and Maunder are known quantities to many on this Council and advisory bodies and the SSC. I wonder that if a fisherman had given public comment, or an unknown scientist had provided public comment, or someone bringing expert knowledge from a different knowledge system had provided public comment years later and on the floor, would it have been considered and sent for additional review? I appreciate the time energy thinking that has gone into solving this problem broadly. I'm deeply aware of the pain this is bringing to those who fish groundfish in the state of California, their families and communities, and for all the others that want to eat fresh and local California fish that is nutritious and supports a thriving local food system that connects everyone in the community. We were reminded this morning by tribal co-managers about the importance of this connection with fish as critical to healthy communities, livelihood, meaning connection of people to our food, which has largely been lost with the industrialization of our food system. It's a steep cost to pay. I want to echo Caroline's comments earlier about the depth of these impacts and Phil's comments about the rock and the hard place, which is a feeling that I think most Council members have been carrying with them since last fall. I hope a more transparent process for collecting, prioritizing, and communicating data can come out of this and spur us to improve how we do our work. And I echo the need for thoughtful consideration of how we use our science and stock assessments for all the fish that we manage. This Council has been given a nearly impossible task given the number and diversity of species we are responsible for, but that doesn't abdicate us of our responsibility to consistently improve. As Mr. Niles noted earlier that we have multiple places this is coming up in the agenda, so I look forward to further conversation. And for now, looking to move the rebuilding analysis forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:10] Thank you. First, I'll look to see if there are any questions for clarification to the maker of the motion? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:05:20] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I just don't know if I heard you correctly so I thought what I heard you say is that the SSC determined that the points raised by Doctors Maunder and Hilborn did not have scientific merit?

Corey Ridings [00:05:36] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Mr. Gorelnik. They did not have

scientific merit in terms of they were not, had not been considered already by the SSC last year. And so, the scientific, there was no additional merit, so there was no merit to discrediting the original stock assessment or the rebuilding analysis. I think the SSC report from the meeting that happened in January, as noted, articulated that there were some ways that the stock assessment could be improved for the next time, and also there is hopefully some new data that could be improved but those were not available at the time of the initial stock assessment.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:22] Further questions for clarification? I'm not seeing any. Any discussion on the motion? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:06:36] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I just want to, for purposes of discussion here, I didn't read anything in any of the responses from the SSC indicating that there was no scientific merit. Instead, they felt constrained by the Terms Of Reference, and I think that's a very, very different thing than saying that they didn't have scientific merit. In fact, I think there was commentary that those are issues that should be, that should be taken into account or should be included in future reviews. So, I just want to clarify that.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:10] Further discussion? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:07:17] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just as a quick response and clarification and appreciation to Marc for bringing these details up. I'm 99 percent sure I wrote this as the meeting's been going on, but I'm pretty sure that sentence came directly from the SSC report about not finding scientific merit to reject the 2021 stock assessment or the 2023 rebuilding analysis. So just for clarity.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:43] Marc.

Marc Gorelnik [00:07:43] In that case, I guess my issue is with that comment from the SSC, if that's the case. I think that what we've learned in this process is that using predetermined constants is not the way to arrive at the best scientifically justified result. These are not physical constants like the speed of light. You know, the stock recruitment relationship is a function of abundance and a variety of other factors and to use a constant number is highly questionable. Nonetheless, they felt constrained and so I appreciate that they operated under the constraints they felt constrained them, but I do think that the points raised by Doctors Maunder and Hilborn must be taken into account in future stock assessments, particularly the 2025 assessment. We should not be using predetermined constants when data suggests the use of other numbers as was noted in the quillback stock assessment.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:59] Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:09:01] Yeah, I'm not going to lie. I can't let this one go by. I heard, I think, three different ways of using the term scientific merit in the exchange between Mr. Gorelnik and Corey. I think we have to be careful here. I frankly admire the courage that Doctor Hilborn and Doctor Maunder demonstrated in raising concerns and bringing that forward to us. I appreciate the groundfish, the SSC's Groundfish Subcommittee willingness to look at the concerns that they raised. They... I don't think I heard or I have read anything to suggest that the concerns that Doctor Hilborn and Maunder raised didn't have merit for further exploration. I think the conclusion that I read that Corey just referenced is that they concluded that their concerns didn't result in the SSCs Groundfish Subcommittee willingness or they didn't conclude that the stock assessment shouldn't be used. So, I don't....I just want to be clear here, at least from my chair, I appreciate all of the scientists that we have in the fishery scientific world. They're not always going to agree. That doesn't mean they're different perspectives don't have merit.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:06] Further discussion on the agenda item? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:11:13] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you, Miss Ridings, for the motion. I appreciate the discussion relative to feeling like we're in a rock and a hard place and I just want to recognize that this is a difficult decision and supporting this motion for me might hinge entirely on the discussion that we just heard from Mr. Wulff regarding process and not holding things up or, you know, taking us down a pathway that could be far more complex and delay our standing 25-26 specification and management measure process beyond that. I'm not sure how I'm going to vote on this, but I just do want to recognize that I respectfully understand the process and don't wish to delay it or make it harder. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:06] Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:12:08] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. This is a tough one. I understand the situation we're in. I understand my Council responsibilities. Was just reviewing my oath and I promise to conserve, manage the living marine resources of the United States by carrying out the business of the Council for the greatest overall benefit of the nation. And from my perspective that includes our, the people that we are making decisions for and in that we're here to represent this fishery in my opinion. And I think we, yes, absolutely have to protect the stocks, but over the time I've heard enough about this particular one that we, it gives me a lot of pause and then hearing all the public comment, hearing our industry, particularly my region where I live, and what this is causing and how all this is going to affect them, I don't know how that benefits the nation to do something like this and put it over the long term that's going to be multiple years before we can get back to normal even if this, and our next stock assessment shows it's good. But I understand my obligation too, and I understand the process if we turn this down. I don't know how I'm going to vote, but boy... heavy weight. It's a heavy weight because I feel responsible by my decisions. So, we'll see. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:04] Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:14:07] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Great comments Bob. And if I did vote no on this it's not a no vote to stop the process, it's a no vote that we've got to do things better next time. We cannot gut communities of the coast. We have to pass the red face test, and I don't know, we got the greatest scientists in the country in this Council, there's no doubt about that, I'm not arguing with that. I am not arguing with Corey and her rationale, I am not, but I have thought this thing has kind of smelled from the beginning. I've stated that. I haven't change my mind and we've been here now for about 45 minutes on this issue and it's not any clearer than it was when we did this in November, September, whatever this thing was to me. We're still having fundamental issues and I don't want to stop the process, but to take it out of our hands, I don't that, but I just legitimately don't know how to vote because I feel we need to send a message that next time we have to do better, we really do. We just have to do better. And thank you. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:34] Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:15:36] Yeah, thanks. I'll be..... thanks Butch and Bob. Totally hear what you're saying and the spirit behind them and I just don't know, I mean we, this Council went through some really tough rebuilding plans, you know, even before my time. And then we had a few more when I started and it was eye opening to me. And I just, Butch, I guess, I would just say we need to talk about how you do better and how difficult it is. And, yeah, this... and Bob on the oath, I think there is... it's not just a science issue, it's... there's policy and legal issues we should be taking up too. Our main duty under the Magnuson Act is National Standard 1 to achieve your conservation objectives, but National Standard 8, do it in a way that you sustain fishing participation and minimize adverse impacts on fishing communities. And we're doing that not just for the short term, but over the long term. And so, I think a

lot of these concerns are taken up best and when we get to the policy aspects of it. And there are some talk about inflexibility, but flexibility of the overfishing laws where some of these concerns come from. But yeah, these are very complex issues and this has very serious economic consequences. And I think Marc mentioned the economic impact analysis, that's going to be, that would be very relevant to the next steps we get and I think they will justify the most gradual way of rebuilding in the way that sustains fishing participation and minimizes adverse effects on fishing communities. And those are the discussions to have, and this is not where you guys are coming from and maybe voting no, but I think a vote no here is saying that it's, that we know better on the science than our science do, and Ray Hilborn and Mark Maunder are some of the most respected stock assessment people around that we have the same...we have just as respected people in this process, and as Phil said it very nicely, they're not always going to always agree. And... but science is a process and for someone... I am not confident enough to tell those folks that I know more about what the best available science is than they do. And I was hesitant to mention this, but I do think that there are questions like we started off yesterday afternoon about where is the line between policy and science? How do we understand each other better? Like it's easy to get... look at these things and see how does that make sense? Like the one that always sticks out to me how does in Crescent City, Brad lives 25 miles away from Crescent City and where he has quillback is above B 40 percent, but then you cross the California border and it's B 14 percent, and no one thinks that that's the reality but it's a lot more complicated than that. So, everyone would like to do better than that and no one likes to use constant natural mortality assumptions or steepness. It's just they're saying is, we would love to know what natural mortality is but the data isn't there to do it. So it's... I'm... this is not maybe coming off like I intended, but these are very complex issues and ones that require really thorough discussions and I think CDFW brought some of them up in one of the reports about the multi-species aspect of how the value comes here, and Ray Hilborn mentioned some of the same things so. Here's a simple, I think this is... we should approve it not just for the process if... but this the best available science and our science is a process. And, yeah, again I would, I'll repeat, if we could do the full assessment tomorrow with the data that would be adequate for that, I think WDFW would be advocating that we do that, but it's just not possible and the stock assessment in 2025 seems like the best hope. And I think the exchange between Ryan and Brad about going to a green light approach is very important too. If it is a false alarm we should act as quickly as we can to... to rectify that. But okay, I think those were the comments I want to make. But again, I think this conversation as others are going to continue tomorrow and later in the April meeting and I'll stop there. But, yeah, everyone, the needs of the fishing communities are very important to consider here and it's the science as well.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:08] Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:11] Well, I'm going to support the motion. I don't want to support the motion, but I think we need to be doing more productive things than the path we're going because there's no off ramp to it. You know I kind of forget this assessment was done under Covid. I'd like to say that nothing was good under Covid. I think should be a Covid mulligan I think, right? I'm gonna pull it out, use it, but I think we ought to look at the pathway to not get here again. I think we all agree upon that. And so, and I've had a lot of people from California call up and talk to me about trying to help them out, but I just there's no nothing... there's no there there... and so I think we need to move forward and I think Steve Hubers talked about what his vision for the future was, I'd agree 100 percent. I think we ought to put all our effort into making that better and I think that we need to be better as a Council as far as how we move forward with some of the stocks and make sure we have enough information to do... do what assessments that need to be, you know, make sure that there's enough information to move forward. If there isn't we ought to be rethinking about on how we're going to do that. These nearshore stocks scare the hell out of me to tell you the truth, because there's just not enough information and I think that, you know, have the state take over the stocks inside their waters and get us out of the Magnuson Act situation where we're bound by these decisions would be better suited to a better way than a full

assessment on a stock that's going to donate 1 or 2 ton to the landings of the state. It seems kind of silly to me. Anyway, I'm gonna vote for it and I think because we have to. So, I'll leave it there.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:08] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:22:11] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. This is a very difficult issue and I am grateful I don't have to vote. I do want to make a couple of observations just about process and my personal feeling about the Council and where this decision and where the management of our fisheries is best done. I think Mr. Wulff is being very diplomatic about how he describes secretarial amendment when that happens. As I sit here and listen to what happens if the Council does not pass this, I think it's clear to me that this Council loses control of groundfish management. If there is any solution, any angle to minimize the effect of this OFL on this rebuilding analysis, it will be found in this process not somewhere else. And so, I would, I will rarely do this, but I'll advise you to vote for it just for that reason. One other comment Butch said, we can't do this again. And I do have some more than thought, some proposals about how we improve. I don't think it's... I don't think it is appropriate here to bring those up necessarily, but I do have some proposals.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:31] Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:23:34] Yes, thank you. I agree with everything Merrick just said and I tried to be diplomatic, right? Because this hits me too, right? I hear the public comment. I am very reluctant to say that the Council is faced with these decisions that are going to impact these communities. That's not what I want to. In fact, this kind of situation is exactly where we don't want to be as an answer as a Council, right? But this is here we are. So, I'll just be short or late. A no vote here for anyone wondering, Merrick is correct. That means you are essentially halting the spex process for all nearshore management measures, not just quillback. You are going down a road that will turn that and the rebuilding plan, which allows us to work together to be flexible for fishing opportunities we can allow, and take into account of needs of fishing communities, that all will be part of those discussions. All of that gets wrapped into the timeline we have without any delays for spex as a whole, for the whole groundfish fishery on January 1 of 2025, and no vote jeopardizes all of that. So, I'll be voting yes. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:49] Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:24:51] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair. I wasn't going to actually speak to this but at this point I figured I should. Based on my earlier question to Mr. Wulff and then Executive Director Burden and Mr. Wulff just were speaking to, I feel that I have to vote yes on this. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:18] I'm looking around to see if there are any further hands for discussion? I'm not seeing any I will call the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:25:30] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:30] Opposed? Abstentions?

Caroline McKnight [00:25:37] Abstain.

Marc Gorelnik [00:25:38] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:42] All right, I've heard...

Bob Dooley [00:25:44] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:44] Third? Three abstentions, Marc Gorelnik, Caroline McKnight, Bob Dooley.

Butch Smith [00:25:52] And one more.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:54] And Butch Smith. The motion passes. Wait till we have everything complete on the screen. I believe that's it. Thank you. So, with that I'll look around and see if there is more we need to do. Maybe I should ask Marlene if she wants to summarize on this difficult topic.

Marlene Bellman [00:26:48] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. The Council has taken up a motion and passed a motion relative to this agenda item. There's also been extensive discussion and deliberation, including some points that I believe will be raised and brought forward again under additional agenda items yet to be discussed at this meeting. And so, it's my understanding that this agenda item is complete.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:15] All right, thank you. I'll look around and make sure, see if there are any final comments here? Not to extend it but I want to make sure we've said everything. We will be discussing quillback I'm sure during the course of the week. So, with that I will consider our work on this agenda item done.

3. Initial Stock Assessment Plan and Terms of Reference

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That concludes all of our reports, the public comment, takes us in the Council discussion on this and action and there it is on the screen before us. And so, with that I will look around for any hands to initiate the discussion on this agenda item. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:00:39] I'm reflecting on Jaime's testimony and reflecting on what we heard from Doctor Hastie about capacity and the only way to change that that I know of, well, let me put it another way. The way to change that and that paradigm of loss of capacity we can't solve that in this room, but we can, I think, develop some information that could be used for others to try to address that problem outside this room. And I am, as I think about this what I think would be very useful, and I'm going to pick the last decade as the timeframe and that may not be the right timeframe, maybe you need to go back farther than that, is to ask the Science Centers to give us information on the change in their capacity to assess west coast, I'll just for the moment use west coast groundfish stocks over the past decade. And again, I would give them the flexibility if there's a longer timeframe that would show in a more demonstrative way the loss of capacity then I would hope they would do that. But before....I know that we're going to get into motions here and stuff that are specific here, but I, we the Council, we the west coast fishing advocates, industry participants are in a really bad spot here in terms of our ability to assess the relative health of these stocks in a meaningful way. And I'm just thinking what can we do to change that paradigm? And information is the first thing that people that want to work on this outside this room would need, and that history would be important for us to have to make the appropriate arguments to see if we can get some additional funding to the west coast.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:49] Thank you Phil. With that inquiry, we do have people from the Science Center here. The interim director, I don't know if it's good to put him on the spot, it's always a challenge. And we have Mr. Craig Russell and, and also Doctor Hastie are back there. Would... is it possible you can respond to that question raised?

Craig Russell [00:04:39] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, thank you Mr. Anderson for the suggestion request. And I think this is something that you can dive into more details with Jim if you like, but we've been actually thinking about this and working on this and are preparing some information and any discussion here will help inform what we develop there. So, this is very timely and we would certainly be happy to bring that information forward. And just having, you know, any further clarity on what you're looking for there would be... would be helpful and we'll be tuning into that closely. And also, before I do change, I did want to introduce Doctor David Detlor, who is our acting Science Center Director here with us and invite him if he's got anything else you'd like to share if that's okay?

David Detlor [00:05:24] Good morning, everybody again. For those of you that I haven't met, my name is David Detlor. I am the acting Northwest Fisheries Science Center Director. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. This is an ongoing concern. It is a conversation that's happening across the Science Centers, across the Councils. Within the federal appropriations process over recent years, we've had an opportunity to ask for what we call annual stock assessment dollars, and those dollars have largely been invested in surveys. But that same federal appropriations line can also be invested in the stock assessment community themselves and our population dynamics tools. That's something that we are actively engaged with Congress on, so it's these types of analyses that Jim, I think, will be prepared to speak to you next month about sort of our declining capacity in the stock assessment realm, our opportunity to deliver that. It's not just a declining capacity of human resources, though, in the population dynamics realm, it's the increased capacities of the needs and the Councils, right? It's not just the number of stock assessments, it's the number of modeled areas that have to be taken into concern and just those demands that ACLs represent. So very happy that the question was

asked and we will be prepared next month to bring that to the floor.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:44] Thank you. Phil, was there something you wanted to add there?

Phil Anderson [00:06:49] I just very much appreciate the thinking that you've been doing, your willingness to bring that information back to this room. And I think not only the people around the table, but more importantly, the people that are listening to us here in the audience and maybe virtually are those, are the people that are going to be able to potentially use that information to the benefit of the west coast fishery. So I'm going to need.....I'm going to need something to do after June here so... (laughter)... this will help me find some additional work. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:37] All right, thank you very much gentlemen for stepping up here to the table. All right, further discussion on this agenda item? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:53] Thank you Vice-Chair. Don't want to cut off conversation under discussion, but there seemed to be a bit of a lull. I think we're going to need like five minutes before presenting a motion, we're close. But I think we, if we could just have a few minutes to huddle, Miss McKnight, Miss Hall, and myself, we would probably have a motion ready fairly quickly.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:21] All right, thank you. The five minutes you need is going to take us to lunch hour so how about an hour and five minutes to work on that and we will be back at 1 o'clock. Excuse me, before we depart Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:39] Yeah, if I could I just, you know, I did a lot of digging as far as the last assessment cycle, the last two, and it seems to me that one thing that stood out, a couple of things stood out. People are wondering kind of what... things went sideways as far as assessments. I mean, just things weren't... the models weren't putting out what we're seeing on the ocean, the disconnect. And you know we had the last two assessment cycles were done under the Covid umbrella, right? And I think it's pretty apparent that virtually everybody in every part of our life that everything was worse under Covid for the most part, except for my cooking at home, because that's what I did a lot during that time period. And I think that didn't help. I also noticed that there was virtually... well, if I look at this Pre-assessment Workshops and, you know, I saw GMT folks, I saw SSC folks, I didn't see any fishermen. And that's, I think one thing that happened, you know, at least I was involved in the Trawl Commission for 15 years and I hit virtually every STAR Panel and discussions prior to that with those assessment folks. I did a lot of interaction, a lot of communication going on there. And I don't think since I left there's been much of that. There's been a turnover in industry. Pete Leipzig was... I mean the same ones. I mean he was heavily involved and there's a lot of back and forth going on and that, we've lost that. And I think it's... it was a little bit of failure here, but it's not just... I'm not gonna blame the Science Center because it's virtually across the board. I think that that people... things have been good and people just assume they're going to be good and shame on industry for not keeping that moving, you know, that discussion happening. And so what I see going forward here, I think we've, we've got to get... we've...everybody in the industry has to be more proactive and be communicating and speaking and talking and participating. I mean Gary Richter, God bless you, he's going to every STAR Panel, but you know, and he'll call when he thinks it's something important comes up, but it's not the same. He's a hook-and-line fisherman from Santa Barbara and he probably doesn't know too much about a number of species up north. And so, but he does his best with what he's got. But really, we should have somebody in that fishery in that seat, and I think we got to do that. But I think in general, I think we need to make sure people are talking well in advance, because the stock assessment authors only do as good as the data they got. The stock assessments are only as good as the interpretation of that data, and if it's happening in a vacuum, you're not going to get the, the nuances are going to be missed and I think that shows in what we've seen the last two stock assessments. So, I know we had some good talk with Craig and

Nicole last night about maybe what we could do different maybe, and in the future I'd hope that we would get there because this part of the management is really, I wouldn't say it's a weak link, but it's where things could go wrong fairly easily if we don't tend the garden. And I think that it just fell. I think it for a business owner, the fact that you could have one bad assessment come through and basically pull the rug out from underneath you and have hundreds of thousands dollars or millions of dollars gone. You wonder why we're not doing better? There's very little stability here and I think we need to work on and think about that and act like that's the case and be engaged at the very beginning because just going to a STAR Panel isn't going to cut it, that's way too late. We need to be involved early on and I would think that, I think the person is to be a stock assessment author. You probably want to maybe go on a boat or two or something like that, get closer to what's actually going on and see the nuances and actually see what's happening. And I think that if they want to do that, we can certainly arrange that. And I think that the time in just in life relationships are what really makes things better. And I think the closer we get to what we're talking, we understand each other, the better we'll do. And so, I'll stop there.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:55] Thank you. With that, when we come back to under lunch, after lunch, we'll continue with discussion to make sure we've fully gone through that, but we're aware that there is a motion that should be available but I want to make sure we fully complete our discussion on this topic. So, with that, let's break for lunch. Be back at 1 o'clock.....(LUNCH BREAK)..... All right. Welcome back, everyone back after lunch. I'm going to see if we can finish this up before we go back to our salmon item that we passed over this morning. So, we ended up we were in Council discussion. We were... there is a motion that is ready, but I'm going to look around to see what additional discussion there might be to have on this? If there was anything we skipped over? Anything else anyone wants to say? And I'm not seeing any hands so I'm going to look for any motion that's available. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:14:06] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I think our tech folks at the back of the room have the motion ready. Okay. I move the Council adopt for public review the species assessment type and anticipated assessment areas in Table 1 below as the preliminary list for 2025 assessments, and the species assessment type and anticipated assessment areas in Table 2 below as the preliminary list for 2027 assessments. For 2025: Sablefish: A benchmark coastwide. Quillback off of California: Benchmark south of 42.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:52] Can you pause for a minute?

Lynn Mattes [00:14:55] Yep.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:57] We have to get the table back up there. All right. Can you start again with just the sablefish?

Lynn Mattes [00:15:03] Sure. I was looking at my screen and not that screen. For 2025 assessments: Sablefish: A benchmark coastwide. Quillback off of California: Benchmark, and that's just south of 42. Roughey black spotted: Benchmark coastwide. Yellowtail rockfish: Benchmark for either both north and south of 40 10 or benchmark for south and update for north, and the anticipated assessment areas will need to be determined coastwide or north and south. Chilipepper rockfish: Benchmark or data-moderate coastwide. Widow rockfish: Update coastwide. Petrale sole: Benchmark coastwide. Yelloweye rockfish: Benchmark or update coastwide. Shortspine thornyhead, oops, English sole: Data-moderate coastwide. Canary rockfish: Catch-only update coastwide. Shortspine thornyhead: Catch-only update coastwide. Then in Table 2 for 2027: Pacific spiny dogfish shark: Benchmark coastwide. Vermilion and sunset rockfish: The assessment type to be determined and it's likely multiple areas. Petrale sole: If not done in 2025, benchmark coastwide. Yelloweye rockfish: If not done in 2025, assessment type to be determined coastwide. And then a slope rockfish species to be determined at a

later date. Assessment type to be determined and coastwide. And that the Council adopt for public review the Draft Terms Of Reference for groundfish stock assessments Attachment 5, incorporating the recommendations of the GMT and Supplemental GMT Report 1 to the Draft Terms Of Reference rebuilding analysis, Attachment 6 and 3 of the draft Terms Of Reference for Methodology reviews, which is Attachment 7.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:16] Thank you. I believe you read that off the screen and appeared accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Lynn Mattes [00:17:22] Yes sir, I do. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:23] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Caroline McKnight. Thank you. Please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:17:31] Thank you Vice-Chair. The 2025 preliminary list in Table 1 is a combination of recommendations from both the GMT and the GAP. Both reports provide a good reasoning for each of the species recommended, therefore I don't feel the need to reiterate all of those. I do want to note that brown rockfish does have an overall number 2 ranking in the NMFS ranking tool, however it is not included in the recommendation now. This is because we are in the process of doing the stock definitions phase 2, where there's going to be discussions and some decisions about state versus federal waters, therefore it doesn't seem like the right time to do a nearshore stock. I do want to acknowledge that there are more species on the list in Table 1 than can be accomplished given the current assessment capacity of the Science Centers. The hope is that we can get some additional feedback from the Science Centers, the GAP and the GMT, and others, on how much of this list could be accomplished and some prioritization for a discussion in June when we finalize the list. The 2027 preliminary list is from the GMT primarily, with an addition of the slope rockfish to be determined from to pull in some information from the GAP. There's good reasoning for these species in the GAP in GMT reports again and I anticipate that additional species will likely be added to this list by the time we get through the next two years from now. On The Terms Of Reference, I think the recommendations from the GMT should be incorporated into the TOR for groundfish stock assessments. They are trying to clarify what the GMT and GAPs roles and responsibilities are, as well as how and when their input is incorporated. However, on the piece of who, when, and how different catch streams or model runs can be requested, may need further refinement for the final version. The goal of putting sideboards on request is needed, however we want to make sure those sideboards are not too narrow. The other two Terms Of Reference documents appear to be ready to move forward as is with no additional edits. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:45] Thank you. Are there questions for clarification to the maker of the motion? Seeing no questions. Any discussion on the motion? Heather Hall. Sorry.

Heather Hall [00:20:05] It's okay. Thank you. Thank you for the motion, Lynn. I appreciate the motion and the fact that it is fairly broad for public review and I just kind of linking that to the discussions we've had this morning and wanting to be very thoughtful and careful about the assessments that we do choose to do in 2025 and consider for 2027. I know thinking about 2027 now seems far out, but as we talk about data needs and I think this really gives us a good opportunity to have conversations leading up to those assessments and make sure we have all the information we need to do a good job. So again, appreciate that this is broad. We likely can't do all of this. I mean, I'm certain we can't do all of this, but look forward to having input from others when we come back to this in June. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:10] Further discussion? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:21:17] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair and thank you, Lynn, for the motion, and

Heather for your remarks as well. I agree that this is a pretty lofty list, but it's comprehensive and it does give I think plenty of time for our Science Center staff to review data and all the other considerations that need to go into staffing capacity to refine this in June. So, I do fully support both lists including that for '27, which I know does seem a long way off but things can change so that's good. I just wanted to make one comment relative to the Terms Of Reference and I think just sort of cross walking discussions that we've had under the quillback rockfish rebuilding analysis and even under our agenda E.1 item. I very much appreciate all of the discussion, the open dialogue, the comment both from the public and our advisory bodies on updating our Terms Of Reference to reflect improvements where they need to be or refinements for clarity for the public. And so, I am very much looking forward to seeing the next draft in June and I encourage all of us to take a hard look at that in June and make sure that it's comprehensive and it covers everything that meets everyone's needs so there's no surprises. But other than that, I'll be supporting it. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:31] Thank you. Further discussion? I'm not seeing any more hands so I'm going to call the question. All those in favor say "aye".

Council [00:22:44] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:44] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much. With that I'm going to turn back to Marlene and ask if there's anything else that needs to be done on this item?

Marlene Bellman [00:23:08] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. The Council has considered the stock prioritization process, as well as input from your advisory bodies and put forward a list of species for '25 and '27, as well as adopting the Draft Terms Of Reference for public review. So, I believe that the action on this item is complete.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:34] All right, thank you. And before we close it out, Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:23:38] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Just thinking about this item and thinking a little bit ahead on the agenda to some of the ecosystem items. And I'm not sure if it's appropriate for guidance at this time or just putting it out for discussion ahead of our next meeting or finalization on this, but thinking about ways to incorporate the ecosystem and climate risk tables into how we do our STAR process. We talked in January and at previous meetings about how we start moving forward with some of the ecosystem work that's been going on for many years, and especially the climate work that's been going on in recent history, and I just really took that to heart in terms of how we can start moving that into more of how we do our business. Tomorrow I'm sure we'll hear another really excellent ecosystem status report from the NOAA IEA Team, and, you know, every year that we get that we typically ask ourselves, 'okay, how can we actually use that information'? So, something that had occurred to me as we were talking about this, and I was previewing some of the EWG and SSC materials for this meeting, were thinking about how to use those risk tables and that we already have this really thought out and good STAR process that provides a lot of the things we're looking for in the process of how we do our ecosystem work and potentially using those tables. So, I guess my request would be that the NOAA IEA folks work with the Stat folks to bring forward risk tables for the species and the motion Miss Mattes just presented and put those through and see how it works. As part of that process, there's review built into it. That's probably why or I'm hoping it's a good idea in the sense that the technical review, the identification of need, and the ability to look at those tables and see their utility is built into that process already. So, I just wanted to put that out as some guidance and thinking with this motion. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:53] Thank you. Any other before we close here, any other last comments?

