

COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPTS

277th Session of the

Pacific Fishery Management Council

June 7-13, 2024

Doubletree by Hilton San Diego – Mission Valley

7450 Hazard Center Drive, San Diego, CA 92108

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. Administrative Matters 6

 1. Council Coordination Committee Update 6

 2. Council Operations and Priorities 11

 3. Legislative Matters..... 30

 4. Fiscal Matters..... 31

 5. Approval of Council Meeting Records 33

 6. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures - 2025-27 Advisory
 Body Composition and Respectful Workplace Policies 34

 7. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning..... 56

D. Habitat Issues 75

 1. Current Habitat Issues 75

E. Salmon Management 77

 1. Sacramento River Fall Chinook Workgroup - Progress Report 77

 2. Queets River Spring/Summer Chinook Rebuilding Plan – Progress Report..... 92

F. Groundfish Management 93

 1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report..... 93

 2. Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Coral Research and Restoration Closures
 – Fishery Management Plan (FMP)..... 95

 3. Final Stock Assessment Plan and Terms of Reference..... 114

 4. Stock Definitions for Species Assessed in 2025 and 2027 – Range Of Alternatives 119

 5. Fixed Gear Marking and Entanglement Risk Reduction – Final Action 121

6.	2025-26 Harvest Specifications, Management Measures, and Exempted Fishing Permits – Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment Final Action.....	129
7.	Inseason Management – Final Action.....	149
G.	Highly Migratory Species Management	152
1.	National Marine Fisheries Service Report.....	152
2.	International Management Activities.....	153
3.	Exempted Fishing Permits	155
4.	Drift Gillnet Bycatch Performance Report	157
H.	Cross Fishery Management Plan (FMP).....	158
1.	Marine Planning.....	158
2.	NMFS Regional Equity and Environmental Justice (EEJ) Plan and EEJ Committee – Update	163
I.	Coastal Pelagic Species Management.....	174
1.	Stock Assessment Terms of Reference and Accepted Practices – Final Action	174

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] Now we'll turn to the agenda and maybe changes to that or need a motion to approve the agenda. Dani Evenson.

Dani Evenson [00:00:10] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to make a motion that we approve the detailed agenda for our June 2024 meeting, as described in the briefing book under A.3.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:25] Thank you Dani. Looking for a second. Seconded by Joe Oatman. Thank you Joe. All right, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:00:33] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:33] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously.

B. Open Comment Period

1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items

No transcription for this agenda item.

C. Administrative Matters

1. Council Coordination Committee Update

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That takes us to Council discussion if any. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:00:09] Thanks Mr. Chairman. My question is for Merrick. In the report there's the reference to the National Standards 4, 8, and 9 topic of keen interest, however no new information was available. To me that suggests that there is some existing information available and I'm just, could you expand just a little bit more so I understand what the issues are around those four National Standards and is there some additional steps that we expect or action or suggestions? Just a little bit more so I understand what that issue is?

Brad Pettinger [00:01:00] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:01:01] Yeah, certainly. Appreciate the question Mr. Anderson. So you may recall that there was an advance notice of proposed rulemaking that the agency came and spoke with us about, all the months run together in my head but I think it was sometime middle of last year, that was being contemplated at the time because the context of our fisheries is changing due to climate change and the topic of Equity and Environmental Justice has caused some to reflect on, I believe, National Standard 8. And so a lot of climate change and EEJ weave themselves together through 4, 8 and 9, and so the agency was contemplating a redraft to the National Standard Guidelines. Since that time, we've heard that the agency does intend to proceed with a proposed rule and we expected to hear more about what that content might be. We have not heard what that content might be. And so that's where we find ourselves now is as a CCC we're interested in weighing-in on this and discussing it because it's something that affects all Councils. There's quite a bit of interest and some concern. There's some optimism. There's everything in between about it, but there's nothing yet for us to sink our teeth into so we're treading water, and that's what I mean by nothing new. So I would maybe look to Ryan and see if he has anything more about where the agency is on this matter, but that's where we are at the moment.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:28] Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:02:32] Yes, so I think what you outlined was correct Merrick. There is a plan to proceed with the proposed rule. It was hoping.....I think the agency, excuse me, was hoping to get that out prior to the CCC. It is still through internal review and clearance is my understanding and that's where we are. I don't have any additional update other than that.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:00] Okay, thank you Ryan. Phil.

Phil Anderson [00:03:00] Excuse me, I had one other question. There's a reference to the NMFS new financial systems that have, I'm aware, have caused a lot of problems and consternation and delays in funding streams, particularly to state agencies, and I'm wondering, perhaps Mr. Wulff could give us a bit of an update on how things are going in terms of working through the problems that were associated with those new financial systems?

Brad Pettinger [00:03:47] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:03:51] Thank you Mr. Anderson for the question. Yeah, I mean our transition has been challenging to say the least. Yeah, it has created a quite a number of issues. This is something that has been taken very seriously by not just the agency, but by NOAA and by the Department of Commerce. I believe the Secretary of Commerce has been speaking to this repeatedly as well as the head of NOAA at various congressional hearings. I think the update that was given to the CCC was the, it continues to be a high priority. As far as fiscal year 24' goes, the first quarter release of funds, all of those funding actions have been completed. We are working on increased communications between all of the, all of our grant recipients and our program offices. We have a whole division working on tracking all of the hurdles, changes, and issues that we've identified as we have started this transition. And as of, I believe the end of April, all non-IRA quarter 2 releases have been obligated, including the Pacific Council issues. So that is the update at least that was given to the ED's at the CCC. I don't have anything further other than it is a challenging issue and we have significant resources being put towards trying to address things as best we can. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:37] Thank you Ryan. Okay, further questions? Comments? Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:05:48] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just commenting on the the GAP's statement on the S-K funding being zeroed out. I know that in May NOAA announced a call for applications to the American Fisheries Advisory Committee. May 2nd to be exact I got the email. And I know that that committee has worked in how to spend the S-K, or to award the grants and to spend the S-K money. My knowledge on that is not complete I guess, but I think that money is being collected from tariffs on seafood to support our seafood industry and particularly in that range. And over the years we've not received this fisheries all that money. There's been a heavy tax taken by the government too and we get a small share of it. Now that it being zeroed out I'm concerned about not only the benefit we get that's outlined in the GAP Report, but also we've got call for applications. We have a committee that is there that does work to identify where the money's spent. This is a, it seems like if there's no money what are we doing? And so I think maybe we ought to be saying something about that. I know it wasn't specific in the CCC Report, at least I didn't see it, but I think it's something that needs to be weighed-in on, so thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:25] Thank you Bob. Okay, anyone else? All right. Oh, Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:32] Sorry. Just to drag this on a little bit, I wanted to make sure everybody had their questions, but I did want to take an opportunity to express some of my thoughts from the CCC meeting. Number one is some acknowledgment or thanks for the job our Executive Director does there, the leadership he shows in the CCC I'm sure you all know it. But in terms of looking for solutions or pathways or work that can help the Councils and work with NMFS, Executive Director Burden has some ideas he presents and some examples on the sanctuaries issue that NMFS and the Office of Sanctuaries are looking at how they develop regulations in sanctuaries. And we've been out of that process and he's suggested that the Executive Directors and NMFS work on some of those things and the harassment and professionalism issues and the budgets are how can the Councils be more effective? So, you know, he brought some great ideas to that and is very much trusted by the full CCC and so it's, as you know, it's very valuable to have him there.

Another observation there. It's my first CCC meeting. A couple of years ago was in a fall meeting in D.C., and all of you are too young to remember the Jetsons cartoon, but somebody made a comment there about the technology, the microphones we had in the meeting. They looked like something out of the Jetsons or that came out of an antique store somewhere and they didn't work well. And this meeting we sat down and we had the same microphones that we have here in front of us. And there were a bunch of TVs around just like this for the CCC to observe. And they had, you know, these owls we use for the other meetings were there. And I heard people who were way back, even at the meeting, who liked the fact the owls were there because they could see people. And the point is where did all of that idea come from? It was like sitting in a meeting here. So we're some.....congratulate our staff, you know, on developing that and we don't realize sometimes how good we have it here and also the management of the sound system. The meeting that we were just that was in the ground floor of a parking garage and so it was very difficult to manage that, and it just made me realize that there's quite a luxury here. So just wanted to highlight a couple of those things. And also I appreciate the GAP, you know looking into those reports that are out there on the CCC meeting website and bringing those comments to us, I think that's very important. You know it's not necessary here to talk about budgets, but there's some linkages is one of the messages I heard there when we talked about budgets is for people, you know, the Councils and as Council members we don't talk to Congress, but there's always this budgeting and issue thing about where could we have influence there, and one of the comments made at the CCC meeting was that members of commerce like things that stimulate economic activity and promote food security. And so we talk about bycatch and bycatch reduction engineering. And the GAP mentioned this Sea-to-School Program and encouraging our markets. And that was part of my question to Mr. Schiff about rebuilding the tuna. There are outcomes from various activities and their outputs, and I think NMFS Reports, you know, they can talk about how many hours they put into going and how many dollars are spent going to international meetings and doing all this work on tuna and the assessments and the outcome of that, I never know if it's right to say the output or the outcome but, you know, so you have a stock assessment and now we say they're rebuilt. But the real outcome of that is this economic activity that's occurring on the coast. And that's the message that needs to get to the people, the value of doing those things. The value of the Council's work is stimulating that economic activity. That's a result of that long term management process we go through. And so I think it's important to hear that type of stuff and people can carry that message and think about food security and economic activity that brings into these various communities and ports and things like that. So apologize for all that time, but there's a connection to a lot of what's discussed there and what we talk about here. So thank you Mr. Chair.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:12] All right, thank you Pete. Actually I think I saw those microphones on rerun of Star Trek, the original series. Okay, all right so that'll take us to.....Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:13:30] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I did want to just make sure that I understand what the will of the Council is with regards to Mr. Dooley's suggestion about commenting on the zeroing out of the S-K funding and the BREP opportunity or the BREP funding. So I didn't hear any acknowledgment from the rest of the Council about that either way and it would help us as we think about our workload just to know if you would like to write a letter to the agency or what you might want to do there if anything?

Brad Pettinger [00:14:03] Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:14:04] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. And thank you for the question. I would be supportive of a letter, particularly in light of the conversation this week at the Swordfish HMS Workshop.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:18] Okay. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:14:23] Thanks Mr. Chair. I guess well then where do we stop? I guess is my question. We have a lot of questions about the NMFS budget, the president's budget, including the flat funding of the Councils. Flat funding of PacFin for going on 20 years, so on so forth. So they're definitely hearing the concern and knowing the value of those. But also hearing Merrick speak to the fact that the Council Executive Directors are thinking about what to do about the overall fiscal situation, maybe just raising a question here more than that, but we've talked in the Budget Committee a lot about how does the Council's.....the costs and benefits of the Councils budget here. How does that get to Congress? And not wanting to put Ryan on the spot at all, but it's been a bit of a mystery on how that works and why, how the message gets to the folks who have the, make the appropriations. So just, yeah those, definitely those programs, see the value, but there's too many budget questions that this Council has.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:41] Thank you Corey. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:15:43] Yeah, I don't know if Phil and I are on the same wavelength here, maybe, perhaps not. But NMFS has already.....NMFS Doesn't have a role now. The budget, it's the president's budget. It's been submitted to Congress. Congress is where that money might be restored. Okay, we don't have a role in writing to Congress unless we receive a request for public comment. So while we may be sympathetic, certainly to the request of the GAP, I don't, I know that writing to NMFS is just sort of pointless at this point because NMFS doesn't have a role at this stage. If we get a request for public comment, Legislative Committee can take it up, make a recommendation, and perhaps a letter would follow.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:35] Thank you Marc. Okay, Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:16:39] I agree with both Corey and Marc's points here. I don't, there's lots of concerns with the budget and that impact the Council and fisheries across the board and I don't know why this one would rise to a point where we would write a letter on this and not write a letter on something else. I remember when they zeroed out PACSURF, that's been, was at 90 million then was at 64 million, and I just, I don't think we should write a letter on this. And number one, and as Marc points out to NMFS, it's pointless. I understand the concern. I'm not necessarily surprised when they do things like this and when it goes through, as Marc said, through the congressional process, lots of things change from the president's budget. So I just don't think this is an appropriate thing for us to write a letter to NMFS on.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:51] Okay. Anyone else? Okay. Well Merrick you're my staff on this one.

Merrick Burden [00:18:11] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the discussion. I guess I will take just this last conversation, I'll assume that Ryan has been listening and that suffices for

in place of a letter. And so we will not take that up under workload planning unless you say otherwise. Other than that, I think this brings a close to this agenda item.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:32] Okay, thank you.

2. Council Operations and Priorities

Pete Hassemer [00:00:01] All right, thank you. All looking in your eyes there's lots of caffeine and sugar in your systems, you're ready to go. So I will look for a hand to initiate discussion. Any thoughts, observations, opinions or discussion on this? Our action again is simply provide some guidance on next steps. Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:34] Yeah, just a small point I think. You listen to the reports and I just, it kind of stands out to me in the GAP Report and the HMSAS Report there's kind of a maybe a model moving forward as far as the bullet points where they're at, but if you want to dig deeper, go down further and report and I thought it was really a nice concise and I think it just a model maybe it's something we might like to see in the future where people just, they cover the bullet points and then people could go from there if they want to dig deeper and maybe ask questions of the people giving the report. And just hats off of them for being a little proactive as getting ahead of it and maybe showing us what the world might look like and still be efficient and get the information out there. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:17] Thank you. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:01:21] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I think I would start out by commending our Executive Director for the work he's done in preparing us for this discussion and potential action here moving forward. I will admit that I was probably in a bit of denial when he first started ringing the alarm bell. Having heard that alarm bell before and not having it really come to a point where we had to make these kinds of decisions, I was hoping that it would quietly go away and fix itself but that, unfortunately, is not the case. Appreciate the, all of the thought that was put in to the comments that were provided to us here. In the reports we just heard a lot of good thinking. A lot of, you know, when you start thinking about all the individual suggestions there's a number of them. And I would suggest that it's probably unrealistic to think we're going to walk through and think about all of those things in one setting here today. I would suggest that this is probably going to be a work in progress implemented over time. And as we move forward there'll be some, there'll be I suspect the Council will make some modifications as it goes along and further considers many of the suggestions that have been made. I do think it's imperative that we set a course here today and map out some of those initial steps that need to be taken so we can begin to make progress toward putting ourselves in a position where we have more financial stability into the future. So in addition to to looking at the detailed report in thinking of the Executive Director having an opportunity to sit in on the Budget Committee's discussion here earlier this week or late last week, I think that focusing on these first few steps that are recommended in the roadmap that you find in your material here under number 5 is a important place to start. And like I say, I think this is a work in progress. We ought to have, ensure that we have these first few steps, that we have agreement around the table that we're going to take those first few steps and that we continue with further deliberation as we move through the roadmap and consider the additional steps that have been recommended. So that's just some of my initial thinking on what I am hopeful that we can accomplish here today.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:25] Thank you Phil. Other thoughts? Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman [00:05:39] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I wanted to offer up some comments on behalf of the tribes. We didn't have any written or verbal reports so thought I would provide these comments under Council discussion. So one of the core Council priorities is addressing the needs of the 26 tribes that have federally recognized fishing rights as other applicable law, and the tribal fisheries and management of stocks that are caught in Council managed fisheries. Salmon, groundfish, halibut, whiting, among other fish species and habitat that support them are critical to the culture, health and well-being, and economy of tribal communities. For instance, today, June 11th, is a significant.....(Joe's phone ringing)...Donuts....(laughter).... I apologize. I apologize, I'll turn my watch off. Okay, let me begin anew. So for instance, today, June 11th, is a significant day for me and the Nez Perce Tribe. The tribe and the United States government entered into the treaty of 1855. I descend from Chief Looking Glass, one of the Nez Perce leaders of the time who negotiated this treaty. And it is our treaty, much like those of the other tribes I represent, is the reason why I sit here today to work in this process to protect our federally recognized fishing rights and the fish and ecosystems that support them. I wanted to note that the tribes are not part of the state liaison contracts despite their role as co-managers, and I encourage the Council to continue to support critical tribal participation in this process, you know the way that you have, as well as potentially other ways as we head into the future. I support the Executive Directors approach of first making the Council process more efficient before looking to reduce the number of agenda items and advisory bodies. Should this not be sufficient to address our deficit, it likely will be necessary to eliminate some items from the Council agenda. I expect the Council will work to pare back the meeting time and the number of agenda items to fit within the Council's operating budget, recognizing that there is simply no way to maintain our current workload with the funding that we'll be working with. As the Council works through this process to prioritize core activities and remove or eliminate non-core activities and workload, that we maintain the ability to address critical items that may go away or be reduced in some manner if certain advisory bodies or agenda items are eliminated. As we work to balance the Council's operating budget, I would encourage us to the extent we can to try and strike a balance between core and non-core items as presented in the Staff White Paper. Much of what made the Council a leader amongst the regional fisheries Councils has come from our work on both harvest management and ecosystem issues along with their efforts to improve public input and engagement. It is important that we not lose sight of the bigger picture challenges that we face, such as managing fisheries in the face of a changing climate and new ocean uses such as offshore wind. To that end, if it becomes necessary to reduce the Council's workload, we should look at each agenda item and determine which are priorities, which can be optimized or streamlined, and which ultimately might need to be eliminated. In particular, our work on habitat, ecosystem and marine planning, while not in an FMEP, does support our obligations to report on impacts to EFH and does directly support all of our FMPs. Our work on EEJ is also important as it fulfills our obligations under National Standards around equitable distribution of benefits as discussed in the National Academies Report, and ensures that we have a role in addressing NMFS West Coast EEJ Regional Implementation Plan. So I do appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments on behalf of the tribes.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:40] Thank you Joe. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:10:44] Thank you Vice-Chair. I just wanted to start with an appreciation for our management teams and advisory bodies and the really valuable reports that they shared with us this morning. I can only imagine how difficult it is to try to find ways to cut back, and I know from

our teams they're willing to give 110% over 100% of the time. And yet I think they did so in the reports that we saw in a way that can be helpful to the Council as we think about what the future looks like. But I did want to acknowledge that it had to be challenging and I really do appreciate the work they do, what they bring to the Council decision-making process and that what I see from them continually is a desire to go above and beyond, and so I just wanted to acknowledge that as we start to talk about this and come up with some recommendations today. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:02] Thank you. Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:12:05] Yeah, thank you. I have to say I was really impressed that everyone leaned in on this. I was a little worried it was going to be people pitching, you know, their FMP or their project, and rather everyone said we get it and we need to work on this. I was also really impressed with the creativity. I mean we had some recommendations made to kind of get the conversation started, but when you read through the reports there are ideas in there that hadn't surfaced before and I am appreciative. I'm not certain I want to do four 10-hour workdays to get us down to a four-day meeting instead of five, but I am appreciative of the thought and the creativity. I also really appreciated the conversation in the EEJ Committee this week around full power versus auxiliary power and the fact that in taking the time to really flesh out what this looks like and move things around, we were leaving the capacity in terms of people and connections so that should we get more funding in the future we would be able to move forward with programs and projects that we have historically done and really have that capacity still rather than making radical cuts and needing to potentially rebuild in the future without those connections. The one item that I do want to put a little bit of emphasis around concern on is that we, as we are looking at this, and I fully agree we need to look at our budget and make some cuts and be prepared for possibly more cuts, is that we don't pass that on in terms of expectation to others. And what I mean by that is if we are asking people who are in roles who have historically not filled in for other people, so asking NMFS as an example for international HMS to provide more reporting. If their funding is also not there we cannot expect the level of reporting from international that we've been receiving by sending Council staff and other participants. And the other component that I am a little bit concerned about in terms of trying to save cost for the Council is the conversation around having meetings at cheaper locations. It may be cheaper, as was pointed out to me, maybe cheaper for the Council to meet in Seattle, but it may not be cheaper for stakeholders that are paying their own dime who don't have access to corporate rates, who are being asked to pay \$50 a day in parking, and whose food costs may be higher to participate. So some thought around how to balance where we're meeting as a Council in terms of cutting cost, but also the stakeholder cost I think really needs to be factored in there to help all of us engage and participate at a level that we are accustomed to.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:58] Thank you. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:16:01] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I think good points have been made around the table already. I also want to compliment staff in that we've already seen cost savings over budgeted expenses so the process obviously has already started. I do think we need to be sensitive to stakeholders to make sure that our meetings are in reasonable locations, both pertaining to the FMPs that may be discussed. I know that we, it's cheaper to meet in some places than others, but as Miss Svensson pointed out, there's a bigger picture to be had. Also a lot of our, I mean the

bulk of our constraints here are the fact that our funding is flat. Inflation since pre-Covid is over 20% and we haven't received 20% more money to operate our Council and it doesn't look like we may get that for the next grant cycle. So we are undertaking steps here that are necessary for us to live within our means. It remains to be seen what Congress does with the President's budget, so we need to start taking steps now, our fiscal situation might improve so let's keep that in mind as well.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:45] Thank you. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:17:49] Thanks Vice-Chair. Largely agree with everything that's been said before me. I'm thinking about a couple ideas that have come up during this meeting. One thing thinking about accessibility of our meetings and where we're meeting and the one of the HMS teams noted and I heard in the Wild Oceans OC Oceana Letter, but the concept of doing a meeting once a year or whenever it makes sense on the timescale more located in a fishing community to be able to get a rotating but wider net of folks who may not otherwise be able to come to a meeting, either because they're not aware or because they can't afford to attend or they can't take the travel and attendance time. Having a meeting in a fishing community would be able to bring those folks in. They could attend our reception, could attend our meetings as well as an idea this morning in the California delegation is that would also allow the Council to get out into the community. For example the SAC open house that some of us attended earlier this week, as well as the tour of the Arctic Fjord that we had in April. So, you know, that's some of the issues around being able to get there. I think Miss Svensson, Mr. Gorelnik just spoke to that. We heard about that as well. So something to offset that cost might be like, that could be a meeting that's either, or would be a meeting where we could just have Council members at that meeting. Anyway, I'm putting that out there as a new idea that wasn't initially presented. I also really like but I think it's going to be very unpopular having ten hour days to cut a day down. So I'm just going to be honest and say that I like that. So as a way for the Council to equally participate in the sort of cuts and the pain that some of our advisory bodies and management teams would be, are going through and has been previously noted we've had a lot of really thoughtful input on this. Another something that occurred to me was when we think about informational reports, and a lot of our advisory bodies supported having those moved, you know, from being heard on the Council floor to an informational report process. And I was thinking about what would be lost in that process? And one of the real, I think, strengths of the Council process in general is the opportunity to learn and to have sort of cross pollination. I don't think that's a word. Sorry, cross pollination? And so just reflecting on an event that the National Fisheries Service did, I think it was last November around recreational fishing, I think it was a roundtable, pardon me if that's not what it was called, and as a member I was able to go attend for I think about 30 minutes and I was really impressed with what was happening there in terms of NMFS staff being able to connect directly with fishermen and that was a more discussional type of atmosphere and just encouraging, I don't think this is like a to do, but just if we do decide in whatever capacity to move some of our informational reports offline, I think that could be a way that we could retain some of that learning and sharing and even help foster that to a deeper level. So thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:19] Thank you Corey. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:21:26] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I too want to acknowledge and compliment our Executive Director on focusing on what's going to give us the bang for the buck to get to where we want to go. You know we need to drain the swamp here. We can't forget about that. We need to, we need to reduce cost and that's, you know, so some things have a lot of impact, some things don't. A couple of comments. One new thing that I learned this morning and a perspective that I hadn't thought about was, you know, we pick venues and cities based on the Council's ability to negotiate a low rate in an area and all of that, and I never thought of the public. It was brought up this morning in delegation that, for instance an example was Seattle. Seattle I think we had a pretty good rate going there as the Council, but the public sure didn't. And we had people, you know, that's an expensive city to live in and eat in and everything else and it's nothing, I mean it's something to consider when we think about these venues and what we do. So just to adding that in there just as a consideration, I don't know, maybe it is being considered and I know that Seattle was a special circumstance and, you know, a product of Covid and not having a place and that place happened to fit the bill through the cancellations and such. The other comment on this implementing streamlined advisory report, kind of building on what Brad had said earlier. I think consistency of format and itemizing the recommendations in bold in one place, beginning, maybe reiterating again at the end. Having a consistent format across all of the advisory groups and management teams where possible makes it much easier for everyone to understand, and particularly when you have multiple bodies commenting on a particular agenda item, it lets you compare one to the other very readily. And understanding a lot of these reports we get the day before, it would help us understand them and bring them together and ultimately have time savings in the big picture. Not just so, I would reflect on the power point in the that the GMT came up with on spex and how much that used to be a 40-page report written, read verbatim on the floor and now it's much more digestible and easy to understand. So I would say that too. The one other thing about the advisory groups, it was discussed at the Committee-of-the-Whole and haven't seen much of it yet, but giving our advisory groups more guidance on what's expected of them in their reports, what they weigh-in on, and I know that was talked about. But another issue that was talked about was the minority reports and addressing that. We've had, I know I've had a couple of the, over my time here which hasn't been that long, but I've had a couple of our advisory panels Chairmen come to me and say, hey, we got to do something about this, the minority report. We have one person out of the group wanting a minority report that's written in our report. And I think we do need to define what a minority report is. I don't discount the fact that not everyone needs their voice, but if it's one person that's what we have public comment for, not two bites at the apple to, you know, to put it in an advisory panel report as well as public comment. So I think it would save us time. It would save some debate that happens within and so taking the advice and then just passing on the advice of a couple of the advisory panel Chairs that I had spoken to over time, it might be valuable to say, look it's, you know, if the minority report is 2 or 3 people, yes. If it's one person, acknowledge that there, it wasn't unanimous and you'll hear more about it later, something like that just to get the, get it down. And I know it's not a big issue but it's in the spirit why we're doing this and particularly as we talk about formats and rules and advisory panels and management teams and such, that we give that advice so that it's clear and it saves them time, saves us time. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:31] Thank you Bob. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:26:36] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So certainly reflecting some of the commonalities that I did hear in the reports, and as we've already asked some of those report presenters a little bit, I know there was a bit of concern over the two-page limit again. I interpreted that as more specific to the presented reports and so I think as we talk about these things to make a clear distinction between expectations for the written reports versus expectations to those presented reports, it may be good to give format guidance on both, but particularly in terms of the written, I mean the presented reports. And I think I hear the committees themselves recognizing a need to summarize. Again, I go back to the last meetings GMT Report, which was amazing where they took something like a 15 page technical report and presented it in a very summarized, digestible format. And I applaud them for that and that kind of leading the way, I think, for the other committees. That is something I don't think we need to delay in terms of beginning to be more specific in terms of our expectations for that. I also agree with the proposal to shorten public comment time. I've been watching the clock for this meeting and generally, whether it's a group or an individual, no one is really exceeding five minutes. I think, I come from an agency where the limitation was three minutes for anybody, and people managed to get their message across. Again, this is something that, depending on how many participants we have for public comment may not gain a lot of time, but I know we had one meeting where it would have made a substantial difference in the meeting time. And again, I don't think it takes a lot of time to go ahead and begin that implementation. I also did generally hear, and they came up with some excellent recommendations, I didn't hear a lot of enthusiasm for a new kind of cross FMP advisory body committee, but alternatively heard many excellent recommendations about how to achieve some of those efficiencies but through different alternative ways. And so I think that merits some review. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:18] Thank you. Have Lynn Mattes then Butch Smith. Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:29:24] Given where I'm going to go it might be better to take Butch first.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:28] All right. Butch Smith, you're up.

Butch Smith [00:00:00] Thank you Lynn. Well first of all before I get started I've been told that it's somebody's 29th birthday. I think it's Jaime Diamond so maybe during break we can all wish her a happy birthday today. So anyway but I want to agree with Sharon. You know when Zoom now is a fact of life and a good thing from Zoom is we get, you know, a lot more testimony on some items. And I am a Port Commission Commissioner of the Port of Ilwaco and and my commission as much as cities all over the United States because of Zoom have certainly had to look at how much time people can testify. And I was noticing today, and I don't mean to pick Michele Conrad out, but she gave very nice testimony. It was very concise and it was full of information and it was all done within five minutes. And so our Commission is three minutes also. Our Wildlife Commission I believe is three minutes in the state of Washington. So I think that, you know, a five and three. And I also think that one thing that I have noticed is anybody that's affiliated with an association all gets the same amount of time. Seemed to me in the old days that the president of an association or an organization would come up and say, you know, have the ten minute or whatever for association and then the others that would come up and support that would be considered as public under the whatever it is now. So I think there's things that we can look at too for making meetings a little shorter, but not, you know, this is a public process. This is one

thing that we champion here is we're available to the public. But I do think, you know, in lieu of what's happened with school boards and everything else that we do have to look at our public testimony times and make them more realistic. So anyway, and I appreciate everything people have said today, but we, I come from the advisory panel world and I come from a time when we were actually begged to respond to different topics and I'm, you know, I'm wondering, you know, too if every advisory panel has to speak on every topic when it doesn't pertain to that particular advisory panel. I've wondered that too. So anyway, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'll be anxious to hear from Lynn.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:06] All right, thank you. Lynn, let's turn back to you.

Lynn Mattes [00:03:09] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I was specifically holding off to try to wait for my chance until everybody else had spoken because I sort of voluntasked myself with trying to wrap this up and provide guidance how we move forward with what our Council action is. I had the chance to speak with Executive Director Burden yesterday afternoon as to what exactly he was looking for from the Council. Did it require a motion or written guidance? Executive Director Burden indicated written guidance would be preferable so I worked on that last evening. I communicated with a number of Council members. I apologize, I didn't manage to communicate with everybody. I ran out of time and brainpower. But I have sent the written guidance to Hayden and Kris and I think this isn't a formal motion but guidance written out so that we all see what we're talking about based on discussions around the table and advisory body reports with help of everybody who helped last evening I think we've captured a lot of it. But since it's not a formal motion hopefully there's room for some tweaking, but I think now would be a good time to start going through that to make progress if that's agreeable to the Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:35] That sounds good to me. Let me just make sure that everybody's had a chance to speak on that sort of high level observations. I think so, but if there's any other things that wanted to be said. I'm not seeing any hands then I'll turn back to you for your guidance. Thank you.

Lynn Mattes [00:04:55] Thank you Vice-Chair. I did want to put in some overarching considerations. These two bullet points were some of the key things I and I think most of us were keeping in mind, and I've heard it both in Council discussion as well as in our advisory body reports, that as we're working on considering these options to create efficiencies and reduce costs, we need to ensure that we do not erode our public process or disenfranchise our public participation. Additionally, reductions in the number of meetings, meeting length, and the use of remote meetings should be spread across all FPs, FMPs, and FMP associated advisory bodies. In other words, we don't always look for CPS and HMS to be remote while salmon and groundfish are always in-person. If one of our FMP advisory body groups needs to be remote part of the time, then all of them should have to be remote part of the time so that the pain is spread about. So into some specific guidance. Looked at the roadmap for implementation of recommendations, which is Section 5 of the Executive Directors Report, and the guidance is to work towards the following benchmarks by the times listed, sooner if possible. If there are things that could be implemented sooner and maybe help start us saving cost sooner that would be helpful. So for January 2025, discontinue staff and contractor travel work on international HMS members and Council member travel to the IPHC Halibut Commission, or to the International Pacific Halibut Commission

meeting. I think we'd already sort of offered up IPHC but wanted to make sure it was out there and transparent that if we're discontinuing international travel support for HMS, we should probably be doing it for IPHC as well. Similar to HMS, there are people from other agencies, other venues who are there and can report back to the Council. So I don't know if you want me to go through all of this or if we take chunks. I don't know what the.....but since this isn't a formal motion, I don't know if we should be doing, discuss January 25' and then discuss September 25', or just go through the list and then discuss.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:15] I'm going to ask people to take good notes, keep it in their mind, but let you go through your guidance here and we'll come back to it.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:21] Okay. Thank you. I should have clarified this with the Vice-Chair at the break. I apologize. For September 2025: Continue to work towards reducing Council meeting length by at least one half a day, including commensurate reductions in the length of advisory body meetings. This may also require a decrease in the number of agenda items covered at each meeting rather than trying to do the same amount of work in less time. Work toward providing advisory bodies with clear guidance on which issues outside of their FMP they are expected to provide comment on. Examples are marine planning and ecosystem. Additional information is needed before guidance can be provided on the proposed Cross FMP Advisory Group, such as where the membership would come from, how and when it would meet, goals of the group, et cetera. Look to revise the public time, public comment time to five minutes for both an individual and a group while allowing the Chair or Vice-Chair to modify that time before public comment begins on an agenda item, depending on how many people have signed-up for public comment. Implement a more standardized advisory body report format with a Summary of Recommendations or Executive Summary at the beginning of each report. As part of that, seek guidance from NOAA General Counsel on what is required to build the record. That is a place where I know various advisory bodies have gotten different advice over the years. Advisory body reports should not have a page limit. Many reports cover topics that have multiple pieces, are complex, and or require a lot of analysis to show the impacts and trade-offs of actions. A page limit could greatly impact the quality of information the Council receives to inform decision-making. Promote summarization of reports, reading only the recommendations or Executive Summary and key sections then have the advisory body member or members is available for questions. Have advisory bodies strive to provide presentations summarizing complex items rather than reading reports as time and workload allows. For March 2026: Continue to explore reducing the size of Council meetings and relocating meetings to more economical locations. Consider having one Council meeting every year or every other year fully remote or only Council members in-person. And this is somewhat new that has come up in the last 24 hours that Miss Ridings just spoke about as well, look into having the meeting in a coastal fishing community, which can encourage participation from local fishery participants and or those that are new to the Council process. Continue to explore annual scheduling for the various FMPs, being strategic in which agenda items would be covered during remote meetings. In other words, not scheduling final action on a contentious issue during a remote meeting. Potential schedule is below by FMP or advisory body. For highly migratory species: Schedule three meetings per year with advisory bodies remote for at least one of those meetings. This would be achieved by dropping the September meeting in odd years and the June meeting in even years to remain consistent with FMP and biannual management cycle. Coastal pelagic species: Two Council meetings per year with ABs remote for at least one of those meetings.

Groundfish: Aim for four meetings per year with at least one meeting every two years being remote. Make a firm commitment, and this is a commitment of us Council members, to have no groundfish scheduled for April of odd years. And consider groundfish advisory bodies remote in March of even years. For salmon: Three to four meetings per year with March and April in-person for all advisory bodies. The one or two other meetings should be remote, depending on topics scheduled. Ecosystem: Two meetings per year with advisory body's remote for one of the meetings. Habitat committee: Their current schedule of four meetings per year with at least one remote meeting per year. The SSC: Five meetings per year with at least one remote meeting per year, which I believe is their current schedule. Schedule advisory body meetings in advance of Council meetings when possible, given Council schedules and process requirements. Explore a decisional mechanism framework to determine effective advisory body size and composition, keeping in mind the EEJ goals and operational needs. For September 2026: Reduce workload and agenda planning to twice per year rather than at every meeting, scheduled for meetings that can help inform the Council's budget process. Between those meetings have Council staff schedule items as necessary. Examine how to streamline the EFP process across all FMPs, such as only accepting new EFPs once per year and approving in a one meeting process, and having only NMFS review and approve/disapprove renewals while keeping the Council informed of those EFPs. Agency reports that are informational in nature, especially those that were available in the advance briefing book, do not need to be read or summarized on the Council floor. Staff from the appropriate agency would be available for questions. And put all informational reports under their respective FMPs and or agenda items rather than bunched together at the bottom of the online briefing book page where they may easily get overlooked. And then for September 2025, and I may need to check with Executive Director Burden to make sure 2025 was the right year for that piece, because it seems like we were going backwards, but work toward developing a new process for considering new initiatives on a pre-specified schedule, which may require changes to the Council Operating Procedure, and this new process should align with the budget process. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:52] All right, thank you Lynn. While you're digesting some of that, I know the Council has not agreed to this yet, but what I first want to do is put the Executive Director and probably the Deputy Director in the hot seat and get an initial response to that because this was crafted in response to the Executive Directors Report and the reports we've heard in the public comment. So just a starting point there. Are we on the right track? Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:14:26] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And thank you Miss Mattes for providing this guidance. It's very thorough. And just my initial read here as I'm going through this, I do find it very consistent with the outline, the steps that I've outlined in the roadmap portion of my recommendations. There is the new matter of the meeting in a coastal community. That's something that I would love to be able to do. What I would like to do is, let me see here, you aim to have that in March of 2026. There's a lot of just logistics and advanced contracting that goes into a meeting and if it is the Council's desire to have that as a aim, what I would do is work with Kelly and our admin staff and come back and say this is what it would take to do that. And I think it would take a pretty substantial change to the way we do things. And then we can consider it more at that time. Committing to it now, I think is, I'd be hesitant to do that. Other than that I think it's very consistent. All these suggestions, recommendations that you have are very consistent with what we've had in mind, but I'll look to Kelly also.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:45] Kelly. Anything to add?

Kelly Ames [00:15:46] Thanks Vice-Chair Hassemer. And yes thanks Miss Mattes. I agree with the Executive Directors conclusions. This looks like a good starting place.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:56] Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:15:58] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Just some clarification for Executive Director Burden on the March 2026 coastal meeting. The intent there was not to have the meeting in a coastal community in March of 2026, but have maybe some more of the information on what it would take to schedule at a future time by March of 2026. Hopefully that is a more realistic timeline than trying to schedule a meeting, you know, for 18 months from now. So just wanted to make sure that clarification was there for you all.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:31] All right, thank you. I'll look around to the Council. Agreement? Disagreement? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:16:37] Thank you Mr. Chair. So in reviewing the roadmap in regard to public comments, it said, imple.....actually indicates implementation of a revised public comment time late 2024, yet you reflect for September 2025. I just wanted to ask if that was intentional or in my mind unless it.....I think the intent was perhaps to move on that sooner rather than take, wait until September 2025. However I will be the first to admit, and we might want a little more discussion, I am not familiar enough with the Council's Operating Procedures to understand where those procedures may need tweaking to be consistent with where the roadmap is going, so is something like revising public comment time articulated in the COP and would require modification or not?

Pete Hassemer [00:17:52] Who wants to respond? Lynn or the Executive Director? Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:17:56] So I had I, through the Vice-Chair, Miss Kiefer, I had it under September 2025 because that is where it is listed in the bullet list in the report. However it does say begin implementation in late 2024. That is why at the beginning I put the caveat, sooner if possible. So if this is something that Executive Director Burden and Deputy Director Ames are able to implement, or we as a group, I'm fine with that. It was just, I caught that when I was typing last night, but because it was listed under that time period is why I kept it there.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:32] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:18:35] Yeah, thank you. I appreciate the question. I do think that's an important point to clarify is that the roadmap portion of my report, the date is by this time we all have implemented this milestone, and the sub-bullets are the essentially the objectives for getting there, and that we would be working on implementing those between now and that time so some could go into place. I don't know if we could do it quite by the next meeting because this one does take a modification to our COPs, but start working on these things earlier rather than doing it all at once in September and doing it all at once in the next milestone, that we're implementing these things over time.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:15] Thank you. Now I'm not sure whose hands went up first on this side. I know I have Christa Svensson and Ryan Wulff, and I have Bob Dooley on my right. So let's start with Christa and then Ryan. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:19:27] Yeah, thank you. I am generally supportive. I do have some concerns around the HMS meetings that were proposed in terms of which ones might be possible to miss. I believe it was September and June, and I apologize I don't remember which page that is in taking notes. I am not certain that that would be wise. And the reason that I am not certain that that would be wise for missing those is if we are asking myself at this point in time, but somebody else in the future, to represent our stakeholders in international forums or National Marine Fisheries, the PAC meeting, which sets the priorities for the Western and Central Pacific happens in October, which means we would not have the opportunity collectively to get input from our stakeholders and provide that information as we move forward. So I, it's a similar situation in June for Northern Committee. It may be more prudent to have the November meeting be the meeting that we drop. We're currently not meeting in April is why I'm not proposing that one. But I would just ask that we leave that particular timing flexible and probably get a bit of input from our advisory stakeholders before making that decision by committing to it on the floor today.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:03] Thank you. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:21:07] Yeah, thank you. And thanks Lynn for putting all this together and getting it in writing. I think this is really helpful and I support the guidance and NMFS will take this back too and also will bring to our next discussion on this any relevant issues we might see as we look towards actually implementing these. But at least on the surface right now I think it's good guidance. I actually have a different view than Christa though. I support the HMS schedule here as outlined in the HMSMT Report, which gives rationale for it. And we, I don't think we could drop November for the reason that is when we take final action on spex so. But that said, again, this I think is more guidance to look into. It does have a lot of, this is what we're aiming for, but it's not necessarily hardwired. So hopefully Council staff will continue to look at this and then we can come back and discuss that in more detail. I did want to also underscore, I think whichever one it was getting at, and I appreciate Lynn putting in the, if sooner if possible, at the beginning, you know, the way you read the report as well as the timeline that's in the guidance here. I'll give you an example of something that NMFS is very supportive of which is giving groundfish every other April off. By this timeline that wouldn't happen until April 2027 and I don't think we need to wait that long. We've got a very.....just a NMFS Report right now and potentially inseason on for April of 2025, I don't see why we couldn't start to implement some of these sooner just like points that have been made, but I think that's covered here in the guidance. I just wanted to underscore that point from our perspective. And then lastly, just appreciate all the discussion that we had prior to this. I think this is a positive start to many changes that we can make that will, I think, help our process and our efficiency, and also provide some cost saving for the Council. But I'd note that the whole roadmap itself, the savings that are listed in there, only total about half of the current annual deficit that's projected earlier in the document. So I think this is a start but there will obviously potentially need to be additional discussions as we go forward if there isn't any new appropriations or fiscal support to the Council. So just put in that as a caveat. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:50] Thank you. Bob Dooley then Butch Smith.

Bob Dooley [00:23:54] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Maybe a question for Ryan and get his opinion on this. But it's, looking at the EFPs and going to once a year, and I know in the past we, you know, at least my understanding has been that the agency can issue EFPs independent of the Council and have modified some of the EFPs or added people to it without Council guidance, and I'm wondering if hardwiring this to once a year if it has the potential of taking some of the oversight the Council has into an input that we give to EFPs over time? And would it lead to more EFPs being, going around the Council process and being implemented by the agency? So just I'm thinking about it from your input and understanding what's gone on in the past. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:47] Okay Ryan, a response?

Ryan Wulff [00:24:49] Yeah, through the Vice-Chair, Thank you Mr. Dooley for the question. I think it's to some extent on a case by case basis, right? But I don't think in principle there is any issue with condensing it to one meeting, right? I think, you know, it's clear in the EFP regs, even though NMFS does that on its own to a process, it does specify, you know, try.....the Council should be engaged when possible and to eventually try and overlap Council engagement with public comment and things like that. So the intent of getting the Council's view on those is foreseen and written into the regs to some extent. I think we heard, I forget which advisory body, but someone recommend maybe if it's renewals, you don't need to come back. I think that's a big difference than a brand new EFP that has potentially a lot of ramifications, right? So I think the way this guidance is written would still allow the flexibility for us to broaden that Council engagement even beyond one meeting as needed, especially on a case by case basis. But I think in general there are ways to condense this and consolidate this, but while still preserving valuable Council input prior to any NMFS approval of an EFP. And we heard a lot about that on the HMS front at the Roadmap Workshop as well as in the advisory body reports. You know we may need to cater a little more specifically based on FMP, and based on that EFPs too that are coming at us, but I think that's something that we can work with even under this guidance.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:31] Follow-up Bob?

Bob Dooley [00:26:31] Yeah, thank you Ryan. I appreciate that. I just really wanted to flag it so it's in people's mind when we think about that, and particularly the Executive Director and how it all fits in the big picture. So thanks for that input. Appreciate it.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:46] All right, thank you. Butch Smith then Marc Gorelnik. Butch.

Butch Smith [00:26:50] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And most excellent job Lynn. One thing that I would, you know have questioned is, although I'd love to have a meeting in Newport or on the coast, but the logistics of getting everybody out there. I don't mind making the three hour drive but, you know, getting people from Portland Airport might be more than, might have a negative effect till hopefully we have better times. But, you know, I see this as a shopping list to fit in with our, within our Christmas budget, and the person who can do the analysis on how well we did and how much money we have to spend for Christmas I think is the Executive Director. So I guess for me if, you know, we want to add more things to our Christmas list and see if we can pay for them, that's one thing, but I think pretty soon we're at a point where Merrick and his crack staff take this back and see if we made the mark or or how much more we got to go to make the mark I think is

the important thing because I myself, you know, this is what we would do at the port and then our auditor/treasurer would go through that and tell us why we can't do it or we need to cut more or we're just right. That's what I would be interested at whatever the end of this, what Lynn has done at some point in time, and I would hope maybe it could be done before September so we could get a look at it before we got to the September meeting and to see, because at some point in time I would suspect we can't keep, and we're not kicking the can down the road, I know that's kind of a bad analogy here, but kind of we are kicking the can down the road and we have to go ahead and make some of these tough decisions. And I always think it's a little better sooner than a little better than later and so, I mean I think that's what I'm hoping will happen out of this process. Whatever list we develop here in the next whatever minutes or hour or whatever, it's taken back and analyzed by the Executive Director and his crack staff to see how really close we are from hitting the mark. So thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:39] Thank you. Executive Director Burden, a response?

Merrick Burden [00:00:00] Yeah, thank you Mr. Butch for those comments. As Kelly and I have been discussing this guidance and how to move forward from here, we would plan to do, I believe, what it is you're suggesting. And so what what I picture is coming back in September with here's our plan following this guidance and here's when we're going to start implementing the following things, everything from public comment time to Council meeting planning. And there's an assessment of the budget impact that goes along with that. So that would be our plan. And then I think you had a specific point on a coastal meeting. I don't know if you want to get into that, but the way that I could see that working would be, one, I can't think of any coastal hotels on the West Coast that could hold us in the way we do our current business. So we'd be looking at a potentially a Council member only meeting, right? But in a coastal community. And so that, those are the things that will take us some time to work through and show you this is what it would look like if you want to meet in Newport or Ilwaco, here's a good place too, that's going to take us a little more time to outline how that exactly would work if you do want to pursue that.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:15] Thank you. A follow-up?

Butch Smith [00:01:16] Just a follow-up, if I may? I'm sorry I forgot one portion of. And then Vice-Chair, thank you, but you know Merrick for me, you get this back and it's not quite what we need to do, I would certainly love then for you to put some more suggestions down and what those equal on what you think, give you the latitude to go back and give us more ideas if needed on where we could save and certainly bring it back and the Council could decide if they have better ones or not. But it certainly kind of gets the conversation going if we have some things to think about if we're not quite on the mark where we could, where we could get there, that's what I envision and maybe my vision is bad, but that's what I would envision would happen at the end of this, whatever the end of this process means today. So thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:18] Thank you. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:02:20] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I too see merit and meeting in coastal locations, but from the discussion it seems like we're not doing that already. We're in a coastal location here. Our Costa Mesa location is four miles from numerous harbors. Our Vancouver and

Portland locations are on the Columbia River which, you know, we have a fair amount of responsibility at some level for fisheries that take place there even though they're state managed fisheries but, so I'm not sure is coastal, a coastal meeting place, is that a euphemism for something else? Because I do share Mr. Smith's concern that if we're talking about, you know, a remote commercial port, it does, even on a Council member only basis it's still, you know, there's associated costs and whatnot with that. So, I mean to the extent we're not getting these, you know, I think the exposure we got in Seattle and here were tremendous. I think those are probably also possible in other locations we've been at but maybe just haven't taken advantage of. I'll have other comments but I'll just want to leave that out there.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:50] Okay, thank you. Did you want to respond?

Merrick Burden [00:03:53] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chairman. It might be better to defer to the EEJ committee members that raise this point, but I took that comment to mean that we'd be looking at a more rural, remote fishing community as a place to host a meeting as opposed to Seattle or the bay area or San Diego like we are now, which are all fine places but that there is a desire to connect to more rural places that are less able to get to our large meeting venues at the moment, but I'll let somebody else clarify that if they have that point to make.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:26] Okay, well Corey Ridings has her hand up. Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:04:31] Thanks Vice-Chair. Thanks for this. Yeah, I think Marc made a really good point and read my mind. We are in a fishing community right now. We were in one at our last meeting in Seattle. And Director Burden I think you just hit on what I, I didn't take the time to describe earlier, which is the report talked about meeting only in large urban areas. And those are fishing communities across the coast and we also have a lot of fishing communities that are in rural areas. And to your point, because we have such a large enterprise here it can be difficult to impossible to meet in smaller more remote rural areas. And so the idea would be if we are moving to a meeting that is only Council members, and we have really put our size significantly lower, that that creates the opportunity to go to some of these smaller rural fishing communities. And my point was just that I see that as a big value add. And I mean I would love to go to Santa Barbara. I would love to be in Santa Cruz. I would love to be in Ilwaco. I think that would add to the Council process. Yeah, that's it. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:46] Thank you. Marc Gorelnik then Phil Anderson.

