

**COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPTS**  
**279<sup>th</sup> Session of the**  
**Pacific Fishery Management Council**  
**November 13-18, 2024**  
Hilton Orange County / Costa Mesa  
3050 Bristol Street, Costa Mesa, CA 92626

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.....	6
1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items.....	6
C. Administrative Matters .....	7
1. Council Coordination Committee Report .....	7
2. Fiscal Matters.....	8
3. Legislative Matters.....	10
4. Approve Council Meeting Record.....	11
5. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures – Including Final 2025-27 Advisory Body Appointments .....	12
6. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning.....	25
D. Cross Fishery Management Plan .....	33
1. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) 2024 Accomplishments and 2025 Priorities.....	33
2. Marine Planning.....	34
3. Research and Data Needs.....	37
4. Council Operations and Priorities.....	43
E. Habitat Issues.....	44
1. Current Habitat Issues.....	44
F. Salmon Management .....	45
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report.....	45
2. Final Methodology Review Results and Proposed Council Operating Procedure (COP) 15 Updates.....	46
3. Queets Spring/Summer Chinook Rebuilding Plan – Final .....	69
4. Final 2025 Preseason Management Schedule.....	71

5. Klamath River Fall Chinook Workgroup Progress Report and Recommendations .....	74
6. Sacramento River Fall Chinook Workgroup Progress Report and Recommendations ....	79
G. Pacific Halibut Management.....	82
1. 2025 Catch Sharing Plan and Annual Regulations – Final.....	82
2. Commercial Fishery Regulation Changes: Vessel Monitoring Systems, Seabird Avoidance, and Catch Reporting – Final.....	86
H. Highly Migratory Species Management .....	109
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report .....	109
2. International Management Activities Including Bluefin Tuna Trip Limits.....	110
3. Biennial Harvest Specifications and Management Measures – Final.....	121
4. Highly Migratory Species Roadmap Workshop Report and Next Steps .....	124
I. Groundfish Management .....	133
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report .....	133
2. Trawl Catch Share Program and Intersector Allocation Reviews: Hearing Officers and Locations .....	135
3. Methodology Review: Final Fishery Impact Model Review Topics and Stock Assessment Methodologies.....	146
4. Stock Definitions for Species Assessed in 2025 and 2027 – Final.....	151
5. Cordell Bank Conservation Area Revisions .....	153
6. Inseason Adjustments and Technical Corrections for 2025-2026 — Final Action.....	161
J. Coastal Pelagic Species Management.....	165
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report.....	165
2. Pacific Sardine Rebuilding Plan Fishery Management Plan Amendment (FMP) – Final .....	167
3. Stock Assessment Prioritization .....	187

## 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] Thank you Director Burden. All right that'll take us to the agenda. Any comments on it? Changes to be made? Approval of? That's the hint. Dani Evenson.

**Dani Evenson** [00:00:15] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to make a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:18] Please.

**Dani Evenson** [00:00:19] I move that the Council adopt the detailed agenda found in A.3.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:28] Okay, very good. Is that language accurate? Language is accurate. Okay. Looking for a second. Seconded by Butch Smith. Thank you Butch. All right, discussion? I'm not seeing none. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:45] Do we need to add the discussed second closed session to the agenda?

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

**Merrick Burden** [00:01:01] Thank you for that remark. I would recommend we do that and I would suggest Saturday afternoon.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:06] Is that an amendment to the motion?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:01:15] That was just a question.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:18] Well, we're starting off right this week aren't we. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:01:24] I'd like to offer an amendment.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:27] Please do.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:01:29] At the end of the language that's there add, "with the addition of an additional closed session on Saturday, November 16th. I'm not going to.....and that's it, well 2024 if you want. And then I'll speak to my amendment if there's a second.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:04] Okay. I guess would you want to add a time for that or just, we'll just.....

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:02:07] Nah, I didn't want to put a time on it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:10] Okay. Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Okay. Discussion? Okay. All right. All those in favor of the amendment to the motion, the motion to amend say "Aye".

**Council** [00:02:25] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:25] No? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Okay, now we have a amended motion on the floor. So discussion? All right. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:02:42] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:42] Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Wonderful. Okay. Thank you.

## **B. Open Comment Period**

### **1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items**

No transcription for this agenda item.

## **C. Administrative Matters**

### **1. Council Coordination Committee Report**

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Questions for Executive Director Burden on the CCC Report? Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:00:07] Thank you Chair. I actually had some questions regarding the NMFS National Seafood Strategy Implementation Report. I was going to bring them up under D.1. Is that more appropriate or should I bring them up at this point, questions for NMFS? Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:24] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:00:24] Yeah, thank you Dr. Lent. I would suggest bringing those up under D.1. I'm not very well armored to, or prepared to speak to that strategy at the moment.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:35] Okay, thank you Rebecca. Anyone else? Okay, I think that concludes C.1.

## 2. Fiscal Matters

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Okay, any questions for Patricia or Vice-Chair Hassemer on the Budget Report? Okay, very good. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:00:16] Mr. Chairman, not to cut off discussion but when the time is appropriate I do have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:21] Okay, very good. Thank you Sharon. All right, discussion? I'm sorry. I didn't see any public comment. I kind of skipped over that but we do have zero? Okay. Good to get it out there. Very good. And no reports either. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:00:43] Thank you Mr. Chair. Sorry I'm a little slow on the draw. This morning in the California delegation meeting an issue came up which just curious about. Out of the IRA funding would there be any support for the EFH work which we discussed under the Cordell Banks agenda item? Just the need to make sure that's adequately funded and ready to go sooner than 10 years. Thank you Mr. Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:10] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:01:13] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And I appreciate the question. My initial sense is that that funding would not be appropriate, appropriate to be used for EFH. It's been a very, very rigid and specific set of projects that we had to propose to receive that funding. I'd be happy to share with you all the proposals. They are on our web page and talk that through and maybe you see something in there that I'm missing, but I don't think so at the moment.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:01:42] Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:43] Okay, thank you. Thank you Rebecca. Anyone else? Okay. I'll turn to Sharon since I don't see any hands. Butch has not got his hand up so, please.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:02:01] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I move the Council adopt the recommendations of the Budget Committee as presented in Agenda Item C.2.a, the Report of the Budget Committee.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:16] Okay, is the language on the screen accurate?

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:02:17] Yes Mr. Chairman, it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:22] Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Thank you Marc. Please speak to your motion as appropriate.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:02:29] Mr. Chairman this does provide the opportunity for the Council to adopt the 2025 provisional budget and that's a pretty important step and that's the basis of the motion.



**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:43] Okay, very good. Questions for the motion maker or discussion on the motion? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:02:53] Thanks for the motion Sharon. And thanks Patricia for, again, for writing up the report so thoroughly and accurately. Just one comment in terms of and just on the state liaison contracts, it said they will review and refine, I think, and I participated by remotely the Budget Committee. Thanks again for the opportunity to do that. But so didn't have as much chance for discussion, but not worth any kind of change to the motion or anything but I am wondering, yeah, I think our statement of tasks are pretty specific already so happy to review that since the Budget Committee, happy to review, we'll see if refinement is needed but yeah, I'm looking at it now and I can see a number. I can't count them right now, but very specific tasks that are already part of our liaison contract. So just a very nitpicky of maybe there could be some refinements, but I think some of our state liaison contracts are already meeting what the expectation would be. Some minor comment, but yeah thank you for....

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:59] Thank you Corey. Anyone else? All right I'm not seeing any hands so therefore I'll call the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:04:10] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:11] Opposed no? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. All right. So with that I'll turn to Patricia. How are we doing?

**Patricia Hearing** [00:04:26] Your work is done. I'll see you in the spring.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:28] All right I like the sound of that. So very good. Thank you.

### **3. Legislative Matters**

No transcription for this agenda item.

#### 4. Approve Council Meeting Record

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] We have the meeting record from September has out there and so I'll let people have a chance to look at that so I'll look for someone to either comment on it's accuracy or maybe suggest approving them. Always a plus at this point in time. Discussion? Christa. I like the looks of that.

**Christa Svensson** [00:00:32] Thank you Mr. Chair. I don't have a motion written, but if you need a motion I would move that we approve the minutes, or the Council meeting record. Excuse me.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:43] Okay. Sounds wonderful. I see staff is on it. You probably might want to say September meeting record.

**Christa Svensson** [00:01:13] Yeah, I would say approve the previous Council meeting record. September would be acceptable as well.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:25] Okay, is that good enough? Okay. All right, thank you Christa. I'm looking for a second. Seconded by Corey Ridings. Thank you Corey. All right, speak to your motion as appropriate.

**Christa Svensson** [00:01:40] I don't think there's much to say. They were well written and thorough.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:45] Okay, very good. Discussion on that motion? I didn't think we'd get any but I had to ask. All right, with that I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:01:59] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:59] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Wonderful.

## 5. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures – Including Final 2025-27 Advisory Body Appointments

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] We're back. We've heard the reports, had public testimony and now we're going to Council action and so I'll open the floor for discussion before we go to the motions. So with that I'll open the floor. Okay. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:21] Thank you Chair. I think a number of us are kind of questioning this National Standards Work Modification Workgroup since we don't have a real good idea if and when this rule is going to come out. Do we need to create this workgroup now knowing it could be later on, or is it best to go ahead and create it now so that we're ready when that rule publishes, assuming it publishes at some point. Just trying to get a feel for the need for it at this time? And I'm not sure who to direct that question to.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:54] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:00:57] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I'd also invite Miss Ames to weigh-in. But I think it's a question of timing. You know if this is going to come out, we had been anticipating that it would be coming out in, you know, a matter of weeks and then, you know, if it waits until the, to come out after the new administration is in, either way it's a long time until our next Council meeting. And so we had some thought that it'd be better to put it in place and have the structure that we're desiring should it come out at a time between now and the next Council meeting. That's our thinking anyway, and I guess I'd ask Kelly if she has anything more to add to that thought process?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:37] Kelly. Okay? All right. Lynn. Okay. Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:01:48] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to, and while I expressed my views earlier, those were, you know, based on what I've known and seen in government, but I should also have noted that the rule was pretty close, like Merrick said, and so it is still possible that it comes out. I don't want to leave you all with the impression that it's a definitive decision already by the agency that it won't come out. So thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:17] Thank you Ryan. All right. Anyone else or you want to get right to the appointments? I'm not seeing any hands so I think that's what we do so. Well the Council action is before us. We'll start off with the very top so Number 1. I would look to Lynn Mattes. Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:02:44] Thank you Chair. Try to do too many things at once as per usual. And I think Miss Ames or the tower of power has these motions ready to go.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:59] Okay.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:03:01] And I will be addressing the ODFW representative to the GMT. I move the Council appoint Miss Katlyn Lockhart to one of the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife positions on the Groundfish Management Team.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:14] Okay, the languages looks accurate to me so seconded by Christa Svensson. Thank you Christa. Please speak to your motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:03:24] Thank you Chair. I think Miss Lockhart is going to be a good addition to the GMT. She has been a port biologist for us for the last several years, has really good communication with the fishing fleet, especially on the southern Oregon coast. It's my understanding in the, as a alternate in this meeting this week, she has already been able to help ground truth a couple of things for the GMT. She also has an educational background in survey and how to incorporate nearshore surveys into fisheries management. So I think she's going to be a good fit on the Groundfish Management Team and look forward to working with her in this new venue.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:05] Okay, thank you Lynn. All right with that I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:04:14] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:14] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you Lynn. Next up, that'll bring us to Idaho Fish and Game seat. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:04:27] Thank you Mr. Chair. I move the Council appoint Dr. Tim, or Timothy Copeland to the Idaho Department of Fish and Game position on the Science and Statistical Committee.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:42] All right, language looks accurate so do I have a second? Seconded by Vice-Chair Hassemer. Thank you Pete. So please speak to the nomination.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:04:52] Mr. Chairman, Dr. Copeland does have a scientific background, I think well-grounded, and he is certainly willing to contribute robustly to the Scientific and Statistical Committee. I think he'll be a good addition. Certainly we will miss Allen, but I think Dr. Copeland's a good replacement.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:14] All right, thank you Sharon. Okay with that I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:05:20] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:21] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Okay, that'll take us to the northwest or the National Marine Fisheries Service and Ryan Wulff. Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:05:38] Thank you. I move the Council appoint Dr. Will Satterthwaite to one of the Southwest Fisheries Science Center positions on the Scientific and Statistical Committee.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:49] Okay, very good. Second? Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Thank you Sharon. All right. Please speak to your motion.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:06:00] Yeah, I think most folks here are familiar with Dr. Satterthwaite. He's been a member of the SSC since 2013. He has over 20 years of ecology research experience with a focus on population dynamics and life history and over 20 years experience working on salmonids and fishery issues. So I think this would allow him to take one of the Southwest Fisheries Science Center positions, which we need filled on the SSC. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:28] Thank you Ryan. Okay I'll call the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:06:33] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:34] Opposed no? Abstentions? The motion passed unanimously. Thank you Ryan. That'll take us to the Tribal position and David Sones. David.

**David Sones** [00:06:48] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I move the Council appoint Miss Stephanie Thurner to the Tribal position on the Salmon Technical Team.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:58] Okay, very good. Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Thank you Marc. Speak to your motion Dave, please.

**David Sones** [00:07:05] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yeah, Stephanie I believe has served in this position before and she comes, well, highly recommended and she'll do a great job.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:17] Okay, very good. All right with that I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:07:22] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:22] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Wonderful. All right, next will come the CPSAS and Marc Gorelnik. Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:07:40] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I move the Council make the following appointments to the Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel. For California commercial fisheries. Mr. Matt Everingham, Mr. Neil Guglielmo, and Mr. Nick Jurlin. For Oregon commercial fisheries. Mr. Ryan Capp. For Washington commercial/processor. Mr. Bryan Blake. For processor. Mr. Ryan Arguello, Mr. Mark Fina. Mr. Mike Okoniewski. For California sport. Mr. Steve Crooke. And for conservation. Dr. Brian Hoover.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:20] Okay, very good. Seconded by David Sones. Thank you David. Please speak to your motion Marc as appropriate.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:08:28] I think that all these folks for the most part have served admirably on the advisory subpanel and I think they will continue to.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:37] Very good. Okay I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:08:42] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:43] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Wonderful. All right, that'll take us to the EAS and Lynn Mattes. Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:08:57] Thank you Chair. I move the Council make the following appointments to the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel. California. 2 At-large positions. Mr. Richard Ogg and Dr. Andrew Thurber. Oregon. 2 At-large positions. Miss Theresa Labriola. Washington. 2 At-large positions. Mr. Scott Hough and Mr. Markus Min. 3 At-large positions. Miss Deb Wilson-Vandenberg and Miss Michele Conrad. Additionally, I request the Executive Director re-advertise for 1 Oregon At-large position and 1 At-large position.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:34] Okay, the language looks good. Seconded by Christa Svensson. Thank you Christa. Please speak to your motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:09:42] Thank you Chair. I believe most of these people are already involved in this workgroup, or the subpanel, and have been active participants providing good input. Appreciate Miss Wilson-Vandenberg and Miss Conrad being willing to switch from being state At-large to At-large At-large positions. I just look forward to their continued involvement in this process.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:06] Very good. All right I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:10:10] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:11] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Wonderful. That'll bring us to the the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel and Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:10:24] Thank you Mr. Chair. I move the Council make the following appointments to the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel. For fixed gear fisheries. Mr. Robert Alverson, Mr. Gordon Lapham, and Mr. Gerry Richter. For bottom trawl fisheries. Mr. Travis Hunter. For midwater trawl fisheries. Mr. Jeff Lackey. For At-large trawl fisheries. Mr. Kevin Dunn. For open access fisheries north of Cape Mendocino. Mr. Harrison Ibach. For open access fisheries south of Cape Mendocino. Mr. Daniel Platt. Processors. Mr. Steve Besic and Miss Susan Chambers. At-sea processor. Miss Sarah Nayani. Washington charter boat operator. Mr. Paul Mirante. California north of Point Conception charter boat operator. Mr. Tim Klassen. California south of Point Conception charter boat operator. Mr. Merit McCrea. Washington sport fisheries. Mr. Phil Anderson. Oregon sport fisheries. Mr. Steve Gordon. California sport fisheries. Mr. David Kasheta and Mr. Louis Zimm. Conservation group. Mr. Shems Judd. And additionally, I request the Executive Director re-advertise 1 At-large trawl position, 1 Oregon charter position, and 1 Tribal position.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:40] Okay Aja everything looks good. Looking for a second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Thank you Christa. Please speak to your motion.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:11:47] Thank you Mr. Chair. This list includes a really highly experienced and dedicated group of groundfish industry contributors and I look forward to working with these folks into the future.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:02] All right, very good. I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:12:07] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:08] Opposed no? Abstentions?

**Rebecca Lent** [00:12:11] Abstain.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:14] The motion passes with one abstention. Thank you. All right, next up will take us to, where are we at here? Salmon Advisory Subpanel. Marci Yaremko. Marci. Is it? Oh I jumped it. I'm sorry. back-up. Christa Svensson. HMS.

**Christa Svensson** [00:12:35] Thank you. I move the Council make the following appointments to the Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanel. Commercial trawl fisheries. Mr. Clayton T. Wraith, Esquire. Commercial purse seine fisheries. Mr. Mike Conroy. Commercial gillnet fisheries. Mr. Gary Burke. Commercial deep set buoy gear. Mr. Markus Medak. Commercial fisheries north.....sorry, screens moving on me.....Commercial fisheries north of Point Conception. Mr. Eric A. Johnson. Processor north of Cape Mendocino. Mr. Lyf Gildersleeve. Processor south of Cape Mendocino. Mr. Dave Rudie. Southern charter boat operator. Mr. Mike Thompson. Private sport fisheries north of Point Conception. Mr. Tom Mattusch. Private sport fisheries south of Point Conception. Mr. Todd Mansur. Conservation group. Mr. Josh Madeira. Public At-large. Miss Pamela Tom. Additionally, I request the Executive Director to re-advertise for 1 commercial fisheries south of Point Conception position and 1 northern charter boat operator position.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:51] Thank you Christa. Looks good. Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Thank you Lynn. Please speak to your motion Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:13:59] Yeah, thank you. We have certainly over the last six years that I've been on the Council had done a lot of work in this room. We have kept a number of appointments to continue with that work, and we will be discussing some of that later today I believe. We've also had a number of positions that we have needed to fill, some through retirement, some through other choices, and I am very grateful for the quality of applicants that we've had for all positions this year. I did want to touch very briefly on the HMS commercial positions. Mr. Conroy is currently slated for the purse seine seat, but he has extensive experience with APHA. Some of the other folks have positions with WFOA or members of WFOA. There are two main commercial groups, so making sure we have representation in this Council process from both groups I think is important. And in that regard, Mr. Wraith has fishing experience off of Oregon. Mr. Johnson off of Washington. And again asking Mr. Conroy to fill-in with APHA we also cover that Southern California fisheries. So trying to get geographic area and trying to get representation from the main groups on the commercial side.



**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:30] All right, thank you Christa. With that I'll call the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:15:35] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:35] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you. All right, and now we move to the Salmon Advisory Subpanel and Marci Yaremko. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:15:48] Thank you Mr. Chair. I move the Council make the following appointments to the Salmon Advisory Subpanel. Washington troll fisheries. Mr. Ryan Johnson. Oregon troll fisheries. Mr. John Alto. California troll fisheries. Mr. George Bradshaw. Gillnet fisheries. Mr. Bryce Divine. Processor. Mr. Gerald Reinholdt and Mr. Jeremy Streig. Washington charter boat operator. Mr. Steve Sohlstrom. Oregon charter boat operator. Mr. Michael Sorenson. California charter boat operator. Mr. John Atkinson. Washington Sport fisheries. Mr. Dave Johnson. Oregon Sport Fisheries. Mr. John Allen Christie. Idaho sport fisheries. Mr. Donald Vernon. California sport fisheries. Mr. Kevin Godes and Mr. James Yarnell. Tribal fisheries for Washington Coast. Mr. Brian Svec. And the Tribal representative from California. Mr. Keith Parker. The Conservation group. Mrs. Megan Waters.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:04] All right. Thank you Marci. It looks good. Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Thank you Marc. Please speak to your motion.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:17:12] Thank you Mr. Chair. The slate is filled with a number of subject matter experts, many of which have lots of experience in this process and will serve us well. I'd like to speak specifically to the appointment of a second processor seat on the SAS. The Council determined an additional seat was needed to provide adequate representation for West Coast salmon processors in the face of changing salmon fisheries. This membership composition is consistent with other fishery advisory bodies, which already include multiple processor seats.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:51] All right, thank you Marci. With that I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:17:56] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:57] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much. Okay, that takes us to I believe the SSC and Corey Ridings. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:18:17] Thanks Chair. I move the Council make the following appointments to the Scientific and Statistical Committee. Dr. Christopher Free. Dr. Michael Hinton. Dr. Dan Holland. Dr. Tommy Moore. Dr. Andre Punt. Dr. Matthew Reimer. And Dr. Jason Schaffler. Additionally, I request the Executive Director re-advertise for 2 At-large positions, highlighting the Council's interest in candidates with stock assessment and social science expertise.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:45] All right, thank you Corey. Seconded by David Sones. Thank you David. All right please speak to your motion as appropriate.

**Corey Ridings** [00:18:56] Thank you Chair. These folks all have the relevant scientific qualifications to serve on the SSC. Actually, all of these folks are reappointments and have been valuable and engaged members of the SSC. They're showing a willingness to continue serving and we thank them for their good work and commitment to science in the Council process.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:17] Okay, thank you Corey. All right, with that I'll call the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:19:22] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:22] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. We're getting a little too fast here for our crew so we are going to take a little short pause so I get the thumbs up at the back of the room. Very good. All right. Next up will be the Habitat Committee and Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:19:48] Mr. Chairman, I move the Council make the following appointments to the Habitat Committee. For the Northwest or Columbia River Tribal representative. Miss Kate Valdez. Klamath River Tribal representative. Mr. Justin Alvarez. Commercial fishing industry. Miss Sarah Bates. Sport fishing industry. Mr. Gary Maganaris. The Conservation group. Dr. Waldo Wakefield. And I was just getting ready, could you scroll down please? And for the 2 At-large positions, Dr. Caren Barcelo and Dr. Scott Heppell.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:25] Very good. And a second by Vice-Chair Hassemer. Thank you Pete. All right, thank you Sharon. Please speak to your motion.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:20:34] Mr. Chairman, I do point out that many of these individuals are new to the Habitat Committee, but they cover a wide range, obviously, of experiences and their areas that they're coming from. I will also note that Sarah Bates was in my MREP class, and I am very pleased to make this nomination.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:58] All right, thank you Sharon. With that I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:21:03] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:03] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Very good. So all right. Have to take a deep breath through all that. All right. And we're going to.....oh, there it is. Okay, so I've got Number 6. We form the ad hoc committee tasked with preparing the proposed revisions to the National Standard Guidelines 4, 8 and 9. Who has the motion on that? Or discussion I guess? I'll open the floor for discussion. Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:21:59] I have a motion when ready. I don't want to cut off the discussion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:04] I'll pause here for a second from the tower in the back of the room. So we still have discussion so if anybody wants to raise their hand. Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:22:39] I just want to go back a smidge on the appointments we just did. I mean it's a great commitment through all those people that joined and I'm very thankful that they did. And the MREP Program has helped spawn some of those off very important. And, you know, I think we better be prepared to keep our eye on Phil Anderson. He'll probably need some help.....(laughter).....but other than that I think the list looks complete and a very great group of advisory panel people coming on for the next three years. Thank you Mr. Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:12] Thank you Butch. They are the foundation or a large part of what we do, right? So awful happy to have those.....absolutely so. Anyway still kind of a pause here so more discussion as needed? You ready? All right. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:23:32] Thank you Chair. I need to get my other glasses to read that one. There, thank you. Remember, we're kind of old people up here. I move the Council approve formation of an ad hoc committee charged with preparing comments for Council consideration on the proposed revisions to the National Standard guidelines 4, 8, and 9 as outlined in Agenda Item C.5, Attachment 2, November 2024. The makeup of the workgroup should include the following positions based on Attachment 2 and our advisory body reports, noting the addition of the EAS positions. I don't know that I need to read all everything in that table. There are some additions and some subtractions based on what was in the advisory body reports.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:29] Thank you Lynn. The language is accurate, right? Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Thank you Sharon. Please speak to your motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:24:40] Thank you Chair. I appreciate Mr. Burden and Mr. Wulff's feedback earlier that while we don't know when or if this group is going to be needed, it's better to have it and not need it than need it and not have it. So there was a good basis, a good foundation in the Attachment 2, but based on interest from, or lack of interest or extra interest as example, four instead of three on the GAP, one instead of two on the SAS, have provided this list with the addition of 2 seats for the EAS as we had some discussion earlier. The advisory bodies have provided names but that is under the purview of the Chair so I will let him deal with that. Speaking with the other agency staff via email this morning, we were hoping to all have a TBD for the agency staff. Depending on when that workgroup meets, we will decide who will be the position. This is a lot of people, but since this is going to be remote the cost should be less than if we were trying to get this many people in-person. I do want to ask, or do want to provide some guidance that the meetings should be scheduled when as many people as possible on this group can be, can get together. I don't know that we'll ever find a time when everybody on that group can get together, but don't let that prevent work from happening. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:14] Okay, thanks Lynn. Questions for the motion maker? Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:26:19] Thank you Chair. I wasn't sure, did the original proposal have just one slot for HMS or were there two? Because two people were nominated.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:29] Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:26:32] I am looking up the original form. It did have two. It did have two and would be up for a friendly amendment if needed. There was a recommendation and some discussion earlier that one of the HMSAS people could be moved to a conservation seat because they represent conservation and I forgot to go back and put that seat back on the HMSAS.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:02] Okay, Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:27:03] Yeah. If I recall, then one of the National Standards being reviewed is National Standard 9, which is bycatch, which is a huge issue for developing the HMS fishery. So it'd be great to see adequate representation of HMS. Thank you Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:17] Thanks Rebecca. Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:27:20] Thank you Mr. Chair. Well I'm going to jump on this conversation and make a friendly amendment. And my amendment would be to change the one on the HMS category to two.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:53] That language looks accurate to me so do you agree?

**Christa Svensson** [00:27:57] Yes, as long as it's changed up above where we strike one and put two in there. But the language of the motion, yes.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:28:04] Okay, very good. All right, seconded by Rebecca Lent. Thank you Rebecca. All right, speak to your amendment?

**Christa Svensson** [00:28:10] Yeah, I agree as we work through things like the Roadmap, gear development, and design and understanding what these are, that it would be beneficial to have two HMS people. We can certainly adjust that if needed later but I think hearing about, hey, it's online and cost is hopefully not exorbitant, that it would be beneficial to have that experience.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:28:38] Very good. Discussion on the motion? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:28:44] Yeah, thanks for the motion and.....well I'll just speak to the amendment. I'm....when I heard this idea I think my gut was telling me to be skeptical. I've been a member of 3 or 4 ad hoc groups and seen how various models work. And I think we're up to I don't know, I lost count 24 now. I'll support this, but it seems like there's a low probability of employing this model, but that group is too big to have any kind of dialogue. I've seen the MPC work and it works because of the efforts of a couple individuals have a lot of time to put into it. So just voicing I want a voice within a timely and concise manner that I don't know if I, you know, WDFW will help try to make this work but I don't think it's workable. But I will support the motion and the amendment and the motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:38] All right, thank you Corey. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:29:42] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And it certainly caught my eye that this is a very large group. But I, just a process question, I'm assuming because as an ad hoc group it's

essentially the call of the Chair. I'm assuming the call of the Chair can include disbanding if indeed it does not appear that the workgroup is making the kind of progress or products anticipated by the Chair?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:30:10] I'm not going to touch that so I'll turn to Executive Director Burden on that one.

**Merrick Burden** [00:30:17] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Could you restate your question please Miss Kiefer?

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:30:22] Well my understanding is the, filling the individuals, since it's an ad hoc committee, will fall to the Chairman. My question was, does the Chairman, because it is an ad hoc workgroup, have the authority if it's too big, it's too unwieldy, things are not happening, the Council is not getting I think what it expected, can the Chair disband an ad hoc committee?

**Merrick Burden** [00:30:56] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the question. I think in practice what we do is have the Chair frequently consult with the Council before anything like that is done. I don't recall offhand if technically the Chairman can or cannot, but I think for purposes of disbanding, I think consulting with the Council. But I think your question does raise some other questions, which I think you might be getting at, which is essentially what's the plan? Is there a plan B if this doesn't work? How would we create comments if this doesn't work? Is that what you're getting at?

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:31:33] Yes, that is kind of part of it, but more it was just a curiosity question. Once again, my newness on the Council in terms of just proceeding. But certainly, I mean this Council I think generally does base a comment letter on the work of committees and staff working together, but just more a curiosity question.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:59] Okay. Thank you Sharon. All right. Okay. So do we have anymore discussion? All right I'll call for the question on the amendment to the motion. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:32:15] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:32:16] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you. All right, now we'll go back to the full motion. Discussion on it, on the amended motion? Okay seeing any hands? Not seeing any hands I will call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:32:40] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:32:41] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much. Okay, that takes care of the National Standards Workgroup and that takes us now to the HMS Roadmap Workgroup. So Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:33:10] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I'm ready with a motion if now's the time?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:33:16] Okay. I'll just open the floor for a little bit of discussion before we get there but I don't see any hands. I think they've worn them down enough sufficiently so please.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:33:25] Thank you. I move the Council form an ad hoc HMS Roadmap Fisheries Innovation Workgroup as follows. Number 1: Membership. Two HMSMT members. Three HMSAS members. A NMFS West Coast Regional representative. Two Council members. And up to two other members at the discretion of the Council Chair. Number 2: Charge. The workgroup is tasked with developing and refining Council procedures which help facilitate the more rapid creation of new HMS gears and achieve the goals of the HMS Roadmap. The work should include: Modification of the Council Operating Procedure 20, which is the HMS EFP process. Improvement of HMS EFP guidance. Development of HMS EFP performance goals, including acceptable bycatch and metrics to evaluate EFP performance. Consideration of the National Seafood Strategy as it pertains to HMS fisheries. Review of the draft HMS Roadmap as appropriate. And discussion of relevant innovative fishery tools or measures needed to support a robust HMS Fishery.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:45] All right Marci is the language of the screen accurate?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:34:47] Yes it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:47] Very good. Looking for a second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Thank you Christa. All right, please speak to your motion.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:34:54] Yes, Thank you Mr. Chair. We heard quite a bit of discussion under the HMS agenda items earlier this week about the need for some work to be done by an additional group. I just want to highlight the content supplied today by Kerry Griffin in Supplemental Attachment 4 describing that the Roadmap would be built from the workshop that was held back in June of 2024, and that Roadmap document is slated for availability at the March 2025 Council meeting. The Roadmap is expected to include a framework to assist in accomplishing the goals of expanding HMS opportunities, minimizing bycatch, and creating and refining gear types through the Council's EFP process. The initiative is aligned with the IRA Project Number 3, which is developing climate-ready fishery methods that mitigate the bycatch of non-target associated species in a changing ecosystem.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:36:04] Thank you Marci. All right, questions for the motion maker? Corey Ridings and then Rebecca. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:36:12] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Yaremko. My question is on the last bullet point, discussion of relevant innovative fishery tools or measures needed to support a robust HMS Fishery. That bullet point seems incredibly broad to me and could encompass a lot of different things so I'm wondering if you could speak a little bit more about what you had in mind with that bullet?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:36:41] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:36:41] Thank you Mr. Chair. I guess I would note that, well maybe I'll try it this way. Would it be all right if I phoned a friend?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:36:55] Absolutely.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:36:56] Thank you. I'd look for another hand to offer some detail on this bullet?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:37:02] Would that be Mr. Ugoretz, or Mr. Wulff? Oh, all right. So that's not quite phoning but got it.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:37:12] Yes, through the Chair, thank you Miss Ridings the question. I think this would allow.....I think it is broad and I think it just allows some additional discussion if things come up that are broader than just EFPs. I think when you're talking about kind of the intention of innovative tools or fisheries innovation, exempted fishing permits are one strategy but they are very specific and they are exempted fishing permits from, you know, exemptions from existing regulations. So there may be other tools or other measures that get at the same kind of intent but are not an EFP specifically. So I think it was designed to be a little bit broad just in case the group wanted to discuss something relevant to the Roadmap as we have yet to see it that touches on something other than EFPs specifically.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:38:08] Corey, good? Okay, thanks. Thank you Ryan. Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:38:14] Thank you. And thank you very much for preparing the proposal. I don't see anywhere on this proposal the mention of the IRA project. It is in the document that the HMS folks gave to us. Is that necessary? I'm still trying to figure how all that weaves together. Thank you Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:38:31] Okay. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:38:37] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. As I interpret this motion, should it pass, there are substantial elements in here that link back to the IRA work and Miss Yaremko did speak to that as she was speaking to her motion so I'm comfortable that this does fit under the umbrella of the IRA Grant.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:38:59] Rebecca, good? All right. Okay. Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:39:05] Yeah, thank you. Would it be possible to see the top of this motion just so that I don't ask? Okay. And that was the piece. I just wanted to look at the membership make-up. I don't think we need to talk about who or any of that today but I just wanted to double check that. So thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:39:24] Very good. Okay. All right, not seeing other hands I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:39:33] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:39:33] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Very good. Okay, Kelly I think we're doing pretty good here aren't we?

**Kelly Ames** [00:39:46] I think you're doing a great job. You've made appointments to the GMT, the SSC, the STT, as well as several appointments to the term limited advisory bodies for 2025-2027. We'll be reaching out to those folks to welcome them to our process. I will also update our Council Operating Procedures with the final advisory body compositions as you adopted here today. Additionally, you created 2 new ad hoc committees to deal with the proposed rule, potential proposed rule on the National Standard Guidelines, as well as the HMS Roadmap Fisheries Innovation Workgroup. So staff will start thinking about the coordination of those committees as appropriate and begin the work as you have envisioned.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:40:35] Thank you Kelly. Well certainly we're in great shape for the next triennium, right? I just made that up. All right.



## 6. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] That takes care of reports. I don't think there's any public comment. All right. Almost there. All right with that we'll turn to Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:00:14] Thank you Mr. Chairman. You have heard from all of your advisers and the State of California and the Tribal Representative regarding several matters. I did pose a few questions for you, maybe to get discussion started. One is... would appreciate your feedback on the April schedule as it is quite short and your comfort with that. My inclination at the moment is to hold it for four and a half days rather than the four we have now, just to make sure we have some iteration time with the salmon groups. There was also an exchange that some of you seemed interested in regarding the CPS Science Needs and Priorities item that's in April and what to do there. I was told after I said that we weren't sure if we could get to the Cordell Bank Conservation Area in March, I was told that that we should go ahead and unshade that, I was told by my helpful staff. So that looks more certain that we can get that done. So that's a little change from the last time. And let's see, maybe I'll just pause there and see if that triggers any thoughts for discussion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:24] All right. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:01:28] Thanks Chair. I actually just wanted to loop back around to I think one of the very first things we talked about under this agenda item, which was the helpful document that Director Burden provided on staff workload. And I just wanted to highlight that the staff is working on average 120% and recognize the staff and thank the staff for that. And also just say, at least it's my opinion that I, it is not an ongoing expectation of mine that staff should be working more than 100%. So again, just wanted to, I appreciate the report, I appreciate the really hard work of the staff and as we move forward happy to move towards an alignment where staff are working closer to 100%.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:17] Thank you Corey. Anyone else? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:02:22] So I'm not sure how we're going about this or just shotgun it, or are we.....March? When IPHC forced us to take over the directed commercial halibut fishery we said we would let that fishery happen for 2 or 3 years to kind of see how it played out, get our feet under us, and then we would re-examine it and look at how we can maybe make that fishery better. The GAP has requested that in both a halibut agenda item and the workload planning, I know we don't have Council staff capacity and I don't think we have NMFS staff capacity to do anything right away, but I don't want to lose that. I don't think changes to the directed commercial fishery could happen as part of our regular 2- meeting Catch Sharing Plan process. I don't know when we need to, we would want to put it on there, I just don't want to lose this because it is a commitment we made to that sector when we took this fishery over and we're getting repeated requests for better economic utilization, safety, et cetera. You know, maybe we put it tentatively commercial halibut fishery planning on June and then we can talk about it, see where we are with staffing in June and plan out. This isn't going to be an easy 2-meeting process. I know folks would like something in place for 2025. I don't think that's going to happen but this.....I just don't want this falling off of our radar. The second thing, I'm not a salmon person but given, having been around this process

for more years than I'd like to say at this point, four days in the April salmon meeting scares me. Even when we're at five and a half days they are often scrambling the last day where we're taking salmon up in between memberships and between workload planning. I will defer to salmon people but that one does scare me. I don't have ideas on what to place in there. We did have the commitment to not have groundfish items. That doesn't mean groundfish doesn't have to pay attention to a few things, just hopefully it's a couple of things they can do in an afternoon. So those are my just some additional thoughts as we think about moving forward.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:44] Thank you Lynn. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:04:44] Yeah, thank you. And thank you for the remarks Miss Mattes. Just in regards to your halibut observation, we won't forget either. There's an effort that...I believe there's a plan to talk with Josh Lindsay and his branch and organize our thinking a bit over the winter regards to our capacity and outlook together, so what can we do on halibut together because it is a unique beast and I believe would be prepared to bring more information about that capacity and that outlook in March. And so that would be I would envision a collective capacity of NMFS and the Council staff. And so that might then inform any further discussion you would want to have about more of a commercial fishery change topic, when we could do that, what it might look like. So that's what we can offer you for March, but in terms of scheduling something now I don't think we're prepared to really do that.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:05:48] Thank you Director Burden. And when it does come time, I did a bunch of analysis on this for ODFW. I remember we were in Sacramento, I can't remember what year, but be willing to help by providing what we started a number of years ago when it gets that time.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:05] Thank you Lynn. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:06:10] Yeah, I was going to.....can we not do this in a scattershot approach, please? I thought Merrick was going to ask us about April first. I think Lynn brought up some really good points there. But on the salmon, on your salmon question Lynn, I think Merrick, I think your suggestion was.....would be in line with what WDFW.....Kyle can jump in on chat and correct me if I'm wrong, but I think you're holding that open, that half day open for in case they aren't able to reach agreement would be what we suggest as an agency. And I think you also mentioned the CPS item on April, which I will hold off on until I see if there's any, anyone else have anything on the salmon?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:03] Okay. All right. No hands up. Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:07:11] Thanks and Kyle does say....said I kind of got it right on the salmon. So the.....but you could check with him if you need more clarification but he's off RingCentral. On CPS, I think in seeing the CPSAS and the management teams reports I think they both have really good ideas, but this is what's tended to happen, and I think Mike O said it's been similar things that have been going on for 7 or 8 years, it's been longer than that, but they have ideas on what our priorities should be but this was, you know, they started another rebuilding analysis. They come up on meeting planning. The Council had no chance to really ask the questions of the SSC on this or on the...or the Southwest Fisheries Science Center, so we've been for at least 7 or 8 years looking

for a place on the agenda where we could have those discussions. And I think instead of calling it Science Needs and Priorities, stealing the I think the names from the management team would be more about Science and Management Priorities for CPS. And I have no doubt that what the management team and advisory subpanel are saying about their priorities will come up again in April and if Council staff has some capacity to do some scoping white papers, I think that would be fruitful. Yeah, so just some thoughts there on let's try to build that place on the agenda where we've been hoping for for a long time and keep being told to be patient because everyone's busy. So those are my thoughts on just, you know, having it as a CPS, you know, management and science priority discussion. And yeah, I'm suspecting what those advisors put in their report will be what rises to the top.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:15] Thank you Corey. All right. David, and then Corey.

**David Sones** [00:09:19] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I've just been trying to get a hold of the Northwest Indian Fish Commission and see, you know, I've been through the salmon meetings also and I've been in the back rooms and I know how long and hard they work at that, and they are trying to meet even that five-day schedule, but it sounds to me like they would really like to see extra.....another day in order to work through their salmon issues in April is the response I've gotten back from them.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:48] Okay, thank you David. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:09:52] Thanks Chair. I was actually just going to respond to what the other Corey was talking about. I agree with what he just said. I just wanted to endorse that and also note that I would be looking to the AS Report for some structure on how to move forward with that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:15] Thank you Corey. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:10:16] Yeah, just to weigh-in on the salmon discussion from the California perspective, I think we'd support the comments noted by the STT and the SAS and that compressing things into four days seems pretty tight. I'd also think back over recent years and often times South of Falcon we get done pretty quickly and we're sitting around waiting, for lack of a better term, but I don't know that that's going to be the case into the future. I wouldn't bet on it. And I also recall last cycle getting a very late data input for South of Falcon that did cause us to need to re-huddle and think about where to make some additional adjustments. So I think I support the longer timeline. I don't know if four and a half or five days is.....I can't weigh-in on what the right amount of extra time is, but four seems pretty, pretty ambitious. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:27] Thanks Marci. Karrie.

**Karrie Jefferies** [00:11:35] Thank you Mr. Chair. If we're ready to move on from salmon, I don't want to jump on anything, but I have a scheduling request for the March meeting?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:42] Please.