Discussion? Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:26:07] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. Just in response to your guidance there Miss Ridings. I think that's a fine thing for this Council to discuss. I would... I guess what I would propose we do is say you've put down your desire to have this be considered and that we take it up again under H.2, which is when we bring back the consideration of Initiative 4. That way we'll have the, the reports that you've just referenced. The Council will have heard them and seen them. We'll have others here in the audience that have been participating in that. I think that might be a more appropriate place to take that up, but I appreciate this is like a putting a marker down for that, if you will.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:47] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:26:49] Thanks, I appreciate that. Yeah, I thought about that. I think I'm fine with that, just to answer your question shortly and to agree with you. Part of my thinking of bringing it up now was just that I think it's helpful for at least my brain to switch gears a little bit and start thinking about things when we're thinking about them, you know, as opposed to siloed and different agenda items across different days. And learning about this process we heard a lot today and we've been thinking a lot about this process and how it's serving us, in addition to the limitations of what stock assessments are able to provide us and the information and the data that we're using to make these critical decisions with. And so, it just occurred to me that I think it's important to have those tools, these new tools that are coming available to us to have those discussions and thinking about them in the context of when decisions are being made. So, perhaps that's a little long winded, but I'm agreeing with you Merrick and I'm definitely happy to bring it up again later.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:55] All right, thank you. Look around to see if there's anything else? I'm not seeing any hands so I think we've finished our work here so we'll close out this agenda item.

4. Trawl Cost Recovery Annual Report

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That takes us to public comment and we don't have any, which brings us to Council action. Discuss and guidance as appropriate. So, I'll open the floor up for discussion. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:00:17] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wouldn't want to disappoint everyone and not have comments. I've had comment every year on this and since it's kind of my last bite at the apple on this as after June I won't be here, I just wanted to make a few comments. One I agree with the GAP's statement, and I understand the shortness and the briefness of that report because it's been a number of years now, I think we're, gosh 13, 14 years now in the Catch Share Program, and it seems like this rolling stone just keeps picking up moss. I do acknowledge that the agency has done a really... they've worked over time to address many of the concerns that the industry's had on this. My personal feeling is that over time this fishery normalizes, notwithstanding some of the bigger issues that, yes, I agree with, like gear switching, things like that. But I do believe that at some point this fishery just becomes normalized. It's like any other fishery. And so rather than rehash all of the previous comments I've made over the years, I really dug into it and thought about it a little bit and one of the things that I thought about was in the final motion on cost recovery, and I could go back and nitpick that and look at and illustrate it, but we've talked about it before in previous years on the floor here and it's been acknowledged that the Holliday guidance is one of the things that we adopted as a Council back when this was first done in 2011, 12, somewhere in there. This Holliday guidance has some pretty specific comments on how we calculate cost recovery. And the thing that stuck out to me the most, and a lot of the stuff that we've talked about over time I will acknowledge that NMFS has come forward and really addressed to a certain extent, but the part that I wish they would take another look at and just another perspective on this is the whole part that talks about incremental costs and there's a lot of time given to this. And what it talks about is obviously the with and without comparison, but what is the cost of running a management program for a specified fishery under a status quo regime? And what is the cost of running a management program under a LAPP Program? And it talks about that and it says since the issue is to find the funds to cover the cost of that in LAPP Programs, then the real problem is to cover incremental costs. And the second point is really the part that I wish they would... the perspective I think that needs to be looked at, is to minimize the disincentives for Councils and their constituents as they consider replacing non-LAPP Programs with LAPPs. It makes sense to have participants in the LAPP Programs only pay for costs that are added because of the LAPP Program itself. For example, and that's really critical to take those words, for example, stock assessments costs will be required no matter what type of program is used. Sorry, I'm losing my place here. Given the current law, it's not possible to have participants in non-LAPP Programs pay for stock assessments. Therefore, having participants in LAPP Programs pay for stock assessments while non-LAPP participants don't pay, it would be unfair and prejudice the Council's and the industry's preference of LAPP Programs as a management tool. So, this incremental cost was examined by the GAO at the time in 2005, and they pointed out that actual costs could alternately be interpreted as full cost of the managing of the fishery. And sometimes I think that's what we do. Every dollar spent on managing the fishery should be counted. In response, NOAA indicated that the current methodology to define recoverable costs that are directly attributable to the implementation of the IFQ program was the correct interpretation of MSA. The GAO did not go so far as to suggest the full cost, rather they said if Congress wanted full cost to be recovered, it should clarify the cost recovery fee provision of the act and to call for full costs to be recovered. The MSA reauthorization passed by Congress on December 2006 made no such change, and it goes on. So, I really... it expands on that and I really think that's the vision we need to look at this and revisit it. And I don't have a specific example here for you, but going through it, going through the Cost Recovery Report, it's very obvious to me that maybe that's not being looked at in that light. And so I would... final ask is that we next time we look at that and I think, you know, I will say, you know, I sense a resignation

almost from industry of well, we're not going to ever change this, but I think we should. I think that this program's done a lot of good over time and it's, you know, it's helped get rid of all the uncertainty that surrounded the trawl industry at the time by requiring full accountability. That's done a bunch and it's not only helped the trawl sector, it's helped all sectors by not having those nine species of fish that were overfished at the time that are now on the... all but one totally rebuilt and in record time. And I think this is, you know, it's been a... to me, yes, it's been a burden, a lift for the Council to go through this, but I think a lot of the things that that program has produced has been really good. So, looking at that and looking at the state of our trawl fishery, particularly with our, you know, the bottom trawlers particularly, they're just a mere shadow of what we had. Our fish stocks are in great shape and we need to start taking advantage of that. And every cost savings we can do that, that is justified for those fleets might start bringing back some of the people that are most burdened. So, we've had a lot of people drop out, but I think this is one straw on the camel's back. So, my last bite at the apple. I'll shut up and I hope it changes. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:50] Thank you Bob. Okay. Anyone else? All right. Oh, Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:08:02] Yeah, I just wanted to thank Bob for his comments. I know we have been trying to work and address a number of things so I appreciate that recognition. I know we have looked at that Holliday guidance. I think we referenced it in our last publication, either with or without comparison in April, but I can't deny your final ask Bob. I'm happy to follow-up with you and take another look.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:30] Okay. Jessi, how are we doing?

Jessi Doerpinghaus [00:08:36] I think you all did great. You've had your discussion and not really guidance for Council staff here so I think you've completed this item.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:44] All right. Very good. I'll let you get back and crack that GAP whip.

5. Implementation of the 2024 Pacific Whiting Fishery under the U.S./Canada Agreement

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports, public comment, takes this into Council action, which is discussion and any guidance you wish to provide. I will look around for any hands. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:00:17] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. It's the first year that I stepped down from the AP after eight years on the AP and there was a lot of turnover this year on the AP. There were some challenges and I participated online. I didn't... not in person, first time in a while. I was concerned that we had six new AP members. We had a new JMC member, not new to the process. Brent Payne joined the JMC in Dan Waldeck's place and did a great job from my view. Phil as always, and Frank and Steve Joner just, you know, did a really, really good job of leading the U.S. side of it. I would say, you know, I was concerned having the conditions in Canada that they did not get much fish up there and there was a lot of consternation. Part of what's made this go round in the years, even the short time, eight years I was there, is our personal relationship with the Canadian fishermen and understanding them. And we had a new group coming in and there was... I was certainly concerned and I know that Dave Smith was the other fisherman that was online as well that was an AP member previously. And so, I got to say, you know losing Joe Birch as the lead of the advisory panel and, you know, starting new, I sensed there would be a test, you know, that we would be tested by the Canadians to see if the strength of our advisory panel and the strength of our process, and rightfully so, I think. I mean they're in pretty dire straits up there. They're on the verge of bankruptcy, a lot of them in that field, so you have to consider that. I will say that, you know, that Lori was elected the Chair of the advisory panel. Lori Steele did just a great job, a really good job, solid. And the new members of the advisory panel, including our, you know, two new fishermen that were on there, just did superb, superb work, worked as a team, did a great job. Sure alleviated all my concerns that that we were, you know, that we didn't leave the place in shambles when we stepped off and I think they're doing a better job than we did really to tell you the truth. But it was contentious. There was a lot of hard, hard decisions to make between the advisory panels. There was an understanding. It was great to see how they worked through the issues and how, and also how well our JMC contributed to the, you know, to helping it. And it was a, like you say, it was a slog to get that, to go through it, but in the end, it was successful because... and I believe that our advisory panel was tested. There was a, you know, they were tested. They were, I think the Canadians were just trying to see what they were made of. And from my point of view, flying colors, they passed the test. So, I feel pretty good to be, you know, after eight years stepping down and it's under able body leadership and everything. And I will comment on Phil. And I certainly hope it's not his last term. I certainly hope we find a way to keep him on there because Phil's been there since day one. As long as he wants to do it, I think we ought to accommodate that because he's the reason that I think a lot of this goes, him, well Frank too, you know, all of them, but Phil's a key part of this and that history, that perspective and the even keel that we all know we witness every day here is needed. So, I certainly hope it's not your last. So anyhow, I'll stop there and I really do appreciate the opportunity I had for the last eight years to do that. I appreciate that I was able to attend and actually do a very little bit to help, but it was a good process and I think we're in good hands and it's a solid... I feel really good about it. So, thank you. And thank you Phil.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:07] Thank you Bob. Frank Lockhart.

Frank Lockhart [00:05:13] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm just going to follow-up on how Bob Dooley ended. Nothing I'm saying here will be a surprise to anyone, but in similar vein, just in case, I just wanted to note that Phil was a crucial part of the success of the Whiting Treaty process and since implementation began in 2012, not just for the TAC discussions, but for the numerous other meetings

we had every year. Furthermore, there were several years where Phil's unparalleled experience in fisheries management, and especially international negotiations, helped us navigate several rocky situations. So, on a personal note, I learned a lot from Phil during this treaty process from just simple things on how to run a meeting to kind of the more complex things, like how to find the areas of commonality in negotiations. I, however, can only hope to be half as good as he is, and I truly, if this is our last meeting, I truly will miss you Phil. And it's been an amazing experience for me and other JMC members to work with you during these past 13 years. So, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:50] Thank you Frank. I'll look around for any other discussion. Hands raised. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:07:01] Well I'm humbled by all the kind words and I really do appreciate them, but getting back to the business at hand. One of the reasons we have this on our agenda now is in the event that we hadn't reached agreement, the Council would have an opportunity to provide any recommendations you might see fit to National Marine Fisheries Service, because in the absence of an agreement it would be in the hands of NMFS to set the U.S. TAC. So, one of the important... don't... don't lose sight of that important role that you have here as a Council in the event that an agreement isn't reached. And, again, thanks for the privilege of being able to represent you in this forum.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:56] All right. Thank you for that reminder that the hard work of a lot of people made our work easier here today I believe. So, I'll look for any other comments, discussion, guidance? I'm not seeing any hands, so, Todd, I'll turn to you and ask if that completes our work here?

Todd Phillips [00:08:16] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. As Mr. Anderson noted that had the agreement not been made, we would be talking a little differently about management measures. However, I would say given the situation and the discussion that we've had, you have addressed all the items necessary and you have completed this item.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:36] Thank you very much. With that I'm going to send the gavel back to my left to our Chair.

6. Fixed Gear Marking and Entanglement Risk Reduction - Preliminary Preferred Alternative

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That concludes all our reports, the public comment, is going to take us to Council action. Let's take a five minute break. I know that sounds short, but try and be here, back here as quickly as possible so you're comfortable when we get into the discussion on this item. Thanks... (BREAK)... Okay, I think we're all back here and we're ready to get into Council action, which is adopt the Preliminary Preferred Alternative for this agenda item. I'll look around and see if there's a hand to initiate discussion. Maggie Sommer.

Maggie Sommer [00:00:44] Thank you Vice-Chair. Groundfish fixed gear marking remains a priority for us, and I just wanted to appreciate the efforts by Council staff, the GAP, and industry members and Council members to develop the alternatives put forward for our consideration and the recommendations we've heard today. It's taken a lot of effort, a lot of discussion to really consolidate, I guess, work through a lot of details and a lot of options and get to a good point here. We recognize that there are a lot of details and that there's a lot of evolution and learning going on. As we heard in just some of the questions after the GAP report, you know, some of these methods haven't been used out here. Some of them have been used but not very much. We know that there will be, there will be a lot to learn. We want to continue to support and appreciate coordination, in particular with the states as they work through a lot of gear marking efforts for their state fisheries and the industry. We've seen that coordination leading up to and at this meeting. It's been very helpful. And, you know, I just wanted again to emphasize that while we know we might not get it right the first time, we might learn that we want to come back and consider some modifications in the future. We do hope that the Council can stay on track for final action in June on this and even if it's not perfect it will be a very important step forward in this. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:25] Thank you. Further discussion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:02:30] Thank you Vice-Chair. Miss Sommer started to hit on part of what I was thinking about, and that is the coordination with the states. The state, all three states have been working on their Dungeness crab fisheries for quite a while and are quite a ways down this process. We've been having good coordination with NMFS, the Protected Resources Division, and with the sustainable fisheries folks. It is challenging, though trying to coordinate people who participate in multiple fisheries, given our state process is on one timeline and one process and the Council is moving at a different pace and NMFS is at a slightly different process. So that gets a little confusing about who's where and how we're doing things. I think it's going to be very important for, as we move forward, if we choose the permanent line marking, whoever is tasked with recommending colors in June, please coordinate with the states because the states already have colors they are going with. Maggie, that seems like it might be you and Heather and Caroline and maybe Mr. Ainsworth. But just make sure we're coordinating and keeping it... I know I've heard some hallway conversations that talking about color, the colors of line seems somewhat silly in this overall process and given everything else we've got going on, but there are things to consider. The fading, the contrast in colors, and one of our salmon people in the delegation this morning used to work lobster fisheries in Maine and said, 'don't forget about colors that stand out against the color of a whale'. I hadn't ever thought about that, but not just stand out against the color of the other gear, but if it's wrapped around a whale's fin, a color that has to stand out against the color of the whale is important. So, we just really want that coordination and I know as we've been moving forward, NMFS thus far has said follow what the East Coast has done. That's sort of our benchmark. That's our rock. It would be really good to get further guidance before we get too much further down this that we don't have the right rock. The analogy that seems to come up in this process

a lot. We don't want to say in June we've got, we're going to use these colors and these marks, and then we get started on the TRT process, oh that's not good enough, and now we've invested time and effort and money in gear and our fleet has to do something very different. So, the communication and coordination piece is going to be important as we move forward with this. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:10] Thank you Lynn. Further discussion? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:05:15] Thank you. I'll just echo the appreciation for how the alternatives were put together, all the presentation materials. Again, thank the GAP and the EC for their really thoughtful input on this, public comment as well. I think it sets us up to be successful in what we put forward for public or preliminary preferred and public review here at this meeting. When we're ready I do have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:55] All right, thank you. Let me just look around to make sure there's other comments. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:06:01] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And thank you Lynn and Heather for your comments. I agree with them entirely, and I just want to acknowledge that I, too, had some confusion about who starts first with color decisions and how we go about that, and so thank you for bringing that up Lynn. I also just want to say that I very much appreciated some of the conversation, discussion, and public comment in the GAP report. That really helps illuminate that while entanglement risk and line marking is very important that there are a lot of differences between Dungeness crab gear and groundfish gear, and I'm trying to keep that in the front of my mind as we proceed and move through this process. And I think I'll stop there. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:47] All right, thank you. Any other general discussion? Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:06:54] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just a thought here. I'm thinking about Dungeness crab pot tags and the renewal of those, at least in California every couple of years, and I know it's not cheap but there's a lot more tags involved. But I'm thinking of the whole process there that, you got to use some thought to that so that we know who do get the tags from, who's authorized to get them from, and who supplies them and what they cost and all that kind of stuff in the analysis when we get down the road here so that we have a plan. I don't think it's five fishermen get together and find somebody to make them their tags, and somebody else gets other tags and you don't have consistency. It should be at least thought through a bit, and I'm sure people will think of that but I just wanted to bring it up. So, thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:48] Okay, thank you. Looking around, Heather, I think we're ready for your motion.

Heather Hall [00:07:56] All right, thank you. All right. I move that the Council revise the range of alternatives for temporary line marking as described in Agenda Item F.6.a, Supplemental Revised NMFS Report 1, March 2024, and adopt the alternatives below as the Preliminary Preferred Alternatives for fixed gear marking and entanglement risk reduction measures. Starting with gear marking. Buoy marking. Alternative 1, Suboption B: Gear specific mark with cattle-ear tags as modified by the GAP in Agenda Item F.6.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1. Line marking. Alternative 1: Gear specific marking. Portion of line marked A.1. vertical line. Distance of mark, B.2, at least the top 20 fathoms. Method of marking, C.1 manufactured line. Transition period, D.1, no transition. Manufactured line required upon implementation. Entanglement risk reduction. Surface gear requirements. Alternative 1: Surface gear required only at one end. Surface line length restrictions. Alternative 1b: Limit the amount of surface line to 10 fathoms. Administrative or other items.

Alternative 1: Clarify regulations to prohibit panel placement of the bottom of the pot, except for slinky pots. And guidance. Request Council staff revise the purpose and need to clarify that the line marking can contribute to both positive and negative fishery attribution. Request NMFS develop a best practices guide and coordinate with the GAP and EC on that. And coordinate with West Coast Dungeness crab fishery managers to identify line and buoy colors that are unique to the federal fixed gear groundfish fishery.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:24] Thank you. So, I read through. That appears accurate and complete. Is that correct?

Heather Hall [00:10:29] Yes, it is.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:30] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Please speak to your motion.

Heather Hall [00:10:37] Thank you. There's a lot in here. I'll start with adopting the Revised NMFS Report, March 2024. Just I know some of those are beyond the PPA that I mentioned in the motion, but it does add those revisions to the range of alternatives that the Council will be able to select from when we get to Final Preferred Alternative in June. Relative to the buoy marking, appreciated the GAP report and the rationale that they described for the cattle-ear tag and the providing the flexibility to switch between gears more efficiently. I appreciated that the GAP was looking for effective solutions. Relative to buoy marking, I spoke to this a little bit in the guidance, but I do offer a recommendation for a static color and shape, and I don't have that color or shape as part of the motion, but there's already been a great deal of coordination with state managers on these types of things and I think we can follow-up to identify unique shapes and colors for the pot and long line that aren't already being used. We have the Tri-state Dungeness Crab Committee. That's a really effective group and I think that can make the conversations with NMFS on that pretty efficient. Relative to line marking and requiring the vertical line marks and marking the top 20 fathoms, I think this acknowledges that observations of entanglements are more likely in line if it's near the surface, and we saw that in the presentation that Miss Doerpinghaus gave us and also in the analytical document in figure 3.2. Let's see, I already covered adopting the Revised NMFS Report. By adopting the revisions in NMFS Report 1, I think that also removes the 50 fathom option for line marking but just acknowledge that here specifically. And on this one this motion adopts the GAP recommendation for manufactured line and no transition. That one, again, I really appreciated the good discussion and feedback from the GAP on this one. I guess was thinking about flexibility and the flexibility that Alternatives C.2 and D.4 that allows for temporary markings and manufactured line indefinitely might provide to the fleet, but again, recognizing this is PPA, I think this would be a great place to look for more input on this before FPA in June just to confirm that. Relative to Alternative 1 and the surface gear requirements and requiring surface gear marking only on one end, this is another place that I really appreciated the conversation. Recognize this is PPA. I think the issues with derelict gear and potentially lost gear by not having that second end marker requirement is something to think about, but I also balance that with the idea that the goal here is a risk reduction measure and that's achieved by reducing the number of lines in the water. I mean it's just simply getting another line out of the water that could potentially entangle a whale. So that's kind of the thought process I got to by at least for PPA going with Alternative 1 here. For the surface line length restrictions in Alternative 1b, this is limiting the amount of surface line length to 10 fathoms. This is again per the GAP's report on this. Minimizes the risk of entanglement, but also covers their operational needs and acknowledges that sometimes with currents that can take some of their surface gear being underwater. On the administrative and other items. And this is the clarifying the escape panel placement on the bottom of the pot, except for slinky pots. I didn't include this in my motion but I would like to ask staff to look at EC's recommendation to consider changing the thread count so that it's in line with the requirements in Alaska and just maybe come back with more information on that. I don't know how

that affects the regulatory process so just put that out as a request to please consider that. And then on the Best Practices Guide, I think this is a really good tool. It's a tool we used in West Coast Dungeness crab as a first step, get people thinking about things that, you know, may not be enforceable in regulation but that are really important things to remember. And I know the EC requested that they be involved in the development of the Best Practices Guide, and I also included the GAP in that. And then again in the guidance is just requesting Council staff to revise the purpose and need to clarify that line marking can contribute to both positive and negative fishery attribution. That's it. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:44] All right, thank you. Are there any questions to the maker of the motion for clarification? Maggie Sommer.

Maggie Sommer [00:17:54] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you very much, Heather, for the motion. I have two questions for clarification really just for, I think I know the answers, we've had lots of discussions around here, but for the public who might not have been as involved I want to make sure this is crystal clear... your motion would include putting vessel identification info on the tags as recommended by the EC and the GAP. Is that correct?

Heather Hall [00:18:21] Yes, it does.

Maggie Sommer [00:18:22] Great. And then once again I just want to make sure everyone is clear about this, the only voluntary component of this package would be then the option to use surface gear on only one end of the ground line. Both ends would remain an option if you want. But every other component of this, setting aside the Best Practices Guide, but everything else here would be required in regulation?

Heather Hall [00:18:48] Yes.

Maggie Sommer [00:18:50] Thanks for clarifying that.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:53] Thank you. Further questions for clarification? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:19:02] I'm just wondering, your line there to coordinate with West Coast Dungeness crab fishery managers to identify line and buoy colors that are unique to the federal fixed gear groundfish fishery. Yeah, I thought what I heard in the GAP report was some implementation that did not force them to have multiple sets of buoys. Did I... they talked about not having to put a shape on the buoy, but in effect if you require them to have a different color of buoy, if they also fish Dungeness crab then would they have to have two different sets?

Heather Hall [00:19:48] You know, I think what you see there, that should say buoy shapes or buoy tag colors, excuse me.

Sharon Kiefer [00:20:00] That clarifies my question.

Heather Hall [00:20:03] And should probably also say buoy tag colors and shapes.

Sharon Kiefer [00:20:10] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:11] It's a substantial change from buoys to buoy tags. Maggie Sommer.

Maggie Sommer [00:20:19] Vice-Chair may I offer an amendment?

Pete Hassemer [00:20:21] Yes, you may.

Maggie Sommer [00:20:22] I think it's there.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:24] Before I look for a second I want to make sure everybody's clear. I think we know... but go ahead.

Maggie Sommer [00:20:39] Thank you Vice-Chair. The amendment would be to add the words "tag colors and shapes" after the word buoy in the motion in order to clarify exactly what the motion is seeking coordination on.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:07] All right. It's up there. That appears to be accurate, complete. Is that correct?

Maggie Sommer [00:21:16] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:17] All right, thank you. Is there a second to the motion?

Sharon Kiefer [00:21:20] Second.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:20] Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Speak to your motion as necessary.

Maggie Sommer [00:21:33] Thank you Vice-Chair. I think I have.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:36] All right. Thank you. Discussion on the motion to amend? Not seeing any discussion I will call for the, call the question on the motion to amend. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:21:51] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:52] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Back to the main motion as amended. Discussion on that? Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:22:09] More of a question.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:10] Oh, sorry. We were in questions.

Bob Dooley [00:22:13] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Heather, your intention of including the GAP in writing the best practices, I assume that was intended to make sure that industry has a voice in this process and has, and can weigh-in on what the best, best practices could be. I just wanted clarification on that.

Heather Hall [00:22:35] Yes, that's exactly right.

Bob Dooley [00:22:37] Thank you.

Heather Hall [00:22:37] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:40] All right. Other questions for clarification? I'm not seeing any questions. Discussion on the motion? Maggie Sommer.

Maggie Sommer [00:22:51] Thank you Vice-Chair. As I've said, we really support the work that went into refining the alternatives and identifying this Preliminary Preferred Alternative. I will be voting for

the motion. I do want to speak to the issue that Miss Mattes raised of NMFS guidance and the need for that and some thought of following the examples in East Coast gear marking requirements. You know, our approach and the approach of our West Coast Protected Resources Division has been really to try to work with the Council and seek a solution that is operationally feasible for industry, works for, you know, keeps costs and the labor, et cetera, required reasonable and still results in marking requirements that will make a significant improvement in our ability to entribe entanglements. And so, you know, we have not, NMFS has not come in and said you must mark X feet of line and the marks have to be exactly this because we really wanted it to be a process with significant industry input. We recognize that that has maybe extended it and made it a little more difficult, but in the end, I think, it results in something that is going to be more, you know, more workable for the industry and hopefully more durable. I specifically want to speak to the GAP recommendation that was picked up in the motion here, to instead of marking the surface line, to leave the surface line unmarked, that's the line that would be at the surface in between the main buoy and any trailing buoys and the high flier at the end, and put a tag, a marked tag on every buoy at the surface. We have heard some information that quite often it is surface line that is observed in an entanglement. But we also recognize the operational concerns, the desire expressed by GAP and industry members to be able to switch their buoys in between halibut fishing, for example, and groundfish fishing and not have to take two sets of buoys, that was expressed in the GAP report. And so, we think this compromise of putting a tag on every buoy instead of just the main buoy will give us a good chance at making an identification when that surface gear is entangling, because when it is that part of a gear, there's a good chance there will be a buoy there along with it. So really appreciate that and, you know, I think maybe actually that's an example of one of the first things I said, which is I think we got to a good solution here by hearing what industry suggested and wanted to do rather than coming in with a NMFS recommendation. So again, appreciate it. Thank you very much.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:53] Thank you. Further discussion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:25:58] Thank you Vice-chair. Obviously, I'm going to support this since I seconded it. But over the course of the last couple of days I've been having some consternation about the new transition piece that the GAP was recommending. That is very different than what we've been hearing in our state Dungeness crab fishery. They want as much transition time as possible, but based on the GAP Report and the very good exchange we had with Mr. Ibach and a reminder to myself that what we're talking about right now is only the groundfish fishery, not all fisheries, I can support that piece since that is what industry is supporting. Just needed to talk that out, the rationale behind that specific piece. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:43] Thank you. Maggie Sommer.

Maggie Sommer [00:26:45] Thank you Vice-Chair. I have one more comment on that topic of transition. I think that's something that will be very important and Miss Hall noted this, but something very important to get public comment on before final action, just recognizing that there may be a wide range of views out there. In terms of timeline, the motion here does not speak to when implementation would occur. I think we can have some more discussion on that. If the Council adopts a Final Preferred Alternative in June, we would proceed with the rulemaking process. We would expect to have that complete by spring of 2025. So probably the earliest implementation could occur would be sometime around April 2025. There is not a hard timeline driving this. We could potentially consider a later implementation, for example January 2026. Again, just noting that, yeah, I think we can have some further discussion on that as we come in for consideration of final action in June. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:57] Thanks. Caroline McKnight then Sharon Kiefer.

Caroline McKnight [00:28:03] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you for this discussion here. And I'm going to start first with the guidance provided under the purpose and need. And I appreciate that we're paying attention to the details and making sure that that accurately reflects what we're trying to achieve here. And with that, edit a revision to note both positive and negative fishery attribution to the purpose and need. I think that the suite of alternatives in front of us here does in fact create a complete package and comprehensive and I'm very pleased with what this looks like. Thank you, Maggie, for your comments you just made because I was going to make comments while about transition period, and my comment was going to be that I think as a PPA I'm comfortable with this no transition manufactured line required upon implementation, noting that we had in between now and June to get a better update on where manufacturing might be, but now hearing that the timeline isn't, you know, mandated immediately or on that timeline makes me feel even more comfortable about that. So, I think I will be supporting the motion. Again, I just want to say that the input from the GAP and the creativity to change out marking or tagging each of the buoys instead of marking the surface line is a fantastic trade-off. And I appreciate that discussion. We ended up in a great place there and thank you for the motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:33] Thank you. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:29:35] Mr. Vice-Chairman, my thought was already addressed.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:40] Thank you. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:29:44] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I had a little angst about the implementation and, you know, requiring the manufactured line right away. And but now that I think about it a little longer, you know, we're going to have a final action on this and it'll be a while before it gets published and implemented and required, so there will be a ramp there for people to adjust to that that doesn't cause that much of a hardship to get there. So, I really like that better than temporary markings and all of those type of things. I think that's... so I'm really comfortable with and I'm glad you addressed that Maggie. That was good to hear that part. So, kind of brings us, brings it back to reality there. So anyhow, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:35] Other discussion? Looking carefully. I'm not seeing any so I will call for a vote on the main motion as amended. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:30:49] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:51] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Any further discussion on here? While you think about that I will just look to Jessi and if we need a refresher on what needs to be done here?

Jessi Doerpinghaus [00:31:17] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Unless there is any other discussion or motions, you have completed your action for today. You have revised your range of alternatives, adopt a Preliminary Preferred Alternative, and have provided some guidance to Council and NMFS staff. We will be, we are scheduled to take final action on this in June so we will return with that updated analysis for PPA then.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:43] Thank you. I am going to look around to see if there's any other discussion before we leave? And seeing none, we'll close out this agenda item and I will pass the gavel back to our Chair.