Marc Gorelnik [00:05:49] All right, thanks for that clarification. And while it's not mentioned here, and perhaps it's not a live issue anymore, there was a discussion at our previous agenda items on this topic about the March and April meetings and salmon. I think that my understanding is that Sacramento is back on the menu for a meeting location and that may eliminate the need to fix the April meeting in the Northwest. And if I misunderstand that please let me know.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:29] Okay, thank you. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:06:33] Yeah, thank you for that point Mr. Gorelnik. Just quickly in response, as you know the bay area is very expensive. Sacramento had been the one area where we had been

able to meet. For a variety of reasons that relationship with that hotel fell apart. We did get an inquiry from them recently asking if we were interested in trying again and so it might be back on the menu. We might not want to select it but it is on the menu so happy to keep looking into that. If it's not the will of the Council to fix that rotation as you indicated, I feel like there are always possibilities and we can keep trying. So maybe that's a, hopefully that's a sufficient response to your point.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:21] Marc.

Marc Gorelnik [00:07:21] Well I would hope that before any such decision were made there would be a thorough vetting of that. It is important for salmon. You know salmon, the salmon process, I've not been involved in groundfish, CPS, and others, but I was on the SAS for many years before I was on the Council and that process involves face to face hallway SAS discussions, stakeholders present in numbers, which is one reason I think those, and I think it's recognized in this guidance that those meetings need to be in-person. Sometimes the March meeting is more important. Sometimes the April meeting is more important. We never really know. But the April meeting is where the final discussion, final decisions are made and so on that basis one may argue it's a more material meeting than the March meeting. And in order to share the burden among the stakeholders and among the states, we have to my knowledge always followed a rotation and I would not want to see that disturbed and I think we need to find a way to maintain that. And so I don't know if we're making any decisions here on that, but I just wanted to keep that issue top of mind because we want the process to be as equitable as possible and to disadvantage one state or one community on a regular basis I think would be unfair. The burden has to be shared.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:06] Thank you. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:09:11] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Just appreciate the work that Lynn did in putting this synopsis of the report together to help focus our discussion. I'm generally supportive of the points that are being made. I would reiterate that I think we need to leave here with an agreement on what some of the first steps that are going to be done. I mean understanding that, I think to Mr. Smith's point, that having the Executive Director come back in September and, you know, with an idea of whether or not this package will meet the mark from a financial viewpoint is important. I still think that there are, these first few steps are important to get some agreement on so we can start moving forward. There was one point at the outset of the guidance where there was some language about if you do have to do one something to one AP, you have to do the same thing to them all. I would hope that we could be more surgical than that because I think there are tools that we can use for some APs that aren't as applicable to others, so I hope there'll be some flexibility in that piece of guidance. Maybe on a lighter note. My first Council meeting as a Council member was held in Coos Bay in September of 1987. I was on a motorcycle trip here a few years ago and stopped by and spent the night at that hotel and to say it had deteriorated quite a little bit from the last time I was there it would be an understatement, so I'm not sure. We also, I also remember vividly going to Eureka twice, and the first time we were there, there were some significant reductions in the California salmon fishery and we were, they actually had a dummy that representing the Council. They hung it in effigy out in the courtyard and set it on fire. And we had Dick Schwartz was the, was the Chair at the time and I was the Vice-Chair and we had a fire

extinguisher located right up there by the Chair. So anyway, maybe you should take a look at Eureka again, I don't know.....(laughter)...

Pete Hassemer [00:12:09] Thank you Phil. Lynn Mattes had her hand up. I just want to, in response to some of your comments which I appreciate very much, as we go through we're discussing, and I agree there, identifying a couple of things that we agreed to immediate that we can do will be good. Obviously there are some things we discussed that need a little more work and processing. So again, not to surprise the Executive Director, but as we wrap this up I'll ask him for a vision of for the guidance that the staff receives from the Council, what should we expect as an outcome from that? How will we proceed and reports back and that on these various things and what could be done? So I'll give the Executive Director an opportunity to explain how this would be implemented and what we would expect from it. So, Lynn you had your hand up next.

Lynn Mattes [00:13:09] Thanks Vice-Chair. Just on the subject, the topic that Mr. Gorelnik brought up about the location of the March and April meetings. I specifically did not include guidance in that one, on that one in my guidance because it seemed like additional discussions needed to have and there are no reports from the SAS or STT under this agenda item so I didn't want to preclude that discussion. It seemed like something that still needed to be discussed therefore it wasn't included. It was intentionally omitted for further discussion. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:46] Okay, thank you. I have Joe Oatman then Bob Dooley. Joe.

Joe Oatman [00:13:51] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I wanted to flag an agenda item that I don't think we've discussed or considered yet, at least that I could tell. So as we're looking to kind of pare things back both in time and agenda items, there's also the open comment period portion of our agenda where it's usually identified as about 30 minutes. And so I think the Council might want to give some thought to, you know folks maybe really lining up under that portion of our agenda and that might add in significantly, possibly more time than 30 minutes. Just something to be mindful of I guess.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:42] Thank you Joe. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:14:44] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm just making a comment on venues and experiences we've had in the past and then new experiences. And I think, you know, typically I know from my personal experience I'll go to a hotel and I had a great experience and I'll go back the next time and it's not so great. And I think we've had that, we've had that happen to us in venues. And I'm wondering if some of this isn't our comfort in going back to places and expecting it to be the same and understanding staff turnover, management turnover and all of those things. And maybe that's something as we line up new venues and prepare to go to those new venues or even old venues, make sure our expectations of what we expect are addressed and before we get there. I know in recent times we've ran into a lot of resistance. Our donut policy and we've run into resistance on our table-of-plenty policy, and I'll give you mine because I don't have an opportunity to comment on that in the future. I think this is a component of who we are. I think it has value beyond just the fact that there's donuts, or just the fact that there's snacks. It brings us together. It makes our Council different. It makes us a family. And I think we need to make sure we stake out that ground and when we talk to a venue we make sure that they understand that we're not trying

to cut off their income, we are, but it's an important component of who we are. And when it's missing I miss it, I miss it, and not from a food point of view but from bringing us together walking across the table and talking. So I would.....one other comment I want to make in response to Miss Ridings ten-hour day comment. And it relates to the same conversation, Council family. You know we put a lot of time at this table, a lot of time in a week, and but we, I particularly and I think others would agree, get equal benefit from being able to have time to interact with our advisory panels, the public during the week to get, to feel the heartbeat, feel what's going on as we make these decisions. And I think if we assign more time for us to be at this table it's less time for that and we become more distant to the people we represent. And you know I, before I got on the Council David Crabbe told me, he says one of the most important times being a Council member is pelican time, and pelican times when the pelican sitting on the piling looking around looking for the bait and looking to interact. And so he said, that means get out in the community. That means get to the delegation meeting a half an hour early because there are people that don't feel comfortable talking or don't, they want to approach you and talk about issues. And I think if we go to a ten-hour day we'll have less of that. That ten-hour day really does equate to about a thirteen-hour day when you're a Council member and you know that already. That additional two hours could really hamper our ability to function and our ability to function efficiently and take into consideration the public and the industry that we represent. So thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:39] Thank you. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:18:42] Thank you. And I want to thank the, what you just said Bob and for some of the input from Phil and acknowledge the really sound advice coming from you about this, I'm going to miss that after this meeting. I had the opportunity to run into Dorothy Lowman last night and she said something that really stuck with me that I just wanted to share too and as we're thinking about this and as Merrick and Kelly go back to dig into the details is, trying to find the right balance of changes that we need to make to adjust to our budget realities but in a way that doesn't deter the interest in the caliber of professionals that serve on our advisory subpanels and our management teams. We want to make sure they're continuing to be interested in participating in this process. So I know that's an obvious consideration for all of us but I did want to just put it on the record. And even this morning in our delegation meeting we had a really good conversation. We're at an important meeting for groundfish, it's final spex, and having our GMT and our GAP together at this meeting and working through difficult situations, even though this particular spex hasn't been too contentious, is really important to keep in mind. So just wanted to offer that as kind of similar to the introductory statement I made as we started on this and just thinking about those things as we think about how we change our Council operations and but also remember what makes a good Council, effective Council. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:39] Thank you Heather. Looking around I'm not seeing any hands right now so what I would like to do, hopefully I gave the Executive Director fair warning. This is a long list of guidance. Thank you very much Lynn for putting that together and initiating the discussion. I can't look around and ask if everybody agrees with it. Obviously there are areas where there it needs a little bit of work. So I will ask the Executive Director to think about the list of guidance that is proposed, how he and his staff will interpret and implement that, and what considerations they'll have with respect to all of the discussion that was had. Basically, what can

we expect as an outcome from this guidance and the discussion surrounding it and see then if you agree with that path forward. So Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:21:44] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. Well I'm, as I think about the timeline for implementation here I go back to our Budget Committee meeting earlier this week and I think Phil said, we're trying to turn a big ship and you turn the wheel and you keep turning and it takes a long time. And that thinking is consistent and embedded within the roadmap that I suggested and that Miss Mattes has picked up on in this guidance. So it's going to take a little bit of a while to do this and we have some time and I think taking that time is important to our continuing the smooth operation of the Council. And so that's what's in my mind as I think about how we go about implementing these things. So coming out of this meeting what I picture is Kelly and I in particular working together on really specifying a clear set of steps for everyone, the Council, all the advisory bodies, just to communicate that here is how we're going to start proceeding. I picture a table with dates and we'll have that in the September briefing book. There's probably going to be another stab at that in November as this conversation continues. Along with that there are some things here that are pretty clear like public comment times that would require a change to our COPs, so we'll start introducing new COP language in September. And then as this clarifies itself again we'll probably do that in November. And that's a standing item on our Council agenda. In terms of actual implementation, because public comment does require a change to our COPs, I would envision that being implemented, any change in our public comment time being implemented in November. I also see the suggestion for AB report formats, that being implemented in November. In January because of staffing and other issues, I think we just have to say January is when we would discontinue our staff engagement in international forums. And that the IPHC also begins in January and we would discontinue a formal Council representative at the IPHC at that time. And then as we get into mid-2020, what year are we in?....(laughter)... Mid-2025 through the end of the calendar year, what we're going to start doing, what I picture is we're going to start streamlining our advisory body meetings. And what that is going to entail is trying to implement some of these sequencing steps. Can we sequence these advisory bodies in a way that minimizes the overlap. Focus, it would result in a more focused Council meeting. Like if it's a CPS meeting, the Council will spend more time on CPS than we're used to. If it's an HMS meeting, we'd spend more time on HMS than we're used to, and so Kelly and I start massaging our agendas to reflect that. And so that's going to take us some time I suspect, and so I'm looking at at least a six month implementation horizon there. So that gets us through the next year and a half and that's what I have in mind in a steady, systematic way of implementing these steps so that we don't cause disruption but that we make the pace that we need to make. Happy to pause there and see if folks are looking for more?

Pete Hassemer [00:25:22] I will look around and see if there's agreement with that? Any strong objections? I'm not hearing any objections. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:25:36] I would agree with all that you said for sure Merrick and I appreciate it. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair for the opportunity here. I failed in thanking Lynn in bringing this forward and have our ability to focus on this and I thank you. Thanks a lot. The other thing I was just thinking about here is as we start thinking about particular EFPs being at particular times of the year in meetings, I've noticed over time that like we come to Southern California in November typically and it's a better opportunity for a lot of the HMS fisheries to engage. And you see the

people in the audience that are, and the public coming forward they're in that vein and maybe we should think about where we are in terms of cost savings there too to everyone including the public, as where we schedule our meetings in the future if we're going to focus things particularly in a particular area. So just an observation. So something that might be an effect of this change could be that, that we need to think of that as well. So just wanted to mention it. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:07] Okay, thank you. Any other comments? Otherwise I think we have a path forward here. It's been described. Kelly, since you're in charge now on this, wrapping us up how did we do?

Kelly Ames [00:27:24] Thanks Vice-Chair Hassemer. I think Executive Director Burden summarized our next steps and from my perspective your work here is done and we'll see you again in September on this item as well as at the November Council meetings.

Lynn Mattes [00:27:45] Sorry, I don't mean to belabor this, but in the Sit-Sum there was talk, there was mention of the prioritization exercise, Attachment 2, we have not discussed that. I don't want to drag this out but just want to make sure we don't miss that. Just in general I think that's a good starting point, but it needs some additional work. I don't know if we need to have a big discussion on that, but just didn't want to miss that piece to this agenda item.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:18] All right, I'll look around see if there's any other thoughts on that or maybe Kelly or Executive Director Burden how we proceed on that?

Kelly Ames [00:28:28] Thanks Vice-Chair Hassemer. I appreciate that acknowledgment Lynn. My understanding is that the Council was seeking to see how these changes first addressed the issues at hand before moving into that prioritization exercise, but I would appreciate head nods or confirmation if that is a correct understanding.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:53] I see some heads nodding in the affirmative to that. That's a good sign so excellent. Well with that I think we've completed our work. It was very important work. I thank everybody for their attention to and engagement in this topic. And with that we'll close the agenda item and I'll pass the gavel back to our Chair.

3. Legislative Matters

No transcription for this agenda item.

4. Fiscal Matters

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] All right, so we've got our charge to consider the report and recommendations of the Budget Committee so I'll open the floor for that. Not everybody all at once. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:22] Well not seeing anybody willing to jump out. I'll see if I can stimulate discussion. I do have a motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:30] I like motions.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:32] All right. I'm going to have to go off the top of my head on this one. I move the Council adopt the recommendations of the Budget Committee as described in Agenda Item C.4.b, Supplemental Budget Committee Report 1, June 2024.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:23] Okay, is the language on the screen accurate?

Pete Hassemer [00:01:25] Yes it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:27] Very good. Looking for a second? Seconded by Butch Smith. Thank you Butch. Please speak to your motion Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:34] Thank you. Just appreciate all the work done by the staff to get us to this point. And it's, there's going to be some complex and a lot of work continued for the staff, especially Patricia, when we consider all the sources of funds coming in but they're up to the task and can handle it so I think this sets us on a good path. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:58] All right. Thank you Pete. Questions for the motion maker? Discussion on the motion? Lynn Mattes. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:02:13] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to commend the Budget Committee and our Executive Director and staff for all the hard work they've done on this budget and enlighten us on all the shortfalls that we're going to have if we don't change our ways. But I do want to commend them on that and we're lucky to have such good people working on this, so thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:37] Thank you Bob. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:02:40] Thank you Chair. While not currently a member of the Budget Committee, I was able to sit in on the meeting the other day and listen in and there's a lot of work that has gone into this, but I think some of what we're talking about in this budget that we're going to adopt and all that is somewhat dependent on something we're going to be talking about tomorrow morning with the Council efficiencies and Council procedures. So in my mind it made a little more sense to do that than this but I understand the need for the timing. I just wanted to note that I'm keeping that in mind as well as I think others of us should keep that in mind as we

start talking about tomorrow and that process, this budget, because those are very intimately tied together. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:27] Thank you Lynn. All right. Anybody else? All right well don't make me call for the question here. All right, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:03:43] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:44] Opposed no? Abstentions?

Josh Lindsay [00:03:47] Abstention.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:48] Abstention. Thank you Josh. Abstention by the National Marine Fisheries Service. All right, and that motion passes. All right, so okay. Patricia, how are we doing?

Patricia Hearing [00:04:02] This completes your work. I'll see you in September.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:05] That's how I work this week. Alrighty. Well thank you.

5. Approval of Council Meeting Records

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] We're back in session and we're on to C.5 and I'll turn to Merrick Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:00:09] Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. This is Agenda Item C.5, which is the approval of the Council meeting records. The draft meeting records for the March 20, March and April 24' Pacific Fishery Management Council meetings are provided in your briefing book for your review. What we are doing here today is approving those and they are Attachments 1 and 2. These draft meeting records also serve as the official meeting minutes and contain links to documents for the meeting as well as staff summary of key agenda items. And Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to take any questions otherwise back over to you.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:44] Okay. Any questions? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:48] Mr. Chairman for a motion?

Brad Pettinger [00:00:50] Please. I'm not seeing any discussion so.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:57] There it goes. Mr. Chairman I move the Council approve the Draft Council Meeting Records included in Agenda Item C.5, Attachment 1, Draft Council Meeting Record 275th session of the Pacific Fishery Management Council, March 5 through 11, 2024. And Attachment 2, Draft Council Meeting Record 276th session of the Pacific Fishery Management Council April 5 through 11, 2024.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:30] Thank you Sharon. Is the language on the screen accurate?

Sharon Kiefer [00:01:34] Mr. Chairman, yes it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:35] All right. Seconded by Bob Dooley. Thank you Bob. Speak to your motion as needed.

Sharon Kiefer [00:01:40] Mr. Chairman I think the motion is quite explicit.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:43] All right, very good. Discussion? All right, with that I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:01:52] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:52] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. All right, very good. Thank you.

6. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures - 2025-27 Advisory Body Composition and Respectful Workplace Policies

Merrick Burden [00:00:00] We did hear a request here in the background to just take a few minutes to talk about Agenda Item C.6 before we take it up later on in this meeting. I believe Mr. Anderson was interested and just outlining some thoughts about that agenda item and in particular the seats that we are considering as part of our next three-year period. So if the rest of the Council's okay with that, I do think that's a reasonable request and it might by spending a few minutes here it could save us some time later on. I'll pause there and just see if you want to concur with that? And if there is that concurrence, I guess I would suggest that we do take up just a discussion of C.6. I think Mr. Anderson was prepared to introduce some thinking. And then at the end of the day I do have, at the end of that item, I do have a few other announcements but I'll hold off until then.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:59] Okay. So Phil when you're ready.

Phil Anderson [00:01:08] Sure. I just thought it might be advantageous just to have a little bit of discussion about the composition of advisory panels, recognizing that we need to wait and get our input from our advisory panels and the public before we make any decisions. I know there was, you know in thinking about our discussion around budget and other things that we want to do a good, take a good look at our panels and while at same time not in any way sacrificing the quality or the breadth of representation that we get from our panels. But if there are some opportunities for us to think about, there were a few relative to Washington that we had done some thinking about and I can turn to Heather if she wants to go over those or I can take a stab at it. But just again, and not wanting to get out in front of hearing from our AP and our APs and the public on this, but we were looking at the CPS piece in particular as one of them, looking at the potential of combining a Washington commercial and a Washington processor position. Given the status of our CPS fisheries and our, and due in some parts or which is due in some part to some of the difficulties we've been having in finding people to fill both of these positions, we thought that might be one area where we could combine a couple of seats and still maintain adequate representation from a Washington perspective. We'd also talked a little bit about the ecosystem where there's nine positions, three at-large from each state, and just thinking about the potential of having two from each state plus one at-large as a possible way to again maintain adequate representation and at the same time reduce the size of the AP a little bit. On the GAP we, you know, the last few years, say the last couple of years, we've been having a difficult time finding someone to represent the Washington sport interests. And we do have a Washington charter boat rep that has been doing a great job. And as the result of our inability to find someone who wants to represent the Washington sport interests, that committee has three sport fisheries at-large, and so one of those positions have been filled by someone from Oregon and two from California. And recognizing that California's coastline, a number of ports and so forth, there was good reason to have two people from California representing their sport fisheries. So, but that doesn't take away our desire to try to have a Washington sport person on the GAP. So instead we would not be proposing to cut positions in the sport area, but rather instead of having one Washington charter, we would have two Washington charter slash sport fishery positions. So give us a little bit more flexibility but at the same time we would be seeking to fill an interest from both those spots. We also looked at the SAS. I'm going to withhold offering some.....we do have a thought, but I'm going

to withhold sharing that until we hear from the SAS. We haven't heard from them yet and want to wait on that, but we might have one idea that we think would make sense in terms of a position that we might propose eliminating. At least from a Washington perspective, those were the kind of initial thoughts we had about potential for reducing positions that influenced and represented our state's interests while at the same time trying to make sure that we continue to have adequate representation.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:07] Thank you Phil. Further discussion, thoughts? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:07:14] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Mr. Anderson for some initial thoughts from Washington. I want to make sure that I wrote down what you said correctly with regard to the EAS. I believe the EAS recommendation that they've provided to us is two from each state and three at-large. And I thought I heard you recommend two from each state and one at-large. Is that correct?

Phil Anderson [00:07:53] That was our initial thinking. If I may? I mean right now we have three at-large from each state, so there's nine. And so we were just looking for a way to again maintain adequate representation from each state but reduce the size of the group from a cost savings perspective.

Marci Yaremko [00:08:30] Thank you Mr. Anderson. Is that in response to, I believe there are a few vacancies at this time on the EAS. Is that your understanding?

Phil Anderson [00:08:43] I believe there are. I don't know exactly how many vacancies there are, but I know there, at least for us I believe we have one vacancy if my memory serves me correct, but again, I was more looking at it through the lens of providing adequate representation from each state while at the same time looking for some cost savings in terms of reducing the number.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:12] Okay, thank you Phil. Marci, okay? All right. Anyone else? Okay, well I don't see any hands. Okay, well we're going to leave this agenda item open until tomorrow. Anyone else? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:09:48] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. If I may I'd like to turn back to membership appointments and composition for a second, if I may? I appreciate the exchange I had with Mr. Anderson regarding the EAS. Looking at the current roster I believe there are two vacancies on the EAS right now. And I believe the proposal I heard was to reduce the size of the EAS to seven members, that would be two from each state plus one at-large. And I guess I am wondering if acknowledging the EAS Report that references a long standing member of the EAS will be moving from Oregon to California this summer, I'm concerned about what seat that individual would apply to?

Brad Pettinger [00:11:12] We might be getting a little too far down the road here I think until we hear from the other groups or advisory bodies tomorrow. Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:11:22] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. This is a rather awkward item, but what we were attempting to do here, I think, is just get some initial thoughts out on the floor. I

would caution you against getting too far into deliberation or what you may or may not be aiming toward, but just some initial thinking we thought was appropriate and then after that time, that's a signal to our advisory bodies and the public. They can provide some feedback tomorrow and you can refine your thinking through that process. And so I would just caution us not to head too far down this road today.

Marci Yaremko [00:11:59] Thank you. I guess I would just offer an alternate perspective that perhaps we would consider two from Oregon, two from Washington, and three from California, which gets us to the same total number of seven. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:14] Thank you Marci.....(BREAK until following day)..... Okay so that will take us to Council action, which I'm sure is going to pop up on our screen before us. Okay, there you go. With that I'll open the floor for discussion. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:37] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I just was going to speak to the ODFW news release briefly. Dr. Debbie Colbert did begin as our new Director on May 21st. She has jumped right in into budget issues among many other things. We are looking forward to having her and the expertise she brings. At this time we do not anticipate any changes to the Council designees. The current plan is to keep the four of us who do the primary Council coverage the same. I'm not sure how soon or how much she will be involved in the Council process, but we'll try to keep leadership updated on that. So just we miss Director Melcher but we're looking forward to our leadership under Dr. Colbert.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:23] Okay. Thank you Lynn. Anyone else? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:13:31] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I'd just like to take a minute to speak to the GAP recommendation regarding the sport at-large positions. They've recommended that they be designated state specific with one Washington, one Oregon, and two California. And we had quite a bit of discussion about this this morning in delegation and I thought there were some really important points that came out in that discussion that I'd like to share with the Council. The private recreational representatives, not only are they filling a crucial role in terms of providing advice to the GAP, but they also serve in a very important liaison role in the sense that they are needing to connect back with a very large constituency, particularly in California, where we have a million licensed recreational anglers that are very diverse and include a wide variety of groundfish fishery perspectives. We have spear fishers, we have kayakers, we have folks that fish offshore at islands and transit across federal waters to and from. Of course, we have those individuals with larger vessels that can travel very quickly to get to offshore reaches and deep water. We have growing interests in sablefish as a recreational pursuit. And so I just want to take a second to highlight the value that has been added to the GAP by having additional representation in the GAP room in the private sport sector. The GAP Report indicates they believe the benefits of an extra, an additional seat, outweigh the cost. I certainly agree with that and just want to note that another efficiency gained that maybe wasn't articulated in the report but certainly is something we've experienced in California is the benefit of outreach and direct communications with industry. We had two individuals this past cycle take it upon themselves to conduct surveys of certain sectors of the private sport fleet with regard to development of our 2024 recreational groundfish seasons. An individual surveyed the kayak sector and another individual surveyed those that participate in

being passengers aboard CPFES to get their perspectives. And I just, I can't reiterate enough how helpful that input has been and how beneficial it's been in towards developing our management recommendations this biennial cycle. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:46] Thank you Marci. Okay. Anyone else? Okay. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:57] Thanks Mr. Chair. I just want to make sure we're in discussion here and comments on this, what we need to do. I guess in response to the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel, I appreciate their comments in thinking about the diversity and the makeup of that and we think about what we're doing forward. I do want to express some of my thoughts about the ecosystem related work. You know this is my opinion, what's going through my head right now, I hope it's shared by others. And that opinion I'm talking about is that this Council has really been a leader, an innovator, a trailblazer in this arena of ecosystem related work and as a result of that we got a lot of stellar work products. The Fishery Ecosystem Plan, which I'm pretty sure I'm right that that was one of the the first ecosystem plan that was put onto the ground. We have the California Current Integrated Ecosystem Report each year. We've completed the scenario planning process. A lot of different outputs there where we've been leaders and we're starting to see the outcome of some of those products, like we heard earlier this week when we were taking up HMS. On the water management of the HMS, quick decisions are driven by temperature models and forecasts that aren't in response to impacts that have occurred, but are implemented to prevent some impacts, so taking some of those things into account. So we've really been leaders in that. And when you're leaders like that you don't have the ability to look back at the work of others and see what they've done and figure out how to go forward, yet you have to chart your own course and that's what this Council has done. And the successes that we had were the result of building the right teams, considering the work that was needed to be done, and then populating those teams with really skilled, energetic, knowledgeable people. Basically, we had the right set of talents to do the jobs we need and that has all worked for us up to this point. We've been chipping away at various initiatives to implement the Fishery Ecosystem Plan, but now I guess as I'm thinking about this, that's looking in the past, a lot of successes, we've done great work and where we've come from. But looking forward today I just see us in a different place. And a part of that vision came from looking at the narrative in our five-year grant proposal. And when you look in there in one place it lists all the tasks for each of the fish management plans to implement those and they're all pretty straightforward. You know, salmon produce a safe document, do a preseason report, a methodology review. Groundfish lays out the spex process. And we get to the Fishery Ecosystem Plan the strategy is to implement the ecosystem plan, and that's the wording in there and so then I think what does that mean when we say, "implement the ecosystem plan"? And at that point my vision for the future gets about as clear as San Diego's skies have been this past week. It's hard to figure it out. So to help clear up that vision I think we need to take a pause on redefining the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel and repopulating that, think, you know, before we jump ahead too far and also think about how we use the Ecosystem Work Group and first really figure out what we're going to do and we're in a great place to do that. We're getting these IRA funds now to bring climate and EEJ concepts into our FMEPs, and this is the chance to really operationalize our Fishery Ecosystem Plan and parts of it over the next three years which, I don't know if it's fortunate or fortuitous or what, but the three years of funding we have overlaps very well with the three-year appointments we make to these different bodies. So.....and the other place we are right now is we have a new staff person to help lead us into the future. As Executive Director Burden said, I think

the first day Gilly Lyons has joined us now to lead the work on the IRA projects. So anyway, this pause allows our Council staff, specifically Gilly in this case, to develop a work plan for us over the next couple of months to chart our course forward, and then we can come back and decide how to build the support teams we need for all of these tasks before us. So you know, maybe more simply stated, let's not build a toolbox before we know what the job is we need to do. It might be using the same teams, the same people, as I said the very skilled and qualified people, but I'm just asking that first we define the work, give our staff the opportunity to put, pull some of that together and then determine what it is we need to do. So it's just taking a step back before we jump too far forward on those things. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:58] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer for those thoughts. Anyone else? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:23:06] Thank you Vice-Chair, or Chair. I did that twice this meeting, I apologize. On adopted preliminary advisory body composition for 25' through 27', I've been struggling with how to think about that, how to approach that. Our current advisory body composition was set up deliberately. Every one of those positions was set up intentionally, was added intentionally for something that is thought was needed for the process and maybe some of those are no longer needed. So trying to reduce that composition I started looking at the individual people and realized that's probably not the best way because all of the individual people on our advisory bodies provide a lot of good input. So just trying to think about what positions, take the individuals out of it, but what positions are necessary to do our work successfully and efficiently. And being a math and data nerd I started doing some permutations in my head about just looking at groundfish to cover all three states, all of our sectors, all of our gear types, to have every single one of those combinations covered we'd be looking at well over 50 people. Instead, we have 21, possibly 22 people on that advisory body to try to cover those, that 50 permutations. And that's not even when we start looking at species specific that the math there got more than I could do in my head. It is a lot of people but they all provide great, a lot of expertise so struggling with how to reduce that, then trying to apply some of that same logic and math to the other advisory bodies that I'm less familiar with. But similarly, we have three states and the operations in each state are very different. Private boats operate very differently than charter boats. An open access fixed gear boat operates differently than a limited entry fixed gear boat. So what is needed to cover the work that we need to do? Then I started thinking are there metrics we can use? Look at it mathematically. Should it be by coastline? By the value of the fishery? By the volume of the fishery? And each of those are subjective. While an open access fixed gear boat may not provide that much income to the community compared to a whiting CP, it provides a lot of income to that individual fisherman and that individual fisherman's operation. So I did not come up with a good mathematical or data driven way to come up with this answer. I've had discussions with some other people. I'm still struggling with how we proceed on this but just trying to share the different ways I've tried to think about this and how we can come to a decision on this. I was a data nerd for 15 years in this process so I went for the data piece and it wasn't there. So I'm not taking this lightly. It's important because these people are the ones who provide us guidance on the actions we take. I did not come up with a good answer so just wanted to explain some of the thinking and how I went about trying to come up with an answer for this and how we move forward. Hopefully somebody else had better luck than I did. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:44] Okay. Thank you Lynn. Anyone else? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:26:51] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And thank you for the comments Lynn. I know we've dug into this a bit, a few of us and tried to think about this and pull ourselves back from the people that are on these seats and try to come up with a way to really acknowledge our budget situation and how we bring in the efficiency that we're trying to do. I think this is particularly challenging but I also would note that this meeting is just putting some ideas out for public review. We can respond to them as we hear back from the public and I think that often helps us get through some of these difficult situations when we put some ideas out there and respond to what we hear from the public. In thinking about some of the things where we might find efficiencies, we looked at, or one of the places was areas where, you know, our Council is focused on fisheries that occur in the ocean area. And so, for example, the Salmon Advisory Subpanel includes a position that is a gillnet position. And I believe one of the California sport positions on the SAS was created for inland fisheries. And maybe it's time to consider those, at least putting it out for public review. I think the input from the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel and what you were saying Pete about that and where we are with this unique funding situation, how do we spend the IRA money and we have a new Council staff officer so maybe now is a good opportunity to put it out and get some feedback from Council staff on what that might look like? How that composition could help us in really focusing on how we implement the ecosystem plan. And then definitely really appreciate the comments from Miss Yaremko on the GAP. We in Washington it's been extremely challenging not having a sport representative on the GAP. We're at a place and we have been at a place where we are struggling to find someone who can make that commitment. We are really interested in going out to the public and soliciting for a spot to bring that sport representation back to the GAP. It is imperative that we do that. So those are some thoughts I have and some of the conversations I've had with other folks in the evenings and as we've prepared for this and thought I would just throw them out there. I could put forward a motion if folks are ready, but I don't want to stifle any discussion if folks have more to say. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:17] Okay. Thank you Heather. We'll probably take these, the Council actions in order but we'll get to that but okay, just, Phil.

Phil Anderson [00:30:26] Thanks Mr. Chair. Yeah, I too like others around the table have been trying to decide how to think about this. And I think we were, we really have, I've been thinking about it in two primary lines of thought. One is, are there changes that we could propose for public review that could save us some money given our financial situation and given that we're doing a really fairly fine look at all of our operations, how the Council is operating, I think this gives us an opportunity to look at our APs and the composition through the lens of is there potential changes that we could make that would reduce the costs associated with our APs? The second lens and on equal footing is to ensure that we don't make changes to our APs that results in us not having a broad base of people in positions that are representing various sectors across the breadth of fisheries that we have. And I think Lynn correctly pointed out that if we were trying to do each and every one we'd have far more people than we do to accomplish that. On the other hand, I think looking, taking a close look at each one and seeing if there are ones that might make sense to change, or reduce, I think that makes sense at this juncture, particularly the way we've set our process up this time where we have essentially two meetings to look at the composition and then move forward from there with soliciting nominees for the positions. Just speaking specifically to

a couple of the APs. On the salmon piece I do agree with Heather's suggestion that we take a look and put out for public review the idea that we would reduce the two positions that are aligned and associated with inland fisheries that are not directly impacted by Council actions in terms of the fishery regulations for salmon in the ocean, understanding that there's an inextricable link between how we manage the ocean fisheries and what happens inside, so not suggesting there isn't a link there, but in terms of the Council's regulatory authority and breadth, we're talking about federal water fisheries and so I think those two positions would be, make sense to take a closer look at. I like the way Vice-Chair Hassemer laid out his thoughts on the EAS and that we take a step back. That we have an opportunity here to evaluate what the best way forward is and that we have a new staff officer that with the consent of the Executive Director that we could have that person take a look and potentially come back with some recommendations or ideas if there are changes that would make us more efficient and effective as we move forward. On the GAP, I mean my perspective is for years we were able to, we had a private boat person that was in one of the three at-large positions. This last round we weren't able to find someone so the position that had gone to Washington for all those years was filled by a second California individual and which much needed likely. But we are looking at trying to get our representation back. And so I am in support of adding another position for the private boat angler on to the GAP. How we do it, whether it's, whether we have four sport fisheries at-large or whether we have a specific seat for each one of the three states and then an at-large. I'm not sure I care which way we go but I do think it's appropriate for us to put out for public review the addition of a seat so we can make sure that our sport fisheries up and down the coast from Washington to California are adequately represented. We did have a little bit of discussion in our group about the CPS as it relates to Washington and thought that there might be a better opportunity for us to fill the Washington commercial seat by broadening and giving some flexibility such that it would be labeled a Washington commercial slash processor seat. We have, I believe we have two bait operations that not only serve the vessels that are operating out of the two ports where they're located in Westport and Ilwaco, but they also do a fair amount of processing of in particular anchovies and sardines, well at least sardines. So by giving that bit of flexibility to the individual that could fill that seat, I think it would enhance our ability to find a representative. So those are my thoughts.

Brad Pettinger [00:37:06] Thank you Phil. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'll be really brief because most everyone said all the things I've been thinking about. I'm just reflecting on what Lynn Mattes was talking about about the size of our and the representation on our different advisory panels and management teams and such that, you know, we get such valuable information from these, from this and particular items and I think it, you know, when we start trying to reduce that we reduce our input and the value we get from them. And so I'm thinking more of the basic premise that we're trying to reduce costs and reduce, you know, get the budget down. And it seems like the bang for the buck there is really in reducing the number of meetings that these advisory committees attend. I mean if you eliminate one GAP meeting you've, you know, one meeting for the GAP attendance, you've got 21 I believe it is, travels, hotel rooms, all of those things. That does far more than, you know, reducing any of these panels by one person so I think that's the path we should go as far as cost. And this exercise though has value, I believe in examining, do we have the proper representation to get the information we need to make decisions? So sorry.....(phone ringing).....Not me.....(laughter)...So anyhow that's my comments pretty much is that if we're

looking for cost I think it's about adjusting the need for having them in-person, having these various advisory groups in-person and maybe limiting that to a certain extent to the extent practicable where we don't lose efficiency. And but as far as the....and it's a good exercise to look at these committees through the lens there, are they really serving the needs for the information we need? And I think that's more important than, you know, trying to whittle down numbers to save costs. So thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:25] Thank you Bob. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:02:29] Thank you very much Chair Pettinger. I just wanted to say that I agree with the GAP Report and I wanted to emphasize the point that I think we often overlook, the charter sector is critically important for giving people access, but they are businesses and their interests align, their interest on the advisory bodies align with their business interests, and often that overlaps with the interests of their passengers, the recreational anglers, but it doesn't always and we saw some of that recently on the salmon business. And so it is very important for the state of Washington to have a recreational representative in addition to a charter representative. But I don't use the word private sport because I think that diminishes the role of that person to represent any recreational angler no matter how they access the resource. So I'm supportive of the GAP Report and I appreciate the recognition that California does need two sport representatives because California is an extremely large state and in terms of the fisheries we manage it's very diverse, particularly north and south.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:50] Thank you Marc. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:03:54] Thanks Mr. Chair. Just a couple notes. I was reflecting on Lynn's comments about trying to find a math data driven way to look at this. I appreciate it. That's where my brain went too. Just wanted to remind us all that under a previous agenda item there was some guidance also provided by Miss Mattes to have Council staff explore decisional mechanism or a framework to think about this from a more objective way. And I think that gets a little bit at what Mr. Dooley was talking about and something that I also think is important, which is as we think every three years holistically about advisory bodies, it should be really about what we need to make the best decisions and not about a specific number. And along those lines, just if that is what we're able to do, the reasoning to be able to keep a seat open, even if we can't find someone to fill it, because it tells our public that we are looking someone for needed advice and we will wait for that needed advice. Reflecting a little bit on, you know, where you draw the line in terms of membership, Miss Mattes pointed out her brief analysis and 50 plus interests around groundfish alone. And I think of my conservation background and the ABs with conservation seats now have only one, but there are many different fishery related ocean conservation viewpoints and organizations and passions. There's bird conservation, mammal conservation, fish conservation, habitat conservation, but at some point you do just have to draw a line and we are going to be continually and always doing that. I appreciated Pete's thoughts on pausing the EAS, or thinking about the EAS and membership there and giving our new staff a chance to come on board and provide us with some of her thinking. I did want to note though that the EAS and the EWG covers a very broad range of topics as well as viewpoints that are represented at least through current membership. It's not just about climate change. It's not just about IRA funding. It's about communities and specifically bringing in thinking about how we look at communities from an

overarching view, not just through that of a single FMP. It's about the existing fluctuation and change that we have in our ecosystem, and it's about managing differently. It's about how we do better. So I just wanted to add that the value that those groups and that thinking which has made us a leader is important but goes beyond climate change.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:43] Thanks. Thank you Corey. All right. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:06:49] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And just a couple of remarks here since the topic has come up regarding the future of our IRA projects and the potential future of our EWG and EAS. We've communicated with Miss Lyons that one of the first things we're going to be asking her to do, have already asked her to do is to put together a project plan for assembling our IRA work and executing upon it. And as we've briefly been able to discuss that internally, it's clear to us that there is a lot of expertise in the EWG. There's a lot of expertise in the EAS, and we fully plan on utilizing those individuals in some way. And that of course is something that we will plan to do in consultation with you. What that looks like at the end of the day I'm not sure. That's what we're asking Miss Lyons to develop for us. But we will be, once we do receive the IRA funds we are then obligated to do those specific activities. And so that will be a priority for our ecosystem capacity. So I'll just leave it there, but we are in response to some of the discussion here, we are looking to develop a plan for your consideration here in the next couple of months.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:05] Thank you Merrick. All right. I don't see any other hands so I guess we're on to Council action. Okay. All right. Well, let's start from the top. We've got five items and we'll go from there. So anyway, Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:08:32] Well I have a motion. Probably be very controversial so I want to warn everyone. I move that Mr. Brad Pettinger serve as Council Chair and Mr. Pete Hassemer serve as Council Vice-Chair for the August 11, 2024 to August 10, 2025 term.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:51] Thank you. Is the language accurate? All right. Looking for a second. Seconded by Bob Dooley. Thank you Bob. Okay. I don't know if we need any discussion on this but I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:09:07] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:07] Opposed no? Abstentions? The motion's unanimous. Thank you. All right. It's a great honor really to be in this position so I appreciate that. Number two I guess, I'm not sure who's making this motion. Oh, Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:09:31] Thank you Chair Pettinger. This is for recommending industry representatives to the TRT. I move that staff send a letter to the Office of Protected Resources recommending the following individuals for the industry positions on the Take Reduction Team. Individuals are listed in alphabetical order and not by priority. The letter should also include the considerations contained in the GAP Report with regard to alternates, remote participation, and meeting locations. And then below is a table of the individuals including the recommendation from the GAP for David Lethin to be added.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:11] Thank you Lynn. Language looks good. Second? Seconded by Marci Yaremko. Thank you Marci. All right. All right, Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:10:29] I would like to make an amendment to the motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:33] Okay.

Phil Anderson [00:10:34] And I would like to add Larry Thevik from Washington, who's President of the Washington Crab Association.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:50] Okay. Wait till it gets up there. Wait until we get it down on the screen. All right, is the language accurate? Very good. Looking for a second. Second by Butch Smith. Thank you Butch. Want to speak to your motion Phil? Or your amendment?

Phil Anderson [00:11:47] Yeah, I it's my feeling that it's, the Dungeness crab fishery is probably in a bullseye here as much as any fishery and while Bernie Burkholder has some.....is involved in the crab fishery, I'm not sure to what degree. Paul Clampett is not. And I'm very concerned that we don't have a representative on this list that is front and center representing the Washington Dungeness crab fishery, and I believe it to be very important.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:26] Okay, thank you Phil. I would like to point out that it's seconded by Butch Smith instead of Bob Dooley. Okay, all right Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:12:37] Thank you. I just want to speak to this amendment and note that not only does Larry Thevik hold a Dungeness crab license, he also own sablefish permit, and he fishes for spot prawn in Washington. So even though the TRT is proposed for California spot prawn, he has experience in all three of the fisheries that are under consideration. He's a valued advisor to the Coastal Dungeness Crab Committee and other committees. So just want to speak on his behalf. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:10] Thank you Heather. Anybody else? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:13:17] Thank you Mr. Chair. Question for the maker of the motion. I believe we had a late addition to this list this meeting with David Lethin being added. I was just wondering if the GAP had an opportunity to discuss this recommendation and just wonder why we didn't hear from them on this individual? Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:44] Phil.

Phil Anderson [00:13:44] Yeah, thanks. Well first of all, the GAP doesn't deal with Dungeness crab fishing. The GAP doesn't necessarily have members who are knowledgeable people that are principals in the Dungeness crab fishery. And so I'm not necessarily surprised that Larry's name didn't come up in their discussions. So this is not about groundfish. And my my issue is not about groundfish and the long line and pot fishery being represented, it's about the adequate representation for the Dungeness crab fishery.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:35] Okay, thank you Phil. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:14:42] Thank you Chair Pettinger. Maybe I'm confused, but the intent of the table that I included based on the GAP recommendations was we were just speaking to people who could adequately represent the sablefish fisheries. It's my understanding the states would be recommending people for the crab, the Dungeness crab fishery seats. That we were only speaking to fisheries that we currently, that we have purview over. I included the Dungeness crab column in this table not to imply that we were covering Dungeness crab fishery completely, but to show that some of these people do participate in other fisheries. So I may have misunderstood what our goal was here. Was it to cover all of our fisheries? Because if we're trying to cover all of the crab fisheries too, I think Oregon would have additional people we want add to the list. If it was just to cover our sablefish pot fisheries, our stablefish long line fisheries, I'm comfortable with the list. I'm just, maybe we as a group have a misunderstanding of what we're trying to do here? So I don't know if that's a question for NMFS or who?

Brad Pettinger [00:16:00] Okay. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:16:10] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I seem to recall when we discussed this, this is one component of all the total of the appointees to this. This is just our Council input of the list and obviously they probably will not take every name off this list to be there. And I didn't remember what Miss Mattes was talking about that the Dungeness crab would probably have their own lists that go into the pot of candidates. Although I still support, you know, I mean we've heard from Larry Thevik on the Council floor and from my perspective part of the Council family. We value his input and value, understand his expertise and as is the rest of this list I recognize almost every name on there, people that have added to our process here and would be very well, represent us very well and obviously take the the GAP's recommendation to heart, but I don't have a problem with adding others. And I think this will be far from the complete list. And I think if we find ourself that we have left someone off the list, we probably have the opportunity to insert that somewhere as we go forward. So I'll support this amendment for sure and I appreciate Phil bringing it forward and I'm ready to move on. So thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:49] Okay. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:17:52] Yeah, thanks. And apologize for jumping in front of a few hands that were up before mine, but maybe because of some of the discussion just a reminder here. You know we did have a detailed presentation in April. These lists are recommendations from the Council. On the end NMFS will decide, but the motion as put forward has no ranking and it has a list now of potentially ten names. When this was, when PRD presented to the Council in April, it went over the list of of members that need to be a part of this. They are targeting 25 to 30 total for the entire TRT and that has to include representatives from all the federal agencies, every state, one for the Council, one for the Interstate Fishery Commission, academic and scientific organizations, environmental groups, tribal organizations, and then all commercial and recreational fisheries groups. So that's a large list to compile into 25 to 30. So I think I'm not over my skis to suggest that ten of the commercial and industry groups would be looked at as needing to be chosen from and picked a small handful, if you will, from that list versus approving the list. And there was a discussion as well in that about how the selection criteria goes so if there is no ranking or additional

justification then we would go with the TRT member selection criteria that was presented to the Council in April, which talks about an individual's ability to bring firsthand knowledge and perspective to bear on the relevant fisheries or marine mammal species, ability to balance a regional perspective with localized knowledge, willingness to express fundamental interests as opposed to fixed positions, and clearly convey the interests of one or more stakeholder groups, ability to work collaboratively, use an effective communication network, willing to travel and participate in person, et cetera. So these are the lists that NMFS will be, the criteria that NMFS will be using as it evaluates this and makes its selection to populate the team that again, due to many factors, needs to be limited to be wieldy enough to do this in a fashion with the appropriations and resources that we have and timeline that we have. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:34] Thank you Ryan. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:20:39] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I guess my initial thought here is that I'm a little caught off guard and my inclination leans against support for the amendment. The GAP has taken this task very seriously developing recommendations to us and has also attempted to provide information on where in addition to sablefish, pot, or long line, what other fisheries some of these individuals participate in to help inform NFMS as they go through the selection process. Adding somebody at this point to the list that hasn't undergone that GAP review just gives me pause. I just want to, I think, second Lynn's remarks that the GAP's role is to ensure that the representation or that NMFS has a full suite of candidates with expertise in the sablefish, pot, and long line fisheries, that's the fishery under our FMP that would be affected by actions of the TRT. So I wholeheartedly agree that that was the focal point of the GAP's thinking and analysis and their starting point in terms of developing the recommendations. I also agree that the states have every opportunity to provide recommendations with regard to state managed fisheries, including each state's Dungeness crab fishery and the spot prawn fishery. I do think we have a good opportunity here again to provide this kind of additional information about, you know, what individuals could potentially represent multiple fishery sectors. So I think we did our homework here with the GAP's help and I would be, I think, reluctant to support at the last opportunity here adding to the list. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:13] Thank you Marci. Anyone else? If not I'll call for the question, so. All right. Okay. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:23:25] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:25] No?

Council [00:23:25] No.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:32] I got nothing.

Ryan Wulff [00:23:33] Abstain.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:37] Unless somebody else got that but I'm....roll call?

Merrick Burden [00:23:42] Roll call.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:42] Yeah.

Merrick Burden [00:23:58] Okay Mr. Chairman and Council members I'll be working off Voting Sheet Number 2. The motion references C.6 amendment moved by Mr. Anderson. Let's see, starting from the top. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:24:11] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:24:13] Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:24:15] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:24:16] Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman [00:24:18] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:24:19] Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:24:21] No.

Merrick Burden [00:24:23] Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:24:24] No.

Merrick Burden [00:24:26] Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:24:28] Abstain.

Merrick Burden [00:24:30] Robert Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:24:32] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:24:34] Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:24:35] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:24:37] Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:24:38] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:24:40] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:24:42] No.

Merrick Burden [00:24:44] Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:24:46] No.

Merrick Burden [00:24:48] Pete Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:49] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:24:52] Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:24:55] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:25:03] As the vote stands now it's 8-4, you do not need to vote Mr. Chairman.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:08] Okay.

Merrick Burden [00:25:09] And with that vote the amendment passes.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:12] All right. Well, I will say that Larry's part of the most articulate fisherman I've ever heard give testimony so he certainly adds value. Okay, so we have an amended motion on the floor. Any discussion? If not I'll call for the question on the amended motion. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:25:33] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:34] Opposed no? Abstentions?

Ryan Wulff [00:25:37] Abstain.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:38] One abstention. Okay, the motion passes. Thank you very much. All right I believe on the number three on the list we've actually, Ryan spoke to that and so we won't deal with the JMC at this meeting. So that will take us to the appointing the CDF and W nominee at the GMT. So Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:26:04] Thank you Mr. Chair. I move the Council appoint Mr. Thompson Banez to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife position on the Groundfish Management Team.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:16] Okay. We'll just pause, there it is. Is the language accurate? It looks so.

Marci Yaremko [00:26:24] Yes it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:25] All right. Looking for a second. Seconded by Corey Ridings. Very good. Would you like to say anything? Speak to that?