**Karrie Jefferies** [00:11:45] Yeah, I would just request the report, if we can move it to Thursday in the afternoon to align with the Admiral's schedule so he can attend. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:57] Very good. Thank you. We're kind of running out of Council members here so Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:12:12] Thank you. I'm actually going to invite any thoughts that Miss Ames might have. I'm trying to wrap my head around, still trying to wrap my head around what the CPS science needs and priorities item would be and I appreciate the several comments that you've had here on the floor. And my mind is seeing a couple of different visions. One is a pretty broad take a step back and look at CPS. I believe that's kind of in alignment with what Mr. Niles was getting at. And Miss Ridings referenced the AS Report, and that was a more tailored look at, you know, managing all of the catch within U.S. waters, that was what I really took out of their report. And I don't know that they're different questions but there's a sequence and so I'd appreciate maybe some thinking there or I guess I'm looking at Kelly too just to see if she has some further clarity than I have about what this item might be and what we might be trying to bring you in the spring.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:13] Kelly.

**Kelly Ames** [00:13:15] Thanks Director Burden. I don't, but I did wonder if Miss Bernaus had anything to offer. I know she's been working closely with Jessi, participated in the MT and the AS discussions this week, might have some greater clarity to offer.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:32] Katrina.

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:13:45] Thank you Mr. Chair, and thank you Mr. Niles and Miss Ridings for both your comments on this item. Being in the rooms with the AS and the MT and reading their statements, it seems like they are on the same page of prioritizing sardine management as the first step of a CPS science management, science and management priorities item, which it seems like there may also be support to aptly name this agenda item that's coming up in April. I will also say that going forward with a more focused agenda item for April does not necessarily mean that other future agenda items that take a holistic approach will not come down the line and the management team and advisory subpanel definitely consider that as well, and that there was other almost sub-priorities that may fit under a larger sardine-focused item. And that potentially I believe it was in the management team report, they mentioned that similar to the stock assessment prioritization process that we went through earlier today under J.3 as science and management priorities could be re-evaluated for CPS on a regular basis to address the holistic approach. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:09] Okay. Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:15:09] Yeah, thank you for that. And thanks Merrick. Yeah, we've again been asking for this for at least 10 years I'm going to say. And the issue was we understand what the AS and the management team we're saying, but there was no chance to talk to the Science Centers. No chance to talk to the SSC. And Merrick those aren't different things, what you're saying, they're one and the same. And as I've said, if you do it the bigger-picture way, they're not going to change their minds. By the time they get to April they're going to, not likely, so they're going to still bring

forward their ideas and their statement. But there's also going to.....we had, I can't forget.....I forget which discussions happened where and which happened in the hallway, but where also the Science Centers are working on Emsy. They're thinking about the update assessments, this, that, and that, and so I think you can do what Katrina is saying while also leaving it open for other ideas, like an example that's probably lower priority that came up today was maybe managing mackerel like with a framework like we use for central population of anchovy. So they're not mutually exclusive. I think you can do both. And seeing the tealeaves or reading the tea leaves you, like Katrina's saying, you can get started on that one idea because, you know, 99% chance they're going to say it again in April.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:37] Thank you Corey. Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:16:39] Okay, that's helpful. Thank you Mr. Niles. And with that description I guess I'm still picturing a discussion paper written by, at this point likely Katrina, and then per usual we interact with other agency staff. So I'm sure I'll call you and we'll call folks at the region and the Science Centers in helping to create that paper, the content of which I think we can think of the coastwide management issue as one topic within a series of topics, and the paper would then be asking the question of how to prioritize and how to move forward. That's what I'm organizing my thoughts around right now.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:22] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:17:22] Thanks Chair. Appreciating this conversation, just in my mind, you know, we have been struggling with this for a long time, that is clear. And, you know, I know we have as we spent time this morning, there are some outstanding sort of science topics that are ongoing and I just want to make sure that we're not getting sort of totally just continuing that dialogue. So in my mind, this was something where we would get a white paper that would sort of discuss the state of the science but focuses on some potential management solutions moving forward for sardine for the purpose of managing fish that are in U.S. waters. So I don't know if that's, other Corey, more narrow than you had in mind, but that is what was in my mind.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:13] Other Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:18:15] We're just going to keep talking to each other until everyone goes home. But the....that's what I heard Merrick say. The difference in my mind would be it's going to be on the SSC's agenda. The Southwest Center will be asked to comment on their workload directly and we hear pieces of it here and there in the region as well so yeah, and there's just a lot more going on than managing. So those two differences I'll leave there, like the SSC will be on their agenda and the Southwest Center will come and tell us, you know, what their staff capacity is and things like that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:55] Okay, thanks Corey. All right, how are we doing?

**Merrick Burden** [00:18:59] Well I think we're doing fine. What I'm concluding is that we will not plan for a.....I see a hand over here, but I'll just try to synthesize where I think we're at now. So April we'll hold that fifth day, and I doubt we can fill it up, but figuring of a half day we've got

the hotel for the full day and so we'll do that. Let's see, we also have I think some good clarity on the CPS matter that we just discussed, so I appreciate that dialogue, that would be in April. And then in March, I haven't made note to change anything in March other than the request to try to shift the, what was that? Enforcement. Yes, the Admirals Coast Guard Report, yes. I knew it came from over here somewhere.....(laughter).... Okay, so yeah I've made note of that in March. And so that's where I think we are now. And then obviously we would not forget about halibut as I indicated before, but we'll come back with another assessment of capacity in March. So that's where I think we are at the moment, but I did notice that Miss Mattes had her hand up.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:20:10] Yeah, and this doesn't actually have to do with Council agenda. I just want to bring back that the GAP, or not the GAP, the GMT requested an over winter meeting likely in January at the Council office to get a jump on 2025. That's pretty standard for the GMT, but I just wanted to make sure we as a group acknowledged or approved that if we need to.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:32] Thank you Lynn. Corey. Oop....

**Corey Ridings** [00:20:33] Thanks Chair. Just two little nuggets here. Looping back to the very beginning of the meeting, which seems like a year ago, but we heard in open public comment about the TNC Workshop Report and noting, looking at this that the EAS and EWG will be meeting in March, which is our next meeting, just to flag that we can hopefully give them the opportunity on their agenda to review that workshop report and provide some thoughts about how that fits into existing Council work. The second nugget is just the request of the EEJC to hold an online meeting in early 2025. So just flagging that and hoping to see that move forward.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:23] Thank you Corey. Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:21:27] Yeah, thank you. I support what everyone's said so far regarding the March and April agenda, but I did want to at least respond to the Tribal Report briefly. Just acknowledge that and note that I do think a number of the information that was requested we have provided under F.4 at this meeting or will be part of the upcoming process as we lead to March. The STT Report that was submitted at this meeting notified, through that now the Council has notified the West Coast Region about corrections in the status of the stock. Preseason Report 3 on the 2024 fishing regulation reports, the exploitation rates on Grays Harbor Chinook in Table 12 from 2019 to 2021 and it will update for 2022 in the March one. And information on the distribution of mortality for those same years is available in the reports of the Chinook Technical Committee of the Pacific Salmon Commission, and we can help provide all this as well. And then the STT will report in March as to whether overfishing is occurring on the Grays Harbor Chinook stock. So at this time, preliminary information indicates the STT will report in March that it is not subject to overfishing. But if that's not the case, we'll work with the Council, PSC, and the affected managers to take action here. So I hope that's responsive. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:01] Okay. Thank you Ryan. David.

**David Sones** [00:23:03] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you for that. The tribes were hoping we could get a response from NMFS and they are really concerned that this information get through

the process and that we going forward that we're confident that we won't, using the correct numbers, that we won't be in an overfishing situation in the future. So thank you for that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:27] Okay. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:23:27] Thank you Mr. Chair. I apologize. I probably should have asked this much earlier in the discussion. I'm looking at the March draft agenda and regarding groundfish Item 8, the Workload and New Management Measures Prioritization, I just want to double check and confirm that Council staff have discussed this item and are certain that we have a need to discuss and prioritize? I know we haven't done it in some time but I just want to make sure that we think there's enough material and that we'll be using our time wisely on that one. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:12] Kelly.

**Kelly Ames** [00:24:13] Through the Chair, thanks Miss Yaremko. Yes, we we have discussed the need for that item. There's a couple of things in our minds. One is we are coming close to finishing the priorities that were set the last round so even having an idea of what the next round of priorities are so we can get a sense of how those might be sequenced. Additionally, there's some consideration to think about measures that might be coming up in the specifications process and any front loading work there that could be done. And lastly, we also have the Trawl Catch Share Program Review, but we haven't really talked about in the event there are follow-on items how those might be prioritized relative to the other groundfish measures. So long story short, we do think there's a fair amount at least to get some preliminary guidance from the Council about the items on your mind once the last priorities are wrapped up mid-year.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:17] Thank you Marci. Thank you Kelly. All right. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:25:21] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just more on a personal note, just to let you know in March I have a family conflict and my seatmate, Virgil Moore, will be doing the March meeting.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:37] All right. Good to see him. All right, Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:25:43] Merrick go ahead if you had something. Sorry to just catch this now, but good news on the Cordell Bank one, and I'm probably missing something, I don't know. And thanks to you and Kelly and probably Kelly in particular for I don't know how you keep track of all this stuff and do so, but I was on the Cordell Banks. I was, you know, I don't know if.....I did ask for it in guidance I believe, but was really hoping the Habitat Committee could help us interpret those two models we have of that area. I don't see them on the agenda for March.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:23] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:26:25] Yeah, thank you. We have started, and I appreciate the question Mr. Niles, there are a lot of moving parts in our process. We have started asking committees to frequently meet ahead of time and so you'll see in advance there's a Habitat Committee scheduled there. And so I think what we were thinking mostly at that time we put that there was the interaction

with the committees and the SSC over research and data needs, but I think perhaps it makes sense to add your question to that meeting.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:57] Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:26:57] Okay thanks. I overlooked that box in the advanced part. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:04] All right. Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:09] Well I sense that we are winding down and so I did just want to mention one more thing here. There is the topic of the stock assessment review project. And you heard the SSC comment on that and they had some concerns. Personally I am compelled by their arguments to make sure that we slow down and we do this right and we do it on a timeline that is logical and doesn't disrupt our stock assessment process. I was also....I found their suggestion that our contractor participate in some of that stock assessment review process themselves. I found that to be a very good idea. So unless any of you object, I would intend to move forward that way with the project. And so we'd slow down a bit and that's what I have in mind, but in the interest of transparency I'm just mentioning that and if you do have feedback I'd appreciate it, but I don't know that I need any necessarily.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:28:09] All right. Okay.

**Merrick Burden** [00:28:16] Yeah, and Mr. Chairman I'm looking at Kelly's way, and unless there's any additional feedback I think we are looking good here on our schedule and I think we've gotten some good input from you all and I think we can dispense with this agenda item, but I'll look at Kelly just to verify and I have a thumbs up so I appreciate all your input into that schedule.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:28:38] All right, very good. Good work everyone. I just wanted to let everybody know that my intent to put Butch on the Legislative Committee for the March meeting so let folks know that last meeting is Chair's prerogative so. Meant to do that actually at the last meeting but skipped that so anyway but I wish he was here when I did that but he snuck off on me. So anyway so we're done with this agenda item which means we're done with this meeting except for one thing. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:29:16] Mr. Chairman, I move we adjourn.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:20] Very good. Looking for a second. Seconded by Corey Ridings. All right. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:29:29] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:29] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Great work everyone. It's been a long, long meeting.



## **D. Cross Fishery Management Plan**

### **1. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) 2024 Accomplishments and 2025 Priorities**

No transcription for this agenda item.

## 2. Marine Planning

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes our public testimony and takes us into Council discussion and action. Consider the marine planning issues. Provide any guidance as appropriate. Who wants to start? Any guidance? Any discussion? Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:28] Thank you. I guess I can start by offering that I heard from a lot of the advisory bodies that there's a desire to have some kind of clearing house of all the research projects that are going on. Maybe a question to NOAA on this one about, or in the Council actually like, what is the capacity for between the two entities to do something like that? And is there another entity where that is better placed or? I do agree with them that this is useful even if the shape of the desire for wind energy changes with the upcoming administration, but having some research about the impacts of industrialized ocean use seems to be high on everybody's priority list. So a capacity question.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:21] I'll look for anyone who wants to respond. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:01:27] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I appreciate the question and it does seem like a worthwhile exercise. I don't, right now I don't know what that would entail and as we get toward the end of the week I'll be showing you some information, showing our staff capacity and we are quite loaded up at the moment, so I think we are in the place of, you know, maybe there's something we could do if we can use the MPC or work with NOAA, but it seems like a stretch. So I don't know, maybe Ryan has more to offer, but I think where we're in is a question of where are your priorities? And then we can talk about what we want to do.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:12] Ryan Wulff.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:02:14] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thanks Miss Szumylo. We also struggle with capacity a little bit as well so I'll recognize those comments. But this is something we're interested in too. We have been having discussions with our state partners already a little bit, as well as Pacific States and folks at the commission there too, so we haven't got really past the exploring option stage at this point, but something we've been interested in.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:42] Thank you. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:02:46] Certainly I recognize the importance and utility of some sort of a clearing house, but the recognition of capacity, you know, it's more than just posting things. You've got to have some sort of a searchable structure. There's a lot involved in creating a a data repositior.....or even a report repository so I'm very mindful of the capacity discussion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:14] Thank you. Dr. Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:03:17] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I believe the MPC's proposed cumulative impact framework, or the proposed outline that we've been shown, it doesn't do all of that but it certainly goes a ways in looking at cataloging research and data gaps, and I believe they and asked

for some input on their outline and it looks good if this is something that the MPC can handle with the resources they have at hand. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:43] Thank you. John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:03:46] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. And a separate topic that the MPC noted in their report and their presentation is the potential need for Quick Response Letters on the draft PEIS's for both aquaculture and California offshore wind and I support their leadership in that for us. They've done a great job in the past and I certainly think they should be given the green light to do that again here.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:18] Thank you. On that matter, let me look around and see, is there agreement that's in the future? I think we were talking about March or something like that deadlines, but before our next meeting does Council agree that we should task them should the opportunity arise with those and we would see it through QR? I'm seeing agreement around the table so we'll let that move forward. Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:04:46] Thank you. Yes, and in addition to that I think what the MPC laid out in Report 2 and request to come back in March too with looking at the science, the strategic science plan and aligning that with the framework that they've been building and working on makes a lot of good sense to me too. And I didn't have any specific recommendations for how they have it laid out. I think there's a lot of thought and I'm not seeing anything missing at this point. So my thinking is just giving them the green light to also work on that and come back in March.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:26] All right, thank you. I'm going to look around the table again and see if there's agreement with that approach that we would hear back in March from the MPC on that? That looks good. Other comments? Discussion? Tasks? Dr. Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:05:48] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Can I just ask Kerry, do you know how long is that DPEIS on offshore wind? I mean is it something we could browse between now and Monday?

**Kerry Griffin** [00:06:01] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, Dr. Lent. I haven't looked at it but I'm not sure exactly where you're going with that. I guess could you like restate the question? Are you wondering if it's something that we could get another report on later in the meeting or. I see. I couldn't commit to that. You know, we could probably provide at least some sort of general summary and we have BOEM staff who is probably willing to help us get that. But what I can also say is that the 90-day comment period associated with this PEIS is longer than they normally provide and we oftentimes ask for an extension because a 30 or 45 or a 60-day is often difficult, so we've been anticipating this and we were pretty pleased to see the 90-day comment period, which I feel would give us an adequate opportunity to address it. But back to your question, I suppose we could provide at least a high level summary of the, of what's in the DEIS in a few days but couldn't do a deep dive.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:20] All right, thank you. Any other questions? Comments? Discussion? I'm not seeing any. Kerry, how about a summary?

**Kerry Griffin** [00:07:37] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think you have completed your business under this agenda item. You've given the green light for the MPC and the HC to work on a QR Letter, comment letters on both the BOEM PEIS and the anticipated NOAA Aquaculture Opportunity Area PEIS. You suggested that they should go ahead and continue working on that cumulative impacts framework and come back in March with them as described by Miss Watson today. They can do that, they're planning on it. And I think, yeah, I think those are the main bits of Council guidance that I heard today.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:28] All right, thank you. I'll look around make sure that's clear with everyone. I'm not seeing any hands. I think we will close out that agenda item.

### 3. Research and Data Needs

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Okay, that concludes public comment, takes us to Council action. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:06] Go ahead.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:14] I just.....

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:15] Okay I'm just, you just.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:17] Yeah, the Council action is different than we have in our, in the summary here so anyway.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:20] And I thought we were in the discussion place.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:22] We are.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:23] Okay, just making sure I hadn't missed a step or two.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:28] No. You're good.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:29] It's day 3 but it feels like day 12. Some of the discussion we're having, we're going to be having and the questions and all that may sound critical of what Council staff has provided us, and please don't take any of that discussion as criticism of what has been done. I and I think others appreciate Council staff trying to come up with something better and more useful for everybody in this process as far as this research and data needs. And I say this having some extra insight having been helping behind the scenes develop the database, helping with the contractor and the nuts and bolts on it. The database is an improvement over the 350 some item list that covers 80 some 90 some pages of text if you print it single spaced, et cetera, but the database still needs improvement. It's still not as useful as it could be. So I appreciate the look at this and try to come up with a better way. I think the SSC has some good points and some things needing to be broken out a little bit more. The Habitat Committee brought up some good points with there needed to be some habitat considerations. So I think we're moving in the right direction in making this more useful. Another piece that has come up as part of this discussion is, what I've heard is the sharing of information. Who all gets this? Who all has this? Do universities have it? Do agencies have it? Do agencies communicate with each other? Maybe not everybody knows that there is something called the Groundfish Technical Committee. It used to be called the Technical Subcommittee of the Groundfish Committee. It is a joint working group of people from Alaska Fish and Game, Canadian DFO, the 3 West Coast state groundfish or marine adjacent states, NMFS, and all of the universities. That group gets together at least once a year to talk about everything groundfish related, which doesn't help CPS, it doesn't help HMS, it doesn't help salmon. But that is, that group is intended to be the West Coast or the Eastern North Pacific think tank on groundfish. I personally don't know if they have access to this database. I will be talking with our person on that group when back in the office, when she's back in the office on Monday. But I think

that might be a venue at least on the groundfish side to make sure there's, okay here's the stuff we know that is going on and moving forward. But again, I appreciate Council staff trying to come up with a way to make this more useful and not so overwhelming. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:26] Thank you Lynn. Anyone else? Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:03:32] I agree with Lynn. I like the kind of the structure you have created in terms of thinking in terms of top challenge and then related topics I think is a good way to kind of start that process of synthesis. I found great recommendations in all of the reports and so, you know, maybe a little further syntheses of what we heard back from our advisory bodies might be worthy. But I like kind of the structure that you have laid out, recognizing those are examples, you know, I know each one of those challenges is going to have a fairly long list of topics probably underneath it, but to me that made sense and kind of that step down process.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:31] Thank you Sharon. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:04:32] Thank you. And thanks to all the advisory bodies for the reports. I thought they were very helpful in articulating the greatest concerns for them. I think some, yeah some of the advisory bodies went certainly into a lot more detail than others. But what kept coming to mind as they were reading the reports was the discussion that we had quickly under Agenda Item C.1 when we were talking about the stock assessment review RFI that the Council will embark on later on. I think this is a good area to look back to, to think about areas of concern across the advisory bodies and might be a way to tee up their involvement in developing the research that comes out of that RFI later. I really loved the GAP's idea about sharing the research priorities with the universities. I know back in my time in NOAA there are a couple of graduate programs too that actively seek out projects from actual entities to see, you know, how they can contribute really actively to the real body of management that's out there. And so I really like more targeted engagement in that way I think would be really wonderful. And I do echo that we saw a lot of, yeah like the Scripts students that have come and commented throughout the meeting and then also the grad students have been around through the week. It's been really lovely to see them engage that way and it might be a really good way to drag people into this very lengthy process in the future. And then, yeah, I just wanted to emphasize the clear calls that I heard for adding habitat in some way. Social science and economics is big areas. And then I heard a lot of, yeah I really want to sit in this space of discussion about on-the-water experience and adding that into the process more effectively as well. And I liked Sharon's ask for like, yeah maybe not just, yeah deciding on the top priority areas right now but having some synthesis of what we heard out of the reports into a new, a new form or structure later that incorporates some of the concerns that they raised. So I'll stop there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:48] Thank you Aja. Anyone else? Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:06:59] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a brief comment in response to Miss Mattes's, I guess, expressed concern that Council staff might take some of this personally. And just rest assured we're not. I think the way this is unfolding is exactly how I was hoping it would unfold. Sometimes you have to float a trial balloon with some structure and get people to respond to it. Those people are the excellent folks on our advisory bodies, the excellent folks in

public, and they're really helping us flesh this out and make it a nice vision. So it's going exactly the way I wanted it to go. So but appreciate your concern.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:40] Okay. Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:07:43] Thank you Executive Director Burden. I'm not seeing any other hands jumping to go up, so I'm going to float a balloon with a draft motion that I'm sure some holes may get poked into, but at least it can continue the discussion if we're at that point. I'm not intending to cut anybody off but I didn't see any other hands popping up.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:01] We like motions.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:08:12] All righty. I move the Council adopt the below list as the top science and management challenges not in priority order with a description of each challenge as specified in the SSC Report. Data Collection. Stock Assessment Methodologies. Life History and Stock Structure. Evaluating Fishery Impacts. Ecosystem Dynamics. Harvest Policy. Economics and Social Science. Habitat Science and Spatial Management. The proposed framework should encourage engagement between the Scientific and Statistical Committee and the other advisory bodies when identifying and prioritizing research and data needs. Additionally, active monitoring and updating of the status, example, active, completed, no action, of the research projects and the overall database is required and should be undertaken more frequently than the Council's 5-year review cycle.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:14] Okay, thank you Lynn. Is the language on the screen accurate?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:09:16] It is. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:18] Okay, looking for a second? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Thank you Corey. All right, speak to your motion Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:09:26] Thank you Chair. I did use the SSC recommendations, their report as the basis for this motion. One main place you'll notice a difference is not having economics and social sciences broken out as two separate items. Those seem to be very much in line together and we tend to often talk about socioeconomics so I thought those would work better together. The SSC list seems to incorporate a lot of the input, a lot of the big picture items that the other advisory bodies mentioned specifically adding the habitat piece that our Habitat Committee had mentioned. I did not put all of the description. I'm referencing what's in the SSC Report so that I didn't have to basically reread the SSC Report, but the descriptions of each challenge, the more details can be found in their report. The two sentences at the end are just kind of cleanup and how we move forward. Encourage early engagement between the SSC and our advisory bodies. I know sometimes their scheduling doesn't always work that way with the SSC meeting before a lot of our advisory, other advisory bodies get here. And then updating of the database, and I will freely admit I'm complacent in that as I transitioned off the GMT and Mr. Devore retired I think some of the database didn't get updated. Even though it's not technically my role anymore I will try to help work with Marlene or whoever and help with updating that. So it's just trying to get the process

updated better. So hopefully that will allow some additional discussion as we go forward. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:20] Thanks Lynn. Questions for the motion maker initially? Marc Gorelnik first. Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:11:30] Just a quick question in the last paragraph. It reads, "Additionally, active monitoring and updating of the status", and there's a parenthetical, (of the research progress). Should that be 'projects' or did you mean 'progress'?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:11:51] Thank you Mr. Gorelnik. It's intended to mean progress on projects. So I thought just process, or progress would cover that without having to have two words that sounded very, very similar. If they need to be, if it needs to be in there I would gladly accept a friendly amendment.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:13] Thanks Marc. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:12:19] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And Lynn you heard me question data collection, just generic data collection. That's the one element that I certainly can.....all of the other challenges I easily visualize topics and are then the research and data needs. But data collection without any qualifier or.....and that's why I had asked about was this about more structure of data collection or actual data collection? I'm having difficulty with that as a stand alone challenge. And just wondering what your thoughts were about that?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:05] Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:13:05] Thank you Chair Pettinger and Miss Kiefer. We can't do any of our jobs without data. There has been challenges recently with funding and the NOAA white ships needing to be replaced. PacFIN and RecFIN either have flat or decreasing funding for our state sampling programs, our on-the- water programs. I know we at ODFW are struggling to put pennies together to do another nearshore survey. So I think it's trying to use that as an umbrella to maybe help support maintaining or getting additional funding and so that we don't lose the sampling programs we already have. Hopefully that helps some.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:13:58] Mr. Chairman. Yes it does. And that actually to me gets more at the structural aspects of data collection. That is a lot easier for me to make that connection from challenge to topics to needs as opposed to fundamental data which all of those other bullets, you know, will have more specific data needs that leads me more easily to the R&D need, and so when you frame it that way I see that and that makes more sense to me. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:36] Thank you Sharon. All right. Okay so I guess now we'll open discussion on the motion. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:14:50] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Mattes for providing this. I was looking at this and thinking about your combination of economics and social science and wondering if it merited a question or whether an amendment or not, and I think at this point, not. But I did just



want to put out for the record just noting that those, you know, economics is a social science, but there is a difference in these two the way that they're described in the SSC Report and the way you briefly described them. So I would hope as this moves forward that there is a, if this moves forward and this is where we end up at the end of this whole process, that there is just a conscientious effort by Council staff and others in the process when this product is being developed to continue to highlight both of those, and especially the social science aspect, because that is something we are continuing to hear across FMPs that we need more help with.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:53] Thank you Corey. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:15:56] Thank you Mr. Chairman, and thank you Miss Mattes for the proposal. I share a little bit of heartburn because, I know you probably don't think it's a big deal, but the way it's characterized both the economics and the social science is that we're only going to look at the economics of policies aimed at economics and economics and social sciences aimed at communities. In fact, this type of analysis of community impacts, economic impacts, we do it for all of them for NEPA for all policies. So I'll share that heartburn with Miss Ridings for different reasons. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:34] Thank you Rebecca. Okay, Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:16:38] Well, just to chime in a little bit on that. I think it's not minimizing either one to combine them, but really the social science is about understanding the effects on communities, so on fishing communities. So, you know, combining them is not meant to minimize either one, but to just say that they're both looking at the effects on communities. And I don't know if that helps with the heartburn.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:13] Okay. Anyone else? If not I get to call for question for there. Okay that's where we're at. I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:17:26] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:26] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. All right, well done. Thank you Lynn. Okay. Let's see. Okay, any additional discussion before I.....oop, Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:17:49] Thank you Chair. Since I seem to be taking the lead on this one. I don't know how I voluntasked myself with that. Given our schedule, it looks like we're doing a PPA in April. I think I saw that in the presentation, therefore hopefully between now and then there will be time for the SSC and our other advisory bodies to look at these management challenge categories and start to fill in some more of it and come back to us in April with some more of these details on the key topics associated with each challenge. I know, like specifically the CPSMT did a good job of trying to provide us some of those details in this report, but hopefully we can have some more of that from the other advisory bodies when we come back to this topic in April if that, I think that was the plan, so when we have the PPA we can move forward. And this way there's time for our advisory bodies to react to what we've just done.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:56] Thank you Lynn. Anybody else? Okay. Well Marlene how are we doing?

**Marlene Bellman** [00:19:11] Thank you Chair Pettinger. You have provided the challenges to guide this process for the next step. You've also provided some guidance for the SSC and the advisory bodies between now and when we would see this agenda item again. I will note that we will work with other Council staff and our executive team on looking at.....this agenda item will be on the Council floor in April, but we may need to take some time with the advisory bodies in March in order to allow for providing you with something in the advanced briefing book for the April Council meeting as well. So just to note that there will be a lot of work done between now and then and we appreciate having the guidance and what you've provided today. So I think that closes out this topic for what we were hoping to accomplish. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:05] Okay, thank you Marlene. Great work on your part getting us here so okay.

#### 4. Council Operations and Priorities

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Questions for Kelly on her overview? Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:00:06] Thank you Chair, and thank you Miss Ames. No question. I just wanted to offer appreciation for this. We're putting our words into action and I can see it and you know when we said goodbye to the GMT and the GAP yesterday it was weird. And seeing them all go home and I think they were feeling a bit similarly like this feels odd. And I know it's different and so appreciate us doing it though and seeing how it goes and offering support to our management team and advisors while they're listening from home or wherever they're, we know they're still there. And so I just wanted to express my appreciation for that, for doing hard things. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:02] Thank you Heather. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:01:04] Thank you Chair. And in a similar vein to Miss Hall, our advisory bodies have been taking to heart how we've requested they provide reports, especially some of our more lengthy and complicated reports. Just because I sit for them more, the GAP and the GMT have been doing a good job of trying to put their recommendations right up front and center so they're easy to follow and summarizing reports where they can. I know other advisory bodies are doing presentations instead of reading reports, which is saving us some time and some effort. So I just want to applaud them because it's not just us that's doing work. I want to thank them for the work they're doing and trying to help us with our efficiencies because it is a change of thought on how you do things and maybe a little extra work behind the scenes. But I just wanted them acknowledged as well.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:55] Thank you Lynn. Okay. Anyone else? All right. I'm kind of disappointed that September 25' is unshaded actually. Okay. Just to be sure if there's a public comment either? I didn't see anything on there. Okay so make sure. Okay. Kelly, how are we doing on this 2 hour.....(laughter).....

**Kelly Ames** [00:02:26] Well we have implemented some efficiencies. Really, really appreciate all the feedback and comments. It is hard to make these changes to a process that has been structured in the same way for many years so really appreciate the creative thinking and the patience as we learn and adjust and implement these new changes. So I will be coming back to you at a future meeting and letting you know about the shaded items, but for now your work here is done and thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:06] All right. Really great work by everybody. It's amazing what we've done since January. So really cool.

## **E. Habitat Issues**

### **1. Current Habitat Issues**

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] We'll move back into Council discussion on this item and I'll look to see if there's any further discussion. John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:00:08] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. And maybe it's the time of day, but I actually wanted to comment on the undersea wine cellar and just mostly for my esteemed colleagues in Oregon, but I was somewhat surprised to see this. This same company operated illegally in California. They put wine on the sea floor without the necessary permits. The California Coastal Commission cited them, and then it was discovered that they also did not have alcohol permits to sell the wine. They actually pled to a series of misdemeanors to avoid felony charges and they were fined a minimal amount but required to dump 2,000 bottles of wine that had lived on the sea floor in California, as well as pay back an investor \$50,000. So we had some discussions about this and about potential impacts. I'd be happy to talk to Oregon about it offline.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:16] Thank you. Interesting topic. Any other discussion? I'm not seeing any here. I will turn to Kerry. Anything else we need to do there Kerry?

**Kerry Griffin** [00:01:32] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. No, I think that completes your business for this agenda item. There were no specific actions, but I heard a request to look into the invasive mussels and report back in March and yeah, and the habitat.....oh and also as we mentioned in the last agenda item, the HC will work on the two potential, or the 2 QR Letters for the draft EIS's that are coming our way.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:05] All right, thank you. Dr. Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:02:07] Thank you. Thank you Kerry. Can you send us a link to the PEIS? I can't seem to find one. Thank you.

**Kerry Griffin** [00:02:14] I'd be happy to.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:17] All right, thanks. Anything else? Everybody is clear on this agenda item before I close it out? I'm not seeing any hands. We'll close that agenda item. I will pass the gavel back to our Chair.

## **F. Salmon Management**

### **1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report**

No transcription for this agenda item.

## 2. Final Methodology Review Results and Proposed Council Operating Procedure (COP) 15 Updates

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] All right, thank you. I'm sure everyone appreciated a little extra time to think through some of this. I think we're all back in our seats. So as I said before we broke two things before us, adopt the final methodology results for 2025 and then as needed proposed updates to COP 15. So let's take up the methodology review first, have our discussion as needed around that, and at some point we will need a motion for that. So on the methodology review topics I'll look for anybody to initiate discussion on that item. I'm sure everyone remembers what we discussed there. Give you a few minutes here to think about that. Corey Ridings. Thank you.

**Corey Ridings** [00:01:17] Thanks Vice-Chair. I'm not sure I'm going to solve the initial problem here, but I thought maybe I could buy us a little time because I am thinking through some of these things I realized I had a couple of questions for Council staff, so if that's acceptable may I?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:30] Go right ahead.

**Corey Ridings** [00:01:30] Okay, thank you. Angela I think these are for you, but obviously feel free to phone a friend. I don't want to put you on the spot. We heard about the concept of developing Fmsy values for Chinook stocks other than just Sac Fall, and so thinking about what that might look like, do you have any thoughts or recommendations on like what the process would be or how the Council could move forward on that if they wanted to?

**Angela Forristall** [00:02:02] Thank you Miss Ridings. Just to get a little clarification on your question, is that in response to what Miss Bishop had noted about Grays Harbor or just wondering where the other stocks is coming in from?

**Corey Ridings** [00:02:15] No, that was in the SSC statement regarding the Fmsy for Sac Fall and then their recommendation to potentially expand that to other Chinook stocks.

**Angela Forristall** [00:02:27] Thank you. Yeah, appreciate the clarification. So I think the Council action under here would just be adopting this for the stock is that is what went through the methodology review at this time.

**Corey Ridings** [00:02:40] Thanks for that. I guess my follow-up would be noting that this may happen at this meeting, if we wanted to follow-up and do that for other Chinook stocks, what would that process look like?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:51] I'm going to call on Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:02:55] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, and thank you Miss Ridings for that question. I did have a chance to talk with, I can't recall if it was the full SSC or a subcommittee or what have you, but you know some of the background and looking at the Sac Fall objective I think is relevant to your question where, you know, some of the rationale was that I think somebody told me the last time we looked at the objective for Sac Fall was when Thriller

came out, which I find hilarious but also very insightful. But as I had this conversation with several folks it became clear to me that this would be a significant and complex undertaking, especially as we get into the north of Falcon arena. And so at a minimum I think what we'd have to start with if we were looking at north of Falcon first, we would have to have conversations with the Pacific Salmon Commission. We'd have conversations with the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, we'd have conversations among ourselves to try to figure out what is actually possible and is it something that is worth doing? It gets, perhaps in my mind, at least a little bit simpler as we get south of Falcon, but there's a lot that happens in the salmon arena that doesn't take place here and it relies on the states, it relies on the tribes, it relies on a lot of partners, and it would be an undertaking. And so I don't think there's an easy way to answer your question now. If the Council was interested in doing this I think I'd want to talk with, you know, NOAA and the tribes and others and try to get a better sense of what that would take and what it would, what it might gain us so that we would have that clarity, but at the moment I think we're talking about a fairly substantial interagency, maybe even international effort at some level so maybe that's a start to answering your question. And I keep looking over at Miss Bishop to see what her facial expression is as I say these things so.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:04] Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:05:07] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Mr. Executive Director, and thank you Miss Ridings for the question. I agree with Merrick's caution on this. I want to be very respectful of the north of Falcon process and in particular the role of the tribes in that process. I know they have active discussions ongoing with regard to which management objectives get updated. This also has implications for the Pacific Salmon Agreement. There are specified in that agreement certain management objectives for specific stocks. We in fact just revised one of those and it's a relatively complex process, so it doesn't just involve, for example, consideration of Council advisory bodies here. There is a specific process in the Pacific Salmon Commission that has technical scientific review by their technical teams, which is international members both in Canada and in the U.S., among the tribes and various agencies. Miss Evenson can speak to some of that as well. So I would want to be very cautious about moving forward on this and in particular would not do that without conversation and agreement with the tribes and the states that are involved.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:23] Thank you. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:06:25] Thanks very much for that. That was helpful and I think puts out there what that might entail to move forward with something like that. Mr. Vice can I ask a second question? Yeah, this is again sort of a question looking at the MEW. Miss Forristall I think this is for you but again maybe others, I'm curious how many times has the MEW met over the past 5kl years? Also, when was the last time and what was on their agenda? I'm just trying to get a sense of how the MEW has been participating in this process and what they've been bringing to the Council process if you know.

**Angela Forristall** [00:07:07] Thank you Miss Ridings. I will definitely lean on others who have been around for longer than I have on this, but the MEW meets as needed. They're a group that's a stand-in group that doesn't really require a lot of Council financial support to exist. They initially

were meeting to develop models and they will meet typically in the March April time period once a year to provide support as needed. They, I think have provided a lot of benefit when there's needed to be some review of modeling work that occurs. But I think within the last five years, I can't tell you an exact number of times that they meet, but usually a about once a year as needed.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:53] Thank you. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:07:55] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And I'm still a little just kind of a recap, I guess, in my mind. So we did hear alignment between the SSC and STT relative to some new methodology approaches. The SAS certainly articulated they were not in favor of changing Fmsy proxy at this point in time. We certainly had a very detailed report from California about the needs to stand up new methodology, and perhaps Marci you could elaborate a little. It was still a little unclear to me whether the bulk of that was more related to the cohort reconstruction model as presented and versus just applying a new Fmsy ratio, so it was a little unclear to me. Are both of those similarly big lifts on the data or is it really more weighted, your concerns more, or what you lined out more weighted to the cohort reconstruction?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:09] Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:09:12] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Sharon for the question. With regard to the Fmsy proxy, I think we've heard consistently from the STT and the SSC that that element is ready for use in implementation starting now. No additional work is needed. What we're talking about here is reducing the maximum allowable exploitation rate from the Chinook default that we're using right now, which is part of the FMP established I think back in 2011 that we didn't have a specific derivation for Sac Fall so we rely on the the default, which was a composite of roughly 20 stocks at the time. I think the work group's recommendation and their development of this new proxy relying on only a subset of the stocks, two stocks in particular where more recent analyzes were done, makes good sense and is, I think, easy to do from an implementation standpoint. We're talking about using one new reference point, and again this can be incorporated into the annual SAFE documents in the upcoming cycle and essentially requires no work at all other than updating some tables. Looking to the cohort reconstruction, very different situation. I think from what we've heard from the.....well the base work of the cohort reconstruction, Chin et al, reached some pretty significant conclusions. I mean this was a pretty substantial undertaking in and of itself and I think we wanted to highlight the new information that really, you know, was revealed by the analysis, which is very significant. The fact that the SI has had a tendency over this time period to underestimate forecast ocean abundance and also overestimate forecast projected escapement in the absence of fishing each year. So in our mind, I mean those are pretty significant conclusions and certainly advances the state of the science. I think we're all looking for ways to advance the science when it comes to Sac Fall. There are a lot of interest and a lot of concerns we've heard over the years about the precision in our forecasting and achieving our objectives is very important to us. So I think we wanted to take the time in the CDFW Report to describe that in order to achieve the full benefits of the cohort reconstruction, that's going to take time and resources and a commitment from a number of co-managing and monitoring agencies involved in the Central Valley. And so I think there are things that we've learned since the cohort reconstruction was completed that we can begin to use soon, but maybe not immediately. And I think that's what you hear from the STT is, okay because there are a lot of metrics that come out



of this analysis and how you use it in the Sacramento Harvest Model, how you use it with regard to the SI. It's not just a plug in a new number or apply a correction factor or something of that nature, it requires a little bit of, you know, deep thought and I think they're just kind of cautioning us that we're not ready right this second to jump ahead immediately in 2025. Hopefully that helps.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:40] Thank you. Sharon.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:13:43] And if I may follow-up one more question and probably to whomever, but it's probably going to be Marci. So in a way that these two technical elements came kind of as a package, it's very clear that timelines of implementation are very, very different between these two processes in terms of, you know, implementation of a new proxy versus really implementation and full cohort analysis application. I didn't hear any discussion in the reports about pros and cons of disaggregation of the two recommendations in terms of do you still reap a.....you know, will there still be benefits? Are there unforeseen impacts? And we really, I didn't hear much robust discussion about that particular aspect and just curious if there are any thoughts on that?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:54] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:14:56] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I guess I would take a step back and look at the agenda item that we are in, which is the final methods review and the process that we have kind of as outlined in the Situation Summary where proposals for methods review are brought to the Council initially in April, and I think as the SitSum recaps, I don't think any were brought to us in April. But then in September the Sacramento Work Group proposed to us actually three items for consideration and for evaluating at an upcoming methods review meeting that would be held in October if we approved items for review that would then be evaluated and reviewed by the STT and SSC that would make them available, may make them available for use in management beginning with the upcoming new management cycle. So the idea with the way this agenda item is organized is to put those technical reviews of new methods on a different cycle because you can't throw it all in in the preseason process and expect to have a good outcome, so it's kind of a deliberate and measured approach with regard to planning agendas and workload to partition items into the methods review process. And I mean I recall years in the past where we've had like six or more items on the methods review list. This year was a little unusual in that we only....we had three proposals and strangely enough they were all from California. Oftentimes we have items on the list, Kyle can fill in the details here, but a lot of review of FRAM and base periods and documentation, those are kind of the more traditional, I'd say, methods review topics and I think the process has served us well so that we get that technical review work done here in the fall so that we're ready to go when it comes to preseason. So in terms of these two elements I would just note that they are distinctly different. The work products are different and were prepared, in fact by, you know, very different contributors and different scientists that have been hard at work in the background complete.....but I would look at them as being completely independent of one another, I guess is the short answer. Thank you.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:17:43] I appreciate the short answer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:17:48] Thanks. Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:17:50] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And thanks for that explanation Marci of how these two things wound up in methodology review. I'm looking at the SAS statement and their recommendation to delay making a decision on Fmsy until the work group is done with all of their tasks. Just wondering timeline, when will they be done with all their tasks? And is anything likely to come out of that that gives us a much different view of where we should go with Fmsy? And maybe there's not an answer to that now, but just kind of a little insight would be helpful.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:21] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:18:23] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Kyle for the question. I'll give you my thinking, it's only mine. So with regard to the Fmsy proxy and implementation for use in 2025, I believe that we can implement it simply with updating the tables that appear in the SAFE documents. We're looking at one reference point. There are many other reference points that would be needed to update the Harvest Control Rule as well as the conservation objective, and those are key tasks that are on the work groups Terms Of Reference. So we'll be hearing about their progress and their plans in, you know, in an agenda item to follow, but in terms of implementation, I believe that since we have a determination that this revised exploitation rate is best available scientific information available that it's prudent to go ahead and incorporate it for use in management beginning with the next cycle. I think there's more discussion to follow about the timeline of the rest of the elements and reference points and HCRs, the other work on the work groups plate and when that is going to be complete. I'm interested in discussing plans for implementation via an FMP amendment because ultimately that's where all of this lands, hence my question earlier in this agenda item about how we're going to wrap this all up and build it into the FMP, but I don't believe we need to have the FMP amended in order to actually apply the new maximum exploitation rate for use in management beginning in 2025. And I have not heard anything in the discussions or in the advisory body statements that I think give us reason to think that we cannot move ahead incorporating it in 2025. The other thing I'd note is that many have observed that the likelihood of this maximum exploitation rate being a real factor in 2025 fishery planning is pretty unlikely. What we're talking about is a maximum exploitation rate that really only would be required if we were at very high abundance levels, so we'd be at the very far end to the right of our Harvest Control Rule, so you know we're hopeful that we're going to see increased abundance here with the upcoming cycle, but the likelihood of us being at that far right end is not super likely. So in terms of it actually playing or having an influence in shaping 2025 fisheries I'd say is pretty unlikely.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:49] Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:21:51] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. And I would agree that the Fmsy that's been proposed here should not be a limitation on fisheries in the near term, and that's only because the near term is very different than our long term. We have been bumping along at an average abundance of 350,000 fish, Sacramento index not cohort reconstruction, and that has been the constraint, but I think we all hope that the constraints on reproductive success in the watershed can be solved. Maybe that's a fantasy but I think that that's certainly our goal. And then we may return back to the long term era where we were seeing abundances average of a million fish, and at that point at a maximum exploitation rate of 58% you're looking at over 400,000 fish returning to the river. I realize, again, that that is not something we're going to see in the near term, so it's not really an issue in the near term, but I would just like to ensure that if our Sacramento Fall

Chinook ever gets back to its former glory that we can revisit this exploitation rate cap. We do need adequate escapement and I learned today that it's not just for reproductive success, but when we have high exploitation rates we may depress the age of maturity, and so that's something else to throw in the analysis. But I am concerned about locking in this exploitation rate when we're hoping one day to see something greater. So I just want to ensure that while we need to adopt this today I think that we, you know, I certainly hope we'll have the freedom to revise that down the road without going through years of analysis.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:24:17] Thank you. Further discussion? Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:24:27] Mr. Gorelnik a little, little practical usage of that. It was me knowing what I know and being caught in booby traps we can't get out of I would put that in your language just so institutional knowledge doesn't forget about it. You know how long are you planning to be there and five, six years from now Marci's in Tahiti, you're in Bermuda, and half a dozen people have changed and all of a sudden that gets omitted. And so this is a suggestion, if that's really what you foresee, I think somewhere I'd get it to word it in there where you can look at it just from my perspective being in the booby trap, which is not very fun when you can't get out of it. So thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:25:24] Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:25:26] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Butch. That brings up a great question and a great point, and if I could maybe turn to Council staff. I'm recalling that in the materials, I don't know if it was this meeting, perhaps the last meeting, but we've received frequent reminders of our obligations to, or maybe our need, maybe not obligations, but the benefits of frequently reviewing our reference points for all salmon FMP managed stocks, and maybe you can refresh me. Is there a required review timeline anywhere?