7. 2025-26 Fisheries Analysis Update and Adopt California Quillback Rockfish Harvest Specifications and Rebuilding Parameters

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] All right, thank you. It looks like we're all assembled here to come back into the session on this. Just as a reminder, your Council action is on the screen before us and I will look for a hand to initiate discussion. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:00:15] Thank you. I did want to add to some of the comments that the folks around the table already said recognizing the work of the Groundfish Management Team leading up to this meeting. They've done a lot of work over winter trying to identify some of the analyses for spex, but also the challenges that the Council really needs to take a hard look at. They pulled together a lot of information. We've seen a lot of good creative thinking and I think they've asked very politely for some prioritization and some help with their workload. We still have a long way to go in the spex development, though it is fast. And I want to help them out on that prioritization. I'm hopeful that the rest of the Council is also ready to try to do that, whether identifying what they should work on first or as extreme as taking things out of the range. From the NMFS perspective, our top priority in the spex package in terms of the things that have come forward today is the rebuilding plan. And in particular, we want to make sure that there's emphasis and time spent on building out that rationale for delaying, rebuilding, for the needs of the fishing communities. I understand that there's a lot of interest around the table looking at the ABC Control Rule, which is the longest rebuilding alternative in that rebuilding analysis, and that will definitely require building that record for why we are going to take that additional time for the needs of the fishing community. So, from our perspective, we want to make sure the GMT has the time and the space to pull that information together. In conjunction with Council staff and NMFS staff we'll certainly expend our resources to make sure that is in there. And I wanted to put that forward sort of to get that ball rolling on prioritization. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:00] Thank you very much. Further discussion? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:02:04] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I think maybe if I could have a question relative to timing or expected timing of completion of a rebuilding plan? And I don't know maybe if that's a question for Mr. Phillips. That might help frame priorities for the entire GMT a little bit differently. I'm not sure who that goes to, but I'll throw it out there if someone can answer that.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:32] I will look to Keeley. I guess you've got that straw.

Keeley Kent [00:02:39] Thank you. I might have to ask you a question to clarify. So, when you are asking the timing of the rebuilding plan, are you asking like Council final action or when the analysis needs to be done?

Caroline McKnight [00:02:54] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, Thanks Keeley. I guess we're a week away from a briefing book deadline for an April meeting so I'm not supposing that there's any expectation that the GMT has any capabilities, even if they put this first and foremost and up front, that there would be something in April. So, I'm presuming that means June, but I just wanted to confirm that's, that's the idea here.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:18] Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:03:19] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So yes, Caroline you have... Miss McKnight, you have recognized the fact that we're very, very close between now and April. It would be highly unlikely to have a full rebuilding plan before the Council in that two weeks so June would probably

unfortunately be the time for the full document or full analysis. However, I would think that in April staff could come back to the Council with at least the differences between whatever rebuilding strategies you select in terms of numbers so you'd have an idea of the overall differences. We, in the spex document, are the management measures that were recommended, or not recommended, but we looked at per guidance from the Council in November. There, we may have already done some of that work so there could be like a brief snapshot or an indication of what would come in terms of management measures. However, things like community dependence or socioeconomic, major socioeconomic ramifications would be very, very tough to get done between now and April. I hope that answers your question.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:38] Okay. Thank you. Further discussion? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:04:45] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you. Just to step back a little bit. And I want to thank the GMT very much for the amount of information that's in front of us under this agenda item and the very great presentation and taking it in bite sizes and giving us a very concise set of questions. Whether you need guidance and information I think that this sets us up very nicely for April and is a good segue. But coming off of this last set of discussions, I think we can dispense with the quillback rockfish needs under this agenda item. I'm prepared with a motion unless there's further discussion around the table.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:23] Thank you. I want to look around for further discussion first. Not seeing any I think we're ready for your motion.

Caroline McKnight [00:05:37] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you. I move the Council adopt a range of 2025-2026 harvest specifications for quillback rockfish off California recommended by the GMT in Table 1 from Agenda Item E.7.a, Supplemental GMT Report 1, November 2023, with a technical correction to the 2026 specification as provided by the SSC in Agenda Item F.7.a, Supplemental SSC Report 1, March 2024.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:11] Thank you. The language on the screen is accurate and complete?

Caroline McKnight [00:06:16] It is.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:17] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

Caroline McKnight [00:06:24] Thank you. Yeah, I think the intent here is to provide a range of specifications and the widest range possible, representing in Table 1 both fishing of none or no fishing up to the ABC control rule. This is intended to support the rebuilding plan development, but it also allows for the GMT to continue work on management measure development and in support of keeping on our timeline for our specification process and a January 1 implementation date. This is supported and recommended by the GMT, the SSC, and the GAP. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:07] Thank you. Questions to the maker of the motion for clarification? Todd Phillips.

Todd Phillips [00:07:13] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Caroline, or excuse me, Miss McKnight, are you indicating then with this particular motion that you would not want to see the... what we're determining, what we're calling the Council or California quillback number that you were recommended in November which was the 8 metric ton OFL, would you want to see that continue on into the analysis?

Caroline McKnight [00:07:38] Through the Chair, thank you Mr. Phillips. This motion doesn't explicitly eliminate it. I think that it's already included in the analysis that are turned in at this point so this would be in addition to.

Todd Phillips [00:07:53] Through the Vice-Chair. Thank you Miss McKnight. I appreciate it.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:58] Any other questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing none, discussion on the motion? Seeing no hands for discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:08:16] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:16] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:08:26] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just following that, I wanted to touch on another order of business and this somewhat sandwiches specific to providing management measure guidance for quillback rockfish. Mr. Phillips, you headed that direction for me, I just wanted to continue to acknowledge that these specifications coming from this rebuilding analysis are going to continue to severely constrain fisheries off of California. However, CDF and W has been taking steps since 2023 and in conjunction with the Council here and inseason for 2024 to reduce impacts to quillback rockfish for both by, excuse me, by allowing some shallow nearshore opportunities balanced with offshore opportunities. So, I believe that in terms of guidance for 25-26 management measures, we've planned for that and we are well suited in a place to be prepared for April and beyond accordingly with these harvest specifications. So hopefully that gives you what you need in terms of guidance. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:36] All right, thank you. Further discussion, guidance here? Maybe if we get our action item list back up on the screen. See if anybody wants to add anything else? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:10:07] Thank you. I just wanted to take the opportunity to thank the GMT for the remarkable amount of work that they did and shared with us at this meeting. The really helpful way that they presented the information to us in their presentation, thinking about how we can help them move forward and give them some guidance, maybe help with prioritization and what they have in front of them to prepare for April and June. I wanted to thank the GAP too. This is... in their working through really challenging conversations on shortspine thornyhead. I know this is a tough week for both of those two teams and I think all of that work sets us up really well for April and I'm very appreciative of it. So, I wanted to just start with that. I think I have my list of issues of places where we can provide input to the GMT. It looks like one of the issues they brought to us was the sorting requirements that will come up, and it seems like this could be one of those places where it's very low priority at this point. We can talk more about it in April when they bring their full report to us, but that seems like a real easy place to signal potential very low priority for work at this point. Maybe I'll just pause there, I think. Lynn has organized some of this input for us to talk about too so I'll just pause and let that happen. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:05] Thank you. Look around. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:09] Thank you Vice-Chair and Miss Hall. I was slightly confused because the Council actions there are different than the ones that are on the sitsum and I thought we were going in order. But we have created a table too, if Kris could display it, with guidance on the items that the GMT requested specific guidance on. We went through the presentation and every place they asked for guidance we have tried to create this table to help that it's out in front of everybody and written. So hopefully this is a format that helps the GMT, Council staff, and whoever from NMFS is working on

spex with this. Just walking down. At-sea set-asides, we believe the current range is sufficient. You don't need to look for any other alternatives. On the petrale sole issue, no further analysis on allocations or management measures. Canary rockfish allocations and widow rockfish allocations. The current range is sufficient. On shortspine thornyhead issue, prioritize pathway 2 as outlined in the GAP report for analysis. No further analysis on the other pathways. Miss Hall spoke to the sorting requirement briefly. The GMT presentation said that there was going to be some preliminary findings and maybe a scoping document in April. Please bring that to us and we will discuss it, however this should be considered a low priority. On the discard mortality rates. This is seen as a technical correction. This is for the canary, cowcod, and yelloweye... therefore doesn't need to be part of the spex package. Ask Council staff to make the corrections. On the sablefish discard mortality rates for recreational fisheries, apply a 7 percent mortality rate same as the other species without a swim bladder, but put this on the workload and new management measures prioritization list, the item formerly known as omnibus, for future further analysis. And then on continuous transit. Yes, please keep this management measure as part of the spex package. So, I think we've covered the places the GMT asked for guidance and hopefully this is a format that is helpful to the team moving forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:38] All right, thank you Lynn. I want to make sure everybody's clear on this. This is offered as Council guidance so that there is agreement around the table. This would move forward and any clarification. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:14:52] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Lynn. I like the table. Just a point of clarification on the sablefish DMR item, on the last sentence there says put this on the workload and new management measure prioritization list. I think the intent there is to put it forward for the Council to consider putting it on the list, not just throw it on there, right? I just want to clarify that language. Thank you.

Lynn Mattes [00:15:17] Through the Vice-Chair. That's correct Miss McKnight. And I also see I have soaring requirements instead of sorting requirements.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:27] All right, Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:15:30] Thank you. And I think maybe in this guidance we have current ranges sufficient and yet we heard a little bit from the GMT and the GAP on their preferences for the range. And so just thinking now about clarifying what we have in the table here for that. So, for example, for widow rockfish, the GMT and yellowtail had added some lower and higher at-sea set-asides in their table, and I think to be clear what they brought up would be included in this range. And then thinking about canary rockfish just in terms of helping to provide guidance on priorities, the GAP also in their table had offered some ideas on what the range of those allocation scenarios could be. And so we say current range but I'm not sure if we've been very clear here about what we mean by that so just...

Pete Hassemer [00:17:01] All right, thank you. And I'm going to turn to Lynn and see if you can clarify the current range. I do remember the widow and the yellowtail that the bolded items, I think, were new?

Lynn Mattes [00:17:18] Thank you Vice-Chair and Miss Hall. Yeah, it was all the stuff that was in the GMT presentation with the bolded and added. I think the mid-range widow allocation item, that was my intent with this guidance. Sorry it isn't perfectly clear. I was trying to do things in a hurry. I thought about this table about halfway through the GAP presentation.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:46] Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:17:49] Let me just turn to canary for a moment just again for clarity on what we're

saying. I'm sure the GAP had a lot of deliberations before coming up with their recommendations. And relative to the commercial non-trawl sectors, excuse me, the commercial non-trawl recreational sharing arrangement, they recommended status quo and not including the other alternatives that were in the GMT report. And similarly, the state specific recreational shares they recommended sticking with status quo and not exploring the other alternatives that were in the GMT report. So just again, I would like clarification on what the current range is sufficient means relative to that?

Pete Hassemer [00:18:49] Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:18:50] Vice-Chair Hassemer, Mr. Anderson. With this not being a decision-making meeting on removing alternatives, the guidance was that what we have in the range is sufficient. They don't need to look for additional alternatives to be analyzed between now and April. And then when we come to the April meeting that's when we will identify a PPA. And I was seeing the GAP recommendations as more of the April step than what we were trying to do right now. Given the analysis that's already been done, I don't think the GMT needs to do any further analysis on the canary allocations. I just don't think that this is the meeting where we are supposed to eliminate anything from the range of alternatives given it's a spex update, and I don't think it was noticed as an action item for this agenda item today. Hopefully, that helps someone with the thinking was.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:48] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:19:49] Thank you. And... and I was thinking similarly too and when I started out by saying that I thought the GAP and the GMT did a fantastic job of setting us up well for April was along those lines, and they've already kind of dug into the details and given us something to think about between now and April about where we could refine the alternatives and select the PPA. So, agreeing with Lynn too that this is really just a high level update. I wanted to acknowledge that it feels to me that the GMT and the GAP are on the right track in much of the input that we got from them. And so hopefully that's helpful and not confusing.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:48] Thank you. Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:50] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I look at this as kind of the broader between the GAP and the GMT that the broader look at it is what we include. The GAP had looked at the status quo on say for canary, for instance, the GMT said to look at the range. I think the range is what we'd look at, what we would have. So, I don't think we should be excluding anything here at this point so...

Pete Hassemer [00:21:16] Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:21:18] Thank you. I wanted to ask about one of the items that's in the GAP report and just whether there was any guidance that the Council wanted to give? So, the long leader gear recommendation from the GAP about analysis for long leader gear in the California recreational fishery. I believe it wasn't in the GMT report. I believe it's not in the range yet, but I understand the GAP has asked for it. I think maybe now this is the second time and I'm simply confirming if there is any guidance at this point on that item or perhaps in April there's further discussion on it.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:51] I'll look around and see... Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:21:56] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thanks Keeley. I think that, if I'm understanding the process right and I might have to tap Mr. Phillips here to make sure that I am, we did not move that. It was on the initial list in September as a new management measure item and it was not

moved forward beyond that for consideration. So, my understanding of process-wise, it would be too far into our specification scheduling process to bring it back at this juncture. But if that's not the case, that would be a good conversation to have, but that's my understanding is that new management measures needed to be on the list in November for over-winter analysis to be ready in time for April.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:51] Pause for a second here. Staff are conferring on that. Todd Phillips.

Todd Phillips [00:22:58] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I was commuting with my... with the better brains. In the COPs there is a footnote that says items can be brought forward in April. One thing to note, though, is that anything brought forward in April or post-November, we could say, could stall out analyses on anything else such as a rebuilding plan or that sort of thing. So, in April an item can be brought forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:30] Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:23:31] If I may, thank you. Just for clarification, that would include what we're typically calling a new management measure as well as, I'm trying to avoid the word routine, but I'm going to say standing management measure changes.

Todd Phillips [00:23:48] Through the Vice-Chair. Yes, Miss McKnight, I would say that you are correct there. I like the term standing management measures. That's a good term. But, yes, you could bring forward a new management measure, and again it would apply the same basic logic there that anything brought forward could be detrimental to getting the spex pushed through on time.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:14] All right, so that goes back. Keeley, did that answer your question? Okay... we have this guidance which I have the Situation Summary checklist here that covers a lot and I just want to make sure everyone agrees with this guidance and is clear with it? Caroline, did you have something?

Caroline McKnight [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I didn't mean to get ahead of you. I think we had a few more orders of guidance to give but I'll pause and let you finish.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:08] All right. I'll just, as long as this checklist, if you want to call it that, is up here before us. See if there are any other questions on that? And I'm not seeing any so go ahead.

Caroline McKnight [00:00:22] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I was going to say, yes, I have been mostly quiet on this table in front of us but I am in agreeance with it. I appreciate the conversation around the table sort of understanding what we meant by current range is sufficient. I agree with Miss Hall and Miss Mattes on what the intent there was. Unless there's anything else I can move on to provide some guidance on copper rockfish ACT south of 34 27 per the sitsum. The intent was meant to be, excuse me, for a recreational, non-trawl recreational ACT south of 34 27 in direct response to the assessment demonstrating lower proportional biomass in that area. And given the timing of how data streams and data programs work, it makes reasonable sense to provide that kind of target for a recreational fishery as they tend to harvest the bulk of that species in the south. And I'll ask Mr. Phillips if that is sufficient guidance on that particular item?

Todd Phillips [00:01:34] Through the Vice-Chair... yes, Miss McKnight, that really does help. I appreciate it. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:40] All right, thank you. Further guidance? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:45] Thank you Vice-Chair. In the Situation Summary under the same Council action and Attachment 1 there was asking for clarification on Council intent regarding the canary rockfish harvest specification. Back in November, in between coughs and cold medicine, I made a motion on the harvest control rules specifying only adopting alternative harvest control rules for rex sole, shortspine, and Dover sole. I intentionally left sablefish and canary rockfish out that; we would, the intent being that we would only use the default. It was caught later in the meeting and Miss McKnight did a later motion to specify that we were only going to look at the default and to remove the alternative for sablefish. We neglected to do that for canary rockfish. So, while my intent was to only be looking at the default of a P Star .45, there's been a lingering question about the P Star .40 out there. The intent with the motion I made, but I think there may be some misunderstanding among other Council members, was to not continue to look, only look at the P Star .45 and no further consideration of P Star .40 similar to sablefish. I don't know if we need to have discussion in case other Council members had a different perspective on that, but that was my intent. I just may not have clarified it or caught that we needed to do canary like we did sablefish.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:30] I'll look around. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:03:33] Thank you. And thank you for that Miss Mattes. I think it was our understanding that a P Star of .4 was in the range and to be analyzed and I know I do recall hearing from the GMT in the GAP that, you know, it's going to be constraining, but we were also balancing that with what we heard from the stock assessment too and the idea that canary rockfish had potentially never actually been rebuilt. So, in November when we're setting up the range, thought that it was appropriate to have .40 P Star in the range so that we could look at that here when we get to April and narrow the range of alternatives.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:33] So I'm looking around. Is it clear? It's not clear to me right now. So, I'm not sure who to turn to on the range. Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:04:51] Thank you Vice-Chair. Given that this is an update and the Council action is guidance, not a motion or not an action item, I almost think we need to wait until April to further refine it. I know the team has been focusing on the P Star of .45 has not been doing any work really on P Star of .40. I'm just procedurally-wise a little unsure of exactly how we proceed given that we're not in an action meeting for that item. I don't know if it would take a formal, another formal motion on that one. I think I'm rambling and talking my own self into circles, but I do know the team has been focusing on .45. And I thought that I saw Mr. Phillips nod his head when I said that. So, I guess some procedural assistance at this point would be helpful.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:53] And what I'm hearing is consistent with the motion that was passed. The team is focusing on P Star of .45.

Todd Phillips [00:06:01] Yes, Mr. Vice-Chair you're correct. The team interpreted, staff interpreted, and NMFS all interpreted the motion as did, well, NMFS folks on the, the GMT I should say. I can't speak for Keeley. We interpreted your motion Miss Mattes to be exactly as you said, so we did not do any work on the alternative harvest control rule for canary rockfish.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:31] And that the door is open to revisit that in April?

Todd Phillips [00:06:36] Yes. It would be tough but we could revisit it.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:42] All right, thank you. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:06:47] Well thank you. I appreciate the conversation here too and if April's the time to bring it up we can but... well, it makes me wonder where the point of confusion was and why this isn't... if there's clarity on the motion why was the confusion brought up in the briefing book and the report so I'm missing that a little bit.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:15] Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:07:16] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Miss Hall, so I had had several discussions with different members on the Council and they were confused as to what that motion meant. And also, it was because the clarity was made for sablefish we also were wanting to make sure that that same clarity was provided for, not copper, but canary rockfish as well. And so, the easiest way that we determined to do that would be through Miss Mattes explaining it.

Heather Hall [00:07:50] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:57] Is their further guidance on these items or discussion? Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:08:07] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I feel I've spoken quite a bit during this particular agenda item but you're going to hear me some more. So, the SSC in their report brings up a point regarding Washington cabezon and the request for a catch-only projection so if we could acknowledge that that's acceptable?

Pete Hassemer [00:08:29] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:08:32] Thank you. No, I have a question about that. Thanks for bringing that up. Can you help me understand why it's needed and why this request for a catch-only update is, it's not too late in the process for that?

Todd Phillips [00:08:49] Yes. I would prefer that we go to my virtual compatriot Miss Marlene Bellman. She has the science words that I don't possess.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:05] Marlene, are you there?

Marlene Bellman [00:09:08] Yes, thanks. Thank you for the question. In reviewing the numbers for the spex, oftentimes we come upon numbers or projections that need to be updated relative to additional catch and this is one of those that came to our attention that the same values had been rolling forward, such as like a constant specification for the category that this is, that's it under and in this instance there's actually sort of year-specific projections that would potentially be needed until you reach that constant value that would be used and would roll forward. And so, there was a need to acknowledge that this projection would need to be updated to get those values so they're actually accurate and they're not a static, they're not necessarily a static constant value that you would continue to use in each cycle, but in this case we actually would potentially have year-specific values to utilize from this projection. And in doing so and realizing this technical correction it was felt that it would be helpful to also update the catches in those projections as well. So, in addition to not carrying forward a static set of numbers that was perhaps not intended to be a constant value, it was also requested to update the catches in those projections as well. This potentially would have been caught and put forward when we requested a couple other things that were identified in the spex process in November, but this had not been caught or brought to our attention back in November. So again, we had a couple of projections requested already to make sure we had the most accurate values for 25-26 going forward. And again, this is one of those that was identified and would benefit from an updated catch projection with those most recent catches included as well so that we have the most accurate OFLs moving forward. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:41] All right, Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:11:42] Thank you Marlene. I'm following, I'm tracking that this does seem a bit out of the ordinary. I heard you say technical correction, but it also makes me think about the Council's request to consider a catch-only projection for Dover sole, where we're using an estimated catch of 50,000 metric tons compared to our actual catch of 6,000 metric tons and we're told that there wasn't time to do that. And so, thinking about it in that context and just want to be very open about that. So, in terms of, you know, the recommendation or the request from the SSC to review this, it feels again like it's going beyond just a technical correction and almost, you know, updating the assessment that was done for cabezon. So, I guess the question there and thank you for that Marlene, is how, what is the workload there and how do you, how are we adjusting to that workload issue that we heard for the Dover sole?

Marlene Bellman [00:13:29] Thank you for the question, Councilmember Hall. We've been in communication with the Science Center and the subsequent author that would be responsible for updating this Washington cabezon projection, and basically been told that that's a reasonable workload and that that's well on track for being able to bring it back in April. I have not, I have not had any, you know, similar communication relative to Dover sole and potential requests for updating that one, so I'm not aware of what the workload, associated workload would be or what sort of subsequent conversations have been around Dover sole and the Council's intention there.

Heather Hall [00:14:20] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:22] Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:14:24] I'm not sure but that this is, but it feels like a process foul to me. We... during our... for preparing for our biennial spex cycle we lay out the stocks that are going to be assessed. We get those results in September and November, and then from November on we take that information and begin to develop and think about management measures to meet the requirements of ensuring that we're managing our groundfish stocks appropriately and consistent with those stocks assessments. So, to bring this in at this stage and get some result, unknown results when we only have one more meeting to consider how we might react to it, to me is the precise reason we don't do that. And we have a schedule set up where it gives us adequate time to consider the results of a stock assessment, be it a update or a full assessment, and then in November and then have the, this seven month timeframe and our Council meetings to reach our spex decision in June, but so I don't like surprises and this feels a lot like one.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:09] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:16:11] Thank you. I wonder if a potential path forward might be, and I should start by saying I agree with what Mr. Anderson just said, and but maybe to move us forward wondering if, Marlene, you could consult with the Science Center on the question I asked around workload ability and to do that for both the cabezon issue that you brought to us, but also the Dover sole question that we've been asking since November and maybe that's something that we could hear about in April.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:58] Sorry. Was there a question to Marlene there?

Heather Hall [00:17:02] It was a request that Marlene consult with the Science Center on the workload question relative to not just cabezon and this request for a catch-only update, but also Dover sole, because that has been a question as well. So, I'm asking if we could understand that better in April.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:30] Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:17:32] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you for the comments, Heather and Phil. I think I agree wholeheartedly that it's hard to get caught with surprises and know how to respond with not a lot of information in front of you. I think maybe a consideration to your request, in addition to that would be a better understanding of the workload associated with catch-only projections. It wasn't too many cycles ago where on the GMT there was consideration for putting lots of species on the list for catch-only projections because there are benefit in the long run to replacing actual or realized catch with assumed catch. And so, I feel like we did have a period in time where we had too many on the list, and then we cut that back and so it's a bit of a slippery slope. So, I think just understanding what that looks like from a workload perspective in April would be helpful to understand if there's others beyond just those two species that should have or could have or none should be in a total package. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:42] All right, Thank you. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:18:45] Thank you Vice-Chair. I agree we need some more information. I'm just worried by waiting until April to get that information, then it's after April before we would get the results of that assessment. And normally we do FPA on the harvest specifications piece in April. So, to me, waiting to get the preliminary results of an assessment till April is way too late because then, you know, there's no, what little time is there to develop management measures by the time we do June final action. I know it's a Sunday and probably not everybody's working, but if there was any way we could get even a little feedback by... in time for our workload planning discussion tomorrow. I agree with what the others have said. This is coming very, very late in the process, and November was too late to ask for it for Dover. So, asking for it in April seems way, way too late for another species. I just... I think we're too far in the process and it could... yeah, cabezon off of Washington maybe doesn't affect as many sectors as something like canary would, but it still has the potential to delay our work on the harvest specifications package overall.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:12] All right. Thank you. And thinking about this the workload issue, bringing that back to us in April is late. I'm just going to look back at the SSC report. They're suggesting we do that and we're looking for guidance. So, do you want to offer the guidance that we follow-up on that or not? I think that's where... what we need to decide. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:20:53] Well, I would say that I appreciate their suggestion and it would have been timely to have in September, but it's too late in our process to, number one do the work and respond to the results in our biennial spex cycle and do our due diligence in ensuring that the public has an opportunity to comment on the results and the implications, and we don't have that time left within our biennial spex process and we have our final decision in June.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:34] Thank you. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:21:39] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And I'm assuming there are, you know, we start the checklist for not the upcoming biennial, but the one after that, and so I guess I just kind of look at this as a marker potential to be in the proper time of the cycle for not this round but the next round. I assume the Council probably keeps, or the staff probably kind of keeps a checklist of things that might come up that are not at the appropriate time in this cycle we're in for that might be something to be considered the next time. I... that's just my assumption.

Todd Phillips [00:22:16] Through the Vice-Chair. Yes, you are correct. We definitely keep lots and lots of lists. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:27] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:22:31] Thank you Mr. Vice Chairman. Just in the interest of maybe getting some resolution on this item. I do tend to agree with Mr. Anderson's wisdom. We do have a process for a reason. There are times when we deviate from that process, like if there's a conservation concern that we become aware of or a significant economic impact that we become aware of. In this case, as far as I'm aware, the catches of cabezon have been well below the ACL so there's nothing that tells me we're likely looking at a conservation problem. I haven't heard from Washington that the species is binding the economics of the fishery. So, I don't see a large scale economic problem like we had with quillback. I personally don't see a reason to abandon our process is where I've landed so...

Pete Hassemer [00:23:26] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:23:28] Thank you. Just wanted to acknowledge the input from Miss Kiefer and Mr. Anderson and Executive Director here. It aligns with my thinking as well. And so, offering the guidance of, you know, thinking about this in the future, I suppose the Science Centers could go forward with this on their own. And I would just say that if they do it'd be interesting to hear whether they were able to do that on their own for Dover sole as well. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:08] Thank you. And while everyone is checking their guidance checklists, I don't want to cut it off, but I'm going to turn to Todd on what we've already provided guidance on. We had a motion on quillback and then some guidance. Are there some holes yet to be filled?

Todd Phillips [00:24:30] From what I understand, you have, the Council has given essentially a prioritized list of how to move forward. We do note that quillback rebuilding plan will take precedence over just about everything. The guidance that document or the table that was shown is very, very helpful. So, I really appreciate that. The motion was clear and adopted so I don't see, I think you've addressed just about everything. So, the key issue, of course, was ensuring that the GMT had prioritization or direction of how to move forward in the next couple of weeks. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:11] All right. I will look around and make sure everybody agrees with that. Or is there anything else to be added here? I'm not seeing any hands so thank you all very much for your work on this and that will close out this agenda item.

8. Inseason Adjustments – Final Action

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That takes us to Council action and I think we're gonna finish that up. We do have salmon right after lunch. So, I hear we have a motion ready at least from California. So, I'd like to maybe finish this up before we break for lunch. So, I'll open the floor for Council discussion or a motion. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:26] Thank you Chair. It's not a motion. I just wanted to call our attention to the appendix in the GMT report. They did provide scorecards on where we ended 2023 for Chinook salmon, spiny dogfish, shortbelly and the rebuilding species and we were in good shape on all of those. So just as a little summary of last year, we ended up well within our limits on those species we've been tracking. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:57] Thank you Lynn. Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:01:03] Thank you Mr. Chair. I guess just for the interest of time hear I will offer out a motion unless there's other comments to get us going.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:19] Seeing no hands, I would say it's yes.

Caroline McKnight [00:01:21] Okay. Thank you. I move the Council adopt the inseason changes for the California recreational fishery under Option 2 with a two fish vermilion subbag limit from Agenda Item F.8.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, March 2024 except for the months where the fishery operates shallower than 20 fathoms. During those times federal waters will be closed. And from Agenda Item F.8.a, Supplemental GMT Report 1, March 2024. Option 1 for the commercial non-trawl RC boundary change and revised trip limits as followed: For LEFG OA lingcod, LEFG OA other flatfish, LEFG OA minor shelf rockfish and suboption as follows for LEFG OA minor, deeper nearshore rockfish, status quo. The LEFG and OA minor shallow nearshore rockfish status quo. And for LEFG and OA cabezon, status quo.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:35] Okay, is language on the screen accurate?

Caroline McKnight [00:02:37] It is.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:38] Looking for a second? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Thank you Marc. Please speak to your motion is appropriate.