Marci Yaremko [00:26:31] Sure, thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to acknowledge that Thompson has demonstrated that he's highly capable. He's been serving as a substitute role on the GMT over the past year. Thompson's a quick study, a great team contributor and collaborator, and I know will serve the GMT and the Council well.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:52] Wonderful. Anymore discussion? Okay. Seeing none I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:27:00] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:00] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much. That will take us to our last item. Okay, adopting the composition for all term-limited advisory body positions for public review. So anyway, further discussion? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:27:40] I do have a motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:41] Okay. Please.

Heather Hall [00:27:51] Not that one. Thank you. I move the Council adopt the following changes to Council advisory body positions for public review. Salmon Advisory Subpanel: Remove the gillnet position and one of the California sport positions originally created for inland fisheries. Coastal pelagic species: Revise the description of the Washington commercial seat on the CPS Advisory Subpanel to be either Washington commercial or Washington processor, Washington commercial slash processor. Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel: Request that Council staff in exploration of new IRA funding and associated work provide guidance on how the composition of the EA, Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel might be more efficient or change with this new funding and associated work. Groundfish Advisory Subpanel: Revise the current three sport fisheries at-large positions to be three state specific positions and one sport fishery at-large.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:05] That language is it accurate on the screen?

Heather Hall [00:29:07] Yes it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:08] Very good. I'm looking for a second. Seconded by Phil Anderson. Thank you Phil. Please speak to your motion as needed.

Heather Hall [00:29:16] Thank you. I put forward this motion to give us a starting place to think about in public review and seek public comment on. I spoke to it a little bit before but I'll just run through the list. On the Salmon Advisory Subpanel, again, these are two positions that were originally created for inland fisheries and I do appreciate they're associated with ocean fisheries, but they may be a bit outside of the Council's purview so wanted to put those out for public review. On the CPS Advisory Subpanel, this would recognize that, or it would condense the advisory subpanel so that it's just a Washington commercial or processor. It was an attempt to streamline that a bit from the Washington perspective. And let's see, on the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel, I'm not sure that a motion was necessary. I heard Executive Director Burden speak to what sounds

like a very similar intent with what I drafted in this motion so, but it's there formally to refer to. On the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel, again, this would really specify three sport fishery at-large positions and change that to be state specific and leave one as an at-large position. And I, the thinking with that is it may be right now that that at-large is important for California to be in and appreciate where we are right now with the current makeup of the GAP, but it may be that California finds themselves in a position where they don't have someone who can be on that, in that at-large position and maybe Oregon does, so it leaves some flexibility in the at-large for that. I'll say HMS is not, I didn't recommend anything in this motion on HMS. I think it's really important that there is representation from each state on the HMS. I didn't find a way to do that in a motion, but maybe in September when we speak to it, again I just, that's really important. We've had incredible value from Doug Fricke who's representation on the HMS position and there's nothing specific to the states on there so I didn't make a change at this point, but just wanted to flag the reason why. I think that covers it.

Brad Pettinger [00:32:27] Okay. Thank you Heather. Question's for the motion maker? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:00] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I have two questions. First, on the EAS item and the Council staff exploration as we heard about under some discussion here. You are requesting that Council staff provide guidance. I guess I'm just wondering what is meant by the term 'guidance' and if perhaps another term like 'recommendations' might be better? Thanks.

Heather Hall [00:00:40] Thank you Miss Yaremko. I had both those words in there at one point, guidance or recommendation. But the idea is really that with the work plan that will be coming from that, that it would just shed light on how the EAS might support the work plan. So it could be, yeah, perhaps a recommendation is better. I didn't want it to be overly burdensome, but feedback or input is what I was looking for.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:17] Okay, thank you Heather. Marci. Oh, is this a follow-up?

Marci Yaremko [00:01:22] I did have two questions of Heather.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:24] Okay.

Marci Yaremko [00:01:24] So my second question pertains to the GAP recommendation to revise the three sport fisheries at-large positions to be three state specific positions and one at-large. That differs from the GAP's recommendation to us in that the GAP recommended that if we're moving to state specific seats, that we designate one Washington, one Oregon, and two California with the idea that should no one come forward from Washington and has been the case before, that that be held open for Washington. So I'm just wondering if you can explain why you are proposing something different than the GAP's recommendation here? Thank you.

Heather Hall [00:02:22] Yeah, the primary goal was to be specific about the current three sport fishery at-large, that they be state specific. And then what it does is add an additional at-large that could be as it is now, you know, it maintains that California seat on the GAP. But if at some other

time, not California, it leaves it open to be filled by Oregon or Washington. So it would be three state specific and one at-large.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:08] Okay, thank you Heather. Thank you Marci. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:03:15] Thank you Mr. Chairman. So as I look at this motion the coastal pelagic species jumps out at me because we're talking about putting something out for public review. All of the others have a specific action by the Council embodied in the motion for review. The coastal pelagic species does not really. I mean, I'm sorry, Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel. I'm saying the wrong words. It's, that's more of an internal ballgame in terms of we're asking staff to do something. And so I have, I'm uncomfortable with putting that one out for public review because what is the public reviewing? We've not identified a specific Council action. Furthermore, what I heard from the Executive Director was of course the consideration is not only going to be about the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel but also the Ecosystem Work Group. And so I would be prepared to make an amended motion to remove the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel section. It just does not seem that that is appropriate in line with the other actions to be sent out for public review.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:45] Okay. Kelly.

Kelly Ames [00:04:49] Thanks Miss Kiefer. Question back to Miss Hall. As I understood this motion, I would have interpreted the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel when we put that out for public review we would be clarifying to the public that in September when we receive the briefing on the IRA projects and the specific recommendations for how to utilize the EAS and EWG, it would be at that time we would be putting out a more specific definition of their composition and work plan for the future. That's how I understood the intent of your motion. Is that accurate?

Brad Pettinger [00:05:30] Heather.

Heather Hall [00:05:31] Thank you Miss Ames. It is, and I understand it could be read as guidance, but I think the public review part is that flagging it, that it could trigger some change to the current composition. But thank you for the question.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:49] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:05:52] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And then I appreciate your comments Miss Kiefer. The other part of your comment concerned the investigation of our work planning and how that might apply to the EWG. We would still pursue that investigation. And the reason that I'm okay with that not being part of this motion is that the EWG is an ad hoc group and this action doesn't concern the ad hoc groups.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:20] Okay. Further discussion? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:06:25] Are we in discussion or questions of the motion maker?

Brad Pettinger [00:06:30] Okay, well I guess we're in discussion.

Marc Gorelnik [00:06:34] We'll be in discussion. All right. I just wanted to point out with regard to the SAS, while one seat that we're discussing, the Washington gillnet seat is obviously an inland seat, in fact the COP refers to two California sports seats, not an inland seat and a coastal seat. So I just wanted to make that clarification, although I do acknowledge that it's been filled by an operator, a commercial operator from, commercial sport operator from the inland. So I just wanted to make that clarification.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:12] Thank you Marc. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:16] Thank you Chair Pettinger. The Salmon Advisory Subpanel piece initially made me a little uncomfortable because we don't have any salmon folks at this meeting and I don't think we've really heard from them but then I read the top line again for public review. Since this is going out for public review there is time for them, the Salmon Advisory Subpanel, the Salmon Technical Team, et cetera, to weigh-in on that. So just wanted to speak that I had some qualms there, but a reminder to myself and maybe others that this is just going out for public review. We're not taking final action at this point. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:55] Thank you Lynn. Okay. Anyone else? Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:08:02] Thanks Mr. Chair. I just wanted to speak to the GAP piece and having the three of the positions be state specific. In the event that one or more of the states doesn't have an individual at the time that we fill these positions through our three year cycle, having that position remain open and assigned to that specific state, giving the state an opportunity to fill it at a subsequent time or fill it through, you know, making recommendations through the Council, obviously to me is important rather than making a decision at the three year mark that, well state X doesn't have a representative identified and so they lose that opportunity to fill it for three years if it's filled by a person from another state through because they're at-large. So to me that was the the benefit of having that three of them be state specific to allow a state that might be having trouble at the time we make our appointments at the three year mark to continue their efforts to try to fill that seat at a subsequent time, thereby bringing that representation into the GAP albeit at a later date. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:38] Thank you Phil. Okay. All right I'm not seeing any hands. Oh, Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:09:45] Thanks Chair. And thanks Miss Hall for this motion. I would like to make an amendment.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:53] Okay.

Corey Ridings [00:09:58] I'm sorry, can you scroll back up so I can see it? Thank you. I move to strike on the fourth line of text and one of the California sport positions originally created for inland fisheries.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:45] Okay, I think.....we got that okay? All good? All right, looking for a second. I'm not seeing a second. Okay so the motion will now fail. Okay that takes us back to the original motion and further discussion? Seeing none I'm going to call for the question. Yes Marc.

Marc Gorelnik [00:11:21] I just wanted a little clarification on Mr. Anderson's comment about the at-large. The one at-large seat that's in the motion here. I appreciated the point Mr. Anderson made. It's analogous to the issue we had with the California sport, or rather with the Washington sports seat needing to leave it open. But if we're going to have a state with a second sports seat, it's hard, and if we're intending it for California, which is what was in the GAP Report, I'm not sure why we would leave that as an at-large if we're, if our intent would be to leave it open to give California another opportunity assuming there were not nominations for the two, for the two California seats at the outset. If that's the intent here, then I'm not sure what the point is of making one of the seats at-large and not simply follow the GAP and GAP recommendations.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:34] Okay. Is that a question for Mr. Anderson?

Marc Gorelnik [00:12:42] Well I mean I guess it's a statement and I'm hoping that it stimulates some discussion.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:50] Okay, Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:12:52] Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd offer an amendment.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:55] Okay. Please.

Marci Yaremko [00:12:58] To....I can't see it. Please scroll back up. Thank you. Stop. Oh, there we go. Under the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel item, revise the current three sport fisheries at-large positions to be one from Washington, one from California, or Oregon, and two from California. One Washington. One Oregon. Two California consistent with the GAP's recommendation.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:28] All right. Is that accurate on the screen?

Marci Yaremko [00:14:33] Yes.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:35] Okay. Looking for a second? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Okay, please speak to your motion as needed.

Marci Yaremko [00:14:43] Yeah, I think the GAP did a fine job explaining the value of this recommendation. And as I articulated earlier, California is a very large state with very diverse private recreational interests that really would benefit from more than one representative. And in fact we've seen the benefits in the GAP room of having multiple individuals representing this very diverse sector. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:18] Okay. Thank you Marci. Further discussion? Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:15:28] I thought we were in questions but I'll....so I'll wait.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:29] Okay. Anymore discussion, or questions for motion maker or.....

Phil Anderson [00:15:42] I'm sorry. No I had a, I don't know if it's a discussion or question to be honest.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:48] Okay.

Phil Anderson [00:15:59] Just a sec here. What I'm reading from the GAP says the GAP proposes adding one more recreational at-large seat to the GAP. And currently there are three at-large seats to the GAP, in the GAP. So this is not consistent with the GAP's recommendation. The GAP's recommendation was for four at-large sport fishery seats.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:39] Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:16:52] Well I'm reading from the GAP Report. GAP members recommend the sport at-large fisheries be designated state-specific as follows, one Washington, one Oregon, two California.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:12] Okay. Phil.

Phil Anderson [00:17:17] I apologize. I had read that first part of the GAP that I just read from their report and did not see this other piece so I apologize.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:33] Okay, Heather.

Heather Hall [00:17:35] This isn't a question. Are we on discussion? I just again want to say that this is for public review. Having what I proposed is different from what the GAP proposed and having, it doesn't mean that in September we couldn't, after hearing from the public, then make a decision on one of the other. So just wanted to put it out there. I understand where the amendment is coming from, but I think It'd be interesting to hear from the public if there's interest in a different way of looking at it than how it was recommended by the GAP.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:24] Okay. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:18:27] Yeah, I think Heather Hall makes a good point. This is for public review. I guess the question is what's the starting point of public review? Is it the GAP's position or is it another position? So that's really what the amendment's about.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:41] Okay. Okay. All right. So there's a, we have a amendment to the motion on the screen. So with that I'll call for question and we'll move on so. Okay. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:18:56] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:56] Opposed no?

Corey Ridings [00:18:59] No.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:00] Abstentions.

Ryan Wulff [00:19:01] Abstain.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:02] Okay, the motion passes with one abstention and one no. So all right, so now we're on the original now amended motion. And so further discussion as needed? If not I'll call for the question on the amended motion before us. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:19:25] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:25] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. All right. Well wonderful. All right anything further, any discussion here before I turn to Kelly? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:19:48] Thank you Chair. Under Council Action Item Number 2 it did say recommend a Council representative to the TRT. And I know, and I specifically did not address that in my motion. I think in closed session we had some discussion and thoughts that we might need to come back in September on that. But just wanted to point out that we did not make, I did not make that motion and we have not taken action on that. Is September too late or is that something we have to address today?

Brad Pettinger [00:20:19] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:20:19] From a NMFS perspective there's no difference whether you make a recommendation now or in September. It's up to the Council.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:30] I believe we're gonna wait until September on that. That's my understanding. Yeah, Heather.

Heather Hall [00:20:41] We also were going to discuss the appointment to the MSAB under this agenda item. Did I jump ahead?

Brad Pettinger [00:20:51] Well that wasn't on the list before us. Okay, please.

Heather Hall [00:21:05] I have a motion. Thank you. I move the Council appoint Miss Lynn Mattes to the Council representative position on the International Pacific Halibut Commission's Management Strategy Advisory Board.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:31] Okay. Thank you Heather. Is the language accurate?

Heather Hall [00:21:34] Yes it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:34] Okay. Looking for a second? Seconded by Phil Anderson. Thank you Phil. Please speak your motion as needed.

Heather Hall [00:21:41] I don't think I need to say much here. I really appreciate Miss Mattes' willingness to serve on the IPHCs MSAB. Yeah, I think it will provide great benefit to the Council and our stakeholders. So thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:00] Okay, questions for the motion maker? Discussion on the motion? All right I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:22:11] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:12] Opposed? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you Heather for picking that up. All right I don't see any other hands so I'm going to turn to Kelly Ames. Kelly.

Kelly Ames [00:22:28] Thank you Chair, Council members. Just to recap the decisions you've made here under C.6. You elected Chair Pettinger and Vice-Chair Hassemer to their new terms through August 10th, 2025. We did receive your industry recommendations for the Take Reduction Team, which we will transmit to the Office of Protected Resources along with the other recommendations from the GAP on the location options for alternates, et cetera. You did decide to postpone nominating a Council representative to the TRT so we will take that up at our September Council meeting. Regarding the Whiting Joint Management Committee, my impression here is by you all not forwarding a motion on this that we will maintain Mr. Phil Anderson as the whiting JMC representative until his term ends for the JMC in 2025. You have also nominated Miss Lynn Mattes to the International Pacific Halibut Commission's Management Strategy Advisory Board. Adopted the recommendation from CDFW to have Mr. Thompson Banez serve on the Groundfish Management Team. And you made some proposed changes for public review for your term limited advisory body positions. So we will put those out and solicit input and come back to you in September where you will finalize those seats and then we will solicit applications to fill those positions. With that I think you've completed all your work here.

Brad Pettinger [00:24:14] Okay, at least on this agenda item. Okay we're going to take a ten-minute break.

7. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] All right. That takes care of public comment, takes us to Council action. All right so I'll open the floor for discussion. Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:00:15] Yeah thanks. A few things from NMFS perspective. I fully support, if we can get there or here or after leaving here for the Council staff to work on the 'if sooner' from our earlier discussion in getting us to five days versus five and a half if that works out and just wanted to note for the cross FMP discussion, I did speak with headquarters regarding the proposed rule on NS 4, 8, and 9. I don't think you need to schedule this for September, so that will give you an hour back. When the proposed rule does publish, the goal is to have that open for a six month comment period to allow all the Councils plenty of time to agendize it. So once we have information that it's coming we will have probably multiple workload planning opportunities to put that on an agenda so you could free that up. NMFS would also support the MTs request to move the HMS Roadmap Workshop discussion to November. If there is a draft report that is done by then, it could be an informational report to kind of start the discussion, but I don't think we're even getting a draft report for the workshop participants till the end of next month, which doesn't leave much time to get things ready for a briefing book submission, but could be ready for an informational report. The regional EEJ plan that's fine to have on. Everything else is fine the way that it's been labeled, although I would note we would also support the GAP's recommendation regarding the halibut agenda item, removing the inseason flexibility portion. And that's it for NMFS. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:05] Thank you Ryan. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:02:08] Thanks Mr. Chair. I can't remember what day it was, but Mr. Dooley and I brought forward a issue before the Council regarding the reporting, data reporting from the co-ops, whiting co-ops. And at least it would be my recommendation that the Council have some follow-up on that issue. I'm calling it the Whiting Data Reporting Standards would be my suggested title for the issue. I would think that a review of the past reporting specifics would be a part of that. A definition of the Councils, either a definition or a redefinition, however you want to look at it, of the Council's data reporting expectations from the co-ops. I'm thinking that the GAP could have that on their agenda, a September and or November, but I'm thinking that a potential agenda item for the Council to take it up that you do that in November, recognizing that the data reports from the co-ops I believe are due to NMFS on, I think I remember Keeley saying March 17th for reporting out in the Councils briefing book in April. So thinking that you would want to make clear what your data reporting standards are in November so that the co-ops in reporting their data out would hopefully be in compliance with what you're asking.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:12] Okay. Thank you Phil. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:04:18] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Just a question on that proposal. Mr. Anderson are you proposing a standalone agenda item that is an action item? Or is it something that is merged with another item that's already scheduled on the agenda?

Phil Anderson [00:04:45] Well I'm looking at November. I didn't see a nice fit for it. I thought it could be a standalone groundfish agenda item. I think it should be an action item where the Council provides clear direction to the co-ops in terms of the data reporting standards that you expect to see from them. So I think it's more than a discussion. I think it needs to be, I think the Council needs to be clear to the co-ops in terms of what their expectations are from a reporting, data reporting perspective.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:31] Thank you Mr. Chair. I appreciate those comments and appreciate the importance of the topic. What I'm struggling with is that we've recommended, or at least what shows right now on the September agenda on the Year-at-a-Glance is removing the Workload and New Management Measures Update. And there have been some other priority recommendations that have come forward from other industry sectors and we've, you know, continued to say that we don't have time to even examine our workload and our priorities. And so my concern here is just, I mean this is a decision for this item, new item to kind of circumvent that process, but that's why I was asking if it's kind of a, something associated with something else that's already scheduled then.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:44] Phil.

Phil Anderson [00:06:44] Well I was looking at November, not September. I thought November looked like it had put potentially some room. I was not proposing trying to jam it into September. I think it's already full, and I think it also gives, it's right in the middle of the fall or the late summer whiting season and then, and just for a number of reasons I think taking it up in November would be superior to trying to jam it into September.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:19] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:07:19] Thank you Mr. Vice....or Mr. Chair, and for your response Phil. My concern is with this circumventing our workload and new management measures process. The proposal that I see on the Year-at-a-Glance from Council staff is to scratch the workload discussion that previously was slated for September. And I'm sorry for introducing this wrinkle, but I'm just thinking about comments that I've heard from our GAP members, our California delegation on other topics that are, in their view, very high priority, like considering repeal of the non-trawl RCAs due to some technical challenges with operations. So I just.....before we just decide to schedule a new groundfish item outside of our normal prioritization process, I just think we should be deliberate about that. Thanks.

Phil Anderson [00:08:28] Well that's why I was bringing it up now so you could be deliberate about it. It's June, I'm proposing something for November. But, I mean, obviously it's up to the Council. If this doesn't make the priority list and you want to wait and see what you get in March, in April, and hope that it's what you need, then that's what you're going to do.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:53] Okay. Very good. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:08:58] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. Thanks Phil for that proposal. I think it's.....I would hope it wouldn't be, I mean it's the first priority there is to understand where the

Council wants to go with this and what they expect. But I think looking ahead, if you expect the next report to be different than the report you have in hand, those reports will be generated by March. And so if you...I agree that in November you will have data from the performance of this year's fishery and it might give you some inkling of what is transpiring in the fishery and whether there's a big concern or how to judge it, but I think that's a good approach. I understand the leapfrog effect, but if you...I think there's a lack of information to react to inseason adjustments you may make in the future for that fishery if you don't have these reports, you know, in a way that you can have that information. And I know we talked about several different ways you might react to the lack of information or the lack of granularity of the information coming forward and the difference that it's been from the past, it just seems like time is there if you forego the opportunity to do something about it before the next reports come out realizing that the report that just came out was, you know, one meeting late. You know it should have been out in April but it was out now. So understanding all the workload, understanding all those things, but I think just bringing it to the attention of what we might want to think about. So thanks for the comments Phil, and I'm right in line. And Marci you make some relevant points. I appreciate it.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:24] Okay. Heather Hall. Ooop? Heather.

Heather Hall [00:11:34] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And yeah I appreciate this discussion. I know we need to walk the walk. But also I don't know if this is a, like something that would go on the workload prioritization because it doesn't create a new, it's not a new management measure, it's just, it's something that is already in place and we're asking for, or what I understand is being asked for is a Council discussion on making sure that the product that we're getting is meeting the Council's needs. And so, in terms of, you know, looking at the workload prioritization process and where does, how does this fit in? I don't know that it fits into that, although I do appreciate the need to consider how we fit it into the Council's agenda. And from the discussion earlier this week, it does feel like something I think that would be important that we tee-up and have the conversation and make the time for it. I'm not sure where that is, but maybe I'll look to Executive Director, maybe have an idea. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:58] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:13:01] I think there's something about fiddling with a bright green pencil that gets people's attention.....(laughter).... I appreciate this discussion and it's raising some memories for me that don't feel that long ago about when we built these co-ops. But as I think about the issue of a co-op reporting and the level of reporting and the confidentiality issues that are associated with this, I would say that this took us on staff a little bit by surprise. The fact that General Counsel has confirmed that this in fact does raise a confidentiality issue, that strikes me as something that this is a really holistic discussion we have to have about what does it mean to ask for this level of reporting? And if you can't get it, what do you do? And that kind of a conversation is, I guess in my opinion, that's why we have program reviews. And so we are taking that up the first time in September just as a scoping matter. And so that puts this on a longer term trajectory that I think what Mr. Dooley and Mr. Anderson are talking about, but I don't know how we would get away from it being a more comprehensive discussion because it's hard for me to imagine figuring out how to go around the confidentiality issues if one or more of the sectors is not willing to sign a waiver. So that's where I think it could fit. That brings it up as a scoping matter

in September. And then we don't have a schedule beyond September, but we have talked about making this a no cost extension project that would be picked up then in the months thereafter, depending on the range of what we're considering under the Trawl Rationalization Review. So I don't think that's quite what Mr. Anderson and Mr. Dooley were looking for time-wise, but I think content-wise that's where my head organizes that question.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:05] Okay. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:15:09] No, I just wanted to concur with the Executive Director. I was about to raise my hand to say very similar things. So just wanted to concur that our understanding was the same. This should be addressed or started to be discussed in scoping. If it is possible that the Council wants to make certain changes to that based on those discussions that could involve regulatory changes that are needed, which will then need further discussion as it relates to those review and other future workload planning discussion. So I just wanted to support what the Executive Director just said.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:43] Thank you Ryan. All right. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:15:49] When it's appropriate I have a couple of topics not on, related to that to bring up.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:56] Okay. All right. Anybody else on that matter for now? I think.....Please.

Lynn Mattes [00:16:03] Okay. I have three if that's all right? The first one is looking at the Year-at-a-Glance. Right now April of 2025 for groundfish only has NMFS Report and inseason management. Based on what we did, the actions we did under C.2, and the need to hold our own feet to the fire, if we can keep groundfish to just those two items I think it would be all right for our Groundfish Management Team, the Groundfish Advisory Panel, Subpanel, to participate remotely thus saving those two teams. While it may not completely eliminate groundfish it would eliminate that travel. But we would just need to make the commitment ourselves to keeping April that simple. So that was just one thought. For September, both the GMT and the HMSMT, in a similar vein, trying to help with travel costs, proposed some new scheduling option of having them meet, travel, and then their last, their last day of agenda items be the day they travel so, or the day after they travel, so the day that they would most, that most of the team would be traveling, their agenda item wouldn't be on the floor. Logistically it may be too late to do that for September, but I would like to see if that's something we can look at for future agendas to try to be creative with their time and the travel, allowing participation, especially in complex items, while still saving those travel costs. And then the last piece. I spoke to it briefly under spex, the GAP recommendation and what Mr. McCrea just spoke about. If there's any way under either NMFS Report or inseason in September we could get some additional information on the discard mortality calculations from WICKOP from research, just getting some information on what exactly is done I think would be helpful in how we move forward. I can see that just being an informational report from either, under either NMFS Report or inseason and shouldn't be a whole new agenda item. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:18] Thank you Lynn. All right. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:18:25] Yeah thanks. Sorry for taking up the floor again, but I appreciate the remarks by Miss Mattes. Just on that last one. Yeah, we can do that on the discard list. That's on our list for follow-up, so support that. And I wanted to wholeheartedly support the recommendation regarding the YAG in April and groundfish and even go a step further. I think to demonstrate what we've discussed in a potential firm commitment, I would request that those get at least shaded if not taken off for now as opposed to hard-wired. The NMFS Report can easily be an informational report in April. And I don't think we'll have many, if any, inseason things because it's the start of a new biennium. So could be at least good to signal at the very least that those are shaded, that we are trying to see if we can have one groundfish meeting, one meeting every two years without groundfish. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:18] Okay. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:19:22] Thanks Chair. I just wanted to speak to my Council Member Report from April building off our discussion in March around the Groundfish Data Collection Enterprise Report. Starting by thanking Oregon for their excellent example that they provided. I think that was really good stuff and gives us a really strong example and a place to start of what something like that could look like. As a brief reminder, because we haven't thought about this in a while, the concept is just to have a report. It was initially for CDF and W and NMFS, but other states and tribal governments as appropriate, which describe the data that is being collected for groundfish species both in state and federal waters and how the public can access it. The report should include all significant data sets used by NMFS and governments that inform stock assessment and management measures at the federal and state levels. Conceptually, I am continuing to talk with people about how this would be most helpful and effective. Have it be some sort of a living document or something that is updated on a quasi-regular basis and provided to the Council platform on a regular basis. In light of discussions we've had this week, I could see this living in sort of an informational report context. And just as a reminder, this is, the concept is not for a repository or a portal for actual data, but just a compendium of what data collection projects are out there and have existed. And the goal is to identify gaps and help engage the public and the scientific community. And again I guess the thing here would be just to have the Council request that NMFS move forward with this in collaboration with our tribal co-managers and state governments.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:22] Thank you Corey. Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:21:23] Yeah, I want to talk for just a second about Blake Hermann's testimony today with regard to HMS. I'm not ready to ask for something to be agendized, but I do have a question and I just don't know the process well enough when it comes to MPA's. And I may have jumped the queue on where we are, but I seem to be having a day of jumping the queue. I looked up his petition. It's got 1,286 people as of today on it, which is not a small petition. It includes CCA, Piers, Wild Oceans, Santa Monica Seafood, and a number of people who have supported it. I don't normally see that big of a variety of HMS people who have at least expressed interest in something. I think I heard the request for a letter in there, this is why I say I'm not prepared to agendize. But I also want to acknowledge that Mr. Hermann is very new to the process

and it will be helpful from some of us around the table that have more history I guess I would say about the process, how to help him be more engaged. And one piece I will point out that we talk about extensively is the MREP Program. I just, if what we are looking for is a letter, I don't know if that would only go through the Legislative Committee, but just really wanting to acknowledge that we do have new people continuing to come in the process and interested in thinking about how to support that in terms of efficiencies for ourselves for how we have these types of requests moving forward using this kind of as an example this morning. And since I have the microphone, I'm going to pivot just a little bit and say I would be supportive of the whiting component that Mr. Anderson and Mr. Dooley brought up earlier. I value their judgment on this one. I think they've got the experience and just wanted to put that out there in terms of kind of where we're headed. I know other people may or may not feel differently around the floor, but I do just want to support and indicate that I do value their expertise moving forward, even if they will not be sitting in those seats after today.

Brad Pettinger [00:24:20] Thank you Christa. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:24:20] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I want to return to Mr. Hermann's public comment, and I appreciate Miss Svensson's comments. I, but I do think it might be appropriate to find a place on the agenda in the coming year to consider this issue. The relief he is seeking is in part in the state's court and in part in our court because the closures, the summer in state waters, the summer in federal waters, was this Council that put those restrictions in, so, and the state is, has started their process and I don't see why we should not in parallel be considering our own process there. I don't want to prejudge the result, but I do, I would like to see something on the agenda when we have HMS on the agenda, a scoping. I'm not sure how to categorize the agenda item. I don't see it being more than an hour, hour and a half agenda item, but to sort of focus, to focus us on what might, what we might need to do. It would also be an opportunity for the involved parties, which I would certainly include sanctuaries there. This is something we did in partnership with the sanctuaries, and perhaps the state if it chooses to weigh-in on the issue. So I don't have, I see that November is already crowded. I don't know if we can find time in November. It certainly would be preferable to do, to have this agenda item when we're meeting in California, preferably Southern California, but I wouldn't want that to inordinately delay the commencement of our consideration of the issue.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:17] Thank you Marc. Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:26:22] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just want to make sure I am accurately following this recent discussion because there's mention of the issue, and I'm hoping I know what the issue is. And I think what we're talking about is the development or modification of fishing regulations in sanctuary waters. That would be the, that would then follow a, I don't know, I can't recall if it's a policy directive, but there's a framework that you're familiar with Mr. Gorelnik about how that happens, and I believe we can initiate that, as you suggested, or the sanctuaries can ask that to be initiated. But is that what you're describing? Or is it something different?

Marc Gorelnik [00:27:01] Well, I don't necessarily want to move ahead of the sanctuary. I think that's something we need to do with the sanctuary. But we have the public process here, which I think, which I don't think exists in parallel in the sanctuary process. So I think this is a good place

for us to have that discussion. Again, not necessarily, I mean not to get ahead of the sanctuary, but to work with the sanctuary. Now whether this results in a change in the regulations and when that happens, I don't know. But I do think the issue has been presented to us. There's quite a coalition of NGOs and fishing groups that are in favor of it. I'd be curious to hear what the sanctuary has to say about it. It's my understanding that they haven't opposed it, but they haven't really taken a position on it because maybe they want to, you know, think about it, I don't know. But I do think having an agenda item that would allow that process to be more focused and to find out where we need to go. After that agenda item we may decide there is a path forward or we may not, but I don't think we can make that decision in the abstract. I think we need to have an agenda item to discuss it.

Brad Pettinger [00:28:22] Thank you Marc. Marci maybe you can get some light on this?

Marci Yaremko [00:28:26] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Just a little bit from the state perspective about the process that's ongoing in the Fish and Game Commission arena. Currently the Commission is undergoing a process where they're placing petition requests into strata, so to speak, so that it kind of creates a framework or a pathway forward. This particular petition has tentatively been placed in a second bin, as it's a request to lessen protections within MPAs. So it's on a longer term timeline, but we expect to hear back from the Commission later this year about the plans for moving forward with evaluating these Bin 2 type petitions. It sounds like we will have a clear picture on the guidance from the Commission by later this year. Mr. Gorelnik mentioned a desire to work in tandem with the sanctuaries, so I think, you know, perhaps.....it's difficult to say if scheduling November is premature or not, but I don't know exactly how....I think we do, there would be benefits to try to align the timelines. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:04] Okay. Thank you. Sort of the timeframe from the state would be nice to know so to the parallel system. Okay. Oh, Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:30:18] I'm just....well first for Marci. Marci, is the state in communication with the sanctuaries at all at this point?

Marci Yaremko [00:30:27] Yes. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:29] All right. Phil.

Phil Anderson [00:30:38] Well as an outgoing present from all of you, I want to try this one more time. Merrick said this took him by surprise. Well, what took me by surprise, and I think Mr. Dooley and others, is when we got the data report that did not include the data that we had previously seen. So, that was the first surprise. So the question is what do you, how do you respond to that? I am not suggesting the Council try to figure out a way to force them to give you the information that you're asking for if they legally have a way to say thanks, but no thanks. All I am suggesting to you is that you make clear the data you would like to get from them to manage your fishery. And do, and that, and that in turn then when you look at the co-ops in the way you have the set-asides, in one pool it gives you the opportunity to see how that's working. And if it isn't working, what to do about it? So I'm not suggesting some big process by which you have to look for a way to change your regulations or to force them to do something that's otherwise in law that

they can choose to use not to give it. I'm just asking you to be clear about the data that you would like. So that's my suggestion. You obviously you don't need to take it, but I wanted to clarify what I was asking, particularly in light of the comments from Mr. Wulff and Mr. Burden that somehow I was suggesting something that was going to create a big process that was going to be looking to potentially change regulations or force people to give you information they otherwise don't have to legally.

Brad Pettinger [00:33:04] Okay. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:06] Thank you Mr. Chair. And yes, thank you Phil for that further explanation. I agree that, let me just say I agree with what you said. I think there is a short term, a quick, I don't want to say it, it's a fix, but what is certain is there's still a deadline next March 17th of getting a report, and I view this as a proactive step in making sure it's clear what's in that report that we want to see. And we should be able to take that up and express clearly what our expectations are related to our management needs. So I support that.

Brad Pettinger [00:33:59] Okay. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:34:05] Thank you. I support that as well, and I just wonder where we fit that on the agenda in November?

Brad Pettinger [00:34:18] Okay? Our Director is looking, so.

Heather Hall [00:34:25] Or how we fit that on there?

Brad Pettinger [00:34:28] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:34:29] Yeah, thank you. So the question is specific to September, is that what I heard you say Miss Hall?

Heather Hall [00:34:36] I said November.

Merrick Burden [00:34:39] November. Well, let's see in looking at November we do have a variety of matters shaded and we are at 5.7 days. Already trying to move some things on to November, so what I take from Mr. Anderson's point is that he is not looking for a lengthy agenda item, but at this point we would be, I think what we're already looking at doing is dropping some of the shaded items to fit within our contracted number of hotel days. So that would be something we'd have to acknowledge that we are dropping some shaded items. I think that exists whether or not we pick up on Mr. Anderson's request. So what I think you're asking then is does it fit into an existing item that's in.....

Heather Hall [00:35:34] Potentially, if that's the creative way to get there.

Merrick Burden [00:35:39] Well, I guess what I would do is I would look first for these sorts of matters to look at inseason, that would be something that comes up under November. At this meeting Mr. Dooley brought it up under spex because it's also related to management measures,

and I think that was appropriate. But inseason as the place I would look to right away just as a, you know a way of, you know, monitoring the fishery as we go along through the year and asking ourselves what sort of data is made available and what we want to do with it. And that would be the first place I would look.

Heather Hall [00:36:15] Thank you. I appreciate a little bit of help with that, and I think it also makes good sense. There's potentially not a lot of inseason in November given it's November, so there might be room to have this discussion under that agenda item.

Brad Pettinger [00:36:37] Okay. All right. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:36:42] Thank you Chair. This is not on the whiting issue. I know we tried to give the GMT very specific guidance on where their priorities should be. I think in September it's going to be even more critical since it's, I'd say 99% sure I'm not going to have Miss Pierson replaced by the September meeting. And I believe Miss Roberts is also going to be absent from the September meeting, so the GMT is going to be running a little short. With that, just wanted to provide some input on where I think they should prioritize their time. And I apologize, I haven't had a chance to check with Miss Yaremko or Miss Hall, but inseason seems like it should be a priority. Then the two scoping items, Trawl Catch Share and Intersector Allocation Scoping and Phase 2 Definition Scoping, they may not have much work to do in relation to that scoping, but I think they need to pay attention to it because it will impact their workload going forward. And then for Stock Definitions for Species Assessed in 25-27. The other groundfish items seem like they don't have management implications where there would be analysis expected of the GMT. And the cross FMP items seem like ones that maybe they don't need to weigh-in at this time. So just trying to help them prioritize their work, given that they're going to be down a couple of very key members. So hopefully that's more helpful to the GMT than to us.

Brad Pettinger [00:38:13] Okay. Thank you Lynn. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:38:22] Thanks Chair. I just wanted to bring a little light to an issue I was thinking that got brought up to us earlier in the week. The concept of a working group for groundfish stock definitions. This has been raised by the SSC several times over the last few years. So just the SSC was talking about the need for a holistic process of defining stocks that follows best scientific practices. They note that they haven't had conclusive discussions regarding the biological attributes to consider when providing guidance on stock definitions and are asking, or suggesting I guess I should say, the establishment of some sort of working group to serve this Council process specifically for defining stocks and noting that this is something that work has been done by other groups. I believe in this report they noted IC's and are suggesting that that is something important for what we do here. For where we are today with the two previous iterations that we've done under phase 1 of stock definitions, there was a graduate student that did a Lit review, and I'm certainly not one to throw shade at the science of graduate students, but thinking of just how critically important stock definitions are. And as we move into this phase 2 which will start in September, and from what I understand will go for a good bit, so there's not like a pressing need here, but important, really important that we do this right. I think what we have gone through with quillback and what our communities are going through with closures related to quillback, really for me just highlights the importance of the science that we're basing our decisions on. To

be clear, stock definitions, especially in this context, when thinking about them as they apply directly and legally to Magnuson-Stevens, you know are a policy call, but they are founded on science. So making sure we do that foundational piece well, the best we can I think is really important. So I wanted to just shed a little light and air on that and hope that we can at some point continue discussions on if and how to do such as a working group, whether it's possible with existing NMFS capacity, whether we have to discuss how we might make that happen or partner with another group to encourage that, I think it's worth continuing to discuss that.

Brad Pettinger [00:41:06] Thank you Corey. Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:00:00] Thank you Chair, and thank you Miss Ridings. Appreciate the comments and do agree that especially the pending stock definition discussion is a big deal. There is a lot of big challenges. We have put that off a little longer because we anticipated the complex discussions. The SSC has raised some things, but that is only one component I would remind the Council, right? Magnuson has its own process for defining stocks a little different from scientists definition of stocks. We are going to discuss all this. NMFS is planning to present information to the SSC during their, during their meeting before the Council meeting. We'll have a full session on scoping where a lot of these will come up. So we have no capacity to do a workgroup on this before September, but do think we will have a lot more information, more information from the SSC after hearing some of the NMFS presentations specific to the stock definitions discussion we'll be having. We'll have a full scoping session in September and then I think this is something we could revisit at future workload planning. But I think it's important to note, but I think we'll have a little bit more information and there is between September, I think it's not scheduled again until March, so if there is the desire to move forward with something like that, we could potentially take this up at September workload planning. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:29] Thank you Ryan. Okay. Marci, did you have.....

Marci Yaremko [00:01:31] Yeah, not on that topic. Just a question on the GAP's recommendation regarding the inseason flexibility part of the halibut items and then the proposed September agenda. I'm just wondering if the GAP's advice is reflected in what's proposed in the September agenda? I'm noting that in total, the halibut items are scheduled for four hours and just wondering if that's a correct estimate in light of the GAP's recommendation.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:14] Kelly.

Kelly Ames [00:02:16] Through the Chair, Miss Yaremko. I think if you do remove inseason flexibility from F.2, that that could be refined. I don't know off the top of my head how low but we would certainly seek to tighten that up.

Marci Yaremko [00:02:34] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair and Kelly. It just seems like two hours even for the CSP and Regs seems like quite a bit. But then the second item having two hours as well, potentially there is some time to be saved there. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:58] Okay. Bob.

Bob Dooley [00:03:02] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. Before Dani Evenson left she sent an email to a few of us regarding an email that was sent from Kelly Denit on the 7th of June as the Friday that we all arrived for our Leg Committee's and Budget Committee meetings the day before the Council meeting started, and it talks about NOAA fisheries to release a revised ecosystem-based fisheries management roadmap for public comment and the date, the deadline on that is like July 27th I think is what it was, but it's before we meet again, before you meet again, and once again, I don't know all the details, I know Executive Director Burden had received this as well. Probably something we ought to discuss and at the very least maybe weigh-in. I know the North Pacific Council was weighing-in on it and I was concerned about, you know, the ability to respond on something that means something to the Council and that we need to, could affect us without having adequate time to do that, so may require, you know, a Quick Response Letter or something like that, but I'm very shallow in this. I'm bringing it up to, and hopefully somebody else could bail me out. So I just wanted to make sure we didn't forget it. So thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:40] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:04:45] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And thank you for that note Mr. Dooley. I guess I would look to our normal QR process at this point, which would entail, you know, myself and at this point likely Dr. Kit Dahl looking at that draft report since he's our current EBFM staffer and drawing some conclusions and recommendations for leadership about whether we should pursue a QR Letter, and if that's the case we would let you all know and then proceed from there. And that's how we tend to handle those things, and that's unless you have different guidance I would plan to follow that course.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:27] Sharon.

Sharon Kiefer [00:05:28] Just to add to that, I do know that the members of both our Ecosystem Work Group and Ecosystem Advisory, whatever the other group is, did receive that notification directly from NMFS as well because our member on the Ecosystem Work Group forwarded it to me. So they are aware of that.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:50] Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:52] Thank you. Different topic. And this is just maybe a reminder. I know the Executive Director and Deputy Director have a lot of chess pieces to move around here, it's complicated. I was looking at the highly migratory species, the management team recommendation about moving their meeting a day earlier related to travel and what we've gone through here, what they said is they'd be traveling on a day when HMS is on the floor. If they met a day earlier, they'd be available online. We heard about the value, you know, of having GMT members here, but it seemed they identified some efficiency there, just creates a little gap between when they meet and when the item is on the floor, but they'd be available, and if they do that then their report is done a full day before the item hits the floor and we avoid some of that discussion about getting reports in the morning. So explore that opportunity.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:01] Okay, thanks Pete. Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:07:05] I feel us starting to come to the end here. So I have a couple of things that I wanted to just bring to your attention. One is that earlier this week you all adopted a budget. Within that budget was some money to hire a contractor that we've discussed before that would do a, I use the word 'diagnostic' exercise of our stock assessment process, and so there's a lot of just consternation and concern that has come out of the quillback issue, and I've been in conversations with a colleague of mine who's based in Santa Cruz actually about doing this review of our process and drafting some, drafting some recommendations or insights that she might find about how we got to where we got to on the quillback issue. And so I think there are some questions about trust. There are some questions about understanding. Questions about transparency that we've been battling around here for a while. I believe from that Budget Committee recommendation and then you're all decision that that money is there, and that's how I would intend to use that, and so I'm putting that marker down just here, just to make sure that we're all on the same page. There was also another point that was raised by the SSC, and I guess the GAP also about a ROV Enclosed Area Workshop. My understanding is that the Northwest Fisheries Science Center is already doing the work. And I'm not sure if the Southwest Center is involved, but perhaps they are also. And the vision there was to do a quote, unquote, "workshop" that would be hosted online, which in my conclusion means it's budget neutral. I personally I think that's a good idea to shed some light onto these topics and if the work's already being done that we should proceed along those lines. I don't recall the actual date, but I know it was the September, October, November time period is I believe what we were looking at. So, put those out there for you to just so they don't get lost in the midst of this discussion.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:16] Sharon.

Sharon Kiefer [00:09:18] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I did have one question relative to the Habitat Committee Report, and they point out to the Columbia River Dredge Material Management Plan Draft EIS and the Hells Canyon FERC Relicensing Draft EIS coming in July. 60-day comment period. Said they are tracking them and ready to draft comment letters for the September briefing book or via Quick Response. My question is, procedurally, who kind of gives them the green light to do that and get them started? I'm just not quite sure procedurally. I mean they've laid it out for us that this is something we're willing to work on, but do they still need a head nod from the Council to proceed? Or does the committee just proceed? I just don't know.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:13] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:10:14] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. Miss Kiefer, just because you raised that question I think it would be appropriate for you to confirm that you do think those are important topics? In the absence of that, we usually we start with looking at what's the charge of a committee and does this fall squarely within their charge, and if so and if it falls outside of a Council meeting we would pursue that QR process that I just described to Mr. Dooley. Otherwise we would intend to bring it back to the Council for your approval.

Sharon Kiefer [00:10:47] Well Mr. Chairman, my understanding is both of these do deal with Essential Fish Habitat for Snake River fall Chinook, which is a Council managed species and so I think the committees were assuming they, these were two that would need their attention.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:09] Thank you Sharon. All right. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:11:14] Thank you. And I just want to go back to the what Executive Director was talking about in giving us a heads-up on the SSC topic and stock assessments and just wondering if the timeline I heard you say Merrick, September, October, November, sometime around in there, but just wondering if we could have the GAP, the SSC, GMT provide some input or look at that idea you have for the consultant work and if there's just an opportunity to have some feedback from those groups on the idea?

Brad Pettinger [00:12:03] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:12:05] I apologize, I might have missed part of that because the Vice-Chairman and I were whispering here, but I believe you were, I believe you were looking to have some input from some of our advisors into the scope of a potential contract?

Heather Hall [00:12:19] Yes. Thank you. And just you mentioned the timeline and it seemed broad, September, October, November, and just it felt like, seemed like there's an opportunity to have some input from them if that is the timeline. So I wanted to request that.

Merrick Burden [00:12:37] Thank you. Just in response to that, the short answer is yes, would welcome some input. The second answer is that timeline was in reference to the ROV Workshop, so I would intend to pursue this contract before then and launch in the summer sometime.

Heather Hall [00:12:54] Okay.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:57] Okay. I think we're.....Corey?

Corey Ridings [00:13:04] Mr. Chair, I just wanted to bring up something that the, I think it was the EWG noted about meeting with the Sac Fall Workgroup, potentially the Klamath Fall Workgroup, and potentially SAS and STT members in regards to developing risk tables. I believe there's a webinar that is being scheduled over the summer to do that as part of our current FEP Initiative. But I just wanted to confirm my support for that and encourage them to bring in the folks that they see as necessary from those groups.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:46] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:13:47] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah, I guess my comment on this is that we are moving very quickly and I'm concerned about the lack of clarity with regard to engagement of the actual STT. I'm hearing discussion about appropriate members of the STT, and I do not understand why we would schedule a webinar on this topic and not include the actual advisory bodies that advise us. The workgroup is an ad hoc committee with a particular task and the webinar proposed is, as I understand it, is pretty far reaching, pretty broad scope, and certainly enters into territory that I think is squarely in the wheelhouse of the STT. So if this is going to proceed I would strongly encourage that it include the STT and the SAS and not just the workgroup. Thank you.

Merrick Burden [00:15:09] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And just in regards to that remark Miss Ridings, we spent some time discussing how best to proceed with what looks like a couple of different interests that are starting to converge on to the Sac Fall Workgroup. And earlier this week there was, I don't know how to really describe that conversation, but it seemed like the progress that was being made by the Sac Fall Workgroup is not quite in line with what the Council was looking for and that there a need for that workgroup to maybe retrench or refocus on their task that they were originally asked to do regarding conservation objectives. So as we think about all the work and how to sequence it, we think let's have them focus on that and then the risk table work can come later on. The webinar that you're describing can still happen, but it's focused on groundfish. And so it's hard for us to imagine doing all of that in the Sac Fall Workgroup at this point until they make further progress with the conservation objective question that they originally..... I believe that's consistent with what Marci is saying.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:27] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:16:29] Yeah, you'll have to excuse my ignorance if this is obvious. I think the inclusion was just to take advantage of the expertise that was on the workgroup and wasn't necessarily within, to your point, the, and again, please correct me if I'm wrong on this, but was in the sort of charge for that workgroup. It was just taking advantage of the fact that that was existence and was doing some good thinking and had various members together. So I'm not quite sure how if we're looking to refocus the workgroup, if this is sort of outside the scope anyway that would matter. Just as I said, trying to make sure that the right people, and I think that dovetails with Marci's comment of having STT and SAS folks there making sure we have the right folks there to work with the EWG to get that done right.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:25] Thank you Corey. I would like to point out that it's up to seven years of the Anderson rule. The author of that rules phone made a noise and so at some point in time.....

Phil Anderson [00:17:37] Gosh, you know if I was going to be here in September I'd buy you some donuts.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:41] We will see you at November.

Phil Anderson [00:17:48] I'll give Kevin Dunn some money for you so you'll have donuts in September.....(laughter)....

Brad Pettinger [00:17:50] Okay. All right. So Merrick do we have what, do you have what you need?

Merrick Burden [00:18:01] Yeah, let me try to summarize a couple of main points here. Let's see starting big picture, I do you think we can plan for a five-day meeting in Spokane just given the note I believe from Mr. Wulff in particular about moving a couple of items. One of those being the E.3, the National Standard 4, 8, and 9 issue. And the other being the HMS Roadmap Workshop. So moving both of those saves us enough time to get down to another five-day meeting. Let's see, anything else I should flag? I did make note of a potential new item about the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuaries. I have that drafted under HMS. I don't know if that's an HMS specific

issue or whether it's something a little bit broader than that. I've tentatively penciled that in November, but we would have to figure out how to squeeze that in, and right now November is quite full so take that as a shaded possibility. Let's see, I also made note of next April, since groundfish does look light we will try to keep that light. And there was a suggestion that we shade the NMFS Report and inseason management and potentially even remove that, so we may get started on making April and non-groundfish meeting sooner than I expected us to be able to do. So we will start to make some changes there to the Year-at-a-Glance. Let's see, I think those were the major items I captured. We also did talk about some workshops and scheduling of advisory bodies and things over the next few months. I don't really feel the need to recap that. I think we've captured it, but I'm happy to look to my left and see hands being raised.