**Angela Forristall** [00:26:12] From my understanding there isn't a required review timeline. Thank you for your question Miss Yaremko. I think that's why we're in this situation with this Thriller-aged reference point, but I do want to note that this is, these reference points are based on two....using two stocks, and one of them is the Klamath River Fall Chinook and that, you know, as that stock, that reference point might be getting updated as well so I think adding in language for a review would be prudent.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:26:48] Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:26:51] Other discussion on this one? A reminder we would need a motion to adopt anything. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:27:09] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have a motion I believe. Great, thank you. I move the Council approve the use of the following methodologies. Number 1: The updated Fmsy proxy and Smsy/Smp ratio as shown in F.2, Attachment 2. As recommended by the SSC and STT use the updated Fmsy proxy value of 0.58 for Sacramento Fall Chinook for management beginning in 2025. Number 2: Cohort reconstruction for Sacramento River Fall Chinook salmon in comparison with the Sacramento Index as shown in F.2, Attachment 1, recognizing that full

implementation will take time and coordination as recommended by the STT in F.2.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, use the postseason exploitation rates derived from the cohort reconstruction as available for stock status determinations beginning in 2025. Number 2: As recommended by the SSC in F.2.a, Supplemental SSC Report 1, and STT F.2.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, include harvest information impacts on Sacramento Fall Chinook from north of Falcon fisheries as soon as reasonably possible, which will likely be no earlier than 2026. And as a matter of policy, beginning with the 2025 preseason management process, the Council may apply the components of this new methodology all or in part as appropriate and as they become available.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:29:06] Thank you. As I followed that the language on the screen appears accurate and complete, is that correct?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:29:12] Yes it is.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:29:15] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Please speak to your motion.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:29:26] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Back to the topic of the Fmsy proxy and the ratio that came to us from the work of the Sacramento Work Group using the updated Fmsy proxy value is easy to do beginning now. It is certainly a reduction from the default of .78, which is for all Chinook as we discussed earlier, but I do not expect that the application of the new number in 2025 to have consequence for management. I want to, I think, flag that I know some folks have recommended delay, but would note that we should take the opportunity to periodically review our reference points, and in this case, this particular reference points that is now being derived from only two Chinook stocks, it would make good sense to conduct the next review of this reference point after we receive an updated reference point for Klamath Fall Chinook, which, as Angela mentioned earlier, might be quite soon. So I would suggest that that is a good review time and I'd welcome any amendments to this motion to add that specificity to the motion language as may be warranted. Moving to the cohort reconstruction item, I think we've had a lot of discussion about this being a blueprint for a ship and that a lot would be needed both in the way of raw materials and shipbuilders to actually sail the ship and it's, you know, going to be some time before we realize the full benefits of the cohort reconstruction. But I think, as we've sort of heard here today, we can take this in bite-size pieces and some of those pieces may be ripe for use sooner than others. As the STT has recognized, the postseason exploitation rates derived from the cohort reconstruction might be available for, or should be available for stock status determination beginning in 2025. And as the SSC notes that harvest information from the north of Falcon fisheries should be available to be incorporated as soon as possible, hopefully....unfortunately not likely to be available earlier than 2026, but I think we want to see that those next steps taken thinking about north of Falcon fisheries estimating that, you know, about 4% on average has been harvested in north of Falcon fisheries. I think we are responsible for accounting as best we can for total mortality, so doing so as part of our postseason reviews will be, I think, meaningful and assures that we are making the proper stock status determinations that consider full exploitation from all sources of fishery mortality. I just want to flag that there are other things that came out of that cohort analysis that maybe we didn't spend a lot of airtime on here in the discussion today, but keep in mind that it was actually the Sacramento Work Group that put this topic on the docket for review for methods review because the work really is, I think, foundational to their next steps in

the work group arena to continue to review and provide recommended revisions to our reference points, our conservation objectives, and our Harvest Control Rules. So this really was a foundational piece and I think by adopting the methods review here today we are setting them on track for continuing their work here through the winter and spring. And with that I will take any questions. Thank you Mr. Chair.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:34:29] Thank you. Questions For clarification on the motion? Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:34:33] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Trying to make sure I understand Number 2 of the motion and the step-through of the first two bullets. So the first bullet use the postseason exploitation rates derived from the cohort reconstruction beginning in 2025. Step 2 include harvest information impacts from north of Falcon fisheries as soon as reasonably possible, likely no earlier than 2026. That piece is still a postseason look, so it would be 2026 before you were looking at north of Falcon fisheries postseason?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:35:08] Yes, that's my understanding that the STT didn't see a way to incorporate that into the analysis earlier than 2026.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:35:19] Okay, and I'm obviously interested in the preseason side too so if there's a third step down the road where preseason impacts we're able to look at those, that's a separate step than what you've laid out here. Thank you.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:35:33] Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:35:35] Further questions for clarification? Not.....Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:35:42] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. For Marci, just clarifying that the last bullet on the second piece here, when you refer to the Council that's basically inclusive of say the SAC Work Group? I take that from your last comments that that would allow the SAC Work Group to move forward in using the cohort reconstruction however it was appropriate in its work.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:36:06] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:36:07] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Susan. Yes, absolutely. That is our goal, again that the cohort reconstruction is foundational to the work, to the next steps that the work group will be undertaking here soon. But I also would flag that, you know, there are, I think, when it comes to policy and the Council's role in thinking about management each cycle, beginning with the next cycle, there are things we've learned from this cohort reconstruction that I think inform us if in no other way somewhat subjectively that the SI, we know that, you know, we know some things now about the SI in that it under-forecasts ocean abundance and over-forecasts projected escapement, and so while we may not see that information incorporated into modeling efforts in 2025 like in the SI itself, I think there are things we can learn and think about and apply perhaps, you know, more subjectively as we think about buffers and other applications or considerations when it gets to preseason process. I do think we're better informed all the way around. So that's another reason for this particular sentence to, I think, embrace what we've learned and use it where we can.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:53] Thank you. Any other questions for clarification? John North.

**John North** [00:38:00] Thank you Vice-Chair. I'm just sitting here I'm kind of curious, I'm interested in putting a time period on this, at least the Fmsy piece. I think Marci you mentioned you're open to that. Given that we're narrowing this proxy down to two stocks and one of those stocks is in a state of flux, it would just seem appropriate that if that Klamath value were to be updated that that would trigger a review here. So, you know, I was just thinking like have this in place through 2030 or until the time that a new Klamath, you know, Fmsy is available but I haven't quite formed how to do that yet but.....

**Pete Hassemer** [00:38:59] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:39:01] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think that's an excellent idea. I support that thinking and it was along the lines of the conversation that Marc had. So again, any amendments on the timeline for review are most welcome.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:39:25] All right, let's see if there's any other questions for clarification. Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:39:32] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I apologize, I'll need to circle back a little bit. I may have misunderstood what Mr. Adick's question was for the second sub-bullet there with regard to the application of the postseason or the application of the information in 2026. My understanding is the estimates of exploitation rate currently include north of Falcon impacts, and so as reported postseason would include north of Falcon impacts beginning in 2025 as I understand the motion. If I misunderstood the question or the answer to that may take some STT input, but would like just want to make sure that we are very clear on the outcome of this one. So maybe my first question is whether I misunderstood the answer to Mr. Adicks question.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:40:23] I think it's not a question for the motion maker, but Mr. Adicks was related to that.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:40:31] I don't think you misunderstood my question. I was trying to understand is step 1, is bullet 1 under Number 2, does that not include north of Falcon fisheries in the postseason estimates? So then it is a second step to get to including them in postseason estimates and I was trying to make sure I was understanding preseason versus postseason and when things were being incorporated.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:40:59] Does that clear it up Susan?

**Susan Bishop** [00:41:02] So I think as I understand it from my STT colleague, the current estimates postseason would include north of Falcon impacts. And so as reported in 2025 those would be inclusive of north of Falcon impacts and whether that is consistent with the desired direction. Maybe that's a question for the motion maker.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:41:29] Marci did you get that question?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:41:31] I think if you're asking for some elaboration on the first bullet point, I believe that's correct that the postseason exploitation rate....well remember derived from the cohort reconstruction which is only from those stocks that were previously reconstructed or those brood years previously reconstructed, I believe, I mean we're talking about incorporating fishery mortality from a fishery that occurred in 2024. I think that would help us, help inform us on total mortality, which would be needed for the determination on stock status as of 2024. So if we're talking about the exercise to tally up all the fishery mortality impacts in 2024 for use in stock status determination beginning in 2025, I believe that can be accommodated starting this next cycle. But in terms of incorporating the impacts into, say, the Sacramento Harvest Model, that is a more technical difficult modeling exercise that I think the STT was clear that they're not going to be able to undertake by 2025.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:43:02] Susan.

**Susan Bishop** [00:43:03] Thank you for that distinction, answered my questions. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:43:11] One last look. Questions for clarification? I'm not seeing any. Discussion on the motion? Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:43:20] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I have an amendment. Under Number 1, if you could scroll down so I can see the first.....keep going because my amendment relates to text I can't see on the screen. All right, so on Number 1 at the end where it says, "beginning in 2025", I would add, "through 2028", period. That's it.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:44:12] All right. I'm going to.....well, I won't assume it's accurate and complete. It's a word and a number. What's there is complete?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:44:22] I think so. I could have screwed it up but I think those two word and number are fine.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:44:27] All right. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by John North. Speak to your motion.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:44:34] Thank you very much. I want to emphasize this doesn't mean it's going to change in 2028. It's merely intended to force a check-in to revisit that number after several years. In the meantime we would expect some new data on the Klamath and maybe some more consideration about the relevance of the Rogue River and the Klamath to this. Certainly this doesn't prevent the Council from looking at it sooner if it wants, but it wouldn't be as a consequence of this motion, an amendment, and it could decide in 2028 that it didn't want to make any changes. Again, the purpose here is merely to provide a check-in to determine whether that number should change or not. It's not intended to direct a change in the Fmsy.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:45:36] Thank you. Any questions regarding the motion to amend? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:45:46] Thanks Vice-Chair. Thanks Mr. Gorelnik. Just a little bit, needing some specificity about what you mean by check-in? I certainly get the intent and description which you just gave. I'm curious if you have any thoughts on what that might look like technically or sort of what the Council would need to put on their 2028 agenda to make sure that happens as you're envisioning it?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:46:08] I hear that, well, to the extent that the Klamath River is determined to be a proxy and we're expecting new information from Klamath I've heard soon, I don't know if that's going to be next year in 2025 or 2026, that's why I put 2028 to provide a margin there. And I think that conditions may change. I mean, we don't know what's going to happen in the next 4 years, 3 or 4 years, but I think that's a sufficient amount of time for us to take another look and decide to change it or not. But in the meantime we should receive by then some relevant information to look at and I'm not predetermining how we respond to it.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:47:03] Thank you. Any other questions? Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:47:07] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I would just point out that Marc reading your amendment and listening to your explanation of that in my mind are different. And so when I read the language it has a very clear endpoint in 2028 and that is not what I hear you saying. So I'm curious if you....if there would be a clarification that that would be, you know, basically a check-in by the Council on the continued application of it or review in 2028, something like that?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:47:38] I think, to be fair, I probably used imprecise words. It's not so much a check-in, it's a review. And so in 2028 we will decide, not me because I won't be here, but the Council will decide whether to confirm it, which it may well do, or to change it one direction or the other. Does that answer your question?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:48:03] Susan.

**Susan Bishop** [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Mr. Gorelnik. I'll be a little more straightforward. I would like to see a clarification in that language to be very clear about what your intent is there. So I don't know if, I don't know exactly what the process is, but I think that is, that's my request. Given the fact you said you won't be here and we will be revisiting this in 2028, I want to make sure maybe being one of the people that is still here that I'm very clear about what the intent was.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:00:33] I think that by adopting this number for this time period it imposes a burden on the Council to come back to this so.....and I appreciate, I think that was to the extent, Miss Riding had a comment to that extent. So I suppose, and I'm assuming that if this amendment passes and if this motion passes, then the Council will plan to come back to this in 2028 to again to confirm or to change, which you could do independent of the amendment, but I take Mr. Smith's comments to heart that if we don't put it on the schedule, so to speak, that people won't remember that we, that the Council intended to revisit this.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:40] Follow-up Susan?



**Susan Bishop** [00:01:42] A follow-up. So I am not arguing with that. I think you're making really good points. My concern and my advice I'm getting from my attorneys is that the concern is that it will be read as a sunset without the intent. I'm hearing that you're very clearly expressing about a review in 2028 and sort of forcing the Council to put that on their workload and their agenda. So I am curious if we could entertain a clarification, some addition to that language of with a review in 2028 or something like that. And apologies, I'm sort of unclear on the process in doing that but hoping that that would clarify your intent and the question.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:02:27] If it pleases the Council I will withdraw my amendment and incorporate your language.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:38] You can withdraw the amendment with the agreement of the person who seconded it. John?

**John North** [00:02:46] Yeah, I agree. Thank you. Okay.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:49] the amendment is withdrawn.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:02:50] Okay. So it would, after 2025, "with a review in 2028". And I appreciate your helpful input.

**Susan Bishop** [00:03:03] My apologies with the clumsy nature of it. So thank you for your patience.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:11] Okay, let's make sure in I heard you making an amendment to the motion.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:03:21] That was my intent, but we'll just pause for a second here. So we would be back to the amendment, to the motion unamended.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:36] And can you clearly state what the amendment is so they can capture it on there.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:03:43] Sure. So now, this is the motion as unamended. So add the words, at the end of 2025 add the words, "with a review in 2028". Period.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:10] Okay, give me a second here. So what we see is your amendment is the first sentence at the top there.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:04:24] That is correct. And I apologize after my years on the Council I still can't get an amendment right on the first try.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:32] So that's.....okay, so now I will ask you the question that, in the first line is your intended amendment and in the paragraph underneath is how it would appear in an amendment, amended motion should it be approved. Is that correct and accurate?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:04:59] Yes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:59] Okay, thank you. Is there a second to the motion to amend? Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Speak to it as needed?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:05:10] I don't feel there's any further need to speak to the amendment.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:12] Thank you. Are there any questions on the motion to amend? Robin Ehlke.

**Robin Ehlke** [00:05:23] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm sorry I was squirming in the back row there. Would it be helpful for the Council to describe what kind of review they're speaking of? In my mind, they're speaking of a technical review and not necessarily some go through the whole methodology review. I hate to get down to the nitty gritty, but again more clarity on what the expectation is I think will help us as we move forward. When we look to 2028 I'm guessing you're going to want that in November, likely from the STT based on the information available at that time. So my only comment would be to try to give further detail on when you say 'review', what exactly that means. And in my mind it would be a technical review.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:06:18] Well we.....

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:19] It's a question on the motion.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:06:23] We underwent a process to reach this number, and if we're going to review this number then it seems to me there would be an analogous process. I don't know and I defer to Council staff, but I don't know that we need to tell staff how we undertake a review of that number. I think it's implicit but if there's disagreement.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:55] Thank you. I'm going to ask Executive Director Burden to speak to that.

**Merrick Burden** [00:06:59] Yeah, Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And I think about the type of review as being informed by where we are in 28'. Do we have any new information to speak of? Do we, have conditions changed significantly? That will help us determine what sort of process to propose to you. So if you have thoughts at this time they'd be welcome, but I think we can figure that out when we get to that time.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:24] Okay. Marci Yaremko, and then I want to make sure, Sharon did you have your hand up also? So Marci Yaremko then Sharon Kiefer.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:07:32] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I share the concerns raised by Robin with the clarity on the term 'review', particularly because we are in the methods review agenda item. I think it would almost be implied by the term 'review' in a motion under this agenda item that we'd be talking about a methods review. And I think I'm hearing from this discussion that probably that's not what's intended when we say 'review'. So you just alluded to the fact that you think we can clarify this either in the the record of our actions this week. However that may take

shape or form I think would be important, but it sounds to me like it's something that you're comfortable with and that I think collectively around the table we're not expecting that this would be a full methods review item that's expected to be undertaken in 2028. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:40] Thank you. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:08:42] Thank you Mr. Chairman. So I just would offer a little different perspective. Particularly, I mean a lot of this is predicated on some expectation of getting new information about the Klamath. However, if that information is not forthcoming it's essentially a policy review. We're going to keep doing what we're doing as opposed to some sort of a technical exercise, which is why I'm comfortable with the amendment as is. Staff and the Executive Director have heard this discussion and I think they've taken that to heart. And again, because it's kind of predicated on an unknown action yet to come so I am comfortable with this as written.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:33] Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:09:34] Yeah, just to just emphasize that point, I think the nature of the review is going to depend upon what happens between now and 2028, and so it's difficult for us to articulate exactly the form of that review not knowing what information may be forthcoming, if any. So I think leaving the language as it is allows the Council in 2028 to determine what the appropriate nature of the review.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:02] Okay, thank you. So we've got some, had some discussion on the motion to amend also. Is there any further discussion or questions on the motion to amend? Not seeing any hands for questions or discussion I will call the question on the motion to amend. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:10:24] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:25] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion to amend passes unanimously. That will take us back to the main motion as amended. And wait a minute till we get the main motion on the screen before us again. Okay, and Kris I believe as amended in that Number 1 up there. Okay I think we've got that correct. Kris, can you just scroll down so we can see Number 2? All right, any discussion on the main motion now as amended? Not seeing any discussion I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:12:30] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:32] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci and Marc for that. Now with that we'll take a pause and move to our next one. I think we've completed action on the methodology results, but we'll come back at the end for a final check and see if there's anything else. Let's take up the proposed updates to COP 15 now. Change your mindset a little bit and I'll look for any hands to initiate discussion on this item. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:13:24] I'll just offer a brief comment endorsing the STT Report on this agenda item to add those additional words.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:36] All right, thank you. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:13:40] Thank you Vice-Chair. I'm offering just an observation, a broader observation. The Tribal Report and the SSC Report both asked for some alignment across FMPs in this broader process, but Miss Bishop and others commented, and my observation of the FMP is that we govern with this Council are that they're really, really, really critically diverse. And I think that.....this is just a comment to bear that diversity in mind in walking forward with any changes that come up. It may not be so simple to just roll all the processes up into one and it certainly couldn't happen with any speed if it were to happen. So I just want to offer that observation. I don't know all the complexities but I do know that the FMPs are super different.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:41] Thank you. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:14:44] Thanks Vice-Chair. Just reflecting on what has now been a pretty long agenda item, one theme that I heard come up and has resonated is that around the importance of integrity in scientific review. And transparency and scientific integrity are just so critical for good management as well as interest holder trust and engagement from folks in the entire Council process. I think we hear across agenda items the budget issues that are affecting our governments. And when we have times of low budgets I think we have things like personnel overlap, and that's just a reality we're going to have to live with. I think it's also especially important when we're in times where our fish stocks are at low abundance. You know our work here is to avoid those times, but in those times pressure is high and it is especially important that the Council and interest holders need to have confidence in this process and how this process uses science. These themes are certainly not just salmon. I feel like we've already had this conversation a number of times in the context of groundfish, and again that comes back to a lot about transparency and even communication. I think about things like best practices for scientific review and like those already exist. We certainly....we already do probably most of them. It's certainly not a wheel we have to reinvent, but things like recusals and again, clear process that is well documented come to mind as ways that we can consistently improve our processes and do better. I want to be really clear that this is definitely not a questioning of any of the technical merits or integrity of the science itself or the scientists that are doing this work. It is really about our Council process, how that work is reviewed, and how we use it as a Council. As I've been putting these things together, I guess I can upon those reflections share a few ideas that I had, which is just that I do like the idea of looking at a single COP for methodology reviews across fishery management plans. Just hearing with what Miss Szumylo said, and we've heard from other folks around, you know, our FMPs are really, really different, but I think it would be interesting to explore this concept of looking at a COP across FMPs and then thinking about how TR, the TORs could operationalize those on a FMP basis. Something that also came to mind was the reality of sort of that we do have recusals in the Council process. I witnessed those personally in the SSC room before, and just thinking about maybe a Council-wide recusal policy for all of our technical teams could be something we could explore in terms of helping create a norm across the Council process to help ensure that scientific review integrity. I also wanted to echo what was in the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission Report. Thinking about the MEW, I think it might be helpful to move forward with this or just keeping this on the stove. If there might be some report, ideally a short report we could get from Council staff that could outline what the MEW does, its responsibilities and the overlap that it has with the STT, the SCC, apologies, and the SSC to better understand how those processes are

working, make those processes a little bit more transparent and maybe help down the line the Council make a decision about the structure of those groups. I do not think we should send the COP 15 revisions out for public review yet. My request would be that we have a meeting of the SSC, the STT, and Council staff. We heard from the SSC about the lack of accuracy in the revisions as well as the need for consistency with National Standard 2, which I find really concerning because to me that's at the very core of what we do as a Council is making sure we're consistent with the National Standards so, and that is, I want to be clear also no shade to Council staff for putting that together. I really appreciate the efforts and appreciate the intent of trying to make things more clear and make them transparent. It just seems like we need a little bit more work to get there.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:19:41] Thank you. Marci, did you have your hand up?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:19:44] Yes I did Mr. Vice-Chair. I guess I would start by thanking Council staff for providing us in our advance materials a markup of COP 15. I think the goal with this cleanup of COP 15 was well founded and I agree that updating the COP is needed. Appreciate that as Angela and Robin transition in their duties and as we're studying how our methods review process works for salmon where we need to bring our COP up to date, so I think a good first step was available to us in advance of the meeting. What I kind of took away from what I view as very different reports from the STT and the SSC is that this draft certainly stimulated quite a bit of discussion and sort of very differing perspectives on where we go with it. I guess I am of the mind that COP 15 specific to salmon methods review has served us well for quite some time and that I feel like making these kind of, I'll call them surgical, but updating terminology, providing more specificity as needed I think is a good, a good step forward. And I think as you see with the the edits offered by the STT, clearly there are I think, you know, you can have several different people put eyes on COP 15 and each might find something to pick at and add a little more language here or there, refine some terms. I think there are a number of important perspectives and other contributors to considering edits to this language. I feel like it needs more soak time before we go out for public review. I think that's evidenced by the fact that the STT, you know, took a crack at it. We didn't see actual physical recommended edits from the SSC, and in fact they kind of went an entirely different direction. I guess my concern with the idea of trying to make a one size fits all COP to cover all FMPs is, I think as Merrick explained, it could be kind of a simple, short, brief summary of methods that reviews that would apply to all FMPs, and then we leave the specificity to TORs or what have you. Sometimes it's really hard to build something that's short and brief and one size fits all. And so I really I think have to question thinking across our FMP landscapes and advisory bodies, you know, if that's, if the utility is really there to undertake kind of such a comprehensive exercise. I feel like, you know, we might, we certainly can make improvements looking just exclusively at COP 15 I think that advance the state of the expectations and the process that we use here. So I guess I'm more inclined to ask the STT, or I'm sorry the SSC to take a look at the proposed edits offered by the STT and see what they might have to offer in addition. I'm just thinking about, you know, what's the best use of our available time and resources and how do we keep this kind of in its box. And so I think more soak time is warranted and look forward, you know, to other eyes, perhaps the SAS would have some input on this. I think they're an integral.....their input to this process matters to us as well. So kind of in the sidebars hearing kind of what might be a useful timeline or what do we do if we don't put something out for public review

at this time? It sounds like an appropriate time to have a new look at proposed revisions might be June. So I think in my mind that is what makes the most sense from here forward. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:24:54] Thank you Marci. Further discussion? Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:24:58] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I agree with with what Marci laid out there. We put this on the agenda, had the Council develop some proposed language changes in response to issues as they have come up specific to the salmon methodology review and roles and responsibilities there. I'd like to try to keep it focused there. Got very different statements from the STT and the SSC. The SSC wants to look at across the board all their FMPs and methodology reviews, but I'd really like to keep it contained to salmon because we had some specific issues we were trying to address there. The MEWs come up a couple times. As I said earlier I had some remarks on that. I could make them now if that would be helpful or it could hold till we get through this item. Maybe I'll just dive into it since the MEW has come up a couple times. And thanks again to Mr. Sones for bringing the MEW issue forward to the Council. As mentioned, a similar statement was brought forward back in June of 2022. Phil Anderson gave some of his perspectives on the issue back then, perspectives that I agreed with. My recollection is that one of the conclusions from that meeting was that the topic was the topic needed additional discussion between the U.S. v. Washington co-managers before coming back to the Council with suggestions. I'm partly to blame for this resurfacing again without any resolution. The topic slipped my mind when we developed the agenda for our next co-manager meeting back late in 2022 and we failed to circle back at it as co-managers over the past two years. My understanding is that the origin of the of the MEW goes back to 2002 and the formation of that group was triggered by more than just the need and intent to reduce FRAM documentation as described in the MWIFC statement. The MEW was formed by the Council primarily due to emerging issues about using the Chinook FRAM to evaluate mark-selective fisheries coupled with a need to increase the number of people with working knowledge of the fishery models used in the Council process. The list of things mentioned and the purpose for the group at its origin, including assisting with model documentation, proposing changes for model improvement, validation of models, review and validation of model changes, conducting postseason evaluations and conducting sensitivity analyses of models. The role of the MEW was never meant to be confined to FRAM, but the tasks taken on by the MEW in the past 22 years since it was formed have largely been FRAM-related. The exact role of the group and composition of active participants has evolved over time, but it's continued to serve many of the purposes originally laid out at its formation. The MEW has one official meeting per year. It usually occurs on the first day of the April Council meeting. Other meetings may be scheduled as needed to prepare for and attend the October methodology review if there are topics relevant to the MEW. The MEW currently has 5 members listed on their roster representing Idaho, Oregon, and Washington states, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission, California Department of Fish and Wildlife seats and a second WDFW seat are vacant. I also recognize that the Idaho representative recently retired and don't know whether that seat's likely to be filled in the near future. Most of the FRAM expertise on the MEW currently resides with the NOAA and WDFW representatives. Both of those individuals are also members of the Salmon Modeling Analytic Workgroup or the SMAG, a group of state, tribal and federal staff that work closely on FRAM modeling issues, primarily focused on the U.S. v. Washington case area. The Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission statement says that the MEW

should develop work products based on a defined need that is not redundant to co-manager efforts. The MEW differs from the SMAG in that it often digs deeper into issues that affect coastal or Columbia River regions that are outside of the focus area of the SMAG. While the SMAG has representation from key management agencies involved in Western Washington Fisheries, WDFW and WIFC, NOAA, and individual Western Washington Treaty Tribes, they're not members that represent other agencies with West Coast fishery interests that are represented on the MEW, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Columbia River Tribes, the states of Oregon, Idaho and California. FRAM modeling changes could potentially impact fisheries of interest to those parties, and it's important to include their perspectives and expertise when exploring PFMC modeling issues. So I don't see the MEW as being redundant to co-manager modeling efforts that primarily occur in the SMAG. A short list of tasks of relevance that the MEW has been instrumental in leading through the Council process in recent years include a deep dive into FRAM representation of upriver Columbia Summer Chinook, production of the online FRAM User Manual, production of the FRAM Overview documentation, a FRAM Performance Evaluation, and the facilitation of the production and presentation of the Oregon Production Index and Willapa Bay coho forecast methodologies for review. The NWIFC statement also says that new proposed changes to FRAM methodologies should be presented to the SSC and STT for review prior to implementation. In my view, the role of the MEW is to help develop such new or changed methodologies and facilitate bringing them to the SSC and STT for their review. One of the major issues regarding the MEW is the current number of vacancies on the workgroup. There are a number of reasons for those vacancies, including staff turnover and the fact that the number of individuals across organizations with FRAM expertise has declined rather than increased in recent years. I don't have any recommendations today other than to ask again for time for the U.S. v. Washington co-managers to have discussions on the future of the MEW. I do see a high value in the MEW as it gives the Council a body of experts it can turn to with issues related to the co-manager FRAM models that are used as a critical part of salmon season planning for a large portion of the West Coast. Perhaps there could be a value in building expertise for state, tribal and federal staff coastwide across the other fishery models through the MEW. I understand the interest in establishing clearer roles and responsibilities, concerns with membership that cross lines between the STT and MEW, et cetera, but I do think we can find ways to address those concerns and believe that the MEW has and can continue to play an important and valuable role for the Council. Thanks for listening to me ramble there.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:00] All right, thank you. Corey Ridings. I see you raising your hand.

**Corey Ridings** [00:31:05] Thanks guys. Thanks Mr. Adicks for that. I'm just going to own that my little hobbit brain couldn't keep up with you there, but I appreciate the information that I did catch and what you are providing. As I suggested earlier, maybe a Council staff report or something that would help us all get our heads around that and as well as the information you just provided, maybe you could provide that in written form so those of us that are less experienced in this process could fully understand what we're talking about here. I also specifically thank you for pointing out the co-manager conversations that you were, I guess, supposed to be held. I had not remembered that from 2022, so I appreciate you bringing that up and of course support that process.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:32:02] Thank you. Susan Bishop. Sorry, did I miss a hand here? Susan Bishop then Dr. Lent.

**Susan Bishop** [00:32:16] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I guess maybe just an observation a little bit in all this conversation is we are getting, we get so focused on what is happening right now that we sometimes forget the history of some of these groups and the longevity in which we need to establish these groups. You know roles change over time, dynamic changes over time, but we need to build in the structure of these groups to be robust to those changes. So we are constantly having catch-up. I appreciated a lot of the things that Mr. Adicks said about the representation, you know, where the vacancies are, what we might need to be pivoting to. The very considered formation of the group and the very explicit decision that it was not focused on one specific task or another, that it was to add benefit to the process in general. So as we go through and consider the changes that we're making here we keep an eye out towards the long view, not just the immediate things that needs to be addressed. We have a lot of talent that's involved. You know, my observation of the MEW, just as one example, is that some of these groups also provide very important role in cross walking among multiple management forms that we're involved in, so Pacific salmon, I mean salmon is unique in the breadth that it goes. We have the salmon, Pacific Salmon Commission, we have the PFMC, we have the north of Falcon process, and the ability to, for people, to have people with that expertise in this group that can speak across those forums and alert the Council if there are potential factors that come up. So, and there are very specific ways in which this Council communicates and operates and speaks to some degree. There's a cultural element to it. So one of the times in which the MEW I thought was very helpful was a conversation that we had when there was a new forecast methodology proposed for Willamette Bay coho, and there was information that was requested by the SSC to be provided. There was escalating frustration, let's just say, when that information was not provided in the timeframe that they would like or in the format that they would like. The difficulty was that, and many of the management staff that was tasked with providing that information is not part of this process, didn't really understand why it was needed or its role in this process. And so the MEW in particular played a very important, in my view, facilitation role to help work through that process. The importance at the end date was that the Council needs approved ACLs to move forward in each year and that engagement by the MEW helped to resolve an issue that allowed the Council to move forward with that very important issue. So I think it's more than just the technical expertise that's brought, it's the broader context that a lot of these staff bring to inform the Council and help us do our jobs.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:35:21] Thank you. Dr. Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:35:23] Thank you very much. And I think Miss Bishop's comments are sort of in the same line. I don't intervene a lot on salmon as you noticed. It is really complicated and I'm hoping that at my next meeting and third meeting some of it will soak in if only by osmosis. I do think that there's an issue with the number of scientists who can engage in this. It sounds like we really need to make sure we're taking care of the new cohort of scientists coming through and mentoring and making sure that we have enough so that when we have these layers there's not this conflict. So let's pay attention to new and upcoming scientists who are coming into the profession. The other thing I wanted to say, and I should have thought of this two days ago when I started reading these materials, but do we know if other Councils have one COP for all of their methodology reviews? Thank you Chair, Vice-Chair.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:36:19] Thank you. And that question I don't have the answer. I'm not sure at this point we've looked into that. Aja Szumylo.



**Aja Szumylo** [00:36:29] Thank you Vice-Chair. And this is what I was trying to get out when I was saying that like all the FMPs are super different, is that all the Councils are really different too and they do this process really differently and I don't think that there's any one way we should approach it. And I've seen it in this Council a couple of times where there's been this like sort of backdoor, and I've done it myself when I first came here, I was like, gosh this could be more consistent. If we all did it the same way it would be so much easier but the FMPs are so different from each other, and salmon in particular is wildly different and has so many more moving pieces than the others that I resist trying to map those processes on to this one or this one onto those ones. And so, yeah, what is the goal of consistency and what are we choosing to do if we choose to, if we choose to seek consistency here, what are we taking, like what are we avoiding doing? What other work are we avoiding doing for fishermen? And I think this is a case where like, I don't know that we gain anything if we were just trying to solve this one little thing with salmon, then I want to keep it there and not let it smush out into everything else. So thanks.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:37] Thank you. Not seeing any hands right now I'm gonna pause a little bit and try and summarize. I have read that the task before us was to adopt proposed updates to COP 15 for public review. I've been hearing that we are maybe not ready to go in that direction, but maybe we need some clarity. I believe I heard in Marci Yaremko's comments about coming back in June to get back to this topic about COP 15 updates. The discussion regarding the MEW, that acronym M.E.W. is included in COP 15 so if there's any further review we can take that up. A different piece I think in my mind is the function of the MEW and the makeup, the discussion about what it does is good to hear. If you want to change any parts of that, that would be under C.5 or at future meetings, whatever agenda talks about appointments. If there are other tasks, and I heard requests maybe for more information about the history of the MEW, how they meet, what they've done, under workload planning we could be clear on what the Council would like to hear regarding the MEW and its functions there. So there are several pieces here before us right now. I want to look around and get the pulse about what we're going to do about COP 15 and public review. And as I said, I believe I heard sentiment that it's not ready to go for public review and I would not anticipate a motion at this time to send it out for public review. Did I misread that? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:39:46] Yes, Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. No you didn't misread that. I would offer a motion on the point of COP 15, and we'll speak through that and hopefully move this forward. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:40:04] Excellent. All right, are you ready with it?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:40:08] Yes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:40:08] Okay.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:40:10] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I move the Council schedule a review of proposed amendments to COP 15 at the June 2025 Council meeting, considering initial revisions proposed in F.2, Attachment 3, and considering the recommended edits offered by the STT in F.2.a, Supplemental STT Report 2.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:40:35] Thank you. That language on the screen looks accurate and complete, you agree?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:40:40] Yes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:40:41] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:40:47] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. It's pretty clear that we have not had enough review and we are not yet ready to put this COP back out for public review. I think there are a lot of needs to update the language. Again, appreciate the initial crack at this effort undertaken by Council staff and pretty clearly the STT has some ideas. The SSC I certainly think they have a lot to offer to the content of COP 15 and so would look forward to their specific recommendations to COP 15 at a future time. I think we'll all benefit by being able to take a step back and think about the content a little on a little longer timeline and I believe this motion gets us there. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:41:53] Thank you Marci. Are there any questions for clarification on the motion? Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:42:03] Just to clarify, I recognize you call out for consideration the specific provisions in F.2, Attachment 3, and those offered by the STT, but I assume the intent of your motion is not to preclude should the SSC come forward with some suggestions that that would not be precluded from the review.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:42:25] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:42:26] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. No, we'd certainly want those proposed edits. What I was trying to, I think, avoid doing here was adopting the edits offered by the STT because I want us to be inclusive in our process of reviewing COP 15. So I think we have a good first step taken by Council staff. We have an additional bite at the apple that's been offered by the STT, but I think a lot of additional review is warranted and I don't know that we will get to, well I think we'll just need to look at the timeline and what makes sense for adopting, you know, if we adopt a version for public review in June then that sets us on a course. We may not get there. We may need to spend a little longer. So I think coming back in June I would expect that this topic would be agendized on the SSCs agenda for the meeting and, you know, perhaps others like the SAS. So we'd look forward to that input and taking up the next step there in June. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:43:43] Thank you. Any other questions for clarification? I'm not seeing any hands. Discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:43:58] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:43:58] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci. Now let's take a break and task Angela with summarizing and telling us if we've done all our work here or not.

**Angela Forristall** [00:44:20] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, you all had a very thorough discussion on the two methodology review topics, and you approved for use the Fmsy value for Sacramento River Fall Chinook for 2025. And for the cohort reconstruction, applying the specific components when possible and appropriate. And for the COP 15 updates, we will come back in June and pick up that discussion at that time with additional input from advisory bodies.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:44:49] All right, thank you. Before I close this agenda item out, let's see if there's any last questions, comments, discussion? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:45:02] Thanks Vice-Chair. Before we close I just wanted to just put something back out there that I talked about earlier, which was the concept of a Council-wide recusal policy for all of our technical teams in these processes. My thinking is just it's a relatively small step we could take to add to the scientific integrity in what we do here in the review process. So just throwing that out again, curious if other Council members have ideas or feedback. Director Burden has his pen up.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:45:36] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:45:38] Yes, thank you. And appreciate the reminder Miss Ridings of that topic. So something that we've talked with General Counsel about over the last year and a half or so. There is an item on our Year-at-a-Glance that has been just pushed back due to, I think, General Counsel staffing issues, but that item is the Recusal Handbook. And so perhaps we can talk with General Counsel about the development of that handbook, when it might be coming forward. And I would, I guess I would start there and that might address many of the questions that you're raising.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:46:15] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:46:17] Thanks. Thanks Director Burden for that. I'm just going to express some confusion and this is just going to be my ignorance over not fully knowing what you're talking about. I assumed the Council-wide, the Recusal Handbook actually had to do with Council members, and I'm thinking about more of a technical team, scientific bodies to ensure that we have the scientific review processes integrity there. Am I...I probably am just misunderstanding the handbook so just looking for some clarity there.

**Merrick Burden** [00:46:48] Yeah, I appreciate the question Miss Ridings. Admittedly, I don't know exactly what the handbook will entail at the end of the day, but we've, in the limited discussions that I've had with some members of General Counsel, we've asked for it to include Council considerations in addition to some of the scientific considerations because there are important recusal issues. When the SSC is making a determination it's important, like you're flagging for scientific integrity. Then of course there are the recusal issues we're familiar with here around this table. So I think it's appropriate to ask for both. I'm not sure where they stand at the

moment and I'm not sure if Miss Stanley is able to address those questions or not but I'll look her way.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:47:26] Rose Stanley, anything to add there?

**Rose Stanley** [00:47:30] No. Thank you. This is on our radar and I know that we are scheduled I think to come back in March to talk about recusals if I'm recalling correctly, but I'm not prepared to get into this at this meeting but it is on our radar for a future meeting. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:47:46] Thank you. So it's on the radar. Hopefully we don't need a motion to remind us to come back in March and think about that. And with that, seeing no other hands I'll close out this agenda item and pass the gavel back to our Chair for some updates on how we'll move forward.