Caroline McKnight [00:02:43] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just going to address, I guess up front, the rationale for this motion obviously is to keep our most constraining species of rockfish, which would be quillback rockfish in the north and vermilion and copper in the south within their harvest limits. And that sounds really easy, but this has been a major reconstruction of our entire statewide recreational fishery in order to provide opportunity everywhere and everywhere we can, so that we can maintain operations on some level. So, I just want to acknowledge that this has been a major feat, starting since last fall when we started taking inseason action to address quillback, and that it's required a tremendous amount of lift from our GAP representatives and stakeholders and industry and public and public officials that we've all heard from over the last several meetings. I want to just quickly address the comment in the motion relative to federal waters being closed during those nearshore times. That's simply to address the fact that the federal regulations are only operational in federal waters. And just making that distinction that we will return to our respective state process and ensure that those shallower than 20 fathom opportunities will be in state regulations. So, I didn't want that to be, make anybody

uncomfortable. Specific to the recreational changes, I do want to just take a moment to acknowledge Paul Chang and Dave Kasheta, who have worked tirelessly to include, I would say, a section of our recreational fishery that we don't hear from very often, which is our kayakers. It's very important to them that they had opportunity in shallow waters and we hope that we've accomplished that by creating our 20 fathom boundary. But specifically, all of our GAP members, Tim Klassen, Merrit, Louis, all the input to find compromises within both north and south is very important and acknowledging that it's also not easy to split a management area and create differential opportunities north and south within one, that's going to come with some trade-offs that we think that it's still, as somebody put it, the best option that we have right now. I'd also like to acknowledge just the Southern California fleet. Copper rockfish is going to continue to be something that is limiting moving forward. We see this as one step of a few maybe that we may need to take to stay within that limit, and so special thanks to our Sac folks and other Southern California input for helping us get there where we need to be. I want to switch over to the commercial part of this motion for just a moment and acknowledge the public comment that while it's not optimal to create differential opening and closures, I think this is a good compromise between the balance of the trip limit opportunities and different RCAs that can maximize the opportunity where we can. We've also heard that it may not have accomplished everything that was needed or could be provided, but we recognize that there is some state opportunity that could be taken up in other venues. So, this is going to be an iterative process. I think I'll stop there. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:19] Okay. Questions for the motion maker or discussion on the motion? I'm not seeing any hands so if I don't see something I'm going to call for the question. Okay. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:06:37] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:38] Opposed, no? Abstentions? Okay. The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:06:46] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just... just a follow-up. This is obviously representing a lot of changes, significant changes than we would typically do for an inseason. So, I just want to highlight a couple of the outreach plans that we do have to help convey this messaging to both the recreational and commercial sectors. We are going to be updating our website content, specifically to the rec regs. But we do have a new 20 fathom boundary website that includes an interactive map and the downloadable files for folks to use and electronically into their plotters. And then we will continue to take phone calls and interact with our representatives and other members of the public to help clarify anything we can if needed. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:34] Thank you Caroline. All right. Before we close out here, what else do we... anybody else have anything? Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:07:43] I would just like to say that... thank you Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. I'd like to thank, you know, appreciate the hard work and the professionalism that, you know, Jamie and Merrick and I even got to say Wayne, unfortunately, and the others have done in this process. This is certainly a process you could lose your mind and see that train coming and you just can't get off the track and you know there's a way that has to be. And the state of California and their reaction and this Council and hopefully when this is all said and done, we can improve too on some of the things that we have pointed out and seen in this and I really do... and the principal from NOAA that sits next to me here, I know he has stated that he is interested in looking to see where we can also improve the process. And so, if anything, because of their hard work hopefully this will make us work harder to make the process better for all. So, I just wanted to say that. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:06] Okay, Thank you Butch. All right. Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:09:09] Apologies. Thank you Mr. Chair. Just a follow-up too. I'm remissed and not.....

Brad Pettinger [00:09:16] Go ahead.

Caroline McKnight [00:09:17] Sorry, I thought I lost my mic there for a minute. I'm just remiss in making sure that I didn't acknowledge all of the commercial input that we got as well in our commercial GAP folks. It was triple duty for everybody and so I didn't want to leave anybody off. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:31] Okay. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:09:37] I was just reflecting on the update that we got from our at-sea cooperatives and their efforts to secure a inter-cooperative agreement associated with how they're going to work together to ensure that they're minimizing bycatch. And we had, the Council had asked them to come back or work on it over the winter and we were interested in having them come back here and give us an update here, which I appreciate. Appreciate their words and appreciate the work they've done up to this point in time. I continue to view it as a priority in terms of, well, certainly in part because the bycatch amounts are not specified to either sector and so there's a dependency on each other as a result in terms of the behavior and cooperation and ensuring that together they stay within those amounts and, and as importantly, don't get themselves into trouble inseason where one of those species threatens to close off the fishery or have, you know, some sort of draconian measures taken to keep the fishery going, but under certainly less than ideal conditions so. I know we're only, what? I think somebody said three weeks, I'm hoping it's four, but I know we're not very far away from the April meeting, but we're not very far away from the opening of the whiting fishery either. And I would like to request that they provide us another update in April and so that we can have a little bit, in part because I'm hoping they will make this a priority and even if they don't get the kind of comprehensive agreement they were looking for at the outset, if there are some of those key elements, some of those key parameters, protocols and how they're going to work together, get that on paper, get that as an understanding between the cooperatives I thinks an important step. So, that's what I would like to put out there as a suggestion from the Council that we make that request.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:41] Thank you Phil. I guess discussion. Bob.

Bob Dooley [00:12:47] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And thank you Phil for that. I totally agree with you. I would hope that they come back with a nearly fully fleshed out plan that gives us the details of how they're going to go back and assure the Council that they've got this under control. I remember when we went to the set-asides and it was the big component of that was that the cooperatives were doing such a good job and continue to do that. And I think they do overall do a really good job of managing bycatch and reacting to high bycatch events. This is all in reaction to a, you know, an offseason where something didn't go like we planned. And so, the Council's continued confidence in their ability to do actually a better job than the Council can do or the agency can do on their own is really important. And I think that's, from my perspective, is what I'm looking for is to make sure that we continue that confidence. And I mentioned it earlier in light of the dire straits that other sectors are in, the light shines bright so you need to... I know that in other regions that, you know, they talk about avoiding bycatch and all levels of abundance. And so, there's a number we manage salmon to by the buy-op but that's, you know, that's a long ways away from what reality is in a lot of the other, in the perspective from other sectors so the light shines bright. We need to continue the confidence that the Council's given and the permissiveness the Council's given in the cooperative structure to continue to do a good job and I think we look for that reassurance in April. So, I really support Phil's words there. So, thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:54] Okay. So, I guess I'm assuming most everybody's for that so I don't see anybody nodding or shaking their head so all right, I guess we'll call that consensus. So, anything else? All right Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:15:09] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. So as the Council's aware or may have with all the numbers and things have been presented here, that the GMT presented some information that the trip limit tables will be corrected and that does not require a motion by the Council, but I was just hoping that the Council could at least acknowledge that those trip limits will be changed. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:33] Okay, you've given that notice so everybody's shaking their head, yes, so fantastic. Okay, so how are we doing?

Todd Phillips [00:15:42] So with that, this Council has adopted inseason adjustments from California mostly, or actually all. One related to the recreational fishery and one related to the commercial fishery by adjusting the line and therefore trip limits within them. You have addressed and you also heard from the whiting co-ops about their progress to date and are expecting, you know, for future interactions with that particular organizations. So, I would say that you have adequately addressed the action under this item. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:16] Okay. Thank you Todd. So, thank you everyone and we're going to come back at 12, 1:45. 1:45.

G. Pacific Halibut Management

1. International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) Report

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That'll take us to Council action, which is to provide guidance as appropriate. So I'll open up the floor for that discussion if needed. Okay. I'm not seeing any hands Robin so... oh, Josh Lindsay.

Josh Lindsay [00:00:19] Sorry Mr. Chair. Recognize the discussion on the discard mortality. I'm happy to provide a little bit of background if folks would appreciate that at this point in time. And also spent some time with the GAP and recognize the request there to bring something back. But as Mr. Alverson described, the primary driver from our understanding of the increase in that number from previous years is the high encounter rate that the FISS saw in sublegal fish. So that ratio that the FISS saw gets applied through math that I'm also not exactly sure how it happens, but it's a variety of factors that IPHC staff, the stock assessment scientists, including lost gear, discard estimates, this year data from the West Coast Observer Program, and that's a three year average, and that's how that goes into creating that value. And it's an estimation from actually a year ago. As I said though, on the three year average, but in talking to IPHC staff yesterday, and appreciate them getting back to us quickly, as I said, the primary driver for that increase that the GAP was concerned about was actually the encounter rates of sublegal fish by the FISS this year, which we'll see how that plays out, but, and still happy to bring something back to the GAP or to the Council on some of that or work with IPHC staff to provide a greater description of how that gets calculated each year. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:46] Thank you Josh. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:01:50] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I'm very interested in that. Thanks, Josh, for the offer. I guess I'm just struggling to understand. I'm hearing that the encounters were of smaller fish this year. I'm not hearing about the encounter rates so much, but it just is difficult to understand why more a more than two-fold increase in the poundage of bycatch discard mortality is now being assigned. So just interested in learning more. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:23] Okay. Thank you Marci. All right. Okay Robin, I don't see any hands so...

Robin Ehlke [00:02:32] Thank you Mr. Chair. You've worked through this agenda item and received some good information from the IPHC and heard from the GAP. No decisions to make here but, so I think that wraps up this agenda item.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:47] All right. Fantastic.

2. Incidental Catch Recommendations: Options for Salmon Troll and Final Action on Recommendations for Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Okay, that concludes public comment and takes us to Council action before us. So, I'll open the floor for discussion. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:14] Yeah, thank you Chair. This isn't one of those three items listed so hopefully it's appropriate for the discussion now. The SAS report requested NMFS look at the timing of licenses. I know the license application period for the commercial troll fishery was before this meeting even started. It was brought up last fall and I'm hoping we can continue the discussion under our Catch Sharing Plan agreement discussions this fall. However, the SAS isn't always at our fall meetings when we talk about Catch Sharing Plan, so I'm just wondering if that's something NMFS is receptive to talking about this fall so that I can go back and tell the, the salmon folks in delegation, yeah, this is something we could look at or it's completely off the table.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:04] Josh.

Josh Lindsay [00:01:06] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, Miss Mattes, this is something the agency's willing to continue to look at. It's something we looked at internally this year actually. We do have certain APA requirements we need to meet in terms of public notice and timing and getting that fishery open on time, but it definitely is something we're willing to explore and see if there's creative avenues.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:31] Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:33] Thank you Lynn. Anyone else? Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:01:36] Are we under discussion? I just wanted to try to provide a little bit more information on the trip limits in our commercial troll fishery off Washington. So, we have three areas off the Washington Coast and they sometimes have the same trip, weekly trip limits, and sometimes they're a little bit different. So, Queets north, Queets which... the Washington Coast goes about 130 miles so Queets to Cape Flattery is about 60 of those miles. And then from Queets down to Leadbetter is our next area that we have trip limits, it's about 50 miles. And then from Leadbetter to the border is about 22 miles. And when we're setting these up and we're doing the modeling preseason, we've got oftentimes we're looking at the Lower Columbia River tule impacts, and so the more fish we put in the south, the higher those impacts, on the other end of the squeeze is Puget Sound stocks, and the more fish we put in the north, the more impacts around there, so it's a balancing act. So just to give you a sense of the trip limits. So, in that first area from the Columbia River up to Leadbetter, we started off with a 90 fish Chinook landing limit per week in May. So that was for the first ten days of May. And then it dropped to 60 in the middle of May. Went back up to 80 in the last part of May through the first part of June. And then at the very end of that first period, the May-June time period, it dropped to 11 for the last week from June 24th to 29th. If you look at the Leadbetter to Queets area, it started with a 200 fish... let me just back up a half a sec. So that Leadbetter to the Columbia River area is there's a lot of sandy ground down there and so there's not a lot of halibut down in that country, but as you move north the availability of halibut gets greater and greater just in a general sense. So, in that area between Leadbetter and Queets started off with 200. It went down to 150 in the middle of May. Back up to 200 around from May 25th to June 7th. And then it too was down at 11 that last week of June before that May-June timeframe was up. And then north, so Queets north and when we get up in an area we call the prairie, that's I mean there's a lot of halibut up in that country, the vessel limits were 105 weekly limit in the first ten days of May, and then it dropped down to 35 and then 40 for the balance of that May-June timeframe because we allocated a smaller proportion of the troll quota up in that north area

because of concerns over Puget Sound stocks. So, this is what happened in 2023. When you have time and you don't have anything else to do, you can look at page 300 of the review document and that's where the 2023 information is that I'm referencing. And you can also look back at 22, 21, and go all the way back to 2015 and look at the history of the trip limits. And it varies from year to year depending on how we split the May-June quota up between those north and south areas, depending on what the stock of concern was in that particular year.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:35] Thank you Phil. Okay, Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:06:39] Thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to thank Mr. Anderson for that recap. And just to note that we are learning from you with regard to use of trip limits in the directed troll fishery, so appreciate a bit of context here and we will certainly be learning and watching how you adjust trip limits in response to impacts in various management areas. So, understood. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:09] Thank you Marci. Okay, Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:07:12] Thank you. I have a bit to add to the discussion too and kind of around the last comment about the pounds that haven't been harvested. And I wanted to start with the, because I wasn't sure which of these incidental fisheries was being referred to, but I did want to mention that for the sablefish fishery north of Point Chehalis, Washington, that allocation that allows for that incidental retention north of Point Chehalis, Washington comes through allocation with the Washington sport fishery so it comes from that. And there's, possibly last year when this came up or the year before, there's a couple of WDFW reports that explain how that works. So, when it's not taken in the sablefish fishery, it can be used by the sport fishery. And then as I was, and I'm thinking about the conversation, too, about the salmon troll fishery and what's kind of been unharvested in thinking about how we manage for incidental allowances, and I think the explanation that Ryan gave and where our fishery occurs, particularly off the north coast in the prairie where halibut and Chinook salmon can be found together quite often, is why we have the incidental allocation, but I also know it's linked to Chinook availability. So, it's important that the allocation is there. I think it's also important that it's not targeted as a targeted fishery and recognized to be an incidental retention. But I'd also note, too, in the 23 years of data that are shown on Attachment 1 for the salmon troll fishery, it's really only in 17 of the 23 years that are shown on here there we've taken the majority of the allocation. So, it's a allocation system that's working. And I recognize that in the last four years and maybe a couple of years other than that, it's not been as effective at, you know, matching the Chinook to the halibut. But I did want to point out that the majority, 74 percent of the years in this table, we have taken the halibut that's allowed as incidental retention. So just offering those up for thought.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:05] Thank you Heather. Okay. Further discussion? I'll look for a motion then. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:10:15] Thank you. I do have a motion. Even though this is one agenda item I did split the motions into two. So, the first motion is for the salmon, incidental salmon retention.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:31] Okay.

Heather Hall [00:10:35] I move the Council adopt for public review the alternatives presented in Agenda Item G.2.a, Supplemental SAS Report 1, March 2024 for halibut landing restrictions in the salmon troll fishery in 2024, beginning May 16th through the end of the salmon troll fishery and beginning April 1st, 2025 unless modified through inseason action.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:02] Okay, is the language on the screen accurate?

Heather Hall [00:11:03] Yes, it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:05] Looking for a second? Seconded by Butch Smith. Thank you Butch. Please speak to your motion Heather, as appropriate.

Heather Hall [00:11:11] Yes, thank you. This motion confirms that there aren't any changes that are needed to the retention limits that are in place now through May 15th of this year and then provides the range of alternatives that were in the SAS report for public review that are appropriate based on the salmon discussions that are underway now.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:36] Okay. Questions for the motion maker? Discussion on the motion? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:11:45] I'd like to offer an amendment.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:49] Okay.

Marci Yaremko [00:11:52] And I will just read it aloud. I move that SAS Alternative 2 be modified to a maximum per trip limit of 30 fish.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:16] Okay. Is that language accurate on the screen?

Marci Yaremko [00:12:18] Yes, it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:20] Second? Seconded by Bob Dooley. Thank you Bob. Please speak to your motion Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:12:26] Thank you Mr. Chair. This amendment would reframe the range of alternatives provided by the SAS to reflect the traditional range that they have offered to us with regard to maximum allowances for incidental landings of Pacific halibut incidental to the commercial salmon troll fishery. I'm mindful and I think the Council should be mindful that we are authorizing incidental catch limits as part of the allocation that's made to the directed salmon troll fishery. I'm not compelled by anything I've heard today that suggests that we need to consider a higher per trip limit beyond what we've ever considered before, or at least as far back in the record as I had time to look. The SAS has always brought us a range of alternatives that had not more than a 35 fish limit. And if you look at Attachment 1 in the history of the maximums, and we've been down as low as 12 fish and as high as 35. So, in keeping with the intent of what the Catch Sharing Plan authorizes, this is an incidental allowance. I'm concerned about somewhat of a blend that I might expect could happen where incidental, you know, somehow starts turning more to directed activity and I think we need to take steps to ensure that we safeguard against that. So that's my rationale. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:16] Okay, thank you Marci. Discussion on the motion? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands. That being the case I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:14:32] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:32] Opposed, no?

Phil Anderson [00:14:36] No.

Heather Hall [00:14:36] No.

Butch Smith [00:14:36] No.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:38] Abstentions?

Josh Lindsay [00:14:39] Abstain.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:41] Okay. Roll call. Okay, let's do a roll call.

Merrick Burden [00:15:14] Okay, thank you Mr. Chairman. Let's see I am calling this one the motion G.2 number 1 amendment by Miss Yaremko. The amendment is to move that SAS Alternative 2 be modified to a maximum per trip limit of 30 fish. I'm paraphrasing a bit there. Okay, starting from the top here. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:15:42] Aye.

Merrick Burden [00:15:43] Josh Lindsay.

Josh Lindsay [00:15:48] Abstain.

Merrick Burden [00:15:50] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:15:53] Aye.

Merrick Burden [00:15:53] Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:15:57] No.

Merrick Burden [00:15:59] Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman [00:16:01] Aye.

Merrick Burden [00:16:03] Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:16:04] No.

Merrick Burden [00:16:07] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:16:09] No.

Merrick Burden [00:16:14] Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:16:16] No.

Merrick Burden [00:16:19] Robert Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:16:23] Aye.

Merrick Burden [00:16:23] Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:16:27] Aye.

Merrick Burden [00:16:30] Pete Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:32] Aye.

Merrick Burden [00:16:34] Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:16:35] No.

Merrick Burden [00:16:39] Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:16:39] Aye.

Merrick Burden [00:16:52] Seven yes. Five no. One abstention. So the amendment passes.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:00] Okay. We've got a motion still on the floor that's been amended so discussion? All right, I don't see any hands so I'll call for the question. Hold it here. Okay. I'll call the question on the amended motion. So, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:17:34] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:34] Opposed, no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. Heather, you have another motion?

Heather Hall [00:18:06] Thank you. I move the Council adopt a final trip limit ratio of 130 pounds of Pacific halibut per 1,000 pounds of sablefish, plus two additional Pacific halibut for the primary sablefish fishery north of Point Chehalis, Washington as recommended in Supplemental GAP Report 1, March 2024.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:33] Heather, is the language of the screen accurate?

Heather Hall [00:18:35] Yes.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:36] Very good. Looking for a second? Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Thank you Lynn. Please speak to your motion as appropriate.

Heather Hall [00:18:43] Thank you. I think the GMT did, or the GAP did a good job of explaining the rationale for reducing the landing ratio down to 130. The last time last year the allocation was 70,000 pounds and the landing ratio included 150 pounds per 1,000, and so this brings it down to a level that's more in line with the 58,000 pound allocation. And as noted in the GAP report as well, we can take action inseason to adjust the landing limit one way or the other. It can go down or up just to make sure that the incidental allocation is not exceeded.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:36] Okay. Thank you Heather. Questions for the motion maker? Okay. Discussions on the motion? Okay, I'll call for the question then. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:19:50] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:50] Opposed, no? Abstentions? Okay, The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. And Heather you have one more, right? Okay. The first one is incorporated one to two? Okay, very good. I wanted to make sure. All right. With that Robin I'll turn to you.

Robin Ehlke [00:20:15] Thank you Mr. Chair. For the incidental halibut retention in the salmon troll fishery, we've adopted three options for public review. We'll come back to those in April. And for the primary sablefish fishery we've adopted the final landing limits for the upcoming season in 2024. So, you have done your work under this agenda item. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:40] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:20:42] Thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to acknowledge Josh's offer to bring us back information on that reduction to the 2023 FCEY due to the increase in the directed discard mortality. And just to note, that had implications for California. Our California quota amount was reduced because of that increase that's now assigned to the directed discard mortality. It may not be a lot of pounds, but for us every pound matters. So, this is a significant issue and we'd like to hear more about it. And I don't know who made the decision. I don't know on what basis. I don't know what discussions took place. I realize that this occurred in the IPHC arena, but it's just want to note that it really had very real world implications for us, and once again we're losing ground. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:42] Thank you Marci. Okay. All right. I think that'll take us to a break actually, where we'll take ten minutes and we'll come back onto H.1 and where Vice-Chair Hassemer will have the gavel.

H. Ecosystem Management

1. California Current Ecosystem Status Report

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] All right, that completes all our reports, the public comment. Because we're close to lunch, not to rush it, but just to... I think if we can get through this before lunch we'll have a good lunch break. So, with that we'll move to Council action and review any discussion on the report and consider Ecosystem Science Review topics for 2024. I'll look for any hand to initiate discussion here. Corey Ridings, then John Ugoretz.

Corey Ridings [00:00:35] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. While we get our thoughts together, although it looks like Mr. Ugoretz already has some, I just wanted to take a moment to thank Miss Yvonne deReynier again for her years of service that are still going to continue, just not in the capacity of the Chair, but she has played an incredibly active role in what she's done at NMFS and has, I think, helped us make progress on this and brought a lot of good thinking and energy to that work. So, I'm sure the new Chair, Vice-Chair, Co-Chairs, as our Chair sees fit to place them, will do an excellent job as well. I just wanted to note all that hard work that she had done in supporting this work over the years.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:26] Thank you. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:01:27] Yeah, thank you. And, you know, as always we've got an excellent report that gives us a lot of information. I heard some good recommendations in a variety of the advisory body reports to us. I don't know that we need to take specific action on those, but I think the team has heard them and will certainly reflect on those in their, their next go round. And then also as the last public commenter stated, and Mr. Niles pointed out, there's some things in those reports that I think tie directly into the next ecosystem item on our agenda and I look forward to discussing those at that time.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:19] Thank you. Further discussion, comments? And as we heard there... Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:02:30] Thank you Vice-Chair. Mr. Ugoretz stole a little my thunder there, but that's okay. I don't think we need a specific motion on this since it's just guidance, but would like to endorse the SSC's priorities and the review of potential topics section of their report. And if we could ask the ESR authors to include a broad overview of short term forecasts in the main body of the report, and to continue providing long term forecast in the appendix as recommended by the EWG and Supplemental Report 2. This is a very large document that's got a lot of good information, but again if we can find ways to make it... just tweaks, and make it just a little bit better for our uses I would appreciate that.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:15] Thank you. And with respect to all the recommendations and comments, as we were going to the reports, I did see our Science Center presenters here nodding their heads quite a bit, so I do believe they heard everything that was said, but let me not shut off discussion. Corey Ridings. Are you....Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:03:40] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, just, I think, agreeing with Lynn and John about endorsing the SSC recommendations for the SSC ES meeting and work by the NOAA IEA team this summer. I also wanted to add to that. I don't want to add to their workload necessarily this year, but just as a little teaser for the future, some other things that I've been thinking about which might be useful to see in the ESR Report in future years might be on ecosystem optimum yield metric and some expansion of reporting on non-target and ecosystem component species status reports. Something we've been thinking about at this meeting has been how we report on and how we use stock assessments, and I think the ESR is also a good place to bring in information to help us make those decisions, and

especially if we're looking at constraints that the agency is having in their ability to do stock assessments, bringing in information in other ways will be helpful. So, thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:47] Thank you. Further discussion, guidance? I don't believe I... Josh Lindsay.

Josh Lindsay [00:05:00] Thank you. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Appreciate all the comments and suggestions to date. I do think the IEA Team typically hears the different advisory comments and takes those into account, as well as the comments provided by the Council. I did note in the SSC statement on potential review topics they mentioned a potential to add the wind indicators as part of that. I wasn't sure if the Council was also suggesting by sort of the moving forward with that, the SSC report, if that was something they also wanted to take on. I would note, I think from the agency perspective, and I know there'll be discussion of this under the next agenda item, that likely the including that would take away from moving forward on the review of those other indicators that might be more ripe for sort of Council use in the future and that regardless of SSC review of those wind indicators, that's something that is a priority for the agency and we are actively working with in NCOS and BOEM on that work and so that might be also something as noted for, as Miss Ridings noted for future ESR products, that might be something more ripe for future years if the Council did have some desire for the SSC to dig into those, those wind indicators. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:14] Thank you. I'll look around. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:06:17] Thank you Vice-Chair and Mr. Lindsay. I had a list of talking points but I chose to skip a few minutes ago. But on the offshore wind modeling review, given the current timelines for additional offshore sighting off the West Coast, there might not be justification for prioritizing this review to happen by the September meeting, especially if it would risk the other priorities happening. However, a review of the offshore wind modeling should be conducted as soon as practicable, just maybe not in time for the September meeting was what I know I was hoping for.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:58] Okay. Thank you. Further guidance on this? I'm taking my time to look carefully. I don't see hands. I'm going to look to Doctor Dahl and see if we, you have everything you were expecting on this and we've completed our work?

Kit Dahl [00:07:20] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, you have. You have indicated that the CCIEA team should take on board the comments that were, are found in the various advisory body reports as they frequently do in terms of continuous improvement of the report and its contents. You also endorsed the SSC proposal in terms of the review meetings coming up later this year. And there was some discussion here at the end about potential review of those suitability model, ecosystem suitability model for offshore wind, and perhaps that's less of a short term review topic. The development of that methodology is ongoing as Mr. Lindsay indicated, but perhaps sometime after the September meeting or into next year would be a better time to put that on the docket for SSC peer review.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:27] All right, with that, that closes out this agenda item.

2. Fishery Ecosystem Plan Initiative 4 – Progress Review

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] So that completes all the reports, information gathering, and takes us to Council discussion and action. And I'll wait for that to flash up on the screen. There was quite a list, bulleted list of action items. And to kick off the discussion I will look to Mr. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:00:27] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I feel like I heard a lot of overlap in the statements, and I want to recognize that. I think there are still differences in some places about how far people want to go with this, but I definitely heard that there's support for using risk tables to see how things might have changed in the past. I like that. I think that's valuable work. I think there's some support for using risk tables in a real world way now in a limited fashion. I don't really think I see a lot of overlap in broadening that out to a whole host of species or all FMPs right now, but I'm encouraged. And again, I've said this in the past, but I feel like this Council is really conscious of ecosystem change in everything we do. I feel like we've made great strides in seeing how we could further that and I really do feel like we're kind of at a good place to let the rubber hit the road in a very cautious way.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:51] Thank you. I'll look for further hands, discussion on this item? John.

John Ugoretz [00:02:04] Well, if nobody's jumping in I do have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:08] Let's hear it.

John Ugoretz [00:02:13] I'll wait for it to come up. I move the Council task the Ecosystem Workgroup to work with the National Marine Fisheries Service ecosystem, groundfish, and other Science Center staff to further explore development of a methodological framework for risk tables and apply it to groundfish as described in Agenda Item H.2.a, Supplemental Ecosystem Workgroup Report 2, Item 1. Include in this a retrospective analysis of how risk tables would have impacted decision-making in past groundfish assessments if they had been used in the manner currently envisioned. If sablefish and petrale sole or prioritized for assessment in 2025 or the risk tables are approved for use without new assessment, update, finalize, and include their risk tables to be considered as part of those stock assessments in the 2027-2028 harvest specification process. Task the Ecosystem Workgroup to work with National Marine Fisheries Service and the appropriate advisory bodies to broaden the application of risk tables to the salmon FMP as described in Agenda Item H.2.a, Supplemental Habitat Committee Report 1. Delay Council development of risk tables for data-limited species or groups or other FMP species until a later date.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:39] I read along, that language appears accurate and complete. Do you agree?

John Ugoretz [00:03:43] I agree.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:45] Thank you very much. Is there a second? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

John Ugoretz [00:03:53] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. We're at a point in our efforts to further consider ecosystem changes where we are ready to start implementation. And I'll note that I say further consider quite intentionally as I know that our stock assessments, fishery management plans, and other actions already account for ecosystem change, just not necessarily with the new tools we're working on now. In some cases, the species we manage are so directly responsive to ecosystem changes that existing management is responding more to the ecosystem than to the fisheries themselves. Given that, I support moving forward in this limited scale to incorporate risk tables for the species they appear to be suited

to. I also recognize the various advisory bodies request to conduct a retrospective analysis for groundfish to show how the risk table framework would have impacted decisions had they been used. I think this retrospective can be conducted concurrently with discussion on moving forward with review and implementation for petrale sole and sablefish. If the SSC review concludes that risk tables can be used in the process for sigma adjustments, prepare risk tables for petrale, sablefish, and they can be used in the 2027-2028 harvest specification process assuming that is approved. I also recognize that the Habitat Committee supports evaluating how to translate salmon stoplight tables into numeric or categorical measures of risk that adjusts harvest levels and support that occurring now. I don't, however, feel we are ready to move forward with these use of these tables in other species or FMPs at this time. I'd like to see the results of the efforts I've lined out in the motion or other scientific review before considering whether these methods would be appropriate for other species.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:51] Thank you. Are there questions to the maker of the motion for clarification? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:05:59] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So, I'm pretty new at this but in the both the GAP report and the GMT report, both spoke to the pathways. Little bit of difference of opinion between those two, but certainly some overlap. So is your... does your... is your motion specific to treatment of the pathways or only certain pathways, or would you essentially just kind of leave that to the Ecosystem Workgroup and the other partners to really... I saw a lot of focus on 1 through 3 or 1 and 2, not much mention about 4, number 4 as perhaps being a little too unwieldy at this point in time. So, are you implying you kind of leave it to them to really kind of dig down deep and determine really what's the most applicable pathway?