Heather Hall [00:19:54] I would appreciate a recap on those workshops. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:00] Okay.

Merrick Burden [00:20:01] I don't have a recap. Kelly, can you help me with the workshop recap?

Heather Hall [00:20:11] Yeah, and I'm sorry. It feels like our conversation this afternoon has, it's we're going from one topic to another so maybe it's not just me having a hard time tracking it either, but you shared that, and I think this came up in the Budget Committee to the idea of the workshop over the summer. I got confused about the ROV that was happening in the fall, but asked about the SSC and stock assessment and getting the contractor on board and whether there was an opportunity to have input from the SSC, the GMT, and folks on what that looks like. And you said there would be time, but if it's happening over the summer that's where I'm a little bit lost and could use some clarity on how you'll just reach out to those teams to do that?

Brad Pettinger [00:20:59] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:20:59] Yeah, sorry for the confusion on that matter. So in regards to the contract, I'm happy to take input from our advisors. What exactly it looks like in terms of timing I don't have that penciled out in front of me, but I would like to make sufficient headway on that contract so that there is a informational report for you by the November briefing book. That then allows us, if we take the lessons from that contract and want to do something, it allows us to do it next year, hopefully under a no cost extension, which would be good for our financial management, also allows us to keep making headway. So I would anticipate reaching out to our advisors over the coming weeks, asking for any input, and then executing a contract after that time and whether that's mid-July or August I don't know, but before the September meeting. The second one on the workshop with the ROV and the closed area topic, that I believe is something we have to, we have to have a conversation with our colleagues at the Science Center. I think there was a more informed discussion in the SSC that I was not a part of, but I believe they're aiming for the fall for that workshop. What exactly that does for the Council I'm not entirely sure, but there does seem to be a lot of interest in the topic and certainly getting more on the same page about the potential for ROV seems like a good thing in light of our data-limited assessment questions. So those are the two that I think we're talking about at the moment.

Heather Hall [00:22:39] Yeah, you got it and I really appreciate that. Thank you Merrick. On the first one, and I think you got what I was hoping for, and that is, you know, as you're developing that contract you'll be seeking input from GMT, SSC folks, not after the fact but to help and get their input as you determine the scope of work of the contractor and all of that so that got it for me. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:11] Okay. All right, so Kelly how are we doing?

Kelly Ames [00:23:20] We're doing great.....(laughter)...

Brad Pettinger [00:23:24] All right. So have we completed this this agenda item?

Kelly Ames [00:23:33] Yes, you have completed your work under this agenda item. Executive Burden summarized the changes that we've heard and we'll seek to incorporate those in our workload planning documents. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:45] Okay. Well very good. We'll foreclose the meeting. We have some people who aren't going to be with us in these seats next year and I've got a heavy heart because I've been around some of you for a long time and some not so much. The last seven years with Joe. It's been great to get to know you and every meetings better. And I hope to see you in the future in the MREP program and yeah, it's been a great to have started a relationship. So he's been a fantastic Council member for the tribes and just hats off to you. Phil, I remember for you, first I met you was in 1990 or something like that in Eureka. You came down to Eureka to talk to the trawlers and the FMA and I was down there because I was a member of the FMA and I remember he needed to ride to the airport and I was driving home. And that's the first time and just, you've just been a standard I think for what a Council member should be and I just admire you and just hold you up just as kind of a, as an example of how you do it. And thank you for 37 years you've been involved this process, yeah, unbelievable. And Bob I just, my brother from another mother. I mean we've known each other for a long time, but just to really know you as a Council member and, just you were the epitome of what a coastal representative on the Council is and really representing your industry in reaching out and just, yeah, love you man. Anyway I'm just going to open the floor. If anybody would like to say something then please do. I mean we just, we'll get a bite of apple in November but I just had to say that just because I appreciate all of you for all you've done and all you're going to do. So thank you. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:25:54] Thank you. Putting this off for a long time, but I also don't want to miss opportunity to speak about how important you three are to me. I'm excited because Joe and I serve on a federal advisory committee and so we'll get to keep working together. And I've been joking with Phil this week of I've put off telling Phil how much I appreciate him since I started with WDFW in 1992 when Phil was running a charter boat in Westport and I was running around the docks asking people how many fish they caught, and I'll just never forget that. But I've been holding on to the fact after Phil retired that we'll still going to keep working together and I think there's still a bit of a string, but I'm still not ready for it. And Sarah Nayani, I don't know if she's still here, but she had a title for Phil this morning at our delegation meeting that was just perfect and part of it was legend, and the first part I won't say, but you definitely need a tee shirt that says that. I'll tell you all later.....(laughter).....it was, but it's true. And Bob, it's just my great pleasure to

be on the Council with you. So smart and a leader in such a great way, in a gentle, thoughtful way with every stakeholder. Your conversation about family and how our Council family is special, really resounded with me. And I thought about, you know, when you invited us to your home for dinner and how lovely that was and that was really neat and it was really important for all of us. But in addition to that, you know, your expertise with the commercial fishing industry is really important and there's shoes here that we are not even going to approach filling. Not even going to think about it so, but I will forever think about some of the things you all said. How you've helped us get out of holes we've dug for ourselves or seeing how you've gotten the Council straightened out when we've gotten, gone haywire or axle wrapped or whatever it is, and so we'll try to rely on that as we go forward without you, but Phil owes us donuts.

Brad Pettinger [00:28:39] Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:28:39] Thank you Chair. I want to echo some of what has already been said, both from me personally and from everybody from my agency who has sat in this seat. The three of you have helped make this process a better process, from the knowledge you bring, the perspective you bring, the passion you bring. Mr. Dooley, the fact that you've opened you're home to all of us and shared your family and shared your cooking, you didn't have to do that, and I think that helped us as Council members bond a little better and was much appreciated. We spend so much time in windowless hotel rooms to be able to relax like that, and that type of situation was really spectacular. Mr. Anderson, I still have trouble calling you Phil. It just doesn't feel, it doesn't feel right. You intimidated the bejesus out of me for my first few years on the GMT. I dreaded getting up to read a report and hearing out of your mouth, you mean to tell me! And I knew to just give up. But I've learned a great deal from you and admire and admire how you handle things, how you work with various groups, the perspective you bring, and if I can be even a third of the Council member you have been in this process, I think I will be doing my state well. So thank you all to all three of you for all of your work.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:18] Butch.

Butch Smith [00:30:21] Well I save my best work for November but still.....(laughter).... I am, I am lucky to know Joe and a pleasure we get to work together on the Southern Panel, where he's the Chairman and does a most excellent job. I didn't go to Bob's house because the last time I went to dinner with Bob he said he was going to pay for it and it was at a reception for the PFMC so.....(laughter).... But you're truly a gentleman and just a great guy. Would appreciate all the talks we've had and all this stuff that we've done together and so anyway. And then Phil, I've had the pleasure of knowing him for 40 years or more. And you talk about, I've never got to you no mean to mommy speech almost, but I've been cracked in the back of the head more than a few times. I've been taught a few times and a lot, and I've learned a lot from him and he is a regular Houdini when it comes to this process because I would never ever play poker with the man because you never know where he's coming from and where he's going to end up that is for sure. And I am sure we will still have plenty of phone calls together. I'm sure you we have a lot more, you have a lot more to teach me, and I sure I got a lot more kicks in the pants or a swat in the back of the head like the last 40 years and I will be looking forward to it all. So thank you Phil and Joe and Bob.

Marc Gorelnik [00:32:01] I just have to say something. Are you? Okay I'm sorry. I'll be brief. You know I'm really going to miss these three Council members. We're going to be adrift for a bit but somehow we'll manage. We'll soldier on but we will miss, Phil, Bob, and Joe for all the contributions they've made. And I'll just say on a personal note, I could not have even approached the role of Chair as I did without having served as Vice-Chair under Phil and watching him work.

Brad Pettinger [00:32:43] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:32:46] Just briefly, like Butch I'm sure I'll have more to say, not as much to say as Butch in November, but just brief comments. I'm really going to miss Bob' smile. It's just kind of who he is and every time I've seen it throughout the process it's just brought lightness and a lot of levity and personality to what we do. Joe, it's just, it's been an honor to sit next to you and I have learned so much from you. And when I think about myself as a member I look to you and say, what would Joe do? Or how can I be more like Joe? So, and then Phil, when I think about the PFMC what comes to mind is you. You are largely in my mind, the PFMC, and it's hard to think about a future here without you. And I know that we're all going to have to move on somehow, but you are such a presence and an inspiration and in a lot of ways the soul of this institution. So thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:33:58] Okay. All right. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:34:02] Thank you. I'm going to chime in here. I appreciate all of you for very, very different reasons. Phil, it has been incredible to work with you. I have certainly gone out there swinging some times and you probably have wondered what the heck did we get ourselves into, especially at the start, because I was not well known in the Council process, but you have been incredibly gracious. And it has been fun to work with you in terms of conversations around parliamentary procedure, which is near and dear to both of our hearts at times. And just your sense of humor is amazing which I'm not going to get into here but perhaps in November. In terms of Bob, it really has been incredible to spend the time that I have with you. We both came on at the same time. We both went back to D.C. for the training together which was, I don't know, three days of basically a fire hose and it was just so wonderful to have somebody there. You are incredible at checking in with people after Council meetings, before Council meetings, if things come up. You were with me when I bought my smartwatch. So you certainly have a place in my heart and I am, I'm just so appreciative of the time I've gotten to spend with you. And Joe you are I guess the lucky one that gets the final comments from me. I sat next to you for my first two years. You were incredibly gracious. Probably a lesser known fact around the Council table. We didn't used to have enough microphones for all of us, and Joe shared for the first two years his microphone with me. So I'm probably grateful that we both didn't have to fight over it for salmon, but just so appreciative of your willingness to lean in, be a part, let me bounce things off of you and share my sense of humor. So thank you all and you will be sorely missed.

Brad Pettinger [00:36:24] Thank you Christa. Okay. All right. Sharon.

Sharon Kiefer [00:36:27] We'll be saving words for November as well. But just briefly, I guess as the newest Council member it was such a pleasure to reconnect with Joe and Phil. I have worked with them in previous endeavors and they continued their substantial mentoring and teaching that

I had learned from in the previous jobs, and so an incredible pleasure to reconnect with you guys and to meet Bob. You know I don't think Virgil would have let me come unless it was to sit by Bob because he thinks so much of Bob, and that's all he could talk about was not about the Council role, but you're going to get to sit next to Bob. And I know now why he said that because he's been an incredible mentor and I've learned a lot from him and I certainly look forward to relaying some words from the agency in November.

Brad Pettinger [00:37:24] Thanks Sharon. Okay. All right.....(applause).....Okay, there's only one thing left to do and I'll turn to Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:37:52] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I move we adjourn.

Brad Pettinger [00:37:55] Looking for a second? Joe. Seconded by Mr. Oatman and Mr. Dooley. All right. All in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:38:04] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:38:06] Opposed no? Abstentions? The motion passes. Thank you all. Safe travels and I look forward to seeing you in September.

D. Habitat Issues

1. Current Habitat Issues

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] So that will take us to Council discussion here. There was a recommendation and just a reminder on the Hells Canyon EIS that I believe at our last meeting the Habitat Committee had offered to prepare a letter had that document been released. It wasn't released. Now it looks like July. Does the Council still wanting a letter drafted by the Habitat Committee? That's one item there, so I'll look around and see if there's agreement on that? That the Habitat Committee, should the document be released, it could be either a QR depending on the date of release of the document, or it might be in our September briefing book. So we would anticipate a draft letter prepared by the Habitat Committee. Anything else? Phil.

Phil Anderson [00:01:12] It's really hard for me to read the third item and reflect on BOEM's activities on the West Coast and square that with a commitment to conserving and protecting our ocean, healthy ecosystems, resilient communities. It's just, it's just a comment. It's hard to read that and believe that there's any sincerity in those.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:48] Thank you. Further comments? Discussion? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:01:58] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I am under the impression that a thank you for one of the members of the Habitat Committee is in order. Miss Fran Recht I believe is retiring after this meeting and I just wanted to express my thanks to her. She has been a leader and very thoughtful and very engaging with the public in all of my time coming to Council meetings and clearly has provided a tremendous amount of expertise towards helping this Council do its business. So I just wanted to recognize her and say thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:38] Thank you. That's a good segue....(applause)....wait. I believe Correigh Green has one more report to give us.

Correigh Greene [00:02:48] Yes I do. This is to honor and recognize over 24 years of service contributed by Fran Recht. Fran started with the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission in 1988 and is retiring after over 35 years of dedicated work. Quantifying the number of years she has contributed to the Council is kind of difficult. Her first year on the Habitat Committee was in 2000 but her predecessor, Steven Phillips, is certain that she helped out earlier. Throughout she has worked tirelessly to advance the now common idea that conserving habitat and managing productive fisheries is a win-win prospect. She helped start Pacific State's Habitat Program in 1990. Initial efforts dealt with gear recycling and reducing oil pollution, and the program expanded to support multiple efforts to improve fish habitat conservation through restoration projects, education, and informed policy. Fran was instrumental in starting the Pacific Marine and Estuarine Fish Habitat Partnership, a multi-agency effort to promote habitat restoration and disseminate information on fish habitats. And of course Fran has been a strong voice on the Habitat Committee. Since I started in 2013 I've always been impressed with her dedication to providing clear guidance to you on the conservation of EFH. From 2012 to 2016 she Co-Chaired the HC with Joel Kawahara and led meetings while he was out fishing. The first time this happened, Joel

gave her a kit to confer authority, including a kid's birthday crown and equivalent scepter and a ballpoint pen with a feather plume for signing official documents all in a pizza box. But of course she's never needed these trappings. She's always led and spoken with authority on the habitat needs for marine fishes. So thank you Fran for being such a strong champion....(applause)...

Pete Hassemer [00:04:42] All right. Thank you very much Fran. Wave to everybody here.....(applause)... All right, thank you very much. And that, I believe, completes our Habitat Committee work here on this agenda item so we will close that out.

E. Salmon Management

1. Sacramento River Fall Chinook Workgroup - Progress Report

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] There are no public comments, so there's a lot of information here. Before we get into discussion let's take a 10-minute break so you can get the blood circulating and get comfortable and we'll come back and have our Council discussion and guidance.....(BREAK)..... All right, we finished all our reports and we're ready to get to our Council action. It's up there on the screen, consider the report and provide some guidance on the next steps. So I will look around for any hand to initiate discussion on this topic. Scanning very hard. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:44] Okay, I guess I'll kick things off with just some opening thoughts, and maybe start by expressing that the Workgroup's Report might be a little beyond what I might have expected. As the Sit-Sum describes really well, last June the Council tasked the Workgroup with providing the Council a report in the spring of 24' that would begin our scoping of a revised conservation objective and related Harvest Control Rule and reference point alternatives. And that tasking that we did arose out of earlier recommendations that were articulated in the Sacramento Fall Rebuilding Plan that was approved by the Council back in 2019. And the recommendations from that rebuilding plan included updating the current conservation objective and developing an age-structured stock assessment, developing age-structured forecasts, and developing an age-structured harvest model. So what we got back here today was perhaps beyond what we had asked for and might offer alternatives that suggest more of a recreating of the wheel than perhaps the Council envisioned when it tasked the workgroup for this report. My thinking is the Council needs to understand how these alternatives that are presented to us actually bring about improvements in our reference points and our forecasting and the management that would result. And importantly, at what cost? There's really no analysis of cost benefit and what it would take. There was a brief mention of it here with the SSC dialogue, but we need to I think have some sense if the cost benefit is there before we would move toward some of the alternatives presented to us. STT noted there was very little time to digest or comprehend the significance of the report and many of the alternatives. And analysis, well there was an initial attempt in the Summary Table to do some analysis. It's really very little and not certainly enough for decision-makers and for the general public. Just to think back on the activities of the Workgroup. There were two Workgroup meetings this spring. The first meeting was described largely as an orientation. We heard today the SSC commend the Workgroup for producing this volume of work in such a short period of time. And clearly there was voluminous work going on in the background, but it came together awfully quickly and without a lot of, I'd say, time for public consumption. I don't know, after hearing the presentation of the report and I've sat through I think 3 or 4 versions of the presentation now. I think read the report, gosh, several times. Asked a number of questions and listened as best I can to a number of the discussion. I don't know how more enlightened I actually am. There are a lot of theoretical assumptions, mentions of theoretical advantages that we heard about today built into the recommendations. I feel like I've been handed a gigantic menu from which I'm being asked to make a dinner selection not really knowing if any of the menu items contain allergens, and meanwhile I'm already a little queasy and maybe what I really need is just a cup of heart and soul

warming chicken soup. From at least this Council members perspective, our task today of trying to provide guidance on next steps is pretty lofty and challenging, but I'll be willing to give it a try with at least some of the things we heard today from our advisory bodies, along with some perspective. So those are just some opening thoughts. I do have some specific guidance when the time is right, but maybe I'll pause here and see if others want to chime in.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:37] All right, thank you Marci. I'll look around and see if anybody else? John North.

John North [00:05:44] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Kind of in alignment with Miss Yaremko. You know, first I want to acknowledge the hard work of the Workgroup in pulling this report together in such a short amount of time. It really looks like a lot of work. However, you know, I admit I struggled to absorb everything in it. I guess I've been out of school too long, but it was a lot to take in with lots of options and limited recommendations, which I was kind of hoping to see some. So overall I don't really feel like I've had enough time to compare and contrast the options presented like in Section 10 of the report with the comments by STT and SSC, which they themselves didn't seem totally aligned. So all of that together makes it really hard to provide good guidance right now. And I guess I'd personally like to whittle down the table and the options more by comparing, you know, where all the groups align. So that's kind of some opening thoughts. I mean I have a few more on specifics, but it would be nice to know like as we move forward, like can the Workgroup make any progress with some limited guidance by the Council? Or do they need specific answers to the questions they had? But that's all I have.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:20] Thank you John. Further thoughts? General thoughts? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:07:27] Thank you. I also want to thank the Workgroup. And I think that it is the task before them and us is pretty intractable because the challenges that this stock faces is mostly influenced by factors outside of our control and factors that cannot even be measured until after we have to make certain management decisions. So it's a difficult situation all the way around, but I do think nonetheless we can still, there's still room for some improvements here and hopefully we can move in that direction.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:15] Thank you. Other comments? Discussion? Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:08:23] Well I want to thank those presentations we had. Those are very informative and I appreciate the little tutor on the side there helps me out. But I, on the Sacramento we've been through some of this stuff in the past and it seems like to me we need that magical thing called water that fish swim in too that makes the difference and makes the recovery pretty fast. I'm not an expert on the Klamath area and River and with the dam coming out there's all kinds of variables on that one. But the Sacramento system seems to be pretty resilient when you give it a chance. Now management, you know, and in between those low water years is probably something that we need to look at, but certainly flying over the Northern California it looked like there was plenty of water back in the reservoirs and stuff so that's a few years in a row. So I just want to keep that in mind too, to look a little bit in history. I don't know if there's some variable that's changed since the mid-2000's, the last time we kind of went through this, although not as bad, but it seemed like back then both systems didn't go down at the same time. But anyway, that's

just a, you know kind of a fisherman's perspective of what I saw happen when I was on the SAS and, you know, one year they were wondering what happened to them and two years later they had 1.6 million coming back. So I just want to kind of, you know, the reality is fish swim in water and it's hard for them to spawn on bare rocks and so I have learned that. But anyway I just, just a perspective. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:32] Thank you. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:10:35] Thanks Vice-Chair. Just a couple reflections here as I'm thinking about this. And also I have to be honest about my inability to fully understand all of this as I think Butch referenced so in similar waters there, but just a few things I've taken away. The importance of the age-based cohort reconstruction for both natural and hatchery fish, noting that the SSC and STT noted that. Also noting that that seems like it's a longer term need, so it would be great to learn a little bit more about what a path to get there would look like given the real constraints that we heard Marci reference about what that looks like and how we get there. My understanding is that's critical for doing the best management that we can in the long term, so focusing on that as a long term goal. Also taking away this issue that is really a policy decision about what's in the FMP in terms of maximizing yield versus production. I'm hearing that that's an important thing to potentially explore further. I don't know whether it's just my own ignorance or whether we need a little more depth here to fully make a decision as a Council, but it seems like that's an important path for us to explore, maybe not today but later. And then I also honed in on something that maybe feels like actual next steps we can take, which were the short term recommendations in the SSC Report and thinking about how we can better do our FMSY and SMSY and our conservation objectives just using the science that we have available now and the work that the Workgroup did to think about in the near term how we can approach improving our management. So I'll stop there. Just a couple of reflections.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:34] Thank you Corey. Other thoughts? Discussion? Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:12:43] Thank you. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just some thoughts from NMFS. I appreciate everyone, again, I want to echo all the appreciation for what the working group has done on a very complex task. The background and assessment of the current management measures, as others have noted, was very thorough and very informative. I think similar to the previous speaker, I did notice a few common recommendations between the STT and the SSC. There is one, some support for cohort reconstruction for Sacramento River fall Chinook similar to that at Klamath. Two, there's support for natural-area or natural-origin objectives in place of the current objective, that includes escapement to both natural areas and hatcheries. Three, careful consideration of the metrics used and treatment of hatchery and natural-origin escapement in the derivation of the cohort reconstruction. And then lastly, that the current objective is not supportive, which is problematic from a NMFS perspective. So given the emphasis, a couple other comments. Just given the emphasis on the use of SMSY in both the National Standard 1 and the FMP, we do support, NMFS supports an emphasis on the use of an SMSY-based conservation objective that takes into account the significant contribution and importance of hatchery spawners on the spawning ground. The Sacramento River fall Chinook in that system is not the only one where we have large hatchery programs and where we've identified SMSY objectives. At this time based on the data limitations in the Workgroup Report, and as described in the STT Report, NMFS supports

a goal based on natural area escapement. However, fall Chinook production in the Sac Basin is essential to support Sacramento River fall Chinook and the salmon fisheries that depend on it, so therefore it will be important to consider how to account for the needs of the hatchery programs in setting the management framework. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:01] Thank you Ryan. Other thoughts? Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:15:08] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I did prepare some guidance in writing that I thought might be most helpful on a few of the topics that other Council members have brought up here in their opening remarks. Maybe I'll get into a little more detail on them. So I would offer as guidance that the future work should reflect that MSY serves as the basis of salmon fishery management, which would be as modified by NS-1 Guidelines to achieve optimum yield and not the maximum sustainable production, which was described in Agenda Item E.1.a, Supplemental STT Report. Both Corey and Ryan spoke to this. This was one of, this was the Workgroup's first question that they posed to us, whether we should design management for MSY. This is what's in use today. It's the most factually accurate. We haven't been managing this stock to maximize production. STT flagged for us that there is FMP language that might need to be updated. And I guess it suggests that when that FMP update language happens, can probably be a discussion in conjunction with other mandatory language activities that may be in front of us for other items. Moving to the second item of guidance, we've heard quite a bit about the significance of the hatchery component of the Sac fall Chinook stock. I'd like to direct the Workgroup to continue developing a contemporary conservation objective and the other reference points and measures that rely on the aggregate of returning hatchery and natural adults. Every salmon cycle we hear the public, we hear our advisers, and we hear our salmon managers wrestle with what this year's conservation objective or escapement goal will or should be. We struggle routinely with that goal range concept of 122 to 180,000 adult spawners and then we wait patiently for NMFS's guidance each year for where within that range we should be designing this year's fishery management to achieve. The Workgroup does a nice job of laying out that that lower end of the goal range was developed in a day when the Red Bluff Diversion Dam interfered with passage to the upper Sac. And the upper end of the range is not reproducible so we're kind of working with numbers that are an artifact of the past, and that was highlighted in the methods review that was conducted back in 2022. The report also notes that some of the escapement goals for Sacramento hatcheries and the mean natural area escapements to the four natural areas from that methods review suggested an upper bound value of perhaps over 300,000 fish. We've heard varying public comments expressing views on what the right number really is and whether the goal should also include San Joaquin and late fall fish, and perhaps maybe that's worth considering. Then the Workgroup turns focus to the discussion of whether we should be developing a conservation objective looking only at natural origin or natural area fish instead of the aggregate that's in use today of hatchery and natural adults. The report goes into a bit of the basis for using the aggregate that was originally articulated in the FMP back in 1984 that indicated that determining the separation of hatchery and natural fish in areas of the basin is artificial, and the distinction between hatchery and natural stocks has become lost. That's pretty, pretty heavy language to me. Before making the decision to move away from what's been there in that language for 50 years, I think we would want to give very serious thought, so I guess I'm somewhat surprised to hear the SSC come out here and now with a very strong recommendation emphasizing the need to disentangle production and yield of natural-origin and hatchery-origin fish in order to reduce the risk of

overharvest of the natural-origin component, and that the Workgroup should move toward developing natural-origin reference points. So I have some pretty significant concern with that recommendation, especially not really hearing enough about the why. The reasons that I think have been offered suggests that it's because that's how it's done elsewhere that we don't use aggregate conservation goals, that we look instead to runner basin-specific goals or hatchery-origin and other goals that are natural. Then the other reason offered by the Workgroup is that it might be perhaps risk-averse regarding ESA listing considerations. And I guess I'm.....that stuck out to me as perhaps a big question mark, and that my feeling is that the Salmon Fishery Management Plan that has been created and guided under the auspices of the Magnuson Act, I don't know that we should be considering moving toward a type of conservation objective on the basis of an ESA argument. It's just kind of subtle suggestions from the SSC that in the Central Valley using the aggregate is wrong and that we should support the Workgroup doing more work to move away from an aggregate conservation objective. I don't know the science and the rationale that was used back in 1984 when the decision was made for a combined goal, but I'm again just not willing to move away from that with, you know, with this one meeting process here today. I'm still not clear why reference points for only natural-origin fish would be better, and for that reason, even scientifically derivable in a way that gives us confidence and able to determine with any level of precision. Again, given we are marking and tagging currently the fall run hatchery production at a 25% mark rate. I want to credit the SAS and thank them for their remarks that the Sacramento River system is unique and that hatcheries play a critical role in sustaining fish stocks. They describe quite well that the abundance of the stock complex is largely dependent on hatchery fish via direct hatchery production and through hatchery fish that are spawning in the natural environment and therefore are contributing to natural area production. Those are major considerations and they shouldn't be downplayed or dismissed. I also want to reiterate that regarding hatchery production in the Central Valley, CDFW and partner agencies have all identified a priority of evaluating increases in fall run Chinook salmon production and are planning for hatchery operations into the future with the possibility of expansion, referring to the California Governor's Salmon Strategy Item 4.1, and then item 4.13, "By 2026 to complete the necessary HGMPs to ensure any production capacity increase is pursuant to the best management requirements to avoid risks to wild salmon populations". I think we need to think about the level of introgression of hatchery and natural fish throughout the Central Valley Basin and how difficult it would be to actually determine the origin of spawners returning to hatcheries or natural areas. And as the STT noted, moving to a natural origin escapement method would be incredibly difficult without some form of mass marking in order to identify what really is a hatchery fish and what is a natural-area spawner. It does seem like the Workgroup Report suggests there may be more promise that we could look at an MSY for natural-area spawners, and the STT Report references this too. But both whether you're talking natural-origin or natural-area fish that we'd be looking at, both of the concepts are challenged with very heavy assumptions and lots of needs for extrapolation. Sacramento fall Chinook are a unique stock in a very unique system, and as we've heard and know, it's bolstered heavily by hatchery production, and as Marc mentioned earlier, is living in a heavily altered water system with federal and state water projects that export water. We also know there's substantial genetic introgression and homination.....homogenization, sorry, and it's on those facts that we expect that our predecessors made the choice to establish a conservation objective that manages for both natural and hatchery components. Also like to I guess go in a little more detail on how heavy the hatchery component is. In this stock, just to refer back to the work we are doing through our Constant Fractional Marking Program, looking at the most recent analysis which was from recovery year

2020 that evaluates the proportion of hatchery and natural-origin salmon in the fisheries and the escapement, the proportion of the hatchery contribution to the natural area scheme ranged from 42 to up to 87% depending on the areas examined, the locations. And on average for 2020, the overall average was 71%. So very significant contribution of hatchery fish. As we discussed, of course, there's year to year variation in that amount, but so strongly, heavily, hatchery contribution, it's just very difficult to understand how scientifically we would be able to move to a natural-only conservation objective. Moving toward the discussion of the cohort reconstruction, we heard a bit about the work that is underway. It is encouraging and exciting. We've been waiting for this kind of proof of concept work for some time, but we'd like the Workgroup to be tasked with evaluating that reconstruction to determine if it will provide substantial improvement in accuracy over current forecasting and modeling methodologies. It's this approach is supported by both SSC and the STT. Again, it's part of the 2019 rebuilding plan. But I want to flag what the Workgroup noted is that the work that would be required to build the work flow would require significant commitments from numerous agencies to collect and turn over the data and process it on a rapid timeline in order to meet our preseason timeline needs, and even with commitments from all of the outside agencies, which many of those agencies are not under the purview of the Council, there's a significant workload that would come with incorporating cohort reconstruction into abundance forecasting, so that would be a monumental and Herculean effort. But before we even talk about that, I think we need to know more about what improvements this will buy us? So in the guidance for Item 3, we really want to focus on having the Workgroup analyze for us if the cohort reconstruction is expected to provide substantial improvement and accuracy over the current forecasting and modeling methodologies. So I think that's a key point. Again, this proof of concept's been underway for some time, let's see, let's see if it really is worth the commitment of resources that it would require to implement into our management framework. Just want to reiterate that with regard to the objectives here of the Workgroup, to flag that in fact the efforts to improve both Sacramento and Klamath conservation objectives modeling and abundance forecasting is a priority item in the Governor's Salmon Strategy, it's Objective 5.10. So these particular tasks that have been identified as guidance fit well within the recommendations that, or the objectives that have been identified by the department and the Governor. I think in conclusion I just I want to reiterate something that we heard this morning in our delegation that we need to be careful not to build something that will hurt fisheries when the conditions change and the stocks are abundant and we're meeting our objectives. So I know some other folks have mentioned that that, you know, we are coming out perhaps of some bleak times with regard to water conditions, but as Butch emphasized for us, maybe we've turned the corner. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:46] Thank you Marci. Any discussion? There's some recommendations for guidance there before us. Let's see if there's agreement. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:33:00] I have a question about Bullet 2. And I'm trying to track everything Marci, so my apologies if you clarified this because I think I understand, but I just want to be sure. When you're referring to the aggregate there of returning hatchery and natural cohorts? Are you referring to the aggregate to the natural spawning areas? Meaning it would not include returns to the hatchery programs? Or is it the alternative?

Marci Yaremko [00:33:34] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair and Mr. Wulff for the question. Returning to the hatcheries as well as natural areas. So the aggregate, and I'm sorry for my terminology there perhaps being unclear.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:59] All right, thank you. Any discussion or.....Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:34:05] Yeah, thanks. And I think that's where I understand the rationale that's given. I think that's where NMFS has some challenges. I think it is tough for us to support that aspect being basically status quo in its current form because I think both the STT and the SSC stated the derivation of a SMSY objective is not compatible with including escapement to both the hatchery and the natural spawning grounds. And since it's kind of central to National Standard 1, it'd be tough for us to kind of continue to support what seems to be a direct sort of look at status quo. However, we do agree that there needs to be consideration of how to consider hatchery broodstock needs, and that we think could be accommodated under the concept of optimum yield. So I think NSMSY objective for natural spawning area spawning objective, but then having the Workgroup consider how hatchery program needs could be considered. You know, I think that's something that we.....that's more along the lines of what I was thinking with my comments earlier, as opposed to what's written here in Bullet 2. So maybe I'll stop there. I'm a little unclear what would be the next step here if we're trying to amend guidance, but that would be differing guidance from NMFS perspective.

Pete Hassemer [00:35:43] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:35:45] Thanks Vice-Chair. Thanks Marci for this guidance. I'm also honing a little bit on Bullet 2 here, and Marci you spoke to sort of not feeling like the why was fully articulated and having concerns about that. And I don't feel like fully knowledgeable in that myself, but in reading the reports and having conversations, to me part of the why is because this is an incredibly important stock and for our fishery and that the risk of it getting listed is just a fate I would want to absolutely avoid. And so if understanding the stock in the way that is suggested by the SSC and pulled out of the Workgroup Report is a way that we can keep closer tabs on our fishery and on how that component of the larger hatchery plus natural is doing, and is how it is done from what I understand across most of the rest of the coast for our salmon stocks, would allow us to have more certainty and less risk of falling into a place where we're risking listing and risking our fishery. That would be the why in my mind. I'm just putting that out there as fodder for thought and just some concern with the second bullet.

Pete Hassemer [00:37:22] Thank you. Look around and see if there's any further discussion? There seems to be....I'm not sure we have agreement on the second bullet item there, but if we, let's take a look at Number 1 first and see in terms of guidance if there's agreement on that? That there was a question about MSY versus MSP yield versus production and that the future work should reflect MSY. Any thoughts, disagreement on that? I guess I'm not hearing any disagreement that that guidance doesn't hold. And the third one there is evaluating that draft cohort reconstruction which is being done by a graduate student at this time, so there will be a product at some time and asking the Workgroup to evaluate that. Is there any disagreement with that that we take that approach in the review? Maybe my question is, is the Workgroup the right group to evaluate that in the context of improvements in accuracy over forecasting and modeling? Or is that something

more in the STT wheelhouse? It's not a methodology review but, so we get the right information on that, but I'll look around and see if anyone has any thoughts. And I'm not seeing any here. Maybe at this point I'm going to task Robin to see what you've heard and what guidance we can provide to the Workgroup?

Robin Ehlke [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, I guess. I think you're correct. It sounds like, at least for Item 1, you know sticking with MSY instead of MSP if you will, focusing on yield rather than production is the intent of the FMP, and so that does make sense and I think that the Council is in line with that guidance and would be helpful for the Workgroup to have that information as they move forward over the summer. And the same story for Item 3. You know pursuing the cohort reconstructions and getting a understanding of, you know how, you know the big bang for the buck, if you will, you know and how much improvement it would provide and managing this Sac fall group. So I think Items 1 and 3 are two things that the Workgroup can take away with them and focus their work on over the summer. Whether or not the conservation objective stays as it is with status quo by including that hatchery return component as well as the natural area returns that do include both hatchery and natural fish, right now that is the topic under consideration. The Council could certainly discuss this more at this time. You could have the choice of not closing this agenda item at this point and pick it up later to further give thought to this Item 2, or could just stop here with Items 1 and 3 and ask the Workgroup to come back in November as they are scheduled, or maybe even in September, where more thought could be put into this item too and let the Workgroup go on with some of the other tasks in the meantime.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:17] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:02:19] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, maybe just to offer some additional clarity on my intent with what's on the screen. We have some differing perspectives as expressed by the SAS and by the SSC. The SAS emphasizes the value of hatchery returns both to hatcheries and to natural areas and indicates the importance of a conservation objective that considers those fish returning both to the natural areas and the fish to the hatcheries. Meanwhile, the SSC has recommended that we move to reference points relying on natural-origin fish only. I think I've articulated the reasons why I see concerns with the SSCs recommendations, but I'd also, I think, like to add that we, excuse me, hang on one second. I'm struggling with whether a move to natural-origin conservation objectives would actually improve management and what does, I mean what does the current literature say about the genetic homogeneity or distinctiveness between natural and hatchery components? We haven't talked about hatchery practices, but what would be the effects of a natural-area escapement objective on hatchery management? And how do operations at hatcheries affect estimations of hatchery versus natural escapement estimates? So I think I'm having a difficult time understanding, and maybe when Ryan said status quo, maybe I need to elaborate that in no way would we expect that development of these updated reference points to be status quo. There are a number of factors that would need to be considered in examining available habitat, examining which basins to use. There's mention in the Workgroup Report of the history of the removal of the San Joaquin Basin and the Mokelumne fish from the conservation objective. So when you say status quo, I just I, that is absolutely not where I think I would expect to land. There's contemporary information. We've acknowledged that the current reference points are not, cannot even be rooted in today's landscape. So I guess I just want to clarify that in no way am I suggesting status quo. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:10] Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:06:15] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I don't know that my observations will be helpful, but I thought what the STT had to say on this subject was informative and I don't think we're at a point that we should be deciding. It's not a one or the other because I don't think we've thoroughly explored what the other is. And by that I'm talking about their statement that in part says, "Given the level of hatchery contribution in natural spawning areas and hatcheries, the STT agrees that giving thought to the right metrics will be necessary when choosing how hatchery fish will be treated in developing a new SRFC conservation objective". Then they go on to mention several things that would need further consideration as we make the choice. So I think there's, and I may be wrong, but the way I'm looking at this is that there is more work to do in thinking about how to treat hatchery fish relative to the spawning escapement objective and developing what they're referenced, or their terminology, the right metrics will be necessary when choosing how hatchery fish will be treated. And I will readily admit I appreciated the work of the Workgroup in their report, but to say that I totally understand it, I didn't. I need more time to look at it. But it seems to me that there isn't a, you're either going to include hatchery fish or not, the question is how you're going to treat hatchery fish in the development of a new conservation objective for the stock. So I don't think we're at that point to make that choice. And they go, the STT goes on to talk about they're not aware where there are other examples like this where there's just mend this bright line drawn between the two. So to me this is a step forward but we need, there needs to be more thought and consideration given into how we're going to treat those in the management objective and what the consequences of how those, how they're treated will be. So that's kind of where I would land on this, on this question. But we shouldn't be trying to answer the question. We need to develop some additional information and alternatives on how hatchery fish are going to be treated.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:31] Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:09:33] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer, and following up on Mr. Anderson's comment. I think the ST is appropriately skeptical of a hatchery-only conservation objective. And so if we're not going to adopt Number 2, which I would support, then I think we would need to ask if we're going to task the Workgroup further that to consider the, to try to scope what advantages are we really going to get out of either of these two approaches or, you know it's.....I don't want to send it back to the Workgroup with either one of these objectives as a predetermined outcome.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:39] Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:10:41] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just with regard to the I guess either or, I just want to be very clear that there's a difference between natural-origin fish versus natural-area spawners. Natural-area spawners certainly have some component, sometimes significant component of hatchery fish contributing to the spawning activity on those natural areas. My primary concern is with the SSC's recommendation that we look to natural-origin fish to be setting our reference points. Natural- origin fish, I don't know how you're going to conclusively determine what a natural-origin fish is in this system. So I just want to make sure that distinction is clear, and I think the SST does a fine job. I just want to echo that as well. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:52] Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:11:54] Yeah, thank you. Thanks Miss Yaremko for that. I completely agree so maybe I can help also clarify some of my earlier comments. So from a NMFS perspective completely agree with what you just said, and that's what I was trying to reference earlier. We didn't, don't support the recommendation for natural-origin only and did support natural-area. I think what I was trying to clarify in Bullet 2 is we thought we heard from the STT and the SSC that you couldn't do a SMSY objective that would have an aggregate of natural adults and those returning to the hatcheries, and you would need to do natural-area, which would be just returning to the spawning grounds. But I also share the concerns of the SAS in that it is important to consider how hatchery returns to the hatcheries would be included. So I do think that needs to be looked at. I don't know if that fits in with a natural-area FMSY objective, so I kind of like Mr. Anderson suggestion that maybe given this discussion the working group could take that and then come back to us with some further discussion. But just to further clarify, I was not trying to support natural-origin. I was just trying to highlight the difference between natural-area and those returning to hatcheries as an aggregate if that makes sense. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:19] Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:13:20] Yeah, there's one other aspect here. Presently because we don't distinguish between the origin or the destination of these fish, we look at jack returns to calculate or to forecast the stock abundance. It's not clear to me how by looking at jack returns you can forecast where their cohorts will return a year later. Maybe there is a solution to that but that is an additional complication associated with distinguishing between natural-area spawners and hatchery spawners, because you don't, the foundation for that estimate is coming from jack returns presently. Where it goes from here I don't know.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:20] Thank you. So as we've gone through this there's still a lot of questions I guess in my mind. Dr. Satterthwaite is here and I'm going to put him on the spot, ask him to come back up here and maybe in the context of Mr. Anderson's statement there, we're not choosing one versus the other, but something that would inform us. Based on our discussion, what you've heard, what could the Workgroup do between now and September or now and November that you could bring back to help us down this road of looking at the conservation objective, which was a priority item to address was the conservation objective. Is there anything from your perspective that the Workgroup can tackle?

William Satterthwaite [00:15:30] Yeah, maybe you could repeat, or Mr. Anderson could repeat his specific question. I think there are certainly things, well I think there are certainly things that have already been done that could be brought to the Workgroups attention that could be informative on some of these questions. But obviously I've not talked to the Workgroup about, you know, what do we think our capacity is? What are people's timelines? Yeah, but maybe if there's a very specific question like, is there, the question, what work could the Workgroup do with respect to a particular question? Or just what can the Workgroup do period in the next couple of months?

Pete Hassemer [00:16:12] I think it's more in reference to the conservation objective and helping to inform the decision we need to make. And maybe I'll, fair or not, ask Mr. Anderson if he can repeat the statement he made.

Phil Anderson [00:16:32] I doubt I could do that but, so Dr. Satterthwaite when I was looking at the STTs comments on this question, it left me with the belief that there was additional work to do. If we were not going to go down the road of just dealing with natural spawning fish, that the statement was given the level of hatchery contribution to the natural areas and hatcheries that the STT thought that giving additional thought to ensuring that we have the right, what they called metrics, would be necessary when choosing how hatchery fish would be treated in the development of a new conservation objective. So, that's I guess, if there was a question, my assumption was that by reading that, that there was more work that could be done in terms of looking at alternatives as to how to treat hatchery fish in the development of a new conservation objective.

William Satterthwaite [00:18:04] Okay, I can take a stab at either answering elements of that question, or at least saying some things that have occurred to me that may or may not be relevant. So I mean in terms of, you know I've heard about there's a value of hatchery fish in and of themselves and in potentially contributing to future natural-area spawning, so there are analyses that have already been done, although have not been seen by the Workgroup that look at for different total escapement, so total escapement to natural areas and hatcheries combined. Under different levels of total escapement how likely are we to meet the various hatcheries stated objectives in terms of how many fish they're saying they want? Those analyses were done based on the goals that are reported in I believe it's the review document. I have been told those may not actually reflect the most current goals that the hatcheries themselves actually hold, but it would be very straightforward if someone would tell me what the actual hatchery goals are. It would be very straightforward to redo that analysis. So an analysis is already out there that says, given you actually achieve a particular escapement, and so there's a whole different set of challenges with are we actually achieving our escapement goal? But putting that aside, analysis are already there that says for a total escapement, regardless of origin, regardless of where they go, how likely are you to meet all the hatchery goals simultaneously for that same total escapement? You can say, you can't say with any kind of certainty how many will go to natural areas versus hatcheries. You can say there's at least this degree of probability that with this much total escapement we'll get at least x number of fish to natural areas, and that will get us at least x percent of potential natural production. So the sort of again this analysis exists. The Workgroup has not seen it in full, but potentially that is something that could be discussed by the Workgroup potentially brought forward. Potentially they could try to turn it into a simpler presentation than the Journal article that it currently is, there's that. Just one other thing that has occurred to me. I mean the questions sort of come up repeatedly, how would we track natural-origin if only a quarter of fish are marked and tagged? I think we would multiply by four if it was truly a completely constant mark and tag fraction. In practice, the way this is done is for each tag recovery we know the tag rate and we can apply an expansion to that. That doesn't work in real time for telling you this particular fish is hatchery versus natural, but if we just wanted to track are we meeting a natural-origin conservation objective, the tools exist to do that even in the absence of mass marking. Mass marking will increase the statistical precision of your estimates of natural versus hatchery-origin, but it's not required. So I know you didn't ask that last part but.....

Pete Hassemer [00:21:09] Thank you. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:21:16] Yeah, thank you for the offer, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, to float that new work by the Workgroup. I guess I was wondering if maybe you can elaborate a bit on hatchery practices and how their activities, for example, to close gates to once they've attained their goals, this is something that's touched on in the Workgroup Report that's very important and that a fish that returns to a hatchery is on its way. Fish are in line to get in and the goal is met and, you know, in some cases in hatcheries, you know, shut gates and fish continue on and potentially then are counted in natural-area escapement estimates. And so I know you contemplated this in the Workgroup to some extent, but maybe you can just elaborate on how those hatchery practices would either be influenced by or would influence calculation of natural-area spawners.

William Satterthwaite [00:22:34] Right, thanks. And I don't know if Colin is still online. He might be better informed on sort of what the current state-of-the-art or thinking of as the hatcheries of how they're going to be approaching that going forward. I do know, just sort of looking at recent review of ocean fishery documents, the escapements to several hatcheries have in many years been well above their stated goals, which would imply that they're not doing that currently. They're not closing the gates currently. I mean I think there are reasons to take in more fish than the bare minimum needed to make the egg production goal. Other than Colin, I don't think there's currently much expertise on that question on the Workgroup. So maybe I'll check to see, did Colin raise his hand? Does he want to speak up?

Pete Hassemer [00:23:21] I don't see him online so you don't have a phone-a-friend....(laughter)....

William Satterthwaite [00:23:24] All right. But then, yeah I mean just based on what I know, I think absent better information we could look at, you know, what has escapement to the hatcheries been? How often is that exceeding the goals? And potentially, and again, maybe Colin would have the right expertise to address this question, but maybe we could get into what would the consequences be of closing the gates earlier, say? I mean one thing that immediately occurs to me is you're therefore then creating selection on fish that return earlier. You may not want to do that, but we could try to predict how the hatcheries might respond to a different objective. Again, I don't know how much the hatcheries take into account the PFMCs escapement objective.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:17] Dani Evenson.

Dani Evenson [00:24:18] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And thank you Dr. Satterthwaite for all your hard work on this. I think, and normally I stay in my lane on this stuff, but I'm going to weigh-in a little bit here. And following up on Mr. Anderson's comments, I think where we're getting high-centered here is how to treat the hatchery fish? And I'm wondering, the potential for the Workgroup to flesh out some alternatives here on how you can differentially treat them, the natural-area, the natural-origin, which I think is probably going to end up being a non-starter because of the amount of data we would need to get to, but we have a difference in advice between all three bodies, you know, that submitted reports to us. The STT said, well you're going to need to take care and consider how, you know, what metrics you use. The SAS had different guidance and the SSC said you need to disentangle these. So I think it would be helpful if we could get some sort of matrix and a look at alternatives, what would this get us? What are the benefits? What are

the risks to the fisheries, to the system, to our management system? What changes would be? And because I'm very sensitive to state entities, management entities, you know, what type of program we would need. So we heard Dr. Byrne earlier say, well you could do PBT, Parental-Based Tagging to get at the natural origin component. You would need to tag all those fish, sample them all, get their genetic fingerprint at the hatcheries. You would need to sample your ocean fisheries at a fairly sizable rate, and you would need to sample inriver some way to know what's coming back and if those are hatchery or natural origin, I see that as a substantial departure and a significant expense. So perhaps I'm wondering, you know, if that would be something that's doable by the Workgroup to come up with something. It doesn't have to be a huge deep dive but the basics because we are wrestling with this here today.

William Satterthwaite [00:26:49] Yes I think, I mean there are already methodologies worked out for how we would derive, or a couple options for how we would derive a natural-area conservation objective. There are a couple methodologies already worked out for how we would derive a total-escapement conservation objective. Potentially those could be put, say, in front of the STT and SSC in a methodology review, and we could identify, do one of those approaches qualify as BSIA? The cost and benefit analysis I think would be a lot harder to develop and would take longer. And there's also sort of potentially almost a circularity question because, you know, part I would think of analyzing costs and benefits or, you know, analyzing risks to the fishery would include things like, well, what's the risk of an overfished determination and therefore trading or rebuilding plan, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, and your risk of triggering a rebuilding plan is of course, in part going to depend on what is your reference point that tells you whether or not you're overfished? So the cost and benefit I think is a much longer term, harder process that may not really even apply to all of these decisions. But I mean in terms of describing methodologies for either approach, I think that's very doable and that potentially it's a matter yeah of STT and SSC methodology review are, is one of these approaches. BSIA is one of these approaches. Clearly not BSIA. That might get us somewhere.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:33] All right, thank you. So Will I apologize for calling you up here but appreciate what you've provided us. And I'm going to look back to the Council here to see if you've had any revelations here or thoughts on the conservation objective and guidance as to what specific guidance to the Workgroup as to what they might do on that, or are we just going to proceed? We've got guidance on Items 1 and 3 that are on the screen before us. And the Workgroup, as I believe, has other meetings planned. They have other work to do. They will go forward but it would help if we can, we don't have to, but if there's some specific guidance relative to the conservation objective it would be nice to get that out. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:29:38] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. There was some discussion in the context of natural-area escapement as to whether we're looking at the aggregate for the Sacramento system versus separate targets for individual tributaries. And I, we haven't had any further discussion on that and so I am going to offer for Council consideration that our guidance would be in the aggregate rather than separate targets for individual tributaries.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:14] Okay. So the.....Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:30:18] I don't want to get out of my lane here, but I thought the offer that the alternatives, the offer that Dr. Satterthwaite gave us would be a logical next step to address the issues that are embodied in Number 2.