### 3. Queets Spring/Summer Chinook Rebuilding Plan – Final

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] All right that takes us to Council action, which is before you so I'll open the floor up for discussion. Does anybody have any questions for the STT on the economic analysis? Motion? Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:00:20] Thank you Mr. Chair. I do have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:28] Okay.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:00:28] I move that the Council adopt the Queet's Spring/Summer Chinook Rebuilding Plan Analysis as presented in Agenda Item F.3, Attachment 1 as final. Adopt Recommendation 1 confirming the default rebuilt criterion from the fishery management plan. And adopt Recommendation 2, Alternative 1, status quo as the preferred management strategy alternative for recommendation to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:53] Thank you Kyle. Is the language on the screen accurate?

**Kyle Adicks** [00:00:55] It is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:56] Seconded by Butch Smith. Thank you Butch. All right, please speak to your motion.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:01:03] Thank you again Mr. Chair. While the need for this rebuilding plan was triggered by low abundances that led to overfished status for the stock, the plan highlights that the combination of poor ocean survival conditions and subsequent low escapements coupled with poor freshwater conditions that negatively affected spawning, spawning and rearing success drove the stocks to low abundance levels that triggered that overfished status. Freshwater fishery impacts to the stock have been extremely low for decades, while marine impacts are more difficult to assess due to data limitations. Under assumptions made for analyzing rebuilding times, closure of non-treaty north of Falcon salmon fishery showed no discernible difference from status quo, while such a closure would have enormous impact on coastal fisheries, communities, and economies. There are a number of co-manager recommendations in the plan. WDFW and the Quinault Nation will continue to engage as they have in the past to prioritize and address habitat actions in the basin to improve productivity for Chinook and coho stocks. Co-manager staff will continue to try to address data uncertainty and improve understanding of impact to marine fisheries throughout the range of the stock and will engage in appropriate domestic and international processes if and when appropriate. This attempt to improve data for the stock is also supported by the STT recommendation to investigate the feasibility of improving data on the stock, which could eventually support reevaluating reference points for the stock. Back in September we heard some, from the SSC that the economic analysis needed some work. That work happened and has been incorporated into this final document. Thanks to all of those that worked on that over the past couple of months. And finally, thanks to the Quinault Indian Nation staff and WDFW staff for their work on this plan, as well as to the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Salmon

Technical Team, and Council staff who contributed to the plan and to the process to get us to the finish line today with the final plan here for adoption.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:55] Okay. Thank you Kyle. Questions for the motion maker? Discussion on the motion? I'm likin' the way this is going. Susan.

**Susan Bishop** [00:03:10] Thank you Mr. Chair. No discussion. I just want to extend NMFSs appreciation and gratitude for the great collaboration that happened. It was a real example of working with some really difficult data-limited situations and getting the work done in a really compressed time period. So it took everybody working together to do that and I just wanted to express NMFSs appreciation for that happening.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:30] Thank you Susan. All right. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:03:35] Thank you Chair. I would just add to that the data-limited situation for the social community and economic analysis, it's always difficult to figure out how this is going to impact communities if we don't have a good picture of those communities. What are the other sources of income when the fisheries shut down? What about other fisheries? Is it other industries? It'd be nice to know a little bit more about that. Thank you Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:01] Thank you. All right, anyone else? I'm not seeing any hands. Seeing none I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:04:13] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:13] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you. All right, I'll turn to Angela. How are we doing here? Anything else we need to address?

**Angela Forristall** [00:04:30] No. You adopted the final rebuilding plan with your FPA and have transmitted it so your work here on this agenda item is complete.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:39] All right. Wonderful.

#### 4. Final 2025 Preseason Management Schedule

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] We have a goose egg. All right. All right, with that I will open the floor for Council discussion. Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:00:13] Thank you Mr. Chair. I'll just say that I'm supportive of having the in-person hearing in Westport. It has been very popular with the coastal community out there and well attended over the years and we will have staff available for it as normal. WDFW will be scheduling a series of public meetings both hybrid and virtual starting in late February going into early April that coincides with the Council March April process to plan our inside fisheries as well as a series of co-manager meetings with the Western Washington tribes. Same idea of moving our inside fisheries along as we move towards final ocean fisheries.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:51] Thank you Kyle. Lookin' to John and Oregon.

**John North** [00:00:51] Thank you Chair. Yeah, I think March.....having the meeting on March 24th for Oregon will work. We had planned on online. That was kind of based on last year. We kind of polled folks that testified to get their input on online versus in-person. It was a little bit majority towards online, but it sounds like now there's a little more interest in in-person. I think we're capable of accommodating that on that same date. There could be challenges with coverage for Council staff or maybe Coast Guard, but we've had that before. So I'm open to that and we'll have our own state meeting in late February for also in Newport.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:52] Thank you John. I'll turn to California. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:01:56] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Just want to voice support for the plan for a California hearing in Santa Rosa. As identified in the SitSum, that venue has worked well for us. Folks have expressed desire to have the meeting in-person and we are happy to help support it. Santa Rosa is a great location for us and fairly easy to get to or as easy as can be given the size of our state. So folks have kind of resonated around this location, which is great. We too will be hosting a salmon informational meeting that week of February 24th. I don't have any specifics yet as to location or the precise date, but we will make sure that that information is shared with our SAS reps and others in the Council family and we'll be doing our normal outreach for that meeting here getting underway shortly. I did want to thank the STT for their report on the technical corrections and the reporting error that, reporting errors that they've identified. I just want to note that I really like the transparency of having this as a standalone document and available for us as an informational item here before we get to the preseason process and just want to thank them for their identified steps forward and their intent to conduct a thorough review of the documents and ensure that the reference points reflect the correct values, so thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:48] Thank you Marci. It does turn out we did have one public comment that slipped in underneath right before the wire. So with that we're to go to Brian McLachlin.....(Public Comment)..... All right, that concludes public comment and takes us to Council action, which is before you. So I guess we've already told what we plan on doing so I think we're good there. Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:04:11] I just wanted to follow-up on Marci's comment that she made, if that's okay? So I just wanted to make....let folks know that from NMFS's perspective there isn't anything more that needs to be done in terms of the correction of the error, so it is corrected. It will be reported going forward and we will address whatever needs to be done at that time with the Council. So I don't see a benefit in going backwards. From what I understand from the STT all the fisheries that impact the stock are done for the year and so there's no real further action that could be taken and the preliminary information that we have indicates that the stock would not be overfished or not be subject to overfishing next year. So moving forward, it's something NMFS endorses and we don't see anything additional that we need to be done.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:02] Okay. Thank you Susan. All right, well we did have to go to public comment after we had given our management schedules for the states, so I will turn to everybody here if they want to comment at or anything to change or if you're good with what they put out? Okay. All right. Angela.

**Angela Forristall** [00:05:29] Thank you Mr. Chair. Can I just ask for some clarification on where we landed with Oregon if that's....?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:34] John.

**John North** [00:05:34] And if I might Chair, I was going to ask Council staff if....are we still no longer capable of doing a hybrid meeting?

**Angela Forristall** [00:05:50] Yeah, that is correct. Thank you Mr. North. These are very staff intensive meetings already and I think the added layer of trying to make them hybrid is not something that we can support at this time, but if there is a request for the Oregon meeting to be held in-person, we could look at potentially doing that on either the Monday or the Tuesday if that ended up working better for staffing or keep with it online as proposed.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:18] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:06:21] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And just building off of what Angela is covering here. You know we found that over time the technology improves. The bandwidth at very remote hotels improves and the speaker systems get smaller and more packable and so never say never. This year it's harder, this coming year it's hard to imagine someone doing that in Newport, but maybe not too much longer maybe it becomes a more realistic possibility. So we'll keep working on it and maybe we'll get there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:56] John.

**John North** [00:06:57] Thank you Chair. Thank you Mr. Burden. I think our problem in Oregon has always been sandwiched in between the states and a hybrid option, I think, would solve all of our problems. But, you know, last year we did kind of poll a relatively small number of folks that testified, but there was more than half that preferred online so that was how we came to the decision for this year to keep it online. So I think we might do.....go with the current path and do the same



poll again and maybe work towards a hybrid where we could have both options that would really help us out. You know, shift to in-person with an online option, but for this year just online.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:54] Okay, thank you John. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:07:59] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And my question is really more just a curiosity question about the process. So in addition to these meetings, does the Council also just accept written comment much as you do for your normal Council meetings?

**Angela Forristall** [00:08:18] Thank you Mrs. Kiefer. Yes, so this is also on the agenda in the March and April meeting, so that's when we would be accepting written comments.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:27] Okay, anyone else? Angela, back to you. How are we doing?

**Angela Forristall** [00:08:34] All right, thank you very much. You have adopted the management schedule and provided guidance for our hearings in March 2025 so your work on this agenda item is complete.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:45] Okay, well we're doing quite well this afternoon. Must've been a good lunch.

## 5. Klamath River Fall Chinook Workgroup Progress Report and Recommendations

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] That concludes public comment and takes us to Council action which is before you so I'll open the floor up for discussion. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:00:16] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I was looking at the Situation Summary that has a, I think a somewhat different set of Council actions if I'm not mistaken.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:39] That is correct.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:00:42] Thank you. So I've kind of been focused on the SitSum actions so I just want to clarify that that's our approach and our action here today.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:54] Yeah it is. I'm not sure.....

**Marci Yaremko** [00:00:55] And if I may Mr. Chair, I guess I'd clarify. The action on the screen suggests that we would adopt recommendations as appropriate while the SitSum describes that we would discuss the options and recommendations in the work group report, recommend additional measures as appropriate, and provide additional guidance and direction. So I feel like that terminology's much different than adopt. So just wanting to clarify....

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:42] Far more specific than what we see before us, yes. Angela. There you go.

**Angela Forristall** [00:02:00] Yeah, I think what Marci's looking at is just the section right under the description versus the text at the very bottom. So I think if the Council could focus on these more detailed questions that would help us in moving forward here.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:13] There you go. Thank you. Okay, Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:02:18] Sure, thank you Mr. Chair. I guess I'll kick us off. I want to commend the work group for a long summer of work. They've been meeting a number of times and have put a lot of thought into what can be accomplished. Kind of going down the list of items, I mean the current Harvest Control Rule and the range of buffers, that was the approach that we took in for 2024 management, and as the STT acknowledges, applying a buffer to the current HCR is an option that's ready for implementation for the 2025 preseason process should we desire to do so. I want to tie that to actually Item 4, which is the matrix-based approach, and just want to clarify that the work that is proposed on the matrix-based approach, as we heard in the work group's presentation under, I guess it's slide.....slide 11, just want to flag that the matrix-based approach is designed to inform us on an application of an exploitation rate buffer. So I see it as an advancement of what we may have done last cycle in the sense of just kind of, I don't want to say arbitrarily, but applying an exploitation rate buffer as we did last cycle that was kind of based on the range of Harvest Control Rule options that was provided to us in the work group report from last year. This is an advancement, what we're seeing here in this proposed matrix-based approach.

And the thing that I find neat about it is it would inform us on what an appropriate reduction or buffer to the ER would be in light of contemporary conditions in the basin. And the example that the work group offers us I think is illustrative of how the matrix-based approach would work if we direct them to proceed with this work over the next year for use next cycle. And again, I think it's.....because it relies on indices that are real and are clearly tied to the changing conditions and the occupation of new available habitat by returning adults, I think it's a novel approach and really does reflect the task that I think we had for the work group, which is to develop interim management measures or a framework for use over the near term as population reestablishes in the upper reaches. So I find a lot of value in this option. I think it advances us from where we were last cycle and would love to see the work group continue with that work. They've also, I think, pointed out for us that the data is readily available and that they have the expertise needed on the work group to continue with this work and develop that framework for us. So I think that's a, for me that's, that's pretty compelling and would like to see that continue. As for the habitat-based approaches, I think it's a great idea but perhaps more involved than the Council might want to, or might be able to bite off at this time. The work group itself doesn't have the expertise to develop a habitat-based approach. It sounds like it might involve something like a contractor, which I'm not sure who would be responsible for managing a contract or a contractor, though I think, you know, though I appreciate that the work group has identified that habitat-based approaches could allow for estimates of the production of the habitat into the future. So I think that's something that would be on a much longer term and more difficult to get us to our end goal, which again is some kind of interim management framework. Speaking to the sub-basin approach, I'm really glad that we had the discussion that we had here. The Hoopa Valley Tribe and our department, you've heard some testimony here that really explained some of the other activities going on out of sight out of mind outside the Council process, so we want to thank the parties for keeping us up to date on those developments. I'm encouraged by what we heard today and what work is in development behind the scenes. I think what I'm hearing in the discussion about the sub-basin approach is that it is going to be kind of a long time in development and perhaps not available for kind of nearer term use, but I think we want to continue hearing about the developments of the work that is continuing in other forums. I guess I'd say the.....it also, you know, might be appropriate to consider as the dual-basin approach develops down the road, I think as we talk about amendments to the FMP once we've had a chance to revisit reference points, et cetera, I think that there is definitely some optimism that the dual-basin approach will offer refined more granular information that is of use in a number of forums. So I think I also want to flag that we talked a bit about application of the matrix-based approach to sub-basin management and I guess I want to just call out the Tribal Report in reminding us of the need that whatever we might develop here in this process we need to be mindful that we're not looking to develop alternatives that would preclude access to these stocks in the Trinity Basin. And I've been kind of thinking about this and thinking about, I have to say groundfish management and sort of, you know, what we're hearing here are some design, I think, needs with regard to how we might develop a solution that from a policy position does not restrict tribal harvest, and I think there are ways to do that. I don't.....we haven't heard anything specific here today, but I am hopeful that there are ways to do that while also employing something like the matrix-based approach that informs us on what an appropriate buffer to the ER might be for the non-tribal portion of the 50% of the adults. So what I'm thinking about is maybe, you know, an exploitation rate or the plugging in abundance levels into the Harvest Control Rule so that we determine a number of projected adults returning and then thinking about how....well we do the 50/50 sharing but then how we might apply the buffer to only the non-tribal portion of the adult

surplus. Sorry if I'm not articulating this in exactly the greatest of words, but I think that's my intention, or what I would think is a path forward noting that the work on the two-basin approach is continuing I think in other forums and it doesn't appear that, you know, it's going to be something the work group itself can pick up and do. So I think we want to acknowledge that work is going on outside of us and we're encouraged by that, especially as that informs us for longer term management. And with that, I will look forward to discussions about how we proceed for the 2025 cycle. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:08] Thank you Marci. Further discussion? Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:13:17] Thank you Mr. Chair. I had a couple of thoughts along the lines of what Marci was laid out. We've talked a lot about how the options are improvements to what we've been doing. You know I think it looks to me from the information we've been presented really the only viable option for 2025 is status quo as we work on the other approaches that are a little further out. One of the things that we sort of didn't talk about was in the Terms Of Reference for the work group itself, one of the things that they were tasked with was building a system or evaluating options with regard to allowing access to more abundant stocks while not impeding rebuilding of Klamath, right? So I think that is really inherent in what you're hearing from the tribe and also was built into the TORs for the work group themselves. And so when I look at that, really Option 2 is the only one that sort of directly speaks to that itself. The homing fidelity of Klamath River fish is pretty high and so little.....as I understand it, and so there's little straying into the Klamath Basin, so constraining fishing on Trinity River fish as was part of the testimony that the tribe gave would have limited conservation benefit to the restoration of the Klamath River while limiting fish on a more abundant stock itself, and in particular tribal fisheries. So the purpose, that purpose is not addressed by the other three options, but that option itself may not be the only approach that accomplishes the purpose of it. So there is, Marci said there may be other ways that allow access, in particular tribal access to more abundant, say Trinity stocks, while offering that same protection to more protection to the Klamath. So I support exploring other approaches that would allow fishing on Trinity, fishing on more abundant Trinity River Chinook once the conservation needs for that stock are met and may not require the intensive data stream structure and process of what was described under the sub-basin approach, although I'm totally up if that's the best way to do it, I'm supportive of that. So further exploration is directly related to the task, sort of in summary of the work group, and could occur within the work group, so maybe in combination with Option 4 or it sounds like perhaps with the additional information we've been provided today, there is more expertise available maybe in an outside process that could be coordinated with the work group process itself, particularly since the work group specifically stated that it doesn't include the expertise or the capacity to develop or implement that option. The additional time noted that this would take is sort of consistent with the longer timeframe noted for the other options, so would allow that collaboration and coordination to occur, and as Marci indicated, could bring us maybe even a better mousetrap that would address that task to the work group as well as the other ones that we've sort of been focused on. So that is my input to the Council action for today.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:34] Okay. Thank you Susan. Anyone else? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:16:40] Thanks Chair. I just wanted to just voice some concern here about meeting our tribal obligations. We, in thinking about the sub-basin approach, which was articulated

to us through the Tribal Report as something that they would like to see continued work by the work group to expand and develop this approach. I'm wondering if maybe there's something here where we can do a bit more recognizing that the work group has said they don't have the right folks that they need and necessary capacity at this time. But Miss Morgenstern also outlined what she thought needed to be done that could move this forward, and we have been excellently educated about the work going on outside of the Council process. So what I might recommend is asking the work group to continue to think about this and come back as a next product or a next step or in their next report and outline a little bit more of what Miss Morgenstern described. Have some more specificity for us on what that workload would be? What the necessary skill sets would be? And if the Council could help put some sort of work plan together to potentially get us there. I'd also like to voice appreciation for Miss Yaremko and Miss Bishop's ideas about helping meet those obligations in terms of thinking about what this might look like in the next year and the nexus with the matrix-based approach, but I would just like to continue engaging with the work, the excellent work that the work group has been doing and keep, I guess barking up the tree of sub-basin management to make sure that we're continuing to keep that on our radar and keep it as an option as we move forward.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:36] Thank you Corey. All right, anybody else? Okay. Angela, how are we doing here so far?

**Angela Forristall** [00:18:49] You're doing very well. Thank you Mr. Chair. I can summarize I think what I have heard so far from the Council's discussion and see if I'm on track with what I'm hearing.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:01] Please.

**Angela Forristall** [00:19:02] Okay, so I'm hearing that you've discussed that the status quo option, a Harvest Control Rule with a range of buffers is the only real appropriate option for planning ocean harvest fisheries for 2025, so that takes care of Number 2. And I think in March when we come back we can really look at what that specific buffer percentage might be. And then for Number 3 I'm hearing a request for further development on the matrix-based approach and further exploration of approaches that would provide protection for fish returning to the Klamath without impacting tribal harvest on the Trinity, including a more detailed work plan for what developing this sub-basin management approach would look like.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:47] Okay. All right. Anything else? Anybody want to add anything else to that? John North.

**John North** [00:19:59] I guess I was just going to add on the matrix-based approach. I'd be....I'm very intrigued with that, but I'd be interested in some mix of environmental variables being one of the inputs. Reading the report it sounded like there was some correlations that they identified and I think that might be something to consider as an input. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:27] Thank you John. All right. Angela.

**Angela Forristall** [00:20:33] All right. And then I think with that we have good feedback to bring back to the work group and I appreciate your discussion today. So your work here is done.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:39] Okay. Well very good everybody. We're going to take a 10-minute break.

## 6. Sacramento River Fall Chinook Workgroup Progress Report and Recommendations

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] That concludes public comment and takes us to Council action, which is before you. So with that I'll open the floor up for discussion. Don't jump all in the water at once here. Corey you're always a reliable hand.....(laughter).....

**Corey Ridings** [00:00:22] I don't even know what to say to that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:28] Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:00:31] I'll do you this favor, I'll get us started. I appreciate the report and all of the hard work that's gone into it by the work group and other folks in the process. I note the goal of basing our management on natural area spawners and I think like we do in the Klamath and I think that's the right thing to do except that if we look at our natural areas over the last several years we're seeing near extirpation in the upper Sacramento. And I'm just concerned, you know, unless and until that issue is resolved we're going to be heavily hatchery-based as we have been and I wouldn't want to see the fishery, inland or ocean, unnecessarily constrained provided we have adequate numbers of salmon returning, just because the Upper Sacramento remains a salmon desert through no fault of the fishery or the Council. Those are strictly a consequence of water policies over which we have no control. So I'll just get us started with that comment which may go nowhere.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:07] Thank you Marc. All right. Boy, tough crowd. I would say Angela how I'm doing, but I know I'm floundering here so someone will bail me out. Corey Ridings. Thank you.

**Corey Ridings** [00:02:40] Thanks Chair. Thanks Mr. Gorelnik for starting us out. I'm just going to reiterate Mr. Gorelnik's concerns about the impacts on these fish that have nothing to do with what this Council does or ocean impacts and just the ongoing need to be paying attention to other entities and continuing to have our voice and raising fishermen's and conservationists voices to the need, this desperate need to make sure that our salmon survive. With that being said, in terms of the Smsy, in terms of natural area spawners, noting that that is a recommendation of the SSC, I voice my support. So moving forward with the preseason planning tools that are needed to do that and assuming when that comes back to the Council with the season we'd be able to look at those tools and again get more advice from our advisers on if they are appropriate to use in the next year.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:51] Thank you Corey. Okay, Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:03:55] Thank you Mr. Chair. I want to apologize I was having difficulty opening a file and that file was the Terms Of Reference of the work group that we adopted back in June of 2023 and just want to highlight that we're making progress. We've made quite a bit of progress here today in the methods review agenda item, which I think.....and adopting the cohort reconstruction and thereby the outputs from that analysis that will be useful for the work group as they continue on the path on their charge to revise our reference points, the conservation objective

and the Harvest Control Rule. So I just want to acknowledge that it looks like the work on Fmsy is now complete and the next step would be to derive the updated Smsy value. So that seems like the kind of next immediate near term horizon task for them. Regarding the conservation objective, I think we've heard some discussion here today and input from the SSC on updating that conservation objective based on total escapement, so looking at natural hatchery areas combined, and based on that revised or newly generated Smsy based on natural area spawners. Regarding the Harvest Control Rule, looking for the work group to bring us back proposed modifications that would account for potential updates to the Smsy and in terms of an updated conservation objective. So they're well on their way. Appreciate the update here today and that's it. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:07] Thank you Marci. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:06:12] Thank you Chair. And just have to complete the California set of comments. And again, this will be at the 30,000 foot level. Really appreciative of all the efforts underway to improve the science so that we can improve the monitoring, the management, and maybe allow this critter to survive. But I'm terribly troubled by the fact that so much is out of our hands. I think Marc explained it to me as we only have a certain set of knobs we can turn and the really big ones someone else is turning. So I guess I'd like to ask two questions. One for the Council in general, is there, are there things that we are doing or not doing that we should be doing to influence these other knobs? And maybe that's the National Marine Fisheries Service rather than the Council, and ask the scientists, are you optimistic that with these additional efforts and these additional tools that we'll survive all these other stresses on this stock? Thank you Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:17] Thank you Rebecca. That'd be a question for Susan.

**Susan Bishop** [00:07:24] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Dr. Lent for the question. On the regard of the scientists view, I will not even attempt to speak for them. I think there's a lot of literature out there and information. We've had past rebuilding plans. There's a lot of background material in the work group reports that have been presented. I think that the Council has had a lot of conversation with regard is there anything else that the Council can do? I think the conclusion of that, and I am happy to defer to anyone else who feels differently, is that the Council does have a limited amount of nobs. We can be persistent. We can demand accountability, which I think we've done through a variety of letters. Mr. Gorelnik has encouraged participation at various forums, meetings that are available to the public or available for representation, and I think the Council has tried to take full advantage of those as far as I know. There has been outreach to our area offices that are directly involved in things like water policy and there could always be invitations for those folks to come to speak to us and tell us in more depth. They have far more expertise in this than I do. That would be my answer to your question. Others may have.....may want to add to that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:50] Thank you Susan. Okay. Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:08:50] Thank you Chair. Just to ask the scientists, are you optimistic that with these additional.....

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:02] I guess would you.....I mean, would you like to have the STT come up or Will? Dr. Satterthwaite can we invite you to the table?



**Will Satterthwaite** [00:09:13] Yeah, thanks for the interesting, thought provoking, maybe not necessarily super easy to answer question. And obviously I can only speak for myself. So am I optimistic? I will maybe turn that to can I find some reason for optimism? And I will try to be a little bit more glass half full. We do know that Chinook salmon have an incredibly resilient life history. You know they have this evolutionary legacy of persisting through a lot of geological upheavals. They persisted through the gold rush so, you know, I think there definitely is potential to respond to actions to try to improve their habitat, et cetera. That's tempered by, they are, you know, the salmon that we work on are the southernmost Chinook salmon stocks so they're already on the periphery of the species range. As climates change they probably will feel that first and most severely. So again, there are....I think we can find some cause for optimism just sort of looking at the history of what the species has survived through. I guess I'll leave it at that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:05] Thank you Will. Rebecca. All right, anybody else? Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:11:15] I've watched this for quite a while and we can make all these plans that we want but if you don't have water your plans don't work. And I haven't heard so far the recognition of one of the variables is habitat for water, and that's what I'm most worried about, that these guys in the audience sit on the dock for a lot of years and we have all these, going to cut production down, we're going to do this and then when we do have good water years it would be nothing for them to fish on because we've planned it right down to nothing. So I would just, you know, hope that we're adding those variables in and accounting for them because if you get production too low the peaks and valleys become Mojave Desert to Mount McKinley instead of rolling hills. And I just caution my friends from California living through this up north that they watch out for that. So anyway, thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:27] Thank you Butch. All right. Okay Angela, how are we doing here?

**Angela Forristall** [00:12:37] Thank you Mr. Chair, And thank you Council. You're doing very well. You've listened to the work group report and you've noted that they have these items that were approved for methodology review and they're able to move forward in a stepwise fashion on the rest of their terms and reference that they're making great progress on. So I think with that, your work here on this agenda item is complete.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:59] Okay. Thank you and great work everyone to get us caught up a little bit.

## **G. Pacific Halibut Management**

### **1. 2025 Catch Sharing Plan and Annual Regulations – Final**

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] So that will take us to Council discussion and action. Two items there, final changes to the 2025 Halibut Catch Sharing Plan, and final changes to the 2025 annual fishery regulations. With that slight pause I will look around see who's going to start discussion. Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:00:28] Thank you. And I didn't get my hand up earlier when Josh was reading the NMFS Report, but I really wanted to offer appreciation for the items you walked through on page 8 and responses to questions that we have been asking as we've been going along the last couple of years and I found it to be really helpful. And thanks for continuing to try to engage on that TCEY/FCEY question that we've had and that was brought up in the CDFW Report.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:09] Thank you. Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:01:13] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just to quickly follow-up on that. I realized after the fact that I failed to mention the permit aspect that Mr. Johnson brought up, and that is in there as well and something we are actively exploring and we do think we could get to a March 15th date. I know that's not ideal for everyone, but that is something we are also still hoping to move forward here in the next year or so, depending on workload and other actions at play.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:43] Thank you. Any other discussion? Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:01:49] This isn't discussion, but I do have a motion if we're ready to move to that?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:55] I haven't seen any hands so let's have your motion.

**Heather Hall** [00:01:59] I'm hoping that they have been received at the tower of power suite. G.1 WDFW Motion 1 Area 2A Catch Sharing Plan. That should say, "final changes". Thank you. I move that the Council adopt the season structure and changes to the Catch Sharing Plan for 2025 as recommended in Agenda Item G.1.a, WDFW Report 1, ODFW Report 1, and Supplemental CDFW Report 1.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:53] Thank you. As I followed along that language on the screen looks accurate and complete, is that correct?

**Heather Hall** [00:02:59] Yes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:59] Great. Is there a second? seconded by Lynn Mattes. Please speak to your motion.

**Heather Hall** [00:03:04] Thank you. I think the 3 reports outline nicely the work that the state agencies did working with stakeholders to develop preliminary alternatives and a final recommendation that reflects our input from stakeholders and the public and discussions we've been having since September. That's it.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:30] Thank you. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:03:43] Thank you Vice-Chair. And thank you Miss Hall for combining the motions instead of us normally, our normal 3 individual motions. I think all 3 of us states are trying to find ways to provide the most utilization of our, the most opportunity to utilize our quota not knowing what our quota is. We do this process in November and we get our quota in January, so this is just an attempt to try to line up our season so that we can work with NMFS inseason once we get our quota and utilize our fishery the best we can. So thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:19] Thank you Lynn. Further discussion? Not seeing any I'll call for the question here. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:04:29] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:29] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Heather. I believe that takes care of the first piece. Looks like Heather Hall has her hand up. Heather.

**Heather Hall** [00:04:47] Thank you. This last motion covered the sport part of this agenda item and I do have a motion that would cover the directed commercial season dates there. Thank you. WDFW Motion 2, Directed Halibut Season Structure. I move that the Council adopt the following season structure for the commercial non-tribal directed halibut fishery in 2025. The 2025 season will consist of a series of 3-day openings each beginning at 8 a.m. Tuesday, ending at 6 p.m. on Thursday of that week. The first opening would be on the fourth Tuesday in June. The second opening would be 2 weeks after the first opener. And the third opening would aim to be 2 weeks after the second opener, but no later than 3 weeks after the second opener. Subsequent openings would occur as soon as possible. Notice of the dates for the first 3 openers would be announced in the Federal Register prior to the start of the season.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:56] That language on the screen appeared accurate and complete, is that correct?

**Heather Hall** [00:05:59] Yes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:00] Great. Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Please speak to your motion.

**Heather Hall** [00:06:07] Thank you. This motion is largely status quo and the only thing I did, the motion describes is the third opener, and it's intended to recognize the work that NMFS is doing to address some of the comments we heard from the GAP and the SAS, and that's narrowing

the time between the openers to 2 weeks. I know they're working on that. So the way this is described as it would be 2 weeks if possible, but no longer than 3 weeks, so there's a range in there and it provides that expectation but also some flexibility as needed.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:53] All right, thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:07:06] Thank you Vice-Chair. It seems like you're hearing from Miss Hall and I lot here on this item. Supportive of this. It is primarily status quo. Do want to make note that there's some things that the GAP requested that are not addressed in the motion, those are things that are outside of the scope of what we can do right now, but we do think there needs to be some bigger discussion moving forward somehow taking a holistic look at this directed commercial halibut fishery. When we as a Council and NMFS took it over, took over management of this fishery from IPHC, we agreed to let it run status quo for a couple of years and then take a look at it, you know, figure out how we did things then take a look at it and I think it'll come up some under the next agenda item and maybe under workload planning too, but we may need to decide, start thinking about how and when and who might be available to start looking at this commercial halibut fishery, directed fishery and how we can better utilize the resource. So it is out there. We are thinking about it. It is being discussed, it's just not something that's available under this action today. I just wanted to make sure that the members of the GAP were aware that it's...we're not ignoring it, it's just not anything we can do right now. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:30] Thank you. Any other discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:08:41] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:42] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Heather. I think with those two items I'm going to turn to Angela. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:09:01] Sorry you're not getting rid of me quite so quickly. I think we've got the formal motions done but was hoping we could provide some informal guidance to NMFS to try to address the license application timing issue as requested by the SAS. I know you all said in your report you were looking into it, we would just like to further encourage looking into that. I don't think we need a formal motion to say please go do that, but just wanted to.....the guidance that if you could continue to look into that to help our, especially our salmon folks we would appreciate it. And now I think I'm done under this agenda item.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:40] All right. And I will pause, look around and see if there's any other discussion? Josh Lindsay.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:09:46] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Apologies. I just wanted to briefly follow-up on Miss Mattes's comment. Yes, that's something we're happy to do and I think absent of even a request it was something that we intended to continue to do. And this may be a little bit of a preview of some of the discussion to come under G.2, but I also failed to highlight one aspect in the NMFS Report, and that is the list of regulatory actions that went into managing this fishery

this year, which is 15. Between the months of February and October there was at least one Federal Register Noticed engaged with this fishery, which is a pretty heavy regulatory workload. So it is something that we are actively looking at and it'll need to be part of the conversation of any sort of other thing, whether or not it's moving the permit date or potential other changes that, you know we are, some of these we do see the benefit of looking into. And I know workload is a difficult one to bring into the conversation, but unfortunately in this case it is given the way that we've sort of developed the fisheries for this commercial and recreational fishery and inherent regulatory nature of it that adding on will be difficult. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:00] Thank you Josh. Further discussion? Angela, how are we doing?

**Angela Forristall** [00:11:11] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. You have adopted final changes to the 2025 Pacific Halibut Catch Sharing Plan and for the annual fishery regulations so your work on this item is complete.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:22] All right, let me scan once more before I close the agenda item, make sure we didn't miss anything. Not seeing any hands that completes work on Agenda Item G.1.

## 2. Commercial Fishery Regulation Changes: Vessel Monitoring Systems, Seabird Avoidance, and Catch Reporting – Final

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes our reports, the public comment. As I said we will come back with discussion and action tomorrow, but before you walk away tonight I just want to look around and see if there's any brief statements anybody wants to make that they think would facilitate your work between now and tomorrow morning on this? Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:23] Sorry everyone, but I did want to ask Angela if....I really appreciate Chris's reminder about the 55 foot and smaller or, yeah I think it's 55 foot and lower exemption for the streamer lines and I didn't see that in the discussion here for these vessels, and so I'm curious if we'd put the same exemption in place for anybody who would be affected by Alternative 2?

**Angela Forristall** [00:00:53] So I think the idea would be to have those requirements match what are currently the groundfish requirements. So for vessels 26 to 55 feet it'd be 1 streamer line. For vessels greater than 55 feet it would be 2. But there would also therefore be there's like a bad weather exemption so if there's winds up to above a certain level then streamer lines would not be required to hopefully mitigate the safety concerns.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:22] Follow-up Aja?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:01:24] Thank you. And then is there information about those 6 vessels where they fall into those size categories?

**Angela Forristall** [00:01:31] I don't have that on hand but if I can get that I will let you know in the morning.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:38] Okay, thank you. There's a recreational roundtable that starts here at 6, but Marci did you have something? I want to make sure we're ready tomorrow.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:01:47] Yeah, will we have an opportunity for further Q&A tomorrow morning?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:52] Absolutely.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:01:53] Okay, great. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:59] With that we'll suspend the action on this for today and we will come back in the morning bright and early and start back on G.2 and finish that up. Have a good evening.....(BREAK FOR THE EVENING).

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:10] With that I'll turn to Vice-Chair Hassemer to finish up G.2. Pete.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:18] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I trust everyone had a good evening to think about all our reports and the public comments and digest this material. When we left our session

yesterday afternoon we had just gotten into Council discussion, which includes any more questions anybody has trying to clarify, sort through things, and discuss this and see what we need to do. I think our Council action is up there before us on those 3 items. So with that great pause I'm going to look around for any hands. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:03:01] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I was hoping to take an opportunity to bring the GAP back up. And I.....they're all gone.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:13] They all left.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:03:16] I believe I was in communication with Harrison Ibach, who is a GAP member. He was not testifying on behalf. He didn't give the GAP Report yesterday but if he's available maybe he'd be an appropriate stand-in?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:34] Do we know if Harrison is here? Harrison is online and trust he'll be able to speak for the GAP. Harrison, can you hear us?

**Harrison Ibach** [00:03:48] I can. Good morning.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:49] All right. Marci, go ahead with your question.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:03:54] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yesterday Harrison, I know you weren't here, but we heard a bit from the Office of Law Enforcement and the Enforcement Consultants about concerns with vessels that participate both in the directed commercial halibut fishery and having difficulties distinguishing those vessels from groundfish vessels because of the way they fish. They're fishing similarly. They may be fishing in the same area and it's difficult to tell from the sky which fishery they may be participating in or if they're participating in both. I know there's concern with DC participants that maybe are not groundfish participants, are not held to the same accountability standards as groundfish, if they were participating in the DC fishery and were not also participating in the groundfish fishery, that would mean they'd be needing to discard the groundfish that they'd be catching in association with directed halibut fishery activities. I was wondering if this discard situation presents concerns for the GAP and what you think about the potential for those discards to increase if we don't take actions here today to essentially bring the directed commercial halibut fishery in line with the same accountability measures that we hold our open access and commercial permitted groundfish fleet to?

**Harrison Ibach** [00:05:51] Through the Vice-Chair, thank you Marci. I appreciate that and good morning again. This conversation, we've been having a lot of this conversation in the GAP, probably a bit more than what I really anticipated. We were a little shocked to see that this could potentially even be on future workload still. I mean we as a GAP and with all of our discussions, I mean we kind of saw this as kind of a slam dunk. Let's make a....let's get moved through with a rulemaking and put this behind us because we feel as though that it's pretty much common sense that even though the halibut fishery may not have an FMP and be, you know, under Magnuson like the rest of these fisheries that the Council has and manages, we as the GAP feel as though that it's one in the same. Halibut and groundfish in our eyes are one in the same. 99% of the fishermen who fish for halibut, you know, directed halibut are groundfish guys, groundfish boats. And we

have been so used to accountability. We agree with accountability. We agree with the use of VMSs and seabird streamers. I think it's all part of the best management for the groundfish fishery. And in our eyes, I say the groundfish fishery, but in our eyes that includes halibut, even though technically halibut is not part of it. In regards to discards, yeah we have a major problem with discards. You know we.....that was part of the discussion that we've had over and over about the issue here is, you know, here's a handful of people that at as of now, a handful of people, but there's a handful of people that are participating in directed fishery that are most likely discarding large amounts of fish just because they don't want to have any sort of accountability or have a VMS. And in our eyes, those of us who have had VMSs for a long time, as far as I can remember I've had a VMS. I've had a VMS from on a 19 foot vessel up to the vessel that I have now, 50 something foot. As long as I can remember I've had a VMS. It's not that big of a deal. And if anything, what we had joked about in the GAP was that, you know, for these handful of vessels that if they were required to have a VMS they would probably write us a letter of appreciation thanking us for making them have a VMS, because at some point in time you never know when there's going to be some sort of salmon collapse or, you know, other fishery constraints that take place and they're going to need more opportunity. And so with a VMS, we've joked about how, if anything, it's going to provide more opportunity to those vessels where they can participate in other fisheries that actually maybe, you know, could probably help them out in the future. So we're not sure on the GAP, we're not really too sure what the hang up is. We don't really understand why there can't really be a rulemaking to require, you know, a VMS and seabird avoidance measures for these vessels because we see groundfish and halibut as one in the same. And we know that it's only a handful of vessels now, you know, an average of 6. But that being said, you know, it might not always be 6 and I think there's a lot of concern amongst the fleet about the halibut fleet, those who participate in the directed fishery about how potentially at any point you can see a major effort shift into this fishery. And if you're not going to allow or require, excuse me, if you're not going to require these vessels to have a VMS and we see a massive effort shift into this fishery, it's going to become a problem as well. So we don't understand why we just don't take care of this immediately before there potentially is some sort of effort shift into this fishery. I think that it's.....I believe that there's even a public comment in the briefing book as well about wanting to close off this fishery. I mean there's quite a few fishermen, and I know that these talks have taken place in Oregon for a long time, and they've heard from quite a few other halibut fishermen that participate in the directed fishery that are wanting to, you know, create this make a limited-entry fishery of some sort. So even those who have participated in the fishery are not wanting any sort of mass increase of effort. I guess I'll stop there for now. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:37] Thank you. Marci, did that answer your question?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:10:41] Yes it does. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:42] Thank you. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:10:44] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Harrison I do have just a question, just my lack of knowledge about the details. So aside from, say, personal motivation, is there anything structural, structural difference about what is necessary for a boat to participate in the directed halibut fishery versus groundfish? I mean does, you know, for someone who is, you know,



choosing essentially not to participate in the groundfish fishery, could that be related to additional other structural needs on the boat or is it really not different?

**Harrison Ibach** [00:11:29] Through the Vice-Chair, thanks Sharon. Any vessel that participates in the directed halibut fishery has the capabilities to participate in any groundfish fishery because the gear types are one and the same. So there are some vessels that are maybe not as equipped. They may not be as efficient to truly participate on a higher level of, you know, retaining more fish or potentially, you know, setting more gear, setting more long lines or anything of that sort. But the reality is, any fisherman, that is any vessel that is participating in the DC fishery is basically participating in a groundfish fishery. The gear types are 100% the same.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:12:16] Thank you. That is helpful.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:19] Thank you. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:12:22] Thank you. I have a question and then some comments to make. But the question was to Angela. I just wanted to follow-up on the question that I ended the day with yesterday about the size of the vessel, the 6 vessels that are currently, that we're currently considering with this action?