John Ugoretz [00:06:58] Thank you, and through the Vice-Chair. Yes, I would leave it to them and of course the SSC to review whatever is decided and determine if that is the best available science to move forward with.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:13] Thank you. Further questions for clarification? Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:07:17] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair, and thanks very much Mr. Ugoretz for the motion. Just... I had a question relative to the sentence dealing with retrospective analysis of how risk tables would have impacted decision-making in past groundfish assessments. And my question is around the term 'past groundfish assessments'. It seems fairly broad and I'm not... is there some limitation on what groundfish assessments would be looked at initially or just...? If I were trying to respond to this and I'm not sure how broad that statement is, if that makes sense. Stumbling a little.

John Ugoretz [00:08:10] Thanks. Thanks Mr. Anderson. I agree it is broad and I struggled a little bit in crafting the motion to decide what to say there. I did ask that question of the Ecosystem Workgroup about what they meant and how far back they could go, and the response I heard was that they would use a range of assumed ecosystem states on some select, recent assessments, I believe is what they said, in order to best inform the Council on how it would have played out. And so that's what I'm supportive of. If they need to go back more years to get a broader range and they have the capacity to do that, then I would also support that.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:59] Phil, a follow-up?

Phil Anderson [00:09:00] So having, you know, the exchange in your description there makes me feel comfortable. And we'd just, going forward with the assumption we'd give them the flexibility to do that, so that addresses my question. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:19] Thank you. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:09:22] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I had a similar thought to Mr. Anderson, particularly groundfish species. But I do note in John's motion he does explicitly call out to delay Council development of risk tables for data-limited species or groups or other FMP species until a later date. So, in my mind, I interpret that as certainly data-limited groundfish species, even though we are talking the groundfish category, that we are really advising them that that's not really appropriate at this point in time.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:06] Was there a question there? You want John to respond to it?

Sharon Kiefer [00:10:14] Mr. Vice-Chair, I guess the question is did I interpret that correctly?

John Ugoretz [00:10:17] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:18] Thank you.

John Ugoretz [00:10:19] Yeah, thank you. And through the Vice-Chair, I think in part, yes. I don't know that I would limit the retrospective analysis if it would be informative to us to see. The last bullet in my mind was more about whether we start developing the use of this tool beyond petrale and sablefish in that groundfish context. And in my answer there is, no, I don't think we should. I want to see how it plays out first. And then I think also that it's consistent with what the Ecosystem Workgroup reports asking. The details are in there and I think that gives good guidance as well, which they've listed for themselves.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:21] Thank you. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:11:24] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Thanks, John, for the motion and, Sharon, for that question. I think I'm going to ask for a little bit more clarification on that as well. The way I was reading the materials, especially those from the SSC and the EWG, where the concept of data-limited species came up, my understanding was that the idea was potentially to develop risk tables for groupings as opposed to individual species. So, kind of as a group or a guild of species that happen to be data-limited to sort of explore the application beyond a single species to a grouping. So, John, that comes up in the context of Sharon's question when looking above, at the above bullets, if that still provides latitude for the EWG and NMFS folks when they're exploring development of the framework for risk tables and application to groundfish, if that could potentially... and the retrospective analysis, if they would be, have the freedom to be able to go back and choose individual species that happen to be data-limited species, if that were part of executing that first bullet.

John Ugoretz [00:12:55] Thanks. Through the Vice-Chair, and thanks Miss Ridings for the question. I do see the bullets as separate. I'm talking in one case about retrospective analysis as well as implementation for a very select subgroup of species. In the case of the third bullet, or third primary bullet, I'm talking about not moving forward with additional Council work on developing tables beyond what we've already done. And I do want to be very clear about that because I do not want the EWG, I don't want Council to be spending time working on new stuff until we see the results of this existing very good work. And so, you know, going back to the initial question, the retrospective analysis could be of anything that is informative to the Council. But the development of other risk tables in other contexts, either in groundfish or other FMP species, I am not supporting.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:11] Thank you. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:14:14] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Just one more question. On the next to last bullet that deals with the salmon FMP, so the way I read that the fisheries north of Cape Falcon would be included. Is that correct?

John Ugoretz [00:14:37] Thanks. And thanks Mr. Anderson. I believe that is in the Habitat Committee report so, yes, it's defined in their report as to how they wanted to do that.

Phil Anderson [00:14:52] When we get to Council discussion I'll have a thought about that.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:57] All right. Thanks. Still under clarification. Josh, I see your hand, but Chair Pettinger was your hand up first?

Brad Pettinger [00:15:06] I'm not sure.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:08] All right. Josh Lindsay.

Josh Lindsay [00:15:12] I think I would have clearly deferred, but thank you. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Mr. Ugoretz for the motion. I did have a somewhat of a clarifying question I hope here and not a Council discussion question. Noting that the motion generally aligns with the Ecosystem Workgroup statement, the start of those first two bullets tasked the EWG. I just wanted to ensure that sort of the intent there is the EWG serve in more of a coordinating, ensure this process moves forward versus perhaps actually doing some of this work, that this work would really fall on Science Center staff, recognizing that the Science Center has already come here today and offered to do some of this work. I think we would still need to look at capacity and things, but under E.1 there was already a request to have some of this work reviewed by the SSC and so I just want to make sure we were on the same page, if you will, on that matter. Thank you.

John Ugoretz [00:16:05] Yes. Correct.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:09] All right. Any further hands? Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:15] Yeah, thanks Vice-Chair Hassemer. I think it's interesting that we're talking about euphemisms for risk tables, the CAFEs, as it was referred to earlier. It's interesting to talk about retrospective analysis of risk tables that talk about past groundfish assessments, but we've had some very tough talks, opinions about assessments the last two cycles and there's not much confidence in those and I'm not sure how much value you're going to get when I would say probably there's a lot of no confidence as far as the outputs of those assessments. So basically, what are you going to get here? It's like people need understand what they're asking for. Sounds to me I think we have some real issues that need to be addressed in the stock assessment process. I think the last two years of two cycles of Covid certainly took a toll. I think confidence in the stock assessments from the fleet perspective certainly has, I'm not saying it's at an all-time low, but it's... I think people really have some questions. So, I'd very careful about what the outcome is going to be here. It's interesting, we're talking about sablefish and petrale I'm assuming because we're doing some MSE work and that's part of the climate thing and I guess it's because people, because we know a lot about those species supposedly. Well, if you want to go by petrale sole, you're going to take a 30 percent cut next year on petrale sole. We had a vessel off Monterrey have a 35 minute tow and had 78,000 pounds, which is the largest petrale tow I've ever heard of in the history of the fishery. It's like we're missing the boat there. So, if you think you know a lot about petrale but I guarantee you, you don't. I think it's great to look at it. I think, I mean, when it comes a medical, when we compare it to the medical world, you know, we're about bleeding in vapor as far as I'm concerned as far as this issue. Sablefish has blown up the last 5, I don't know how many, 5 or 6 years we've had fantastic recruitment. Why did that happen? The stars aligned and I mean

can anybody tell me why that happened? I don't think we do. We just know it happened after retrospectively after we talked to the fleet for a number of years and finally the survey picks up on it last year, thankfully. You know I think we should... just moving forward and need to realize we're just, we're just barely touching about what we know about the ocean and its productivity. And be very mindful, very careful about adding another buffer. I'm kind of buffered out on a lot of this stuff, especially when a lot of these stocks we're not even coming close to the OYs when it comes groundfish. Anyway, I think it's great to explore it and if they'd look at it like the retrospective analysis, but just understand the limitations you're going to get with that, especially given the last two cycles. So, I'll stop there.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:23] All right. Thank you. I'll take that it's not a question to Mr. Ugoretz but a good segue to our Council discussion here. And if there are further questions for clarification, we'll ask him. I saw Mr. Anderson had his hand first, then Mr. Dooley.

Phil Anderson [00:19:41] I did have one more question. And I'm back to the second to the last bullet on salmon and their reference to the Habitat Committee's report, which seems to me to suggest that relative to salmon, that it should be focused on Sacramento and Klamath River fall Chinook salmon. They talk about stoplight tables for both those stocks have been developed and so on. So, my reading of the Habitat Committee's recommendation, and because you reference it here, is that that would in fact restrict the work here to those two stocks as a first step. Is that a fair interpretation?

Pete Hassemer [00:20:36] John.

John Ugoretz [00:20:37] Thank you. Thanks Mr. Anderson. Yes, what you just said is what I intended. Perhaps I misunderstood your first question. But yes, I am intentionally referencing the Habitat Committee report to restrict this motion to what they recommend.

Phil Anderson [00:20:57] Perfect. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:00] Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:21:03] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Are we in discussion now?

Pete Hassemer [00:21:06] Yes, discussion. But if there's questions, make sure they're asked.

Bob Dooley [00:21:10] Okay, thank you. Just a comment on the discussion part of this. I'm glad our Chairman started off this discussion the way he did. I think I'm cautiously optimistic that this probably could work, but I'm listening to the GAP statement and the GMT statement and they brought in this retrospective analysis, and the GAP actually, excuse me, actually touched on a real time analysis. And what I... my reaction to that was, yes, we're adding a whole new knob to turn with a lot of knobs that are already there to turn, and it's very important we understand the effect of this one when it's applied. And so, I see the retrospective would give you a with and without comparison. Go back and see what happened as we did it and apply whatever we come up with on this to the retrospective analysis and I think we could have a with and without comparison. But I also think as it goes forward that that same thing needs to be applied when we use it if we get to that point. And when it's used to be able to make a comparison. We're saying, okay, if you add this component to it this is the change, this is what it adds, this is what it... the added buffer and is it what we intended? I think, I would suspect that all of us have a vision of what this might achieve and what the outcome might be, but it might not be that, and I think we need to be very precautionary at least until we're confident that these changes can be, we could have confidence in them in the result and understand what changes those are affecting our normal procedure. So, I'll stop there, but I really appreciated the GAP's comments and the GMT's comments in that regard.

and I think it's good, it's good advice and I hope we keep that in mind. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:35] Thank you. Further discussion on the motion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:23:43] Thank you Vice-Chair. I know over the last few months we've all been talking about should we move risk tables forward for other FMPs? Should we not? I know there's been interest both ways. I think I've come around to we need to figure out how to do it right with one small subset, get the framework in place, and then we can move forward. And I believe that's what this is trying to do, therefore I be, I'm supportive of it as trying to get it figured out before we move forward with a bunch of other species. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:19] Thank you. Look around. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:24:24] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Thanks John again for this motion. I will be voting for it. Thinking about the data- limited species and that they're still important noting that at some point down the road it's probably very important to be thinking about groupings of species, especially as we think about improving our overall stock assessment and star enterprise. I think Brad and Bob rightly noted the concept of buffers. That's something we've heard about from various reports, as well as the SSC, who noted in one of their reports about the importance when we think about our entire sort of star enterprise, how we don't double count for certain aspects that come in. And that's part of the, the technical merit and the importance of having these figured out. I think that's reflected in the EAS suggestion to sort of change the name. I can't remember what it is now, but I think it was CAFE. So that's... I have to think a little bit more about acronyms, but you know, on the face of it that seems like a good idea. But I also wanted to note, you know, looking long term and in response to some of the things the EAS noted, especially in the context of groundfish where our Pstars are pretty high, we could be in a situation where they are lower, and the intent of this sort of information is not just to turn the knob down, but to be able to turn the knob up. And that was noted as part of the SSC report as well when we think about when we're applying this in situations where we don't have fresh assessments or we're thinking about between assessment years and we're setting spex. So, like I said, I'm going to vote for this. Thank you, John, for this. I think this is thoughtful and really moves us forward in an important way. Just wanted to note, I continue to see the importance of thinking about data-limited species and look forward to visiting that at some point down the road.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:34] Thank you. Further discussion? I'm not seeing any discussion. I'm going to look around. Nope. So, I will call the question on the motion. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:26:46] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:46] Opposed, no? Abstentions?

Brad Pettinger [00:26:54] Me.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:57] Chair Pettinger abstains, and the motion passes. Thank you. With that, before I turn to Kit and see if we've completed our work, I have been quite neutral on this. I just want to make an observation. When we talk about risk and that, I believe this... we're going to learn something from this. My primary interest is in the salmon because part of my prior life I was a salmon manager and I was doing that during the development of stoplight tables and we looked at those very hard to see how they inform our decisions. I see Mr. Oatman shaking his head because he was there too with us. But we had these jack predictors that told us what to do and as I listened to the CC, the California Current Ecosystem Status Report today, there was indication that the stoplight tables said that things would be above the ten year average for some Snake River stocks and that things didn't look so bad,

but when I look at the actual forecasts for this year based on the tools we have used for years and years and years, they give a different story that the returns are poor. So, this would be a situation where a risk table could tell you that there is more fish coming back than what the predictors you'd been using for 20 years and were very comfortable with tell you. So, risk goes both ways and it's not just telling you, and I think about myself in the position as a manager where now am I going to use this one that says there are more fish that hasn't been around for a long time versus this one that I've used forever and the consequences of making the wrong decision there. So, the point is I look forward to seeing some of these retrospective analysis and development of these tools. So, with that, I said too much. I'm going to look to Doctor Dahl and... oh sorry, Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:29:14] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just a couple notes. I don't think there's a motion required. I just wanted to put this out as possible guidance to take the HMSMT up on their offer to provide suggestions for how the Council could provide information on climate change impacts to HMS and HMS fisheries to the U.S. delegation during their regularly scheduled Council meetings. In my mind this isn't a big lift. My guidance would be to just add this to their next meeting with the anticipation that they would provide us a short report after that. So, I just wanted to note that and appreciate their offer to do that.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:56] All right. Thank you for that. Chair Pettinger? John, would you like to speak in response to that?

John Ugoretz [00:30:06] I would. Thank you. The axle is now turning. That's not what I read in the report. I read that if the Council directs them, they would do that. I'm not offering that direction. It was not in my motion. I don't want to add that to their task right now. I think highly migratory species are a whole nother situation when it comes to ecosystem. And if we want to see how everybody around the table feels we can, but no I'm not agreeing with that.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:57] All right. Thank you John. And just note my discussion with the Executive Director, if we want to direct the team to do something it would take a motion to do that. So, with that, we're still in discussion on this agenda item. Chair Pettinger had his hand up.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:16] Well, yeah, I just... you know I didn't vote no against the motion. I'm supportive of the work we're doing. I think we need a lot more. I just wanted to... I voted abstain because I just wanted to highlight my concerns I brought up during the discussion was all so...

Pete Hassemer [00:31:36] All right. I'll see if they're... take a pause here, see if there are any further hands on anything? And if not, let me turn to Doctor Dahl and have you summarize and see if we've completed our work. Before you do, Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:32:01] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Just beg my indulgence here. Maybe a process question. I just provided some guidance and I heard Mr. Ugoretz speak against it and then did not hear any other discussion. So, I'm happy to keep this open if others would like to weigh-in. I'm also happy to provide a motion if that's an easier way to get group consensus.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:26] The floor is still open for discussion so if anybody wants to join in and if you have a motion, we would entertain that at any time. So, I'm still looking around for any hands for discussion on this agenda item? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:32:49] I'm getting some guidance from an ODFW staff member who I think is in a Quizno's parking lot listening and helping us. The thought is that this may be already considered as part of the pathway for the international management activities. And it could also be considered as part

of the HMS roadmap that's going to be discussed or that's in the process of development. It's my understanding from the Oregon HMSMT member.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:20] John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:33:22] And I think maybe to clarify a little more in why I'm not asking the HMSMT to bring us something. You know, the IATTC has a specific group that already looks at ecosystem considerations in highly migratory species management, I believe, and we'd probably have to bring the team back up here to ask, but you know, they were suggesting that, again, if the Council directs them and if they're developing risk tables for HMS species then that could be something that could be brought into the international process. Not that they want to bring us some ideas of what sorts of information they could bring into the international process separate from that. I just don't see them as having something new right now to work on. And I very specifically didn't want to expand the risk tables into other FMP species.

Pete Hassemer [00:34:29] Thank you. Further discussion? And not seeing any hands I'm going to again ask Doctor Dahl to summarize.

Kit Dahl [00:34:51] Okay, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Well, you presented and discussed and passed a motion that I think provides clear guidance on next steps on this initiative. And tasked the EWG to coordinate further development of risk tables. I think in the first instance it would be focused on the two that were, that are already developed and have further improvement of those, but there'll be some initial discussions around this sort of scoping this exercise and what else additional. Also bringing the salmon stoplight tables into consideration, and I think that's, there's probably another group of folks at the Science Centers who would be working on that effort. And so, those would be brought forward in methodologies associated with those in terms of how to bring those into management to potentially, you know, for example, adjust harvest specifications. And also, that those... there would be some concrete examples, part of that, as part of that exercise that would be brought forward. Those would then be considered and reviewed in this Ecosystem Subcommittee of the SSC meeting that is tentatively scheduled for this summer, early enough so the results of that and a report from that could be put in the September briefing book, and then all that information would be brought back to you in September with, you know, those examples and so on so you could consider whether you want to move this forward in any way, you know, in sort of any real world application at some future date in a future harvest specification cycle. So, I think that's about it. There was some discussion around the HMSMT idea. I think that's maybe something that could be considered at some future date, but not an immediate tasking in that regard. So, I think that's my summary. I hope it was reasonably clear and accurate.

Pete Hassemer [00:37:37] All right, thank you. And I'll look around if there are any closing comments? I'm not seeing any I will consider this agenda item closed and pass the gavel back to our Chair.

3. Climate and Communities Initiative Review and Prioritize Tasks

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] All right. So, our Council action is before you on the screen. So, I'll open up the floor. Excuse me, Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:00:11] Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman and Council members. Just some, I don't know if pontification is the right word for me on this agenda item, but that's the word that comes to mind right now. When we put this together, we were under the impression that this agenda item would have the information available letting us know which and whether our IRA projects had been funded and that we could be moving forward at this point in planning and coordinating and starting to make some headway with those projects. And, of course, we don't have that answer in front of us and as we heard on the first day, we don't expect to hear until about May. And so, we are continuing to tread water. I'm reluctant to execute without the resources to execute and so I appreciate all of the information and time that everyone has put into, you know, the thoughts about how to move forward and how these things connect with the work we've done to date and that's all good information. But the big picture is we are still waiting and each time we get an update on the proposals, it's another month or two where we're waiting. So, we're still in that unfortunate position. So, what you do here, I guess, I'm not exactly clear. Maybe this is just a discussion for us all. Maybe you do have guidance. I'm happy to take it. But I'll just leave it there.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:42] Okay. What do you... (laughter)...

Heather Hall [00:01:47] We're both deferring to each other. I'll get it started.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:53] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:01:54] Thank you. I was just noting that in the Ecosystem Working Group's second Report, the Report number 2, they suggested a meeting to help put all these ideas and information together. Help really understand the requirements of the IRA funding and received by the Council and then the plans of the Science Centers bringing those all together, and so wondering if that might be a helpful way to package this and do it in a way where we're not trying to choose priorities now when we don't have all the information. And also, in a way that could, as suggested in the Working Group's Report, you know, include the advisory bodies, include others. And so maybe coming back Council staff could come back, bring information to our April future meeting, future workload planning agenda item to see what a meeting like that could, how that might work.

Merrick Burden [00:03:10] Yes, thank you. I appreciate the suggestion Miss Hall and I did make note of that suggestion in the EWG's report also. I think it's a fine suggestion. There are a lot of attempts at synergies between, you know, what Mr. Hayes had indicated, the Science Center projects, a lot of those align with what the Council has proposed and, for that matter, when I have spoken with Mr. Wulff about how they're staffing up, he indicates that they are trying to staff up in a way that aligns with our work too, but we're all... we haven't actually sat down and talked through any of that, it's all unfolding in a very, I'll just say, very uncomfortable way. It's going very quickly and not able to work through the usual Council process given the timelines we have in front of us. So, I would certainly welcome that kind of a discussion. And planning for it I think is a good thing. I would... what I would like to do is make sure that the new staff officer, who we still have not identified yet, to staff this work is available to make that meeting. I think it would be important for that person. So, we're close to identifying that person but not quite there yet. So that would also go into that thinking and I believe we could have some thoughts available for you in April. I think that's a reasonable request.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:33] Okay, thank you Merrick. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:04:37] Thanks Mr. Chair. And I agree with both what you said and the suggestion to have a workshop at what you said being it's really difficult for us to make a decision on anything without knowing what arena we are playing in. So that was going to be my recommendation in discussion that we hit the pause button on this, noting the good work that has been done and the advice. I will note that at least a very quick tally on my part, looking at what the 6 advisory bodies recommended, there's at least half of them, half or more of them recommend the same 5 items as a priority. So, there's some overlap there that could be looked at mostly in the process in one science item to consider. But more importantly, it would be helpful to the Council to know what we applied for for the IRA funding. And I know we saw a draft of that, but having a full understanding of what we asked for would help us in then making the decision once we know what we get. So perhaps it's a request to get that. I don't know why we wouldn't have that now.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:20] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:06:20] Yeah, thank you Mr. Ugoretz. That's a fine suggestion. I would just make note that the drafts you saw at the Committee-of-the Whole meeting, they are basically what we submitted. So, you have almost all the information. I'm happy to share all of those with you. We can plan to bring those back for that April item if that's the ideal time to do it and have those materials available for you then.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:47] Okay. Further discussion? All right. Josh.

Josh Lindsay [00:06:59] Thank you Mr. Chair. I guess in the theme of discussion related to Mr. Ugoretz' first point, it does seem like the advisory bodies, at least the ones that took the time to provide statements, did do some prioritization that, in my mind was in the theme of a perfect world, if you will. Some of those related to IRA, some of it was just if and when we ever do get funds and time to do some of these things. So, maybe there is some value in taking a look at those, perhaps having Council staff compile them, align them, and see if there are some that stand out as potentially fitting in with the IRA proposals, as you noted Mr. Burden, and ones that maybe could be done outside of IRA funding that are maybe less budget dependent, if you will. Not remembering what 12 CD was, I can't point out which one of those that might be, but perhaps there are some. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:53] Okay, thank you Josh. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:58] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And this may be a question for Executive Director Burden. If we do get all of this funding for all of these proposals, who is it is anticipated to do the analysis? Is it all going to be on the shoulders of the player to be named later? Is it expected to be the Ecosystem Workgroup? A combination of? I'm just thinking that's an awful lot of stuff to put on one person. And also thinking about the workload for our EWG moving forward.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:28] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:08:32] Let's see. It would take a long time to answer who would be proposed to do what because we picture a group effort. And so, within those proposals there's funding to support staff. In particular, NOAA made it clear that there was going to be funding made available for a staff person in each Council to lead this work. And then we have work for contractors. We have funding for our advisory bodies. It's a mix of different resources and how we apply it.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:11] Okay. All right, anyone else? Okay. Kit. Oop. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:09:29] Thank you. I just wanted to ask if you thought a motion was needed here if we're clear on the path forward? It seems like we are.

Merrick Burden [00:09:42] Well, I'm happy to tell you what I think we're doing. So we are as staff, we're continuing to communicate with NMFS and the best estimate we have right now is that we should hear and maybe even receive funding in May. I don't think that precludes your idea of starting to organize our planning for that in April. It's hard for me to imagine the funding being delayed further past May, because then we'll have to resubmit our proposals because we're out of time. So, I am optimistic we'll have it by that point. So, bringing back some thoughts in April under our workload planning to talk about this meeting of the advisory bodies and staffs, I think that's generally where we're landing for the April plan. I believe that's what we're agreeing to. And as part of that we'd have available information, like Mr. Ugoretz requested the actual proposals so we can make those available. If I'm missing something, let me know.

Heather Hall [00:10:38] I think you got it. Thank you. And with also the input from Josh too, about the, what we heard here might feed into that info package as well. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:54] Okay. So, everybody's good with that? Okay, no one else? Kit, how are we doing here?

Kit Dahl [00:11:05] I think you've done what you can Mr. Chair. Mr. Burden just kind of provided a summary so I'm not sure if I want to step on his toes, but anyways, basically we're kind of waiting for this funding. There'll be a bunch of staffing-up and resources available. You've taken up the thought of once that funding is secured, we've brought somebody on board to manage these projects that we could organize some kind of meeting slash workshop to engage with advisory bodies and others to look at these intersections between various, these various ideas coming out of the Climate and Communities Initiative and the projects and maybe more generally, ideas around developing those projects. And that staff would be prepared to bring back some sort of description or proposal too for the Council to take a look at under workload planning in April, a concept of what this might be, this thing we're talking about here. So, we're holding off and probably revisiting this in a concerted way once the funding is in our pocket.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:35] Okay, thanks Kit. Well with that, that'll close H.3 and I will pass the gavel to Vice-Chair Hassemer to finish the day off.

I. Highly Migratory Species Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] So that takes us to our Council action, which I believe is discussion on this item. And I will look around to see if there's any discussion that needs to be had. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:00:17] Thanks Mr. Vice Chair. And I just wanted to thank NMFS for the report and for their efforts in the deep-set buoy gear authorization process, as well as supporting the Council EFP processes where we've made recommendations. We're looking forward to seeing those EFPs fished on the water to help inform our process in the future.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:42] Thank you John. Further comments, discussion? Not seeing any, Doctor Dahl does that complete our work here?

Kit Dahl [00:00:56] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, it does.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:58] All right. Thank you. Then we'll close out I.1

2. International Management Activities

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes all our reports confirming that there is no public comment. I don't see any. That's correct. So, on this agenda item we can move into our Council discussion. And there it is. Any recommendations on U.S. positions? I will look to see if there are any hands that want to initiate discussion or have comments. I'm not seeing it. Oh, Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:00:37] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I guess you don't want silence to come off as lack of interest. I think, as usual, we're pleased and grateful for the work of National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Delegation and Christa and Dorothy representing us in these various places and don't have much to add. I guess we did get the update under the last agenda item from Dave Hogan, but it's also brought up here in the NMFS report. So, I think that was good news to hear that on the U.S. Albacore Treaty that there, we didn't know if there was going to be any additional discussions and time possibly for this season, but it's encouraging to hear that talks may occur and there's definitely potential for benefits from both sides if those happen. And I think I heard Dave say that he would notify, I believe, Christa's our rep for that as well, that if there are developments. So that was... I just wanted to note we heard that and it was encouraging. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:46] Thank you Corey. Further comments? I'm not seeing any. I'm not going to push this to beat the 3 a.m. record. So, Kit, how have we done?

Kit Dahl [00:02:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, I think you've done fine. And there probably wasn't a lot of need for extensive discussion or development of recommendations since there aren't any imminent, significant international activities between now and June. I think June will be a more significant opportunity for the Council to make recommendations, as suggested by Mr. Wulff and Miss Svensson, given the over-summer activities related to bluefin and other northern stocks. So, you can close out this one.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:40] All right, thank you Doctor Dahl. I will close this out and pass the gavel back to our Chair.

3. Highly Migratory Species Roadmap – Final Planning

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Okay, that takes care of public comment I believe and takes us to Council action, which is before you. So, I'll open up the floor for discussion. John Ugoretz, but I want to say Marci Yaremko but...(laughter)...