Marc Gorelnik [00:30:37] Yeah, I don't mean to perturb that. It's just that to the extent we're going to be talking about natural areas, I just want to make sure that we're talking about natural areas in the whole. I don't want to invite any further parsing.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:02] Looking around. I'm trying to avoid calling on Robin, but I may have to do that here. We will need to wrap this up at some point. So, Robin.

Robin Ehlke [00:31:18] Thanks again Mr. Vice-Chair. Definitely, again where we were. We're good on one and three. It's not clear to me right now where we landed on Item 2 given Will's input. So if I could have clarification on that. And then understanding the desire to when we think about tributaries we'll look at them as an aggregate rather than the individual. Just have that as well. Then I think we'll have guidance enough to get us through our summer fall workgroup plan.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:01] Okay I'm going to look around and see if anyone here has thoughts on that rather than me trying to summarize it. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:32:16] Not necessary thoughts, but something related. And I appreciated Marc's suggestion and can support that. But just wanted to highlight that as I look at the detailed report of the working group on page 26, it does say that they discussed the possibility of moving to a conservation objective and SMSY reference point measured in terms of natural-area spawners, but also noted it could be possible to still define these quantities in terms of total spawners while basing the total spawner numbers on more explicit consideration of what levels of natural-area escapement would be expected at those levels of total escapement. So I think that that portion of the report does include consideration of natural-area escapement consistent with SMSY as well as hatchery program needs. So maybe that's something we can also highlight for the working group. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:10] All right, thank you. Is there any other specific guidance on this related to the conservation objectives? I know this is a difficult one. I'm trying to think back to the suggestions we heard from Dr. Satterthwaite on looking at alternatives to treatment of hatchery origin fish in this and some of those alternative methodologies, but I don't know what the specificity is there so I'm looking around. Robin.

Robin Ehlke [00:34:01] I think the Council is understanding that we need to think about this a little bit more. I think we can all agree on that as far as, you know, where the hatchery fish play a role. And that kind of leans into where, you know, what the STT was saying and what Mr. Anderson was saying about, you know, we.....and also hearing Marci say, you know, trying to figure out, you know, what to do with hatchery fish in the sense of making a decision, you know, at this one meeting, we're just not there yet. And so perhaps as far as Item 2, just guiding or giving direction to the Workgroup to, you know, just think about more ways on how those may be incorporated, hatchery and natural fish, you know, in the hatchery, on the spawning grounds, acknowledging Ryan's point about the information in the Workgroup Report already and what Will

has said, I think we can work through some direction and but not make any decisions. And then when we get back in November when we're scheduled, unless the Council decides otherwise, we can pick this up. But it does identify for the Council how complex of a topic it is and, you know, perhaps give everybody some time to think about it a little bit more. So just no decisions right now on what to do or any changes anyway on the conservation objective relative to hatchery and natural fish. Give the Workgroup some time to work through it. They'll come back in November and let you know, and in the meantime follow the guidance on Items 1 and 2. That's what I'm picking up.

Pete Hassemer [00:35:47] I'm going to look around. Are people comfortable with that? I'm seeing head nods. No disagreement so I think that's a good approach. So we've been at that for a long time. Is there anything else on this agenda item? We've got some guidance to provide to the Workgroup. Right now we're scheduled to hear back in November from them. We'll have more information before us. So not seeing any other hands I'm going to close out this agenda item.

2. Queets River Spring/Summer Chinook Rebuilding Plan – Progress Report

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] No public comment so it takes us to our Council discussion and action. This is just simply a progress report on progress to date and if there's any guidance the Council wants to provide at this time on that? So I will look around to see if there's any hands. And I see Kyle Adicks has his hand up. Kyle, please go ahead.

Kyle Adicks [00:00:36] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Chair can you hear me okay?

Pete Hassemer [00:00:39] Yes we can.

Kyle Adicks [00:00:40] Great. I don't have any specific guidance. I want to thank the STT and the staff that have worked on the rebuilding plan so far for their efforts. Thanks to the Habitat Committee for their report. I'm not aware that anybody's identified any need to or desire to request help from the Habitat Committee as of yet, but if issues arise we'll be sure to get in touch with the right people. A lot of local area experts are working on it. As Dr. O'Farrell said, the data on this stock is really limited and it's going to be tough to identify much of a range of alternatives for potential fishery management actions. As I was thinking back to past rebuilding plans, I was originally thinking we usually had three alternatives, but looking back in the past it's often only two. So I suspect it'll be a struggle to come up with what those two are, but trust that the group working on the rebuilding plan will do that and have us some alternatives to consider by the time we get to September. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:45] Thank you Kyle. Any further discussion or guidance on this one? And I'm not seeing any. It's simply a progress report up on the progress to date so I believe that concludes our action, but I will turn to Angela to see how we did.

Angela Forristall [00:02:09] Yep. Thank you for considering the progress report. And that concludes everything for us.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:14] All right, that wraps up, closes this agenda item.

F. Groundfish Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] I believe that completes all of our reports here and we have no public comment so I will quickly look around to see if there is any discussion to be had regarding those reports? Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:00:17] Thank you. I may not have heard it right that there's a reference to a change in the Hoh Tribe's usual and accustomed fishing area and the definition of that area. And there was reference to a proposed rule to deal with that. Did I understand that correctly?

Pete Hassemer [00:00:40] Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:00:42] Yes, you did understand that correctly. I'll just note that the court settlement is already in effect. We'd need to update the regulations to be consistent with that. So it is considered non-discretionary from our point of view so we will not be issuing a proposed rule. We will go straight to final rule. And I'm happy to share that court settlement document to see the changes. We have been in contact with the tribes about that change and are moving it forward.

Phil Anderson [00:01:07] I would appreciate getting a copy of the settlement if possible? Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:15] Okay. Further discussion? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:01:20] Thanks Vice-Chair. Thanks Miss Kent. Can you provide a little more information about the hook and line survey that's going to be happening?

Keeley Kent [00:01:33] Thank you. It is the typical hook and line survey. So it's the standard that we have been operating in previous years that is being worked on for this year, so no changes as of yet. But I know conversations continue about whether there may be an expansion in the future.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:55] Thank you. And look around, no other.....Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:02:03] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair and good morning. Keeley, question. You noted the emergence, or the 2024 Pacific whiting harvest spex expected in June. And I remember in years past they were needed to be published in the Federal Register prior to the opening of the season and we'd made some moves to get that done earlier in the Council process to make sure there was time to do that. And so one, I know the whiting season isn't progressing very smoothly right now, it's pretty low catch, but how did we get started here without it really being in the federal rule and is that a problem, and what caused this delay?

Keeley Kent [00:02:52] Thank you for the question. We have altered the whiting spex rulemaking process. In the past few years it started when the JMC did not come to decision. Sort of the old model used to be that we would publish a proposed rule prior to the JMC meeting. And then with the years of not having an agreement out of the JMC, that meant we had to do another proposed

rule before we could go to a final rule. That created additional workload for us so we shifted to a model where we'd held the proposed rule until after the JMC met in order to make sure we didn't have to do three rulemakings. That model has been in place the last couple of years so we have the rule package prepped and ready to go, but wait for the JMC meeting and then push the proposed rule forward. We do the shortest comment period that we can, which is 15 days that we have to seek a waiver for, and then look to move for the final rule. We have gotten pushback in years from the Department of Commerce about a 15-day comment period. That adds additional time when we have to spend time working with them on trying to demonstrate that we need to have that short period. And to be honest, every rulemaking package sort of over the years encounters new review delays along the way. There are many, many steps and so it's sort of hard to speak to exactly what happened this year because we see this unfortunately in a lot of our rule packages, that the timelines in general over time have grown and our ability to do quick rulemakings has changed. This one, the real goal was publishing the proposed rule before the May 1 opener. And that's the other part of it too, that changing the season date start really impacted our ability to do the rulemaking on the same timeline. But from our perspective, we have the ability to do in-term allocations in the regulations. We spend a fair amount of time making sure we're issuing enough for the fishery to not be constrained while we finish up that final rule. If there were a different driver, if we weren't able to do that, I think we would revisit the structure, but because we're able to do that without disruption to the fishery, that seems to have worked out in recent years. However, if that is, you know, concerning or if you have concerns about the structure and want to chat about that more, we're happy to do that.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:15] Bob.

Bob Dooley [00:05:15] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah that clarifies it a lot. I remember when we, the first year of the Catch Share Program there was not a rule published and we got a notice at Friday afternoon at 5 o'clock that there was no rule and you can go fishing but there is some risk. And it took an act of many people, including Will Stelle at the time, to get the fleet who was already on the water out fishing. And I just wanted to make sure we weren't in that same situation at some point or any risk and I'm glad to hear that. I hadn't followed that as closely probably as I should have, and I hadn't seen a problem in the past. I just saw it here so appreciate the explanation. I see that that means we can start the fishery and if we'd a had a normal year we wouldn't have had any problem starting in the fishery. So thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:09] Further questions? And not seeing any, Todd I believe that wraps up our work here on this agenda item but I will confirm with you.

Todd Phillips [00:06:22] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. You've heard from the agency, both from the perspective of the Region and the Science Center. You've answered some questions, had a little bit of discussion. I would say yes Mr. Vice-Chair, you have adequately addressed this agenda item and could move on.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:43] All right. Thank you very much. That concludes Agenda Item F.1.

2. Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Coral Research and Restoration Closures – Fishery Management Plan (FMP)

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports, our public comment, takes us to Council action, which is to adopt the Final Preferred Alternative and the FMP Amendment. And I will look for any hand to initiate the discussion on this item. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:00:25] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just wanted to say briefly, you know we appreciate the reports that we got today from the GAP and the HC. I did have an opportunity to sit in the GAP room for a lot of that discussion and I think they had a great discussion, so it was helpful to sit and listen. I appreciate all of the written public comment and the oral public comment about this process and the alternatives in front of the Council and where we're at in the process. From my perspective, I just wanted to note that what I've seen over the past year and a half that we've been looking at this agenda item is a good faith negotiation. I think where we started with the areas that the sanctuary's brought to us for scoping, as we talked about, we had ten sites originally in two different sanctuaries. The Council narrowed that, you know, very quickly and we did not scope all of those areas. And then further narrowing occurred of the two sites within the Monterey Bay list of areas in direct response with fishermen's concerns and feedback. I understand that there are several folks who still feel unsatisfied with the outcome, but from my perspective what it feels like is that we've had a negotiation and that the sanctuaries have brought their issues through this Council, and there's been opportunity for public comment and an opportunity to shape what we're looking at today. I don't see how that process could occur any other way without, with getting the input of the Council and the state and the industry. And there was external webinars and things like that and so from my perspective it seems like this is how it should play out if this is how the Council wants to work with the sanctuaries that we're doing that process. And so I'm hopeful that we can all see that we've gone through a good process to lay out all of the concerns and hear from everybody through this process to get to where we are today.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:23] Thank you. Further discussion? Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:31] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I would say hats off to Monterey National Marine Sanctuary for being able to get the Vietnamese fleet involved in fisheries management because we've been trying to get them here for years in the amendment process and so it looks like they finally found a segue way to that. My brother's, I have a vessel this that fishes out of Moss Landing trawling for groundfish and I can say that what we've heard today is fairly accurate as far as the situation as far as the Port of Moss Landing. I mean for the most part what I see as far as operations down there is the fleet is, it is the black cod fishermen. That's a port that's struggling. It never has been rebuilt since the groundfish disaster declaration in 2000 and they continue to, you know, try to do what they can do to get back, but they lost but it's a pretty dire situation. You know we talk about rebuilding fleets, rebuilding fisheries, but fisheries are going away and we're actually putting nails in coffins here it seems like almost to a certain extent, and there's no mandate to do what we're doing, although there are certainly some advantage for scientifically as far as corals. I think there's ways we could probably craft whatever we do today to make it work better than what I'm seeing right now. I can't believe there's not a way for at least whatever we do at least maybe they could work with the fleet down

there to have some volunteer closed areas. I don't think that would be that hard if there's some actually true outreach and building relationships between the sanctuary and the fleet. But I look at the salmon fishery, the crab situation with the whales, the nearshore rockfish. Ooof! So I'm not sure we're going to go here today but I think we probably need to do something but I think we ought to maybe mitigate what that is to a certain extent and still get the work done and at least some opportunities for some alternative ways to gather that information. I hope that people are open, may be open to that outside of this arena. But I certainly sympathize with the fleet down there. This is just a tough situation so I hope we can make a decision that will work for them. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:19] Thank you. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:05:23] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. It seems like I'm being pretty chatty today. I'm sorry about that, but a pretty important issue. I do appreciate the sanctuary and how much, and everyone's efforts to come to compromise in a place where we could, being I do understand and I acknowledge that there has been a lot of compromise. But here we are at final decision and we have what I amount to new information coming forward. That's why we didn't take final action before this. And I think the fishermen that have been so silent that are I would consider under, you know, underrepresented communities. When I say communities, both geographic and in fisheries that don't have great representation overall or don't have a great voice, that we need to take that into consideration now at the last moment. I would point out that, you know, seems there's a common thread here about maybe, you know, taking, closing the Sur Ridge, but leaving Ano Nuevo and Ascension alone and leaving it open. But I also would note that we've been told that there's a vibrant, I think the word was used, I'm sure it was vibrant, corals in that area. That was one of the qualifications for choosing it as an area. And I would also note there's fishing there. We know that and it's been going on. I haven't heard that there's a huge amount of damage from that fishing and maybe, maybe it's a viable thing. It doesn't mean you can't plant there, but it might be a viable thing in that small area that's roughly 16% of the total area that is being requested of the three. That those two areas represent about 16% according to my math, that could be wrong. But it seems like there's a place to land here. I mean I think that the studies would be, you know the research would be very valuable, very, very valuable. I, you know and I think the GAP has given us some good guidance, but I do believe we need to protect our communities. I get it, on the coastwide basis this is just a speck, but for those communities that are trying to pay slip fees, trying to feed their families with nothing else to do, this is life or death. We've had fishermen, you heard Melissa Mahoney talk about it, fishermen that are no longer in the fishing industry. How do you answer them? How do you say we haven't heard their voice, even though it's late, we haven't heard their voice and we haven't....our job here is to, you know, National Standard 1, but also National Standard 8. We need to recognize those communities and those people. And I think that's where I stand and I think there's a compromise to be had here. I don't believe it's what's on the table now. I think we need to, we need to think about that. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:40] Thank you. Further comments? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:08:46] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I have to say that he can't help but be sympathetic to the feelings of the fishermen because every time they and we turn around there's another reason to restrict access. And so we need to be cognizant of that. I am somewhat

sympathetic to the GAP suggestion that there be, I guess, a burden shifting at the end of this 10-year period to sort of justify the continued closure. I'm not exactly sure how we would articulate that and so I'm not prepared to do that. But on the other hand, I think the research is fascinating and I'm eager to see the results. I'm appreciative of the commitment, at least from Oceana, that this will not be the prelude to additional loss of access. There's plenty of areas where access is already severely restricted. Another point, it's not really squarely on this issue, but we do know that the state of California is working with sanctuaries to fashion perhaps additional fishery closures in some of our coastal sanctuaries in order to meet the state's own definition for 30 by 30. And so, you know, I hope we're not back here, you know, in another year or two or whenever it happens with additional requests for closures from the sanctuary. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:40] Further discussion? Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:10:45] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Along with Bob and what I heard and what I've read in the testimony and what I've heard in the testimony, I think this is more of a timing issue than anything. You know I heard the testimony from Ben and and Geoff and I don't have any doubt what they say is true and forthcoming. And you know I think that if we were at a different time in the state of the fisheries in California I think, you know, this might not be as big a issue or is needed to the coastal communities as it is right now and so I do have a lot of mixed emotions, but what I see is not the normal tomato throwing in these things when opposing between the environmental community and between the fish community. I just, I hear that they're not necessarily against this, but right now is just a huge burden on what their, on their survival and, you know, I hope this phrase is not politically correct anymore, but on the schoolyard we used to call it dog-piling. Give the kid a ball and dogpile. And that's kind of seems what's going on now to the, you know, to the California fisheries. We're just kind of dog-piling on these different closures that they're going through with all kinds of things. And so I certainly would be very interested in looking at a compromising position if it can come up with and do what we need to do to at least start and, you know, there's not to say in five years things might be a lot different where you might be able to do what we're trying to do now, but you're taking a stair-step approach instead of all at once. So anyway, that's my comments and thank you Mr. Vice-Chair for giving the opportunity.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:18] Thank you. Other discussion? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:13:23] Yes, thank you. I'm prepared with a motion if now is the time.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:28] Let's go ahead with.....excuse me one minute, Virgil Moore.

Virgil Moore [00:13:32] Thank you Mr. Chair and Marci. I don't mean to interrupt moving forward, but I do have a comment here in general. But I'm confused on a number of aspects relative to the science and the rigor of the scientific evaluation and the breadth at which the mitigation funds can be used. Through the public input process, as Miss Kent pointed out and what we've heard, there has been some scaling down of what was originally thought to be for recovery. And I guess my question would be, why haven't we proposed trying to do recovery in areas that are still open to fishing? If we're really trying to avoid getting into this trap of, oh it's successful, these were all closed so we have to close all areas to bottom contact to get recovery of corals, why not

have some of this research done in areas that are still open to those fishing to see how that compares? It seems shortsighted to lose that opportunity here to not only look at whether we can recover corals, but whether we can recover coral across the diversity of what we have out there. There are obviously other habitats out there suitable for coral introduction that are not part of this proposal. Are we going to do some of that? Is the rigor there with the necessary power analysis to get that done? Without having those kind of proposals and understanding, I'm having a tough time with putting the burden of this on some of those small communities, as Bob put, that are underrepresented in this process, and asking for our scientific communities to look closer at a breadth of things that gives us more management options in the future depending on the outcome of this research than less management options. Look at beyond coral, but to the whole community that the ocean provides for there with the benefit to all of those ocean organisms. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:03] Thank you. And I'm not sure if there was a question you wanted to ask specifically there or just make the comment?

Virgil Moore [00:16:15] Just a comment.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:16] Okay, thank you. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:16:20] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I just had a few thoughts also I wanted to share before we get to the motion. First I share Mr. Gorelnik's perspective that the research here is on looking for ways to restore corals is an exciting thing for us to be looking at and fully support that effort. I also appreciate and agree with Miss Kent's observation that the sanctuary did their utmost to try to work with the affected communities, work within the Council process to try to resolve and come up with a solution that's in keeping with what they are trying to achieve and at the same time honoring the authorities and jurisdictions and responsibilities that this Council has. I was appreciative of Melissa Mahoney's testimony. The letter from the Vietnamese-American group that's based in Moss Landing, and I think it maybe brought home to me one of the things that we were trying to look at in our EEJ efforts, and that is to try to reach communities that we normally aren't getting to with our historical way of trying to communicate with the fishing industry. And clearly here, to me at least, that it took a while for the affected communities to become aware of the action and to begin to engage. Now to what extent that delay and their engagement affected the process up to this point I'm not sure, but it's at least clear to me from the letter and what Miss Mahoney had to offer that there was a significant delay in understanding what was being proposed here as we went through our process and the sanctuary went through theirs. That brings me to kind of my closing thought is that I think there is an action here that can be taken that accomplishes and meets the problem statement of closing an area where we're looking at coral rehabilitation and research and protect an area from potential harm from bottom contact gear, but at the same time not moving and closing areas that are important and fundamental to the success of the fishing communities that depend on some of the areas we're talking about. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:02] Thank you. I'm going to look around and make sure anybody else who has any general comments, thoughts, observations has a chance to speak. Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman [00:20:14] Yeah, I thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I think some of the thoughts kind of going through my mind. You know I think Phil kind of articulated some of those. You know at

this meeting we're kind of getting back to EEJ issues and this seems to be one that kind of goes with that. So, you know what kind of strikes me is that, you know I think it might be Andrew Corr who made this statement about fishermen being punished for the actions of somebody else. And so with this dry dock being sunk and the settlement that was reached between the affected parties to do this research and secure that \$8.7 million for the restoration, you know it doesn't appear to me that, you know, those affected communities, those affected fishermen, you know, were involved in that. You know maybe I might misinterpret or mischaracterize that, but they are being asked to do something for this settlement. They are being asked to potentially have to live with some additional closure areas and recognizing that, you know, some of these affected communities, you know, are just now raising some concerns with respect to the type of impacts that they may have to live with. You know it seems really important, you know, for this Council and as we are starting to learn how to deal with EEJ, how to incorporate into our decision-making, you know this is one example I think that we're dealing with at this moment. And so I do recognize, you know, the concern about, you know, protecting deep sea corals. Protecting the best of the best, as we've heard in comment a moment ago, but we're also hearing a comment about, you know, how can we preserve the best of the best fisheries, you know, as they exist right now. So given all of the impacts that, you know, have occurred in various California fisheries, from quillback to salmon and potentially this, I can easily see, you know, how big and how significant of an action that we might take today could have on them. So I just wanted to provide that general comment. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:48] Thank you Joe. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:22:52] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah very thoughtful comments from everyone. This is a big coast. This is a, this Council has so many issues to deal with so it's very tough to track everything in detail and have confidence that understanding everything in detail and often looking to leadership of others from the area for guidance but. So Bob, I guess starting with you, your comment. What strikes me is one of these areas where we're hearing opposition to, and again I fully understand the awareness part, is less than two square miles, nautical miles in size. So question, you say there's room for compromise. Okay if that small of a area is not workable, and I understand not every area the ocean is equal in its importance, where is the compromise? If, you know are these, if these folks unfortunately are needing to rely on the open access black cod sablefish fishery, we do have opportunity for increased trip limits, but that's not going to sustain a community on its own. And I think as Oceana mentioned, we just opened a very large area of the non-trawl RCAs to another gear type and where is that opportunity in this picture? So these are, I'm just, a lot of questions bouncing around in my mind. Yeah, where is the additional area for compromise with more time? And you know Virgil asked very good questions about the research design and in restoring in areas that are fished so I'll leave it with those comments.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:48] Thank you. Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:24:50] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Since everybody's weighed-in and we are talking about a couple of items I think are important on both sides, research and the opportunity I think is extremely exciting. We've spoken a lot about EEJ and the need to get out to a variety of stakeholders in our community and I do see this as a great example of small scale ports and small scale fisheries and different community members providing comment. And really, in

thinking forward, what struck me this morning was the comment around promises made or comments and how they were interpreted and it reminds me a lot of a lot of the conversation we've had in other arenas within this Council, and it was helpful to hear from the sanctuaries how they were interpreting what those comments were. But I think in moving forward it will be equally important to work with fishermen so that everybody can have a clear understanding of how things are interpreted for both sides, whether it's through the sanctuary process with coral research or any other opportunity. But that idea of, hey this was what was meant, I'm not certain that fishermen believe that that was what was meant. I certainly haven't spoken to them. It's not my neighborhood. But I do want to recognize that just because there is an understanding, even in going back and speaking with the original speaker, that that may not be the understanding of the people who were engaged in that decision at the time and that are in the other side of that community.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:03] Thank you. Further general comments, observations, discussions? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:27:12] Thanks Vice-Chair, and sorry Marci I keep jumping you in the queue. Just reflecting on what I've heard others talk about a few things have come to mind. One is the research opportunity here isn't just exciting in sort of a nerdy way, but it also stands to provide benefits to our fisheries directly. We have heard about what those habitats and ecosystems provide, but there are still a lot of questions and that this research in the long term could be highly beneficial to how we understand our West Coast ecosystem and habitats and how we move forward with area-based management in the future. They also contribute to the interest of an overall healthy environment, so not even thinking specifically about the fish as the next beneficiary, but having an overall healthy environment that supports our fisheries. I really appreciate the fact that EEJ has been brought up. We had an EEJ Committee meeting a couple days ago and it was great to be able to revisit that, review the National Academies study and think exactly about this, which is how the Council could move forward and how NMFS could move forward applying that thinking to how we do our business generally. So I'm really happy to hear it come up. One thing that I took away from that meeting were the different lenses or axes of equity and thinking about the context lens and how we approach that and thinking about how we are including underrepresented communities and how the process unfolded. I appreciate the recognition by one of our public commenters that the Council does not fully represent all fishermen, and it can't. That's not necessarily a shortcoming, it might be, but it can't. And that we seek to find those impacts and those folks and understand more about them and understand more about how our management impacts them. But thinking about that, and specifically with the Vietnamese community in Monterey Bay, thinking about the context and the history, there are reasons why those folks are hard to find and are hard to bring to the table. So acknowledging that there is a history behind that and how we invoke and appreciate and respect those voices is part of the journey of how this Council and NMFS will move forward understanding what applying EEJ means to our process and our actions. I have some questions and I haven't really figured out how to say them, but I'm going to voice this around the mandates here. I'm not a lawyer so I don't fully understand what happens with the various recommendations with this Council makes, what NOAA and specifically the sanctuaries program at NOAA has to do. I heard some things from I believe the sanctuaries about that this Council has kind of the final word, but I'm concerned that that may not actually be the case. Miss Lynch, not to put you on the spot, I know this is a big question, but if there's an answer to that I would appreciate a little more clarity for the Council on how we fulfill, help them fulfill their legal

obligations? I also wanted to recognize, and I really appreciated the answer that Miss Mahoney provided to my question about the larger landscape of the pressures and the problems and the challenges that California, especially fisheries in California, are facing. I heard her talk a lot about things that this Council does not have control over, and the larger social and economic forces and landscape that have put our fisheries in what appears to be a very hard spot. My personal belief is that it is a hard spot. I agree with the situation that a lot of our fisheries are facing, that's through personal observation and what I've learned about the history of fisheries, specifically in my neighborhood of Monterey Bay. I will talk a little bit more about the EEJ lens here, which is that we need more information. We need demographic information. We need to know more data about these issues and how they are affecting our fishing communities so that we can make better decisions in that context. Finally, I wanted to, I really appreciated what Virgil said, the question about the research. I have to admit I had a similar question. But just voicing that I'm relying on the experts that the sanctuaries convened as part of their process, they had a large number of coral experts and ecosystem experts come together to try to figure out the best space and put together the sampling frame and research approach. The habitat Committee, in my understanding of the report, have signed off on that and feel that it's a reasonable approach and want to support that. So just noting that I too have some outstanding questions about the research and the goals but I'm going to lean on the sanctuary's expertise and our Habitat Committee to help me answer that.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:03] Thank you. Look around, any other general comments, observations?
Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:33:13] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think I should probably respond to Corey a bit, and also make another comment I think that in the EEJ context, you know we have goals. We have lofty goals of trying to reach out to underserved communities and it's been difficult. And I worry here that we finally have some inroads to in underserved communities and underserved fishermen and if our answer is, well you're just too late to the door and our decision's made and we're going home and we don't really take those to heart, how do we expect them to engage in the future? How do we expect them to come back and get thinking they really do have, they do matter? And that's part of getting them to engage in the future, part of seeing the value of this process. So I made a comment earlier about it. You know we got this data late but it doesn't mean we can't change our mind. When I talk about compromise, I really am focused most on the fact that we, you're right, two miles or six miles depending on which, how you look at it and, you know remember, it's more than that if you reflect on what Valerie was talking about when she testified about the middle ground is pretty much off limits too, and we're hearing these are important but I didn't hear really loud and clear. A mixed message. There's vibrant coral supposedly in these areas. That's why it was chosen. It was one of the criteria. And so the coral's there or else it would not have been chosen as an area to try planting. Also, those areas are being used as fisheries and have been used in fisheries for a long time. I heard nothing about damage there, you know, at all. So reflecting on what Virgil had talked about is why can't they walk and chew gum at the same time? I mean, why do we have to close both areas? We could leave that area open. Potentially as their research continues in five years or whatever and they go, hey, here's what's going on, we have these, we're planting and we're seeing damage or we're as we monitor this, or there's a reason to do this. We could, that's a further action we could take in the future. But to start out that way, particularly now when we are, when our fisheries are really needing. Those, you know I live there, I take it to heart what they're saying, I see it. I see these guys and they show up at the coffee shop,

not the same guys they used to be, I'll tell you that. It's a, we're in pretty desperate straits in our fisheries. One thing I will say, and I said it years ago when I testified before a congressional subcommittee, you can't stop and start fishermen and fisheries and expect them to endure. You can't just turn them off and say we'll turn them back on in ten years or five years and expect them to be there. We have, you know, food security issues. We have community issues. We have all of those things that we need to deal with and just the historic footprint of our fisheries in those particular areas, it's just a shadow of what it used to be and we're struggling to survive. Seeing some bright spots but boy in the last few years there has not been much sunshine. And so I think we can walk and chew gum at the same time. I think I value the research. I value all the things that are being said and I don't doubt them. Ours is to chart the course that gets us where we need to be, maybe not perfectly, but at least gets us on the road. We have the ability to react to this in the future. I would hope we can find that compromise. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:37:05] Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:37:08] Thank you. And thanks for your comments Mr. Dooley. I did want to speak just on the the one part of it related to the bottom impact of fixed gear. From our view, you know, the Council has seen information about that. We are well aware that pots and longline, bottom longlines can damage bottom habitat. You've seen analyses of that most recently in Amendment 32 and looking at the impacts of moving the boundaries of amendment of the non-tribal RCA and the CCA. We've seen that in EFH. So we had a similar conversation when I was in the GAP. I think I want to recognize that we are aware of the impacts of those bottom contact gears. That's why we do have bottom contact gear closures that aren't just bottom trawl. And it would be a very expensive gamble to try to leave areas open where you're planting corals with money that is, with money that will run out, that if there is damage to those corals that you have planted, there is not more money that you can go get from the folks that caused the damage to be able to add new plantings. So that is a very expensive gamble to try to undertake. I certainly hear what you're saying and I understand what you're, the questions that you're asking, but sort of that one premise of it, I do think it's fair to say that we are clear that there are impacts from those gears. How we compromised through that? That's certainly the conversation that we've had. So just wanted to revisit that one small part.

Pete Hassemer [00:38:39] Thank you. Sheila Lynch.

Sheila Lynch [00:38:47] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just wanted to circle back to Miss Ridings question. And I'm definitely not in a position to comment on what's required by the settlement regarding the dry dock or what authority the sanctuary might have to take action outside of this process, but the Council's action here is discretionary. There's no requirement that you select any particular alternative before you.

Pete Hassemer [00:39:21] Okay, thank you. Any general comments and observations? I'm not seeing any, so I think a lot of these questions that were being asked maybe could be more focused in the context of a motion, a specific action. Marci, are you ready?

Marci Yaremko [00:00:00] Sure. Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I move the Council adopt the following recommendations as the Final Preferred Alternative for Monterey Bay National Marine

Sanctuary coral research and restoration closures to be implemented as an amendment to the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan and Regulations. Number 1: Create the following Groundfish Exclusion Area closures, or GEAs, to commercial groundfish bottom-contact gears for the purpose of deep sea coral research and restoration as described in F.2, Attachment 1. A: Alternative 1, Option A: Ano Nuevo Canyon, which is shown in Figure 1. Coordinates defined in Table 1. B: Alternative 1, Option B: Ascension Canyon shown in Figure 2. Coordinates defined in Table 2. C: Alternative 2: Sur Ridge shown in Figure 3. Coordinates defined in Table 3. And Number 2: Adopt the proposed FMP amendment language as shown in the Agenda Item F.2, Attachment 2.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:16] Thank you. I read along as you went through that. It appears, what's on the screen appears accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Marci Yaremko [00:01:24] Yes I do.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:25] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

Marci Yaremko [00:01:32] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And maybe just I do have some general remarks as well that I'll make at this opportunity. I just want to highlight a few of the points Keeley made about the discussions going back with the sanctuary office and the, under the standing sanctuary coordination agenda item that we deal with each year and the clarifications that we made in that process with regard to fishing regulations in national marine sanctuaries. And the Council's intention that it wish to be the entity to recommend and develop fishing regulations, and we encourage the sanctuary to use our process rather than to go off using their own regulatory authorities and processes to implement fishing regulations. That agreement that we made with the sanctuaries in the course of those discussions in 2022 played out here in this process I think very well. And the sanctuary folks have upheld their commitments to us to bring requests rather than move ahead on their own. And they came early and they came repeatedly and there were discussions that happened at the very earliest phases and in the back advisory body rooms and they've worked through our process effectively. They've listened to industry input. Consulted with those industry representatives that have been here and made adjustments along the way. With regard to the work that they've done to build their research plan and the proposal that they brought to us, we've seen them each time iteratively develop and flesh out the details of the proposal. So they have, I think given a lot of thought to the issue about what the bare minimum needs were with regard to fishery closures. We asked them very clearly what the minimum need was after they provided us with the ten proposed sites that originally were brought to us in September. They spent a lot of time and effort to identify those ten sites. There's been discussion about their panel and their process to develop those proposals and I just want to make sure we not overlook the content in the Situation Summary that described that, you know, we scoped those ten areas and made a decision early on to move forward with the three that are in front of us here today. They told us that their bare minimum was two of the five and sites, or general areas, and that's what we've gone forward with. In the process that we went through to select these two areas, three sites, we listened to the GAP, we listened to industry, and they brought us a number of significant concern about many of the other areas that are no longer on the table for consideration. We heard substantial concerns with the Football and Cochrane Bank and how important these areas were to existing

fisheries. And then we made the decision based on input from our GAP, and I'll just read from the September 2023 GAP Statement that states, "However we do offer that Ascension and Ano Nuevo Canyon areas and the Sur Ridge area may be the least impactful to fisheries and could be moved forward by the Council for consideration for the range of alternatives. The other areas, (that means the seven that are no longer in the range), have been continually fished for years and are too valuable to lose to any coral restoration project. In other words, these areas will become even more important as nearshore restrictions are proposed. Additionally, if the Council moves forward with a proposal to develop new closed areas, the GAP suggests that only groundfish bottom-contact gear be restricted and non-bottom-contact gear types should be authorized". So I just want to reflect on that and acknowledge that we've taken the advice and moved forward with the process. We're now at the final action and final considerations here. But I would say that we've done really well and the sanctuaries have as well to make these proposed closure areas as surgical as possible. We considered the input that was received about how, you know, the shallower depths are where the greatest impacts are. And in fact, that's why we had the revisions that came forward to us in March to deepen the two proposed areas as well as make them smaller. I will say that I take the sanctuaries at their word about what that minimum need is and that on our end I intend to ensure that the need that they've articulated to us, that need is continuous and that we don't put closures into place and then walk away and not reconsider whether or not they continue to be necessary on an ongoing basis. The topic of closing off more fishing area off California certainly doesn't come lightly. I think we've discussed that at length here today and that, you know, some effort shift would come, would need to come in order to recover what appears to be some use of these areas for fishing activity. I want to talk a bit about the information in Jessi's presentation and the somewhat recent VMS tracks that were evaluated and acknowledge that clearly there is some recent use and therefore reliance on these areas. We do have some comment in the briefing book about that that's come forward more recently that we're acknowledging here today. I don't know that I'd characterize it as being substantial or significant. And I guess I would say that I agree with Melissa Mahoney's analysis of the analytical document and that the impacts are unclear, but I'd say that if the impacts were clear and were significant the analytical document would show it, and in fact we did not include some of the other areas in the range that likely would have had significant impacts, and it would have been a lot of analysis that would have been done showing that those impacts would have been very significant. So I just want to make sure that we don't forget that this process has been iterative and, you know, some time has passed since September when we made the decision to remove the areas that were the most impactful. So I feel like, you know, it's important to sort of reset that baseline. Those more burdensome alternatives are off the table and we don't have an analytical document showing the extent of those impacts, but we can believe they would have been quite significant. I want to talk a bit about the use of limiting these closures to, these GEAs to only bottom-contact gear and the discussions that took place last fall. On that point, it would not interfere with the use of other midwater groundfish gear. We are aware of how important midwater gear is becoming, particularly to the central coast and these particular ports. We've had quite a bit of testimony and support for the use of developing midwater gear for targeted open access groundfish midwater stocks. In these same areas we supported and approved an EFP in this area for testing and development of 12E gear, which has since been incorporated into our specifications at the urging of industry because they would rely, needed to rely on continued access or gain access to these healthy midwater stocks. I also want to acknowledge the steps that we took with the non-trawl RCA action to provide additional grounds to access healthy shelf and slope stocks. So there are, I guess I'm not quite sharing the same picture of complete doom and gloom

for these particular port areas, and would also, you know, again through the EFP development and the active engagement of the industry, that gear is now available in regulation for use, and that was a very big development so. And also I think note that we had some discussion in delegation this morning that coral assemblages are really important in supporting fish stocks and being able to use midwater gear in these areas in fact might be something, you know, looking forward that is going to be a positive as we have more coral and as that coral attracts more fish it should help us sustain and develop healthy fisheries on midwater stocks. I want to talk a bit about public comment and the public process that we have heard here today, as well as in the series of agenda items leading up to today. We had a handful of public comments here today, and we had a number of them submitted in the written record dating back to September of 23'. And in March we also had a handful of submitted comments and verbal testimony, maybe a few dozen in total. But I want to just, I think, not lose sight of the fact that these same ports, Morro Bay, Monterey, Santa Cruz, have been very active in providing public comment to our process. By comparison, I look back to the April briefing book and we received 692 public comments. Of course this was when we were considering final action on salmon, but thinking back to those public comments on salmon and also on quillback, we certainly have seen quite a bit of engagement and comment from our small coastal ports in Monterey, Santa Cruz, Half Moon Bay, Morro Bay, and in fact many of them have come to provide testimony in person to us. So I don't quite jump to the conclusion that they've been left out or that we haven't made efforts to outreach and to engage these small communities, so I just wanted to note that and that, you know, they have been, I think, very important in terms of shaping our public processes across a number of different agenda items. One thing I want to go back to is this concept of a sunset date and the exchange we had with Merit. And I believe, I understand the perspective that he's bringing that perhaps at the end of this ten year period we should allow the regulations to lapse and then ask the sanctuary to come back and convey to us the need to renew them. I kind of have a different thought about how we might go forward. I know we heard a lot about a five-year review and perhaps a reconsideration at that point. I was really intrigued by the testimony we heard from the Habitat Committee here today and the notion that it is possible that a site might fail and that we might want to think about how we would deal with that. I appreciate the sanctuary's offer to keep us up to date on the progress and their planning to use the mechanism of the annual sanctuary report that we have usually at the March meeting, that they are committed to bringing us updates on the development of the research and the outplanting and the monitoring. So I'm very interested in that and certainly support them doing that, but I feel like maybe we do want some sort of a check-in perhaps at year-three to hear for certainty that the outplanting has happened and that the monitoring is underway. Now, in speaking with the sanctuaries it's pretty clear that they're not expecting to see, or it's going to be very difficult for them to measure results very quickly. Coral don't grow very quickly. It's a ten-year plan. They're not really expecting to be able to have conclusory information until year-ten, but I think we can still get information about the progress and the work that's being done, and as Mr. Gorelnik indicated, it's quite fascinating work and I think it would be worth us planning to hear a more detailed update on the activities that have taken place kind of at the three year mark. And then perhaps, another similar check-in at year-six, particularly by that time I think we would expect to hear if any of the sites have failed. And then I think at year-nine is when we would want to consider if there's, if the research, excuse me, if the closures are still necessary after year-ten. I think if we got a detailed report on the progress by year-nine we would learn more about the sanctuary's plans, their budget. I mean this is a long term plan for research and restoration and so I think we would have some idea about what regulatory actions may or may not be needed in advance of, you know

right now what's a ten-year timeline. So that would be my thought about how to proceed after action here today and the implementation that I believe is scheduled for January of 2025. That's it. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:54] Thank you Marci. Are there questions to the maker of the motion for clarification first? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:19:06] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Miss Yaremko you suggested a timeline, if you will, for check-ins. Do you see any reason not to include that timeline in this motion?

Marci Yaremko [00:19:31] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Mr. Gorelnik. I guess because I feel like the, there's a commitment to receive the annual information through the sanctuary report so we're certain that would happen. I feel like memorializing this discussion in the meeting minutes is maybe the best we can hope for, given we don't put things on a ten-year-at-a- glance type of a calendar. But if there's another pathway forward that gives people more comfort that we memorialize a plan then I'm certainly open to supporting that.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:19] Thank you. Other questions for clarification? I do not see any hands so that would take us into discussion on the action. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:20:34] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'd like to offer an amendment to the motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:42] Please go ahead.

Bob Dooley [00:20:45] I move we strike 1.A and B from the motion keeping the Alternative 2 Sur Ridge as defined in the motion. And I think that's it.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:14] Pause while they do this magic, give you a chance to read it to make sure that is exactly as you intend. Is that language accurate and complete?

Bob Dooley [00:21:29] Yes, thank you. I think maybe the only clarification might be making a capital A and a capital B so it's clear.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:46] All right.

Bob Dooley [00:21:47] It looks good.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:50] Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Butch Smith. Please speak to your motion to amend.

Bob Dooley [00:21:59] Yeah, thank you very much. I'm finding it really hard to ignore the new position the GAP has presented with us, or presented us with. I'm, you know information comes, I get it. I really do understand that the sanctuary has done a very good job analyzing this. Our staff has done a good job analyzing this. But when new things come to light and we understand those, that when we ignore them there's consequences to that. And I think we, I don't, I'm not convinced that this project can't go forward without those two areas. We've seen in the public comment that

the industry supports that, that we could go with just Sur Ridge and that they support that. I think that we're in a position here to really support our local communities here and our local fishermen. And I understand that when you say it's insignificant effect on them or that this data shows that, well that's a point of view. I mean it's where you're sitting. I will tell you the fishermen I talked to from Monterey to Half Moon Bay and even Morro Bay don't look at this as insignificant. This is meaningful to them. And I do value the research. Not certain not convinced the research can't continue. I'm not convinced that we can get what we need out of this with those two removals of this from the original motion. I think it's important that we acknowledge the people that we are and then speaking, I already talked about this, but speaking to the DEI and the underserved communities part of this, I really am concerned that when people come to the table, even though it's late, particularly the people we're trying to reach out to, we ought to at least acknowledge that we listen to them. And the message I'm hearing is, yep we listen to you but you're too late. And I don't think there is too late at this, that's why we're here at final action. I think we have the opportunity to make an adjustment. I don't think it's catastrophic to the research. I haven't been convinced of that. So others may be, but I think we can go forward with this and so I hope we can support this amendment. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:47] Thank you. Are there questions to the maker of the motion for clarification? Not seeing questions for clarification, discussion on the motion to amend? Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:25:02] Thank you. Thank you Mr. Dooley for bringing this amendment forward. I will not be supporting the amendment. We've heard clearly from the sanctuaries that in order to meet their objectives they need multiple sites that allows for diversification of the planting and the research and also provides a little bit of buffer against any sort of catastrophic impacts that may occur outside of fishing, but the known impacts that could affect the coral planting. I, as I've noted before, I feel very comfortable that through this process, in particular with Ano Nuevo and Ascension Canyon, that at the March meeting we cut each of those areas in half in direct response to what the fishermen were saying were the most important parts of that area. And so I think what we're left with are individually small areas for those two sites and that we've sought those compromises along the way to try to get where we are today. So I will not be supporting the amendment. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:00] Thank you. Further discussion on the motion? Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:26:05] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I will be supporting the motion. I am also supportive of the original motion, meaning I am grateful for the effort that has been put in to listen to community members who were participating at that time. I do recognize the concern of we've heard from a lot of people as of late who would be able to be more successful with it being solely Sur Ridge. We also heard some commentary this morning about the idea of a voluntary closure. And I think the ability to work with fishermen to determine where those areas might be in the Ano Nuevo or Ascension Canyon regions may be a possibility and may yield results that would be beneficial for corals and beneficial for outreach to communities that we're trying to accommodate. So the final piece I will say here on this is that the maker of the motion is somebody who from a commercial perspective is definitely engaged in that area, and since I'm predominantly

a commercial rep I'm going to heed your judgment on this. So thank you for bringing this forward and I am supportive.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:46] Thank you. Further discussion? I believe there are no other hands. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:27:58] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Just I always feel uncomfortable not explaining the vote sometimes before voting, but I am, yeah this is a tough one but I'm really deferring here to vote to our sister agency in California and their take on the situation. I do think we understand what there is. There are impacts to these areas. I kind of, I tend to see it as Marci explained it, that if they were larger impacts they would be clear, and all the other actions this Council has taken to try to improve economic conditions in the area we're talking about, not saying that the motion is unreasonable or what we would do in Washington if this was our local communities. But yeah, Miss Kent and Marci's perception of this process as being one of compromise where we've come down, the sanctuaries come down to areas they think, I forget the term that Marci made, minimal, the minimum what they would need. I will be voting against the motion based on I guess CDFW's vision of how this process worked and the impacts of that and the impacts that would be expected here by this action.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:25] Thank you Corey. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:29:28] Thanks Vice-Chair. I will not be voting for this amendment. This is really a hard issue. I know that it's hard for every Council member, but this is my neighborhood so it feels especially hard. Thinking about overall benefits to the nation and the West Coast though, Miss Kent and the sanctuary's just made it very clear that the proposal that's on the table right now with all three alternatives or all two alternatives in three areas are the bare minimum for what is necessary for the sanctuary to meet its obligations. So thanks Mr. Dooley for providing this and providing your perspectives.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:19] Thank you. Further discussion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:30:25] Thank you Vice-Chair. I'm in a similar page to Mr. Niles wanting to defer a little bit to our neighbor agency to the south. I've been listening to the entire discussion and it's made me think of something that John Holloway said on one of my first meetings, if you're not at the table you're on the menu. The sanctuaries have been very good at meeting us at the table and so that we are not solely on the menu. We've reduced seven things from the menu. We are still left with three. Is it perfect? No. Is there room for improvement? Always. But for the scientific rigor that they need the bare minimum that was discussed earlier and by Miss Ridings, I don't think I can support the amendment to the motion just for those key issues. The original motion I would be supportive of because we have been at the table and we've compromised and worked through it. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:28] Thank you. Any further discussion? Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:35] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Well certainly they put out ten sites. As you'd expect they want to get a pretty, probably the best sites they can, the most sites they can,

and certainly that affected the larger coast. And as we've narrowed this down, we're starting to fix individual ports and individual fishermen. And so for fishermen maybe up north that maybe don't affected near as much, but certainly the individuals in the Monterey Bay area it's going to affect them quite a bit. You know there's six, a little over six square miles, six and a half square miles in the two northern sites and there's 36 miles on the bottom site off of Point Sur, or Sur Ridge. That's a pretty big area as far as a footprint so I don't know. I don't know if actually need more than one site. If it was Ano Nuevo or if it was Ascension I'd say they probably need more. I mean, like I say there's no mandate here. If the barge hadn't sunk we wouldn't be doing this. They got money for mitigation and they're going to spend it for mitigation, that's probably part of the agreement they need to do that so that's what they're doing. I get that. but I'm going to support the motion. I understand where everybody's coming from here but I think you gotta go with your gut and that's where I'm at. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:14] Thank you. Any further discussion? Not seeing any hands I will call the question on the motion to amend on the screen before us. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:33:28] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:28] Opposed?

Council [00:33:30] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:33] Abstentions? Mr. Executive Director that was not clear to me. Would you please use a roll call vote on this item?

Merrick Burden [00:33:48] Yes certainly Mr. Vice Chairman. Just one minute here. Okay I'll be working from Voting Sheet Number 1 regarding the amendment to a motion I've referred to as F.2. Let's see, starting from the top. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:34:15] No.

Merrick Burden [00:34:18] Virgil Moore.

Virgil Moore [00:34:20] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:34:21] Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:34:26] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:34:27] Cory Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:34:29] No.

Merrick Burden [00:34:32] Marci Yaremko

Marci Yaremko [00:34:33] No.

Merrick Burden [00:34:35] Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman [00:34:38] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:34:39] Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:34:41] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:34:42] Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:34:44] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:34:47] Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:34:49] No.

Merrick Burden [00:34:52] Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:34:54] No.

Merrick Burden [00:34:57] Robert Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:34:59] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:35:02] Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:35:03] No.

Merrick Burden [00:35:06] Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:35:07] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:35:18] And Mr. Vice-Chairman if you do choose to vote you have the opportunity to create a tie.

Pete Hassemer [00:35:29] I will not vote.

Merrick Burden [00:35:32] Okay the vote is seven six. Seven yes, six no. The substitute, or the amendment passes.

Pete Hassemer [00:35:42] Thank you very much. The motion to amend has passed so we are back to the main motion now as amended. And now that is showing up on the screen. You need to ignore the part that is indicated with strikeout as that was removed with the amendment. Further discussion on the motion as amended? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:36:23] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I guess a question for National Marine Fisheries Service. In light of Miss Kent's remarks on the bare minimum and the deference that is provided to the sanctuary in making that determination and the clear need that's been articulated by them, is there any change in light of the amendment to the motion about your plans regarding development of regulations?