**Angela Forristall** [00:12:41] Yeah, thank you Miss Szumylo. We were able to get that information. So of the vessels participating in 2023 in those vessel classes A through C, so those are the ones with the most revenue concerns, there was one vessel that fell into that class range in 2023 and 3 in 2024.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:13:02] Thank you. And so I'll go into my comments and I am going to stop short of everything that I have to say to allow additional discussion here. And I wanted to agree with what Harrison said and echo what he said about potential new entrants to the fishery in the future being a concern and something that we should think about in the long term, that if we're creating regulations here we're trying to ensure that we have the mechanisms to monitor and prevent bycatch on all the vessels that might come into the fishery in the future. So it's not really just thinking about these 6 vessels, it's thinking about what we want the shape of this to be in the longer term. But as it stands right now, there are still only 6 vessels that we're potentially talking about. It's a very small set of regulated entities. And what really strikes me is there's a really unfortunately large cost to those 6 vessels as it stands right now in the way that the action is set up and a really large regulatory burden for the agency to put this action through with it focusing on that few vessels. In some of the discussions that we had last night and then in considering the broader changes that the Council wants for this fishery that we're thinking about for expanding access to this fishery, it really strikes me that this is somewhat a prioritization exercise and I think it, and yeah I guess this is a question to NOAA somewhat and to the Council about future workload. You know if we put our eggs in this basket of finalizing this action right now, it's going to tie up some of the regulatory staff workload time that I think could potentially be devoted to other things that may benefit more participants in the fishery. And I guess I haven't been around in the discussions enough to know the nature of the other things that the Council is considering for halibut? And so that's a question to everybody. Is, does doing this right now, knowing that it's probably going to tie everybody up for a long time, is it worth it to spend the energy here on this action versus doing

something else that may benefit more participants in this fishery? And that's a question to everybody. I just not knowing what else is going on. So thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:15:31] Thank you. Excuse me. Further discussion? Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:15:38] Thank you Vice-Chair. And thanks for the input from Harrison. I really appreciate that and I just wanted to share some of the things that I'm contemplating about this and it is really an action that I think that I support. I support the actions proposed here, the VMS and the seabirds in particular. But I am not.....I'm very open minded to understanding this workload issue and I know sometimes when we hear workload it's unsatisfying. Like we think, well that's not a very good excuse to not move forward, but I note that that issue is bigger than just not having enough staff. But I think it's important that we think about how this fishery has evolved since it's been taken over by National Marine Fisheries Service rather than the IPHC, and I don't know that there's really been the resources available to accept that new workload. And so that's just me explaining that I appreciate that not only is there workload with the 17 halibut actions, if I got that number right, that happened last year for halibut alone and how that affects a rule such as this. And so is there an opportunity to think about some of these ideas that we've heard from the GAP about improving the directed commercial halibut fishery alongside what I view as a necessary action to enforce bycatch and enforce area closures that are in place for other sectors. So that's just sharing some of my thoughts here. And maybe a question to NMFS. Josh, on....I thought I heard you say yesterday about when you were speaking about the need for all of the inseason rulemaking actions that you had to do that you're working on improving that, and just the question is did I hear that right? And maybe could you explain a bit if that's what you were saying? Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:12] Josh Lindsay.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:18:14] Through the Vice-Chair. Thank you. Thank you for the question Miss Hall. Sorry about that. Yes, for the directed fisheries specifically we've been looking at new ways to both streamline our process and then make it more efficient for the industry. We've heard from the industry that not knowing the dates, the preference for the 2 weeks to get at some of that, we've been exploring different avenues. We've been looking at some of the ways the bluefin fishery has utilized notice for putting actions out, and that's something that staff and I have been exploring and hope to get to. That will not relieve the burden of still needing to track landings, determine what new limits will be, and all the other associated work that comes to that, so it'll most likely be a time efficiency with a slight workload efficiency on that one.

**Heather Hall** [00:19:15] Thank you. And just again, an appreciation for what I think is happening behind the scenes that is not always seen and that you are adapting to managing this fishery and appreciate that work.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:19:30] Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:19:31] Through the Vice-Chair. Thank you. If you don't mind, I just wanted to follow-up on also the workload comments by Miss Szumylo and Heather Hall. I think we've previously expressed and still have concerns about the cost and burden of these actions on the fishery participants. I think those are the comments we provided previously. I very much

appreciate some of the questions. I don't expect less from this Council of trying to get to sort of the impacts of these actions. Very much appreciate the amount of time and effort Council staff put into this robust analysis that's in front of the Council. This is by far the largest like look at the halibut fishery that I think has happened by this Council and it was pretty impressive. And so interested in the continued conversation and participating in that conversation today on those costs and benefits to the fishery participants. But yes, as a secondary matter, all these actions will take time and effort and staff resources. And I agree it's not necessarily the reason to not move forward on actions that the Council has in front of them, but I do think it's important information for the Council to have to make those decisions of the impacts of moving forward with a certain action and what that may mean for other actions. These commercial fishery actions will be ultimately, if the agency determines they're appropriate and moves forward with them, 3 separate rulemaking packages and complicated rulemaking packages. When you are inputting new regulations on the public like this, not just setting a new TAC or a new quota, it comes with a lot of other steps on the regulatory side. So each of them would likely take a year and a half or so to do. And, you know, either that means moving, you know, for my branch and it's a bit of a microcosm of sustainable fisheries division, you know, that's either moving resources from CPS ecosystem climate work that my folks work on, or not being able to take up other actions, or both. So just to maybe follow-up on that workload aspect. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:40] Thank you. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:21:43] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Josh. I certainly recognize that halibut is part of a new branch and your workload and your responsibilities have evolved substantially. And there are certainly, I think, our expectation that there will be some growing pains as things develop. I guess I would just note that the Council and its other fishery FMP processes and activities has a pretty extensive process for inseason actions, both for commercial fisheries and for sport fisheries. And on the regulatory side, I'm thinking of salmon as an example, we take about 40, 50 inseason actions on salmon throughout the course of the fishing season. And the reason we do that is to ensure that we stay within our accountability measures and that our objectives are achieved both so that we maximize available harvest and that we ensure that our conservation objectives are attained. And so we go through a process that's fairly involved, that involves agencies, agency co-managers and stakeholders, and we discuss the progress of the fisheries to date with the most up-to-date catch information. And decisions on things like rollovers are made, impact neutral measures to.....and then determinations on numbers of fish that are allowed in subsequent quota periods, all in response to our overall goal of managing fisheries both to maximize utilization and to ensure that we are working within our ESA and our MSA objectives. On the groundfish side, we have a different yet similar inseason process here in the Council arena where we take up groundfish inseason actions at each Council meeting. And again, we're tracking the progress of the catch inseason and agencies are providing information that they've gotten from fish tickets and monitoring programs, and we consider input from industry in terms of what opportunities perhaps they would like to see increase, and then there's an evaluation done to see if increases can be provided, and then the Council takes that advice and considers it and makes recommendations and NMFS does respond accordingly with an inseason rule usually following each Council meeting, but it's a well-defined process. The rules of the road are laid out ahead of time pre-season in terms of what's in bounds in terms of an inseason action versus what may be out of bounds so we have some guideposts, which is similar to salmon, although they aren't doing an

actual rule with each of these 40 inseason actions. We utilize the tools like the salmon hotline. I would note we have a halibut hotline and that's used as well. And so I appreciate that regulatory needs are extensive and time consuming and labor intensive, but I guess I would just ask, have you looked at these two other, I think, excellent examples of how we do both sport and commercial inseason actions for salmon and for groundfish perhaps as a model? And again, I realize your shop is not intimately connected with either salmon or groundfish, but perhaps those are some examples to look to that may bring future regulatory efficiencies. So maybe you can speak to that. Thanks.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:26:25] Josh, anything you can add there?

**Josh Lindsay** [00:26:28] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you for the question Miss Yaremko. Yes, where of those other processes I think we've looked at those as templates. I'd say I think we move quite a bit faster than groundfish. The actions that we're implementing I'd also note, we are following the guidelines that the Council has asked us through through the Catch Sharing Plan similar to the proposal California has under G.1 to be able to move fish inseason between areas, so we will be codifying that, which will set guidelines on how we do inseason actions. So yes, there is a regulatory burden to some of this. This is a regulatory burden somewhat established by the Council of how they would like things to be done inseason. I think we've, you know in terms of speed, we've, you know, gotten those down to seven, eight days. We're always looking for efficiency when in the government if there is another way to do business, such as our exploration of the bluefin and email announcements to better accommodate that directed fishery. As I mentioned before, that's something we will do. And I'll note I didn't, although I spoke to them a little bit about workload yesterday, that inclusion of the list of the actions in our NMFS Report, that was just a standard thing we do typically in our NMFS Report, it was not sort of any sort of underlying intent behind that. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:27:55] Thank you. Further discussion? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:28:03] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. You know, I got to say I wish Bob Dooley was here, because one thing that Bob has really impressed on us in the California delegation is the importance of accountability and holding ourselves to higher standards. And this was definitely a focal point of discussion for him throughout his tenure with particular focus, I'd say, on the open access fleet. He's often noted that we, you know, we do need to hold that sector to standards, maybe not the same standards as perhaps the IQ fleet, but we need to do our best to ensure that our fishery participants are accountable. We made some decisions long ago with application of VMS to the OA fleet with the goal of ensuring accountability. I'm thinking about the recent actions we've taken to require non-trawl logbooks and actions to require a permit registration for the open access fishery. And these are things that, again, allow for reporting and accountability and allow us to, I think, do our best to adhere to and uphold the National Standards. This Council is a Magnuson created body and we are, I think, tasked with upholding the National Standards and ensuring that they are met. And even though halibut is a fishery that's not an MSA fishery, if it is the subject of our discussions here around the table, I believe that in taking our oaths it's our responsibility that we are attempting to manage this fishery under the guidance and auspices of the National Standards. I'm thinking about what Harrison said about the halibut fishery, or halibut fleet and the groundfish fleet being one in the same. And I do not know why we would want to continue to develop this fishery without ensuring that there are accountability measures.

We are only asking to hold this fleet to the same standards that we're holding our groundfish fleet to. So with that I support the action. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:04] Thank you Marci. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:31:08] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Marci, thank you for that very careful description of the regulatory processes that your state goes through. And this has been coming up the last few days, and I speak somewhat from my old experience in NMFS. We always, in this process, compare our state and federal processes to each other without a strong understanding of each other's processes and sometimes disregard each other's processes and the complexities behind them and underneath them. And so I want to say that for everyone to remember that we don't understand what each other, what each of our systems take to move, and whatever we can do in the future to gain better understanding of what our different systems do to move before casting aspersions on other systems or asking people to do things other ways, I hope that we can try to do that in the future. And that came up, it's come up a couple of times in my discussions around this issue, and I speak a lot from my familiarity in NMFS, but something that's easy in the state or easy for a few people may not be easy on the federal level and I think that's just something to keep in mind. I do support all of these measures going forward, less so the catch reporting requirement, more so the streamer line and the VMS requirement. I think I'm just asking for balancing it with some other benefit to the fleet and some grander benefit on the whole and asking if, again the regulatory time and effort at this moment is what everyone wants to spend time on given that it's going to be a lot of work. Are there things that are better for the fishery as a whole.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:32:58] Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:33:00] Thank you Vice-Chair. Along the lines of what Miss Szumylo was just asking about, this is maybe a question for NMFS. You mentioned that these 3 actions would have to be probably 3 individual rulemakings, if we were to go down a route of maybe postponing action on these for now but instead under workload planning prioritize looking at the directed fishery more holistically kind of like the GAP recommended, would we be able to fold 1 or 2 of those into reimagining that fishery or would they still need to be separate agenda or separate rulemakings? I'm just thinking doing a bigger picture halibut, directed halibut rulemaking could we incorporate these into that?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:33:53] I think that was the question to NMFS. Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:33:58] I was hoping you were going to say Council staff Vice Chair.....(laughter).....Through the Vice-Chair, thank you for the question Miss Mattes. I'm always hesitant to speak about hypotheticals and I hadn't, I'm not sure I've fully thought through this, this concept. But yes, at the moment I don't think I can.....there's a reason why that could not happen. Obviously all the same standards sort of apply. You need to be looking at the costs and benefits of the action. But if a new action is, you know, sort of changing what is happening on the water, that may change what, you know, sort of the record in front of the Council for these other things as well so, yes, it's something we typically do when we implement a new conservation management measure. We need sort of additional enforcement actions for those types of actions. We do dual packages like that or combine packages. So the scenario does exist.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:34:59] Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:35:03] Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:35:05] Thanks Vice-Chair. I just wanted to note, and I really support what Marci said earlier, I'd like to see at this point moving forward with an FPA for all 3 of these Council actions. Marci channeled Bob. It's funny because I had the exact same thought, which is something that Bob talked about a lot, which was accountability and thinking about fairness across fleets. And you know that's a tough subject, it means a lot of different things, but I think we have an interesting example of it here today with what I see to be a relatively straightforward set of things that we can do to increase fairness and accountability. We are improving enforcement at the request of enforcement, protecting seabirds and avoiding ESA issues and improving our data. Overall, I think this is in the scope of improving our halibut fishery and hopefully growing it and ideally getting more access and getting a larger slice of the pie in the future, so planning for an optimistic future where this can become a bigger fishery and we can have more fishing. I wanted to recognize what Mr. Lindsay and a couple other folks have talked to regarding NMFS workload. It's real. There's no....I get it and I thank Mr. Lindsay for sharing this and outlining exactly what that looks like for his shop and what the resources NMFS has available. At the same time it's incredibly difficult to sit here as a Council and listen to this, especially at this point where we have what I view to be a pretty straight forward set of actions. At the FPA point where we've talked about this for a while, we have had the Council work on it, we've had our advisory bodies work on it, and then at this point say, oh but we have some workload stuff and we can't move forward with it. That's incredibly inefficient for the Council itself. And I realize that that is... there's no like perfect way to do that but, you know, we're, it's very difficult for the Council. We can't let workload drive policy. And so in terms of thinking about things like prioritization, which Miss Szumylo brought up, that also makes sense to me. You know when we choose to do something we are choosing not to do something else, and that's really important to think about. You know, I think all of us probably have that in the back of our minds in everything we do here on the floor. We also do it very explicitly under workload planning, which is the main exercise, at least in my mind, where this Council steps aside and says, okay where do we want to spend our time and how can we spend it and what's our workload? And we're even moving towards adding another important piece to that, which is what's our budget? So trying to be more efficient, trying to be more thoughtful and more strategic. So I just wanted to share those thoughts, express my appreciation for bringing up the workload considerations, but also feeling like it's not, not that it's not relevant, but given those I still recommend moving forward with this and trusting that NMFS will be able, if the Council does go to FPA and make these recommendations, that NMFS at the end of the day is still in charge and they are still the ones executing these Council recommendations. So thanks very much.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:38:38] Excuse me, I have a couple of hands here. I don't know if Aja had hers up and I missed it, but Heather and Josh, Josh did you want to respond? I think there were.....to some of the comments first and then Heather Hall.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:38:56] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, I can be brief. I did just want to respond briefly to Miss Ridings. And just to clarify something, I thought I had said this when I spoke previously, the agency is not saying workload is a reason to not move forward. I want to make sure that is clear. I know workload has come up in the conversation. Our primary, like I would, you

know, for lack of a better word, concern with these actions has been a true discussion and look at the true costs and benefits of implementing these things on the fishery participants. Should workload and be part of the conversation? That is something for the Council to look at and talk about prioritization, but from the agency perspective we're not saying not move forward. I don't think the agency has said not move forward with anything because of workload. It seems relevant and there seems to be some questions surrounding it. From my perspective, it's the other aspect of still from an agency perspective of the impact of these actions on the participants and the potential benefits. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:39:57] Thank you. Heather Hall. And then let me just check, Aja did....had you raised your hand earlier and I missed it? Okay. So Heather Hall then Dr. Lent. Heather.

**Heather Hall** [00:40:13] Thank you Vice-Chair. And I think we're having.....I think this discussion is really helpful. I agree with Miss Ridings that there is information here to adopt FPA on these actions and I think we can do that. And going back to what I said earlier, I'm just also wondering if adding to the efficiency and the success of a rule package going forward if FPA that we select on these actions here is combined with some of the, we've been calling them big picture ideas that we've been hearing from the GAP in the last couple of years for this directed commercial fishery, could be included in that type of a package and then that, and the way I've been thinking about it, is then that contributes to the cost benefit we're providing. You know, I think what is a really important foundation for this fishery and the accountability measures that Miss Yaremko is speaking really clearly to and I fully support, I completely agree, and the fair playing field that I think was included in the GAP Report and that we heard from Harrison. And so I think we can take final or adopt FPA and consider some of these things in a package that aligns them together and maybe creates a successful package going forward. Thanks.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:41:53] Thank you Heather. Dr. Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:41:56] Thank you Chair. Actually, just in line with what you just said Heather, I'm hearing that there's an interest in taking a holistic look and backing up and seeing what are some of the longer term things. And I'm also thinking about the fact that costs to the agency are not just implementing regulations but also managing the fleet, you know, what kind of inseason actions, what kind of monitoring and depending on how you've got your fishery set up. So in terms of the bigger picture, what are some things that we could consider at the next few meetings? And I know there's a schedule, but what are some of the things that this fishery needs that are higher level, longer term? What are some of the thing.....the ways we'd like to see this fishery five, ten years down the road? Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:42:43] Thank you. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:42:46] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I want to speak directly to this question of costs versus benefits. You can't put a price on equity. What I'm hearing from the groundfish fleet is what they're asking for is simply equity. They've acknowledged that the fleet is one in the same. And I just do not understand why we would not move forward with applying the same measures that already exist for groundfish fishery here today. Similarly accountability, you can't really put a numeric value next to that. But gosh, I would think that that should weigh very heavily

in terms of the benefits that we expect out of this emerging management program for this fishery. We were very deliberate in our thinking when we recommended that NMFS take authority back from IPHC to manage these fisheries under our auspices. I feel like what has been on the table with this action for 5 years now is what we're really looking to do is clean up loose ends and bring this fisheries requirements in line with those that already exist. I feel like not acting today would be a big step backward. I don't know why we would walk up to an FPA and get cold feet on something that really does just amount to cleaning up loose ends. And I would just ask, what kind of message does that send about us as a Council? In terms of this question about why not just pause and take a holistic look? The fishery is changing, we've heard that. I don't know why in the world we would wait until a problem is created to take action. We're talking 6 participants now, it could be 600 tomorrow that are out there operating under reduced limits, as we've heard is of interest to many on the GAP, a longer fishing period with reduced limits. That's going to incentivize entry because with longer fishing periods more people might take advantage of that opportunity. And if a low limit opportunity is created over a longer time period, we will get new entrants and they will be a different composition of vessels. And if those, I'm just going to say it, lower....newer vessels with perhaps not looking to make large volume landings, they're looking for more small, low volume opportunities, the impacts to groundfish are likely to be very significant, and I think we heard that from Harrison's testimony today. I'd also flag that the fishery historically has been observed only on occasion by the WICKOP Program a few years here and a few years there and at least in a few of those years had a very significant bycatch problem with yelloweye, which is still a rebuilding stock and something that we have spent years working to manage to rebuild and conserve and share those impacts across our fleets. So I am very concerned about the development of a directed halibut fishery in low volume, small quantity, without ensuring....we know we are not going to be expecting future WICKOP coverage on this fleet. To me it's very important that we ensure that we build this fishery right. And from the beginning we should be expecting accountability measures. I'll stop there. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:47:49] Thank you Marci. I think Executive Director Burden.....No? Nothing? Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:00] I want to be very clear here, I a hundred percent agree I want to put these measures in. I agree that they need to be there. For me it's the process and balancing it with other things that we need to do. I think this is a prioritization issue more so than like whether or not these things need to happen. Absolutely I'm on the same page that we should expect the same level of accountability for these vessels that are doing the same activity as the other groundfish vessels, but what I hear from NOAA is that, and I think Council, and I should turn this question back on to the Council too because we're also losing the opportunity to develop other things that could be beneficial to the fleet if we choose to do this right now and do not choose to do some of the other things that have potential benefits to the overall halibut fishery. But I think it's an issue of like choosing to do this now. If we choose to direct NOAA to move forward with the rulemaking now, what does that cost the fleet over the next, you know, over the next 18 months that this is going to take to develop? And I'm just asking everyone to balance those out. I completely, completely agree that the measures should be there. I don't even think we should discuss, or sorry, other people may have different opinions about whether or not we should do these measures, but what I want to discuss is the overall balance of workload and how we choose to spend Council and NMFS time. So yeah, I just wanted to stop the arguments about whether or not accountability is necessary,



whether or not we should protect the shape of the fishery regarding new entrants, that's not where the issue lies for me. It's where do we want to put our workload at this moment when we have limited resources and are we getting the best benefit for everyone if this only affects 6 vessels right now and potentially into the near future?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:51] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:01:53] Thank you Aja. I agree with you and I guess I want to just distinguish, my recommendations here speak strictly to the Council's actions here today. We of course acknowledge that NMFS, they're in charge of rulemaking. They make their decisions about how to prioritize what's on their plate and how to get it done and on what timeline. So please just wanting to clarify, my comments are to this Council and what we do here today and I completely acknowledge that, you know, that whole discussion is in their arena, and I think Corey Ridings spoke to that earlier as well. We're not trying to dictate to them how to do it, but I think for us to not deliver this action and not....and step back and try to consolidate these actions into other future actions that the Council might consider for halibut, we're actually creating more workload for our own Council staff because we'd need to repackage, revisit, update, so there's that staleness element that would occur that would come from delaying today. Thanks.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:20] Thank you. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:03:23] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I guess my perspective is recognizing the Council has expressed interest in a more holistic look at the DC, in particular halibut fishery, but in my mind consideration of the actions that are on the table, having those in place may actually have some outstanding influence on the kinds of things we would think about in terms of trying to grow this fishery. So I guess that's what's kind of swaying in my mind in terms of certainly an appreciation for the regulatory workload. And I guess my question, the action on the table now is creating a preferred final, so I'm assuming that's going back out to the public. So it's not like we're initiating rulemaking right now, which does give the Council some flex once we get feedback, whether they do want to do a staged.....are we ready to go now? Okay. Again, trying to think about what that fishery looks like in the future, to me setting the stage with the accountability may create for me more room to consider how that fishery might look in the future. So that's kind of where I'm coming from relative to this discussion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:01] Thank you. Chair Pettinger.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:03] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Great conversation here and actually I was going to speak earlier but Marci was hitting all the points I was going to bring up. And I'm sure Bob is smiling somewhere now. But I think it's important we do move forward for all the reasons that have been brought forth. I think that it's up to NMFS to decide maybe how fast they want to move with that, but I think if we push, if we moved forward, it says mention everybody else because there's only 6 people today but as Marci brought up, it could be 60 or I mean, who knows how many in the future, and so 6 boats might not seem very much. Halibut and yelloweye do hang around the same areas, that's not a secret to anybody and so this is a conservation issue in my mind. So I think that I agree with the proponents of moving this thing forward today so.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:59] Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:06:01] Thank you. I agree with the discussion around here. I think that sending a message around the idea that we're laying a foundation to build this fishery and a foundation built on accountability is strong. And we also heard yesterday in public comment a generous offer to help financially with seabird avoidance tools and selecting FPA and signaling that intent to move there, acknowledging what you just mentioned Brad about how fast that moves forward I think is smart. I also just wanted to add too around the conversation around bycatch and yelloweye, if this were any other fishery, it feels like we're struggling to talk about it because it's halibut, but if it were any other fishery it would it be I think a different conversation. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:05] Thank you. Chair Pettinger.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:07] Yeah, I apologize. One thing if we move forward with this today, it sends a message to everybody out there that they understand the cost that's going to be incurred for doing it. I would hate to have somebody buy some equipment and become a groundfish vessel, which would be a haulers and long line equipment, and then find out a year or two later, hey I spent this money and I don't want to go down this path. So I think it basically allows people to make an informed decision on what they may do with their business operation going into the future and I think that's important. So thanks.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:38] Okay, thank you. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:07:45] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. Just listening to this discussion that I think is a, it's a very healthy one and I commend you all for that, but there are a couple of streams of thought that I think on a process level I just would like to offer some clarity. So one is final action. That is something that if you do decide to move forward I would encourage you to do that today. If not today, the next time we could take this up might be June or September, at which point, and I think you mentioned this Marci, we'd be looking at refreshing the analytical package, putting work into this again. And so maybe there's good reason to do that, but that would be the implication of not taking action today. There's a second conversation about bigger picture, more holistic view. If that is something that you're interested in, I would appreciate having the time to consult with our deputy and just figure out when we might be able to bring something back that could be a coherent discussion. That would take some prep work on our part to help guide that discussion. And of course that our halibut people are fully booked through June so that would be another thing that would come up middle of next year. But I would encourage you to keep those two things separate. I understand that they do have overlap and they do feedback on each other, but I think for purposes of today I'd encourage you to keep those two topics separate in your mind.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:11] Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:09:13] Thank you Vice-Chair. I didn't see any other hands reaching up so we may have reached the point. I'm prepared to toss a motion out and generate some additional discussion if now's the time.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:27] Now is the time.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:09:28] All righty. Kris, this would be the first one, not the alternative one please. Okay. I move the Council adopt the following as the Final Preferred Alternative in priority order. For waters north of 42 degrees North Latitude. Action 1: VMS. Alternative 1 with the following components. Component 1A: Applicable waters require VMS on applicable vessels when fishing in the EEZ. Component 2A: VMS ping rate. Require a VMS ping rate of four times per hour once every 15 minutes. And Component 3B: VMS status requirement. VMS must be turned on and transmitting location data when participating in the directed commercial halibut fishery. Action 2: Seabird avoidance measure. The Council adopt Alternative 1, which was our PPA with the following component. Component 1A applies to applicable vessels when fishing in the EEZ. Until implementation, request NMFS do outreach promoting voluntary usage of streamlines by directed commercial halibut fishery vessels. And for Action Item 3: Catch reporting on fish tickets. No Action.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:56] Thank you Lynn. I followed along. The language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Is that correct?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:11:03] Yes sir, it is.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:04] Thank you. I'll look for a second to the motion? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Please speak to your motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:11:12] Thank you Vice-Chair. As we've had some very robust discussion here this morning on this and there were a lot of discussions in the hallways, emails last night, we have been working on this for a fairly long time and we've gone several iterations. At one point I think we thought there was 18 vessels and then 14 and then 9, and now we're down to 6, but that's just right now. This is an open access fishery and depending on what happens in some of our other fisheries, particularly salmon and Dungeness crab, we could see new participants, new entrants because this is a relatively low cost entry fishery so wanting to keep that in mind. Additionally, we're trying, thinking trying to be proactive and thinking towards the fishery and modernizing this fishery. While we've not currently had any issues with seabird bycatch, this action will help further reduce the potential for further, for future interactions. This also brings this fishery into line with other fisheries that fish in similar but not always the same areas and with similar though not always exactly the same gear types. It makes enforcement of regulations to protect seabirds and closed areas easier to enforce. Limiting the VMS and seabird streamer lines to when fishing in the EEZ rather than halibut conservation waters makes the regulation consistent with those of groundfish. It also reduces the potential confusion for state waters fisheries that do not currently require VMS such as the Oregon state managed commercial nearshore fishery. If the stream liner.....in the time that it takes to put the streamer lines into regulation, we do encourage NMFS to work to do outreach on the directed fleet and encourage voluntary usage of stream liners. And note we heard in a public comment yesterday that there is an organization willing to purchase the streamer lines next year so hopefully that can be communicated. As I did mention, the directed fishery is an introductory fishery because of the cost, the low cost to participate. And yes there are some costs associated with this action. As I just mentioned, somebody is willing to purchase streamer lines for the 6 to 7 vessels in 2025, there may also be programs available to help fund the initial purchase of VMS units. I know there's something on the Pacific States website. I don't know how much funding is available. I was not able to catch Mr. Thom while he was here, but there may be other

avenues besides the Pacific States. On the fish ticket reporting issue there's concerns that this may be out of the Council's purview as fish tickets are required in state regulations. Currently the number of halibut are required to be reported on fish tickets in Oregon and Washington, and we have some concerns that requiring it in federal could be some double counting of those fish. We are trying to be cognizant of the possible workload associated with this, and if there has to be a choice of which comes first, do recommend the VMS piece be the higher priority. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:26] Thank you Lynn. Questions for clarification on the motion? I'll look very carefully. I see no questions for clarification. Discussion on the motion? Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:14:44] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I figure I will speak early since I have not weighed-in a lot on this topic today. I will be supporting the motion. I am appreciative of the time we have spent and the depth of conversation even leading up to this motion. And what really has stuck out to me over the last two days is the conversation around accountability that we've heard from members of the public both on the fishing community side and also from NGOs and even from some of the students that spoke to us yesterday in public testimony. The other piece that I really have appreciated hearing is the consideration around cost for new entrants and the opportunity potentially for entrants. And I thought it was interesting to hear this morning, hey, we had a lot of discussion. We had some discussion about people maybe thanking us later in terms of we don't, they don't want to put this equipment on now but we may have more opportunity, or they will have more opportunity if we do implement this. So I think it's helpful to strike a balance in terms of how we move forward. I am appreciative of the equity piece. And Marci I agree with you that you can't put a price on equity, but I do think that having everybody playing by the same rules is helpful, particularly if those rules make it so that some people have more opportunity to get in and we do end up in a situation where we have a lot more participation. So the ability to highlight this topic, the ability to get people interested and engaged may lead to more people wanting to participate and more opportunity. So I appreciate that we're thinking about what our future looks like and how we're going to mold that, and Aja thanks for really helping frame that first thing out the gate this morning in terms of this isn't just a decision about a few boats today, but it's really about what our future looks like. So with that, thank you for the motion and thank you for the few minutes to comment on this topic.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:17:22] Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:17:24] Thank you. And I know we're extending a conversation from yesterday so I'll keep this brief because my thoughts are very similar to what Miss Svensson just expressed. And I know we need to take cost burdens on industry very seriously and think about those. I do think that there is an added value by having VMS on a vessel and then the ability to retain groundfish that that brings. And that was one of the questions I brought up yesterday and I think that was supported a bit by Harrison's comments this morning. And there is a benefit add here, it is not solely a cost burden, so I want to share that. And I also really appreciate the conversations we've had around yelloweye and bycatch, and it's an important part of this conversation and the need for some of these measures. Relative to the cost, I also again want to just reiterate the idea that we have an offer to support some of the costs relative to streamer lines, and I think that helps with us thinking about that added burden and offsetting that through that generous offer. So thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:55] Thank you. Other discussion? Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:19:04] Thank you and thanks everyone for the commentary. I just wanted to add on the streamer line issue. It would be really lovely if we could all try to work together with Miss Conrad and her organization to try to get the 6 vessels to adopt using streamer lines voluntarily in the meantime between when this rulemaking, well now and when this rulemaking will go in place probably 18 months from now. So perhaps there is a way for Council staff and NOAA and whatever organizations are funding this to collaborate on making that happen a lot sooner before the start of the upcoming season. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:19:43] Thank you. Other discussion? Not seeing any hands I'll call a question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:19:51] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:19:52] Opposed? Abstentions?

**Josh Lindsay** [00:19:58] Abstain.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:00] The motion passes with one abstention, National Marine Fisheries Service. Thank you very much Lynn. With that if we had our action list up there that covers the 3 actions, but I want to look around to see what other comments and guidance there might be. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:20:27] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just wanting to note the motion that we just passed spoke exclusively to waters north of 42 degrees and I am prepared with a motion for south of 42 degrees, if I may.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:43] Yes you may.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:20:45] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you. I move the Council adopt the following as the Final Preferred Alternative in priority order for waters south of 42 degrees North Latitude. Action 1: Vessel Monitoring System. Alternative 1 with the following components. Component 1B: Require VMS on applicable vessels when fishing in convention waters of IPHC Area 2A. Component 2A: VMS ping rate requirement. Require a VMS ping rate of four times per hour, i.e. once every 15 minutes. And Component 3B: VMS status requirement. VMS must be turned on and transmitting location data when fishing when participating in the directed commercial fishery halibut fishery. Action 2: Seabird avoidance measures. The Council adopts Alternative 1 PPA with the following component. Component 1B: Applicable, applies to applicable vessels when fishing in convention waters of IPHC Area 2A. Until implemented, request NMFS do outreach promoting voluntary use of streamer lines by directed commercial halibut fishery vessels. Action 3: Catch reporting on fish tickets. Alternative 2: Require that fish receiving tickets for landings of halibut from any commercial vessels landing halibut to include both weight and number of halibut landed.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:22:25] Thank you Marci. As I followed along everything on the screen looks accurate and complete. Is that correct?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:22:31] Yes it is.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:22:32] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:22:39] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just wanting to reflect back on our discussions in September and note that regulatory processes are different in California, which is the reason that you see a separate action for south of 42. It would be California's intention that we have one federal rule that speaks to halibut for the extent of the waters off the coast of California, so covering both state waters and waters of the EEZ. The Halibut Act provides that authority to establish federal regulations that span that extent versus just waters of the EEZ, which is what Magnussen Authority authorizes. For California, we'd prefer to have one rule that is clear and simple and comes from one rulebook. We had some discussion about, back in September, about some of the unique challenges with the way the California state fish tickets, the rules are written, and we've heard from the EC the concerns about the clarity on the state's fish tickets requirement. So this will clean that issue up and make it nice and clear and there would be no need to worry about whether state waters rules were consistent with federal rules because it would all be one in the same. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:24:27] Thank you. Are there questions for clarification on the motion? No questions for clarification, discussion on the motion? Josh Lindsay.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:24:42] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. One of us might have been involved in a discussion category one might have asked for a clarification so I apologize. Miss Yaremko on the catch reporting one, we didn't have a chance to get into this during full Council discussion, but from our perspective there's still a little bit of confusion on that one in terms of the ask from the Council in terms of implementing a new federal fish ticket that would apply to this or somehow implementing this sort of requirement in some other fashion. And I guess while I'm on that one, I was hoping maybe you could speak to a little bit more of the need for any commercial vessels versus some of the discussion around salmon specifically? Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:25:31] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:25:32] Yeah, thank you. Appreciate the question. The California state fish ticket requirement does not speak to requiring the numbers of fish recorded. We'd like a rule that plainly and clearly states that reporting the number of halibut on the state's fish ticket is needed for, or is required for halibut management purposes. Right now we have a ratio requirement in the salmon fishery which relies on the number of fish to fulfill that ratio requirement. In the case of the incidental halibut fishery north of Chehalis there is a requirement that authorizes, you know, one free halibut per and then the ratio requirement. So we already have a basis for using a number of halibut authorized in a incidental sablefish fishery elsewhere on the West Coast. It is highly foreseeable that at some point in the future as we talk about changing our rules for the directed halibut fishery in a way that allows perhaps more co-targeting, co-retention incidental to other

groundfish fishery activities, it's highly foreseeable that we might be using some kind of numeric ratio requirement looking ahead as we consider these holistic needs for the fishery. So to me it makes good sense to go ahead and require that both the number of fish and the pounds be required on the state's fish ticket.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:27:40] Thank you. Josh, follow-up to that?

**Josh Lindsay** [00:27:44] Sorry Mr. Vice-Chair. There was going to be a separate question so I'm happy to have you go to somebody else if it's a preference.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:27:54] Let's go to Sharon Kiefer. We'll come back to you then. Sharon.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:27:57] Marci, I'm not sure you completely answer....at least in my mind answered the question. So more explicitly is the format of the current fish ticket capable.....is there a place, you know, that somebody can record a number, or does it require reformatting of the physical fish ticket?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:28:19] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:28:20] Thank you Miss Kiefer for asking that question. There is no expectation here that we create a federal fish ticket to record the number of halibut. The state's fish ticket is completely capable of accepting an entry for the number of fish, just like we do for salmon so there are no changes needed to the form. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:28:43] Thank you. Josh, I'm going to turn back to you for any other questions.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:28:53] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I was going to move to a question on VMS, but I appreciated the follow-up by Miss Kiefer and now I guess I have another one on the fish ticket topic. I guess Miss Yaremko with that response, you still view a federal action needed to make that change to the state fish ticket?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:29:21] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:29:25] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm not asking for a change to the state fish ticket. I'm asking for there to be a rule that would require that fish tickets that are filled out by dealers include recording the number of fish as well as the weight. The physical fish ticket system, the entry process, again does allow for entering number of fish in addition to pounds. The states rule, as we've seen in the analytical document, is not clear enough for enforcement purposes. And as we've heard from the EC, making a clear requirement for halibut that the number be recorded will assist us with our monitoring and management needs looking forward.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:30:30] Okay, thank you. Josh, you may have another question, can I go.....I'm going to go to David Sones first. He had his hand up and then we come back to you. David.

**David Sones** [00:30:50] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. Just that cleared up a lot of that for me. I wasn't sure if this is requiring the buyers to actually count the halibut in the directed fishery under

this motion. And then is that....I had a question. That wasn't in the other motion was it? So this is different from the previous motion? Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:16] I'll let Marci answer that.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:31:20] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Mr. Sones for the question. So the issue is with the state's statute with regard to what is required to be placed on the fish ticket. The rule itself is a little bit ambiguous and enforcement has noted that it is not clear enough for them to be able to enforce a requirement that halibut be reported on the states fish ticket. So a federal rule, which is the same rule we have for salmon in federal rule that requires reporting the number of individual fish, would just be a matter of a federal rule, not changing the state's form or requirement under state law but, you know, one blanket rule that is applicable for waters off California. I think it's important to note that in the process of any halibut fishing that occurs off California, whether it be directed commercial or incidental to salmon, the dealers are already counting the number of halibut that are landed. It's already part of the process. They're also, I believe, required to document that information on the logbook. I'm not 100% positive on that. So it's not like there's any work or cost associated with this extra step.

**David Sones** [00:33:03] Thank you.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:33:04] Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:33:05] Thank you. I'm going to turn back, Josh did you have a question? Lynn.....if not I'll go to Lynn Mattes or Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:33:19] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'll admit I think we're struggling on our end a little bit with the motion as it reads on the fish tickets. And maybe I'm not fully understanding the desire by Miss Yaremko and maybe missed something in the analysis. I guess my understanding is that the current fish tickets in California state that the fish tickets will report individual fish as applicable. And I hear Miss Yaremko say they do not need a change to the fish ticket, but I understand that has been the complication as we do implement federal ratios that are enforceable. And so maybe that's not a fully formed question but just noting that I think we're a little uncertain on the federal action we would take to enforce this on the fish ticket. And then just noting that the distinction of that, that would only be in California. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:34:18] Thank you. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:34:22] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I believe that language that, that as applicable language is exactly the problem in the sense that there is no clarity that it applies to halibut, so people are left with some confusion about not knowing if they need to report the number of fish unless we....and so unless in.....unless a federal rule tells them, hey, you need to report the number of fish, there's not a requirement to do so and a dealer is left to interpret. We don't want to put anyone in the position of being confused about whether a reporting requirement exists or not so we just want to make it and be clear about it. And I guess I would invite EC, this has been a long, long term discussion in their corner and if there's anything to add either from California Fish and Wildlife Enforcement staff or OLE on this point, I think they have more firsthand experience



with this issue and have brought it to our attention and believe it's fully analyzed in the document. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:35:43] Thank you. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:35:46] Thank you Vice-Chair. This is on a slightly different.....some little birdies have been in my ear that we may need to make a small amendment to this motion. We were working together. We did some copying and pasting and under Action 2, Alternative 1B, 1A was the PPA, 1B was not the PPA. So I think we need to make an amendment to delete the parentheses PPA end parentheses, and I'd be willing to do that. I know it's a minor thing but I think it cleans it up for everybody.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:36:28] Please go ahead if you're ready with your motion to amend.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:36:30] Yeah and sorry Kris I don't have language for you. I move we delete, begin parentheses PPA end parentheses, from Action 2 in the bullet list in the motion, in the main motion. Is that? Hopefully that is clean enough and simple enough to take care of our copy paste issue from this morning. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:11] I will give them just a minute to finish. All right, so what I see on the screen is your amendment, the one sentence there. That looks accurate and complete, and below this shows how it would read should the amendment pass. Is that correct?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:37:40] It is sir. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:41] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Heather Hall. Speak to it as needed.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:37:49] Copy paste. Just fixing a copy paste error from doing too many things at once this morning. I think that's all we need to say.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:58] All right, thank you. Questions for clarification? Discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:38:08] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:38:09] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion to amend passes unanimously. That takes us back to the main motion now as amended. Further discussion? I'm going to look very carefully. I am not seeing any hands so I will call the.....Josh Lindsay.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:38:35] Sorry Mr. Vice-Chair. I did have one more question for Miss Yaremko on the VMS component and I guess the seabird one to some degree as well. Recognizing there was, that the sub-alternatives to have VMS and streamers apply to convention waters, IPHC convention water, so running from shore out, much of the purpose and need on the VMS was associated with our federal groundfish closures and needing to protect those habitat areas and those species in those areas. Somewhat similarly on the seabird component, some of these diving birds

that are a little bit further offshore and helping to potentially minimize interactions, I was hoping you could just speak to a little bit more of your rationale for the need for south of 42 for those to occur within the entire IPHC waters? Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:39:41] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:39:43] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. We again would like to maintain consistency between state and federal waters rules as they apply to halibut. The fact that VMS and streamer line actions that were taken under Magnuson for groundfish do not apply to waters off the coast in state waters zero to 3 is not something that we ever wanted as a matter of policy. We'd prefer the rules to be consistent zero to 3 and 3 to 200. So for the case of halibut, where that ability is there to have one federal rule that applies off the entirety of the coast, that allows for ease of enforcement, it minimizes confusion, and again, has everything effective in one rule under one federal rule. So in terms of need, I think we've discussed the need for streamers and for VMS and there's nothing unique or different about state waters. They are equally needed in waters off the state that are near to the coast versus waters that are offshore.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:41:24] Thank you. We've been at this for a long time, this discussion. I'm going to allow us to take a 10-minute break here to before we go to vote on this issue, give you a little break, and then we're going to come back and resume action, our discussion and then maybe get to a vote. So 10 minutes please.....(BREAK)..... I think we're ready to get back to action here. We were still in discussion with this motion as amended on the floor. Any additional thoughts that came to mind? Chair Pettinger.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:42:09] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Yeah Josh asked about the need to have this south of 42 degrees. And I pulled a picture of a shorttail albatross between the mud gear off of Eureka. This was taken by an observer a few years back. So I think there's certainly a need, given the importance of protecting that species and the consequences that come down if, with 2 of those deaths in a year it shuts down the entire fishery. So I think that's a pretty good enough rationale to have it south of 42 degrees.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:42:43] Thank you. Other discussion? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:42:55] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I want to appreciate the opportunity to huddle with NMFS staff and NMFS GC on these specific questions relative to Action 3 on the catch reporting and the kind of the situation with how we're dealing right now with regulations that apply both in salmon management and in groundfish management, and then these would be regulations that apply for directed halibut as well as, and the language says, "any landing of halibut". So I can appreciate that there may be some additional work to do on how to word this most effectively and what the most efficient and effective vehicle is for a federal regulation that addresses reporting the number of halibut. Appreciate the concerns raised here in the discussions and would agree that maybe this particular piece is.....would have, would benefit from further analysis and discussion between law enforcement staff and regulatory staff, maybe across disciplines before we're ready to move ahead with it. So with the.....I'm not, I can't amend my own motion but I would perhaps look for an amendment to strike Action 3 from this motion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:44:40] Thank you Marci. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:44:45] First, I guess a process.....I guess we can amend before finalizing decision on the first Amendment? Or do I need to incorporate Lynn's amendment....