John Ugoretz [00:00:17] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. And, you know, I really appreciate all the work our advisory bodies and others, the public, have put into considering this issue. We've been talking about it a long time. And I think the goals that the team has provided for moving us forward are really close. I do actually have some ideas for some final edits that I want to present today for consideration. But looking first at the workshop and roadmap. I do want to say, because it comes up in the team report and a variety of other places, that I do not see this roadmap as specifically tied to the Driftnet Act and I really don't think it should focus on a transition program. We've discussed that on the floor in the past. There is no funding federally for a transition program. If that does happen, I absolutely want this Council to be a part of it, but not at this time. I really think that the overarching purpose has been to focus on how we develop new gears, and one major way to do that is through the EFP process. I also think that looking at past swordfish monitoring management plan actions that are either unnecessary due to the sunset of the DGN fishery or have already been discussed at great length in this Council process is ill advised and I would not recommend doing that at this workshop or, you know, in the roadmap. I think that specific discussions on ranking the action items that the team has put forward or adopting definitions right now is not the right time. I think that's something that could be discussed either at the road... at the workshop, or at follow-on discussions from it and be adopted when we adopt a final roadmap. We have, however, talked a lot about EFPs and the need for a framework for this Council to better achieve that goal of increasing supply of HMS off our coast. And I think as was noted in the management team's response to Executive Director Burden's question, it's not about changing the process in itself, it's about focusing that process in and as we've heard from Theresa and others in the past about developing some metrics that we can use when considering EFPs. And so, if I look at the workshop in my mind, it really does come down to a series of questions that could be asked about EFPs. Things like, you know, what should the Council consider when reviewing HMS EFP requests and what sorts of EFPs might we want to see specifically. What should the Council consider when examining EFP performance? Including things like defining what is acceptable levels of bycatch, or defining what is a successful EFP in terms of economic performance, marketability of the catch, social constraints, gear conflicts, and a host of other things. And then are there ways to streamline the EFP process? If there's things that we're doing now that are cumbersome, I'd like to know and I think others could weigh-in on that. I think in order to do that we need time off the Council floor. We've said this before. I think we're moving towards that and I think we've made some strides. I do think the participation and who discusses that needs to be broad. And I think with that, I'll let others talk.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:42] Thanks John. Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:04:45] Yeah, thank you. I am also supportive of decoupling the DGN transition from the workshop. I think I've certainly been advocating for how do we get swordfish and other HMS species in terms of opportunity for reaching OY out in the public in terms of, of testimony and advocacy for that for more than just the DGN fishery. And I think the testimony that we've heard over time supports that. And I do want to reflect just for a moment on the testimony we heard a moment ago around moving forward. When I'm thinking about multiple HMS species, that doesn't necessarily mean that I'm thinking about them all at one time. But there are a whole host of species out there that we have historically targeted, or that have been marketable species, so opah comes to mind as an easy one to talk about, that we don't particularly have a game plan or path forward with. And so, do I expect us to talk about opah or any of those in the workshop? Not necessarily, but I don't want to leave the

impression that, 'hey, when I'm talking about multiple species that it's a fixed idea'. And I would encourage others when they're thinking about how do we capitalize on this opportunity that is available, and we've heard throughout the week from a number of fishermen, commercial, recreational, charter, about the lack of opportunity. How do we create that? And I see this workshop as a path for moving forward with that. And I do think that the EFP process is important to think about. We have EFPs that are taking years to get through the process, having to come back to us multiple times because we were not maybe as clear as we could have been in what we were looking for. I think that's discouraging to fishermen. I think it's discouraging in some cases to the public. I think it's confusing for everybody, and in some ways it makes more work for ourselves. So, I'm excited about the concept and I do think EFPs at the end of the day, if we want to get more fish out of the water are the way we're going to get more fish out of the water. So, I, in listening to our management team in terms of why they chose that as kind of that first step, I'm feeling very supportive of that.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:50] Okay, thanks Christa. Bob Dooley then Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Bob Dooley [00:07:58] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I guess the thing that troubles me in this whole discussion that keeps circling around is the prescriptive nature of what we object to being used. I get the DGN part of it. But from my point of view, I don't care if they use a butterfly net. I want the performance. I want the limitation of, you know, of bycatch. I want performance goals. And I think, you know, we're asking for innovation in the absence of our ability to get swordfish out of the water in this particular case and other HMS species as well. And, yes, we need to be selective and we need to do that, but, you know, having personally been through a lot of development of different fishing gears and trying to reinvent the wheel a lot of times, it's trial and error. I mean, you know, you don't get it right the first time. And I think that we need to not judge the tool so much as judge the performance. And of course, it has to go in some type of a orderly timeline to get those results and to be able to say whether it's successful or not, but it also... you have to understand that, you know, it's not going to be perfect to begin with. So, to put a really hard line on what it needs to do, needs to improve over time, needs to achieve its goals, but it's development. So, I would hope we would focus more on what we want it to look like, what we expect, rather than which tool. Don't say use this 9/16 wrench and go out and prosper, we're not going to let you use anything else. I don't... I think that's the wrong approach. If we took that approach on bottom nets and, you know, and judging on what they were 50 years ago compared to what they are now and how selective they are and how light touch they are, we'd a never thought that, we'd still judge it on that. So, you know, we're venturing on building a car but we're worried about scaring the horses. So, you know, when they developed the automobile there was a lot of outrage that it's going to scare the horses. And I think that we need to not do that. We need to.....if we want to go forward, we didn't get to the moon doing this, you know, we need to allow it to go forward understanding if it's limited, particularly in the EFPs, and we have the right direction, the right understanding the goals, but it's an experiment and I trust. My motto all along has been if you want something done tell a fisherman he can't do it and he'll show you how it's done. And I've seen that time and time again. So, if we want to get this successfully launched, we need to go about it in a not so, you know we need to be open minded so, and encourage our industry to innovate because they do it the best. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:27] Thanks Bob. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:30] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I think this is going to sound a lot familiar to what Mr. Dooley just said. Some of my thoughts also but I'm going to repeat it. I guess as I went, as I go through this and thinking about the workshop and the roadmap and what we want, I still have in my mind this idea about optimum yield and getting those fish out of the water. I believe I've heard from NMFS. NMFS and General Counsel can correct me if I'm wrong, but National Standard 1 trumps everything else. Prevent overfishing while achieving optimum yield. And I feel strongly that we need

to build a system where we can take a broad look at ways to increase the harvest of HMS species, create that, build that viable fishery that supports strong fishing communities. Some of this pathway to get there will help, but I take a different view that the EFP is just the mechanism we're going to use to explore how to get there. My question to Mr. Rudie about parameters they might put on, what I heard in his response is they already sense limitations to what they can do, maximum number of hooks and that. Now you know I know we have to avoid tearing this wide open, but there needs to be some thinking in the sense of what would an economically viable fishery look like before we put on bycatch constraints and other things? I guess out of a workshop I wouldn't want somebody to come and tell me what acceptable levels of bycatch are. I would want to look at opportunities for creating a viable fishery and bycatch levels associated with that, and let this Council determine what's an acceptable level to create an economically viable fishery for the swordfish species. So, you know, parts of that are in there. I'm just... I'm worried that focusing solely on streamlining the EFP process is going to give us what we really need. The overarching piece is economically viable fisheries achieving optimum yield and sustainable fisheries. So, what's going to get us there? So, as we go through that, that's what I'm looking at. I've spent time over the last week or two looking at our COP 20 and the protocols for EFPs in the HMS fisheries. I mean, I can point out a couple of things pretty quickly to simplify that, but I don't know if it takes a two-day workshop just to focus on that. But there may be a way in the workshop and looking at the construct of the EFPs and what we're trying to get out of that that would help us. So, I'll stop there for now. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:20] Okay. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:15:23] Thanks Mr. Chair, and thanks Pete for those words. I actually agree with you quite a bit. I do think that the goals that the team has provided get exactly to what you're asking and focus quite specifically on those National Standards and desires to have a sustainable fishery that meets economic performance values. I said and I have some changes to their goals that are modest, but I definitely hope that whatever metrics for review we come up with through the workshop or further discussions do not constrain gear configuration. I haven't suggested that. I don't think I've heard others suggest that. What I've heard rather is the opposite, that we're hoping to get as much gear innovation as possible but have ways to measure performance that we can look back once they're done and say, 'did this perform?' And that's economically, that's yield, and that's bycatch, and that's other things. So, I'm hoping that's what happens.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:41] Okay. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:16:45] Yeah, thanks. I'll just speak briefly, and I'm looking forward to seeing John's possible revisions. And I think Bob said this a couple of times where he thinks, you know, the most effective way to achieve some of the things is to tell the fishermen that they can't do it. So, I'm wondering if we just need a motion that says they have this workshop or get a facilitator just to tell people they can achieve these goals. But I agree with you Bob but... Pete, I guess I just, we've been doing this a long time and I think everyone shares this goal of increasing the domestic swordfish harvest. But I think there's just realities out there that, for example, you said nothing trumps National Standard 1, but the ESA trumps National Standard 1, Congress trumps National Standard 1, state legislatures can trump National Standard 1. So, we exist in a, you know, in a society where the people have other goals and they're going to work towards them whether we agree with them or not. And that's been the challenge all along with this. So, yeah, we're very supportive of this. I know the Council went all the way to final action, I don't over ten years ago trying to create a shallow-set long line fishery which, you know, participation in that was pretty, wasn't clear exactly who was going to participate. So, it's been a long struggle. I just don't think it's... if it was an easy thing it would have happened. Deep-set buoy gear didn't turn out to be, yet hasn't turned out to be as successful as hoped but we'll see. But, yeah, I think everyone's on that same page. It's just, it hasn't been easy and for factors beyond this Council's control

in many regards and I think we heard about this EIS that NMFS is doing, draft EIS for EFPs and I think part of it is because of those, all those complicated factors that are involved here, but, yeah, really very supportive of this. And I meant to say thanks again to the HMS Management Team for distilling all their thoughts into a presentation that was easy to follow. But, yeah, again I'll keep it there and look forward to John moving the discussion on.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:05] Thanks Corey. And no hands. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:19:11] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And again, sort of new to this, and I do recognize this topic has been briefed multiple times with the Council seeking recommendations. What I'm going to speak to, and while I appreciate a proposed effort to kind of combine the location of the workshop with a Council meeting for, because many of the participants would probably already be coming to the Council meeting and that reduces cost and how many extra trips you need to make. Given the extensive interest that the team working on the workshop has expressed regarding outreach and so forth, I see a semi-proposal or suggestion to align with the June Council meeting, and it just strikes me that that would be a huge, huge lift. Relative to outreach, I don't believe they have a facilitator yet. So, I like the idea. I'm just throwing out there that certainly when I see that timeline and the fact that there's still some work in progress, that that seems like a big lift.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:36] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:20:39] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. Well, since November we have been working on this workshop and we've gone ahead and secured space at the June meeting hotel, so that's been squared away. I've been in touch with three people who I think would make excellent facilitator candidates. None of them have committed. I haven't offered yet, but I feel like we can execute. I would let you know if I felt like we can't. But a lot of this also hinges on getting clarity here today. So, the more clarity we can get the better, and then we can begin building our way forward in earnest. You also raised the question of just scale of the workshop. And if we are aiming very high for a lot of participants, that does make me nervous. I don't think that's what we're doing, yeah. But if we are I would appreciate that clarity.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:35] Okay. Thanks Merrick. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:21:42] Thanks Mr. Chair. I've kind of struggled with how best to lay out revisions to text in goals. And the best thing I could do was come up with a motion that everybody could see that I could speak to and we can discuss rather than me trying to describe them. I wish I had had the foresight to put this into a report, though admittedly, I was talking to a lot of people at this meeting and honestly don't think I could have done the right job in a report. So, if people are ready, I do have a motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:22] I think we're ready.

John Ugoretz [00:22:23] All right. And there it is. I move the Council adopt the following goals for the HMS roadmap as edited from Agenda Item I.3.a, HMST Report 1. A. Support innovation and development of multi-species HMS fishing methods to increase the domestic supply and meet the demand for swordfish and other marketable species. Support and test fishing practices that have potential to be economically viable while minimizing unmarketable, prohibited, and protected species bycatch. Support the economic viability of West Coast, excuse me, West Coast commercial fisheries for swordfish and associated marketable species through a diverse range of HMS fishing methods. Promote climate ready fisheries and fisheries resilience by developing flexibility in management and other tools to account for changes in HMS distributions, ecosystem structure and function, and the communities depending on HMS fisheries. Engage fishery participants to preserve knowledge and help

bolster resilience in future fisheries, and support recreational HMS fishing opportunities.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:36] Okay, is the language on that screen accurate?

John Ugoretz [00:23:39] It is. And you will note that I did not read struck out words. I was trying to give the actual meanings.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:46] Appreciate that. Seconded by Corey Ridings. Thank you Corey. Please speak to your motion John.

John Ugoretz [00:23:52] Thanks. As we heard from Mr. Wulff and it was reiterated in discussion of the MT report, swordfish populations may be as much as 2.5 times greater than MSY and that we're fishing at a level about 45 percent to achieve MSY. And the Council has long agreed to a need to increase domestic production of swordfish as well as other species that are coming primarily from imports, or which were previously taken in larger numbers in other fisheries in the state and the West Coast. I believe the team has done an excellent job of distilling a variety of interests into a set of goals that can help guide this fishery through the roadmap and in my opinion, in my motion, excuse me, I've also recognized some of the other input received and some changes I feel are needed to both focus and clarify the goals. So, the rationale for the changes you see, and if we scroll up to A, I don't think West Coast based vessels is appropriate in this goal. The goal is to develop methods, and if we focus on domestic supply for a Pacific Fishery Management Council FMP then we should achieve that. Also, there are vessels based on the West Coast that do not participate in fisheries permitted through the Council's FMP. I agree with the term West Coast fisheries in Goal C, but not vessels here. I added increasing supply in addition to meeting the demand, the two things I think go hand in hand, and we're trying to do them both. In B just the phrase "while also" is unnecessary. While also implies a contrasting viewpoint and while means to do things at the same time, which I think is the goal here. In Goal C, HMS is redundant to swordfish and other species and I focused on commercial, which I think is what this goal is geared towards. I added associated as the intent, as I understand it is to account for things like opah that are not technically highly migratory species in our plan but are caught in conjunction with HMS species. I'll note that Goal C is broad enough to encompass a range of gear types that would include both single species and multi-species gears. In Goal D, developing flexibility, I feel is more active than promoting. I think the intent is to find new ways to make things flexible. I also see the potential for other methods and did not want to constrain the goal to only management flexibility. I found the term "ecosystems" didn't have necessary context, so based on some public comment I feel the addition of structure and function makes sense. And Goal E the term "traditional" may have other unintended connotations as people have been fishing highly migratory species off our coast for centuries. I don't think it's necessary here as we want to include all voices, including past, present and future fishery participants. And finally, I added Goal F as suggested in public comment. I did, however, change the suggestion from "preserve" to "support" from the public comment, and this was both for consistency with the other goals and to avoid an incorrect interpretation that we could not reduce recreational catch in the future if needed. Preserving something in my mind means keeping it static for a long time. So, I think my... my given change from HMS to commercial in C above makes this a necessary goal so that we have a goal specific to recreational. And I appreciated that in the public comment. And with that I'm happy to take any questions.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:45] Very good. Questions for the motion maker? Sharon Kiefer and then Pete and then... so Sharon.

Sharon Kiefer [00:27:57] I'm supportive of this. I just point out that, the use of the word "climate-ready", I noticed you use that. I went back to how they were defining it and it was really, it was incorporating available and climate and ecosystem environmental data, which to me means it's a

climate-informed fishery. I have a problem. I have a challenge in my brain when somebody says it's climate-ready, what exactly that means? And so that's just something for us maybe to kind of chew on a little bit. But to me it's a... they're recommending climate-informed fisheries. And I do appreciate you added the recreational because that went through my head as well.

Brad Pettinger [00:28:46] John.

John Ugoretz [00:28:46] Yeah, thanks. And I didn't change climate-ready from the team's version. I understand your concern, actually and that's probably another good term to define in a workshop. There are somewhat common use definitions of that, but I think they vary. So, I appreciate the comment, yeah.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:08] Okay. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:12] Thank you Chair Pettinger. Yeah, and when we get to discussion I might have something on climate-ready. But my question is on Goal C, sorry Goal B. The supporting test fishing while minimizing unmarketable, prohibited, and protected species. I'm just wondering if you thought about that being more in line with National Standard 9, which says to the extent practicable minimizing impacts to those species?

John Ugoretz [00:29:59] Thanks Mr. Chair and Mr. Vice Chair. I think it's a great comment. Again, I'm going off of the team's recommendations and I think the advisory subpanel supported these as the team had them written. I certainly wouldn't be opposed to, you know, minimize to the extent practicable, but it's just, yeah, I wasn't adding that in.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:28] Pete.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:29] Thank you. I'd like to offer an amendment to the motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:35] Okay.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:38] Under Goal B strike, now I can't see it, strike the piece that says after the word while, "minimizing marketable". In fact, strike the word "while" also. So, I'm going to strike that and then after economically viable, I know this is difficult to work through these here, we're going to add the text "consistent with National Standard 9 guidelines". Okay, thank you. And as you're doing that I'm going to add a word but I think we're getting there.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:57] Okay.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:01] Yeah you need to strike the word "while". And I think I need one more word. Try a "and" there. And consistent. Okay. I'm going to say you got it.

Brad Pettinger [00:32:38] Okay. So, the top yellow is struck and the bottom yellow is added. Okay.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:46] And it's not clear there. I don't know if you can put the upper yellow piece in strikeout. Strikeout, strike-through, whatever it's called.

Brad Pettinger [00:33:06] Okay.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:07] Mr. Chair, the language on the screen is accurate and complete.

Brad Pettinger [00:33:11] Okay. Looking for a second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Thank you

Christa. Please speak to your amendment.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:20] Thank you. I've read National Standard 9 quite a bit. That lays it out. That's the place where bycatch is addressed. The process of evaluating that and looking at it is, goes through everything we do and NMFS reviews that. And just to keep it simple, I think that's better that those fisheries are just created consistent with the guidelines for bycatch.

Brad Pettinger [00:33:54] Okay. Very good. A question for the motion maker or discussion about it? John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:34:05] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. I will not be supporting this amendment. The team actually developed this after discussions by the Council. This is not about National Standard 9. I don't mind making it consistent with National Standard 9, but to replace it with that I believe changes the intent of the goal. This is something we have struggled with in our swordfish fisheries. The issues of bycatch led to legislated changes to remove drift gillnet off our coast and I feel that the discussions to date have been about minimizing this type of bycatch, and that was specifically intended by the team's goal that the advisory subpanel agreed to.

Brad Pettinger [00:35:04] Thank you John. Anyone else? Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:35:08] I just, I don't intend to support the amendment either for primarily the same reasons as Mr. Ugoretz just stated. I think the RAP spent a lot of time thinking about this. I think minimizing unmarketable and prohibited and protected species bycatch has been one of the cornerstones that we have used over time in looking at years for this fishery and so I won't be supporting it.

Brad Pettinger [00:35:47] Thank you Phil. Anyone else? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:35:53] Yeah, thanks. Just agreeing with the spirit that Pete's after here, but you know, and I try to... thinking about the definitions discussion that the AP and the team had and I don't think you're going to ever get rid of matters of people interpreting words differently. And if we did, you'd probably have a 10th of the number of lawyers you have now out there in the world, but I think even Pete your, if you want to get super precise here, like National Standard 9 doesn't apply to Endangered Species Act species, so there's all kinds of pitfalls that we could be here all night probably trying to break the record of Christa said, and on daylight savings time change. But, no, really appreciate the spirit, but I think I will also vote no, just because of those considerations, but agreeing that no matter what the goals are here, most of it will have to apply with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and other consistent laws. So that's the lens I'm, I would take towards these goals.

Brad Pettinger [00:36:56] Okay. Thanks Corey. Anybody else? Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:37:04] Thank you. Appreciate that last comment by Corey. And I understand the intent as well. Just to say I also understand the intent of the original text. And from NMFS perspective we can support either. Obviously, I won't be voting no against National Standard guidelines... (laughter)... so thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:37:26] Okay. Anybody else? If not, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Ryan Wulff [00:37:34] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:37:36] Opposed?

Council [00:37:37] No. No.

Brad Pettinger [00:37:40] Okay. Abstentions? I think it failed. Who are the yes votes? Three. Okay. All right. Okay, we're back to the original one and get rid of all that ink off there so we could... Okay, we're back to the original motion and further discussion or... Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:38:19] Yeah thanks and thanks for understanding my last vote. If you could scroll up, I do want to see the full motion for a sec... oh sorry, the other way so I can see A. Thank you. A little bit further down. Perfect. Okay. Yeah, I did want to intervene and I'm going to have more comments because I just wanted to note here I do think we're talking about the goals for the roadmap here and I think this will be relevant to our next discussion as it gets to the workshop, but I can support all these. I appreciate the suggested additions, especially the addition of the increased domestic supply. I think that's going to be very relevant to some of our next discussion. I also appreciate the rationale from John regarding, you know, separating out the commercial and the recreational side. I think that... I think you could have read it the other way as including both, but I think it's worth, given the interest on both sides, calling that out separately. I guess since we're in discussion now I probably could have asked this as a clarifying question, but maybe I'll just say it as a comment. Given my earlier remarks under international, you know, I do think when we're talking about the roadmap itself, while I know swordfish is one of those top species to discuss, it's clear from our discussions also, not just on the commercial but on the recreational side, have an interest in tuna as well. And so, I imagine that's incorporated as in other or associated species here when you're talking about increasing domestic supply. So, with all those points I'll be supporting the motion. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:39:59] Okay. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:40:03] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And thank you Mr. Ugoretz for the motion. There's a lot of good material in here. Since we will be eagerly trying to execute on this after this meeting, I have a couple of clarifying questions just in the sense of essentially what does this look like? So, if we were to have a roadmap, and maybe I'm about to answer my own question, but if we were to have a roadmap that does all of this, what does that look like to you? And maybe we're not ready to answer that, but that's what's on my mind.

Brad Pettinger [00:40:41] John.

John Ugoretz [00:40:41] Thanks Mr. Chair, and thanks Executive Director Burden. I think a roadmap stems from the old monitoring and management plan, which had some goals and actions. I see a roadmap as having goals and actions. I see it as having associated activities, all of which are guiding the Council to achieve the goals. So, you know, I would see it as having a similar look and feel to the old Swordfish Monitoring and Management Plan with a lot of different content.

Brad Pettinger [00:41:28] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:41:28] Yeah, thank you Mr. Ugoretz. And I also got my wires a little bit crossed here in asking my question. I'm thinking ahead to the workshop so I'll ask the same question when we start thinking about what the workshop should look like. What does success look like at the end of the day? That'll really help me and others to execute on that so just put that marker down.

Brad Pettinger [00:41:53] Okay. All right. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:42:00] And just for my edification, I heard you mention a monitoring report? I'm wondering where's the aspect of evaluation? And I'm assuming that comes later with development of some actual proposals, kind of getting back to Bob's performance goals. To me that's more granular than what we're trying to achieve here, but did not know if there's already, since you mentioned the monitoring plan, already something that's kind of developed to address those issues?

Brad Pettinger [00:42:39] John.

John Ugoretz [00:42:40] Thanks, and through the Chair. So, the history of this is that we had what was known as the Swordfish Management and Monitoring Plan. That plan was developed in a time where the significant focus was on reducing bycatch and increasing monitoring in the drift gillnet fishery and consideration of establishing a long line fishery off the U.S. West Coast. Gosh, I don't know how many years ago now, the team came back with some proposed edits to that based on recent times. My feeling at the time was I was ready to round file that plan and be done. However, NMFS actually brought up a very good point that they had been using that plan as a guidance document when looking at approving EFPs. And that led to the series of discussions that got us to where we are today to create this what is now known as a roadmap that will help guide that. And it does lean back towards the second part of your question regarding performance and evaluation. And I think a large part of the workshop is, as I see it and as I mentioned in my floor comments, would focus on looking at those metrics. Sorry, I shouldn't say metrics, looking at those considerations that the Council would take when looking at EFPs.

Brad Pettinger [00:44:20] Okay. Further discussion? Have we voted on this yet? Okay. It's been a long day. All right. With that, I'm going to call for question. How's that sound? All right. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:44:46] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:44:46] Opposed, no? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously thankfully. Okay, Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:44:58] Thank you. Just a quick comment before that leaves the screen. It's in support of what's there on the climate-ready fisheries. I'm glad the team came up with the statement and the goal. When I read it last week, I spent a lot of time thinking about it a lot. And not in disgrace to them, I'm glad it was there, but I came to the realization that's not needed there. That's a much higher, loftier thing that goes through everything we discuss here. Every topic we come to we're thinking about climate-ready fisheries. And we have these IRA funds that if they come are focused on climate-ready fisheries and adaptations. So, as I read it, I thought if you take out HMS, there's two occurrences of it in there and just put in fisheries or something like that, that covers all of our FMPs, all of the things we do. And I thought it was interesting when we had the presentation from the International Pacific Halibut Commission yesterday, the Halibut Commission passed, adopted a climate change paragraph that they use as kind of a banner in there things. It was in the slide that was presented, but I can't find that anywhere now so I don't know exactly what it was, but I did go through our Council website and look through where would we put something that identifies how we respond to climate change and those types of things? So, I'm just throwing it out there is a marker that somewhere down the road as we go through there, you know, it shouldn't be necessary to put it in as a goal in this roadmap. It should be broader over our Council activities and apply to everything. So, I just wanted to highlight that for people's thinking and sorry that took us off the workshop topics.

Brad Pettinger [00:47:06] John.

John Ugoretz [00:00:00] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. And thanks again Pete for your thoughts. I don't disagree with that. There is something and I think it kind of pushes us towards the next step of this, which is what do we do with the workshop? And that's, the Council has spent the last, I guess five days talking primarily about constraints on fisheries due to stocks that are at extremely low abundance and they are constraining our ability to even have fisheries, and the difference here is we have a fishery that is at very high abundance and underutilized and we're doing everything we can to come up with new ways to get out there and fish it. And so, again, I don't disagree with you. I think it's in here for a reason. I think there's concerns about what might change in this fishery and we want to be ready for it.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:59] Okay. Anybody else? Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:01:04] Thank you Mr. Chair. I do have a motion about a workshop. I think it may behoove us if we take a few minute break just to make sure our ducks are in order if that's acceptable for everybody. But happy to launch it now but I think we may be happier with the results if we give everyone a couple of minutes.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:25] Okay. Ten minutes, okay? All right, back here in 10 minutes... (BREAK)... All right, back in session on I.3 and, Christa, I believe you have a motion.

Christa Svensson [00:01:45] that is correct. And thank you for making it a little bigger. All right I move the Council host an HMS workshop June 6th and 7th at the same location as the June 8th through 13th Council meeting in San Diego, with the workshop goal of developing a streamlined and flexible, in parentheses, Council EFP strategy to support innovation, sorry need it a little bigger here guys, in fishing practices for HMS fisheries. Sorry, the screen is a little tilted as well which isn't helping, with the following guidance. In developing this program, consider the goals of the roadmap and the action items and definitions proposed by the HMSMT. Not consider outstanding swordfish Management and Monitoring Plan Action Items A.3 and E.1 through 3 for the roadmap and remove HMSMT Action Items 1.a through c found in Agenda Item I.3.a, HMSMT Report 1 from the HMS roadmap draft list of action items. Use the HMSMT definitions 1 through 12 as drafted in Agenda Item I.3.a, Supplemental HMSMT Report 2, March 2024, and definitions 13 and 14 from Agenda Item I.3.a, Supplemental HMSAS Report 1, March 2024 to facilitate discussion at the Roadmap Workshop. Include in the notification of workshop the Council is encouraging all interested stakeholders to participate.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:51] Okay. Is the language on the screen accurate Christa?

Christa Svensson [00:03:55] It is.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:55] Okay, look for a second? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Thank you Corey. Please speak to your motion.

Christa Svensson [00:04:02] Thank you. The need for future planning around fisheries opportunities and EFPs in general continues to be real. We've heard repeatedly this week across FMPs that our coastal communities are struggling. My heart goes out to everyone. HMS currently is in a similar situation, and I see the HMS roadmap as a critical step in helping move all of us forward on a path to provide more sustainable fishing opportunity. I looked this morning at the current PacFIN numbers regarding swordfish price as a metric to support the urgency of why the Council should spend time and resources doing this work. Workshops after all aren't free, even with IRA funding. The current price of swordfish is \$6.96 per pound. And I realize that that's a market price. It could fluctuate. It could go to \$3 or some other number but we'll take it for what it is today. And using the approximately 5,000 current established, or excuse me, estimate of volume for swordfish we could take in terms of harvesting without overfishing or harming the biomass, today's current market value of swordfish, if caught

commercially, is just over 76.7 million dollars. That's almost as large as the 80.7 million in landings for 2023 of the West Coast trawl fisheries, including Pacific whiting. Even if we work towards targeting half that volume for commercial fisheries, we'd still have over 30 times the dollar value of just over 1.2 million in swordfish landings for 2023. I chose half that number, not because I think we can only achieve half the opportunity, but to leave room for recreational and charter opportunities that may become available through the EFP process that could increase the value significantly, not just in terms of dollars, but also in terms of communities up and down our coasts. These numbers also don't include other market species that have historically been caught in HMS fisheries and that should be considered within the scope of the workshop, which will all add further value. I agree with the recommendation from our advisory bodies to place the workshop in San Diego at the June meeting, both for the cost saving benefits, but also because the location is close for many of the people who have historically caught swordfish and other HMS species. Clearly defined terms provides shared common language for diverse stakeholders to engage in, and I think we heard that from our management team. In the spirit of defining terms, I chose to put the word Council in parentheses in this motion because my intent is not to infringe on the NMFS EFP process outside of the Council, but just to keep awareness there that that is what we are talking about. I also think that all interested stakeholders, including more than commercial folks, commercial and NGO folks, should be involved. This workshop should be viewed as an opportunity for rec fishermen to also provide input on EFPs and to help us all envision what we want HMS fisheries to look like. And I just want to think for a minute on why it's important, and I mentioned this earlier on EFPs. I think in not addressing it we're creating risk around unnecessary and likely lengthy delays in issuing our EFPs. I think it reduces the number of participants we're likely to have. And I think it puts a lot of extra burden on Council members. You know there are a lot of successes with buoy gear, but that did come at a cost for Council members. I mean we were looking at 18 EFPs at a time and they are all different. There are a lot of similarities, but it still is a tremendous amount of workload. So, we're finding that is important. That being said, the decision to not include items like DGN or other gear types in this motion, it wasn't easy. But I think we need to think about how we're going to approach this process as a whole, and sometimes when we start thinking about hooks or long line or DGN transitions or buoy gear, we get fixated on a concept or an idea as opposed to that bigger question about how are we going to deliver for fishermen and for the public that does want a more sustainable option when it comes to swordfish and other HMS species. And I think that I will stop there in terms of my rationale, but I will say in conclusion that should this motion pass, I'm looking forward to working with everyone who's interested in developing an HMS roadmap beginning in June.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:00] Okay, thank you Christa. Questions for the motion maker? Justin Ainsworth.