Keeley Kent [00:37:03] I think at this point we would need to talk with the sanctuaries and come back to the Council. I don't have an immediate answer based on the amended motion so I don't, I can't answer that at the moment.

Pete Hassemer [00:37:22] Thank you. Further discussion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:37:30] This is much more in the weeds, but wouldn't, would Number 2 need to be altered as well? And maybe I'll just, the FMP language..... I'm stuck between two screens here so maybe I'm not reading, but.....

Pete Hassemer [00:37:48] Both Keeley and Jessi have their hands up. Let's.....and Keeley deferred to you Jessi.

Jessi Doerpinghaus [00:38:02] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. No, the Number 2 does not need to be amended. We actually created a more generic language within the FMP so regardless of if 1 or 3 areas were selected by the Council, the FMP language would still stand as proposed.

Pete Hassemer [00:38:20] Thank you. Further discussion? Not seeing any hand I will call the question on the motion as amended. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:38:35] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:38:36] Opposed?

Corey Ridings [00:38:40] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:38:41] Abstentions? Hearing no abstentions the motion passes with Miss Corey Ridings voting no on the motion. And so with that we've taken action on this. While you all are gathering your thoughts I will look to Jessi and ask is there additional work to be done here?

Jessi Doerpinghaus [00:39:14] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. You have adopted your Final Preferred Alternative to create a GEA at the Sur Ridge site only for groundfish commercial bottom-contact gear, and adopted the FMP language. There was some discussion on a potential review timing, and I might look to Executive Director Burden to see if we need that more spelled out on some kind of written guidance or motion, or if that would suffice if the Council's in agreement with Miss Yaremko's proposed timing.

Merrick Burden [00:39:49] Yeah, following up on Miss Doerpinghaus's question there. The way that I've interpreted this Council action is that absent any more guidance this would be it. There would be no monitoring or review, so if you do want to have a more specific review we would

appreciate more specific guidance and agreement from the broader Council. A motion is usually the clearest way to do that.

Pete Hassemer [00:40:18] Okay. Give you a few seconds to ponder that. Corey, did you? Keeley Kent it looks like your hand was up.

Keeley Kent [00:40:30] Thank you. I was not going to offer a motion, so if that is what Corey was going to do, great, but I was just going to say I think we have been in close communication with the sanctuaries. We are comfortable with the guidance that Miss Yaremko provided about the requests to come back. Obviously I'll leave that to the Council ED whether or not you feel that is a comfortable place for you in terms of scheduling that time. So from my perspective I think we're settled, but I would not undercut if you think that would be more clear to have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:41:02] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:41:04] Thank you. I don't want to belabor the conversation and if a motion isn't needed then that's okay. I would appreciate a restatement of what we all think we are agreeing to by a Council member.

Pete Hassemer [00:41:17] Marci I'm going to turn to you.

Marci Yaremko [00:41:18] Sure.

Pete Hassemer [00:41:18] You had a pretty clear statement when you were speaking to this. Go ahead.

Marci Yaremko [00:41:24] Yeah, I believe we have a commitment from the sanctuaries to provide us an annual update via the annual report that we receive from the sanctuary. So we'll expect to see content each year in that written report and the presentation that is given to us. On top of that, my suggestion was that at year-three we schedule a standalone agenda item where we receive a presentation on the research and the outplanting activities that have occurred to date. And, you know, in line with some of the comments of the Habitat Committee, what do they know at year-three? And then again similarly at year-six. Maybe by that time there would be information suggesting, for example, that the site wasn't effective, not that the efforts had failed, for example. My point with this timeline was that if we needed to provide regulatory relief from the closed area that we do it sooner than the conclusion of the ten-year timeline. That was my intention was that we have a couple of check-ins to be able to do that. So, and then by year-nine I think the sanctuary should be pretty clear on what the future plans are following the conclusion of this ten-year study period, like what are the next steps? What does the future hold? And that should give us some idea as to whether or not we would need to revisit removal of the regulations or changing the provisions in any way. So that's why I suggested those discrete agenda item check-ins beyond just the annual sanctuary coordination topic. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:43:46] Okay, thanks. So as guidance, if I captured that right, the discreet, the check-ins on the coral restoration years three, six, and nine. I'll look around for any agreement. We

don't need a vote on this, but does that sounds good to everyone? Okay. Thank you. Anything else on this? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:44:16] Yeah, I raised my hand, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I raised my hand earlier because I guess I'm not.....I don't even know if I.....I wasn't feeling great about my yes vote in terms of what Miss Kent said about not knowing what the sanctuary's going to say about the viability of all this and I was expecting to, what I heard implied and what Keeley said was that we would be hearing from the NMFS and the sanctuary sooner than Marci's grander plan. So that's that's all I was going to say. I expect we'll be hearing in response to Merrick's question some feedback from the sanctuary based on this action today.

Pete Hassemer [00:44:58] Okay, thank you. Further, anything further on this item before we close it out? Spent quite a bit of time here. I'm not seeing any hands so Jessi is that it?

Jessi Doerpinghaus [00:45:14] Yes Mr. Vice-Chair. I think you all have completed your action here today and we have the guidance on our check-ins, which will happen after implementation which we will start working with National Marine Fisheries Service and the sanctuary's very shortly to get them planting by 2025.

Pete Hassemer [00:45:30] All right, thank you. That will close out this agenda item, take us to lunch. Let's be back here at 1:05.

3. Final Stock Assessment Plan and Terms of Reference

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] Thank you. We're all ready to get back to work here. Let me just state we've had these HMS people here for our last two agenda items today waiting patiently. They've stopped migrating and have been waiting in this room showing a lot of patience. So as we proceed we've got a lot of important work to do here, but think about that. Let's make sure we're concise and stay on topic here. So with that I'm going to look for anybody's hand to initiate the discussion here. Any general comments, observations or whatever you want to discuss. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:45] Thank you Vice-Chair. Not to preclude any further discussion. I think there's been a lot of good question and answers that may have been part of what we were going to discuss. When it's appropriate I do have a motion ready that I sent just a few minutes ago to the secretariat, but I don't want to preclude any discussion.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:05] All right, thank you. So with that forewarning there is a motion ready, but I would just want to make sure here if there's any other comments, discussion? Oh, okay. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:01:27] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Well I certainly anticipate supporting the motion even without having seen it....(laughter)....I wanted to just put in a plug here. The number of stocks are listed in common both by the GAP and the GMT for benchmark assessments, one of those, of course, is quillback. There was reference I've seen in a number of the reports under this agenda item about incorporating additional data into the quillback assessment, but I want to remind everyone that in the course of reviewing the last assessment there was an agreement that a number of assumptions and other parameters were also going to be revisited in the quillback assessment. So I just wanted to keep that top of mind.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:19] All right, thank you. Any other comments, observations, discussion? And not seeing any hands a motion always stimulates some discussion so Lynn, we are ready.

Lynn Mattes [00:02:36] Thank you Vice-Chair. That's what I suspected might happen. So the motionsatpcouncil.org folks have the motion up for me. I move the Council adopt the species, assessment type, and anticipated assessment area or areas in Table 1 below as the Final Preferred Alternative list for 2025 assessments. And the species and assessment type and anticipated assessment areas in Table 2 below as the preliminary list for 2027. For 2025, the final preferred list is: Sablefish, benchmark coastwide. Quillback off California, benchmark south of 42. Roughey blackspotted, benchmark coastwide. Yellowtail rockfish, benchmark north of 40 10 only. Chilipepper rockfish, benchmark coastwide. Redbanded rockfish, benchmark coastwide. 2. Updates. Widow rockfish and yellow rockfish. I do want to note that as we heard, if there's capacity to only do one update, widow is the priority over yelloweye. And then yelloweye rockfish would be a priority for a benchmark assessment in 2027. And then there are 6 catch-only projections: Petrale sole, canary rockfish, shortspine thornyhead, darkblotched rockfish, and Bocaccio rockfish, all coastwide. And black rockfish off of Oregon only. For 2027. Table 2: Pacific spiny dogfish shark, benchmark coastwide. English sole, benchmark coastwide. Vermilion sunset rockfish, assessment type to be determined in multiple areas. Cowcod, benchmark. I'm not sure if

that's suppose to be coastwide or south of 42, so it says coastwide for now. Lingcod, benchmark north and south of 40 10. Petrale sole, if not done in 2025, a benchmark coastwide. Yelloweye rockfish, if not done in 2025, a benchmark coastwide. And a to-be-determined slope rockfish species assessment type to-be-determined coastwide. And the Council adopt as the Final Preferred Alternative, 1: The Draft Terms of Reference for Groundfish Stock Assessments in Attachment 4, including the clarifications in Supplemental Attachment 7, and the edit from the SSC Report, Supplemental SSC Report 1. The Terms of Reference for Rebuilding Analysis, Attachment 5. And the Terms of Reference Methodology in Attachment 6. Additionally, have Council staff work with NMFS Science Center staff to determine which assessments should occur at which Star Panel based on the assessor being assigned to the assessment, data deadlines, and age reading needs.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:32] Thank you. As I've followed along all the language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Lynn Mattes [00:05:40] Yes sir, I do.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:41] Thank you. Is there a second to your motion? Seconded by Marci Yaremko. Please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:05:49] Thank you Vice-Chair. There was a lot of good information in the Science Center Report, the SSC and GAP and GMT recommendations. The species in Table 1 for 2025 are a combination of the GAP and GMT reports. Most places they agreed with each other, where there was some disagreement went with the GAP's recommendation, with the exception being in the catch-only projections, the GAP had darkblotched, the GMT had bocaccio. Since there was only five there and we were informed we could have maybe up to ten of those, added both. I do want to note that redbanded rockfish was not part of our preliminary discussion so there will be some implications for F.4 tomorrow. If we adopt redbanded rockfish as an assessment for 2025, we will need to add it to the list of species we talk about stock definitions for tomorrow. For 2027, similarly it's a combination of the GAP and the GMT reports. And similarly since cowcod is new and has not been done, we would need to add cowcod to the stock definitions piece. I think there has been a lot of good questions and discussion already about these list of species. And then to the Terms of Reference, we've had several iterations, several cracks at these eggs and have a fair bit of edits in there. And then the last paragraph. I think the Sit-Sum asked us to identify the Star Panels, which ones would be at which? Which timing? I don't know that we as a Council have enough information right now and would like to leave that up to the discretion of Miss Bellman to work with Dr. Hastie and Dr. Wetzel to determine the the timing of which assessments at which Star Panel, based on if there's a lot of aging needs that should maybe be at a later assessment, or if there's fewer needs then maybe that could be at a sooner assessment. So I think I'll leave it at that given where we are with time.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:54] Thank you. Any questions for clarification to the maker of the motion? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:08:02] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Yelloweye rockfish if not done in 2025, so are you suggesting that if we do an update assessment for the yelloweye in 2025, which is what's being proposed, that we would not do a benchmark in 2027?

Lynn Mattes [00:08:23] Through the Vice-Chair, Mr. Gorelnik. That was more of a placeholder that if there was not an update done in 2025, then definitely it would have to be in 2027. If an update is done in 2025, I think that will determine how we move forward on 2027 or beyond. So it was not to preclude a full benchmark.

Marc Gorelnik [00:08:43] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:46] Thank you. Further questions for clarification. I'm not seeing any. Any discussion on the motion? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:09:00] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to thank Lynn for her hard work piecing together the recommendations out of three tables and three reports and getting us a great list for 2025. And then acknowledging, you know that our 27' list is preliminary and I just want to compliment the use of the TBDs on some areas where there may have not been agreement between our advisors, like for example, on the vermilion sunset and on slope rockfish species, yelloweye as the discussion we just had. So thank you. I think this gets us in a very good place for the cycle. I do want to note that for sablefish, I appreciated the discussion about the fact we've done this assessment now four cycles in a row, something like that, and hopefully we can do this benchmark and then set it aside for some time so we can focus on other stocks. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:10] Thank you. Further discussion? Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:18] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. A little bit of consternation I guess about chilipepper given what the SSC said. I'm hoping there's enough information to get a good benchmark out of that. I think that the last few cycles kind of stuck us with some surveys, assessments we'll be stuck with for awhile. And I think that'll be what those outcomes reflect what's on the water. I think across the fleet I think people fishing these species probably could back up with that observation, and it's going to be a tough four years because we had two years coming up with the petrale and canary, and we're gonna have two more after that and I don't, it's going to be tough coastwide. And I mean I don't think, to hear what we heard from the Science Center, I think we're just, it's just where we're at. We can't....there's not enough new information to fix it. But we have a lot of work to do. I know on my end I think that I need to figure out what industry can do as far as getting information to inform, and it's going to be next, it's going to be a tough four years. So anyway, but I think this is what we got and I'll be voting for it. So it is what it is.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:56] Thank you. Further discussion? I'm not seeing any hands. I'm going to call a question on the motion before you here. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:12:11] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:13] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. With that I am going to do a process check because I believe that covered all our actions but I don't want to preclude anything. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:12:36] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I would just want to touch on the suggestions the Science Centers brought forward and SSC brought up and we had some discussion about of

the issue Dr. Hastie brought about capacity and maybe a broader look at how to do things differently other regions do things. And so maybe I think the John Fields suggestion was maybe to think about it as part of our September stock definition discussion. So I don't.....just trusting that staff could think about that and if we're hearing that there's a need from our Science Center or the SSC the benefit of thinking about doing things differently, we should be figuring that out how to fit that in. And so, and maybe a question for Merrick or for meeting planning of how do we start thinking about that and fitting it in as, you know, in this process things quickly get too far ahead and so I'll leave it there but I do think there.....yeah, very curious about how we might fit that type of evaluation into our process?

Pete Hassemer [00:13:50] Okay. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:13:53] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I appreciate the question Corey. Let's see, a few different agenda topics coming together into your question so I would say for starters, the budget being recommended by the Budget Committee has some money in there for a workshop that's still yet to be defined. The second piece is that over the last few Council meetings we've had discussions and suggestions for workshops, many of which cover things regarding assessments, fishery dependent data, new forms of data to get into assessments. We've also talked about our assessment process, and now we have the Science Center folks, like you indicated, suggesting maybe we should take a step back and think about how to prioritize what we're doing. All of that in my mind is a workshop with several agenda topics that are all pointing at the same thing. So what that means in detail I don't know, the devil's in the detail. But Kelly and I can think about this some and maybe talk to Dr. Hastie before we lose him here and maybe come up with a more coherent plan in time for workload planning that covers what I think you're getting at and what I think I see a lot of different threads coming together in a similar vein of question is what you just raised. So that's what I've got for you at the moment.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:20] Corey.

Corey Niles [00:15:22] Thanks. Perfect, I would say. But one more thread and possibly that you would think about is it seems to me that this would be something to think about in terms of the climate ready ability to respond thread too, but that, but yes very much appreciate your suggestion there so thank you. And yeah, thanks to the Science Centers and I don't think we're somewhat behind time, but just recognizing all the work that did go into this process and resulted in a very clean, pretty easy motion that Lynn put together for us thanks to the GAP and the GMT and all that work from the Science Centers was very organized and, but yeah, very curious to see how we might do things different.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:07] Okay, thank you. With that I'm going to look to Marlene and ask how we've done here?

Marlene Bellman [00:16:15] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. The Council has completed their actions as specified in the Sit-Sum for this agenda item. We will take that guidance from the Council and move forward on crafting up the final assessment plan based on you're, what you've adopted today and bring that forward to you and make sure that that's available by September. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:38] All right. Thank you. Looking around. Everybody's good on this. We will close out this agenda item.

4. Stock Definitions for Species Assessed in 2025 and 2027 – Range Of Alternatives

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That takes us to public comment and we've got a goose egg, okay, which brings us to Council action which is before you on the screen. So with that I'll open the floor for discussion. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:21] Thank you Vice-Chair. Under F.4, or F.3 yesterday we did add redbanded rockfish to the list of species for benchmark assessments in 2025, therefore I think we need to consider redbanded rockfish for this list. Also, the table in Attachment 1 that's got the categories of the information will need to be updated to include redbanded rockfish if we move forward with that. That being said, when it does come time, I have a draft motion ready but I don't want to preclude additional conversation.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:57] Okay, thank you Lynn. Anyone else? I'm not seeing anything unless Keeley wants to give us something. Okay. Alrighty Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:16] Thank you Chair Pettinger. The motionsatpcouncil.org has my statement, my motion up on there. So I move the Council adopt the following Purpose and Need Statement with an amendment, The number to be determined, to the Pacific Fishery Management Council's Groundfish FMP. The Council intends to identify stocks in need of conservation and management in the FMP which will enhance the ability to attain sustainability objectives, especially those outlined in National Standard 1 of the Magnuson Stevens Act as guided by National Standard 3 and informed by National Standard 2. Appropriate specification of stocks in need of conservation and management is a foundational aspect of sustainability and instrumental in the Council's ability to maintain optimum yield objectives. With this amendment the Council intends to identify a subset of species that is to be assessed soon within the groundfish FMP to define stock boundaries for status determination based on key biological, ecological, social and economic information currently available, and adopt the species and alternatives in table below as a range of alternatives for stock definitions for stocks being assessed in 2025 and preliminary identified for assessments in 2027. For chilipepper rockfish, Alternative 1 coastwide only. English sole, Alternative 1 coastwide. Redbanded rockfish, coastwide. Rougheye blackspotted rockfish, coastwide. Widow rockfish, coastwide. Yellowtail rockfish, Alternative 3 north and south of 40 10. And yelloweye rockfish, Alternative 1 coastwide and alternative 2 state/ regional.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:10] Okay, thank you. Is the language on the screen accurate?

Lynn Mattes [00:03:14] Yes sir it is. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:15] Thank you. Looking for a second. Seconded by Marci Yaremko. Thank you Marci. Please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:03:21] Thank you Chair. The Purpose and Need Statement is very similar to the one we adopted for amendment 31, just cleaned up a little bit thanks to some guidance from Keeley and some others, so it's pretty similar to what we've adopted previously. The species in the table

are the species that we adopted yesterday for benchmark or update assessments. This does not include any species that were a catch-only update as that is not used for, generally isn't used for stock status determination. We did remove Alternative 2 state/region from chilipepper rockfish as recommended by the SSC. Additionally added Alternative 2 state/region for yelloweye as recommended by the SSC. I believe this table also incorporates the GMT recommendations. And as I noted in discussion, redbanded rockfish was added to what is in Attachment 1 and we'll need to have some data updated. And I think that speaks enough to it.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:30] Okay, thank you Lynn. Questions for the motion maker? Discussion on the motion? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:04:39] Thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to thank Lynn for the motion and to thank Keeley and the states for some discussion on this topic and sidebar about what we need to put on this list for this particular action and thinking about the timeline ahead for additional actions where we will be considering stock definitions. You'll note that cowcod is not on this list, and that was one of the species that we preliminarily adopted for 2027 and we expect that we will consider stock definitions for that species or anything else that may change with the 2027 list in a future action. So just appreciate the dialogue and the opportunity to take a number of different bites at the same apple in different agenda items over several spex cycles. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:38] Thank you Marci. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:05:42] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And thank you Lynn for the motion. I'm supportive of the motion. I also want to comment on the SSCs Report and just highlight their comments relative to the periodic review of stock definitions. I think that's really important. We've moved forward on doing this in a way that makes sense for our stock assessments, but I just recall early on we really had a strong interest in having workgroups and some discussions about what this looks like and how we apply defining stocks. And so just wanted to flag that and interested in seeing those things move forward and appreciate the SSC for bringing them up. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:40] Thank you Heather. Anyone else? All right, well with that I'm going to call for the question. So all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:06:54] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:56] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay the motion passes unanimously. All right. Marlene.

Marlene Bellman [00:07:09] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I believe that concludes the requested Council action with the motion adopted.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:17] Wow, well very good. Great work everyone.

5. Fixed Gear Marking and Entanglement Risk Reduction – Final Action

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Back in session and we completed public testimony and the Council action before us to adopt a Final Preferred Alternative so I'll open the floor for discussion? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:00:17] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I'll just start by offering my appreciation to the GAP and members of the public who have provided input on this topic as we've worked our way through PPA and now at FPA. I think the input from industry has been really valuable and I think they've done a good job of looking at the alternatives and providing really meaningful comment. I appreciate the comments from EC as well and from the conservation industry and so I think we have a good framework to consider action under this. And I do have a motion when ready. I don't want to preclude anybody from making any comments but I do have a motion when it's time.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:13] Very good. Thank you Heather. Anyone else? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:21] Thank you Chair. Just going to echo a little bit of what Heather just said. Thanks to members of the GAP and the public and the Enforcement Consultants for working together to try to come to solutions that could work for both parties as best as we could. That's what makes this process work is being able to work together and come back, look at something, come back and say, hey, this may not work let's reevaluate it, thinking of the no transition time that folks took the time to really think through what that would mean. So I just wanted to express the appreciation for the communication and coordination.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:56] Thank you Lynn. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:01:59] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I'd also like to, I'd like to thank the GAP for their work to do the outreach within their own states to bring the information into the GAP arena about what developments have occurred on the the state fishery management side. The transition time issue was one, particular colors or configurations that are being recommended in various crab fishery arenas. It's very helpful to have them have done their homework and been able to incorporate that information into the development of the PPA. So I also was hoping we might turn to the issue of Pacific halibut, and maybe I'd ask if National Marine Fisheries Service can clarify. It's my understanding that in this action that whatever line marking requirements, buoy marking requirements that we recommend that the intention is that the, these provisions apply to the sablefish fishery and only the sablefish fishery and that other fisheries would not be either not be authorized to use these color schemes or not recommended to use these colors. I'm not sure exactly how that is going to come together in the regulations and so that's kind of part one of my question. And then part two, thinking about halibut, recognizing that sablefish and the directed halibut fishery are somewhat connected. What's the plan on how we go about implementing this measure for the sablefish fishery without addressing questions on the directed halibut fishery? Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:15] Thank you Marci. Maggie Sommer.

Maggie Sommer [00:04:19] Thank you Chair. Thanks for the question Miss Yaremko and the opportunity to address halibut. I know there's been some confusion at multiple meetings so it's good to be clear. You are correct that these actions that come out of this decision will apply only to federal groundfish pot and longline gear using vessels, and the, so the marking schemes required would by this, would be required when using groundfish pot or groundfish longline gear in federal waters. We would, it would be ideal if those marks were not used in other fisheries, but through this action we are just addressing the groundfish fisheries and we can't through this action, for example, prohibit any particular gear coloration in other fisheries. Maybe I'll add in a little bit again, addressing some questions that have come up about potentially using the same marking scheme for halibut as groundfish. I understand the operational benefits of that. Well aware that there are a lot of people who fish in both fisheries and that it might be, you know, folks might want to use the same gear. If we can't, If we observe an entangle.....if there is an entanglement observed, whether through personal observation, photos or whatever, and that does not allow us to distinguish groundfish from halibut gear, for example, then there, then we would probably be attributing the entanglement to both gears, or certainly there's a risk of that and so, you know, I think we, there is benefit in enabling as precise attribution as possible. The Council could consider halibut gear marking requirements, but that would need to be taken up in a separate action as a halibut regulation change. Right now if somebody wanted to fish, you know, somebody fish both groundfish and halibut and they were fishing.....well, maybe let me just stop there before I confuse the matter further, when fishing groundfish with pot or longline gear they would be required to use the markings resulting from this measure and NMFS regulations implementing it.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:18] Thank you Maggie. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:07:20] Yeah, if I may follow-up on your reminder that this rule of course will apply to groundfish fisheries in federal waters. Of course we have groundfish fisheries that operate in state waters and some activities cross the state and federal waters boundary line. Presumably, I mean since your rule applies only to state waters, and as you've described your rule won't be prohibiting use of these color schemes and other fisheries, but is it going to be all right I guess for state nearshore fisheries, for example, to be using these scheme, same schemes if they're targeting groundfish that kind of may co-occur in state and federal waters?

Brad Pettinger [00:08:25] Maggie.

Maggie Sommer [00:08:28] Thank you Chair. Thanks again Miss Yaremko. You know, again, our regulations will apply to vessels fishing in federal waters. If the states would like to apply the same marking scheme in state waters they would need to do so through state regulations.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:01] You good? Okay.

Marci Yaremko [00:09:02] Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:02] Thanks Marci. Thank you Maggie. Bob.

Bob Dooley [00:09:06] Thanks Mr. Chairman. Just to follow-up on that to Maggie if I could. You mentioned they could use the same gear in the halibut fishery, but is there different buoy markings

that are required in the halibut fishery? I'm pretty ignorant on that. I'm just understanding that they couldn't use the same buoys or they would have different buoy markings? I'm not sure. That's just a question.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:27] Maggie.

Maggie Sommer [00:09:28] Thank you Chair. Thank you Mr. Dooley. Right now in both groundfish and halibut fisheries, although under different regulations, buoys are required to be marked with the vessel ID number. That's in federal regulations for groundfish fisheries and International Pacific Halibut Commission regulations for halibut fisheries. This wouldn't change those requirements for the vessel ID number to be on the buoy. We are talking about adding a requirement for federal groundfish fisheries to add a tag to a buoy when they're fishing groundfish that has a color and shape unique to the groundfish fishery that we would specify in federal regs along with some identifying information on that tag.

Bob Dooley [00:10:12] Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:14] Thank you Bob. Thank you Maggie. Sharon.

Sharon Kiefer [00:10:17] Thank you Mr. Chairman. So Maggie so hypothetically if, I'm just trying to sort all this out, so if you had someone using the same line schematic in the halibut fishery but a buoy that only had the vessel ID on it and did not have the cattle tag, you could presumably attribute that to halibut and not groundfish hypothetically.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:47] Maggie.

Maggie Sommer [00:10:48] Thanks Mr. Chair. Thanks Miss Kiefer. It would depend on what parts of the gear we observed in the entanglement. If we saw line that was marked for the groundfish fishery, we would likely be entangling it, sorry, attributing it to the groundfish fishery. If we saw that there was a buoy attached to that without a groundfish tag on it, I think we would be hoping for more information. That's an example of a case where the vessel ID, whether it's on the buoy and or on the tag, but in this case on the buoy, is very helpful because it allows us to hopefully identify a vessel and interview the captain and find out what fishery they were operating in at the time. But I'll just make the point that I think you all are making with these questions that the more overlap between different fisheries in terms of the marking scheme there is, the less clear our ability to confidently attribute either to make a confident positive or negative attribution. So, again, ideally in the long run we have clear and unique marking schemes for various fisheries. This action today will only apply to groundfish pot and longline gear in federal waters.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:18] Thank you Maggie. Thank you Sharon. All right, anyone else? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands so I'll look to Heather so, Heather.

Heather Hall [00:12:34] I have a motion. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:36] Very good. And there it is.

Heather Hall [00:12:44] I move that the Council adopt the alternatives described in Agenda Item F.5.a, Supplemental Gap Report 1, June 2024, Table 1 as the Final Preferred Alternatives, except revise the transition period from temporary marks to manufactured line, which is Alternative 1, Option D to three years and specify that the temporary marks should be continuous over the 20 fathom marking requirement and consist of alternating bands of the gear specific colors to be determined by NMFS, National Marine Fisheries Service.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:25] Thank you Heather. Is the language on the screen accurate?

Heather Hall [00:13:28] Yes it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:29] Okay. Looking for a second. Seconded by Phil Anderson. Thank you Phil. Please speak to your motion as appropriate.

Heather Hall [00:13:38] This motion really reflects again what we heard back in March, but it's refreshed with what we heard from the GAP this meeting. I asked a couple of questions of the GAP and during public comment about the changes to the transition period and considered the input from the EC on that particular issue. And in thinking about the continuous line marking, really weighed that with the flexibility to have a transition period, but in a way that has a really strong line mark during that temporary, during that temporary transition period. So that's my thinking into the motion. I think the GAP did a really again great job of providing input to the Council. And so for primarily all the other alternatives this reflects the input that we heard from them.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:52] Okay. Thank you Heather. Questions for the motion maker? Discussion on the motion? Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:15:06] I will be supporting the motion of course. I really want to commend the the GAP and particularly the fixed gear folks and their alternates for the work that they've done on this. We starting down this road and getting to a place where we have industry recommendations and acceptance of taking this step is, is, I don't know that it's remarkable, but it's admirable. And I just want to, they've helped make our job easier by the work that they have done in coming up with this approach that will ensure us in terms of being able to help both identify where we have entanglements as well as there are steps in here that will help reduce entanglement. So it's a, I think a really good piece of work by a lot of people.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:07] Thank you Phil. All right. I'm not seeing hands so, oh, Maggie Sommers.

Maggie Sommer [00:16:18] Thanks Mr. Chair. I just wanted to address a few aspects of this. I would echo everyone's thanks. I have been part of some really great discussions. There's been some evolution in this, some compromise and on all sides and I really appreciate the thought and expertise from both our whale entanglement experts within NMFS who have been advising me, and then the industry and fixed gear fishermen, as well as a lot of the public comment we've received written and verbally. There are a number of aspects of this marking scheme that we have been talking about all along that aren't specified in this motion or in the underlying report,

specifically line color schemes, tags, shape and colors, et cetera. I think that's fine. There has been plenty of opportunity for the Council to weigh-in and having not heard anything we will go forward and we will go ahead and consult with the Tri-State Crab Fishery Managers to make sure that we are picking colors that, you know, don't overlap with the crab colors or any others that might be under consideration for state fisheries. We also welcome all the good ideas from enthusiastic fishermen as we go forward on this. So you can expect to see those things specified as we go forward and work through the rulemaking process on this and a proposed rule when it comes out. We also had some discussion on different fisheries and, you know, I provided the answer that all we can do here is within the groundfish regulations. So we could prohibit, you know, the use of other fishery color gear marking specifications I guess in the groundfish fishery as part of this action. If that seems necessary, I understand that there may be different line diameter, et cetera, used with crab gear, so I'm not sure that is a concern, but it seems straightforward enough to do and maybe I would just ask for any, if there's any opposition to doing that or any Council thoughts on that? I'll give you a moment to think about it.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:07] Okay, Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:19:12] Thank you Mr. Chairman. We heard a little bit about the East Coast having some of this already multicolored line multi, and there was a comment about an, and there wasn't much extrapolation on that so I'm not sure if it's relevant or not, but if there are line manufacturers doing this on the East Coast and the diameter is correct, it might be good to maybe match up to that so that the availability of the line might be more readily available quicker and maybe even cheaper because it's already being done. But at least I heard a talk about it but I haven't know anything more about it, so thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:55] Thank you Bob. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:19:58] Thank you Vice-Chair. Miss Sommer beat me to something I was going to bring up after we talked about this motion and voted on it, was providing the guidance or the recommendation that we provide guidance to NMFS to work with the three states Dungeness crab fisheries on the line markings. That seems like it might be the most efficient use of time. I don't think this group sitting around here arguing over color combinations of lines is an effective use of our time nor should I be one of the people in charge of that group or part of that conversation. But I think Miss Sommers' on the right track that we ask NMFS to work with the states with the coordination there on the lines and the buoy markings. We're just talking about it a step ahead of where I figured we would. So thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:47] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:20:48] Thank you. I do have a few more thoughts to add to the discussion too. Just want to start with the gear marking itself. This does.....just inside the table isn't showing up here, just going to walk through what this includes in many ways. The use of cattle ear tags that would have a vessel identification on each buoy, I really appreciated the EC and GAP discussion on this. And my recommendation here is that tags be marked in a way that's as permanent as possible. And really understand that the EC has experience with buoy tags and fading just from our crab fisheries operations and reliance on buoy tags. The motion doesn't include marking the

line at the surface so it's really reliant on every surface buoy being marked in a way that is visible and really meets the intent to be able to identify gear to the fishery. The motion is specific to line marking, requires that at least the top 20 fathoms of the line is marked and is different from the PPA and what I mentioned earlier in that it allows for a transition from temporary to manufactured line, and this ensures that line marking is implemented as soon as possible, but also recognizes the availability of manufactured line and introduces flexibility to vessels who may not be able to immediately go to manufactured line, and I really think that's important. It also could reduce waste by allowing line to be replaced potentially as it becomes worn, but at least within a three-year transition period and I think moving from the five-year recommendation from the GAP to three years here was really trying to move in the direction of the original PPA, which is straight to manufactured line in a way that's a little bit on the shorter timeframe and gets folks moving in that direction but targeting a little more sooner than, sooner than later on that one. And I just wanted to speak to the motion, including a continuous line mark over the 20 fathom distance. Again, this would really make that transition period, that three year transition period, the line marking in there being really meaningful, really focused on the intent and so this is something that we learned in the Washington Dungeness crab fishery. We are, our first line marking rule did not include the word 'continuous'. And we just revised our rule to add that and I think it's important to add it now. And then the discussion around marking gear on one end as opposed to both ends, I really, again, there's really good discussion on this. I think one thing to note here is it's an option not a requirement. When it, when it's right for the fishing operation to only mark gear on one end, it does reduce the amount of line and I think in that way it gets at the risk reduction that we're looking for through this action and so I think it's really important to include that here. This motion does clarify regulations to prohibit the panel replacement on the bottom of the pot, except for slinky pots. And it also does include the recommendation from the GAP to change the twine from number 21 to 30 as recommended by the GAP. And again, I just would request similar to what Miss Mattes said, continued coordination with NMFS and the three West Coast states and Dungeness crab fishery managers to help with line and tag colors and shapes that are unique to the federal groundfish fishery and in a way that, you know, is also prohibits lines that are required or line marking or gear marking that's required in another fishery. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:56] Thank you Heather. Okay, anybody else? Maggie I might have misheard you, but you were saying that you could determine potentially the, what fisheries it's in because of the diameter of the line? You mentioned that earlier if I could.

Maggie Sommer [00:26:15] Thanks Mr. Chair. I just meant to ask if the Council concurs with, if NMFS went forward with an intent as we write the regulations and we specify the colors, et cetera, as part of that we prohibit line markings, line markings that are required in other fisheries. For example, you would not then be able to use a vertical line marked with Dungeness crab state colors in this fishery.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:55] Okay. Thank you. I just thought I'd mention that because I know that well Poggi and Bob their boats are bigger and they use bigger rope. I know some of the small vessels use the slinky gear. They do use crab pot size rope, so just to make sure you're aware that so. Okay. All right, anybody else? Well then I think I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:27:28] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:29] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you. All right. Maggie.

Maggie Sommer [00:27:40] Thanks Mr. Chair. I just wanted to make a couple more brief comments. And first, I think I owe Miss Hall an apology for jumping out in front of you before your remarks on the, before we voted on the motion. I do want to acknowledge some of the information brought forward in public comment and discussed here about some of the developments in whale safe gear, including but not limited to ropeless gear. There's a lot of room for exploration there and I know we're all watching it closely and looking forward to any innovations that can make further progress toward reducing the risk of marine life entanglements in this fishery. We recognize that ropeless gear in particular is probably not ready yet operationally for the grant for the sablefish fishery because of the depths at which it's fished. I have reached out just informally to some of the manufacturers and chatted with them about that. But I know there are plans for further testing and, you know, as I said, going into the future that's something we will be paying attention to is as we know you will. Also I'd like to acknowledge the ongoing request from industry for funding to support the purchase of lines and tags, or for NMFS to provide lines and tags. I want to be clear that at this time our expectation is that it would be an industry responsibility to purchase and obtain your own lines and tags that meet the specifications that we will put into regulation. We are aware of the challenge that might present to some participants. We will certainly continue to keep an ear open and explore the potential funding sources. And I know there are others who are listening, including some NGOs for example, who are very supportive of gear marking and who may also have or know of potential funding and I know any opportunities there would be very welcome, so certainly encourage anyone to make those connections if you have any information to pass along there. And then finally, I just wanted to bring up again, I'm not sure it has come out in our discussion today, it did at the last meeting, that we at this time are anticipating a January 1st, 2026 effective date. That's certainly not a guarantee, but that is what we would be thinking about targeting. We would be working on the rulemaking process between now and then and we would expect that a final rule would be published in the first half of 2025, providing some time for then gear distributors to order the appropriately marked colored line and for fishermen to go ahead and set themselves up with a line and with tags that meet the specifications. So I just wanted to have an opportunity to clarify all those, make sure everyone's on the same page as we're going forward. And I appreciate the time. Again, appreciate all of the input and I'm glad we're taking some steps here toward addressing or improving our understanding of the source of whale entanglements and making some concrete steps here toward reducing the risk. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:06] Okay, thank you Maggie. All right. Looking around. Further discussion? Motions? Do we have more motions? No? We're good? Okay. All right, Jessi, looking to you.

Jessi Doerpinghaus [00:31:27] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, you have completed your action for today. You've selected your Final Preferred Alternatives for fixed gear marking and entanglement risk reduction. We'll work on updating the analysis and work with NMFS to work on the regulations.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:43] All righty. Wonderful. Well, well done. Great job everyone.

6. 2025-26 Harvest Specifications, Management Measures, and Exempted Fishing Permits – Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment Final Action

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Okay no public comment so that takes us to Council action. Which actually which is going to be to not have action besides discussion I guess, Council discussion, so I'll open the floor up for that. Well, this is going to be a short day. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:00:25] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I will try to be short, but I don't think I will be. So I just wanted to take an opportunity to point out something that isn't in this agenda item that should be. If you look, just so people are aware of where I'm looking at and what I'm going to be referring to, it might be useful to have your laptop to go to the briefing book and look at Supplemental Informational Report Number 5 particularly because it'll be an example of what I'm talking about. My reason for doing this now, just so people are aware, everyone knows I won't be here next meeting and neither will Mr. Anderson and this pertains to whiting and both of us are very, very knowledgeable and have a long history in whiting. And I think the Council needs to understand the effects of things that have been going on here, and it's nothing devious, I'm just going to point out some information that we won't have. So I think I'm going to start that with a little history lesson if it's okay?

Brad Pettinger [00:01:46] Okay Bob.

Bob Dooley [00:01:47] Being here with the whole rationalization program when we started way back when, the at-sea sectors, at-sea whiting sectors were interested in cooperative management. The Council was very interested in an ITQ system that was similar to what was going on in Canada. The Canadians actually came down here and made presentations to us. The one component of that program of the program that we developed was individual accountability and for the Council to be able to see that accountability transparently. Their heartburn over co-ops was the thought of issuing an entire quota to an entity like a co-op that would not have that transparency embedded. One of the problems with the transparency in the reporting that the Council that would justify the ability to have a co-op in that manner was reporting to the individual vessel level performance, which is a confidentiality issue with NMFS and no confidentiality. The sector had experience with that because a part of the American Fisheries Act in Alaska for pollock specified that we report to the individual vessel level transparently public document, and we did so. It was, I would characterize it as the price of admission, so we're very familiar with it so we're not, the sectors were not afraid of that. They were not worried about that and were willing to forego the confidentiality to have the benefit of the co-op. I'm sure if I say anything wrong during this I'm sure Mr. Anderson will correct me because he's got a lot more tenure here than I do. We made that promise to the co-ops, when I say we, I was part of that sector as part of the development, part of all of the background, that combined with our cooperative agreements and the self-monitoring that the co-ops do and the self-enforcement that's contained within the agreements that the Council was privy to and saw it fall short of approval, but accepted it as being adequate. For the first 13 years we have held that promise. I didn't realize it until I went through the briefing book and the informational reports that I pointed out to you that there's a deviation from that now. It's nothing, and I want to point out that it's nothing nefarious here but in my opinion it's a change to our promise and it has an effect or could have an effect. It takes our transparency to a different level. It takes the Council's ability to

monitor the progress of the co-ops to the level that we promised, and to the level that the concern the Council had of being able to see that individual accountability and performance. So now I think I'll jump into maybe some specifics. If you want to follow along it's great. If you don't, I can try to do my best to explain it. In that, in the report, the informational report, and I will.....it explains the co-op's responsibilities and what they have done. If you look on Page 2 at the top, it says the federal regulations regarding the reporting requirements and three, two little i's, I don't know how to say that. The co-op's actual retained and discarded catch of Pacific whiting, salmon, Pacific halibut, rockfish, groundfish, and other species on a vessel by vessel. So the annual co-op report will contain about the previous fishing years including this. So it's on a on a vessel by vessel basis, that was our promise. It's contained in the Federal Register, or in the federal regulations. As we go down, if you go to the table on Page 6 of the document it is the report card of all the vessels that participated. So understand for the first 13 reports from 2011, and actually 12' because we reported on 2011 to now, it contained on a vessel by vessel basis all the bycatch amounts of all the species listed on this Table 1 and under the next page actually in Page 7, every species that's caught and the vessels performance to that. You'll note that in this report for the first time, it only lists the Pacific whiting amount on a vessel by vessel basis and it states the bycatch in aggregate for the whole sector. I'd also point out that if you look at the third column where it says,"at-sea percent attainment", this report expresses the amount of bycatch that was caught in relation by the CP sector in relation to the entire at-sea set-aside. We have had many discussions on that in the last year, and although not reflected in any regulation or anything, we have made it clear that co-ops are to, should be weighing their performance against their pro-rata share of that at-sea set-aside. That percentage is not simply the percentage, the 25% that the motherships have, 24%, and the mothership sector of the entire whiting sector, it's not just the 24%, and it's not just the 34% that the CP sector has because the whiting set-aside only applies to the at-sea, you need to, the pro-rata share is really 41.4% whiting mothership co-op and 58.6% PWCC co-op. That's the pro-rata share of the at-sea set-aside. This is expressed as the entire set-aside. So we don't have a feeling in this with this information of what percentage of the set-aside their pro-rata share is being taken. And it's very informative to the Council to be able to judge a particular vessel and co-op's performance, it's very, very important. So you'll also see in that third column, it says at-sea attainment. And you'll notice when you go down to, in this example or in this, when you get down to sablefish it says 100%. It says 130.23 as the CP total catch and 100% at-sea attainment. If you look at that, that is well above the at-sea sector set-aside, 130. The actual set-aside I believe was 100. So it's not informative of what the Council needs to know to judge performance. And that's the thing that was really promised that we would be transparent in that. So what's my concern and why am I bringing it up I guess is, is that I'm concerned that we would punish the entire sector for the, or disadvantage the entire sector for the performance of one sector, and we've talked about that a lot at this around the table in previous times. Sorry I drift a little bit. I'm trying to stay on track. Okay, another component of this is this report is due in March. Let me back up I'm going too fast. You'll see in yellow it says, "individual vessel catch data other than whiting is removed below for confidentiality". It's true that they have the right to confidentiality and I believe they've talked with National Marine Fisheries Service about that, and that of course they can, they have that right, but that's outside our promise. The promise was to be transparent with this Council so you have the ability to manage. That was done. These reports should have been in the briefing book in March. They were not and I was told the reason they weren't is that this particular report was not ready because of this issue in getting, working through it. And now it's in our briefing book now and when we really have, it's getting late in the year for us to have any real meaningful discussion on

management measures that we might take to account for this uncertainty. So I think in normal times we would have had it in March and I think it would be better. I'll divert a little bit just so, put a little comfort in the room. The whiting fishery right now to what I know about it we're not, attainment's way down this year. I believe the mothership sector's got 270 tons of approximately 90,000 tons. The fish haven't shown up yet. I don't think many people are fishing out there. I think the shoreside's been having an equal amount of difficulty I think. I know the CP's have too. Bycatch is down. I know the mothership sector. I get those reports. The mothership sector's caught four salmon to date, four. And so I just want to make sure people don't think there's things that we need to really react to right now. I'm concerned about this and the reaction the Council might take without a lot of, without the historical perspective, without the understanding of the significance. That's why I came forward with this. I've been thinking about possible remedies. I know the Council has asked the two sectors to come forward with an inter-cooperative agreement to kind of respect that pro-rata share sharing of set-asides, understanding set-asides aren't hard caps. The Council has been very understanding that conditions change over years and sometimes they get exceeded and as long as they're being managed and they're justifiable and all that, we've in the past.....and there's room in sectors like in darkblotched there was a lot of room in the whole system to allow that to happen, that overage of the set-aside that it was okay. And that's a privilege that that sector, those sectors have enjoyed because of their transparency. And I'm worried that if we lose transparency in one sector and we don't, and the other sector is going along like always and honoring the promises, that we might paint them both with the same brush. So I've been thinking about that and potential idea that could happen is you could separate the set-aside pro-rata share between the two sectors. It wouldn't be ideal but at least we would have some accountability. It's not on the table now. And the reason I bring it up is because I think we have understanding of this that might not be here in the next session and it may be an issue, we don't know, but I think it's something to watch out for. I think it's something that we may want to put buffers in. We may want to be concerned about. So all that being said, I think I'll stop there. I may be coming forward with a motion later but, and I may re-address it again in inseason, but I just wanted to bring it to attention. And I think I've covered what I need to cover here so I'll stop there and if you have questions I'm more than happy to try to answer them.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:21] Okay, thank you Bob. All right. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:16:27] Thanks Mr. Chairman. And I appreciate Mr. Dooley bringing this topic up. As the catch share was developed, and I'll try not to repeat what Bob said, but I remember how important the use of co-ops was to the at-sea fleet. Co-ops were foreign to most of us around the table at the time. It took a while for us to become comfortable. I'm not sure everybody became comfortable but because there was a fair amount of trust involved that what we were being told in terms of the formulation of the co-ops and how they would operate was dependent on the participants in each sector fully developing those co-ops. I remember one of the primary benefits of the co-ops that were being, that was expressed was the degree to the flexibility that resulted to the boats that are part of the co-op, that if a particular boat had a high bycatch of in a particular time, the flexibility within the total of the co-op allowed those members to move that fish around so it reduced, at least, the potential of having someone lose their ability to fish throughout the season if they were under a specific quota for their boat. And then the other issue was talking about, well do we take what were at the time hard caps of bycatch and assign them in a pro-rata way to each sector of at-sea and CP's, or do we manage them as in a lump sum? And again, by

managing them in a lump sum provided an additional level of flexibility between the two sectors that otherwise wouldn't be there. And I think that was probably a pretty, I don't know that, but I think that was a pretty big step for each of those sectors to say, yeah we will play within, we're willing to play within the same sandbox, if you will, of having these quotas of bycatch managed under the umbrella of the two sectors. And one of the, or the primary way that the Council would be able to continue to know how the fishery was performing was the annual data reporting that Bob spoke to and the regulations that went with that. The performance of the 2023 fishery, and you saw some of that even in this report where one sector took 100% of the whole. My words caused some angst between the two co-ops, the two sectors as to how to deal with this and when as the season progressed and they were moving toward and reaching these set-aside numbers and exceeding them, what's the response? What's the response of the mothership sector? What's the response of the CP sector? They don't necessarily need to be the same but there was a lack of agreement on how to respond in those circumstances and which, again from my seat, drove us to strongly request that they develop an innersector, innerco-op agreement on how those situations would be handled. And we know that they took that to heart, both sectors, and they worked hard to try to get there but they weren't able to cross the finish line with that. So now we get this report, this Informational Report under Attachment 5 that Bob referenced and there's a, in my mind, a significant change in the information that is provided. And while I won't be able to do much about that soon, what I'm urging my colleagues around the table is, don't accept this new reporting as acceptable without thought and deliberation and making a conscious decision that the coarser scale of reporting here is okay and it meets your needs, because in previous decisions around this table we concluded that this level of reporting wasn't sufficient given the history, given how the co-ops were developed, and the fact that we agreed to have their bycatch amounts managed together under a single umbrella and left it to the sectors to manage it appropriately. And my other, my last point, next to last point, is we made a significant change, this Council made a significant change in moving away from hard caps and going to set-asides for bycatch allowance in the whiting fishery. And we were, we had been confronted several times with inseason emergencies because of the hard cap approach, and in some cases we had a lot of, I'll call it headroom, between what had been taken overall for a particular specie in the ACL and allowing catches above that hard cap would still not create a conservation problem, but it took a Council action to make that happen to provide that flexibility and we addressed that by creating set-asides instead of hard caps. And in my mind, the reporting, in part the way I looked at that and thought that that was a reasonable thing to do was because of the type of reporting that we were getting from them and had been getting for the past 12 years, this is the 13th I think, I can't...anyway close. But here we have a choice that's been made, I'll call it unilaterally, to report in a more coarse scale. And again, my final point is if this is acceptable to the Council make that decision thoughtfully and deliberately. If you don't believe this level of information and moving away from the finer scale, if you don't believe that will give you the information you need, then take a step back and ask that the additional information be provided at that finer scale from both sectors so you can continue to have that information in front of you.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:40] Thank you Phil. Bob.