**Pete Hassemer** [00:45:02] No, we're dealing with the main motion as amended.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:45:05] Okay, perfect, that helps me. And I'm sorry I don't have anything written down. I move the Council strike Action 3, catch reporting on fish tickets from the Final Preferred Alternative.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:45:34] All right. Your motion is up there to strike Action 3. Is that language accurate and complete?

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:45:44] Yes Mr. Chairman.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:45:46] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Please speak to your motion as necessary.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:45:58] Mr. Chairman I think it's quite clear we heard that California has come, and in consultation has come to the conclusion that perhaps Action 3 needed some further consideration. So I believe removal at this point in time is warranted.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:46:19] Thank you. Questions for clarification on that? No questions for clarification, discussion on the motion to amend? Seeing no hands for discussion I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:46:34] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:46:34] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Sharon. Now we are back to the main motion as amended, which is on the screen before us, Actions 1 and 2. Further discussion on that? Seeing no hands I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:47:09] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:47:10] Opposed? Abstentions?

**Josh Lindsay** [00:47:15] Abstain.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:47:17] Thank you. The motion passes with National Marine Fisheries Service abstention. Thank you for that. And now we are back to our Council action. And I realize now we have covered the waters from Canada to Mexico. And I want to look around and see if there's any other guidance or discussion to be had on this action? While you think about that I can come back. Angela, is there anything else you see that we need to do?

**Angela Forristall** [00:48:03] No, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. You have selected a range of final preferred alternatives for both north and south of 42 for the 3 actions that you had before you for this agenda item. So your work here is complete.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:48:18] All right, thank you. So I'll look around seeing no other hands, nothing else we need to do here, I'm going to close this agenda item out.

## **H. Highly Migratory Species Management**

### **1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report**

No transcription for this agenda item.

## 2. International Management Activities Including Bluefin Tuna Trip Limits

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes our reports, the public comment, takes us into Council discussion and action. And the action there, provide some recommendations on U.S. positions. We'll look around see who wants to initiate any discussion on this topic. John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:00:27] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. And I think just to kind of kick things off, the advisory subpanel provides some good information about our interests in international forum and I think I support what they're saying and suggesting. I'd love to hear what other Council members have to say about that.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:53] All right. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:00:57] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Along those same lines, I mean there are a number of other international venues that bear on opportunities on fisheries managed by our Council. IPHC comes to mind. There's albacore negotiations with Canada and there are probably others that don't come top to mind. And I know that we have stakeholders who participate in those and my question is, to what extent has the Council sponsored such participation?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:45] I believe I will turn to our Executive Director with that one.

**Merrick Burden** [00:01:49] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, and appreciate the question. The the short answer is that it has depended over time. And I think you referenced the IPHC Mr. Gorelnik and we had historically over the last few years sent Phil Anderson as a designated representative of the Council to the IPHC. In June we decided to stop doing that. And then as Mr. Clayton indicated, historically we've sent, you know, Dr. Dahl to the WCPFC and the IATTC and in June we decided to stop doing that. So we've been reigning this in unfortunately due to our budget situation. For other matters like U.S. Canada negotiations, we haven't to my knowledge, sent an official representative. We look to, you know, folks like NMFS to represent the U.S. interest, maybe the State Department. Anyway, we don't have a formal designation or designee there. And then, of course, we have Miss Svensson, who's a commissioner on the WCPFC for us so. And looking at Miss Svensson's facial expression I'm certain she has more to add to this discussion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:09] Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:03:10] Yeah, as my mouth has kind of fallen open. I happen to be the representative for the Council on the U.S. Canada Albacore Treaty negotiation, and I have been attending that. I will also add that in terms of sending other representatives of not speaking to Council staff, we do have a history of on occasion sending people to workshops like the one we're discussing under this agenda item for IATTC, WCPFC, and Northern Committee on the bluefin MSE. We did that I believe in 2020 under albacore and I know we sent a couple of people to the Northern Committee meeting when it was in Portland, Oregon under albacore as well. It really has depended on the international topics, what the item is, so when we're really talking about setting the course strategy for albacore, which has been an open access fishery, to something that will be

more limited using Harvest Control Rules and similarly with bluefin, we really have encouraged and tried to support our stakeholders in attending. That being said, traditionally it has been domestic travel, so we have not been flying people to Japan or Hawaii or, well Hawaii is in the U.S., but Fiji as an example, unless they are an acting representative of the Council and even that for WCPFC, IATTC, et cetera, would fall under the State Department not the Council. So I guess I will just remind everybody that when I'm up here giving my report, it is not necessarily as thorough as perhaps Dr. Dahl would be giving, and that is in part because I am not a doctor I suppose, but also in part because I'm your representative and your advocate. So that is what I do is advocate versus be able to pull all of the details together. So you are not necessarily getting the same level from me that you would be getting from others that are being paid to be in that position whereas I'm there as your designee and essentially an unpaid position. So with that, I hope that helps clarify why sometimes we send people and when we send people why we are sending them and like I say, typically domestically.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:52] Thank you. Let me look back to Marc, see if that answers your question? Is there a follow-up?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:05:58] I think I understand the answer is basically we don't have a policy. There have been times when it's been done. Miss Svensson reminded me I believe I attended the meeting in Portland some years ago. I think that their, our Executive Director at the time, Chuck Tracy went, and I think a couple of Council members went but it was.....so.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:30] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:06:33] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. Just some considerations as I reflected on my still fairly limited time here and dealing with some of these international matters and thinking about some of our recent decisions. What occurs to me is, yes of course representation and participation in international forums is important. I think it would be wise just to be very intentional about that, like what is the purpose if we are to send someone? And, you know I think, I reflect on, you know, Miss Lowman's participation in the Northern Committee, which was extraordinarily successful. And my understanding of the history of that, it was very intentional and focused on bluefin and that in some ways also explains why she's decided to step away from that position and we no longer support her as a contractor. I think there's some logic in there. So I would just encourage you to be intentional as you think about representation on or participation in other international efforts.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:36] Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:07:37] Yeah, thank you. When appropriate I do have some guidance in terms of what I think might be beneficial for moving forward this next steps on international.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:48] I believe we're ready for that. Why don't you go ahead.

**Christa Svensson** [00:07:51] Okay, and I have sent it. I see Mr. Kleinchmidt's hand up so I don't know if that means he's ready. But I did actually send written guidance in because I thought it might be helpful for people to see what I was talking through. Do you need a minute there?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:18] I suspect pretty quickly it will flash up before us.

**Christa Svensson** [00:08:32] Okay, here we go. So I've sort of grouped all of these into a couple of separate categories. The first set is surrounding guidance for WCPFC. On the first point I'm recommending that we adopt the recommendations from the HMSAS, Agenda Item J.2, Supplemental HMS Report 1 in September, and that we let NOAA know what those positions are so that they can help inform the U.S. delegation to WCPFC 21, I believe I've got the year right on that one. And then those recommendations, just in case people don't remember what we got recommended in September are below, one on Pacific bluefin tuna and the second one on albacore. In addition to those I am, hold on here, lost in my own notes, making the recommendations from this particular meeting and that, it should be from November instead of September right there, thank you, that we support the recommendations from the PAC Advisory Committee, so that was one of our attachments. That if WCP adopts measures on South Pacific albacore that we encourage NOAA to maintain positions that will support the stability and accessibility for West Coast troll fishermen to participate in their fishery. And that we also express support for forming a joint working group between WCPFC and IATTC on South Pacific albacore. So just continuing to advocate to have managers manage in tandem since they are currently co-managing stocks. And then in terms of other guidance not related to the meeting that's coming up shortly, I think we've heard a lot of conversation around participating in February for the Joint Working Intersessional Working Group, so this is IATTC, WCPFC, and Northern Committee. And I do agree with the HMS Statement that this is important for commercial and recreational fishermen and I think it is important for stakeholders to attend this meeting. So personally I'm supportive of sending up to 5 representatives, which is what the HMSAS recommended. I am very cognizant that we have limited funds and that we discussed 2 members attend in September and that may be the landing point if we decide to send anybody in-person. I think we heard from our public comment that yes Zoom is important and perhaps those extra 3 people could be attending via Zoom, which is very cost effective, but that it is important to have people in the room, particularly when we have other delegations that are sending a large number of people. And I will also just say, having sat in the room at a number of these international forums, yes you are in Zoom, but if you get asked a question on the floor, having somebody that is physically there that you can ask not having to wait for somebody to respond back in a chat box can be critical. So I do think it would be worthwhile to send a couple of representatives. I will....I've just put it in there, I don't have a motion for it, but I believe there is one that I'm supportive of the "Run Down the Middle" option that's found in the HMSMT Report. And then lastly in terms of albacore, I'm appreciative of the request made by the State Department to schedule conversations with our Canadian counterparts, but I just want to reiterate that I think we need to do this as early as possible. Yes it is lovely to have a treaty regime, but if our fleets can't really use it because they don't have port access to get their boat work done or to pick up crew, then they're not really getting the full benefit of being able to access Canada and they are definitely bearing the full hardship of having Canadian vessels fishing in our EEZ. So if if we are going to do this I think it is important to make sure that we have really a positive benefit for both of our fleets so that we continue a treaty and a treaty regime that has been beneficial for both countries and for our fishermen for over 30 years, probably pretty close to 40 considering it was started in the 80's. And with that I will conclude my guidance, but hopefully it's helpful to see some of those points on the screen.



**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:54] Thank you Christa. Appreciate you putting that in writing so we can look at it. There are a lot of pieces there. There are recommendations to National Marine Fisheries Service. There's the piece that involves the Council representatives to the February 5th joint meeting or intersessional meeting, and also recommendations to, if I can call it that, to the State Department regarding the Canadian negotiations. So I'll look around and see if there's agreement with that. I think there's a few pieces we need to flesh out a little bit, but is there anything to add or comments regarding that set of recommendations? John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:14:44] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair, and thanks very much Christa. This is very helpful and I appreciate getting things actually on the screen so we're all on the same page, so to speak. Given the conversation we just had about the bullet that's there at the top right now, I agree with you and the advisory subpanel it's important. Given what we heard from Executive Director Burden, I'm unclear on what's available in terms of Council to get people to this meeting. I don't think it should be just fishery participants. I think we need management team representation as well, given that, given the funding situation I will go on a limb here but I think given the location of the meeting in California I could definitely support a mission critical trip for the state for at least Miss Hellmers and possibly myself to attend under state funds. It makes it easier to do in-state travel. We're under some constraints at this point, but I think this is an important topic for the state, so I'll offer that up. But I'm curious from Council perspective what's possible for this bullet?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:16] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:16:19] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, and thank you for the question. So we have built a provisional budget for next year, and within that budget we've included travel funding for this meeting. And what we've contemplated are sending 3 representatives for 3 days. So my understanding is the meeting is February 5th through the 7th in Monterey as you indicate. Due to the way that we have to do business those would, we would be treating those folks as representatives of the Council, so they would be presumably AS members or MT members if you prefer or want to balance that. So that's what's in our budget. Assuming that that's passed here in a couple of days, that's what we've contemplated within that budget.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:17:10] Thank you. Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:17:14] Yeah, no, thank you. I think that that is extremely helpful. I think having a mix of AS and MT members will be beneficial. It sounds like we may between the state of California's generous offer in terms of going out on a limb and having 3, the potential for 3 representatives get close to 5, meaning they're asking for 5 fisheries representatives and I don't think that we're going to have 5 representatives from fisheries, although I think we will have 5 representatives from fisheries and management. And just to probably keep that in mind in terms of we may want to send 2 advisory panel and 1 management team through the Council side considering we have 2, well 1 management team and 1 Council member coming through on the other. So certainly not telling anybody not to apply and if it ends up being all of one and none of another I'm not going to lose my wig, not that I'm wearing one, but just wanting to recognize that it is important to get a variety of stakeholders.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:43] All right. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:18:46] Thanks Vice-Chair. Thanks Miss Svensson for this guidance and really getting us off to a good start here. My question about sending representatives, especially in the Council capacity, we've talked about AB members, MT members, and I'm curious what you think about Council staff, given that they are there to represent the interests of the Council I'm just trying to think about this. Thanks.

**Christa Svensson** [00:19:14] Yeah, thank you for the question. I would be supportive. I really think that this is about how do we get people who are going to be making decisions and people who are going to be explaining those decisions and gathering input from a variety of stakeholders really up to speed on this topic. Just having gone through this process with albacore it was quite a lot of meetings. I will say that bless WFOA. When they got the urgency they sent a number of people, I mean they sent people to Japan, right? Like it was pretty mission critical and that's why I'm hopping up and down on this topic. I think for bluefin it is a lot of moving parts and pieces, but making certain that we have people who really can understand at the international level and have the viewpoint in the lens of attending. I mean this is an opportunity. It's in California really to allow other people to see what myself, people like Josh Madeira, people like Kit, who have been actively attending these meetings, what they're really dealing with in terms of commitment and at a fraction of the price that we would be doing that otherwise.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:54] Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:20:56] I have just a question on process. I am, and I'll state it in the form of an assumption, I'm assuming that the leadership team, Council leadership team will, you and Chair Pettinger and Executive Director Burden will be charged with responsibility of choosing among various people who want to participate to identify the 3 Council representatives. And based on the discussion we've had here, I'm assuming the eligible population includes the AS, the management team, staff, and Council members. Do I have that wrong?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:38] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:21:41] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And I think our question, our mind is asking the same question. So I would turn the question back to you, if that's your preference that we seek to design the appropriate representation we can do that. I was going to ask you what you wanted the representation to be? Is it AS members? Is it staff? Is it MT members? For example, if it's AS members, I would then turn to them and ask how about you self-nominate, we'll review that and approve it. If you want us to design it, I guess we would take a step back and figure out who are the best folks to represent the Council in that forum so.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:22:24] I guess speaking personally it would be good to have a representation across those groups but I don't know who is going to be interested. I don't know who is best qualified and I'm certainly not interested. But I just wanted to clarify for those who may be interested who may, who should consider whether they could be effective on behalf of the Council by attending.

**Christa Svensson** [00:23:03] So I.....

**Pete Hassemer** [00:23:03] Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:23:03] Thank you. Sorry I thought I got acknowledged and then I thought, oh God maybe I didn't, but now I have been so we're all good. In terms of cross representation, because this is Council I do like the approach of probably having one, one, and one. I think it would be helpful to have our Executive Director and his team kind of run and organize that approach. February is coming and we're not having another meeting. I suspect that it will be that the advisory bodies nominate whoever that person is by talking amongst themselves, but that again would be up to really the Executive Director and teams prerogative. On a personal level, I mean I'm interested in attending, but I think because I have the ability as a commissioner to request for meetings that I will be able to apply as a commissioner to attend. I would want to confirm that with Kelly in the State Department, but it is unlikely that you will need to pay for me to attend the meeting, which I think is beneficial in terms of freeing up space for others. So just putting that out there as a, hey, likely to have your representative attend but likely to also not be at a cost to the Council.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:24:34] Thank you. Corey Niles. Sorry, Sharon Kiefer then Corey Niles.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:24:43] Thank you Mr. Chairman. In recognition, obviously conversation for those who would be physically attending, my assumption though is relative to those who have the opportunity to attend virtually, that we're not going to put any kind of sideboards or expectations but other than encouraging that participation.

**Corey Niles** [00:25:11] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Maybe I'll be taking us from the practicalities here of how to make this work, but just thinking longer term about how sustainable this is. Definitely, you know, hearing Merrick's advice to be intentional about this. This is one of many possible international issues that could arise. You know, and bluefin is obviously very important to California, maybe not other places on the coast. So just, you know, maybe a question to, well maybe to Ryan, all the forums that, you know, Marc mentioned, you know including, I'm thinking of the Pacific Whiting Treaty and it works in large part because it has a very healthy advisory subpanel from both countries that are supported by the federal budgets to attend. I'm not sure about how that.....I know we send folks there, but just wondering, you know, over the long term, and maybe this discussion for the future, yet what support is there from the federal budgets to make sure that industry is represented including those and Council folks? Yeah, because I guess I'm hearing Merrick we don't.....this is might have budgeted this, but how far could it continue given our budget situation? So yeah Ryan I don't know if you could speak to what the State Department or you all support for the IATTC and the other forums and how we might align what you support with what the Council budget could support. But yeah I'm just wondering how this one meeting might work, but it's not going to work for other potential similar type efforts.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:27:06] Ryan Wulff.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:27:08] Yeah, through the Vice-Chair, thank you Mr. Niles for the question. A couple of points here, but to answer your question first, when it comes to the IATTC, and I imagine it's similar to WCPFC, the U.S. government will fund through the State Department the travel and engagement of our U.S. Commissioners, which is not just federal as you know per their

implementing legislation and includes other commissioners to the annual meetings. That doesn't always include meetings like this. We're talking about now like a joint working group. It is also a U.S. responsibility to cover the representation and attendance of members of our advisory body's to that when we host our advisory body meetings to that. So that is something that is that we do when we host in-person advisory bodies for our General Advisory Committee to IATTC or Scientific Advisory Subpanel. So that is where the federal funding is to answer your question directly. But we don't do invitational travel for everyone that is an accredited member of our delegation. If since I have the floor as it relates to this discussion, I will note there's kind of a difference in a conversation here. If you are talking about engagement from this Council and its bodies at a meeting, that is, for example, like will happen next July in Japan in a vastly different time zone where real time discussions in-person are happening and it may be more of a challenge to participate virtually for especially meetings that would happen in the middle of the night for a lot of West Coast folks. For this meeting here that is in Monterey on this same time zone, it is a joint working group so it is an informal, excuse me, it is an informal working group which means me likely as head of delegation for this will be overseeing a delegation that doesn't have specific restrictions on size. We will have meetings both in the margins of this meeting as a delegation that would have virtual ability also to chime in. We will have pre-meetings of the delegation or you could also be virtual, which will be virtual. And we have real time communications going on as the discussion has happened between everyone on the delegation, wherever you are in-person or remotely. So there, in this particular one I think, it's completely up to you who you want to send in-person. I do think there is a lot of additional benefit to that, as noted. But for this meeting in particular I think because of where it is, because of the time zone, it will be very easy to have engagement. And I think to Miss Kiefer's question, we don't necessarily need to be as limited in numbers. What is important though is to compile that delegation, which is why we've requested just notify us if you want to be on it by mid-December so that we can set you up, make sure you are on all of those communications going forward. So I hope.....I expanded a little bit there but I thought it might be relevant to where you might go with the rest of this discussion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:30:33] Thank you Ryan. And maybe I have one question that was going through all this. There is a cost to participate virtually though. Is that correct or was that a different meeting where? Maybe Christa knows.

**Christa Svensson** [00:30:51] I spoke to the cost of participation under the WCPFC meeting. I don't know and did not see whether there was an online cost to this one.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:30:59] Okay. So Dr. Dahl.

**Kit Dahl** [00:31:05] Yeah, just a little bit of a clarification on that. So if you apply and are accepted on a U.S. delegation, you're sort of under that umbrella for these meetings. It's more formal for the, for example the annual commission meeting versus these subsidiary body meetings. I think what Miss Svensson was talking about, if you.....and the deadline is long past, for example, for the WCPFC meeting, if you're not on the U.S. delegation and you still wanted to participate, there is this option to join the meeting as an observer. The WCPFC secretariat imposes this \$500 fee for observers to participate in the meeting. I'm not sure if that applies both to virtual participation or only in-person meeting, but it's sort of like the idea that it covers the costs they incur for incremental increases in participation in these meetings. So just to clear up what that's about.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:32:14] Okay, thank you. But for this meeting in Monterey it sounds like there's no cost to participate virtually. Thank you. Other discussion here? John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:32:32] Thanks. If we've wrapped up going to a meeting?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:32:38] I think we've wrapped it up. Let me make sure we're clear. The sort of the guidance I heard was the Council's supportive of 3 people. There was talk about one, one, one advisory management staff. I'm going to ask, does that allow the leadership some flexibility depending on who's interested? It's not a hard constraint that we can look and see who. So everybody agrees with that then? All right. Thanks. Now.

**John Ugoretz** [00:33:18] Great. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And regarding the second bullet showing on the screen right now, I do have some additional thoughts on catch limits and some more specifics on that. I believe we seem to have support for the "Run Down the Middle" option. I appreciate that. I think it's consistent with what we discussed from California's perspective at the last meeting. There is also information about seasonality in the reports that given what I've heard today and in the reports I'm supportive of. And I'll say that I've got a motion on this once other Council members have weighed-in.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:34:07] All right, thank you. See if there's any other discussion. I think.....Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:34:16] Yeah, Thanks for that John. I just wanted to.....yeah, thanks Christa for putting this in writing and just, you know, echo what you have there for albacore and just to say we did hear from in the NMFS Report that that sounds like it's, the State Department and NMFS is aware about this timing being important and just wanted to speak to that and, you know, after all that fun discussion on meeting attendance. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:34:44] All right. Thanks. Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:34:46] Yeah, thank you. And just to wrap this up, I appreciate the acknowledgment on albacore and it sounds like we've got general agreement on the guidance for all the pieces, including our WCPFC recommendations, but just wanted to confirm that before I go marching in saying this is what our position is once and for all from everybody.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:35:15] Thank you. Dr. Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:35:17] Thank you. Should I just assume that since the U.S. is sponsoring the cetacean measure with Korea that we don't need to put it on this priority list?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:35:31] Ryan, would you like to answer that?

**Ryan Wulff** [00:35:34] Well, I'd actually raised, because I noted I meant to get back to Miss Lent on her question, but yes, it is my understanding that that proposal would not require any changes to U.S. regulations as our best authority already do that so yeah, if that helps you. I mean, if you want to further endorse this U.S. proposal I leave that at your discretion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:35:58] Thank you. Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:36:02] Yeah, I believe that would fall under the recommendations from the PAC. I believe that was one of the recommendations in the PAC, but I could be mistaken on that.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:36:14] Thank you. I'm not sure it's in the PAC. They do mention Electronic Monitoring, but the reason that it's important to all of us here is that it levels the playing field for U.S. fishing vessels. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:36:31] Okay. Thank you. John, I think I heard an offer for a motion.

**John Ugoretz** [00:36:41] Thank you. Yes, I have one for catch limits. I move the Council recommend National Marine Fisheries Service implement Pacific bluefin trip limits for the 2025-2026 biennial cycle as outlined in the Highly Migratory Species Management Teams H.2.a, Supplemental Report 1 Appendix and supported by the Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanels H.2.a, Supplemental Report 1, which includes a seasonal component, an additional 25 metric ton annual buffer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:19] Thank you. That language on the screen looks accurate and complete. Is that correct?

**John Ugoretz** [00:37:25] That's correct.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:26] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

**John Ugoretz** [00:37:32] Thanks. I actually don't know that an additional buffer is necessary, but I do recognize the advisory subpanel's desire to be more precautionary in this, and I appreciate that, just to ensure that sufficient quota is left for harvest by other gear types. Additionally, as I asked on the floor, if this doesn't work out in either direction in the first year, we do have that ability to modify in the second year and I would expect some discussion a year from now to see how things are going and make any recommendations to NMFS if needed on changes that they can make under the authority that's used to do this, which I can never remember what it's called. So I really do think it's important that we use as much of this quota as necessary. It's a now healthy stock. We have fish in U.S. waters and I think we want to forecast and send that message that our fisheries want to catch this. So even if we don't achieve the quota, if we are building our catch and increasing our catch, I think that's very important.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:38:53] Thank you. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:39:06] Yeah, thanks John. Just very supportive of the approach. I was wondering if....you maybe did it I missed it, but can you just briefly remind us how you tracked this fishery and how quickly you're able to account for catch?

**John Ugoretz** [00:39:25] Thanks. Through the Vice-Chair, thanks for the question Mr. Niles. Yes, since we had our problem in the bluefin fishery when we passed our quota, California has implemented electronic fish tickets for monitoring all fisheries. And importantly, after that event we changed the California regulation for bluefin tuna specifically to require 24 hour reporting. So we have as near to real time landings information as we can. We also have our dock samplers monitoring highly migratory species and when we start getting close to those quotas we increase that monitoring as well. So it's not just through the reports that we receive, but it's through our eyes on the dock. So I feel that in collaboration with National Marine Fisheries Service we've increased our ability to track this fishery and we now have the ability to keep a hold on things if the fishery is going at the rate that would achieve the quota.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:40:36] Thank you. Further discussion? Seeing no hands I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:40:44] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:40:45] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you John. Okay with that, great, our action is there. In terms of recommendations we had a motion, a specific motion on management measures there, but a long list of recommendations. I want to make sure everybody agrees with that. Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:41:23] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Because it isn't in writing, I do agree with Dr. Lent about the cetacean component and leveling the playing field. And I would ask to add one more bullet point around expressing support for the U.S. proposals, including.....and I've just lifted this text out of one of the reports, which is including options for catch reduction scenarios for North Pacific striped marlin and improvement to management collection for cetaceans. So if others are in agreement, and sorry to beleaguer things here, I do think that it would be beneficial to have our Council express support for those 2 U.S. proposals and appreciate you raising it. You are correct, it was not in the PAC, but appreciate raising and really raising the awareness around the importance of why.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:42:28] First of all let me look around the table and see if people agree with that as a recommendation? Good. There's agreement. Let me look to NMFS, Mr. Wulff that is there, you've heard that here on the floor, do you need anything else to support that recommendation? Okay, great. So Dr. Dahl, what else should we do?

**Kit Dahl** [00:42:56] Don't do anymore.....(laughter)....I'm having trouble keeping track of it all, but yeah that seems like a very beneficial discussion. You've reviewed and endorsed a variety of recommendations in terms of at the international level so generally in the WCPFC Arena and then including following-up here towards the end with specific endorsement of the 2 U.S. proposals. I guess one of those is a management measure for striped marlin and the other one is a U.S. proposal in terms of requirements around incidental interactions with cetaceans that I guess was co-sponsored with Korea. You had a long discussion about possible support, Council support for participation in this upcoming joint working group meeting slash workshop in February and provided a lot of guidance that the Council leadership, the Executive Director, and the Chair and Vice-Chair will take under advisement and, you know, figure out who to support probably with

some consultation with the two advisory bodies. And then I guess last but not least, as you made a recommendation on the trip limit regime that NMFS should implement for the next biennial period to ensure compliance with the catch limits established under the IATTC resolution. And that is endorsing or consistent with what was put forward by your advisory bodies with the proviso that, or the hope if necessary, that the Council could provide further input and NMFS would have the capacity to perhaps make modifications to the measures for 2026 based on the experience in 2025. So I might not have caught everything, but I hope that's a reasonable summary of everything that you talked about and provided as guidance.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:45:33] Thank you. I going to look around and see if there's any last comments or discussion on this agenda item? It appears everything's been said and we've completed our work there so we're going to close that out.



### 3. Biennial Harvest Specifications and Management Measures – Final

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] Completes the reports, takes us to public comment. There is no public comment so that will move us into Council discussion and action. And that is up here on the screen before us. Adopt SDC criteria, consider the needs. I'm not going to say any more about that just look for any hand to start the discussion here. John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:00:32] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I appreciate the advisory subpanels concern about regulatory discards, especially when we've got a species like bluefin that we're trying to increase catch of. At the same time, we've been digging into this since the last meeting and trying to look at the data we have available. It just doesn't appear to be a major concern at this point. I understand that it's possible that occasionally people are running into this. I am also a little concerned about opening things up and potentially having people start target HMS when they're not in an HMS fishery. And so from my perspective, I think it's something that we need to keep our eye on and we need to track over the course of the next year and see what happens. I don't think that this has risen to the level of a necessary action that we need to add to NMFS plate in terms of a regulatory action. So at this time I'd rather, with regard to that state managed smidgeon fishery, keep looking at it and come back and see where we're at in a year.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:01] Thank you. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:02:04] Thanks John. Maybe question on that and just not as familiar, obviously, with your.....and I should ask this of the AS, but are they, it seems to be on being able to keep an eye on it what.....and there's this idea that people are not going to report it in their logbooks for fear of running afoul of something. Do you have any comment on that of how we would notice if the amount of bycatch, you know, increased?

**John Ugoretz** [00:02:33] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Well, some of that is landed and so it does occur. And so we can look at the frequency of landings in this fishery of non-target species like bluefin or other HMS. Again, what we've seen so far is that, yes, it occurs but it's a pretty low rate and it appears to be within the current limits. Now, that doesn't get to what if they caught a whole bunch more and had to throw it away because of the current regulation. It is a logbook fishery. We will certainly be looking at logbooks in the fishery and ensuring that we try to improve compliance if we see a problem there and then, you know, go from there.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:30] Thank you. Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:03:32] Thank you. Just one quick follow-up. So you would presume that if they are, given the relative value of bluefin, if they are getting them and they're going to land them preferentially, they would land those over other less valuable species is kind of the logic there you're saying?

**John Ugoretz** [00:03:52] Yes. You know, again, the target species should be placing these fisheries in areas where it's unlikely that they're encountering bluefin, but it can occur and does occur, and from what we can tell when it does occur they're landing those fish because of the value.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:13] Thank you. Further discussion? Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:04:21] I don't have further discussion, but when appropriate I do have a motion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:26] Let's see it.

**Christa Svensson** [00:04:27] All right. And they said they have it so I think we might really be all right. Okay, here we go. I move the Council adopt the Umsy and Dmsy proxies as suitable Fmsy and Bmsy proxies for completing status determinations for the North Pacific shortfin mako shark stock.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:52] Thank you. That language appears accurate and complete. You agree?

**Christa Svensson** [00:04:56] I do.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:58] Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by John Ugoretz. Please speak to your motion.

**Christa Svensson** [00:05:04] Certainly. And I normally am quite wordy, but this one I'll try and keep it short. These Msy-based proxies were recommended by NMFS and they've been reviewed and endorsed by the SSC as adequate. And that you can find stated in H.3.a, Supplemental SSC Report 1 if you need to. Personally, I'm comfortable with using them in determining the status for the stock based in accordance with the status determination criteria in the FMP.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:38] Thank you. Are there any questions for clarification on the motion? No questions for clarification, discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:05:54] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:54] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Christa. Let's move back there. So we've adopted the stock status determination criteria. Anything else here? I'm going to turn to Dr. Dahl and ask him what we've done and what we need to do.

**Kit Dahl** [00:06:38] Okay, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So as just noted, you have endorsed these reference points as the basis for the status determination criteria, the status.....those SDCs themselves and the resulting determinations for, specifically for shortfin mako, and I think generally you are comfortable and have agreed with those that were put forward for those other stocks based on recent stock assessments, so I think you're done there. There was some discussion about whether to move forward with this possible change to the regulations for the incidental landing limit. Mr. Ugoretz recommended the Council not take action at this time and that you potentially come back in the future, see if there's more information that could support consideration of a change, so I take that as Status Quo, No Action, whatever you want to call it. So if that's the Council's understanding and the Council is comfortable with that recommendation, then I think

you're done with that as well and would be done with the items that were brought forward under this agenda item.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:14] All right, thank you Kit. So I want to look around. I didn't circle back to that last item on the incidental landing limits. The suggestion that we watch this for a year, take no action at this time. The Council agrees with that? That appears that's the case here so we'll watch that for a year and that may come back before us in the future. Other than that, anything else to be said here? Not seeing anything I'm going to close out this agenda item and move us to our lunch break.

#### 4. Highly Migratory Species Roadmap Workshop Report and Next Steps

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes all our reports and will take us into Council discussion and action which is up there. Adopt the final report and provide guidance on the next steps. Who would like to initiate discussions here? John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:00:20] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I really appreciate, actually, the work that the advisory subpanel and management team did for this meeting. I'll admit that I was unclear on where to go next with the roadmap after the workshop. And I do feel that the path that the management team has laid out is a sound one in terms of fleshing out the document itself. There's some key components of the document that need, I think, more focus. And I appreciate the advisory subpanel's suggestion for a special workgroup in particular to focus in on the EFP component of the roadmap. And there are some key items surrounding EFPs like measuring performance and defining what acceptable bycatch is for the Council that we still haven't been able to sink our teeth into. I think Council staff could probably come up with a charge for a group like this that is consistent with the IRA funding that we've received to help and that might get us to the point where we could put together a workgroup. I will admit I get a little concerned when we talk about a group like this and we start adding a bunch of names to it. I think it needs to be lean enough that they can actually function. I don't know what the answer to that is. I don't have a magic number, but I just would, you know, ask that maybe Council staff consider that and think about what an appropriate size group is, what the appropriate composition of that group is. I disagree with the advisory subpanel. I think some Council membership, more than one on this workgroup would be helpful because I want to ensure that what comes out of it is something that is consistent with Council goals and priorities. I think I'll stop there.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:38] Thank you. Ryan Wulff.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:02:43] Yeah thank you. And of course appreciate all of the reports we just got. And I appreciate the points just made by Mr. Ugoretz. From a NMFS perspective, I do think I agree with what was just said by John. I think that there is....I'm happy to support some additional work by the advisory bodies but do think some sort of constituting of a group would be helpful, and I know there was some questions around the table about the utility of that and how that might differ from our Council process, but I think we've used this successfully in other FMP work in other fora here at the Council where you have a group that is, and I agree with John, should be wieldy and not necessarily, you know, should be representative but also not too unwieldy to get business done. I think it could be very helpful to help consolidate some things, get some things ready to come back to Council discussion as opposed to constantly having to utilize this, you know, advisory body then Council floor then advisory body then Council floor process because of some of the things that I think we need to work through and figure out to complete the roadmap. I did also want to speak briefly to some of the questions that came up to them on the National Seafood Strategy and was just waiting here for Council discussion and I can provide a little bit more feedback because I was engaged in those discussions before the plan came out. So you'll notice in our informational report that lays out the implementation plan it talks about Pacific and Atlantic HMS fisheries resilience, but if you look at the four bullets there, the first three of those should look very familiar to you as they talk about EFPs, coordination with Councils and industry, and

then the use of kind of dynamic ocean predictions or management tools, which is exactly some of the topics from the IRA work the Council has put forward as well as is part of this roadmap and that is for a reason. So I do think while we are still working on how we might implement that pilot, obviously the point was to highlight the work ongoing by the Pacific Council on this roadmap, so we do want engagement and a process that incorporates the Council's input and it was meant to support the Council's projected work on this, not necessarily direct it what to do. But we were also cognizant that a lot of the, there was a lot of themes when it comes to HMS that the Council is dealing with or will deal with down the roadmap that are actually relevant to our HMS fisheries all around the country. And so therefore I wanted to acknowledge that in the National Seafood Strategy too that what is going on out here on the West Coast is also relevant to some of our other broader HMS Fisheries. So that's just a little background. I'm happy to expand further or take any questions as it relates to it, but those are just some initial comments from NMFS. Thanks.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:49] Thank you. Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:05:51] Thank you Mr. Vice Chair, and thank you Mr. Wulff. So I guess the story is there really does not need to be a reach out to NOAA fisheries to say can we be an official pilot of the Seafood Implementation Strategy? And are the Atlantic HMS folks involved in that pilot or not pilot? Thanks.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:06:17] Yeah, through the Vice-Chair, thank you Dr. Lent for the question. Yes, I mean I think the part of this implementation plan I would consider yourself already part of the pilot. They're going to look to further underscore and support in any way that we can outside of and in addition to this process, and yes we are engaging with our Atlantic HMS colleagues, they are a part of this too as well as Pacific Islands Region.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:47] All right, thank you. I'll look around and see. Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:06:51] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And appreciative of the conversation around the table today. I have some comments around the working group as we're calling it currently. Certainly open to other names if there's a better one. And then I have a question, I think, for our Executive Director who may be deferring this out to somebody else so bear with me for a minute here. I think in terms of having a workgroup, because we're really talking about putting together a kind of a document in terms of a roadmap, it makes sense to not necessarily have a gargantuan group of people. I don't know, sometimes when we talk about small I envision like 3 or 4 people and I think we will need more than just a few. But I do think when you get, and I agree with Mr. Ugoretz on this, when you get too many people trying to cook up a strawman or a first draft it can get very cumbersome very quickly. And it is beneficial to have a reasonable number of people taking that approach. That being said, I am fairly sensitive to the public sentiment of things being behind closed doors, and I think it would be beneficial once we have that document or whether we have whatever that is that we put together in this workgroup, probably some press or, and by press I mean something on our website, I'm not asking for a full fledged press release, but a vehicle for really getting that out so that the public, who has shown quite a lot of interest in this topic, is aware of the opportunity to weigh-in and comment on whatever it is that is created in that group. And at that point we think about how we're going to create opportunities to make that happen. I also agree I think it's important to have Council members involved in this. This is

something where several of us have really led the charge in terms of wanting to move this forward and I'm excited that we're moving it forward. I know when we had the workshop there was concern around, hey, we have workshops all the time and we kind of have a nice document and that's the end of it. Why is this going to be different? And I said, you know I don't know, but you don't have different if you don't try different and we're apparently trying different because we're doing something different. So thank you all for the opportunity on this which leads me to my question for our Executive Director and staff. In the management team report they're talking about, hey we'll essentially be working on this over the winter and then there's the last sentence is around the IRA Project 3 initial workshop on December 17th, and I'm just kind of wondering how if we put together a workgroup how we ensure that this works in tandem so that we're not trying to draft a report short order or we're missing components, like is there something that you envision as we move through this topic in order to make the work we're doing under this agenda item flow more easily into that Project 3 and vice versa?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:35] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:10:37] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman and Miss Svensson for the question. I might invite Gilly up to the table just to help me. I'll start off and then see if she has anything to add. I'm just sitting here listening to this discussion and asking myself that very same question that you've asked, which is how does this dovetail with the IRA 3? And as I think about all the moving pieces and how we're staffed and our resources and things of that nature, I would anticipate that this workgroup and the further development of the roadmap would have to be entirely covered in our IRA project work. So it would maybe not address all of what we're planning to do in Project 3, but it would be covered under that umbrella. Is that a sufficient answer or are you looking for more detail?

**Christa Svensson** [00:11:28] Thank you. I wasn't necessarily looking for more detail. It was more a matter of I don't have any, you know, the detail from you and your team so wanting to make sure it was possible and practical and it sounds like it is.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:49] Thank you. Any other discussion? Let me just maybe summarize some. Corey Ridings let's go to you first.

**Corey Ridings** [00:12:00] Thanks Vice. I guess I'm just looking for a little bit more clarification from folks who've been thinking about this workgroup. Thank you Miss Svensson, thank you Mr. Ugoretz, about sort of getting at this thing. In my mind when the Council puts together any sort of workgroup they're usually all public meetings. And so Miss Svensson I just want to clarify that you weren't implying that they would be private, that the workgroup meetings would be.....you're nodding your head I'm just gonna let you speak. Thank you.

**Christa Svensson** [00:12:30] No, thank you. My concern stems around from a couple of issues. Firstly, sometimes when the Council has workgroup type meetings we have them during Council time, which works if you are a state agency person, but if, say, Dr. Lent or myself wanted to participate or even yourself as a political appointee we are up here the entire time and would not have the ability to participate. We also don't necessarily have a call-in for all of our meetings. So you know if we're here at the meeting you can't necessarily listen to what's going on in an advisory

panel. So my concern is if we're going to do this that we have it in a workshop type or meeting type formation that allows for people to listen and provide that public comment should they choose to as opposed to not. I mean, that really is my underlying concern. So hopefully that helps clarify, but I do think having focused voices rather than trying to have a 60 people workshop, a document may be the approach to take so that we can get something before the March meeting rather than work on it for the next however many years trying to get 60 voices into one document for a first draft that would then go out for public review and work through the Council process.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:19] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:14:21] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. And maybe just to add to a bit of what Miss Svensson is outlining. As I look at, you know, our rules and the ways in which we form various groups, we would be looking to form this workgroup under the rules of an ad hoc committee, and so that would then give rise to our requirements to have public meetings. I highly value public meetings and then I think that might tell you something about then how we use the Council process. So I can envision, at the risk of getting ahead of myself, but I can envision, you know, this ad hoc committee that we call a workgroup producing material, and then that material coming to the Council where there's another opportunity for public viewing and input. So it should look pretty similar just if we formulate it under our existing rules. I don't know that we could formulate something outside of our rules to be honest, but I'm looking to do this as an ad hoc committee if that helps.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:15:24] Ryan Wulff.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:15:26] Yeah thanks. I had the same kind of view as Merrick, and that was kind of where I was going with my earlier comments. I had the GEMPAC in mind just as an idea, but very, very similar open process for public comment, but it's a smaller subset to tries to not take up Council agenda time while you're trying to work through some things before it's ready to come back to the Council. That was at least the structure that I had in mind and thought it could be helpful for some of the tasks still ahead before you get to a draft that's ready for Council review. And then maybe it's not a question, but maybe Merrick just correct me if I'm wrong, I think if this, if that is the recommendation of the Council here, I think we would need to probably still come back with some sort of draft charge for that group later in this meeting, right? Under appointments or C.5 to formally look at it right before it's constituted or I'll defer to you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:23] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:16:25] Yes, thank you. Yeah I have been conversing with some of my staff and what we would, assuming the Council does want to move forward with this committee, I think we could bring forward a draft charge for you to review on day last and maybe some thinking about the composition thereof and then at which point you can tweak it or bless it and then we would go through our normal process of moving forward with whatever names and the formulation of that committee. So hopefully that answered your question Mr. Wulff.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:17:01] Thank you. And with that, just reading the tea leaves here, assuming there's interest in the Council having some type of workgroup, any information on shape, form,

context you could provide at this time as staff and develop that under C.5 we would take up formation of a workgroup and then there's of course our workload planning where we figure out where the work gets done and our schedule. So if you have any other ideas regarding that now's a good time to assist, give the staff some assistance in putting that together, but I think we could expect to see something on day last regarding this. And with that guidance on the next step, there's also this piece about adopting the final report. That's the final Workshop Report. I think that step is to bring it to closure and show that there's an endpoint on the Workshop Report. How anyone wants to do that? John.