Justin Ainsworth [00:10:09] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And thank you Miss Svensson for the motion. Could we scroll so I can see the upper part? Thank you. Just in the third paragraph, in developing this program consider the goals of the roadmap. Can you describe what developing this program is referring to?

Christa Svensson [00:10:33] Correct. So that at least initially would be specific to the workshop. If the workshop is successful and we have action items that come out of it, that would further turn into what I am calling a program here, but it certainly if we say, 'wow, that was a worthwhile exercise and we are stopping now', I am not going to demand that we do more. But that is the reason why I chose program rather than just say, 'hey, in developing this workshop I also decided'... and this was the reason I called for the pause, this was not originally in my motion, I did want to include this component because I think that this moves us away from this conversation around is this only EFPs? Or are we really looking at those wider goals and how we achieve moving towards OY.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:38] Thank you Justin. Anyone else? Discussion on the motion? John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:11:47] Thanks Mr. Chair, and thanks, Christa, for the motion. I think it's well thought and timely. I appreciate in particular the response you just gave regarding what a program is, because I understand that. The workshop is a way to get to something broader. And I like that there's latitude in here to go beyond just EFPs in the workshop. I'm hoping that through the development of a workshop agenda and the inclusion of a facilitator that, you know, a good scope of what can be done is developed. And if there are additional tasks after the workshop, then we figure out when we tackle those.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:33] Thank you John. Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:12:36] Yeah, thank you Chair, and thank you, Christa, for the motion and I echo John's points there. I appreciated the way that you explained that. That's my understanding too and I appreciate the addition of this first sentence there in the guidance, because it's one thing to develop a streamlined and flexible EFP strategy, but you cannot do that in a vacuum without talking about some of these broader concepts and issues, or even just getting some of the information that is highlighted that could facilitate some of those... how you would develop a strategy that are laid out in the action items and even to some extent the definition... so I appreciate that because, and I didn't get to weigh-in as much earlier, but tying back to the goals that we just adopted, right? I mean to have a streamlined and flexible EFP strategy, and I echo some of the discussion we had earlier in this agenda item, you really have to talk about what is an economically viable fishery. You have to talk about what you were looking for in the data that you'll get back from those EFPs. You have to address the 80 to 85 percent of foreign imports that are coming in and what are the measures that they're using and how does that impact the conservation of our living marine resources? And you have to talk about the cost to develop for fishermen, to develop these innovative gears not knowing if they're going to be able to be used to scale up. I mean, those are all important questions. Those are all very relevant to the goals and are in the Action Items, and so I really appreciate the incorporation of this because I think it's crucial to having a successful workshop. So thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:13] Thank you Ryan. Anyone else? Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:14:20] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I really appreciate the motion, Christa. I think it's very well written. I like the word flexible in the third line there, but when it's limited to EFP I hope there's flexibility that... what I heard from the NMFS Report 2 in the third line, actually the second sentence fourth line, it talks about EFPs. It says proposed action covers a range of fishing practices that would otherwise be prohibited by existing regulations and goes on from there. So, I don't know everything. Obviously, I don't think we all, any of us do, but there may be methods proposed that don't require an EFP, maybe require a research project. So, we limit ourselves to an EFP that, or you know, and I'm hoping this motion has the flexibility in it, and I believe it does, I just wanted to make sure that I put that comment in there so that we can go back to it at the time whenever we run into a roadblock on something because not everything requires an EFP, but research project absolutely. So, thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:39] Thank you Bob. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:15:43] Thank you Chair Pettinger. This is actually kind of a parliamentary question for the maker or for our parliamentarian. I'm noticing it seems to be a motion, but it also has... with the following guidance in it. And I have to admit that I'm ignorant about sort of what the difference is in terms of written guidance that's part of a motion versus typically how this Council talks about guidance, which is usually general head nodding agreement or something verbal. So, I'm just looking for some clarification in terms of if there was something in the guidance part? Would I need to offer an amendment or could I just talk to it?

Brad Pettinger [00:16:32] Chris.

Christa Svensson [00:16:37] So I do not have an answer off the top of my head on the parliamentary component. I certainly could probably look that up in Robert's Rules and did not do homework on that. I did choose to put guidance in on this rather than just make a motion and then speak to guidance afterwards. For the same reason that actually I was going to speak to, with response to the previous speaker, Mr. Dooley. When I thought about how to structure this topic, I wanted to leave as much flexibility as I possibly could and at the same time have some siderails. My concern with this whole conversation is there's a tremendous amount of opportunity here. And it is a little bit like seeing one of those money booths with the cash machine in it and everybody is really excited when they get in there and they kind of go crazy. And obviously I'm cracking myself up here. And I just want to make sure that when we go through this process, we don't end up walking out of this with a few dollars when we could be creating a lot more opportunity than that. And there also... so that was the rationale in terms of choosing EFPs and really structuring flexibility around that. And then speaking to the guidance piece. Continuing to have a few pieces on there that are, are really written in is more of a let's make sure we're very clear on what guidance that we are providing so that we don't take up some pieces of guidance and we have a whole bunch of other guidance that may be lost in the fold. I think all of these have been vetted through conversations with a number of people. If this is not the full list, then by all means I'd welcome a friendly amendment, but I wanted to make sure that these components were encompassed and incorporated and not left somehow accidentally off the table.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:03] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:19:06] Thanks for that Miss Svensson. I agree with everything you just said. I'm not sure it answered my question though. Does perhaps Mr. Oliver.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:17] Chris.

Chris Oliver [00:19:17] Well, I'm not certain it's a parliamentary question. The language below the word guidance is fairly specific and I think it's meant to frame the parameters of the workshop. So you may have used a different word with the following prescriptions or the following instructions or the following parameters. So, the effect may be the same, I guess. If everyone understands that and agrees with the three phrases that are below, the four phrases that are below the word guidance, I'm not sure. I'm not sure it matters, but he could have used a more...

Brad Pettinger [00:20:07] Executive Director...

Chris Oliver [00:20:08]specific word.....

Brad Pettinger [00:20:12] Burden. I agree.

Merrick Burden [00:20:13] Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. I would say I agree with Mr. Oliver. I'm not sure if it's a parliamentary issue, but I would say this is all part of the motion and what you're essentially doing is directing me to go execute on a workshop. I would like this to be as clear as possible and this is all part of a motion so if you want to change it, I would suggest making an amendment rather than new guidance.

John Ugoretz [00:20:42] I'd like to make a motion to amend.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:45] Okay.

John Ugoretz [00:20:52] After the word at the top there that I can't see anymore, sorry. After the word "fisheries" before the period, use "so fisheries using the following Council direction" colon. And then

strike "with the following guidance". Thank you. And everything else is the same.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:51] Okay. Looks good to you?

John Ugoretz [00:21:52] It does.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:53] Okay. Seconded by Bob Dooley.

John Ugoretz [00:21:55] Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:55] Please speak to it as appropriate.

John Ugoretz [00:21:57] Given that the question was raised and my experience with Council guidance being misinterpreted when it is not clear, I feel that the motion should be very clear that this is direction that is being provided for how to conduct this workshop.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:14] Okay. All right discussion? Okay, I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:22:24] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:24] Opposed, no? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Okay. Corey Riding.

Corey Ridings [00:22:38] I would like to offer an amendment.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:40] Okay.

Corey Ridings [00:22:51] I move to add the definition of the following definition of climate-ready fishery. Tower of power you have going to indulge me. Can you go back up to the rest of the motion? After the second to last paragraph, yeah, right there after the word "workshop". Between workshop and the period say, "as amended by this new definition".

Brad Pettinger [00:25:12] I think you want to put a period after "it" and give them separation maybe so you can people... it all runs together.

Corey Ridings [00:25:19] Yeah, it's a little bit clunky and I apologize. I'm sorry it's not great doing it two parts on the page there.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:26] And then, yeah.

Corey Ridings [00:25:30] Thank you Mr. Chair.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:36] Okay. When you're good let me know. Okay. All right. You want to read that into...

Corey Ridings [00:25:46] Thank you. I move to add the definition of climate-ready fishery, colon, a fishery that incorporates available climate and ecosystem environmental data to support management decisions and the resilience of communities and ecosystems that depend on it. This definition is to be added after quote, "use the HMSMT definitions 1 through 12 as drafted an Agenda Item I.3.a, Supplemental HMSMT Report 2, March 2024, and definitions 13 and 14 from Agenda Item I.3.a,

Supplemental HMSAS Report 1, March 2024 to facilitate discussion at the Roadmap Workshop as amended by this new definition".

Brad Pettinger [00:26:22] Okay, language accurate?

Corey Ridings [00:26:24] Yes.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:24] Looking for a second? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Thank you Marc. Okay. Please speak to your motion.

Corey Ridings [00:26:35] Thank you. Given that there is a tight tie with what we're doing here around the workshop and development of this roadmap with the IRA funding, and the comment that Miss Kiefer made earlier on the floor regarding the proposed definition for climate-ready fisheries, she pointed out it was really more climate-informed fisheries and I would agree with that interpretation. Thus, in the spirit of encouraging the use of this common vocabulary for the workshop, even if it's just used to facilitate discussion at the workshop, I wanted to offer a slightly different wording for that concept, and you'll see I underlined it here because that's the part that's different. And the... I think that this captures that the management is climate-informed and that the resilience we want to achieve isn't just community resilience, but the larger ecosystem and our fisheries in the communities that are dependent on that ecosystem and part of it. So that was my intention with this was just to add a little bit of clarity around that. Hope that that captures it.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:49] Okay. Questions for the motion maker? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:27:59] I guess when I read that and we're talking about a fishery incorporates available climate and ecosystem environmental data. Got that. And the resil... but it's the resilience of communities and ecosystems I'm not quite sure, are we suggesting that the fishery contributes to the resilience of the ecosystem? And when I'm thinking about the ecosystem I'm thinking about the ocean or I'm a little... I'm just not really clear how I would explain that to someone. So, a little more clarity.

Corey Ridings [00:28:37] Thank you for the question, Miss Kiefer. I can definitely keep talking. In my mind the way this was written, I was reading it, you know, a fishery that incorporates available climate change and ecosystem environmental data to support management decisions and the resilience of communities that depend on it. And as we manage fisheries, which are part of ecosystems that feed into communities, I didn't want it to say just communities, you know, is the focus of what we do is really fisheries and the ecosystems surround it. So, I wanted the action part of this definition to be more about than, as you pointed out, just making them climate-informed, but actually having the outcome of a climate-ready fishery is an ecosystem, a fishery, and communities all together that are climate-ready as opposed to just communities, which stepping back is actually potentially the thing we have the least control over as we're a fishery management group.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:53] Okay. Thank you Sharon. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:29:58] Thanks Mr. Chair. Miss Ridings, it appears from your amendment that you're suggesting adding a definition to the management team's definition list, but there is already a definition. Did you intend to modify the management team's definition?

Corey Ridings [00:30:22] Thank you Mr. Ugoretz. I did intend to modify the existing definition.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:29] Okay. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:30:35] Thank you Mr. Chair. Normally when it comes to fisheries, ecosystem, et cetera, I am supportive. I will say I'm not supporting this amendment simply because the definitions initially came from our management teams and I feel that they've had time to work on all of this come together. I'm not saying that when it comes down to a workshop they may not revise and take up the ecosystem component, but I do think that it is appropriate if we're going to pick up their definitions that we stick with the definitions that they provided. But I do appreciate the amendment and I am appreciative of the thought that has gone into it and our willingness to discuss it on the floor today.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:30] Butch Smith and then John Ugoretz.

Butch Smith [00:31:32] Well, I'm just a little confused here. And maybe it's a general practice of this Council, but cities and ports and other forms of government usually the Executive Director has a list of the way he or she thinks the workshop is going to be laid out and then we can vote or not on it, but this is kind of backwards foreign to me, and it's really turning into an exercise of wordsmithing and definitions and I am for the... you know this is, clearly our Executive Director has in his mind how this wants to go and what should be in there and it seems like to me that he could bring back a definition... it's probably too far down the road, but I just to me this is a little bit backwards and I think maybe in the future it might be better if, you know, he had some ideas on paper the way he thought it should be run and then we can tear it down or accept it or add to it might make the process a little better. But anyway, I know that didn't speak to this thing, but I'm sorry but this is getting a little long in the tooth, so thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:33:02] Okay Butch. John.

John Ugoretz [00:33:07] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. I will also not be supporting this amendment. I find it odd to start wordsmithing the definitions prior to the workshop. My understanding from the original motion to use the definitions to facilitate discussions at the workshop made sense to me that those discussions would occur if there were edits needed to the definitions that could be discussed in that group setting, certainly not on the floor here today. If we had intended to modify the management team's list of, lengthy list of definitions, I would have hoped we'd do that with floor discussion. So yeah, I'm not liking that.

Brad Pettinger [00:33:59] Okay. All right. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:34:05] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. Yeah, I guess I'm pretty ambivalent about this. I don't think I've seen this approach before by putting these definitions out there, and I when I spoke, I'm not sure how that's going to go and it's not going to... they're almost trying to be a different way of setting forth goals and getting everyone to agree with you on them and I don't think that's how dialogues work. So, I'm just not a fan of the definitions at all. But, you know, go ahead and try it as kind of and I'll see how it goes. But, yeah, so.... I guess Corey I would add on along those lines don't think it's the way to reach, you know, better understanding within people who have different goals. That and to show you that I can also get wordsmithy if I don't... but it seems to me that I think you would want... usually a fishery depends on the ecosystem but I kind of I think I'm reading this to be the other way around and I guess that could, that works too. But, yeah, I just don't think that... I think the discussion should focus on the goals and the practical ideas of how they're achieved more than trying to keep people to use words in a uniform way, which is just, I just don't think it's going to be possible. So, I would either probably vote no or abstain from this.

Brad Pettinger [00:35:26] Okay, thanks Corey. Anybody else? Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:35:31] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I have similar thoughts. Agree with many of

the comments here. I won't be voting for this. And my reason is this is... if it's in... we're adopting what the committee said in the body and that's okay that we've got that, but when we add a definition thoughtfully as a Council, we're setting the definition of climate-ready fisheries for the Council and I think it's more than just doing it on the fly. I think we need to really thoughtfully think... I've never seen a definition that satisfies me anyhow of climate-ready fisheries. And I've heard others say the same thing and I think it needs a little more thought if we're going to go on the record and that's going to haunt us for a long, long time that that's our definition. So that's my biggest complaint about it is that. I think we're good enough with what's there. I trust our Executive Director to handle this and I think I'm fine with that, but I won't be voting for the motion. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:36:39] Okay. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:36:45] Thank you Mr. Chair. I would like to withdraw the amendment.

Brad Pettinger [00:36:50] Okay. I need a second. All right. Okay, thank you Corey. Thank you Marc. It's withdrawn. It takes us back to the modified motion I believe. Well, the previously amended motion. So, with that, Corey, yes? Do you have a motion?

Corey Ridings [00:37:12] Thanks Chair. No, I do not actually.

Brad Pettinger [00:37:14] Fantastic.

Corey Ridings [00:37:16] Actually, I was just going to wrap that up a little bit very quickly. And just note that I actually agree with a lot that was just said. I just wanted to point out this was definitely not intended to create a definition for this Council of climate-ready fisheries. It was in the spirit of which it was provided in the motion, which was that it is to be aiding in the discussion during the workshop which, because I agree with Mr. Dooley, I don't think we're here to create definitions and that's not how this is happening. Why I thought to do this and mucked up my English on the screen in front of y'all is that I do think it's important and about, you know, words do matter and they were part of the motion so Miss Svensson thought that they mattered as well. And I wanted to make sure that we actually have some of the flexibility and latitude that has already been talked about and I felt like that definition was perhaps too short. So, I just wanted to share some thinking for everybody lest they think I'm a total bumbling idiot, and just trying to incorporate some of the good thinking that's gone on this week into that.

Brad Pettinger [00:38:22] You're good. You're good. Okay. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:38:29] Thank you Mr. Chairman. So, I'll ask the question now I promised I was going to ask, which is first, thank you for the motion. Looks quite good. What does it look like when we get through this? What does success look like on the back end of this workshop?

Christa Svensson [00:38:48] Which is a great question. I appreciate it. I... in my mind we would come out with some clear metrics in terms of what it is that we are trying to accomplish. When we are putting out requests for EFPs, when we are engaging in conversations around what a successful future looks like. So that would be that wider scope than just the EFPPs. Based upon the conversation that we've just had we may want to have some further discussion around what terms we want to be using and I didn't find you bumbling around here. And I think it is important to have that conversation and discussion about, 'hey, it probably is more than just communities'. So, if we are going to continue using those terms moving forward within the roadmap, I think it would be beneficial to get consensus from the workshop participants and longer term, get consensus from Council members that those are, in fact, the terms that we wish to be using within at least HMS. One of the possible longer term, and this is

something I'm just going to put out there. This is my opinion, not necessarily other people I've spoken with. At one point we had the conversation about, could this process be used for EFPs in other FMPs? It's a mouthful. And, so if there is the ability to have this work for groundfish or some other FMPs that have at times also said, 'hey, we've got a lot going on and how do we streamline that process'? That could be a possible outcome. But I do like Butch's comment of 'hey, if there are ideas that the Executive Director would like to incorporate, I would certainly be open to that'. I don't want to tie your hands too completely. But I did try and put some guiderails in here so that we didn't have 20,000 topics morphing into 50,000 ideas that you could not capitalize on.

Brad Pettinger [00:41:17] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:41:18] Yeah, and thank you for those comments. I sort of hesitantly asked my question because it risks getting into another debate of what this motion does, but did want just to hear from you a little bit. And so just for everyone's benefit, what I would intend to do is move forward quickly with identifying a facilitator. And I've always viewed the role of a facilitator as helping to scope things out. That facilitator has to do their homework and figure out what the issue is, how to go about executing the workshop. They have to spend some time thinking about the success. But having a couple of thoughts from you I think is helpful in that. So, I don't want to go too far down the road of unraveling this workshop or this motion with those questions, but I think just having a couple of your thoughts on the floor is helpful. So that would be my intention if this passes and just for everyone's benefit, I'm just putting that out there.

Brad Pettinger [00:42:16] Okay. We probably should get it passed first. But, John, before we do that.

John Ugoretz [00:42:21] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. And just bringing back an answer to a question that was asked at the last meeting about the workshop and what it would and wouldn't do. And I recall hearing that the intent of the Council was that this workshop would help inform the development of a roadmap, but would not result in a roadmap itself, that that would require additional work. And I just want to reiterate that. Make sure it's clear on the floor.

Brad Pettinger [00:42:51] Thank you John. Okay, I don't see any more hands. Let's call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:43:03] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:43:04] Opposed, no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Thank you Christa. Okay. Anybody else? More discussion here? We're good? Okay. Kit, I'm going to ask how we did but be gentle on us.

Kit Dahl [00:43:30] Thank you Mr. Chair. Well, I think you did a lot. And I think we... (off mic comments)... I guess I would, well hearing from my boss, the Executive Director, and I would agree, I think we have enough here to, you know, the proximate need to really get down to brass tacks on planning this workshop in terms of content and participation and so on and I think we have enough to go on. I think there's some indication that there is some flexibility for the Executive Director and others to, you know, plan the workshop and take this under consideration in that process. And I think that the final revised goals for the broader roadmap, so-called roadmap, will help inform that effort and our thinking about what this workshop will do. So I think we, it's going to be a sprint I think, but I think we can get something put together to conduct a workshop in early June.

Brad Pettinger [00:44:55] Okay. Fantastic.

J. Administrative Matters

1. Approval of Council Meeting Record

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] We're going to jump ahead to, to J.1, the approval of the Council meeting record. And so, I guess I'm the staff officer for that one so I'll entertain any discussion or motions on the meeting record. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:00:25] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everybody. I move to approve the previous Council meeting record.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:32] Okay. I need a second?

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:33] Second.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:35] Seconded by Sharon Kiefer from the verbal. Okay. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Phil Anderson [00:00:42] I didn't get to speak to my... (laughter)...

Brad Pettinger [00:00:43] Oh, my apologies.

Phil Anderson [00:00:50] I just wanted to make sure we acknowledge the good staff work that is done to keep our records clear and precise and thank you very much.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:01] All right, well, Sharon's verbal second kind of threw me off there Phil so. Okay, very good. Okay now we're going to vote so. Okay, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:01:15] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:15] Opposed, no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Wonderful. And good point, because we always want to thank the good work our staff does so absolutely.

2. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] You've laid out a plan, right? As far as how to go forward but I'll open the floor for discussion. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:09] Thank you Chair. I agree with the plan on appointing people temporarily for... in the interim. I did reach out to Miss Labriola a day or so ago. She has still expressed interest and willingness so I think she would be a good replacement for Miss Kirchner, who we are very happy to have back at ODFW. And I think the same with Mr. Newell. Appreciate his willingness to fill in in April. So, from the Oregon perspective I think that would be a good idea.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:41] Okay, thank you Lynn. Anyone else? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:00:50] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. And thank you Kelly for the well thought out plan. Yeah, for the time being we'd like to keep the Washington seat on the EAS for Washington residents and open to that, discussing that when we get to start our process on composition of advisory bodies, which I believe begins in June. And I think there's ways we can think about doing it differently. And yeah, thanks. We also spoke with Catalina and Kelly. As Kelly said, this was her... she's willing... she enjoyed being, filling in this meeting but wasn't sure about her ability to do that going forward. But the process worked well if she's unavailable. Mr. Chair, I think you were, reached out to Heather and about ideas of filling that seat and so that would work again for us. And I believe there should only be one more EAS meeting before the, the new term starts so it seems sensible to wait, to hold off on soliciting new nominees for that until we get to the next term. So, thank you. Yeah, thanks Kelly for the plan. It works for us.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:08] Okay. Thanks Corey. Sounds good. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:02:11] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I do have a motion whenever that time is appropriate.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:18] Okay.

Sharon Kiefer [00:02:18] It didn't show up yet? I just sent it to you.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:25] Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:02:30] Thank you Mr. Chair. While we're waiting for the ethernet to get the motion. On a related, somewhat related to membership, et cetera, wanted to give everybody in the Council family an update that Director Curt Melcher of ODFW in January announced that he is retiring from ODFW effective at the end of March. He will be missed. We've had his steady leadership for over a decade now. Our Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission is in the process of hiring a permanent replacement. The next step in their process is going to be some public interaction in May. In the interim, Miss Davia Palmeri has been appointed our interim Director. She has been involved in a lot of high level things during her career at ODFW. At this time, we don't anticipate Miss Palmeri making any changes to the Council designees. We'll see what happens when we get our new director, but we thought we should let you all know that Director Melcher is retiring at the end of this month.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:31] Okay.

Lynn Mattes [00:03:32] Thank you for letting me provide that update.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:33] I'm sorry Lynn. Yep, thank you very much. Okay, before we go anywhere with motions, there's no other reports. Public comment? Okay. Kelly, what do you got?

Kelly Ames [00:03:52] I didn't want to interrupt the flow if you were...

Brad Pettinger [00:03:55] Please do.

Kelly Ames [00:03:56] Okay. Thank you Chair Pettinger. I also just again wanted to highlight Miss Anna Weinstein's vacancy, the CPSAS conservation seat. And so, in this circumstance, because the seat is not assigned to a particular state, you know, I would be looking for anyone to bring me a name for an interim position that, again, I would work through with the Executive Director and Chair Pettinger for appointment. Recall the CPS groups are meeting in April and do have some work on the horizon, so if there are interested folks from the conservation community listening out on the internet or folks in this room who know a good candidate for an interim appointment, please do reach out and we'll work through that process. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:49] Okay, very good. All right, so Sharon did you... there's no public comment. I'm sorry. We had a visual. There's no public comment with Kris so. All right, now I'll open the floor for discussion or a motion? All right, Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:05:24] I just wanted to express thanks to Gway and to Anna for their service. Gway has been instrumental in, I think, moving this forward in the ecosystem management world and their organization has been very supportive and has brought forth resources to the Council to make that happen, so very, very much appreciate Gway. Anna was a really strong advocate for forage fish and particularly forage fish that are important to seabirds. And her contribution on the CPS panel was very valuable and we're going to miss them both. So thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:16] Thank you Phil. All right. No more discussion? Sharon.

Sharon Kiefer [00:06:29] Mr. Chairman, I move the Council direct the Executive Director to appoint alternates rather than soliciting for nominations to fill advisory body vacancies through the 22-24 term.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:44] Okay. Is the language accurate?

Sharon Kiefer [00:06:47] Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:48] Looking for a second? Seconded by Bob Dooley. Thank you Bob. Please speak to your motion as appropriate.

Sharon Kiefer [00:06:54] I think staff, given that we're really almost on the cusp of a new cycle for nominations to fill advisory bodies, I think staff has laid out a very reasonable approach to get us through the end of the '24 term.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:12] Okay. Questions for the motion maker or for discussion? All right. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:07:23] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:25] Opposed, no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Kelly, I think we're....

Kelly Ames [00:07:34] That's it. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:35] Very good. All right, that closes out J.2.

3. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Okay. And with that I'll open the floor for discussion. I'll turn to Executive Director Burden for...to see what he wants to do from here.

Merrick Burden [00:00:13] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. Let's see, I was listening to advisory body comments as they were being made and appreciate all the thought that's gone into it. We did hear and have some exchange on SSC workshops. I'm not really sure where we landed with those. Frequently what happens with those is that staff will discuss them and our work plan and try to mesh those into our Year-at-a-Glance Summary and use that as a guide for prioritizing those workshops. So, unless you have other comments on the SSC's request, that's how we usually tackle those matters of business. Let's see, just looking around at my notes and seeing if there's anything else that I feel needs to be flagged. I guess I would just note that there was some discussion earlier about moving the Budget Committee on Friday, April 5th, to an afternoon rather than a morning meeting. I think that is very sensible. Let's see, and then there was also an earlier discussion about the March 2025 Coast Guard Annual Report. I was reminded that we aim to have one of those in the spring, and we aim to do the Coast Guard Report at the spring meeting that's done in the northwest rather than California, so that's why that's in March rather than April. Maybe that answers that earlier question. Other than that, I don't have anything else to summarize so I'd welcome any additional input.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:49] Okay. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:53] Thank you Chair. Executive Director Burden, I know you spoke to it briefly, but I think there's going to be some confusion around G.2, Council Operation and Priorities. If you could provide a little more specific guidance of what you're expecting from the advisory bodies for this meeting. I know this is going to roll into June, but I think they would benefit from knowing ahead of time some expectations. Do they spend a bunch of time on this or take the April discussions and then spend more time for June? I just....some more guidance, specific guidance on that I think might help our advisory bodies on how and where to spend their time. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:34] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:02:36] Yeah, thank you. We'll of course provide more guidance to our advisory bodies. Just the high level comment here. What I'm looking for is, in the... well let's see, we'll take a couple of steps. So, after this meeting we're hosting what we're calling an all advisory body briefing on the Committee-of-the-Whole since there have been some questions about that. We're also... we've just finished, the... I guess... the summary report of that meeting, so that will be in the briefing book. And then what I'd be looking for from you all is whether you have any additional input or reflection on that meeting. But really, I see the bulk of the discussion and the advisory body responses coming in June. And so, this is more informational with some minor refinements potentially, but the bulk of the conversation in June.

Lynn Mattes [00:03:31] Thank you for that additional clarification. I think that'll help set our team... our advisory bodies up to know what they need to do.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:38] Thank you Lynn. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:03:41] Thank you Mr. Chairman. A question or comment for Merrick. Revisiting the Co-op Report from....Whiting Co-op Report into the April, and you'd suggested maybe open public comment and then followed up inseason. I just have had some comments sent to me and, and actually

a couple during the week as well, that our meeting overlaps with North Pacific, the April meeting. And there's some very contentious issues in the North Pacific as well that those very same people will be conflicted in, in the early part of it. So, I would hope you could follow-up with both of those co-ops and we can schedule something that allows them to participate fully in the discussions and the presentations and keeps the Council fully informed. So, just flagging that. So, thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:41] Thanks Bob. Sharon.

Sharon Kiefer [00:04:45] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I was wondering, March of 2025 will essentially have been a year since the signing of the Columbia River Settlement Agreement. And I was wondering, and I'm, you know, within the March meeting or sometime thereafter, if we could get an update briefing in regards to both the habitat restoration actions and hatchery actions that are being implemented because those will have ultimately some meaningful provisions, I think, for fisheries that the Council manages. And it'd just be... I'm not asking for a detailed report, but just kind of a general update to give us a sense, particularly relative to the habitat restoration activities, what the focal stocks, the focal areas will be under that particular settlement agreement? So just something to consider in that year plus out timeline, because I recognize it's probably going to take them at least six months just to get the money. So, it wouldn't be anything we'd need right away, but kind of looking a year or a little more out.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:06] Okay. Informational Report maybe?