Bob Dooley [00:26:46] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And Phil thanks for those comments. It filled in a lot of gaps I left. One that's left on the table here that I would like to point out is that the whiting mothership co-op continued and continues, you'll see it in the briefing book, I think their

Report 4 I believe, they have continued to report to the granular level that we, that was promised and I believe they have signed a waiver to do that, continue to do that. So they've committed to doing this and so it's a departure and I wanted to point that out. And I agree with all the comments that Phil said. It's, and I have no, this isn't, I have no animosity to anything. I just, I think this Council needs to be understanding how the management measures were integrated into that program and promises that were made and any changes that are coming. And I don't know that, like I said before, I don't know that there's, you know, because both Phil and I are so well versed in this and this will go on after we leave that I think it warranted this explanation and this description so, and I agree Phil that we, if we are going to accept this, it should be a conscious and willful decision. So thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:28:22] Thank you Bob. Okay, further discussion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:28:33] Thank you Chair Pettinger. It's my understanding the whiting co-op, the CP co-op went through some leadership changes this year. Could, just my reading other than the highlighted part about the remove from confidentiality, is there any possibility that this was done this way just because of some change in leadership and not understanding what was required? Or am I being a little naive here? And I don't expect anybody at this table to answer, be able to answer that question as they're not the authors. It was just a thought, as we've been, as I've been listening to this discussion is there potential for that change to have been part of the reason for the format of the report this year? Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:21] Thank you Lynn. I would just like to point out that the reports in at least 2022 were also in June, they're not in March. So that's nothing new as far as coming in June so. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:29:41] Thank you. Just to Miss Mattes's question. And I was not directly involved in these discussions but my understanding is there was a discussion and the CP co-op was clear on what the regulations do require but that the confidentiality issue arose and they were provided the pathway that the MS co-op chose, which is to sign a waiver to be able to continue to do what we've been doing. They had chosen not to. I can't speak to that decision. That would be appropriate for you to ask them if that's the path you wanted to go down. But just closing that loop, and I'll just also say the requirement for the reporting, the reporting deadline is March 17th just for the record.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:26] Thank you for that clarification Keeley. Okay. Butch did you have a? All right, anyone else? It's gonna be a short day. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:30:41] Thank you Chair. Not on that subject, which is going to address the.....it may seem like it's being a short day today and this is going relatively quickly and tomorrow may as well, but that's because of all the work that the GMT, Council staff, NMFS staff, and the GAP put in over the winter. All the work they did at and in preparation for the March and April Council meetings as well as the work they've done in preparation for this meeting. So while this may seem like it's going quick, that is not a reflection of the amount of time and effort, I'd say probably blood, sweat, and tears the GMT and others have put in on this. So I don't want that to be lost that maybe it's going this quickly because of how they laid stuff out and all of the good work they did. I just

wanted that acknowledged that it shouldn't be a reflection of the quality or quantity of the work they did and to especially thank them for that work. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:41] Thank you Lynn. That's right. Nothing happens in a vacuum. Okay. Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:31:52] Yeah, Mr. Chairman, and I apologize I just sat here and listened to an eloquent how we got from A to B. And I don't know if somewhere between A and B in the last little bit it got forgotten or institutional knowledge change. I just, my question is what's the next step if we're not doing it correctly as planned? Not meant to change. What do we do from here? Or what's the two whiting experts that we currently have on the Council while they're here better have them here than us trying to call them on the phone during break when they're in Tahiti enjoying their vacation. I want to kind of understand this I'm sorry. A little bit of a salmon heavy guy and little light on whiting, but you know I want to learn as much as I can. So I just, that's the question. What is, I guess, what is the solution or what's the, or what are we looking at by the whiting experts while we have them here? So thank you Mr. Chair.

Brad Pettinger [00:33:16] Thank you Butch. Phil.

Phil Anderson [00:00:00] Well at the risk of admitting that maybe I'm not sure we brought this up at the right time but we weren't really sure when to bring it up. We thought we'd at least introduce the topic now. We can work with our process experts to think about whether or not we want to define what the next step is when we get to the inseason management agenda item. If that's the appropriate place to do it we can have some time to think about that or whether tomorrow under this agenda item is the appropriate place, but we'd like to, I say we meaning Mr. Dooley and I would like to have an opportunity to consult with the powers to be to see when that time is but we thought, given the time that we had here today, it would give us an opportunity to introduce our concern to all of you and then think about what next steps are.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:10] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:01:14] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the question. Just from a process perspective I do think it was appropriate to discuss this here because under this agenda item we are considering management measures and this is part of our management measures discussion, but in terms of making sure that we have a, you know, a well thought out discussion of this item, it just came up suddenly. And so what I would suggest we do is look ahead to September where we begin our consideration of trawl set-asides and the trawl program review and that could allow for some more deliberate information to be brought forward by Jessi, who will be leading that item for us, and give you some lead time to think about this issue a little more specifically. So that would be my suggestion but I don't want to cut off your, this is your show, so I don't want to cut you off if you'd like to do something here today.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:11] Okay. Thank you Merrick. All right. Phil.

Phil Anderson [00:02:19] I think that makes good sense. I do want to make sure that those that are affected by the discussion are aware that at least several of us on the Council have some

concerns and it we'll be talking about it again in September so I think that works. I was, I hesitate to think out loud here, that if there was any part of this reporting other than the part that deals with confidentiality, that we wanted to make a request back to PWCC on an additional piece of detail, particularly when it talks about the percent of at-sea attainment column, maybe providing us an additional column that compares that to the pro-rata share, that that might be informative but let me think about that a little bit more as to whether or not I want to actually suggest that or not. But I think taking it up in terms of what we want in the future, what the Council wants in the future and having the benefit of the sectors providing us their thoughts and other members that have, or other people that have an interest in this is a wise thing to do.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:00] Thank you Phil. Bob.

Bob Dooley [00:04:04] I do agree with that approach. I mean I would be really reluctant to make a decision here today without having a public open process and the ability for the sectors to address the concerns and I agree with that. I guess just to kind to couch my concerns and my thoughts is this is a departure from what we've done. It creates more uncertainty and less ability for the Council. It's a really important fishery to our communities to our actual, you know the fishing communities that do that, that prosecute that fishery and it's a very important component of the, of our whole process. It's a huge fishery and I'm worried that we may not see the whole picture here and we may not understand the differences of an accountability and our ability to manage. So I want to, you know, and I'm not so certain that, that might have been, that part of it might have been lost on the people that have done this, you know the sector, because Butch I think you're right that there's been change and, you know if you don't have the understanding of how it got here you might make those kind of decisions. I mean confidentiality is a big thing so I think we've probably gone far enough. Let the, you know, and I hope that the Council has an understanding of the issue. I would hate to, I use the word penalize, but I would hate to if you have differences of approach in the sectors, that means you got of maybe consider a different approach of management for each and the one size fits all might be not correct. So those need to be real thoughtful decisions and there's a lot to go here but I think hopefully this was worthwhile. I know we took a lot of floor time on this and I'm sorry if people didn't think it was worthwhile, but I felt I should bring it up. So thank you. Thank you Phil for your much better comments than mine. So thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:29] Thank you Bob. All right. Anybody else? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:06:36] Thank you. I did want to offer my appreciation to Mr. Dooley and Mr. Anderson for bringing this up and exposing us to this for some of us who might not have tracked this as closely. I really appreciate the background and refresher on it and queued to think about how we move forward carefully. So just wanted to put that out there and thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:02] Thank you Heather. Okay, I'm not seeing any hands but the day's not over I don't think. We're going to take a 15 minute break to see if we can put inseason together. So anyway moving things right along here so a 15 minute break and we'll.....oop, yes Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:07:17] I just want to say something really quickly. Which is while it may be a short day for some of us, it will certainly not be a short day for those that are working on motions for this. So just wanting to recognize that there's a fair amount of work and that spending

a lot of time today may not be beneficial for them. That being said, I do think that this whiting component was well worth bringing up and having the discussion around. And I am thankful for those of you to take the time to give those of us that were not here the education on it and the pointers on where to go look for the future. So thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:59] Thank you Christa. Okay, so Todd how are we doing on C.6, F.6?

Todd Phillips [00:08:03] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. You have heard all the reports. You have had some discussion. I would say that you are teed up for action tomorrow, tomorrow morning. Very good. Okay, so I guess a 15 minute break and we'll see where we're, see what comes together or not so okay? (BREAK until following day)

Pete Hassemer [00:08:22] Thank you Mr. Chair. And this is a continuation of our spex process so I'm going to turn it over to Todd Phillips to update us, summarize where we are and what we need to do today. Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:08:40] Yes thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Good morning Council. So as the Vice-Chair indicated this is F.6, the continuation from yesterday. This is the harvest specifications and management measures item. So yesterday we heard from all advisory groups that provided comments. We heard from the states. We heard from the region as well. There was a little bit of discussion on the floor. Today we are scheduled to take action as noted in the Situation Summary. I can easily repeat that or it's also shown there on the screen. Let's see, today you could have additional discussion as appropriate and then move into any motions that you may have. That's really it. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:24] All right, thank you Todd. So I'm going to see if there's any questions on that? We had a chance for that yesterday, but you've had a chance to think about it. We initiated discussion on this agenda item yesterday and I will look around to see if there's any other additional discussion that needs to be had before we get to motions? And it appears there is no additional discussion to be had on the matter so I'll look to motions. Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman [00:10:06] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I did submit a motion a moment ago. See if it's arrived yet? Thank you. So here's the F.6 tribal motion. I move that the Council adopt as Final Preferred Alternative the tribal set-asides, harvest guidelines, and allocations as shown in agenda item F.5.a, Tribal Supplemental Report 1, April 2024.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:12] Thank you Joe. That language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Joe Oatman [00:11:20] Yes it is Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:21] Thank you. Seconded by....No sorry. Let's make sure.

Bob Dooley [00:11:27] I'm sorry. I think there's a mistake in that. It's not F.5 I don't believe. I believe it's F.6.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:36] It was the April meeting though. Let's make sure.

Bob Dooley [00:11:43] Oh, okay. Okay, I'm sorry. Thank you. Didn't want to.....

Pete Hassemer [00:11:51] All right, thank you. Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Please speak to your motion Joe.

Joe Oatman [00:11:57] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So as the Council is aware, the tribes intend on continuing all their existing groundfish fisheries for 2025 and 2026 and have developed set-asides which allow them to accommodate and manage the expected mortality in their upcoming fisheries. The Council adopted as a PPA the set-aside request as outlined in F.5.a, Supplemental Tribal Report 1, April 2024. The Coastal Tribes have requested no further adjustments to set-asides, harvest guidelines, and allocations after their initial request and therefore would like the Council to adopt these set-asides and allocations as identified in F.5.a, Supplemental Tribal Report 1 as Final Preferred Alternative. I would also like to highlight that in late May some legacy language regarding tribal fishery management measures was found in the Council analytical document which did not accurately reflect PPA as adopted by the Council in April. Tribal representatives on the GMT and the GAP have confirmed with Council staff that removal of this language from the Council analytical document will not result in any changes to management of tribal fisheries and that the language has not been relevant to management of tribal fisheries for several biennium. Following adoption of Supplemental Tribal Report 1 as FPA, the Council analytical document will be amended to accurately reflect FPA as adopted by the Council.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:41] Thank you Joe. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Not seeing any questions, discussion on the motion? No discussion on the motion. I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:14:01] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:02] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Joe. Next I believe Lynne Mattes has a motion. Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:14:18] Thank you Vice-Chair. Yes I believe I'm next in the queue. And our fine folks in the back of the room have just put it up. I just do want to note that the numbers, action item numbers are based on the Action Item Checklist from which is Attachment 1. So I move that the Council adopt the following alternatives as the Final Preferred Alternative for groundfish management measures in 25' and 26'. Exempted Fishing Permits: Adopt both EFP renewals for 25' and 26' management period. Number One: the West Coast Seafood Processors Association and Oregon Trawl Commission year-round trawl gear EFP. And two, the CDFW Fishery Dependent Biological Data Collection EFP renew for cowcod and add quillback and yelloweye rockfishes for 25-26. For Action Item Number 2: Off-the-top deductions. That should say, "adopt the following final set-asides". Thank you. For 25' and 26' as shown in Appendix 1, Agenda Item F.6.a, Supplemental GMT Report, June 2024. For research: Use the rolling 10-year maximum of research mortality to set research set-asides in 25' and 26' except for: Canary rockfish, set at 10.1 metric tons per year. Cowcod, 10 metric tons per year. California quillback, 0.1 metric tons per year. And yelloweye rockfish, 2.9 metric tons per year. For incidental open access: Use the rolling 10-year

maximum methodology to set IOA set-asides for 2025-2026 except for: Bocaccio south, 2.2 metric tons. Canary rockfish, 2.8. Darkblotched rockfish, 10.7. Longspine thornyhead north of 34 27, 1.3. Petrale sole, 4.4. Sablefish south of 36, 25.0. Widow rockfish, 1.0. Nearshore rockfish north of 40 10, 1.1. Slope rockfish south of 40 10, 0.9. And yelloweye rockfish, 3.9 metric tons, and each of those is per year. Exempted fishing permits: No set-asides for 25' and 26'. And for recreational sablefish north of 36 north latitude, create a recreational set-aside of 30 metric tons. Action Item Number 5: 2-year trawl/non-trawl allocations. Adopt status quo for 2-year allocations for all stocks except widow rockfish. Make it 30 metric ton non-trawl remainder to trawl as recommended by the GAP in Appendix 1 of their report here from June. Action Item Number 6: Rebuilding species overfished species allocations. Maintain the current yelloweye rebuilding allocations of 8% trawl, 92% non-trawl. Action Item number 7: Amendment 21 allocations. Maintain current amendment 21 trawl/non-trawl allocations for all species except for shortspine thornyhead, which will be covered under Action Item Number 19. And then reconsider allocations during the Intersector Allocation Review. Action Item Number 8: Harvest guidelines state shares for stocks in a complex. Adopt status quo harvest guidelines for blackgill rockfish within the slope rockfish south of 40 10 north latitude complex. And no species specific harvest guidelines for Oregon black/blue deacon rockfish complex or the Oregon or Washington cabezon and kelp greenling complexes. Action Item 17: The Oregon recreational fishery. Adopt the recommendations for the Oregon recreational fishery as outlined in Agenda Item F.5, Supplemental ODFW Report 1 from April of 2024. And Action Item 19g: New management measures/other. Adopt the updated scientific name for Pacific sand lance to *ammodytes personatus*, and the common name for spiny dogfish to Pacific spiny dogfish in regulation.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:44] Thank you. And before we go too far can you scroll back to Action Item number 5? As you read it you said 30. It says 300 metric tons here.

Lynn Mattes [00:18:59] Thank you Vice-Chair. It should be the 300. I misspoke when I was reading.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:03] All right, thank you. I believe that's the only correction that was necessary. So I will ask you, there's a lot of stuff, the language in your motion is accurate and complete?

Lynn Mattes [00:19:18] Yes sir. It appeared to be so.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:19] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:19:26] Thank you Vice-Chair. This is the culmination of a lot of work by a lot of people behind the scenes as we moved through. On the exempted fishing permits, both of these are continuations and neither will require set-asides, so there's no impact to other fisheries. And it's believed there's still pertinent information being gained from these EFPs so there seems good reason to keep, to renew those. For the off-the-top deductions, I believe it was last cycle the GMT went to a ten-year maximum rather than historic maximum to try to reflect better what is going on currently. And that seems to make sense for most species with the exception of the few that are outlined in the tables and those are high, tend to be high attainment species so we really try to

narrow down exactly what research is going on and account for those specifically. As an example with yelloweye rockfish the way it's set up we know there's some research going on in all three states in the IPHC survey so we try to very specifically account for that. Similarly with the incidental open access, those are fisheries we do not have active management over but we do our best to estimate what those might be. The recreational sablefish north of 36, that has been a 6 metric ton set-aside in recent years, however with the boon of sablefish that seems to be out there and the restrictions due to other species there is renewed, there is some new interest in targeting sablefish by the recreational fishery. So to try to account for that we are increasing the set-aside to 30 metric tons, and given where we are with the ACL in 25' and 26', that should not have an influence on any other fishery. It should not cause restrictions to any other fisheries. On the trawl and non-trawl allocations, the GAP, the GMT had agreed with status quo for everything except widow rockfish. As the widow rockfish ACL has been decreasing there's some additional need for the trawl sectors, and the GMT and the GAP took a look at what the non-trawl sectors have been taking and felt it was appropriate to reduce the non-trawl allocation by 100 metric tons, that it should still be enough to cover the non-trawl fisheries and not restrict those while providing an additional 100 metric tons to the trawl fishery. On item 6, rebuilding species, overfished species allocations, both the GAP and the GMT recommended maintaining the current sharing percentages as that stock continues to rebuild. Amendment 21 allocations for trawl/non-trawl for all species except shortspine thornyhead, I believe later this year we are starting the intersector allocation review process, and that seems like an appropriate time to dive deep into this rather than try to put it into a spex process knowing this other process is coming up. I believe Miss Hall will speak to shortspine thornyhead in a later motion, but that one is called out because of some new management measures we are going to be conducting. On item 8, harvest guidelines and state shares for stocks in a complex, it is status quo for the blackgill rockfish as part of the slope complex. That is a highly targeted species for some sectors and warrants some protection or some monitoring on it's own. The no-species specific harvest guidelines for the Oregon black/blue deacon complex and the Washington and Oregon and kelp greenling and cabezon complexes, that is status quo. That is not something new. We're not removing anything. Both states have made the commitment to manage the species in those complexes to their species specific shares and have been doing a good job therefore those don't seem warranted at this time. For the Oregon recreational fishery, as I mentioned yesterday we did not submit a new report. We are going with what we had in April. The season structure would be year open year-round, all depth, and we are going to be working through our state process this summer to set up bag limits and sub-bag limits. Once we have some additional data from this year to see how fisheries are going we are likely, because of the decrease in black rockfish, going to be looking at a pretty big decrease to the recreational fishery bag limit or a sub-bag limit for black rockfish. Additionally, we will be implementing, there will be an implementation of a five-fish sub-bag for canary rockfish in the long leader gear fishery. And then a new item is a separate bag limit for sablefish. Pulling sablefish out of the general marine bag and having an individual limit of ten fish for that, again to try to accommodate some new and renewed interest in the sablefish. And then finally, the last item here is updating the scientific name for Pacific sand lance. This has been a very important issue for an ODFW staff member to get that updated in all of our FMPs, and updating the common name to spiny dogfish better aligns with the American Fishery Society. So I think that's a good overview of what's in there. I think that's it for this one. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:12] Thank you Lynn. I'll look around and see any, if there are any questions for clarification on the motion? I'm not seeing any questions. Excellent description of that. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:25:34] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:34] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much. Now I will turn my eyes to my right to see if there are any motions on this side? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:25:53] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I believe a motion has been sent? Great. I move the Council adopt the following Final Preferred Management Measure Alternatives for 2025-2026 following the Action Item Checklist in Agenda Item F.6, Attachment 1, June of 2024. Action Item Number 1: Area management. Minor revisions to Rockfish Conservation Area waypoints as recommended in agenda item F.5.a, Supplemental CDFW Report from April of 2024. Action Item Number 4: ACTs. Adopt the following: Yelloweye rockfish non-trawl ACTs, 2025 of 31.7 metric tons. 2026, 32.3 metric tons. Remove the California quillback rockfish non-trawl ACT. For California copper rockfish, remove the statewide ACT and establish a recreational ACT south of 34 27 north of 15.8 metric tons in 2025, and 18.0 metric tons in 2026 as recommended in Agenda Item F.6.a, Supplemental CDFW Report, June of 2024. Action Item 10: fixed gear OA and recreational. Adopt status quo two-year within trawl and or non-trawl or sharing agreement for blackgill rockfish and slope rockfish south of 40 10. Canary rockfish 36% commercial non-trawl. 12.3% Washington recreational. 18.5% Oregon recreational. 33.2% California recreational. For cowcod South of 40 10, 50% commercial non-trawl, 50% recreational. Bocaccio south of 40 10, 30.9% commercial non-trawl, 69.1% recreational. Sablefish south of 36,70% limited-entry fixed gear, 30% open access. And also a 10 metric ton sablefish south of 36 set-aside for the recreational sector. No federal harvest guidelines for the area of 42 to 40 10 and the status quo state specified informal harvest guidelines for Washington and Oregon. For yelloweye rockfish, 20.9% commercial non-trawl. 24.9, excuse me, 25.6% Washington recreational. 23.3% Oregon recreational. 30.2% California recreational. Moving to Action Item 18. These are the California recreational trip limits, bag limits, and season structures. Adopt the recreational fishery season structure and sub-bag limits same as those that are in 2024 and remove size limits for cabezon, greenling, and California scorpionfish as described in Agenda Item F.5.a, Supplemental CDFW Report, April 2024. Include the Enforcement Consultants fillet skin requirements as described in Agenda item F.5.a, Supplemental EC Report 1, April 2024. Moving to Action Item 19e and f: These are new management measures for recreational. Item e, Option 2, require recreational anglers to possess a descending device aboard while fishing in federal waters. Item f, Option 2, modify continual vessel transit limitations for California recreational vessels in federal waters. And moving to Action Item Number 20: quillback rockfish rebuilding plan. Remove the California quillback rockfish from the nearshore rockfish complexes off California. Adopt harvest specification Alternative 2, the ABC Rule, from the rebuilding analysis. Adopt the California Quillback Rockfish Rebuilding Plan Analysis for 2025 and beyond, which is in Agenda Item F.6, Supplemental Revised Attachment 3, June of 2024. And adopt the FMP language and changes as shown in the Agenda Item F.6, Attachment 5, June of 2024.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:58] All right, thank you. So a lot of things there Marci. Let me start first, just to make sure it's all accurate. And I apologize for being so critical on this one. On Action item Number 10 if you can scroll up, and again I apologize, there's one word I couldn't comprehend at the end of the first bullet there, "adopt status quo two-year within trawl and or non-trawl or sharing agreement", that last 'or' at the end of the line? Maybe I'm just not reading it right.

Marci Yaremko [00:31:45] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. If I may turn to Council staff to assist me on this? I have my notes handy.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:02] Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:00:00] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So I believe that language comes directly from the GMT Report. In general, it's just considered trawl and or non-trawl sharing agreements. These are not formal allocations and or, I guess formal or informal, they're more informal slash sharing agreements, so you could strike the 'or' portion.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:19] Okay it's just an extra word there.

Todd Phillips [00:00:21] It's an extra work, yeah.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:22] Marci is that okay?

Marci Yaremko [00:00:25] Yes, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:26] All right. Then I'm going to check with Todd and see if there was anything else here?

Todd Phillips [00:00:32] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. The very last line, Action Item 20. You have, where it says, "adopt proposed FMP language and changes", and lists the agenda item as Attachment 5, it should be Attachment 6.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:53] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Todd for that correction. That's correct.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:59] All right. And with that and our sharp eyes around the room here, I'm going to ask you, is that language accurate and complete?

Marci Yaremko [00:01:09] Yes it is. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:10] Thank you very much. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Bob Dooley. Please speak to your motion.

Marci Yaremko [00:01:16] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So working through the items shown on the screen, Action Item 1 for area management. These are minor revisions to waypoints. We take this up every biennial cycle. These are the same types of minor modifications that we've done to a small handful of waypoints with the intention of better aligning the RCA lines with the bathymetry.

The changes should help ensure fishing access is being maximized while also maintaining and improving enforceability. Action Item Number 4, the ACTs. The first item regarding the yelloweye rockfish non-trawl ACTs. You might recall that both the GMT and the GAP recommended removing the, or I'm sorry, the GAP recommended removing ACTs. However this, keeping the ACTs in place this cycle would maintain our precautionary approach to managing this overfished stock. We are looking forward to the day when the stock is fully rebuilt, but in light of the GAP's recommendations, it really does not matter in terms of the proposed management measures because none of them have been designed to project or exceed the ACT. So while they offer reasonable rationale for removing ACTs, it's equally rational to keep the ACTs in place as we continue toward rebuilding. With regard to the California quillback rockfish non-trawl ACT removal, with the expectation that the ACL of 1.5 and 1.7 metric tons will be in place for the 25-26 cycle, really there's no utility or realistic application of an ACT as quillback will remain a prohibited species. With regard to copper rockfish and removal of the statewide ACT and establishing a recreational ACT for south of Point Conception, this comes about as a result of two considerations, first being the new stock definition for copper rockfish that's been designated off California, and in the two area assessment models that were conducted that gave somewhat different pictures of the stock. While the stock assessment for the entirety of the California stock is healthy, the southern model did reflect a much lower proportional biomass in the area and as a result the need to address that lower proportion of the biomass in this area, the tool of an ACT for the recreational fishery will address the conservation need to ensure that the harvest is aligned with the lower proportional biomass. This is a fresh approach with the information we received with the stock assess.....or with the stock assessment and the new stock definition. The recreational fishery has historically been the primary harvester in this area and setting the ACT allows management measures to be developed specific to the rec fishery to ensure that there's not an excessive over-harvest in the Southern California Bight, and acknowledging the review and support of the application of this ACT by both the GAP and the GMT. Moving to Action Item 10. Just to speak a bit to the recreational sablefish set-aside south of 36 degrees, this is in response to increasing amounts of incidental catch associated with the recreational fishery in somewhat random ways this past few years, and recognizing the increase in the OFL expected, this strategy to to set aside some for the recreational fishery is appropriate. Moving to Action Item 18. These are the California season structures and sub-bag limits. Again, just carrying over the management that we now have effective for 2024, which we took up in great detail in March and April. These measures represent the best available options in light of the extreme constraints that quillback rockfish has put on California fisheries north of Point Lopez. And also the season structures are kind of this delicate balance of making sure that we're effectively managing to all of our species that need management to stay within our specifications and management measures and all consider the newest stock assessment information from copper rockfish, canary rockfish, and vermilion, and recent catch trends. These are all highly attained species and very important to the recreational fisheries as well as commercial. So the recreational seasons are designed to keep us within those numerous constraints. Moving to Action Item 19e and f. These are new management measures for recreational, the descending device and the continuous vessel transit limitations. The transit piece is really important to ensure that we can keep both the combo trips going with groundfish aboard and also multi-day trips with our kind of more recent restructuring of recreational seasons to allow offshore only groundfish trips. It's been, it's been an iterative process realizing what flexibility we need to build into things like transit provisions. I just want to thank National Marine Fisheries Service for the Emergency Rule that was in place this year as a temporary measure and so this

action here in the specifications is the opportunity to make that flexibility final. Moving to Action Item 20, the Quillback Rockfish Rebuilding Plan. Removing quillback from the nearshore complexes comes about due to the current overfished status determination for quillback off California and the resulting very low and very constraining harvest limit. The situation allowed for development of management measures and fishery performance that will be tracked separately from the aggregate of other nearshore species. And we've said a lot about quillback and the record speaks for itself. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:34] Thank you Marci. Thanks for that thorough explanation of the motion. First, I will look around to see if there are any questions for clarification on the motion? And I don't see any questions. Discussion on the motion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:09:54] Thank you Vice-Chair. And thank you Miss Yaremko. I know you touched on it briefly, but the yelloweye ACT and the fact that we are, or the motion that recommends going against the GAP and the GMT recommendations, we had a pretty robust discussion amongst the three state folks last night about this. So it wasn't something we took lightly. We do appreciate the guidance from the GAP and the GMT, but just felt since we're getting....it's, yelloweye is scheduled to get a new assessment next cycle. It was pertinent to maintain the precautions so we weren't ignoring the advice and recommendations of our advisory bodies, just wanted to maintain the precautions. So it wasn't a decision we made just lightly. It was, like I said, some pretty robust discussion last night. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:48] Thank you. Further discussion? I'm not seeing any hands I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:10:56] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:56] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci. Now I will again turn my eyes to the left. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:11:15] Thank you Vice-Chair. I have a motion. I move the Council adopt the following alternatives as the Final Preferred Management Measure Alternatives for 2025-2026. Numbering refers to the Action Item Checklist, Agenda Item F.6, Attachment 1, June 2024. Action Item Number 9: At-sea set-asides. Adopt at-sea whiting fishery 2025-26 set-asides as detailed in Table 21 of Agenda Item F.6, Attachment 2, June 2024. Action Item Number 11: Shore-based IFQ. Adopt status quo IFQ trip limits for non-IFQ species. Action Item Number 12 through 15: Open access and limited entry fixed gear north and south of 40 10. Adopt trip limits in Agenda Item F.6.a, Supplemental GMT Report 1, June 2024, Appendices 2 and 3. Action Item Number 16: Washington recreational. Adopt the recommendations for the Washington recreational fishery as described in Supplemental WDFW Report 1, June 2024. Action Item Number 19: New management measures commercial. 19a: Adopt Option 2, which establish a directed open access permit program. 19b: Adopt Option 2. Correct EM program discard and retention requirement regulations. 19d: Adopt shortspine thornyhead management changes as noted in Agenda Item F.5.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, April 2024, and detailed in Agenda Item F.5.a, Supplemental GMT Report 2, April 2024. Number 1: Remove the management line for shortspine thornyhead. 2A Suboption B: allocation proportions for the 2025-2026 biennium. In 2025, 64% trawl, 36% to

non-trawl. In 2026, 71% trawl, 29% non-trawl. 2B Suboption 2. Non-trawl ACT north of 34 27 north latitude set at 25% of the coastwide non-trawl allocation with 2A Suboption B: 2025 ACT 67 metric tons, and 2026 ACT 55 metric tons. 2C Option 2: Non-trawl trip limits. Convert OA trip limits from monthly to bimonthly. Increase trip limits for LEFG north of 40 10 north latitude and between 40 10 north latitude and 34 27 north latitude trip limits. Confirm a two-year allocation and adopt proposed FMP amendment language as appropriate. Action Item Number 21. Convert current shortspine thornyhead ACL to a single coastwide ACL. Convert current shortspine thornyhead ACLs north and south of 34 27 north latitude into a single coastwide ACL based on recommendations under 19d.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:25] Thank you. So I've followed along. That language appears accurate and complete. Is that correct?

Heather Hall [00:15:31] Yes it is.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:32] Thank you very much. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Phil Anderson. Please speak to your motion.

Heather Hall [00:15:39] Thank you. For several of these, these actions move our, the Council's PPA to FPA and they were really thoroughly discussed in April 2024 so I won't spend too much time commenting on those. I do want to mention under Action Items 12 through 15 regarding the open access trip limit south of 40 10. In April the GMT recommended changing trip limits to be bimonthly to allow flexibility and minimize regulatory complexity. At the time, splitnose rockfish was not included which was simply an oversight, and now has been added to Appendices 1 and 2 in their report. And so just pointing that out that that is a little bit different that this motion would implement a 400 pound per two month for all periods. for Action Item Number 16, Washington recreational. WDFW not proposing to exceed the Washington harvest guideline for canary rockfish. We saw a pulse of canary rockfish catch after we opened two small areas that have been closed to the sport fishery for many years. Since then we've seen canary catch drop under status quo bag limits. We're confident that our FPA is appropriate for the Washington harvest guideline. We've been very transparent in our evaluation of canary rockfish sub-bag limit and sharing our projected impacts and recommendations for final action, including the evolution from our PPA to the FPA recommended here. The WDFW Report speaks to the uncertainty in catch projections and that it's not unusual for any projections that we consider in the spex process. If needed, WDFW can respond quickly to take emergency action through our Emergency Rules, and if so, we will bring these changes to the Council and request consistent federal action so that state and federal rules are aligned. Under Action Item Number 19, this is, includes a few things. 19a and 19b are moving PPA to FPA. Under 19d, adopting the shortspine thornyhead management changes that the GAP and the GMT had been working on over the winter and provided really good recommendations for in April of 2024, those are reflected here. I just want to mention under 2B there, 2B, Suboption 2, this provides a mechanism to slow the concentration of effort in the north, northern non-trawl fishery by applying an ACT. Relative to confirming that this would be a two-year allocation rather than a FMP amendment, this is a, represents a pretty big change to the management of shortspine thornyhead, confirming that a two-year allocation is really consistent with our past actions when we consider changes to Amendment 21 species and leaves an option to revisit the allocation next cycle when we've had an opportunity to see how this plays out. And then

Action Item Number 21 is really just clarifying that this would then convert the ACL to a single ACL to coastwide based on the action taken in 19d. That's it.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:53] Thank you Heather. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Not seeing any questions, discussion on the motion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:20:06] Thank you Vice-Chair. On the confirm two-year allocation piece for shortspine thornyhead, the GAP in their report said that they did not have a recommendation, and in our discussion last evening it seemed like this was the best way to move forward slowly. When I brought it up in delegation this morning to the few people who were in our delegation meeting this morning, they were supportive of it and thought this was a good path forward. So thank you for bringing that forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:34] Thank you. Further discussion? I'm not seeing any discussion. I will call the..... Oh, I'm sorry. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:20:46] I'm sorry Vice-Chair. I'm getting some notification from behind me that there's some double checking of trip limits happening. We may need to hold off for just a moment. I don't know if anybody else's staff is having that panic.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:07] We've got lots of time so we'll just pause while they look into that. Make sure we get it right. Let's take a break for ten minutes. This is important. We want to make sure we get everything right. So ten minutes let's be back here and proceed.....(BREAK).....So I think everybody's back in their chairs. When we took this break we were discussing a motion that was made by Heather Hall on this and we were in the discussion phase of that motion. It will be back up on the screen here. There it is, at least the end of that motion. So I will look for further discussion on the motion. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:22:37] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I believe there is one amendment that needs to be made to this and I have one prepared to offer with the caveat that this is probably my last attempt to get a motion passed through the body so please vote for it.....(laughter)...

Pete Hassemer [00:22:57] Thank you. There's the motion. Please go ahead.

Phil Anderson [00:23:03] Yeah, I move to amend the motion as follows, under Action Item 19d strike the last bullet as indicated below. And so here's the full body of 19d and at the very bottom you'll see that last bullet under this amendment is struck.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:24] All right, with that strikethrough language that appears quite accurate, complete. Do you agree?

Phil Anderson [00:23:30] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:31] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Please speak to the motion.

Phil Anderson [00:23:37] Just briefly speaking to the motion and the need for the amendment, this particular trip limit is addressed in a prior part of the motion under Action Items 12 through 15 so this just ensures that we don't have any confusion or conflicts and provides absolute clarity to the trip limits above and below the line here both north and south of 34 and north and south of 40 10.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:09] All right, thank you. Any questions for clarification on the motion to amend? Discussion? I'm not seeing any. I will call the question on the motion to amend. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:24:25] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:25] Opposed? Abstention? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Phil. That takes us back to the original motion now as amended. Further discussion on that? Not seeing any hands I will call the question on the motion as amended. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:24:50] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:53] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. All right. Now as we go through I think we've got the motions off the floor. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:25:16] Thanks Vice-Chair. I'd like to make a motion to reconsider a prior action under this agenda item. There are some needed clarifications in regards to the CDF and W motion on yelloweye rockfish ACTs that were not available in the GMT Report.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:33] Thank you. There's a motion to reconsider prior action. That does not require a second, but I will look to see if there's any discussion on the motion? Not seeing any discussion, all those in favor of reconsidering that say "Aye".

Council [00:25:48] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:48] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion to reconsider passes. So with that we need to take another look at that. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:26:05] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I was made aware by some very sharp cookies following the process that the information related to the tribal set-aside was not up to date in the final GMT and GAP Reports that we were working off of in developing the final action. The calculations all flow from a tribal set-aside which has changed. Between April and June of 2024 the tribal set-aside was increased to 8 metric tons. And that was something that we had adopted earlier in an earlier motion and so now carrying forward the 8 metric ton value, the resulting ACTs need adjustment. So with that, if you would scroll down or show the motion on the screen, please? Thank you. Looking to Action Item Number 4, the change to the motion has been made that now reflects the correct non-trawl ACTs as shown in Table 7 below. So the 2025 non-trawl ACT is 29.6 and the 2026 ACT is 30.4. And in reconsidering this action everything else in this motion remains the same except for this provision related to the yelloweye ACTs. And then I'd highlight two corrections that were made in the course of the motion discussion earlier. First looking to

Action Item 10. Back up. Scroll back up please? Thank you. The removal of the word 'or' as we had discussed previously so that we are discussing the within trawl and or non-trawl sharing agreements. And then scrolling down to Action Item 20, the correction that was noted by Council staff earlier to correct the attachment number in Agenda Item F.6 regarding the FMP language and changes. So that is now the correct attachment that's referenced. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:06] All right. Thank you Marci. So with that we still, we have the complete motion there that's accurate and complete. And you highlighted the table now that replaces the prior one and that is now accurate.

Marci Yaremko [00:29:21] Yes it is.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:21] Thank you. Is there a second of the motion? Bob. Seconded by Bob Dooley. I think you spoke to it already but I will ask if there is anything else you need to add?

Marci Yaremko [00:29:33] No thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:34] Thank you. Questions for the maker of the motion for clarification? Seeing no questions for clarification, any further discussion? I'm not seeing any discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:29:53] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:54] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much. And with that I believe that completes all the motions on my checklist, but Lynn Mattes has her hand up. Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:30:13] Thank you Vice-Chair. I don't have another motion but I do have a couple of quick thoughts before we leave this item. And this isn't intended to sound eye-pokey to the, some of the discussion we had under C.2 yesterday, but I think what's just been happening here the last 25 minutes or so shows why it's important for some items to have our MT members in the room helping us, listening, paying attention, so that we can be notified and helped with when errors arise. The second item in the GAP Report, the GAP requested that the Council recommend the observer program use the same depth-based mortality rates for research and onshore discards. In talking among the three states and with Keeley last evening, we don't feel that that is an appropriate piece for the spex process but we would like to highlight it and have it included, discussed and looked into at some future date. I just didn't want to let that fall off the radar and make sure the GAP understood that we saw it and we think it's worth looking into. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:18] Thank you Lynn. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:31:22] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just wanted to acknowledge and point out and thank all the parties that put so much time and effort into this from obviously the late night last night for our state representatives, Heather and Lynn and Marci, and how much time that our GMT and our GAP and all the people involved and the public put into this. And it was really evident in the exercise we just went through of making sure this is all right. And I just wanted to

make sure they understood all that hard work, particularly the GMT, put into this is well appreciated. And I also wanted to acknowledge that the streamlining of the reports are right down the alley of what we're talking about of Council efficiencies and how well that's gone and compared to many years ago when this was a multi-day presentation and a lot of reading verbatim out of long, long reports. So job well done. Really appreciated and I don't know, sometimes we just don't say thank you enough, so thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:32] Thank you Bob. Any further comments? Otherwise Todd I believe we've finished all the items but I will check-in with you.

Todd Phillips [00:32:42] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I agree with you that the action items, especially as noted in the Action Item Checklist, have been checked off. I appreciate Miss Yaremko and her willingness to walk back that particular motion and fix it for the record. I know that's a difficult thing to do. And I would say Mr. Vice-Chair that you have completed the draft, or you have completed the 2025-26 harvest specifications and management measures process, a year long slog so thank you very much.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:16] All right, thank you. And to echo what Mr. Dooley was saying, you know it seems so easy here but there's been a lot of public input, a lot of work with the public, the GAP, the GMT, coordination between the GAP and GMT is just the result of a lot of a long road and a lot of hard work so thanks to all of those involved. And with that, I will pass the gavel back to our Chair.

7. Inseason Management – Final Action

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] So that will take us to our Council discussion and action, which is adoption of final inseason actions. There it is very simple before you. Anybody want to raise their hand to initiate discussion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:21] Thank you sir. I feel like I'm talking a lot here today. I have a question for our NMFS friends if that's all right? On social media last week the Northwest Fisheries Science Center was heavily promoting photos of an extremely large tow from the bottom trawl survey of canary rockfish. Are there any updates from the survey about lightning strike tows or anything else that we should be concerned of? And if this information isn't available now could we possibly get an update on that for September? Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:58] Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:01:01] Thank you. And thank you Miss Mattes for the question. I'll just acknowledge at the start that the social media posts were insensitive given the ongoing issues with canary rockfish and the very real restrictions, that because of the recent assessment that we will soon take final action on. The information that I have right now, and I'm certainly happy to seek out further, but what I have right now is that across all years of the survey large survey tows of canary have occurred due to how the species aggregates even when stock size is smaller than the current stock size. We're not expecting to exceed the research set-aside for canary and one large tow has relatively little influence on the annual survey biomass estimate. That said, I'm happy to seek further information. If there is anything more to bring forward we could bring that forward under a September NMFS Report.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:54] All right, thank you. Lynn, any more?

Lynn Mattes [00:01:56] Thank you Vice-Chair. I think that suffices for now, but just if there is any other lightning tows or anything unusual happening appreciate the heads-up on that for September. But I appreciate the additional information you all provided.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:11] All right, thank you. Further discussion, hands? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:02:18] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I want to thank the GMT for the detailed analysis and description that it provided us in this report, in their inseason report pertaining to the request to retain incidentally taken lingcod with 12e gear in the RCA. A lot of work has gone into this question and analysis over the past, I don't know, six weeks or so a lot of discussions have happened. I just want to credit the GMT for their thoughtfulness and want to make sure that the good work that was done here isn't lost and isn't forgotten. And the reason I bring that up is we are not taking an inseason action on that particular request. The GMT thought about it, had discussions with the GAP, and a lot of credit to the GAP. We had this discussion in our delegation kind of on an ongoing basis over a couple of weeks and a lot of very conscientious recognition as to how important 12e gear is to the future of our fisheries and the need to ensure that we keep that gear type available for use to target midwater rockfish and avoid contact with the bottom. We spent,

gosh, eight years working on EFPs to collect data to ensure that the 12e gear worked as intended and minimized bycatch of sensitive bottom contact species so, or bottom dwelling species, and so I just I want to credit the GAP for their recognition in their report of that importance. And again credit the GMT for memorializing this discussion. What concerns me is that there's nothing in this.....we've now said that we want a summary upfront of what these reports contain and this is an absolutely great write up in the GMT Report and it's at the bottom of the report because we put other stuff up in a summary box. So I just want to make that comment and just again, thanks Thompson, Harrison, Gary, Dan for the.....Keeley, for Lynn for all of the, you know, this has been a big topic in the state of California over the past several weeks so just didn't want it to be lost. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:12] Thank you Marci. Further discussion? I'll scan the room carefully and I suspect at some point we will have a motion to adopt this. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:27] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have a motion on the proposed trip limit increases.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:35] Great. Go ahead.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:36] I move the Council adopt the recommended trip limit increases for sablefish north of 36 north latitude, widow rockfish north of 40 10 north latitude, and yellowtail rockfish north of 40 10 north latitude as described in Agenda Item F.7.a, Supplemental GAP Report, June 2024.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:58] Thank you. That language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Marci Yaremko [00:06:02] Yes it does.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:03] Thank you. Is there a second? Seconded by Bob Dooley. Please speak to your motion.

Marci Yaremko [00:06:08] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think the GMT did a very thoughtful analysis that the proposed increases are going to keep us well within our limits and the.....hopefully it does provide some increased opportunity. I want to recognize that the requests are intended to increase harvest opportunities in response to some particularly bad weather conditions this spring, so hopefully folks can take advantage of new opportunities. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:42] Thank you. Questions to the maker of the motion for clarification? Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:06:50] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. A question for Marci. Marci does this include the as soon as possible that Gary had mentioned?

Pete Hassemer [00:06:59] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:07:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Mr. Dooley. I'll invite Miss Kent to jump in if she sees it necessary, but NMFS does a very good job at promulgating these inseason actions and getting them effective in a very timely fashion. And I think what I've seen as they've continued to turn these rules over and get them out in a very short amount of time and as quickly as possible, I think that's expected. And I think, like I said, they do a great job getting it done in a timely manner. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:42] All right, thank you. Further questions for clarification? I'm not seeing any questions. Discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:07:57] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:59] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much Marci. Todd, is there anything further on this?

Todd Phillips [00:08:12] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. No, to my opinion no, the Council has adopted the inseason adjustments that were just on the screen, which are reflected in the GAP, Supplemental GAP Report 1. I would say you have addressed all items under this particular agenda, all items under this particular agenda item and can move on.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:29] All right. I will be careful to look around to see if there's anything else anybody needs to say here. I'm not seeing any hands so I'll close this agenda item and pass the gavel back to our Chair. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:42] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Great work everyone.

G. Highly Migratory Species Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Discussion as needed? John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:00:05] Thanks Mr. Chair. Just quickly, I agree that rescinding the closure as soon as practicable within the regulatory framework makes sense. I know that the conditions have to officially change. And I just point out that this is one of the few places in fisheries management where we actively manage based on the ecosystem, and it's something that HMS has done for years, and I want to give the management of HMS that kudo for actually having considered that a long time ago.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:42] Thank you John. All right. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:00:46] Yeah, thanks. And since after hearing the AS Report, I'll just also note that the next ENSO diagnostics discussion is scheduled for June 13th. So that's probably the earliest we would possibly see a declared change. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:02] Thank you Ryan. All right. Anyone else? Do one scan. Kit, I don't see any hands.

Kit Dahl [00:01:10] Okay, well you're done with your discussion then and we can move on to the next agenda item.

2. International Management Activities

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] All right, that takes us to Council action, which is provide recommendations on U.S. positions at upcoming meetings and other forums as appropriate so I'll look for any hands. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:00:17] Thanks Mr. Chair. I just would say that I support the advisory subpanel's recommendations. I think NMFS understands those and with Mr. Nile's clarification it makes sense to me.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:30] Very good. I would say just look around and see if anybody disagrees with that. I saw a few nods so, okay. Anyone else? Okay. Oh, Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:00:44] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. Yeah, thanks John. This was maybe for Ryan hoping for a.....well first of all, yeah per your announcement in the last agenda item about Celia. I know she's done a really good job and it was appreciated by the management team and keeping them and us in the loop about what you all are doing in these many forums. So thinking of albacore and you did note general agreement with the timing of the advisory subpanel's recommendation on a.....Do you have any more thoughts or maybe you could bring some back in September? I would like, how do we get our management team involved as well? Or, is it through the U.S. delegation type meetings and just, knowing you're going to be down some staff there for, presuming this is kind of new news and you don't have an immediate replacement, just a little curious about how we can engage in those? Like there's a couple of reports, very interesting reports here in this briefing book that we didn't really have any chance to ask detailed questions on. I'm just thinking a bit so hopefully it sounds like the plans there are, there are plans that have that opportunity and just would like to hear some more detail and in September it would be, sounds like it would be timely.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:59] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:02:02] Yeah, through the Chair. Thanks Mr. Niles for the question. Yeah, I mean we can come back with more detail, but I would imagine this would work very similar to some of the processes we've done in the past. We would set up a stakeholder meeting to, that would be open to get to start to get input. We would then filter that back through the Council process involving the MTs and the ASs and bring it to the Council floor. Like I noted earlier, I do think we have some time. I think the main discussions on these components that need to still be fleshed out regarding the harvest strategy will be targeting the 2025 IATTC meeting, which should be in the fall of next year. We also, I think, then have a little bit more time too to touch on some of the domestic management implications that the Council obviously may want to weigh-in on too, or the MT would be, and the AS will be very relevant in helping with that. And so we can kind of build off that in both of those processes, both of how we'll engage internationally, but then also how we'll bring back these considerations for how that implicates things for domestic management too. And I think as we get closer here we'll be able to nail down a more fleshed out, you know, vision of a potential schedule and bring it to a future Council meeting.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:25] Okay, Corey. Thank you. Anyone else? All right, Kit I'm not seeing any more hands so can you wrap us up here?

Kit Dahl [00:03:33] Thank you Mr. Chair. You've had some discussion and recommendations about next steps, mainly hearing back again in September on the outcomes of some of these things happening over the summer and what further engagement the Council may have in that regard in the coming year or so. So I think you're done on this item.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:59] Okay. Well thank you.

3. Exempted Fishing Permits

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Okay that takes care of a public comment, takes us to Council action, which will be on the screen. So I will open the floor for discussion. John.

John Ugoretz [00:00:16] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. A couple of things to say. First, with regard to the two applications we received and sort of teeing off of Miss Ridings comment or question earlier, I do feel we need some more effort in the night-set buoy gear EFP realm in order to gather enough data to determine whether we want to move forward with changing the fishery rules for buoy gear to allow it. If we approved these two it would bring the number up to five, which I think is a reasonable amount of effort. I don't think we need much more than that to test this. I'd rather move forward quickly with the testing and approval. So I'm in favor of both the management team and advisory subpanel report and the public comment that we heard today that was helpful. And I appreciate that the people made the time and effort to come and speak to us. The other thing I have to say though is with regard to public comment, and I know we'll talk about this in terms of meeting efficiencies later on at this Council meeting, but encouraging the public to stay on topic, to read the Situation Summaries, to not speak about things that are not on our agenda. There is an open public comment time that would be the appropriate timeframe to talk about items that we're not considering. And I did not see a longline EFP nor did I see an extended-length buoy gear EFP in our meeting materials, and I didn't expect to hear a public comment on either of those.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:57] Okay. Thanks John. Anyone else? All right. John.

John Ugoretz [00:02:09] I have a motion if we're ready.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:12] I think we are.

John Ugoretz [00:02:14] All right. I move the Council recommend that National Marine Fisheries Service approve the EFP's from Mr. Mintz, Attachment 1, and Mr. Langowski, Attachment 2 for ten pieces of night-set buoy gear each and consistent with the terms and conditions for all other night-set buoy gear EFPs issued to date.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:35] Thank you John. Is the language of the screen accurate?