**John Ugoretz** [00:18:19] I hadn't anticipated needing a motion for this, but I think I can do it very simply if needed.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:28] All right. We normally don't but sometimes it helps to show we've finished that and there's an expectation that there could be some final I's dotted or T's crossed, but I'm going to let you try and craft the motion here.

**John Ugoretz** [00:18:46] Thank you. I move the Council adopt the final HMS Roadmap Report found in the briefing book. I am not going to know the reference. If somebody has it they can stick it in here.

**Kit Dahl** [00:19:20] H.4.a, Attachment 1.

**John Ugoretz** [00:19:22] There we go. H.4.a, Attachment 1.

**Kit Dahl** [00:19:27] Oops, maybe put workshop between HMS and roadmap.

**John Ugoretz** [00:19:31] Thank you.

**Kit Dahl** [00:19:33] Or...No, I'm sorry. HMS Roadmap Workshop Report. I don't know.....anyways because there's been a lot of confusion...

**John Ugoretz** [00:19:45] You notice I'm now able to throw my voice through Kit. I move the Council adopt the final HMS Roadmap Workshop Report found in the briefing book H.4.a, Attachment 1.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:19:58] Thank you. And that looks accurate and complete. Do you agree?

**John Ugoretz** [00:20:03] As far as I can tell.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:04] All right. Great. Is there a second to that? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Speak to your motion as needed?

**John Ugoretz** [00:20:11] I think as Vice-Chair pointed out, it's good to have closure on items like this and understand that the Council has approved a final report so this can go into the record as such.



**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:26] Thank you. Any clarification needed? Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:20:30] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I may be losing my marbles but I don't think there's an 'a' after the 4. This is just H.4 Attachment 1?

**Kit Dahl** [00:20:42] Correct.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:20:43] Good. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:48] There is none there.

**John Ugoretz** [00:20:52] I didn't say 'a'.....(laughter)....

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:57] Other clarification? Discussion on the motion? No discussion. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:21:07] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:07] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you John. And with that, Kit we almost have you making a motion and it's your last item and here's your chance to.....oh, I'm sorry. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:21:35] Sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt there Mr. Vice-Chair, but I had some thoughts on this workgroup. I'll keep it brief, but looking.....you asked for guidance and we moved to that, Ryan's mention of the GEMPAC got me thinking of it. There's various models out there. Our traditional model is what we do here. We have our technical people on one group and advisory panel folks on another group. We had the Climate and Core Communities Team when we had Council members together and I don't know that was my favorite model either. So I just hoping that, you know, trusting that staff can work on the charge, but I hope it's clear that we follow the, you know, the rules of consensus and that every member of that workgroup, you know, understands what the role is on equal standing and everyone's opinion gets expressed without having to, you know, label minority reports and all that kind of thing. So I think this group have worked really well together lately, but it just when we mix and match all these rules together I'm just asking staff to kind of give some thought to that. And I do...I am thinking of the GEMPAC and the GEMTAC and GEMTAC never really having their own independent forum to make comments on what the GEMPAC was saying. So yeah various models out there but I just I thought just keeping those roles and responsibilities and consensus in mind I just wanted to voice. There's, there's many ways to do that and we have really good people involved here so not too worried about it, but just being careful when we depart from our normal model of management teams and advisory subpanels.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:23:19] Thank you Corey. Ryan Wulff.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:23:22] Yeah, through the Vice-Chair, thank you Mr. Niles. Just to clarify, I fully support it. I was more thinking of the concept of the work they were talking about and then bringing it back to the Council, not the representation or the way it was constituted so my apologies. But I support what Corey said. Thanks.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:23:39] All right, any other comments? Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:23:41] Yeah, before you have Dr. Dahl take us home on this agenda item, I did want to say thank you to Dr. Dahl personally. I have been on the Council for a little over 6 years now. Bless his heart he has really helped to guide me through all of it, including going to Port Moresby my first year on the Council, which was absolutely wild. You have never led me astray and you've certainly helped me with a lot of motions, including today. So thank you for the work that's been done and I wish you a happy retirement.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:24:25] All right, John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:24:27] And I tremble at doing this because I don't want to have to have all of us speak, though I think maybe we all should because Kit your presence here has been extremely helpful. Your ability to guide us through process, to summarize sometimes incredibly complex discussions and to bring us back information that is requested and needed and help guide the team and AS and doing so is commendable. I wish I could sail away with you, but fair winds and following seas.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:25:06] Thank you John. Other comments? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:25:12] Thanks Vice. Just thank you pocuya.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:25:18] Thank you. Looking around. Thank you Kit. I'm going to give you the last word. Tell you how we've, or let you tell us how we've really done here.

**Kit Dahl** [00:25:30] Okay. Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. There was one thing that came to mind that maybe just a little clarification on. HMSMT had proposed that they would, in collaboration with the advisory subpanel, come up with kind of a draft of the roadmap document to get into the March briefing book and then this discussion around this workgroup also, there was some ideas that that workgroup would be involved in putting together this, perhaps this document. So I guess maybe just making a suggestion, if it's amenable to the Council to go ahead and have the team put together the draft and then perhaps, and obviously as the Council's indicated, they're looking to staff to come back on Monday with a draft charge for this group. And but in any case just to keep the ball rolling, go ahead and endorse that idea of them putting that draft report together and then this workgroup could take that draft and carry it further. And I'm thinking also that in the AS Report it was suggested that a potential role of this workgroup would be then to see through further implementation steps. So all of that said to just make sure you're comfortable with the MT's proposal of doing that work and keeping the ball rolling on that.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:27:21] All right, let me look around the table here. John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:27:24] And this is why we will miss you Kit. Thank you for bringing that up. I see it perhaps very slightly different than what you said. My understanding would be that the team does what the team suggested in their report, which laid out some specific portions of the roadmap that they would complete and bring back to us in March. I think they should still do that. I think that this workgroup should be focused on a specific portion of the report, that is the FP component.

And I think as I mentioned in my comments, I think there's some very clear tie-ins to the IRA funding for that in looking at bycatch reduction and looking at performance of EFPs towards enhancing that. And in essence I would see the team as creating a placeholder for that portion of the report.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:28:24] Thank you. I want to make sure with what John just stated if that's the path forward for what the team will do in a draft. Sorry, John.

**John Ugoretz** [00:28:38] And again, not taking away from the fact that we understand Council staff is going to be drafting some kind of a charge and description of this group and process that we'll look at again on Monday.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:28:51] Correct. That piece of it and the charge for what the workgroup would be. And I'm just again, I'm asking the Executive Director to look at the March QR, I don't have it here in front of me, whether or not HMS is on there or if we need to be prepared under workload planning. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:29:16] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. We do have HMS groups meeting in March so per usual Kelly and I will put together a revised Year-at-a-Glance summary that outlines and contains your guidance here and so look for that before we get to day last.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:29:35] Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:29:37] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just to confirm that this, if I got it right when I asked that question what all these different pieces are, this group is going to be working on EFPs and the framework and revising the COP, but will also be looking beyond at the fishery, the fishery, the different aspects of getting it developed and expanding the fishery as needed in a cautious way. It's not just about getting these permits, correct? Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:30:07] I guess I can't tell you that's what the workgroup will be doing. Again they'll come back with a charge for us on day last on Monday under C.5 when we create the workgroup and then further discuss what....finalize what its charge is, make that clear and expectations for that. Ryan Wulff.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:30:32] Yeah, thank you for that. I put my hand up before you finished talking. My apologies Mr. Vice-Chair. But yeah that was my understanding that and I think we can revisit this when we see the charge, but the EFP framework was just one component, one action of the roadmap so I do think it's important that my interventions previously we're talking about the roadmap as a whole and the concept, not just the EFP framework, but that is an important component and I think this will be easier when we look at the charge on day last. Thanks.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:03] Okay, thank you. So is that clear on those pieces of it, draft, pulling together a draft roadmap, what's outlined in the team report and creating a workgroup and discussing on Monday what the charge of that workgroup will be and potentially talking about populating that so is that good? All right, thank you Kit. What other box did we forget to check here?

**Kit Dahl** [00:31:41] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think you have a game plan going forward that includes a draft, a first draft of the roadmap document formation of a workgroup with a charge related to the EFP aspect of the roadmap and perhaps some other elements of that to be revisited on Monday under the COPs and appointments agenda item. I think that's kind of....I think that's the plan at this point. I guess I won't be around to see it move forward but I hope that the Council is able through this process to meet the objectives of, or the goals that you've laid out for this roadmap and that we'll all see the development of vibrant fisheries, I guess you could say, for HMS on the West Coast and, you know, we have seen some potential loss of at least one fishery here that targets HMS and that is sunsetting in a couple of years so hopefully the Council can thread the needle to new avenues in that regard in terms of providing HMS to consumers. I'd also like to say how much I am heartened and honored by all the kind words and nifty shirts and everything that all of you have said and done at this meeting, my last meeting, and from the Council and from the HMSMT and advisory subpanel. Unfortunately the two ecosystem groups were not scheduled at this meeting but we did, I did hear kind words from them both from Tommy Moore at the banquet and then also, you know, personally through emails and so on. So anyways, it's been a great run and thank you all. And I guess I'll sign off and turn off the microphone and turn it over to the next Council staff to keep your business moving.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:34:26] All right. Thank you Kit. I still need to close out this agenda item. So thanks Kit for everything. And instead of a closing I'll just say hoist the sails. And with that, this agenda item is closed and I'll turn the gavel back to our Chair.

# I. Groundfish Management

## 1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] That concludes public comment and brings us to Council action, which is before you so I'll also open the floor for any discussion as needed or not. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:17] Thanks Mr. Chair. I'll just start with an easy one. I think this is the place where I do my standard comment about salmon bycatch here. I echo Marci's comments about the Science Center Report there, the detailed information. It's great to see that. What it reflects is a lot of efforts by the various fishery sectors to avoid salmon run away from salmon. It's important. Salmon are important to us way up there in the headwaters of the Columbia River areas and so we watch it very closely. And I commend, I compliment those fishery sectors on the efforts that they put into that to watch it. I've said this in the past, I still have this expectation that at some point salmon bycatch is going to go up because salmon abundance is at very low levels. And so part of that increase, it's nice to see it at a very low level, but I have to temper myself a little bit and not be shocked when it goes up because the allowances that are set in the buy-op, they're working underneath those, and at these low abundances when it's very important to prevent it the sectors have done I think a good job, an admirable job of taking, watching out for salmon and running away from them when they get into them. So, again, I thank the Science Center for the report and the detail and as I said, it reflects a lot of efforts that go on in the fishery sectors on the water to avoid salmon. So thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:14] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Okay, anyone else? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:02:18] Yeah, thank you Chair Pettinger, I think I read in one of...in the Halibut Report that this is the last year halibut is going to be a standalone report and it's going to be included in the Groundfish Mortality Report. One, did I read that or imagine that? And if it's true, I just wanted to highlight that for others so that they're not looking for the Halibut Report in the future.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:41] Keeley.

**Keeley Kent** [00:02:43] Yes, that is my understanding is that there is a streamlining effort and a consolidation effort but that the overall information shouldn't change but where it will be will change.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:02:54] I appreciate that clarification as well as the streamlining of reports for us.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:00] Thank you Lynn. All right, anyone else? Butch Smith. And welcome back Butch.

**Butch Smith** [00:03:07] Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm sorry I missed yesterday but things weren't clicking very well. So anyway, I would just like to echo what Vice-Chair Hassemer said. When we started this project of cutting bycatch the trawl industry meant what they said and said what

they meant and I think we're in a much better place. And I think they want to....they don't want to catch salmon and I truly believe that and they're doing what they can to, you know, stay away from them. And we thought at first it'd be all right for Idaho fish to be caught as long as they didn't catch Washington or Oregon fish, but I guess that's not the case. No it's just I said that in jest. But anyway, I am really appreciative of all the hard work over the last how many years have gone into this to how two industries can work together to have a positive outcome. So I just wanted to convey that to the Council and to the public. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:14] Thank you Butch. Okay I see no other hands. Todd if you were here you'd see no hands so I'll turn to you.

**Todd Phillips** [00:04:28] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Having looked at your action today and having heard from both the National Marine Fisheries Service and Northwest Fisheries Science Center and heard from the public and had some discussion, I would say you have appropriately answered all of those actions and have concluded your discussions. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:46] All right, well thank you and stay dry up there in the northwest so. All right. Okay so that takes care of I.I.

## 2. Trawl Catch Share Program and Intersector Allocation Reviews: Hearing Officers and Locations

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] That concludes our reports takes us to public comment, which is zero, which brings us to Council action, which is before us. So with that I'll open the floor up for discussion. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:00:15] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Jessi did you have the benefit of the GAP Report prior to or any interaction with the GAP regarding their thoughts on the proposal? I see a lot of alignment, but I see a couple of things that aren't quite the same, particularly you talk about in one of your proposals a single online hearing, GAP recommends as many as three. To me, I don't....I can see the merit of having at least two different times to broaden participation. I don't know if three would be necessary, but just wondering if there was any discussion about that.

**Jessi Waller** [00:01:02] Mr. Chair, Miss Kiefer, yes, as the GAP Staff Officer had a lot of discussion with him about this. So fortunate in that capacity. We had a really good discussion I'll say. And thinking through, you know, not only just like their proposal for three online hearings, but also the idea of not hosting hearings related to the Intersector allocation review and just having them for the catch share review, I kind of instructed them, you know, I think the idea to split.....to not host hearings for the intersector allocation review for the reasons they outlined was a good one and kind of like had a really good discussion around that and I think some clarity came out of that. With regards to the number of online hearings, I at that point could not make any promises because I needed to have some internal discussions with that. I think that is a question more better suited to Mr. Burden than to me, but I will say I was privy to all of the GAP conversations.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:02:06] Thank you Jessi.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:08] Thank you Sharon. Anyone else? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:02:11] Okay. Thank you Chair. Thinking about the online meetings, would it be permissible for organizations to hold like a listening station to set up, you know, kind of like we do our delegation meeting with a puck in a....our puck thing in a conference room at a harbor office or something, or is it intended just solely to be individuals listening or am I getting way too into the weeds?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:43] Jessi.

**Jessi Waller** [00:02:45] Thank you Mr. Chair, Miss Mattes. We actually did propose that in our own, I think maybe there were some questions around that, but we proposed that as an interoption B, you know to try to expand because we do understand that some port communities folks might not have stable Internet connections, so I had thought about maybe the states want to offer up having a listening session. That being said, we had some good conversations in the GAP and, you know, there was talks about, yeah, community groups could absolutely come together, have the listening station open for the online hearing locations and could submit a, you know, public

comment that way or something to that effect. So I think that's completely within the realm of possibility and potentially some creative thinking.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:28] Thank you Lynn. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:03:32] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And maybe just to add to what Miss Waller outlined. I think the way that you described it Miss Mattes was having me envision something different than a pure listening session, more of an engagement area. And this is a part of the new frontier of all the online and remote capabilities that we have. And so I think conceptually that seems possible to me. We would need to have someone staffing the listening station or maybe not staffing, but perhaps a Council member such as yourself could organize that. And so we would, you know I think, I'm sure you can envision as we're calling people to come testify we would then hand the gavel to you and say, please call the people in Newport forward and we would listen and you would be responsible then for managing that. So those are things that could be worked out, but there are some complexities.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:04:26] I appreciate the additional input and discussion. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:32] Thank you Lynn. Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:04:33] Thank you Chair Pettinger. Just I want to start by offering appreciation to the the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel and the lengthy discussion they had on this and their consideration for narrowing down from six public meetings to three and their discussions around where to have those and how to make sure that the public input is received efficiently and recognizing costs and workload. I know that can be hard. This is an issue that deserves time and attention and so I know it took a while and I'm glad that Mrs. Waller was in the room and helping with that discussion. I'm sure that helped a lot. So thinking about this in terms of cost as well, and I know that we're talking big picture Council efficiencies and operations and budget issues, that just naturally comes into play, and I'm just curious about when we assign staff officers to these meetings are they, I assume they're paid and just wondering what that cost is for the in-person meetings or maybe you don't know the exact cost, but.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:12] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:06:17] Thank you Mr. Chairman. My files just aren't loading quickly enough but we have budgeted for that and.....

**Heather Hall** [00:06:23] Okay.

**Merrick Burden** [00:06:24] Yes we will continue to pay Miss Waller if she does this.....(laughter).....

**Heather Hall** [00:06:30] I should have said hearings officers, I'm sorry.

**Merrick Burden** [00:06:33] Oh hearings officers, yes.

**Heather Hall** [00:06:34] Yeah.



**Merrick Burden** [00:06:35] That would tend to come with a stipend as a representative Council member, I believe that's how we do that. And then we have some travel expenses associated with that. And you know some some parts of California can be expensive to travel to. Some parts of Washington, like Seattle area, can be expensive to travel to. We have incorporated that into our provisional budget.

**Heather Hall** [00:07:00] Okay.

**Merrick Burden** [00:07:01] Right now we've incorporated three in-person hearings into our budget.

**Heather Hall** [00:07:06] Perfect. Thank you. If I might while I still have the mic.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:09] Please.

**Heather Hall** [00:07:09] I had one other thought I wanted to share, and this is something that Miss Mattes kind of teed up but something that we talked about in our delegation meeting this morning, is the idea of WDFW at home as we do for other things and halibut is a really good example where prior to Council meetings where halibuts on the agenda we host stakeholder meetings and get that input at those. And I have, we have the intention of doing that as part of this process and facilitating some specific input and so just thinking about the idea. We also thought about ideas of hosting listening sessions or ways that we can support the process, but just wanted to share that idea for other states that we intend to do that during this process. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:05] Thank you Heather. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:08:10] Thank you Mr. Chair. I just have a.....well first I'd also like to go back and express appreciation for the GAP discussion. I know that it's hard to give up the chance for representation for your location and the chance for representation at all. So I know it sounds like they had a really lengthy discussion about this and took it very seriously. And I appreciate like looking for the greater good and looking for hearing from as many, like whatever opportunities create a chance for hearing as many people as possible in this process and the creative thinking that's going into how else to gather input. So with that in mind, I have two questions. One is with this do we accept, yeah when we do hearings like this is written comment or other forms of comment that's like asynchronous from the meetings accepted as well? So say like somebody writes a letter or records their own voice and shares that, do those things get pulled into the record of input and feedback on the process too?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:16] I would say yes, but I will turn to Jessi.

**Jessi Waller** [00:09:22] Thank you Mr. Chair. I'll take a stab at this. We've been talking about some creative ideas, whether there could be like a separate public comment portal for our catch share hearings or, you know, doing something like that. Like obviously we will have the public comment portal when the review document itself comes back in September. So that's at least one very clear point of written public comment, for example, to come in. I do not think we have any specific like plans laid out for like the individual hearings themselves in terms of written public

comment, but I think looking to Mr. Burden, if we could, like depending on what the Council desires, like could look into some of those creative solutions.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:06] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:10:06] Yeah, thank you and appreciate the creative thought here. My preference is to try to keep this as clean and orderly as possible. I think as we get more complexity I just, I can't give you any data but the workload starts to increase exponentially with that complexity. And so what I would prefer we do is if there are comments that folks have that they like to provide at a time other than a hearing, I think the Council meeting is the place for them. And, you know, we will have an agenda item where we summarize the hearings and that's a place for public comment. And I think that works because of the purpose of these hearings. You know the hearings are, the way I see them, is that we're trying to gather information to help, as Jessi said, diagnose why this program isn't working well and getting out in the communities accesses people that we don't see very often. That conversation might trigger more public comment, but all of that is good fodder for the Council then taking action and saying, here's what we want to pursue for Amendment 20 or an Amendment 20 amendment, an IFQ program amendment potentially. So I'd like to keep that clean if that logic makes sense to you and just say we've got the hearings, we have public comment and all of that is an orderly process that we can structure.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:37] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:11:37] Thank you. And yeah, with that in mind, because I, so the way that I think about this is like we do the public hearings, we do the online hearings, it's a limited number of hours. And there's I guess....I'm assuming we'll use the same time rules that happen at the Council meetings or I don't, I actually don't know what the plan is. So maybe that's a better question is how does that work? I remember being in public hearings for different issues when I was on the East Coast, but I also remember that like sometimes people didn't get a chance to comment because like it took all day and like we got to 7 o'clock and we just had to cut it off. And so that's what I'm saying by limiting the number we do in some way limit potential for participation. I don't know how many people will come out to these, but I just wanted to give some thought to that. Like logistically will everyone get a chance to say their piece? And if not, writing provides another opportunity for that. And then my other question was around I'm just trying to get a full understanding of workload. I think that description that you provided in the staff summary really focuses on travel days and the number of days that Jessi is physically there, but I also know that there's some workload to summarization and to pulling things together afterwards, and so, yeah, I come at this from a very process standpoint like what.... yeah I'm trying to understand the full scope of burden that that puts on Jessi so that we're not overloading you and also ensuring that everybody gets a chance to participate. So I'll stop there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:14] Okay. Jessi? Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:13:14] I keep looking at Jessi because I'm hoping we can help one another here. So the most frequent hearings that we do are salmon hearings, and this would be different from those. The salmon hearings come forward with, you know, we are considering these clear options. What do you think? What's your preference? And here what we're saying is we think

there's a problem with the IFQ Program. What do you think it is? And so it's a much more open question. And I'm not sure if a hearing would take all day. I don't have a good sense for how many people would show up at each place, but that is a more open ended question. And then that feeds on to then your assessment of what does it take, in this case on Jessi's part, to synthesize all of that. And I think that takes quite a bit more time on the staff officers part then the salmon question, which is we had eight people that wanted option 1, seven people who wanted option 2, here's the makeup, here's the main comments. Here you have to go back and digest the information down and try to synthesize it and say, here's what we learned, here's what we heard, and it's a more intense process on the back end. That's what I would anticipate. What that takes in terms of time I think depends on what we hear. But it is more intense in my mind and Jessi I don't know if you want to add anything to that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:46] Jessi.

**Jessi Waller** [00:14:48] Thanks Mr. Chair. Yeah I think, you know there's some....with the like, for example the GAPs proposal, you know, I think the level of comments we could get if we hosted one earlier it might not have as much information to provide feedback on as compared to ones that might happen later in the summer when our contractors might be further along with the review and there's more to comment on. So the amount and level of comments might get larger. I had initially been envisioning under the more condensed timeline kind of having the summary included more as an appendix to the review because I think it's going to be a little hard on the timeline we're on to like incorporate a lot of it in, but I think the information, you know, I see it as gathering some really key elements to help inform the review. Maybe we get something out of like an earlier hearing that helps us, like our contractors and staff kind of like dig into key questions a bit more before we finalize the draft for September. But it also might help the Council in your selection of recommendations for Follow On actions. I could see some of that coming out. Not necessarily.....we're not looking for please make a change to X, Y, Z, but you know this whole diagnosis thing, but at least getting us like in really good shape for the rationale for picking Follow On actions after the review document is complete. So I do agree with Mr. Burden, it's going to be a little bit more intense than probably the salmon hearing reports are. It's just going to be a matter of what actually ends up coming out of these hearings, which is a little hard to determine.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:20] Aja, a follow-up?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:16:25] Sorry. And then just the final question. Logistically does this mean like at the event people get 5 minutes to talk for example, or like yeah, what are the rules for engagement at each individual event?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:42] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:16:42] The way that we tend to run hearings does have a nice orderly flow to it. That's, I think, our M.O. with everything we do. And as you were to envision a hearing you would have the hearing officer, which is a Council member. You have Council staff helping to administer, you know, the check-in and then also provide report. And you may have one or two other folks helping to organize that that meeting. There's....when I picture this hearing you know, there'd be a start. The hearings officer or the Council member would introduce everything and tell

everyone how the flow is going to go, likely turn that over to Miss Waller to give a presentation about where we're at and some relevant information, and then we start the public comment and there would be time allotted to each person. And as that comment is coming through there's usually a recording device and a staff officer taking furious notes. So it's all managed very well. It's worked for salmon. It's worked for the, in my experience in the prior trawl hearings that we did. My experience with that was a long time ago now. But it's all very orderly and works pretty well.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:56] Okay. Thanks Aja. Heather Hall and then Lynn Mattes.

**Heather Hall** [00:18:01] Thank you. And Mr. Burden just my question is what is the role of the hearings officer and you got it that a little bit. And so it's really just facilitating these discussions and it's a Council member because, well that's part of my question, the role of the hearings officer. And I'm just wondering if there's, thinking about cost and if there was a NMFS person there and there would be no cost to having them serve as the hearings officer rather than a Council member, or if the benefit to having a Council member is that it's, as you put it, you know, this is your opportunity to tell us how the programs working or not working, if that's better received or received differently to a Council member than it would be from someone who's from National Marine Fisheries Service. So and I'm bringing this up just to simply bring the cost issue back into this and is it an opportunity for savings or is that feedback from industry better, you know, presented by someone, a Council member? So it's a bit of a question, but also kind of just a comment.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:29] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:19:32] I appreciate the thinking Miss Hall. The Magnuson Act has a section on hearings and in there it provides some structure. And one of those pieces of structure is that it says a Council member shall preside over the hearing. And so if we're going to call these hearings I would want to be consistent with that structure. And in my experience it is important to have someone there that is, you know, a person of authority that presides over the hearing, that essentially Chairs the hearing, and that helps with the orderly flow of that hearing. We have NMFS people on the Council. Maybe that's a way to thread that needle. I'm not sure if they'd be willing to preside over everyone, but maybe one of them would be reasonable. And then in terms of what other Council members we might tap to save some cost, I mean some Council members we pay stipends to others we do not. So maybe there's some thinking there too.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:38] Okay. Thank you Heather.

**Heather Hall** [00:20:40] Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:40] Keeley, is that a response? Okay, please.

**Keeley Kent** [00:20:46] Thanks. Just to wade in very briefly. If that conversation goes further and there's discussion about NMFS being a hearing officer, I just want to remind folks that our engagement with the catch share reviews those are recoverable costs. So those become cost recovery costs so it's not necessarily a cost to the Council, but I want to be fully transparent about that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:10] Thanks Keeley. Caroline McKnight.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:21:14] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just a couple of thoughts. I just want to echo the sentiment that I think the GAP had a great discussion and I really appreciated their report. And the value of meeting in-person rang so clear and I think that we're listening to that. I have a question I guess that is timing in nature. There was a little bit of confusion for us this morning about which is that some of these might, these meetings, whether in-person or remote, could happen after June when this comes up in front of the Council but that intersector would come back in September. So if something should come from a meeting, a post-June, a public hearing post-June Council meeting, there's still an opportunity for discussion in September along with intersector. Is that correct?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:06] Jessi.

**Jessi Waller** [00:22:08] Mr. Chair, Miss McKnight. I think something might have got a little crossed there. So our plan is to bring the intersector allocation review back in June, and the GAP's recommending not having, having none of the hearings consider intersector allocations. So the catch share, the hearings would be strictly focused on the catch share review, which is not planning to come back until September is our proposal. So I would think about them now like we were already planning on having them completely separate items and the GAPs recommendation, which I think is a good one, is to like just not do hearings for intersector and just focus the hearings on the catch share review. So we could have hearings after June and I think that would be fine. Like I mentioned to Miss Szumylo that I think at that point in time we would also have a further along draft of the catch share review that could be presented on in that later part of the summer in advance of having the September materials in place.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:23:07] Thank you for the response Jessi. And then just a follow-up. I'm hearing that we have this schedule. I'm hearing they're going to be orderly and maintained in a fashion that's organized. Do we have an option somewhere along the way to check-in if more is coming from these than we anticipate? Meaning like we're not sure if we're going to get a lot or a little and so we're prescribing a number of hearings and remote now without knowing what may come. So I'm just looking for is there a possibility to have a check-in to make sure that we're adequately addressing? And I feel like that's getting to Miss Szumylo's point of making sure that everyone's heard and we've given enough time and space for this. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:56] Jessi.

**Jessi Waller** [00:23:59] I can start and then I might look to Mr. Burden on this. If the Council were to go with the GAP's proposal to have one hearing online and maybe one hearing in-person in that April-May timeframe as we were initially proposing, by the time we got back to June we would have at least some kind of, I mean we'd obviously know who showed up and how many people commented, where and how that could come in I don't know. I don't think it could be like a formal summary of what happened but maybe, but yeah I'd look to Mr. Burden on how and why, how we could bring that information back I guess if that's your question.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:39] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:24:43] Thank you and appreciate the thought. What's coming to mind as I'm thinking of your question Miss McKnight is, well a couple of things. One, you know hearings are

good usually at getting people that we don't frequently get to the Council meetings to share their thoughts and that, you know, in my experience has been very valuable. And I think maybe one example of what you're getting at is that what if there's something out there that we see that we're getting an inkling of in these hearings that's really controversial or it's a hot topic but we're not quite getting it fleshed out. Like the hearings haven't quite gotten enough for us to really understand it. What would we do? I would think of this as a like an adaptive management exercise. So we'd come back to you and there's a report from staff saying there's something out there and there are a couple of ways to go about it, should we do one more hearing this time next year, you know, or something like that. We can adjust. We can always adjust, but it's difficult to play the hypothetical. So I think what we do is we take a best cut out it now and if there's something out there that causes us to want to change course or add some more resources later on we can always do that. That's how I would encourage us to think about it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:05] Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:26:07] Thank you. I think that what I'm asking for is not a comprehensive, you know, download on everything that's taking place to date, but just an ability to do a check-in for a signal if something more is needed. And I think you answered that so thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:21] Okay. David Sones.

**David Sones** [00:26:24] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'm just thinking, you know, somehow the community in Neah Bay particularly, but even La Push Tribal communities have had a big impact by this program. And you know we were watching it closely when the economic analysis was being done and it was pointed out that you probably will see a collapse of the outer edges of where processing is taking place and it's going to get centered into the Astorias, the Newports. And it's happened. In Neah Bay we've gone from up to nine trawlers to one, which is me. And I've been able to try and hang on to processors in Neah Bay and we've added one in this last year, but somehow we need to get our concerns and interests out and it doesn't seem to benefit us just to go directly to NMFS and talk about our concerns. We need to get it out in the public so the processors understand what impact it's had on us. And as it works now we are having to whatever fish we are buying is.....I also have Sole Catcher Seafoods and there's our co-op in Neah Bay and Harmony Seafoods, anything we're buying in the trawl or catch is going either to Astoria or California. So there's high costs associated with all that trucking and it reflects in our prices in the community. So I'm just trying to think of how we get, and maybe by attending the Astoria hearing where there are a lot of buyers there that we could participate there, not me as a Council person, but maybe me as Sole Catcher Seafoods or the co-op, or our port directors just so we can get our information out there, our concerns out there and the impacts to the public and to the processors and to NMFS so they can understand what impact it's had, you know where do we go in the future. I guess maybe some of....maybe we'll get ideas from participating in those hearings. So I'm just thinking that might be a way for us to get our information out and heard and so NMFS understands the impacts it's had on our community and try and search for resolution. How can we with the system we have now, how can we increase our opportunity to harvest? Probably you would notice in the GMT or wherever the tribal fishery has basically gone to almost zero. I mean this year we actually caught our petrale, our petrale quota, and it's the first time in probably 10 years or since this program went

into place. We were kind of plugging along for a little while when Bellingham still had a processing plant, but it just didn't work out for them. They were losing money there in Bellingham so they closed it and from there then we had to really move our fish a lot further to get to a market. So I'm just trying to think of how we could get our information out there. Maybe these public hearings would be a good place for us to share that information and maybe encourage processors to work with us up in the Neah Bay area. And I guess for them they need to understand what the program's going to do and where it's going and what the problems are as it's been implemented. But that's kind of my thoughts here on how we should participate in there because we do get, not left...we kind of get left out of a lot of things because like even I noticed on the salmon bycatch in the hake fishery, we are included in the impacts but we're under the overall accounting for the fish. It's not the tribal allocation of salmon impacts, we're umbrellaed under the hake one. But I notice when the reporting comes in it doesn't, it says non-tribal hake impacts for salmon. And I don't know if there's a...we don't have a separate category, we just are under there so maybe that's just misrepresented there. But just small things like that we need to get out to the processors and the public and try and work, try working on some solutions that could help our communities build those fisheries back up. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:24] Thank you David. Anyone else? Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:31:29] Thank you Chair. This is a hopefully a much simpler discussion point. We're trying to appoint hearing officers today and I think we have a plan to do that, but trying to say yes I'm available for some date six, seven months out that they don't know yet, if we appoint hearing officers and something comes up is their ability, an ability to change who's that hearing officer is or is this set in stone? I think all of us would be doing our best to make it, but I can't tell you what I'm going to be doing on the third Wednesday in June right now. So just is there going to be some flexibility as we, as things get flushed out a little better if there's a conflict that somebody could change?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:32:18] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:32:20] Yeah, I appreciate the question Miss Mattes. I think it would be fine to, but I would...I think it'd be fine to provide some of that latitude and that adaptability, but since you will be making a motion to appoint a hearing officer, that sort of adaptability I think would be appropriate in the motion. Just and I think what I'd be looking for is just the same process we use for like assigning an ad hoc committee where it's the discretion of the Chair. And so you'd reach out to me and the Chair and we consult and then say, okay Lynn can't make it, Miss Svensson can and we'll make the change. But just saying that I think would be cleanest.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:33:02] Does that mean you have a motion Lynn?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:33:05] I do not, but I know there is one that is maybe circulating toward the power table.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:33:11] I see Heather's hand. Heather.

**Heather Hall** [00:33:14] Sure if we're ready I do have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:33:17] We like motions.

**Heather Hall** [00:33:20] That's what I hear. I move the Council hold three in-person hearings for the trawl catch share review in Astoria and Newport, Oregon, and the San Francisco Bay Area as recommended by the GAP in Agenda Item I.2.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, November 2024 and two online hearings, one during the day and one during an evening. Try to have at least one in-person at a minimum the Astoria meeting, and one online hearing in April. The other hearings could be spread out into the spring and summer. Appoint the following hearing Officers: For Astoria, Aja Szumylo. For Newport, Christa Svensson. San Francisco Bay Area, Corey Ridings. Online, Lynn Mattes.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:20] Thank you Heather. Is the language on the screen accurate?

**Heather Hall** [00:34:23] Yes.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:23] Okay, please speak to your motion as appropriate.

**Heather Hall** [00:34:27] Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:28] Sorry. Seconded by Caroline McKnight. I couldn't help myself. All right.

**Heather Hall** [00:34:33] Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:34] Thank you Caroline.

**Heather Hall** [00:34:35] Well, I just again want to appreciate the GAP and the work that they did in coming to their recommendations. This does have two online hearings rather than three. Appreciate the balance between the need for these hearings and the value of them with workload and what we're trying to get in terms of the hearing officers and the conversation we had before these are Council members that put in the motion, and but I think...I appreciate the perspective of having that come from a Council member and maybe not a NMFS staff person for now, but I think it's something we can continue to think about as we look for ways to consider cost savings in the work that we do for the future. That's it. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:35:43] Okay. Thank you Heather. Questions for the motion maker? Discussion on the motion? Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:35:53] Thank you. I'm just.....thank you for the motion Heather. I'm just trying to confirm with Merrick that the listing of appointment, or the appointment of hearing officers in the motion adequately allows you the discretion to replace those names if necessary when the time comes?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:36:13] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:36:15] Thank you Mr. Chairman, and thank you Miss Szumylo for the question. If you didn't ask it I was going to ask it. So perhaps Miss Hall you could just speak to



that question as part of your motion and what happens if someone cannot attend as a hearing officer?

**Heather Hall** [00:36:33] Thank you. These names are offered as a placeholder so we know we have names assigned, but if for some reason these folks can't serve for once the meeting dates are established, replacements could be considered. Does that work?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:36:59] Okay. All right. Further questions? Discussion? I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:37:10] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:37:11] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Jessi, how are we doing?

**Jessi Waller** [00:37:23] Thank you Mr. Chair. You have provided your guidance on your hearing schedule and locations to have three in-person and two online and you're hearing officers. We will take this back and start planning out potential dates and locations for these hearings and working with the hearing officers to get these scheduled noting your comments on having some in the spring and then moving forward through the summer. So you have completed your action for today.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:37:53] All right, thank you Jessi. Well with that, we're a little behind but we've been at it for an hour and 20 minutes so let's take a 10-minute break.

### 3. Methodology Review: Final Fishery Impact Model Review Topics and Stock Assessment Methodologies

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] No public comment so it takes us to Council action, which should be here shortly. Okay with that I'll open the floor for discussion. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:22] Thank you Chair. Appreciate the close look that the Groundfish Subcommittee of the Scientific and Statistical Committee looked at the FT-NIRS. Hopefully this is a way to increase production output of aging for key species since that is currently a backlog. Do note that there are still some challenges with that progress, with that process so I think want to be supportive of moving forward with that. I'm a little perplexed on how to move forward with the non-nearshore projection tool that the GMT is requesting help on. I don't know, I don't have a recommendation on that right now about how to proceed. Still trying to absorb some of that information. When it comes time I will have a motion I'm getting ready to send on at least the FT-NIRS part.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:24] Okay. Thank you Lynn. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:01:30] Yeah, thanks Lynn. I'm feeling similar to you, as you. I in my brief exchange with Dr. Field it's just, I'll take the opportunity to just again emphasize a theme of this week and other meetings about, and Jeff Lackey even spoke to it in the NMFS Report, about the importance of data collection and funding data. And it doesn't seem like from the answer Dr. Field gave to why this isn't working well for rougheye, it doesn't seem like it will ever work well unless we start finding the smaller fish. So it's going to take that intensive effort for humans to read otoliths or to find other ways. So again, these assessments are really, especially for species like rougheye that don't have a strong signal from the trawl surveys, the ages and lengths and all that are just are what are giving us the information on what the status of these stocks are. So just, you know, there's a lot of hope for this technology and I think agree that it's going to help, but it's going to be for those the rich getting richer of pollock and whiting and Pacific cod, which are already the data rich stocks working for those. So, again, just emphasizing the continued importance of this core data collection that we also talked about in the research and data needs agenda item.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:06] Thank you Corey. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:03:09] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And similar to Corey, I mean, from reading the report I certainly got a distinct impression that pursuing an actual model for non-nearshore shelf CPT at this time was not prudent and a recommendation that really they need more data to really create an informed and robust model. So to me it sounded like they were essentially asking for a pause and really wanting to focus more on data collection.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:46] Keeley.