Sharon Kiefer [00:06:09] Mr. Chairman that'd be great.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:11] There you go. Okay. All right. Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:06:18] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I know the GMT regularly asks the Council for some guidance on where they should spend their priorities. The three state folks, Heather, myself, Caroline before she had to leave, with Corey and Marci, wanted to provide some guidance specific to the GMT for April, and I think this is now the time to do it. There are five groundfish items on the April agenda. We think F.2, Biennial Harvest Specifications FPA should be the first priority. Number two should be F.5, The Management Measures PPA. And number three would be F.3, Inseason Management. We don't expect there would be a team report on F.1, NMFS Report, or F.4, the gear switching, as that at this point gear switching and I think all the analysis has been completed. It's a policy decision. And then you provided some guidance on G.2. So just trying to help their GMT prioritize their work and what items they should focus on. We wanted to provide that feedback for the team. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:32] Okay. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:07:39] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thanks Mr. Chair. I'm looking at the Year-at-a-Glance and looking at the IRA Adaptive Management response scheduled for November and Director Burden noted this was going to be a planning discussion, and I'm wondering if I can take him up on his offer at this point to provide a little bit more about that item?

Brad Pettinger [00:08:00] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:08:05] Yeah, thank you Miss Ridings. I'm pausing here just because I'm digging back through my memory banks after eight days in Fresno. So, there were three proposals submitted. One of these is a.....one of their proposals it was in regards to, well let's see, it builds off of a, one of our climate initiatives looking at essentially how we can do adaptive management more effectively. And so that proposal, the top line message of that proposal is to formulate a, I guess at this point we're envisioning an interagency workgroup that would look at our processes, how we do our business, and

then look at those through the lens of how we would essentially speed up our ability to be adaptive in the face of climate change. And so, what I would envision here is an initial paper that we would have Kit and our new staff officer take the lead on saying here's, you know, 'here's what we see in terms of fleshing out this idea some more and how we envision it going forward and bringing that to you for your further consideration and refinement'. So that's where my head is now. All of that assumes that we don't keep getting delays in our funding and that we're able to start pretty soon, but that's what's on my mind at the moment.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:30] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:09:32] Thanks. That's very helpful. Just a quick clarifying question, and you'll have to pardon me as well, my memory's not super sharp at this time either. Would that, so we would expect some sort of staff proposal that would be just on the first of the three proposals that we submitted? Or would we expect some sort of staff proposal, potentially an update on the other two portions of that work?

Merrick Burden [00:10:00] Yeah, thank you Miss Ridings. So, let's see, a couple of ways to answer this question. So one is, under the April meeting agenda there's G.4, where we'd begin talking about how to pull together all the different streams of work that are, from my vantage point very complimentary, but still haven't been pulled together between what we've proposed as a Council, the regional office, the Science Centers, and then our other partners and advisory bodies. So having a call after that to discuss how we'd bring all that together. Then there's the sequencing of all the different projects. And so we have them being sequenced in a way that we think is manageable and that responds to the type of work that would be involved. And so, the other proposals... you don't see them on the Year-at-a-Glance yet, eventually you will. I think we still have some thinking to do and talking with you all and others about how to execute all of those, but they would eventually come back for your further input at an appropriate time and in the sequence that makes sense and at a level that is appropriate given the type of project.

Corey Ridings [00:11:10] Great. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:12] Thanks Corey. Anyone else? Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:11:17] Yeah, thanks. Sounds like we're giving comments on both April and the YAG. I actually don't have many comments from NMFS perspective. I think it looks good. The only comment I wanted to note is on the Year-at-a-Glance, on the HMS, the FMP amendment to remove drift gillnet gear, it's my recollection that in our last workload planning in November we wanted....we just wanted to put that on as a placeholder to remind us that. And it was....that's why it was in the last box, which at that time was November. The Drift Net Act doesn't begin its implementation until December of 2027, so we do have some time on that, but it's fine to remain shaded. I just wanted to highlight that that I think was the intent was just to keep it on our radar. But that's the only comments I have from NMFS.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:07] Thanks Ryan. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:12:10] Thank you Chair. And this is more on the April agenda. And I wanted to take the opportunity to respond to the GMT's statement, which I read, my understanding of it was the GMT requested prioritization under F.7, which I think we provided them, but then they said if you didn't use the future meeting to do that. So, I appreciate that and I thought it might be just a good opportunity to refresh some of those priorities from F.7. And so, first of all, recognizing the high priority work for quillback is really the focus for the GMT. But aside from that, from that guidance that we provided that guidance table, I think the key thing there is the continuing to work on pathway 2 for shortspine

thornyhead and really the excellent review that we got from the GMT and the response from the GAP. It didn't flag anything new to add to their analysis, so I hope that gives them some comfort that we haven't piled a whole bunch more on their plate at this point. And then Miss Mattes, I think, did a nice job addressing priorities that I agree with for GMT work in April. So, I hope that's helpful to the GMT. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:43] Okay, thank you Heather. Anyone else? It's only 10:24 I mean... Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:13:57] Well, let's see if we are done looking at the agendas and our schedule, I did have one, I guess it's a proposal. Earlier in the week we did have quite a bit of discussion about quillback and our stock assessments and what we could do better, and I indicated to Mr. Smith, I said I've got some ideas I'll bring them up later, and so now is later. What I would like to do is bring in a third party review of our stock assessment process. And I don't want to investigate the internal workings of science and the scientists in the Science Center. I think we have some of the best stock assessment scientists in the world. But I do want to partner with the Science Centers in doing this review and how our process has evolved over the course of at least the last 15 years. I see some fairly distinct changes that have occurred since my last tenure at the Council and now, and I think it's the culmination of a lot of little decisions. And I would like to ask how we do this better? And so, what I would propose to do is flesh out this idea a bit, bring it back in June, have the Budget Committee consider the expense. Then have you all consider it as whether something we should, in fact, try to execute on. And then the idea is that that would inform our next stock assessment process to some degree. It will be... it will have launched by that time, but hopefully inform our stock assessment process to some degree. And then we can see if there are other improvements we can make thereafter. So that's my overarching, I guess, workload proposal to you all to see if that resonates with you. And if so, we'll take this back and scope this out a bit more and bring forward a more formal proposal in June.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:57] Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:15:58] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And I want to thank Executive Director Burden for that proposal. And I would support it, at least this opening effort to sort of examine how it might be done and what it might cost.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:15] Okay. Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:16:18] I would give that an amen and a support at the same time, so I agree.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:23] Thanks Butch. I'm not see anybody shaking their heads, but Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:16:28] So would the idea be that you'd bring some information forward to the Budget Committee that would help have some estimated costs associated with it?

Merrick Burden [00:16:41] That's precisely right Mr. Anderson. I'd envision... I've got a couple of people in mind that I think would be good at this, and speaking with them about what this would look like, that tells me then how much it would cost and then bringing this to the Budget Committee. I think that's all doable by June and then the Budget Committee can chew on that and provide the Council with some more direct recommendations about the expense and implications on our budget and all that.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:09] Okay. Thanks Phil. Anyone else? Marc.

Marc Gorelnik [00:17:16] I don't know if this was addressed and I completely spaced on it. But before

Council discussion it was raised about changing the time of the Budget Committee meeting in April to 1 o'clock instead of 10 o'clock just, you know, so folks don't have to arrive the night before. It makes a lot easier to make the meeting. So, I just want to raise that again.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:39] Yep. Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:17:41] Yeah, I think that's a fine proposal. I don't see anything, any reason not to do that at the moment.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:51] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:17:53] Thanks Chair Pettinger. I just wanted to also voice my support for Director Burden's proposal. In that spirit, and earlier this week, I think it was under the NMFS groundfish science item or intro item, I voiced some interest in requesting a joint report from NMFS and CDFW and Council staff that describes sort of the historical and current biological data collection enterprise focusing on our nearshore groundfish in California. I'm still interested in that. I think it would be really useful, especially as we're dealing with quillback in California and we're looking at a lot of closures across the state for many fisheries. Again, I think that this data has been really important and potentially under-collected and under-prioritized and just hoping to get some clarity and transparency around that. And potentially down the road this could add in whatever work Director Burden is talking about in an improvement of our process. Noting that this would primarily be the work, in my mind at least, of NMFS and CDF and W and that Council staff would be there to track, answer questions, give initial review, and provide their expertise. So, I don't see that as a huge budget lift for the Council. But when I brought this up earlier in the week, Director Burden asked me to bring it up here as it's not work neutral or budget neutral. So just bringing it up and I think that would be useful.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:31] Okay. Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:19:39] Yeah, thank you Miss Ridings. I would appreciate hearing from other Council members if you'd like to pursue this. If you do, what I would have in mind... just, I guess off the top of my mind... is to draft a letter to the Science Centers and CDFW, and maybe Pacific States might be involved too, just requesting that this review and documentation be done. I don't know that I see much of a role for Council staff other than coordinating some of that. It does fall outside of our wheelhouse. But I think drafting that letter and getting the ball rolling could be something we could do. But I would appreciate an acknowledgment from others if you'd like us to do that.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:23] Okay. Sound reasonable? I'm seeing people head nod their heads. Phil do you have a... okay.

Phil Anderson [00:20:39] I guess I'm a little slow again this morning. If you could describe it one more time for me it would help.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:47] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:20:49] Yeah. Thanks Chair Pettinger. Thanks Mr. Anderson. The concept would just be a report, relatively simple, pulled together primarily by NMFS and CDF and W that would focus on California's nearshore data collection enterprise focusing on biological data, and data that's important for understanding the status of our stocks. I don't see it as being sort of lengthy or necessarily doing much analysis, but simply providing the Council and the associated public with a deeper understanding of what we as a West Coast fishery science enterprise have and how that's informing what we're doing. And I think that it provides for folks that are not living their life deeply embedded in fisheries science

and specifically fisheries data collection, understanding what we're doing can be really difficult. And as members of the public have expressed that to me, I, as a member of the public, I have felt that and I think it would be just incredibly helpful to provide some fluency and some understanding about what, as a West Coast scientific enterprise, we're actually capable of doing. I think moving forward that would help people understand what we can do, and I think that that would be valuable towards several bodies of work we have moving forward in the next couple of years pertaining to how we are thinking about the management of our groundfish stocks.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:37] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:22:39] I have a question unless Phil had a follow-up?

Phil Anderson [00:22:46] So it, basically it'd be, I don't know if these are the right terms, but an inventory of what's being done in terms of data collection and where the gaps are?

Corey Ridings [00:23:02] Definitely about the data collection. I think that gaps would be reasonable as well to get some idea of what might be potential needs moving forward. But my initial was sort of thinking, okay, what have we done? What are we doing now? And can that be for a platform for discussion and understanding on how we can do better?

Brad Pettinger [00:23:29] Okay. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:23:32] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I think I'd like to reference the body of work that has been done by the STAT teams the past few cycles at least during the Pre-assessment Data Workshop process. Every stock assessment, whether it be a data-moderate, a benchmark-full, data-poor, employees use of different data streams, depending on the type of assessment and depending on what's available. In that Pre-assessment Data Workshop process agencies gather, public gathers too, and we discuss potentially available data sources for each assessment given, you know, the species, its range, and other considerations. In California, for example, there are oftentimes folks that are familiar with, say, grad student work where specialized data streams might be available or historic collections might prove useful in that particular assessment for that particular stock. But I just really want to emphasize that it really is a case by case basis, depending on what stock is being assessed or stock complex and what existing repositories have in them. I feel like we do a pretty exhaustive search each time we get together when we're talking about an upcoming assessment. So, I guess, I would just note that that's one place where... I'm not sure what's being described here as this enterprise. I'm not really familiar with what that is or means. But just generally speaking to the data collection activities in the state of California for recreational fisheries, we have copious information about the monitoring programs and the resulting, you know, the estimates of catch certainly are presented here to the Council routinely. In terms of biological data collection, RecFIN is a great repository. We supply our recreational biological information to RecFIN. That information is in some form publicly available. On the commercial side, Pacific States is tasked with the commercial monitoring of groundfish fisheries in California. So, I guess I have some reluctance with proceeding with, you know, a report to try to summarize everything. All the existing activities in the state of California. There are things that go on well outside of us, universities under either scientific collection permits or collaborations, so I wouldn't want to exclude any summaries. So I just want to be cognizant of, you know, I mean to do a very... to do the... what's being asked here I think is, you know, could be a very enormous undertaking and I don't know that we'd be able to fully characterize everything in a simple, short summary. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:57] Thanks Marci. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:28:00] Thank you. Also, thank you Miss Ridings for the, the explanation of what this

is. I needed to hear it twice myself. And as you were describing it, and this is along the lines of what Marci's talking about, I mean under Agenda Item F.3 in this Council meeting, we have a summary of available data to support U.S. West Coast groundfish stock assessments. And so, I mean that's a tremendous resource that we have too in terms of what data there is, and so there's that. And I'm just trying to think about what else the request includes and if it's targeted at this, you know, tremendous request from the public to let us help, you know, let us help with data collection and how does that all fit in? So anyway, I wanted to just flag this great report that we have. It compiles a lot of the data that is available for stock assessments already as we think about how to do this. So, thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:15] Thanks Heather. Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:00:00] Thanks Chair Pettinger. I can just respond to that a little bit in hopes of making my concept or vision a little bit clearer here. I think it is exactly because of what was just noted. Thanks Miss Hall, thanks Miss Yaremko. It is because we have this tremendous data repository. We have multiple sources. We have data that's collected by the states. We have data that's collected by the feds. Marci brings up an excellent point about academia. I don't think that we'd be able to find every single last piece of fish information being collected in the state of California, but I would leave it to our experts to sort of pick that line. But we do have these resources and I think it would be very beneficial to see it together in one place and presented and communicated in a way that this Council and our public could better understand it. I think there's a real benefit to seeing things together. To Mr. Anderson's point, that helps you identify the gaps. We all sort of silo down in our individual states and jobs and geographies and interests and seeing that bigger picture when trying to solve big problems I think can be really helpful. You know, I think that this information and what I'm hoping to get out of here, we need to know because we need to do better. You know, like I was saying, we have a lot of closures in California. We may be looking at more going forward. We're going to try to solve those problems, and I think this is just one piece of solving those problems. We've known we've had data collection problems nearshore California for a long time. We've heard that from multiple stakeholders. I've heard that from multiple folks in government, fishermen, environmental groups, and we haven't been able to solve that, so this is trying to take a closer look at that so that we can move towards solving that. I understand, you know, I think it was even said at this meeting, you know, it's... our borders are artificial in a sense. I mean, they have very real meaning on paper, but for fish and fishermen the state federal line, it doesn't necessarily mean much. So, trying to take that approach and realizing... that's what I, I'm saying that in clarity to Marci's question about the word "enterprise". You know, I think about it as a joint enterprise because all of that data is important together. Finally, I think that putting this information out there speaks to something that I heard this week in public comment, which is that fishermen want to help collect this data moving forward, could be an untapped resource, especially given the cutbacks that we're hearing. And so, by providing some more clarity on those data streams, it could provide the opportunity for fishermen to see what's going on and come forward and help us collect that data, especially as we're having, it sounds like some new technologies are being developed around, or maybe technologies the wrong word, new methods to be able to get information that are coming in as fishery dependent data. I'll stop.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:26] Executive Director Burden.

Marc Gorelnik [00:03:31] All right, I appreciate the intent behind Miss Ridings proposal. All of the data collection that I'm aware of is through, is this fishery dependent and it comes from the state. I'm not aware that NMFS does any fishery dependent data collection, at least in the recreational fishery. So I think that, as Miss Yaremko pointed out, that data is already available. It exists and I'm not sure that we need an additional effort to gather that. I think what we're hearing at this meeting is the need for fishery independent data that currently doesn't exist. And so that's what anglers were talking about participating in, was trying to help collect that data. Now there is some fishery independent data that's

now coming in through CCFRP and maybe ROV, but I don't know that that data has been collected yet. Hopefully it'll be collected and used in time for the 2025 quillback assessment. But I think, you know, I think that the data that currently exists is probably already collected. The one whole, and I think this is an issue in the 2021 assessment, was the inability to age otoliths that did exist. And then biological material that's available but it's not utilized for stock assessment, that might be a valid line of inquiry, but I think that that's sort of an ad hoc thing, at least in this case. I don't know how it exists in other species.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:19] Okay. Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:05:24] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just listening to this discussion and, in particular, I'm sitting here refreshing my memory of the report that Miss Hall referenced. There is a lot of information out there and as I hear Miss Ridings describe what she is proposing, I wonder if it's helpful to think of it as, and I don't want to put words in your mouth, but think of it as more of a strategic view of where we are at in regards to nearshore data collection programs and how that limits our abilities. And so, it's not necessarily a review of just the data, but here's what we're able to do. This is what we're not able to do. This is the implication for the Pacific Fishery Management Council. Is that a way to frame what you're after?

Corey Ridings [00:06:15] Thanks. Yes, I would say I think those words are good words and accurately reflect what's in my mind. I will just add that I... when I was visioning this at the outset the idea was to not necessarily have a gigantic workload associated with it, and so wanted to kind of veer a little away from sort of recommendations or too much analysis and was just thinking more of a compilation, a thought for a compilation for understanding, but I think that that matches with what you just said Director Burden.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:50] Okay, thanks Corey. Anybody else? Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:06:52] Yeah, thanks. And I appreciate you raising this again Corey. In this case I think our centers did want a little more of just explanation of what you're looking for and I think we got that here. And of course, as I think a number of you have had conversations with our center folk over this week, there's been a lot of work that's already been done looking at this, so I think you're right, it may not be necessarily an extremely large lift, especially now hearing the guidance that was just done, so we're happy to at least undertake that. I think it also might be relevant for some of our upcoming discussions on stock definitions. So, thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:42] Okay. Marci and then.....

Marci Yaremko [00:07:47] Yeah, just another thought and reminder for the Council. You know, when we receive our stock assessments and the recommendations from the stat team with regard to future research and data needs that would help fill data gaps for that particular stock in question, I know that the co-managing agencies as well as the Council take those recommendations to heart, and I just want to acknowledge that this Council has quite a history of receiving EFP applications and approving them specifically for the purpose of filling some of those data gaps. I'd like shout out to the state of Washington and the amazing work you did with your EFP data collection on yelloweye and what a substantial project that led to collecting, I think what, upwards of maybe 500 fish somewhere in that neighborhood and how important that baseline biological data was, you know to be used for, I'm assuming for the next yelloweye full assessment. Similarly, in California, we have an EFP that has been underway now for two years, focused on cowcod collections and looking to this upcoming cycle, a pending expansion of that EFP program to additionally collect biological samples of both yelloweye and quillback. When possession limits are zero it is difficult to get hold of specimens, but I feel like

we've done really well in finding ways to still get that baseline biological data that is so essential to our assessments. So, I just want to make sure that we keep that in mind in this discussion. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:03] All right. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:10:10] Thank you. I have a thing I'd like to talk about that is not related to groundfish if now is the time?

Brad Pettinger [00:10:20] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:10:20] Just to maybe put a bow on this discussion before we turn to Miss Svensson. I guess what I'm hearing is support for Miss Ridings concept, and so I would be prepared to write a letter to the Science Centers and CDFW requesting, I'll probably use the word strategic level review, something like that. I just want to say that's what I'm concluding from this conversation and if I'm getting that wrong, please let me know.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:50] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:10:50] Yeah, just on that point Merrick, I think I'd appreciate that. I think the centers would appreciate any time there's a kind of Council request of them as part of this. I'm happy to pass it on but I think an email or a letter or something coming from you too is helpful to the directors. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:06] Okay. Sharon.

Sharon Kiefer [00:11:09] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And once again, just to specifically clarify, we're talking about the types of data, not the data itself. That is my understanding of Miss Ridings request.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:31] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:11:32] Yeah, thanks Miss Kiefer. I think it was... I'm not recommending that gigantic Excel spreadsheets get sent around the internet, or having every last 1 and 0 be compiled into one mega spreadsheet. That is not what I'm suggesting. I'm suggesting other types of data. What's available with them? The year, that sort of thing, I would definitely, all the data sets are different and the information that they contain is different, so I would lean on the experts and the folks who are putting this together to pick what those elements are, but it is definitely a description and not actually cells of data. Does that help?

Sharon Kiefer [00:12:16] Mr. Chairman. Yes, it does, although however having been involved in this type of request, even including all of the years of collection is quite an undertaking, particularly when you have data sets that go back to the 30's may have been intermittent, and so perhaps framing it in more of a more contemporary perspective so that folks don't get wound around the axle on all the historical data might be helpful.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:55] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:12:55] Thanks. I think I will just steal Director Burden's word of strategic and leave it up to the folks who are actually doing this to decide what's strategic. If something from the 30's is appropriate, so be it. If something from just last year is appropriate, so be it.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:18] Sharon, you're good? All right. Phil.

Phil Anderson [00:13:23] I'm suggesting we pause here for a moment and not that I don't, it's not because I don't think the idea has merit, but it doesn't... there's not enough meat on the bones here for me to really understand what the ask is. And I know if I were in, if... if I were in my old chair for WDFW and the Council was asking me to do this with the lack of clarity of it, and not only clarity but wanted to make sure I knew if I was going to embark on this and provide the information, what the objective is. I don't... like I say I don't want... I'm not... it's not that I'm not supportive of looking at what data we have. I've been exchanging emails with different people this week on Science Center people and PSMFC on trying to figure out how we might get some more money to the West Coast for data collection, not only collection, but processing of things like otoliths and ensuring that we have, we can try to get some priority for the West Coast in terms of white ship time and money to contract with private vessels to do survey work, because I really think in my mind that's... if we're going to get ourselves out of the situation where we're having to do stock assessments that don't have enough data to really support, to support them in the manner in which we and the public have confidence in their results, then I just don't see how we can move forward and improve what we're doing. And it's not a criticism of any of the work that's been done, but, you know, we're asking people to go out and do assessments without the needed information and data. So all... I'm just... so as I hear this conversation I'm left not certain with what the product is. And we have another meeting that's not too far away, we could pause here and maybe put down on paper exactly what it is that's being suggested here so we have a common understanding of it and as well as an understanding as how it's going to advance, how it's going to help us move forward in terms of the collection of the data that we don't have in the processing of that data to help put us in a position where we have fewer data-poor assessments being asked for, fewer data-moderate assessments being asked for. To me that's the endgame here in my mind. I'm rambling here a bit, but I just... and I'm not going to stand in the way of, if people are satisfied that the conversation is complete and you know what's going on, great, but I'm still not sure of what it is we're doing here and why.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:31] Okay. Thanks for that Phil. I can't remember of a situation where we had something like this come up at this part of our workload planning, because it's not Council workload planning. It's something outside of that almost it seems like. I like the idea but when you say a pause you want, as far as discuss about this at the pause beyond today?

Phil Anderson [00:18:04] Yes. And it's just... this is me. I'm not... I don't have enough information to know whether giving the head nod on the idea is, you know, is what I think is appropriate given what I know right now. So again, not wanting to, I'm not... I'm supportive of, I think, the intent, I'm just not sure that there's... that going off and asking CDF and W to do the work and I think... and I hear Corey saying I don't want it to be this big, I want it to be this big, but it's the lack of specificity of exactly what we're being, we're asking CDF and W and the Science Centers to do leaves me with uncertainty as to how big it is and how much workload it is, and having them embark on that workload when there's all kinds of, it's not like we don't have... that they're not already fully engaged in their job so...

Brad Pettinger [00:19:24] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:19:27] Thanks Mr. Chair. Thanks for the discussion. I actually think it's really helpful and that is why I brought it up, is to just have these discussions and get to a product that can actually be most helpful. I have maybe a suggestion here that could walk us down the middle, which would be, I'd be happy to, especially given what Mr. Anderson just pointed out, is that we have another meeting in three and a half weeks and I'd be happy to do some sort of Council member report to articulate this a little bit clearer, have a couple conversations in the next few weeks to put that meat on the bones. Something short I'm thinking, like one page, and then we can further this discussion under workload planning in April, if that's amenable to folks. If that's a helpful way to move this forward and making sure we have the clarity to make a decision on it.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:26] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:20:30] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I guess I'd also like to flag, or maybe I'll ask Executive Director Burden when the last time was you drafted a letter to the department that will be received by our Director. It sounds like we're not really clear on exactly what the ask is and the receiver of the letter is to interpret the ask and provide what they think is the right answer and I just, I think caution that we're adding in a number of steps here that will create questions. And if there's something that we can help with offline in terms of providing information and what available data might exist on a particular species or stock, we can certainly answer that question. But I don't know how well a request to our Director's Office, given the description we've been working with here today, I don't know how well that will be received. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:01] Okay, thanks Marci. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:22:05] Thank you. I appreciate how this conversation is going and I've found myself trying to put myself in this position of CDFW and really appreciate those last comments, but then also how without just the letter issue, how would I go home and navigate doing all this or asking my staff to do all of this for whatever amount of this it is as they're working on spex and management measures in the next couple of weeks and all of that too. So, the question here is the timeline. And I understand the sooner the better that we understand where gaps are and we can start filling them and getting better information for our assessments, but also just wondering about a timeline. And again, maybe that comes up in the report that Miss Ridings was offering to write, which I think, I think that would be really helpful, but then also wondering if that would come up in April or June when we can start to think forward after getting through spex. So just throwing a timeline question out there.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:22] Okay. So, I guess we're not going to do anything today, that's right? So...

Corey Ridings [00:23:30] Thank you Chair Pettinger. If the Council wishes to take me up on my offer, I'm happy to prepare a supplemental Council member report for workload planning and provide a brief description of this for April.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:52] I think that would be a great idea and I would encourage some conversations between Council members on that one so...

Corey Ridings [00:23:58] Hundred percent. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:24:00] Okay. All right. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:24:05] Thank you. I just wanted to circle back to the marine planning item we had spoken in a fair amount of depth around the long term cumulative effects analysis and kind of how to bring this back up. I, in talking to a couple of folks on the Marine Planning Committee, wanted to propose that we just make a note to include that as part of the November agenda item under marine planning. And it is not an analysis. It's more about having a research and data needs outline so that should there ever be analysis we already have kind of a document that we can put out there. That would also give us time to get letters out as we discussed to some of the organizations, including WCOA who said they might be interested and to find out a bit more on that. So just wanting to nail that down without creating a new agenda item, but really get it fleshed in there as an item that should be included in that November item we already have on there.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:22] Okay. Any other thoughts on that? It's a pretty good idea. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:25:29] Yes, I think that's a great idea. It was on my list to bring up from earlier this week so appreciate that, Christa.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:36] Perfect. Wonderful. Anyone else? Okay. I don't see any hands coming up. Butch.

Butch Smith [00:25:45] Just one more circle back and like my grandma always said, 'it's always doesn't cost any to say thank you'. And I want to thank Executive Director Merrick for... this is kind of a project that I've taken on through him for a couple of years and looks like it's going to come to fruition just to see how we can better the groundfish process. Not that it's broken, but better. Better disseminate the information and translate the information that comes out of that project and I thank you Executive Director for hopefully making this happen and just making it a better process for all, hopefully at the outcome would be, so thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:34] Okay, thanks Butch. All right, well Merrick, I'm not seeing any more hands so...

Merrick Burden [00:26:45] Mr. Chairman, no, I'm not seeing any other hands either other than Corey Ridings over there to my right.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:54] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:26:55] Thank you. Just reflecting on some of the things we heard from the advisory bodies and wanted to pull a couple things out. The EIS and the EWG requested to meet in person in September, so I just wanted to suggest endorsing that. Also, the EAS made a request for a webinar to discuss their composition and provide the Council advice ahead of our June meeting, and I think it would be good to just put that on the docket if we can. I've been informed that that is considered useful advice in terms of when we get to June and start thinking about composition and they won't meet again until September, so just wanted to endorse that and hopefully it can be wrapped into another... I think, they have weighed-in in the past on EEJ items so they may have something to say on that so if we could put those things together. Also, the EWG requested a webinar ahead of the September meeting to work with the relevant ABs to review recommendations of the SSC/ES meeting, so I would say let's just put that on the docket as well.

Brad Pettinger [00:28:13] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:28:13] Yeah, thank you Miss Ridings. Very happy to take that under advisement. I would just request that we be able to huddle as staff and consider budget and workload sequencing and all that and sometimes these meetings we're not able to get them to transpire or they become redundant, but I do appreciate the request and the rationale, but I would just ask that we be able to cogitate on that.

Brad Pettinger [00:28:47] Sure.

Corey Ridings [00:28:49] I was just going to say, I kind of assume that's always the case when it comes to when we're talking about agendizing things and thinking about the future that, you know, the Council staff are the experts and are always juggling a very intense agenda and their expertise is always appreciated. So, if that was not implied, I'm sorry, I should have said that from the start. I just wanted to recognize that those requests were made and wanted to acknowledge them and, and voice that I think they're worth having, if it makes sense.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:22] Okay. Thanks Corey. All right. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:29:32] If there's nothing further Mr. Chairman I do have a motion. It's just it's not sent. It's just a verbal motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:40] Sure.

Bob Dooley [00:29:41] I move that we adjourn this 275th session of the Pacific Fishery Management Council meeting.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:48] Looking for a second?

Sharon Kiefer [00:29:49] Second.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:51] Everybody. All right. I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:29:58] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:58] Opposed, no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Well, thank you all. Yep, great work by staff and everyone. A tough meeting so see you in three weeks.