John Ugoretz [00:02:37] It is.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:37] I'm looking for a second? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion as appropriate.

John Ugoretz [00:02:44] Thanks Mr. Chair. As I mentioned, I think we could use some more night-set buoy gear effort. We haven't seen quite a bit to date, although the people who have been issued those EFPs have fished them and have had success with minimal bycatch. And I also, as Ryan noted earlier, that these EFPs would fall within the current NMFS analyses and would be approvable without conducting additional consultation. So with that, I think given we've already

approved night-set buoy gear EFPs, I don't feel we need another meeting to discuss these and we can move forward with recommending them to NMFS.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:30] Thank you John. Questions for the motion maker? Discussion on the motion? Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:03:40] Yes, I know the Council has heard me say this on many occasions under many FMPs, but since the EFP process is a separate regulatory process that under NMFS and NMFS has our own process that we will go through. It involves a Federal Register Notice of Public Comment and then approval by NMFS. Just reminding that so I will abstain because this is really a Council recommendation to NMFS, but just wanted to explain that so it was taken for what it was. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:12] Okay. Thank you Ryan. Anyone else? I'm not seeing any hands so I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:04:21] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:21] Opposed no? Abstentions?

Ryan Wulff [00:04:25] Abstain.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:26] Okay. One abstention. Ryan. All right, very good. Thank you. Thank you John. Okay Kit, we're rolling along here.

Kit Dahl [00:04:37] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, so you just passed a motion and recommended that NMFS move forward to issue Exempted Fishing Permits based on the 2 proposals that you have before you in the briefing book. So that I think completes your work on this agenda item.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:03] All right.

4. Drift Gillnet Bycatch Performance Report

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Well that concludes public comment and takes us to Council action, which I think is pretty light here. Okay, I guess we've kind of done that so I'll open the floor for any discussion so. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:00:18] Thanks Mr. Chair. I just wanted to give my appreciation to the management team for doing the report. My understanding is it really is not a heavy lift for them to do the report as we've asked, and I would like to continue seeing an annual report on this fishery performance. We decided to continue doing a limited report in order to ensure that nothing crazy happens between now and when drift gillnet fishing ceases to occur.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:54] Okay, thank you John. All right, anyone else? Kit I'll turn looking to you.

Kit Dahl [00:01:03] Thank you Mr. Chair. Well I think you're done here. We heard the message from Mr. Ugoretz that the Council would like to continue seeing this report, so I'm sure the management team will be doing that in the next year and the following year. And aside from that, no discussion so you're done.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:26] Very good. Thank you. And that concludes the day and we got, almost came in on time, so. Good work everyone. We'll see everybody tomorrow at 8 o'clock.

H. Cross Fishery Management Plan (FMP)

1. Marine Planning

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports, our public comment, takes us into Council discussion and action and there it is, guidance as appropriate. A reminder that there are the two draft letters that have been provided for the Council to consider and other possible comment opportunities. So with that pause I will look around to see if there are any hands to initiate discussion here. It's Monday morning. Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:00:43] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I figured everybody I'd give a fair chance at having discussion. I do have a couple of motions ready if we don't have further discussion prior to.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:55] All right, thank you. Before we get to that I think Phil Anderson was trying to raise his hand. Phil.

Phil Anderson [00:01:04] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I wonder if Michael Clark from Fish and Wildlife Service is with us online this morning? I have a question for him if he is.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:23] I am not seeing him online on our panelist page and I do not see any hands raised virtually here so no, I'm sorry.

Phil Anderson [00:01:42] If I may, I would like to get, I'd like to request that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at a future meeting, not too distant future meeting, provide us some of their thoughts as how they intend to evaluate seabird mortalities of species that are included in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. There are four countries, four or five, but they do include Canada, Mexico and the United States and Russia I believe. But the Migratory Bird Species Act specifically prohibits the taking of species that are covered under that act, and if there is a take, which includes killing, capturing, selling, trading, transport, that it has to be authorized by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. And in considering the number of pelagic bird species that are likely to be encountered by wind turbines to, you know, who knows, families of everything from albatross to shearwaters to fulmars to the petrels, the auklets, murrelets, all those species that are included in the protections provided under the act and would require authorization of takes, I would like to have the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service provide us an update and strategy as to how they intend to approach mortalities associated with offshore wind projects.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:06] Okay, thank you. And I'm going to, well ask, that would be part of included with a future Marine Planning Committee agenda item?

Phil Anderson [00:04:19] That seems an appropriate place for it to start.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:23] All right. Thank you. On that I'm going to look around and see if there's consensus, general agreement with that, including that report? I don't have the QR or the Year-at-a-Glance up in front of me, but I'm just guessing that at a near future meeting we will have a

Marine Planning Committee agenda item and we would expect that report at that time. I'm just going to look to Kerry first to confirm that.

Kerry Griffin [00:04:56] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, we have marine planning on almost every agenda item so we will identify a suitable upcoming meeting for that.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:07] All right, thank you. Further general....any comments or discussion before I turn back to Christa for her motions? And not seeing any hands, Christa go ahead.

Christa Svensson [00:05:25] If I could have Motion 1 please? All right. I move the Council adopt the Draft Comment Letter on the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management's commercial leased for wind power on the Oregon Outer Continental Shelf, proposed sale notice, parentheses, H.1, Supplemental Attachment 6. And the Draft Comment Letter on Bureau of Ocean Energy Management's Draft Environmental Assessment for the Oregon Wind Energy Areas, in parentheses. H.1, Supplemental Revised Attachment 4 as final and submit them to BOEM.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:06] Thank you. That language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Christa Svensson [00:06:12] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:12] Is there a second? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

Christa Svensson [00:06:18] Thank you. The Council offered comments on the Draft EA and PSN for lease sales offshore of California. These draft letters provided in the briefing book by the MPC and Habitat Committee are updated and reflect specific considerations needed by fisheries stakeholders related to wind power leases on the Oregon Outer Continental Shelf. It's important to continue to communicate to BOEM our recommendations and concerns related to the activities allowed through leasing.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:56] Thank you. Any questions to the maker of the motion for clarification? Not seeing any questions, discussion on the motion? Mike Harrington.

Mike Harrington [00:07:09] Yeah, you guys are probably, excuse me, probably getting used to this from Oregon a little bit, but I do want to thank Marine Planning and the Habitat Committee for all the work that they've put into making these, to writing these letters and pulling them together. And I don't want to show any disrespect to the ideas or any of the concerns that were raised in those letters, but we receive, as ODFW we receive our direction from the Governor of Oregon and that the state has already has a relationship through that process and a voice within the BOEM process and through the Intergovernmental Task Force as a cooperating agency in the federal consistency review process, we're going to abstain from a vote on this.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:55] Thank you. Further discussion? I'm not seeing any hands I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:08:04] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:04] Opposed? Abstentions?

Ryan Wulff [00:08:11] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:12] Thank you. And the motion passes with abstentions by Mr. Harrington and Mr. Wulff. Okay.

Christa Svensson [00:08:28] Thank you. May I have my second motion please?

Pete Hassemer [00:08:32] All right. The second motion. There it is.

Christa Svensson [00:08:35] Thank you. I move the Council draft a comment letter for submission to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on BOEM's request for a consistency determination that leasing activities planned for the Wind Energy Areas, in parentheses, WEAs offshore Oregon are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the Oregon Coastal Management Program, in parentheses, OCMP, conditions applied using Oregon's enforceable policies. This letter would include the November 2023 comment letter on BOEMs Draft WEAs off the Oregon coast and the two letters approved in the prior motion on the Draft Environmental Assessment and Proposed Sale Notice.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:29] Thank you. That language appears accurate and complete, do you agree?

Christa Svensson [00:09:33] It does. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:34] All right. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

Christa Svensson [00:09:41] Thank you. The federal consistency process being led by Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development is critically important to ensure that activities proposed by BOEM are consistent with applicable state laws. Given the tight timeline between today and the comment deadline, which I asked about earlier as being five days, it's unrealistic to task Council staff, the MPC, and Habitat Committee with developing a detailed response. The Council has previously submitted recommendations to BOEM in writing during the draft Wind Energy Areas comment period and will be submitting additional recommendations to BOEM with our comments on the Draft EA and Proposed Sale Notice. To facilitate the quick timeline for this request using comment letters the Council has already developed and forwarding them to DLCD for their review should reduce the burden with whomever is tasked for this work. DLCD could then make a determination if any of our recommendations could be included as condition in the state's consistency determination.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:57] Thank you. Any questions for the maker or the motion for clarification? I'm not seeing any questions. Any discussion on the motion? Looking around carefully I don't see any discussion. I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:11:18] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:18] Opposed? Abstentions?

Ryan Wulff [00:11:25] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:27] The motion passes with abstentions from Mr. Harrington and Mr. Wulff. Thank you. With that I'm not seeing any hands shooting up here so I'm going to look to Kerry first to see how we've done.

Kerry Griffin [00:11:48] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Well, you've done very well. You're on time and actually ahead of time and under budget so good job on that. So what I've heard today is that the Council is endorsing sending the two letters that are in your briefing book materials. I might have misspoken that EA Comment Letter is due this Friday and the Public Sale Notice Letter is due later, on July 1st just to be clear, but the EA letter obviously is a quick turnaround. And then the third letter, I'm envisioning a very short sort of a cover letter and attaching the three other letters that Miss Svensson referenced and sending those off by the deadline for the DLCDS comment period. And then the last thing as far as Council guidance was to get in contact with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and ask if they would provide a briefing at a future Council meeting relative to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act per Mr. Anderson's suggestion. Did I miss anything there?

Pete Hassemer [00:13:03] I don't believe you missed anything. Phil, did you have something?

Phil Anderson [00:13:09] He didn't. Kerry didn't miss anything I just missed getting my hand up quick enough before the summary occurred.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:19] Now's your chance. Phil Anderson.

Phil Anderson [00:13:21] I just wanted to acknowledge that there is the draft report relative to a proposed offshore wind engagement framework for Washington state that has been under development through state processes in Washington that included contracting with Gridworks to help develop the proposed framework. It is in process and the governor will be considering the recommendations that come out of that along with the comments from the public and the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council, which I am a part of. There may be, it may be useful for the MPC when they meet again to have an update from probably from Corey on how that process is going and what conclusions, if any, the governor came to so there's an understanding by the Council of the engagement framework that Washington would intend to employ when engaging, when and if they engage with BOEM.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:53] All right, thank you. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:15:00] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, and I think that Phil's suggestion we're happy to do that. My listening skills might not be what they are, but Kerry and Mike Conroy did an excellent job laying out the situation and I might have just missed it what Phil said. But one of the next steps for the public just emphasize that what will be the Washington Coastal Marine

Advisory Council that Phil just mentioned is meeting on July 10th to, you know, specifically and solely to consider those, the final report, so that will be broadcast online, TVW, and just wanted to emphasize that that opportunity will be there for folks and happy to point folks to the right websites, et cetera, if they're interested in engaging there.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:53] Thank you Corey. Any further comments, discussion? And I'm not seeing any. We'll close out this agenda item.

2. NMFS Regional Equity and Environmental Justice (EEJ) Plan and EEJ Committee – Update

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports, public comment, takes us to Council action, which is to review the committee reports, provide any guidance as appropriate. So with that I'll look to see if there's any hands to start discussion on this matter. Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:25] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. At the CCC meeting this last month, I had an interesting discussion with Bill Tweite, whose the state of Washington, sits on the Council for the North Pacific. He said, you know the EEJ, if you look at that as far as the best example, probably the blueprint of a project, probably the most successful project in the country is the North of Falcon process as far as bringing underserved communities into the Council process. And it just kind of hit me like, I didn't even think about it. We've been doing it for so long. I think it's, I can be mindful that all the things we are doing properly instead of looking at all the things we can do. You know my wife always has asked me more things for me to do and that's great. We've been married for 38 years successfully, but there's a capacity issue so she's not going to get everything, so be mindful about that. I put off all things I'm doing, right? But with that, besides of the North of Falcon process, which is a great example, yesterday we heard from the Vietnamese community about the National Marine Fisheries Service sanctuaries request to close areas that impacted them. And then we tried to get them involved in the in MREP program and for 2 or 3 years at least trying to get...they didn't want nothing to do with us. And something came up and they got involved, they wrote a letter expressing their issues. We heard them and this Council narrowly supported them. And so I think we heard them and we acted upon that. And I think we need to follow-up with them to make sure we can get them more involved in that. But I think this Council, I mean we heard....well we want to cut the Council meetings down to five, less than five days, right? We're flat lined. We have big budget issues that we need to be aware, that we are all aware of. That's not going to solve itself. And I don't know necessarily the environmental justice, I'm not sure exactly what that, what that is, but I know what environmental injustice is, is when we're, we can't do the basic things we need to do under Magnuson to manage fisheries properly. We all heard the Science Center Report yesterday from Jim Hastie. You know we've got some changes, we have....this is not going to be an easy road before us and we don't need to be adding more stuff, but we need to be aware that there are communities out there we need to address and so it seems like we're trying to locate a problem more than....how bout we have a solution before we have a problem identified in my mind. I'm not saying we shouldn't be doing that. Make sure we're, we need to keep doing what we're doing and be open and transparent, and I think this is the most open and transparent public process in the country and if you have a better one I'd like to know what it is because anybody can come in here and give us their take on whatever their issue is and we can act on it or not depending on the merits of it. And this all says, it all sounds good that we ought to do more, but sort of the administration is not helping us out to do more. And so we ought to be basically take that as a hint on about how much more we can do. I'll stop there.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:07] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:04:09] Thanks Vice-Chair, and thanks Mr. Chair for those notes. I'm wondering if I can ask you a little bit more about that success of the North of Falcon process? As

someone who's not engaged in that, I'm not familiar with what Mr. Tweite was speaking to. I'm wondering if you could highlight some of those successes for us?

Brad Pettinger [00:04:27] Well, I'm not involved in the Council, in the North of Falcon process, you know it brings all the tribes, the Treaty Tribes together. And if I may turn to Mr. Anderson could maybe.....he's certainly involved in that and gives a presentation to the MREP Program and would probably be more concise if he maybe answered that so. Phil if you could?

Pete Hassemer [00:04:51] Phil, would you like to respond?

Phil Anderson [00:04:55] Well I don't know what was in Mr. Tweite's mind when he mentioned the North of Falcon process as it relates to the Council's current practices of reaching out to a broad set of communities. The North of Falcon process is a unique process that was developed by agreement between the leaders of the, in the tribal, among tribal policy representatives and the governor's office and Department of Fishery leadership in 1984 that has evolved over time. It includes participation from all 24 treaty tribes. It includes participation from a wide variety of interests in the recreational communities spanning interests from Lower South Puget Sound through Central Sound, the straits, the ocean, and the Columbia River. It includes participation from both recreational and commercial interests throughout those areas. It includes participation from various gear types within those sectors, sport, charter, gillnet, purse seine, and from a wide variety of communities, both large and small throughout the region that I referenced. So I know Mr. Tweite fairly well and I would guess that that was what was in his thinking when he used the North of Falcon process as an example of current activities that are closely tied and linked to the Pacific Council process as it relates to EEJ.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:40] Thank you. Further discussion? Virgil Moore.

Virgil Moore [00:07:44] So I guess I just want to add in here as a member of the committee, the Ad Hoc Committee, we are really not ready at this point to bring forward strong recommendations, we're waiting for NOAA Fisheries to provide us their operational plan from the work that the National Academy of Sciences has done. I mean they're building a foundation. I certainly appreciate the input we got about expertise needed on this subject. To address the Chair's comments about, yeah we're doing pretty good, I don't disagree with you. I think the Council does a very good job of seeking and getting input from a large diversity of communities thinking, however you want to classify that. At the same time, we can be better at it, just like a winning football team can be better with good practice and the addition of expertise in their training, we can do the same. Now can we do that without additional resources given the realities that our Executive Director and National Marine Fisheries Service is up against, that is a discussion I believe we're going to have to have with National Marine Fisheries Service and how much resources they're going to be given to develop some of that within their own shop that they can share with us as we try to do the job that we see. The next, we'll likely have some interim discussions here this summer and work on that, that was the nature of some of the discussions we had in our meeting. And so while I appreciate all the insight, I don't think, at least this committee member, would be ready to endorse infrastructure increases at this point given the realities of the Council. We've still got some work to do as an Ad Hoc Committee and bringing forward recommendations based on the kind of input we're getting. And I certainly appreciate the input we

got from the advisory group, created some thinking I hadn't had before certainly, and that's what part of this is. But I really am anxious to get National Marine Fisheries Services operational plan and then have some discussion with them on how they intend to implement that, and then what aspects of that flow to the Council in terms of resources that could be available to get at this outside expertise or whatever it is that we need to do our job just that much better. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:44] John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:10:46] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. And thanks Virgil, you just said exactly what I wanted to say, that we're not at a point where we can make concrete decisions. And very importantly we need that regional plan from National Marine Fisheries Service that is coming later this month. And I think the EEJCs final paragraph lays out a good path forward. I don't necessarily disagree with the good insight and advice we got from the SSC and the GAP and the public, I just don't want to take a ready, fire, aim approach here. We've got to aim and we can't aim until we have the guidelines and guidance to help us, so I could see us having additional EEJ staff or consultants or support at some point, but I don't know what that looks like and I won't know until we have more information. So hopefully in November we can have a more concrete discussion.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:51] Thank you. Joe Oatman.

Joe Oatman [00:11:56] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I guess as one of the members to the EEJC I wanted to provide some perspective. So we did some work September 2023 and we were able to meet here this week and try and help provide, you know, a path forward on how we might be able to address EEJ in the Council process. So I think what we've heard is that there is a clear mandate, a need for the Council to consider and address Equity and Environmental Justice in our process. That this should be a part of what we do and who we are and how we do it. And so we're trying to figure out ways that we can, you know, embed this work in our process. With respect to the National Academy of Sciences Report, that report explains that the contextual equity is important in addition to the other dimensions that were identified, those being the procedural, the recognition, the distributional dimensions of equity and that these must be taken together. And so when we are thinking about environmental justice we should also be aware and be mindful of past inequities and marginalization that some people or groups may have experienced. And so to that end the Council needs to be aware of and educate on ways to address inequity and injustice to the extent it may have occurred or is occurring in the Council process. And as we've heard, you know, we need expertise in this area. We are not the experts, but we know experts do exist and we should try to engage them to the extent that we can. So what we've heard in the SSC and GMT Report, as well as past reports from other advisory bodies, is that we need to have expertise both in the short term and in the long term. One of the things that we heard at the EEJC meeting on June 7th was that Mr. Jim Seger is on contract to provide some services in some of these areas. We understand that he is working on developing EEJ definitions. And the COP analysis that we included in our September 2023 Report, as well as the EEJ web page. And so we look forward to that work and seeing how that work might help us in this effort to incorporate EEJ into the Council process. So maybe a bit further on the GAP analysis that we had proposed and the Council supported. You know we do reiterate the importance of connecting this analysis and that Council staff could develop a draft proposal that could be used to solicit, you know, expert support from NMFS or external partners such as academic, contractual, or NGO. And this could include a case study on a

recent Council action as you see how each of those elements of equity were considered. That was one of the things that we had recommended in our EEJC Committee Supplemental Report. So lastly, with respect to the NMFS EEJ Strategy and Regional Plan, the EEJ would like to have a discussion on that plan in August as Mr. Moore just spoke to and see how the Council can respond to that, which could include, you know, advice that we might be able to give to NMFS on actions they can take that can help meet the goals and objectives of their EE strategy, as well as, you know, thinking about what the GMT recommended, is to perhaps, you know, create a parallel, a document for the Council itself on this topic. So with that I just wanted to kind of share some points and I think a bit later might be looking out for some guidance to help us move this forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:49] All right, thank you. Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:16:52] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. You know although not as...I don't participate as much as I did in the MREP Program but I still support it, and I think, you know, it's been the goal of this Council for quite awhile in inviting diversity and I thought we had a pretty good win in having first or second generation Americans participate in the process that generally don't. But, you know, there's something else that's going on that's kind of evolved in the last ten years at least but, and we heard it in the testimony and I don't know if we heard it heard it, but fishermen now are having to work a lot harder and a lot longer to make ends meet. It's not like it was years ago, even for myself and my own business. If you asked me ten years ago would I be fishing in November, I'd say you better go check yourself into rehab. And so I think that's an issue that has evolved and we heard in testimony why some of the fishermen didn't hear what was going on, couldn't testify to the topic because they were simply out fishing. I know we're in kind of a soft seafood market that's probably hasn't been seen if not ever, but been a while where just about all the seafood is down in price and so I don't know how we, how we account for that, but I think we need to recognize it and you know add that to the soup that we're trying to do and, you know, if we can't get them off the boat, we can't get them here. Now we've offered Zoom and all that stuff, and there's times that you can Zoom and chime in while you're fishing, but it is difficult. So I just thought I'd point that out that, you know, I think we had a pretty good victory yesterday that we can continue and build on and should build on, but just recognize our West Coast fishermen and probably United States fishermen, but I know the West Coast fishermen for sure are working a lot harder and a lot longer with a lot more expense and their bottom line is a lot smaller. So anyway I just thought I'd point that out of what I'm kind of seeing, you know, what I've seen in the last so many years. So thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:51] Thank you. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:19:54] Thank you Vice-Chair. Trying to think about this and how we can move forward it's kind of overwhelming. This is a big item. It's kind of nebulous and it can be overwhelming just trying to figure out how to move forward. An experience last week made me really think about how our information is accessible to people. We do a lot of very, very technical writing. That doesn't, that probably doesn't work well with Google Translate. I had the opportunity to speak to a delegation of East African fisheries professionals and enforcement officers last week, and trying to give them a 10-minute presentation on the risk tables we have done through our ecosystem process and how I could give this presentation to people who for whom English is likely a third or fourth language, and or if there was a translator who is going to be translating into French

for them, and it took, it was harder than it seemed to come up with six slides that were in plain language to try to describe some very complex issues. So I know we need the technical for a lot of things, but language is going to be an issue. We had the discussion about the Vietnamese folks yesterday. During Covid we discovered there is a large population of indigenous Guatemalan people in the Newport area who work in the processors. I think it took a week or ten days to find a translator who could come and translate to them to tell them about Covid. We have a lot of Ukrainian people who participate in our fisheries, not to mention the Hispanic and the native languages. So having our information available in such a manner that people for whom technical English maybe isn't their first language or something they speak, would be helpful. I joke with some of my colleagues when they start talking salmon. I don't speak salmon. I don't understand those acronyms. I know it's part of the way we do business, but just language and the accessibility of the information we provide. Maybe the Vietnamese folks in the Monterey Bay area heard about the meeting, but because of the way it was written they didn't understand the concepts and how they needed to be involved. So that is maybe someplace we can think about how we move forward is with the language and possible translation services, et cetera, as we move forward as a step to, that's maybe a little less nebulous or less overwhelming. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:35] Thank you. Maggie Sommer.

Maggie Sommer [00:22:38] Sure. Thank you very much Vice-Chair. I just wanted to overall convey our appreciation for the Council's time and attention to this and the great thought by this. You know that comes out in the discussion we are having right now around this table, but also in the committee reports, and I had the opportunity to sit in and listen to the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel's discussion on this agenda item yesterday and they had some good concrete ideas as well. I'll just maybe respond to a couple things that have come up. Another sneak peek. You will certainly see continuing support for the MREP Program as one of the actions in our West Coast plan. And then in general, I know that there are efforts underway right now across the agency nationwide to work on some of those translation issues, both languages, but also the technical terminology that you just brought up Lynn. And that was, again, something that came up in the GAP yesterday and is, it seems like a very important starting point to me if we need to be able to communicate what we're doing to everyone to even be able to provide opportunities for them. But again, thank you all very much for your involvement in this and continuing ideas going forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:04] Thank you. Bob Dooley.

Bob Dooley [00:24:06] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I just wanted to comment and expand a little bit on both Butch's and Lynn's and Maggie's comments and related to MREP. We are struggling at MREP. I mean you all know that I'm one of the principals on the West Coast, and I'm also involved in the National Steering Committee and the development of the North Pacific and development of the Western Pacific programs. And the one, one of the problems is, you know, MREP is a primarily a neutral educational program. People that have been there know that. We don't solve problems, we educate people and fishermen and industry folks and not just, you know, not just fishermen particularly, we try to focus on fishermen, for fishermen, by fishermen. But when we are talking in the context of the Caribbean, we're talking in the context of the Western Pacific, one of the goals and probably one of the primary products of MREP is we build relationships, we build unity, we build people understanding each other, and when the language

barrier is there it's very, very difficult. So the concept was, well we'll do independent MREPs for people that speak different languages, and I've been adamantly against that since day one, but that is just contrary to what MREP was trying to do. So we're getting into an area now that and having the discussions that we need to bring people to a common place, which we do at MREP on the West Coast for sure, many have experienced that. But we also need to bring interpreta....you know interpreting tools and there are many, and things are getting better all the time in that aspect. And so I think we can learn from each other. I think that's some of the things we need to reach out for and, you know, you spoke about the Vietnamese community and Vietnamese-American community in the Monterey area, and we've been trying for years to get them involved, at least five years at least. And really a lot of it's language barrier. A lot of it's cultural barrier. But, you know, as you begin talking and have common interests and common concerns, we've seen now that they've come forward and I think you got to get through the language and then you have to show them the benefit of being involved and I think we're seeing the edge of that now, so hopefully we get some inroads. But that's common and isn't just language, it's, you know when I was, Maggie's question about underserved communities that I asked and what that is? I mean it could be a group of fishermen that just don't have the wherewithal to be part of a big organization or the desire, but they, are they underserved or they choose to opt out, but we know in different cases they need to be involved. So it's a big chore, a big task. And to get it into like reflecting on what Brad was talking about is, you know, do we have the capacity financially and just the capacity to deal with this to those degrees? I don't know, but we have a pretty good.....if we use our resources and think out of the box sometimes we might have people that could help us with that, like MREP. As we struggle through it maybe we can get to a place cumulatively that works for all of us. On a different subject and I'm a little concerned about this. I've been reading through this document and they talk about the beneficiaries of commercial and for higher fisheries. And, you know, we've dealt with that over the years in many of the rationalization programs about who gets, you know, who gets the fish, who gets the benefit? And, you know, as being a boat owner for many, many years and being an employer of many fishermen, and the same thing applies to fishing processors, when you look at the benefits, particularly in fishing rights and things, a lot of people want a piece, crew, non-ownership captains, all of that, and it's been a struggle because we don't operate without them, and the same with the processors. They don't operate without their crew and all the people that support them, but you got to take into consideration the responsibility, the investment, so it's not all benefit that they get. It's the fact that, you know, from my point of view and from my experience, you know, over the years, over over 40 years of owning boats, you have many, many crew members, the benefit is we have a boat that's well maintained. We have the tools to support it and we, you know, we support that. And ultimately it's a job that, it's a job for people into the future, maybe different people as time goes on because people come and go, but it's a stable platform to provide that. And I hope we don't go down that road to that degree thinking that we got to look at that benefit. So, I mean we can look at it, but we need to be cognizant that if you take the benefits away, the base source of employment and keeping our industries alive are the investments in the operations that support them. So when you talk about benefits, also talk about responsibilities and the financial responsibilities, particularly that people bear to keep those businesses alive and provide, you know, food security, future employment, all of those things. So it's easy to look at just the benefit, but you got to look at the other end of it too so. I just wanted to say that because I won't have the opportunity in the future to say that, so thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:05] Thank you. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:00:00] Thanks Vice-Chair. Just reflecting on some of the things we've read and heard so far today. I think that there has been demonstrated a very clear need for this. There is a mandate across the Magnuson-Stevens Act, especially in the National Standards found in NEPA, I found across civil rights law to do this work and I think the NMFS EEJ strategy outlined that pretty clearly as did the NAS Report. I wanted to quote a couple of things from the NAS Report. As I read through the report I thought it was quite good and helped me understand a lot of things that I hadn't understood before in terms of the connection between Equity and Environmental Justice and how our U.S. fisheries operates. And they note that wholesale changes in the approaches and procedures used in coming to management decisions, including thinking about how to encourage and support broad participation, are likely needed if NMFS is going to achieve its equity goals. We've talked about underserved communities quite a bit. I think that makes sense. That was a key item of the NMFS EEJ strategy and it's an area where the Council can be particularly helpful, I think, in helping NMFS get to their goals. The strategy and the NAS Report highlight that being underserved is part of a historical process and cannot be understood solely as a present condition. And quoting the report, in terms of looking at where we are with that, "The committee heard of very few examples, and none that were fully operational at the regional scale, of participatory approaches to enhanced procedural or recognition equity that had succeeded incorporating the perspectives of traditionally underserved communities, or that could demonstrate more equitable process as well as outcomes stemming from management decisions". So thinking upon those, that to me indicates we do have a clear need here, both to support NMFS in their efforts as one of their primary advisers, as well as how we do business. I think it's difficult to think about Equity and Environmental Justice without thinking about some of the foundations, especially around environmental justice, which is very much rooted in our country, and is rooted in struggles that black people have faced and theories that are rooted in traditions and histories of indigenous peoples in our country. So I think it's hard to talk about that so I wanted to again read something from the NAS Report that I found valuable. This is on page 29. It's around tribal nations and indigenous peoples, "The importance of procedural equity via the indigenous peoples is highlighted not only as members of underserved communities, but also as members of sovereign tribal nations and with particular political status in the United States that may have been greatly harmed by various historical and ongoing processes of assimilation and suppression". And apologies, I read that "may" is not in there, it is that "have" been greatly harmed. "In addition to the NMFS EEJ strategy, several recent executive orders, presidential memos, and related policy directives reaffirmed the federal government's trust responsibility to federally recognized tribes, to address past harms, and make clear that the impacts of federal fisheries policy on tribes requires additional and explicit consideration beyond NEPA, social and environmental impact analysis, and MSA requirements". We heard across our advisors a need for expertise. This has been a theme since we started talking about this item last year. We are not experts. We need experts. We should engage them. As Chair Pettinger said a few moments ago he doesn't know what environmental justice is, so we need to bring in folks that do. I won't claim to be an expert either so I think all of us could probably benefit from that. Outreach is important, it's a huge part of what we do. We do it now. We're trying our best and yet we could probably do better. Outreach is, however, just one dimension. I heard Mr. Dooley talk earlier about this, and I appreciated that about that translation or language is just one element of EEJ. The NAS Report put together six challenges, and I want to acknowledge this at this point that there are a lot of challenges to doing this work. I was.....that was very impressed upon me when I read this report that talked a lot about the challenges that NMFS will face and the Council faces in doing this work, and it's important to know that from the

start. They were, NMFSs acknowledgment and awareness of underserved communities, we're here now. Historical privilege and allocation. It's difficult to find those who were excluded and those with access and power will likely resist efforts to address prior injustices. Engagement and access to services. Things such as language, costs, geography, and culture. The highly hierarchical and complex nature of the fishery management process. This underemphasizes the difficulty to integrate qualitative as well as indigenous knowledge. That permit and quota allocation are only one part of equity. That other fisheries and ocean management has impacts and cannot always be addressed by NMFS alone. I think wind energy probably comes to a lot of our minds when we think about that. And then what we've heard a lot about, especially from our SSC, is the NMFS social science capacity, and consequently the Council's social science capacity. I just wanted to finish with a subquote that came out of the report. They quote Campbell et al. 2011 and notes that, "Poorly designed or intended efforts to encourage participation can increase inequity". To me that's a reminder that any institution that moves forward trying to address inequity risks doing and perpetuating harm. So in any efforts that we do I want to make sure that we as a group think about that and are cautious in how we do this work.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:05] Thank you. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:07:08] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair, and thanks Miss Ridings. I think your statements and your quotes provide a compelling call for action. I think that the need is clear and I don't think anybody around this table disagrees with that. What I didn't hear was any recommendation on how to address that need, and that is what I am hoping we will get from the NMFS plan and from the EEJCs work around that plan and recommendations in November. So again, I'm looking forward to hearing some concrete recommendations on what this Council can do in that timeframe.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:58] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:08:00] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Thanks Mr. Ugoretz. I think Mr. Oatman had mentioned earlier that he may have some guidance for us so I didn't want to jump ahead of that and would certainly give him the microphone if he chooses to do that.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:18] Okay, let me make sure. Is there anything else others want to say before we get, assuming you have some guidance Joe. I did want to take this opportunity to weigh-in a little bit. I've had the gavel, give everybody a chance to speak, and I'll put the guidance off so I don't have the last word here that you do, the Council does. I agree with what's been said around the table that the need for action, the importance of it. I think Mr. Moore, Mr. Ugoretz, Joe in referencing the EEJC Report, there's a plan forward. There's more work that needs to be done. The pace of doing that waiting for the regional plan. My concern very specifically is the language we use when we talk about the issue that very often leaves the perception or the implication that the Council has erred in its process, that we've created problems. And I don't believe that's the case. We talked about it a little bit. You know there was reference to the North of Falcon process, how that's a good example, and what happened yesterday on the sanctuary issue. But as I look through the reports I will point out a couple of things that in the SSC Report they use the language, "There is also a clear need to identify groups that are underrepresented in the Council process". And so what's the metric that says they're underrepresented? And indicates that the groups are out there.

If there is a problem we'll address it, but the implication is they're there. At the end of the GMT Report it says, "Develop an action plan for change specifically within the Council process". Well, and they do add that it should compliment the NMFS Regional Action Plan, but I'm not convinced we need the change yet. We need to look at our process. If there are intrinsic flaws or biases they need to be corrected. But as an example, I'm going to look back to yesterday's action on the sanctuaries. And the bottom line, I'm going to be frank, is we've characterized this fishing community that had concerns, and part of our decision was based on that, is underserved or underrepresented. And I'm trying to figure out what the metric is that put them in that box. I just heard from Mr. Dooley that they've been working for at least five years reaching out to that community, that some of it is they're choosing on their own to opt out. We have open access permits to for people to engage in the fishery. We allocate quota to the open access fishery. They are selling on the markets. I have not seen yet any enforcement report that says there are violations, there are fish ticket reporting problems, and so I'm trying to decide how all of a sudden they become to be underrepresented or underserved when our process all the way along has created these opportunities. What did come up yesterday when they said, well why didn't we hear from them earlier? There was one specific example was they don't have access to computers and the internet and smartphones. Well there's a solution then, NMFS will cast a Wi-Fi cloud over the entire coast and provide computers and fix that problem. So the bottom line is, let's not create problems that don't exist but let's, and I think what I heard in the EEJ and their path forward, is let's figure out what the problem is and then how we address that and address the things in our process that are broken. And the last thing I'll say is what I, a statement in the GMT Report, which really resonates with me that the importance of incorporating the EEJ into our work is that it will improve our ability to effectively and fairly serve our diverse constituents in a challenging and changing world, and to me that's the key. We have a diverse group of constituents. We have to pay attention to them all, and in this world. So I apologize for taking the time but I do have an opinion. And now I'm going to turn it over to Joe Oatman. Joe.

Joe Oatman [00:13:41] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I think some of what I'll be offering here in terms of guidance I think sort of gets at, you know, your last points there about, you know, we do have diverse participants and we need to figure out how we can better address their needs and to figure out how we can better integrate this into our Council process. So the guidance that I would like to offer this morning is going back to what was in the EEJC recommendations that was approved by the Council back in September 2023. And so what we would like to see occur would be to develop the GAP analysis. That was proposed to the Council in September 2023, and have it be further informed by the advisory body and management team, our reports from this meeting. We also acknowledge that this should include identifying, you know, the investments of time and resources and expertise that may be needed for the Council to improve how it integrates and considers EEJ in the Council decision-making process. As we move forward, and as part of the forthcoming three meeting advisory body appointments process, that we take steps to designate a social scientist position with expertise in EEJ on the SSC. And as part of the future meeting plan agenda item, we would like to schedule a virtual meeting of the EJC to discuss the NMFS EEJ strategy and the regional plan and scope a workshop as described by the GMT in their report. Also would like to schedule an EEJC in-person meeting as part of the November 2024 meeting that is scheduled at a time that does not overlap with other advisory bodies and Council subcommittees. So hopefully with that guidance that might provide us, you know, a path forward to put more work into this.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:24] Thank you Joe. It's offered as guidance. I'll look around and see if there's any discussion on that, their agreement with that path forward? It's a long list. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:16:38] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. And Joe, just a question and looking back to the September 2023 EEJC Report, what would the GAP analysis be looking for gaps in and what is the timeline you're proposing to complete that analysis?

Joe Oatman [00:17:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thank you Mr. Ugoretz. So the GAP analysis contemplated a review of the Council Operating Procedures to identify, you know, to what extent, you know, if any EEJ type of issues are considered. And if not, if there were a potential desire to provide some refinements to that, that might better address those. And so, as I mentioned earlier under Council discussion, we do understand that Mr. Jim Seger is on a subcontract and he would be helping us kind of do that GAP analysis. And I think as we kind of move forward with that work, starting to also look at the suggestions that we've received from the advisory bodies and management teams to the extent that those are relevant to the GAP analysis.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:24] Thank you. Anyone else comments on that? I suspect Angela, I hope we have a list tracking that. Christa did you want to offer something?

Christa Svensson [00:18:37] I'll just say I'm supportive. I'm on the committee. I haven't said much I think. I think the Council does a very solid job at doing our best to work at all of these issues, but it is very hard to identify things within yourself that if you got, say a 360 review, others might be able to help you with. That doesn't mean that they are bad. That just means you may need a little bit of help. And as a number of us have said, we don't necessarily know all of how things are defined, whether that's what an underserved community is, what environmental justice might be. I by no means am an expert on either of those topics, and I really am appreciative of the SSC and others weighing-in and saying getting some help from social scientists or outside opinions could be beneficial. I realize there may be a financial cost to that and I'm certainly not advocating or asking for that now, but I do think that the work is important. I think we have seen this week people beginning to come into the process who we may not have heard from before and that continuing to do outreach not just to those communities, but to others that we may be aware of, will be increasingly important as our fisheries potentially diversify, but also as demographically we diversify over time. So with that, I think the one piece in terms of language I would also like to comment on is not just about translation in terms of language, but really hitting home the translation in terms of educational level. And the level that many of our documents are written at is decidedly over probably 12th grade. Typically when you're writing for the general public you target somewhere around 8th grade. Some publications target around 6th grade. And working on things like the grievance mechanism for my own company it became very apparent very quickly that using terminology that was common and understandable was critical, and I think that is something that we need to recognize and continue to work towards. And that's something that we can start right now that really wouldn't hopefully cost much of anything, that's being mindful in our own writing and our own comments.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:46] Thank you. I'll look around see if there's any further discussion on this? Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:53] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. No I like what Joe's laid out, particularly the GAP analysis. I mean it's good to be introspective, but especially given the National Academy of Sciences a review of looking at the national scale, right? So I think I'd be careful to paint a broad brush here, right? All regions aren't alike. All Councils aren't alike. And I think it'd be good to see what that would turn up so I welcome that. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:29] Thank you. Any other hands? I'm not seeing any. Our Deputy Director, Kelly Ames.

Kelly Ames [00:22:44] Thank you Vice-Chair. And thank you Council members for this really thoughtful discussion this morning. Merrick and I and staff will reflect on the priorities you've laid out here and come back to you under workload planning with our plans to accomplish your objectives. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:05] Thank you. And that was going to be my closing comment. Some of that guidance will have very near-term implementation in day last discussion. So Angela, what else do we need to do here?

Angela Forristall [00:23:19] Thank you. The Council had a very engaged discussion under this agenda item. You heard from the EEJC, the SSC, and the GMT. And the Council acknowledged that a lot of work is already being done in taking into account EEJ considerations, but that we can continue to identify where we can improve as a Council. And the Council also noted that once the regional plan from NOAA fisheries is available, we look forward to having more discussions on how to proceed, taking into account what is in that document. And we also received guidance to have, to continue looking at that GAP analysis and also taking into account in that what we've heard here today. So I think if that accurately summarizes what we discussed then we are concluded with this agenda item.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:08] All right. I think that captures it very good and we've finished our work here so I'll close out this agenda item.

I. Coastal Pelagic Species Management

1. Stock Assessment Terms of Reference and Accepted Practices – Final Action

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes all our reports, public comment, takes us to Council discussion and action which is going to appear on the screen very quickly. There it is, Adopting the Stock Assessment Terms of Reference and Accepted Practices. Guidance on the future reviews. So anybody want to start the discussion? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:00:28] Thanks Vice-Chair. This is I think a question for NMFS, either Mr. Lindsay or Miss Kempton. Thinking about the public testimony we just heard. The Council received an update on that lawsuit during closed session but I'm now thinking about as raised here in public comment what the application is here to the TORs? Could one of the two of you provide an update on that relationship?

Josh Lindsay [00:01:08] Thank you Miss Ridings for the question. Sorry, through the Chair. I don't have anything much to say beyond what was discussed under closed session. I don't think there's anything preventing the Council from taking final action as is with the Terms of Reference, but I'll defer to GC if there's further questions that you have on that.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:33] Nothing else to add on that? Kathryn.

Kathryn Kempton [00:01:38] Thank you Chair. I was waiting for the, for the prompt. No, we have nothing further to add. As you know there is, and this is public knowledge, there is a remedy hearing that's upcoming and we are waiting for the outcome of that remedy hearing before advising on any further action.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:58] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:02:00] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Thanks both. Proving my non-lawyer self here. When that remedy is received, which I believe will be some point in the near future, would whatever is in that, would that then be applied to these TORs to make them legally compliant? Or maybe I should rephrase that. Would it have to come back to the Council for us to reconsider it if those TRs were then not in compliance with the legal requirement?

Pete Hassemer [00:02:44] Kathryn.

Kathryn Kempton [00:02:52] Thank you Chair. Thank you for the question. I am, I'm thinking that only if the court explicitly directs us to take some action related to CalCOFI would we have to circle back?

Pete Hassemer [00:03:20] Corey does that answer your question?

Corey Ridings [00:03:23] I think so. I'll just add that I don't want to say anything I'm not supposed to say given the private information that we were provided. I think I'll just stop there and just note

that maybe we can get an update as we usually do under the next closed session at our next meeting and see if that has any bearing or demands the Council take another look at that. I see Mr. Niles, who is a lawyer, has his hand up.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:52] Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:03:55] Thank you. Not practicing as a lawyer, let's make that clear. But the, and I don't, and this is a question I've had a number of times. I don't think the information much that we get from NOAA GC in closed session is confidential. So I think what we heard was when are we going to know more about what NMFS is instructed to do by the courts and this Council would have to do? We would have more information on that in, well not for sure, but NOAA GC at that time thought there was a decent chance they could have remedied by September. So that's what I heard process-wise and I think that's what Kathryn's saying is all public, and just we, the public hadn't heard that part. So September was where we would have possibly more information. Was pretty sure my memory is decent enough at this point is that's what we were told on the first day.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:52] Miss Kempton.

Kathryn Kempton [00:04:55] Thank you Mr. Chair. And thank you for the question both Corey's. The the remedy hearing is, I think, the 25th. This judge has been difficult to follow with respect to the timing of her rulings. The ruling on the remedy could be nearly immediate in which case we would have our instructions, you know July well in time for the September meeting and that there's nothing confidential about that, correct. If it takes months, then we have some uncertainties to deal with by September. My sense however, though, is because she asked for argument, and this is not speculation this is also public record, that she asked for the argument when it was possible that she simply took the matter under advisement enrolled without argument that she finds it complex enough to require that kind of input from the parties and it may be a little bit longer than immediate for a ruling. But I would be surprised if she waited months for a ruling, given the need for urgency expressed by at least one of the parties.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:13] Thank you. Further discussion here? And I will admit, since I have the gavel here, it is a little complex that we did hear in public comment what the judge said, don't use it and the TOR says use it and what pathway that sets us on should we make a decision here. But Josh, you were raising your hand.

Josh Lindsay [00:06:48] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah, I just want to state one sort of factual point to this. So both the FMP and the Terms of Reference provide the formula for calculating the fraction parameter, which is used in the harvest guideline control rule. The EMSY used in the OFL and ABC, that formula is not dictated in the FMP or the Terms of Reference in terms of CalCOFI use.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:17] All right, thank you for that. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:07:24] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And I think I'm sort of building off of some of the information Mr. Lindsay just provided, but Terms of Reference, you know, isn't a regulatory document and we can change it and so the reason that we use it is to, you know, help

guide our analysts and scientists as they develop, in this case, stock assessments. And so I guess my thinking, and I'm just going to look at Kathryn to make sure I don't really screw us up, but my thinking is that this is still a helpful document and that if we do get to a point where the court instructs us to do something different, we can take that up and change the Terms of Reference.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:08] Okay, thank you. Kathryn did you want to respond to that? You don't have to.

Kathryn Kempton [00:08:13] Thank you Mr. Chair. No clarification is needed.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:17] Thank you. Further discussion? And again, at some point we will need a motion or motions to adopt these, but let's make sure we get all the discussion out of the way first. And if we have no motions then we don't have to adopt it. Do we need a few minutes to work through this? Let's take a five-minute break. No break yet. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:09:05] I was....thank you Mr. Chair. I was going to see if Kerry had a....could help us in what the difference between if we just adopted the SSC Report or the management team report, are there, would that be sufficient? And I noticed there was some corrections made, but just wondered would it be that simple for our intent to be clear to adopt these with the advice of the SSC and management team?

Pete Hassemer [00:09:34] Kerry.

Kerry Griffin [00:09:35] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair, Mr. Niles. Yeah, I think I agree with Mr. Burden and Josh that there's nothing that should prevent the Council from adopting these changes. There are many other updates and changes to the proposed TOR that are, you know, intended to help clarify the process and lend some certainty. Also as Mr. Burden noted that this is, you know, this is a guidance document. This isn't regulation. It's not a part of the FMP and it's at the Council's discretion if they want to update it. And in fact, that's something that you heard in my overview and in this SSC Report that the question of how often should we revisit it? And the draft says whenever you feel like you should. And so I'm also not an attorney, but I would think that if there's some sort of compelling legal reason to update it before we actually do a stock assessment, we do have an update assessment scheduled for next year and a catch-only projection estimate that the update is for Pacific sardine, they would presumably get started on that this fall, but it's not happening yet. So, you know there is some timing or some flexibility I would think. But again, this is a Council guidance document and, you know, it's at the Council's discretion when to update it and modify it as needed.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:14] All right, thank you. But we will need some motions to adopt something here. So now I'm going to suggest a five-minute break. Somebody could be working on that. We have the track changes, the clean versions of the two documents. We have some suggested edits in the SSC and the management team reports. So let's be back here in five minutes.....(BREAK)..... All right. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:11:48] Thanks Vice-Chair. I have a motion that appears to be ready.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:54] There it showed up on the screen. Go ahead with it.

Corey Ridings [00:11:57] Thank you. I move the Council adopt Terms of Reference for the Coastal Pelagic Species Stock Assessment Review Process for 2025-2026. I.1 Attachment 2, and the Accepted Practices Guidelines for Coastal Pelagic Species Stock Assessments in 2025. I.1, Attachment 4 as modified by Agenda Item I.1.a, Supplemental SSC Report 1, and Agenda Item I.1.a, Supplemental CPSMT Report 1.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:27] Thank you. That looks accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Corey Ridings [00:12:31] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:32] Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

Corey Ridings [00:12:38] Thanks Vice-Chair. Want to keep the CPS process moving along smoothly and make sure that our assessors and STAT teams and Council staff are able to do so. My understanding is this will help do that while providing flexibility moving forward should there be any changes at any point that the Council wishes to address.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:06] Thank you. Any questions to the maker of the motion for clarification? Seeing no questions, any discussion on the motion? Seeing no hands for discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:13:24] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:26] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. And with that I'm going to turn to Kerry, ah, excuse me Kerry, before you do, Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:13:44] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. And I just didn't give my hand up enough to speak to it real quick, but just wanted to thank Miss Ridings for the motion. But to the.....we did break this off from groundfish, put it back together, pull it apart again, so I really did appreciate the language here and the CPS one about the data stewards and I found that.....and wish we had used the same language in the groundfish and that's, it was to come up with the data stewards, which typically are the three states, and come up with a data plan instead of just deadlines and eight weeks is preferred. And I really just wanted to call out that, the way that was phrased and to me it recognizes the key role that the states have. And it is a partnership between the stats and the state data stewards. And sorry for missing my.....I was going to speak to the motion on that but didn't want to lose the chance to voice that appreciation.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:37] All right, thank you. I'll make sure there's no other hands, other comments on it. I'm not seeing any, then I'll turn back to Kerry and see if we've completed our work?

Kerry Griffin [00:14:49] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. That does complete your work under this agenda item. You were tasked with adopting as final the terms of, the proposed Terms of Reference

and accepted practices, as well as giving guidance on future reviews, which as I mentioned before, is incorporated into the updated or the proposed Terms of Reference and so that gives the Council latitude to update as needed. So what we'll do is clean up the document and incorporate the edits from the SSC and the CPSMT and get these posted to our website and consider them final until they are updated as needed. So yeah, I think that completes your business. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:38] All right, thank you. With that we'll close out this agenda item.