**Keeley Kent** [00:03:49] Thanks. On that point about the data collection in the non-nearshore, I think Thompson spoke to it a little bit, but we are hopeful that over the next couple of years that there is more data available. You mentioned the electronic logbook. I think as the Council knows,

as of 2025 all sectors of ground.....directed groundfish will be required to use the electronic logbook. That will really help solidify that collection, the timing of it rather than being sort of across paper and electronic, so we're really hopeful for that. We've also seen a lot of refinement of that data collection already, more fishermen getting used to it, able to work with that. We've been refining the data validation components of that as well. So it is emerging as a better and better data tool for us and I think as the Council knows too, a lot of times it's building that time series. So I have no doubt that it will be useful. I can't say exactly when for this particular thing, you know, the data will be ready to go, but I think giving that just a little bit more time. And then separately in the discussion as part of our spex process, one of the reasons why we recommended the Council consider a directed open access permit, one of the pieces was to try to help us better understand some of the patterns in the fishery to potentially consider a different observer coverage. And really what that means is digging in on some of these different gear types, in particular the 12E gears. They'll always be 12E to me. I know other people don't like that name, but those 12E gears and trying to understand those fishermen and patterns and communities so that we can do more targeted observer selection, but it's true sort of across the board. Right now with open access in particular, until we get that permit, which I'm very thankful we're close to, we just don't have a lot of ability ahead of time to track specific gear. So right now a lot of folks are lumped together in a big hook and line sector, and so that limits our ability to extrapolate that information out across the fleet based on the way that we're setting up that observer coverage on the front end. So we are in conversation with the Science Center. I think we're looking at the ways once that permits online that we can tailor things better, and so I think there will be multiple changes that are coming over the next few years that will change the baseline of this and maybe make it less of like, okay, we would need a really complex model. And I do think it's worth waiting to see some, how some of those pieces fall together to then revisit that question. So I appreciate all of the GMT's discussion on that, but I wanted to add a little bit more flavor of what's happening on the sidelines.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:30] Thank you Keeley. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:06:34] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I'm also thinking about the comment here on the fishery impact model. And I guess it's my perspective that fishery impact models are one of the core tools that we have at our disposal for managing fisheries, and I'm not saying that because I used to be a modeler. I feel that pretty strongly and that in order for us to, you know, go about our spex process that we have to come up with a way of estimating what a bag limits going to do, what a trip limits going to do, or an area closure is going to do. And I believe in the people that we have in our midst. And I think the GMT is flagging their capacity concerns and I appreciate that. The GMT has been undergoing some turnover and things of that nature. We have good folks in other agencies. We have good folks in the Science Center. We have good folks at Pacific States. And so I think some more door knocking I think might be in order rather than concluding we need a contractor. I'll just be blunt, I think if we have to find a contractor to do this we have bigger questions. I think there's somebody in our midst that should be able to help us here. And so I think Kelly and I can help with that task and figure out if there's somebody out there or another agency out there that can help. On the question of data, that is always an issue. We have data-limited models so usually there's something we can do in the interim to kind of get through the period until we have data to develop something more rigorous, and that might be a different approach but perhaps the same person that we're looking for. So I think there's a way forward on that fishery

impact projection tool. And for what it's worth, unless you'd like to take a different direction, my deputy and I can help knock on some doors and figure out who can help us and report back to you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:35] Okay. Thank you Merrick. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:08:40] Yeah, thanks. I think I agree with Merrick. This gear type does not happen. It is not fished off of Washington. If it were I think we would be offering to help with that model. We have the staff that can do that and Miss Roberts in particular. But I'm calling out a couple of things that Sharon and Keeley said and Merrick too of I do wonder sometimes if we put too much effort into these fishery impact models, and I'm trying to avoid the flashbacks of Merrick showing me the Jim Hastie derived spreadsheets back from the trip limit models from before the FQ program, but the....it really that data collection and the monitoring is key. And for example, Heather.....well I won't explain it as accurate as I can, but our, for example our Washington recreational fishery, our projection model is almost as simply as taking your effort and your catch, your CPU from this year and then saying next year is going to be the same. And then but we're confident in that simple model because our ocean sampling program is getting really good estimates of what efforts actually are and what catch actually was. And so yeah, we'd rather probably have good monitoring of these fisheries and these models are always going to be, you know, a bit wrong. And I don't....I'm agreeing a long way. I don't know that we want to spend the resources on a contractor at this point in time when the data availability is going to be pretty, you know, pretty uncertain on what you're going to project anyway.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:23] Thank you Corey. All right, anyone else? Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:10:33] Not seeing any other hands raised on this topic so I am prepared with a motion if now is the time?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:41] I think it is.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:10:44] The tower of power has it? I move the Council adopt the SSC recommendations on 4-year transformed near-infrared spectroscopy, also called FT-NIRS, aging methods for 2025 and beyond as described in Agenda Item I.3.a, Supplemental SSC Report, November 2024.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:08] Thank you Lynn. Is the information on the screen accurate?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:11:09] It appears to be.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:11] Looking for a second? Seconded by Corey Niles. Thank you Corey. Please speak to your motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:11:16] Thank you Chair. This speaks to the SSC Report and their recommendations on how to use FT-NIRS moving forward to help with some of our backlog in aging. The motion specifically does not speak to the non-nearshore non-sablefish model. We need to come up with clever names like we had Sylvia and Rupert and others, but this does not specifically speak to that GMT model as based on the discussion and the questions around the

table and some discussions I've had with the ODFW GMT members. It doesn't seem like that is something that is ready to move forward at this time. I don't want it to fall off, completely off the stove, but maybe it can go to one of the backburners and start thinking about it. We definitely won't be able to do anything for the 27-28 spex cycle, but, and this was horrible to start thinking about the 29-30 spex cycle. There's hopefully something there we can we'll have some data and some door knocking to find some folks to help with this. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:21] Okay, thank you Lynn. Questions on the motion? Okay, discussion on the motion? Tough crowd this morning. All right, I'll call the question then. Okay, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:12:37] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:37] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Okay. Thank you Lynn. Okay, so with that I'm trying to think here, you did breach the issue about the on Number 1 a little bit I guess so. Marlene, what else do we need to do here? Did we get this covered?

**Marlene Bellman** [00:13:06] Yes, thank you Chair Pettinger. I believe the Council has completed their... our task for Agenda Item I.3.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:14] Okay, I'll turn to Executive Director Burden. Merrick.

**Merrick Burden** [00:13:18] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. Just in looking at the Council action, if you could go back please on the screen. Looking at the final topics for fishery impact model methodology review. Absent identification of some topics on your part, maybe just some confirmation about what you'd like us to do in terms of next steps in pursuing any new non-nearshore modeling? I offered to help try to identify some capacity to help us and if that's what you'd like we can do that and report back at another time. Or if you have some additional guidance about that topic in particular that would be welcome at this time too.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:04] Okay I'll look around the room here. Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:14:09] Well I believe what the GMT suggestion was, or and maybe Keeley's was, just let's not worry about it for this next cycle too much. I think the GMT will still be making a estimate for the, you know, the catch in the sector. It just won't be a new model. It will be a, you know, a ratio based way and I don't know if we're anticipating big changes to this fishery given it's so new, so I don't know what the use of the model would be in terms of, like you said, evaluating changes, alternative changes. But I believe using the simple approach for this upcoming cycle was what I would recommend.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:01] Okay Corey. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:15:01] Thank you Chair. And to get at Mr. Burden's question, I do think whatever we can happen over the next couple of years behind the scenes, knocking on doors, additional training for, you know, those of us for additional training within our staff members so

that maybe we can have something for the, not this next spex cycle, but the following one. Give it a little time we'll have a couple more years worth of data. So I think we should continue to pursue whatever we can behind the scenes to help the team out for the next cycle. Hopefully that was clear.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:44] It is. Caroline McKnight.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:15:46] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah, it occurs to me that one of the limitations of changing regulations drastically and having not enough data now may not be stable into the future. And so by the time we were to hire a contractor to look at something, we may have made evasive changes to regulations again that would put us right back in the same situation. So I'm in favor of knocking on doors. I'm in favor of keeping this in-house. I'm in favor of the GMT continue to be creative and, you know, account for some uncertainty and some changes in behavior that we can't always predict, as we always have. That's what I did when I was an analyst many, many years ago as well, and stay the course for now and see what we can drum up in between now and then.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:31] Okay. All right I think we have.....that's good clarification. So all right, very good. With that I think we've, we're good on I.3 and we will move to I.4 and Vice-Chair Hassemer's going to have the gavel.

#### 4. Stock Definitions for Species Assessed in 2025 and 2027 – Final

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] So completing the reports we'll move into Council discussion and action on this item. And the screen....there's our final....or our action before us, adopt the final preferred alternatives and also adopt the revised FMP language. And with that who's going to start the discussion? Caroline McKnight.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:00:35] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. In absence of any SSC Report here indicating any new information that would deviate or change from what RPP was, I feel like there's not a whole lot to discuss, so maybe I'll just leave it with that and see if there's other thoughts.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:54] Any other thoughts before we move into motions on this? And I would be, not seeing any I would be happy to entertain any motions. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:01:07] Thank you Vice-Chair. I thought I was really early in sending my motion to the gentleman in the back, but I do have a motion if now's the time.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:19] Now appears to be the time.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:01:24] Okay. Just a moment. There they go. I move the Council adopt as the Final Preferred Alternative the stock definitions in Table 1 for groundfish species to be assessed in 2025 or proposed to be assessed in 2027 and adopt the Revised Fishery Management Plan language as shown in Agenda Item I.4, Attachment 2. And then Table 1 has four priority species: Chilipepper. Alternative 1. Coastwide. English Sole. Alternative 1. Coastwide. Red Banded rockfish. Alternative 1. Coastwide. Rougheyeye black-spotted rockfish. Alternative 1. Coastwide. Widow rockfish. Alternative 1. Coastwide. Yellowtail rockfish. Alternative 3. North and south of 40/10. And yelloweye rockfish. Alternative 1. Coastwide.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:27] Thank you Lynn. As I followed along that language before us appeared accurate and complete. You agree?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:02:34] Yes sir I do.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:35] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Sharon Kiefer? Please speak to your motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:02:42] I think Miss McKnight spoke really well to it, but we have no new information from the SSC. All of the.....all of the, everything in the table is the same as the PPA. There was some good analysis on this previously. I don't know that that much more needs to be said on that. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:04] Thank you. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Discussion on the motion? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:03:16] Yeah, I think, well thanks Mr. Vice Chair. And I think Caroline said that we don't have any new information to change our minds. But I do think.....just want to say a few words about, you know, what we're doing here is maybe we're getting through this, but I don't know. We're not really doing justice to how complicated the real world is. I just....like I'll use yellow rockfish as an example of one of the alternatives was to have a Washington, Oregon stock, and a California stock. And that's how the assessment is currently done, it has two areas. They used to have three, but now just given data limitations, Oregon and Washington are combined in California as a separate area. And it'll be an update assessment. It'll be the same same way. We might call the OFL coastwide, but we know that, you know, adult yelloweye don't move all that much. You're not going to repopulate, you know, central California from the yelloweye off of where Dave lives in Neah Bay. So we still want to pay attention to these differences and area as much as we can. I know it's really hard with the assessments and data we have, but supporting this but not believing that coastwide management really covers what we're interested in here for a stock like yelloweye. And just my favorite example I did. I did take the opportunity to drive down here from Olympia and you know when I crossed the Oregon California border the thought of, oh wow, you know quillback just went from 40 percent, B40 percent down to 12 and that as soon as I crossed that line. And so we're really oversimplifying things with what we do here. That's not how it really works. And yeah, these population structures are something we may never figure out with the resources we have. But thanks to Lynn for doing the motion and getting us through this, but I hope we'll continue to investigate and think hard about not just, you know, stock structure and perfect mixing, but also what are the area differences and what is local depletion. And I know we're going to enter the second phase here coming up soon and looking forward to continuing bringing the science to our policy discussions here.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:40] Thank you Corey. Further discussion? Not seeing any hands I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:05:50] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:50] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Lynn. That one motion covered both Action Items 1 and 2. I keep scanning the room to see if there is any hands for further discussion or items? Not seeing that I'll look over to Marlene and ask what else we need to do.

**Marlene Bellman** [00:06:21] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. With the motion adopted by the Council I believe that the Council action is completed on this item. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:33] All right, thank you. With that we will close out this agenda item.



## 5. Cordell Bank Conservation Area Revisions

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] All right. Thank you all. When we left here we had completed all the reports on this agenda item and the public comment, takes us to Council action. And on the screen before you related to adopting a purpose and need, a range of alternatives, and if possible, a Preliminary Preferred Alternative. With that, Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:00:26] Thank you. Before discussion got going I just wanted to say two quick things, just some acknowledgments. One, I did want to take a moment to recognize Jessi's work on this analysis. There's been a lot of work, a lot of careful work and a lot of additional work even after the Habitat Committee meeting. And I just wanted to recognize that that this certainly I myself had some idea going into it that simple is not simple but she's done a great job of working through all of the information, some of which was emerging throughout the process of developing that analysis and I just want to recognize that. I also want to recognize and appreciate the remarks from the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. We really appreciate Maria and Danis engagement throughout this entire week at this meeting. And just wanted to be clear that we definitely support the way forward summarized by Maria in her remarks under the ONMS Report about further Looks at Cordell Bank coming up soon.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:28] All right, thank you. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:01:33] Thanks to Jessi and for all the information we received in the course of this agenda item. I wanted to respond to Miss McKnight's question about how long will it take? I know that that question has been asked a number of times and apparently it's a difficult one to answer, but I will answer it.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:55] Before you answer, let me ask are you a subject area expert? Do you have a boat?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:02:00] I will concede that I have a boat that I launch in San Francisco Bay and in better times of opportunity I would actually take my boat out as far as Fanny Shoal, which is short of Cordell by a bit. But I would say that if I woke up in the morning and wanted to check the weather and said I can go if the weather is acceptable to go out there, it would take me from the time I left the port at least three hours to get there. And my boat, I have a planing hull, a boat that, a larger boat that doesn't plane would take considerably longer, it would basically would not be feasible. In weather, if there were some weather, you know we have a typical northwest swell, it might take over three hours to get there so. And I don't run as fast as I used to because my body is more brittle than it used to be.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:09] Thank you. Other discussion? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:03:16] Thanks Vice. I actually have a question, and I'm guessing this is for GC, but I'm thinking about NEPA and how we usually structure alternatives when we make decisions that involve a range of alternatives. And this one the way that we're looking at it at the moment is a No Action and then one other alternative. So just thinking and asking how this....I mean how does this meet the need for a reasonable range under NEPA?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:46] Rose Stanley.

**Rose Stanley** [00:03:48] Through the Chair, thank you for the question Miss Ridings. So under NEPA there's no requirement that you consider more than one alternative. That said, you want to think about the purpose and need and how many alternatives meet that purpose and need. So the Council often does and can consider more than one alternative but is not legally required to do so. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:11] Thank you. Caroline McKnight I saw your hand.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:04:14] Yes, Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'd like to echo the comments made by Miss Kent that I very much appreciated the robust engagement with everybody this week and the dedication to get here. I really appreciate Maria and Dani from sanctuaries being here and engaging with us and finding how we can close some communication gaps and move forward in a productive and collaborative way. I think that was a huge success moving forward. I'd like to just walk back just a little bit and speak to the reason this seemed simple but not simple from the onset. I think that CDF and W viewed this very much as a surgical fix to a very complicated problem. And if everyone has a knot or two in their brain trying to understand all these polygons, that is what prompted this to begin with. When we moved to a recreational all-depth fishery in 2023, at the start of 2023, there was interest in accessing this location and it became a very glaring and challenging education and outreach problem for CDF and W to try to explain how to engage in the open waters versus the GCA in a way that they could follow the rules and make a successful fishing trip out of it. And so I appreciate the answer to my question Marc, that it is a intention and a well-planned intention to get to this fishing location and folks were blowing our phones up trying to make sure they were doing that appropriately. And so that's really was the launching pad for this discussion and I think that fell in line with two very important crossroads. One was that at the close of the Amendment 32 Non-Trawl Closed-Area action, we had the new innovative GEA tool at our disposal. That means that we can look at these kinds of areas and decide how to use them and when to use them, how to use them without the need for opening up full EFH review and wait for years to get there. The other and more unfortunate one or intersection was that we took sort of a hard left turn because of quillback rockfish and now the season structures are limited to just a few months of the year where this area could even be accessed at all, let alone the limitations we're hearing from being offshore in other. And this is speaking to recreational fishing at this time. So I just wanted to provide like how we got here. And I think that where I need some help, and we've had some conversations this week, as you know EFH we keep saying it's coming soon. I have a question that I believe is most appropriate for Miss Kent as to, it's not on the YAAG yet, but it might be in the near term, and if there's any indication how soon or how near-term that might be coming up? Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:31] Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:07:34] Thank you. Thank you. I'll just comment on sort of what's been happening behind the scenes. I want to certainly acknowledge, you know, it's up to the Council on the actual scheduling of it, but because I think there are some excellent lessons learned from the last process, and you know I'll be honest, I was only around in this process for the very end of that, but we have already started behind the scenes the prep work, right? So we are working on a GIS tool already

because we currently have some GIS capacity. It's the same capacity that we had with Amendment 32. So we are building a tool already for the Council bringing in all those data layers that we think will be helpful to set the stage for that. So there's been a small group that's been meeting periodically on that. There'll be an end point where we can't go any further until the Council actually officially starts. And I know that there's other considerations, not just workload, but the other EFH reviews that are needing to happen. But we are, you know, trying to put all those pieces in place so that when the Council does schedule that we are ready to go. We have a lot of interest in improving that process, making tools that really make it accessible for stakeholders to be part of that process and look at maps and data layers and all those good things to bring forward their perspectives on that, and so we'll keep doing that and would support the Council when it fits within the workload of the rest of the Council starting to schedule those agenda items for groundfish EFH review.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:08] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:09:11] Thank you. And just to add to Miss Kents explanation, we do have several EFH matters and we try to schedule them in a rolling sequence so that we can keep up with our timelines. We are....the next one we have in the bank, if you will, is salmon EFH and then after that we'd be looking at groundfish EFH and oftentimes are the same people. There's a lot of the same people. And so this is a, not primarily, but there are some significant workload implications and we have to figure out how to stagger these things so we can make quality analyses and make headway. Sometimes we can have an overlap, but we haven't really talked that through just yet.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:00] Thank you. Further discussion? Not seeing any hands for discussion here. I think we do need motions at some point to adopt these things. Caroline McKnight.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:10:20] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I believe mine's traveling to the, what do we call it? The tower of power as Lynn referred to it?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:33] Looks like it's there.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:10:34] There we go. Thank you. I move the Council adopt the following purpose and need from Agenda Item I.5, Attachment 1, November 2024 as follows: The purpose of this action is to provide fishing access to previously closed areas surrounding Cordell Bank while protecting sensitive habitats. The Cordell Bank GCA was initially implemented to reduce catch of several overfished groundfish stocks which are now rebuilt or rebuilding ahead of schedule. This action is needed to reduce unnecessary regulatory complexity. And adopt the range of alternatives and select Alternative 1 as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative from Agenda Item I.5, Attachment 1, November 2024.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:16] Thank you. I followed along that language before us looks accurate and complete. Is that correct?

**Caroline McKnight** [00:11:22] It is.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:22] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik? Please speak to your motion.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:11:29] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. We've been having, as I mentioned, these very robust discussions in our California delegation and sidebar meetings all week and we really appreciate that there is broad agreement and support for this motion with the understanding of how this particular action fits into the larger context of EFH review that is upcoming, although not formally scheduled yet. I do again want to thank the Cordell Gulf of Farallons Sanctuary staff for being here and working through this process with us. There is absolutely no doubt that this particular area has tremendous ecological value, and the discussion on how to balance the habitat protections with fishing activity is a delicate one. I do want to also echo that this is a rather a success story in one way in that we can remove and no longer need or use something called a groundfish conservation tool. But it's also coming off of heels of another problem with quillback rockfish, so it's a little bit bittersweet. But I think that through this motion and through these discussions CDF and W is committed to working collaboratively with the sanctuaries and the NGOs and the stakeholders and everyone involved through the EFH process to further those discussions. I'll stop there.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:45] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:12:55] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I hope this is the point at which I might suggest a small amendment?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:01] All right. I just want to make sure nobody has any clarifications, but yes go ahead.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:13:07] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I thank my fellow California delegate for this proposal. So I would like to add the following text in bold to the proposed purpose and need. And just to skip to the last sentence is the only change, "This action is needed to remove unnecessary regulations and to reduce regulatory complexity". Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:38] All right as I look at that, what you're proposing in your amendment is on the screen in bold. It's accurate, complete. Is there a second to that? Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Please speak to your motion.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:13:53] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. This is just along the lines of my intervention this morning. I think if we hadn't had the recovery of the stocks that these closures were meant to rebuild, then we might not have been doing this regulation. So it's important to, again, celebrate the success of the rebuilt stocks and say we're taking away regulations that are no longer necessary. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:18] Thank you. Are there any questions for clarification on the motion to amend? No questions for clarification. Discussion? Oh, excuse me, Jessi.

**Jessi Waller** [00:14:31] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just a really quick clarification. It's says adding the following text in bold. And I'll just note that the, "to reduce regulatory complexity" is

already in the current purpose and need so you're just proposing adding the "remove". Just minor clarification point.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:14:53] Actually, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thank you. The last phrase actually had said, "reduce unnecessary regulatory complexity", so it's slightly different. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:15:14] All right, look around and make sure everybody's clear that there is a change to the last sentence, the portion that's in bold. Other questions for clarification? Discussion on the motion to amend? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:15:34] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Supportive, I just.....those who know me know I really do not like wordsmithing purpose and need statements, but I think the point was, is an important one and just making....when you first brought this up Dr. Lent I thought, oh yeah we should add, you know, the Magnuson Act language of, you know, there's the fair and equitable sharing of both the restrictions on rebuilding needed to rebuild stocks, but then there's also the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits that you achieve from rebuilding. And so that is a nicer way of saying it than just regulations are unnecessary. It's a sharing of the recovery benefits that, you know, the industry and this Council worked hard to achieve. So appreciate the amendment.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:29] Thank you. Other discussion? Seeing no discussion I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:16:37] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:38] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion to amend passes unanimously. Let's go back to the main motion now as amended. And that motion as amended is now on the screen before you. Any further discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:17:17] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:17:18] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Caroline. What I saw in that motion that was just passed addressed items one, two and three, but let me talk to, turn to Miss Waller and see if there is more work to be done.

**Jessi Waller** [00:17:47] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. You have completed your Council action for today. So you've adopted a purpose and need, a range of alternatives, and a PPA, and we will be coming back to you in March to take final action.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:02] Thank you. And as I try to do before we close this out, Corey Ridings had her hand up and Corey Niles and Chair Pettinger. So in that order. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:18:15] Thanks Vice. I just wanted to share a few thoughts on this. Obviously I'm supportive of the motion and the work that CDF and W just did and helped us move us along here. You know I do have a few concerns about habitat and primarily the opening to bottom trawl.

You know we heard from our Habitat Committee that we could have had a fuller analysis and the data is lacking and that it just makes me nervous to think about the importance of some of these extremely sensitive habitats and how we move forward with them. I also heard that there is likely not going to be much effort there, especially trawl effort. But that is, I mean I would like to be more optimistic and think moving ahead that we will get more trawl effort and that that is going to be a place that more fishermen will come to. And we certainly heard about 50 miles and distance to get there and how difficult it is and that is what it is, but all that being said, I want to think that there is going to be growing effort. So in terms of thinking about what we do? I'm always thinking about, okay well, how is this going to be in the future under different scenarios but one of those scenarios is a more optimistic one with more fishing. Having the sanctuaries here I'm grateful for that. So thank them again for coming. They also, having their presence here and seeing their materials in the briefing book always makes me think about what their purpose is and why they exist and why they participate. And, you know, the cultural value of the ocean and ocean life to non-fishing interests, that's a big part of why sanctuaries exist in our nation and I don't want that totally lost in our process. I think it's our responsibility, even though we're here to focus on fish and fishing, to recognize and acknowledge that. I'm hopeful with the discussions and conversation that we had here today that we can move relatively swiftly to our next groundfish EFH review. Certainly seems like we have some work to do there and I'm grateful for NMFS and CDF and W and the sanctuaries and our members of the public, both fishermen and the conservation groups we heard from today, that will be willing to work together and hopefully make it a not 10-year EFH review and that hopefully it can be a shorter but also robust and collaborative EFH review like we had last time.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:03] Thank you. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:21:07] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. And not to speak to what I should have spoke to with the motion, but similar to Corey just thoughts about, you know, I do think, you know even though the purpose of these closed areas was to rebuild rockfish, that we do have a duty under NEPA and under the Magnuson Act to understand what the impacts of this action would be on essential fish habitats and also very deferential to CDFW and others and it seems like a very thorough process. And yeah, as I got to in Q&A with Geoff is this seems like a lot of data in a much more smaller geographic area than we usually, you know, so it's it seems like a manageable decision of the same type that we would consider under the EFH review. And so this being PPA there's opportunity to understand those impacts and for the public and others to help us understand what those uncertainties are. And so I still think that's opportunities there is my point, but that was a long way of saying I do hope, this is just in terms of guidance, hope that the Habitat Committee would, Dr. Greene said they would be willing to help us understand what these two different models of the habitat and all the other data are telling us and not about areas of concern. And so I do hope Council staff takes them up on that offer and they can help us interpret this data and modeling that we have before us. And yeah, thanks to staff and CDFW because I do think there is a lot of information there.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:22:52] Thank you. Chair Pettinger.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:56] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. A little bit of angst maybe was entered into the room I think on the, with the trawl impacts maybe to the open area. As I mentioned

earlier, that area has been.....that whole bank has been trawled substantially back in the 70s and 80s and 90s by numerous vessels with much bigger gear than we have now. A different world today than it was back then. The 7-inch foot rope I think certainly changes behavior as far as just hurting your net. I know we had....my vessel was fishing down in that area, not that position, but just south of that and I think they had 34 pounds of yelloweye fishing in the mudflats. So no one wants to go anywhere near hard ground because of what they're going to catch. And so as far as the irreversible impacts to trawl, interesting that the testimony that talked about the recovery that's happened since we stopped fishing there so obviously irreversible impacts isn't necessarily a correct statement to make. And while some corals may be very old and they grow very slowly, during the EFH review we did last time I spent a lot of time with National Marine Fisheries Service scientists, and actually a friend of mine gave me a piece of coral that he got when he drug up a, or wrapped up a abandoned pot gear in 300 and some odd fathom, it had a piece of coral the size of my fist growing on the rope. So obviously not all coral grows really slow. I think the Southwest Science Center actually has that piece of coral. I gave it to them. So anyway just one broadbrush here painted all that everything's slow growing and never recovers. So I'm sure there probably is some very old, slow growing coral out there, but that isn't necessarily the case across the board. But as far as the impacts that you might see from a trawling area, I did....this area came up for a potential opening. I did talk to the skipper who knows that grounds really well down there and he mentioned that tip of that place has quite a bit of bocaccio in that spot. And so old growth bocaccio which isn't really marketable, no one really wants it at least on the commercial side of things. So it's a big place. That area that people are concerned about is going to be, have any impacts. So kind of calm people's fears about what might happen. So anyway I'll stop there and I'm glad that Cal Fish and Game brought this forward and it's great to have some impacts for the local hook and line fleet and they need all the help they can get, so appreciate that. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:25:48] Thank you. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:25:51] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. You know I think we at the Council need to be careful with sensitive habitats and I think we have been, but when you have historic fishing grounds that are being taken away for an express purpose, and when that purpose is met and if we delay returning it because we're introducing a new criteria, then I think that it's much harder for us to justify taking stuff away. It can't be a one way ratchet. If we're going....if we need, we have an obligation to rebuild fishery stocks and we take measures that put a huge burden on participants, participants in the fishery, put some people out of business, you know we have a corresponding obligation to return that, return those fishing grounds. We do have a separate EFH process and I understand that, you know, that's coming up and we will take a look at that but, and we should, but I guess all habitat is sensitive in one way or another. I'm not sure that anyone has designated anything as insensitive. We're going to find fish where we find them, and it's going to be over rocky habitat, for example, and of course that's where you're going to find substrate for corals and sponges. We've taken a lot of that off limits through our previous EFH process and maybe we'll take some more in the next process, but for now I think we've accomplished our task in rebuilding stocks and we need to return that area back to the fishery.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:27:58] Thank you. Any other comments, discussion needed here? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:28:08] Yeah, I, well I don't want to.....I do want to get to lunch, but I think that I don't think you can make up your mind yet Marc until I forgot to make the analogy to BOEM and all the issues we've had with how they do NEPA and people suspect that they are taking actions before considering all the impacts. So I do think, I fully agree with you on the purpose, but it doesn't mean we can't take a hard look at what the impacts would be. And I'll have to say I'll just express some disappointment in the, and I'm going to forget the name of the sanctuary we did that, we also, the Council chose not to provide like a one, two square mile area for coral research. So I do think there's a balance here in closed areas in returning fishing grounds and that we do have that obligation under NEPA to take a hard look, and this being the PPA there's still time to consider all that information. And so I just I don't want to keep going on the debate because I think that happens later, but I think there's a balance to be had an at least to be aware of what our impacts are of this action.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:29:23] Thank you. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:29:26] Thank you Vice-Chair. I'm sorry to keep you all from lunch again, but just to add to the discussion that's going around the table right now. I'm with you Marc too that, and Brad that, yeah I think returning areas that were used in the past builds faith in this process that we can, that it can go both ways. And then I'm also super sensitive about there being really important habitat in these areas that we may not have totally looked at yet in the context of EFH now that they've recovered in some ways. But you know the beauty about all of our extensive process is that if we do it the right way and the Habitat Committee does kick in and take a really hard look at this one area, it can all go into the record for whatever we choose to do with the next EFHCA action as well. And so some of this can be foundational work for making choices later on that meet the goal that comes up under that mandate instead of, while allowing us to use this action to clear up some regulatory complexity and return some former fishing ground to folks. So I don't think this work, excuse me, if we didn't do it here it's not lost provided that we keep going. And I'm really hopeful, yeah I like Keeley came in on the tail end of the EFHCA process last time around, but it was thorough and sweeping. And you know what I'm hopeful for this time is that we made some really great sweeping changes last time that won't necessitate a 10-year process this time around and mean that we can do this like very surgical uptake of really important habitats that are important to the coast. So that's it. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:21] Thank you. Any other comments? I'm not seeing any hands so I think we've completed our discussion on this. We've completed our action items. With that I will close out this agenda item. We are going to break for lunch.



## 6. Inseason Adjustments and Technical Corrections for 2025-2026 — Final Action

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes all the reports, public testimony, will take us to Council discussion and then action. We'll start with Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:00:10] Thanks. I just had a couple of things that I wanted to address that have come up now throughout this agenda item, different random different topics. One, going back to the GAP Report and my question of Gerry, you know I just wanted to point out from a rulemaking perspective, if there's a particular action that isn't suitable for an inseason, that doesn't mean that the spex is the only place where that could occur. And so I'm not suggesting that we've evaluated that this should proceed separately, but just I want to be clear for folks that if something is not an inseason, right, it's not meeting that criteria of waiving prior notice and comment from the public. And so that means that you can undertake a proposed and final rulemaking and so the Council certainly could consider actions outside of just spex that change things like trip limits in a bigger way. Again, not suggesting that, but I think it's important that it's clear to folks that there are those possibilities given Council workload. That's a different discussion. So I wanted to close the loop there on why I ask Gerry that question. And then separately, just from the public comment that we got, I wanted to just bring back around, hopefully all those folks are listening, I was trying to recollect the last time that we talked about the lingcod retention inside of the non-trawl RCA. I think it was perhaps June was the last time that we, that the Groundfish Management Team looked at that. And I had some of these conversations when we were on our port tour so I just wanted to close the loop again. My recollection, certainly welcome around the table if anyone else recollected it differently, that we did not open back up lingcod inside of the non-trawl RCA. So that would be lingcod that would be caught with our 12E gears that are up off the bottom. You know, two main reasons. One, the concern about quillback and particularly the concern that we have a lot of new folks that are using these gear types, and so while, you know, the EFP data is useful in trying to understand how that gear fishes, we know that it takes folks a bit of time with new gear to understand how it works and to figure out things like the bottom depth and really making sure that they're using that gear correctly. The risk, as I recollect discussing, was that folks that maybe aren't fishing that gear, right? Right they drop it lower than it's supposed to be. They catch a lingcod, they catch a quillback, right? And we're really looking at keeping the 12E gear as one of the few lifelines in some of these areas during these quillback closure times and the risk of just 1 or 2 quillback coming up in that gear and then it not being the same lifeline that's what I remember that discussion of of the tradeoffs there. That isn't to say I think necessarily that the door is closed forever. The other part, too, is that when the Groundfish Management Team was looking at that question about the lingcod retention, the data wasn't there that lingcod were being caught and discarded in that fishing gear. And so, you know, we've heard a little bit about people are encountering them, but it didn't play out in the logbook data that we were looking at. So the other part of it that, you know as we, you know we had a lot of good conversations when we were out on our port tour talking about the importance of that logbook data collection and folks telling us exactly what is happening on the water so we can bear out exactly where those fish impacts are looking like. And so not having seen it bear out that there were a lot of folks encountering lingcod with 12E gear that they were then forced to discard, it didn't also lend in to that conversation of the cost versus benefits of carrying that out. So because we had lots of good public commenters

asking about that, I thought it was appropriate to bring that conversation back. From my perspective, it doesn't mean it's done forever but I thought we had a really good evaluation of that issue a couple meetings ago and I wanted to make sure that folks were tracking sort of where we ended up with that. My very last point, I would just say on the questions about the troll gear depth, which is another thing that we talked to a lot of folks about, you know, I think that's certainly a consideration outside of inseason. And I think if folks are interested in evaluating whether there's a possibility there when we move that EFP into regulation, it was set up that way by the EFP Director, there might be conversation that we could have, but I view that as something that folks could bring forward under the Workload and New Management Prioritization as something for the Council to consider in a separate action.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:56] Thank you. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:05:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. If I may, I have a question of Miss Kent based on her remarks? Thank you. Your first point regarding the separation of the shelf complex in the area north of 40 10 so that we might have specific line items for bocaccio, chilipepper, and vermilion, I'm curious about what you might have in mind if there is a possible alternate path forward? And the reason I ask is it sounds like you think we may not need to wait until the next specification cycle. I know you're not suggesting it, but I'm just curious if you have another thought in mind and if it would be, or how expeditious it might be? I think we'd certainly be interested in looking to do this sooner if possible, but I don't know if you've thought through what rulemaking activities and what analytical needs might exist? Thanks.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:07] Keeley.

**Keeley Kent** [00:06:08] Yep, thanks for the question. I have thought about the rulemaking part of it so I'll be very clear that.....and really I just wanted to make sure that people understand, you know, what we can look at inseason and what some, a different pathway might be, right? I think the Council could spin off a separate agenda process, and again I'm not advocating, just saying you could do this. If you felt like that was where you wanted to spend your time, because this is a thing that is timely and important for you, right? You spin out an agenda item. I would leave it to Council staff to talk through however many meetings that would take, but from our perspective then it's a proposed and final rule. All we're saying that, when we're saying it's not an inseason, right, is that it's not meeting that bar under the APA of waiving prior notice and comment. As long as we can do notice and comment rulemaking from our perspective, there's a pathway different. You may have other considerations that you want to think about doing spex types things outside of spex, but I don't want people to feel concerned that you only get a bite at the apple every two years. It's more of a workload consideration of when you want to do things separately and if there's urgency we're happy to work with you on that process. I have had no conversation with Council staff leadership about workload or capacity and so if that was where you're going I think that's would need more discussion and things like that.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:07:30] Thank you. Sounds like we might want to chat offline with Council and NMFS staff. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:41] Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:07:43] Thank you Vice-Chair. This to me seems like it's something that should be part of our groundfish workload prioritization, which I think is scheduled for either March or April. So we'd look at it in combination with all the other groundfish items that are sitting there on the back burners. I'm not saying this one isn't important, but just trying to have that holistic look. And if I may, since I've got the mic, if Mr. Phillips is still around I have a question for him on Item Number 3 on this list in front of us? I didn't hear it in the overview and I didn't see anything in the GMT Report, should I take that to mean no technical corrections to the 25-26 harvest specifications have been found since we last looked at this in September? Thank you.

**Todd Phillips** [00:08:35] Yes, through the Vice-Chair, thank you Miss Mattes for the question. You are correct. We did not find any other corrections for 25-26, and we were able to confirm that post, post when the Situation Summary was produced on the website for the briefing book. Thank you.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:08:53] Okay, thank you. Just thought so but I wanted to make sure we were all clear on what actions we actually needed to take here. Appreciate that Mr. Phillips.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:03] Thank you. More discussion? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:09:13] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just wanted to note the discussion, the fairly detailed discussion that we had in the GMT Report about sablefish and the additional commentary offered by the GAP, and just wanted to note that it is a positive sign that we've seen an uptick in sablefish landings and have actually seen some vessels approach the trip limits in the period since June. So that's encouraging. And I just want to thank the GMT for taking a look and then I think prudently recommending to us that no action be taken at this time, but noting we'll have another opportunity here in March. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:04] Thank you. Any other discussion? Motions is needed to adopt anything. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:10:16] Yes I do have a motion whenever the tower is ready. Thank you. I move the Council adopt the following inseason adjustments as recommended by the GAP in Agenda Item I.6.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, and the GMT Agenda Item I.6.a, Supplemental GMT Report 1. Number 1: Set the 2025 Pacific whiting set-aside for research in the pink shrimp fishery at 750 metric tons. Number 2: Increase the open access trip limit for shelf rockfish in the area between 40 10 and 42 North Latitude to sixteen hundred pounds per 2 months as shown in option 1, Table 4 of Agenda Item I.6.a, Supplemental GMT Report 1.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:11] The language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Is that right?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:11:14] Yes it is.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:15] Thank you. Is there a second to your motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:11:22] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I want to thank the GMT for their work and their detailed report this meeting. Speaking specifically to Item 2, the OA trip limit increase, I just want to thank the GMT for thinking about how we can possibly provide some relief and some new opportunity for the northern area in their interest of pursuing higher trip limits for shelf rockfish. I think we've heard quite a bit about interest and need and although we can't go as far as we may have liked to in this inseason action because of the way that shelf complex is structured and that we don't have certain species broken out as we do south of 40 10. This alternative that allows us to increase the limits between 40 10 and 42 so that they are at least equal with the limits that are up off Oregon and Washington should provide some increase in opportunity. And I think as you've heard from the testimony here today, we're certainly interested in trying to find a way to provide greater access to those midwater shelf stocks and they are certainly of value and we recognize that. So I just want to thank everyone for the hard work and also note that we are tracking vermilion very closely. We do acknowledge that we're already over that ACL contribution for vermilion in the north, but that the way we've done our accounting we are looking very good with vermilion and that we do expect off California in total to remain within our vermilion ACL contribution this year. So that's good news and we will keep looking for other paths forward to create additional opportunities where we can. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:35] Thank you. Are there any questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? No discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:13:50] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:51] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci. I'll look around for any other hands for discussion, motions. And Todd I don't see any hands going up here. I believe we have covered Action Items 1 and 2 there, but I will rely on you to tell us what else should be done.

**Todd Phillips** [00:14:25] Yes, Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, as you're aware the Council did adopt some inseason adjustments for the open access fishery. They have also adopted, you've also adopted the Pacific whiting yield set-asides. And Action Item Number 3 is no longer germane to the discussion as we were unable, or we were not, we did not find any other items that needed to be corrected in the 2025-26 harvest specifications as appropriate. As such I would say that you and the Council have achieved your goals here under I.6.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:56] All right, thank you. I'll scan the table once more to make sure there are no additional words needed here. And not seeing any, thank everyone for their work here. I will close this agenda item out and pass the gavel back to our Chair.

## **J. Coastal Pelagic Species Management**

### **1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report**

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes all the reports, the public comment, takes us to our action, which is just discussion on this item. So I will look around and see if there's any additional discussion that's necessary? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:00:20] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Well I guess on the question to Josh, I mean is....I read the report, your report, to say there would be alternatives and it would be open to the best available science discussion. Did you have any thoughts in response to that?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:42] Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:00:44] Through the Vice-Chair, thank you Mr. Niles. I guess our current plan is to review the relationship of CalCOFI, that has not gone through a formal review. There's been concern expressed around this body in that relationship. The Corp found that did not represent best available science. We're going to take a look at that and bring that to the SSC for sort of a more formal discussion around that parameter and then the Council and SSC can, you know, make a best scientific information available determination in setting the 25-26 spex. I can speak to a bit more of the rationale, but that's the sort of short answer there, if that helps.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:33] Follow-up Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:01:34] If they find that it's not a good relationship any more than the alternative would be to not, the SSC would come up with a way to not use it, like take recruitment off the stock recruit relationship or whatever it is they've done in recent years, correct?

**Josh Lindsay** [00:01:53] Through the Vice-Chair, Thank you Mr. Niles. Correct, I mean I'm hesitant to speak to options at that point in time, but the Council and the SSC has been in this situation previously back in 2012, 11, something like that, when it was perceived that the productivity relationship with the Script's Pier temperature had been found false. We removed that and used an alternative approach. As I think we've mentioned previously that CalCOFI relationship is not hardwired for that Emsy and OFL and ABC, so yes there would need to be likely an alternative chosen and, you know, at this point trust the SSC to provide the Council appropriate guidance on how to do that at that time.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:34] Thank you. Other discussion? Looking around I'm not seeing any so Katrina. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:02:55] I'm sorry Vice. My hand was not quick enough there so that's on me. Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Niles thanks for this conversation. That's helpful to get some detail on this. I had a similar question around sort of what review meant when I read the report but didn't get a chance to ask. Thinking about the SSC and appreciate the intent to sort of use our system and bring it back to get a better grip on that. I guess my question is just in thinking about, you know, we had

the Scripts Pier version before we found that to be invalid, that came through and was changed. Has the version that we use now been reviewed by the SSC before? Because we are using it for management now and I'm curious how that had come through our review process before if you happen to know?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:49] Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:03:50] Through the Vice-Chair. Thank you Miss Ridings for the question. Yes so, and I'm happy to follow-up if this is not the answer you're looking for, so when there was some research that came out that appeared to show that that Script's Pier relationship was no longer valid, and I say proceed because then a subsequent review found that it was actually still significantly correlated, the Council initiated, I think it was a multi-day workshop process for a variety of environmental covariates were looked at and explored. CalCOFI ended up being the most significantly correlated and moved through the Council process for that. And so yes it went through extensive review and sort of discussion by this body on the appropriateness both by the SSC to recommend it for the OFL and ABC and then that led to a subsequent conversation for impacts on the harvest guideline control rule, but that's a sort of a separate distinct aspect of it.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:56] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:04:56] Thanks. Thanks for that. Just following-up on sort of our thinking about the timeline here and the logic. So if this was to come back to the SSC as suggested following for a review, if it was to be found to be scientifically invalid would that mean the expectation would be that NMFS would want another workshop or a similar process to be able to reconsider that methodology and find a better one?

**Josh Lindsay** [00:05:31] Through the Vice-Chair, Thank you Miss Ridings. I guess I'm hesitant to to say what NMFS wants, but I think NMFS would support a process like that. We're obviously, as with the Council, we want to ensure that our process and our specifications are based on the best scientific information available. If that is to continue to use some sort of environmental covariate in our control rules, then we would support some sort of workshop to look at that. You know there's been discussion that maybe moving away from environmental covariates maybe a path forward. There's also been work done that show that even a slight relationship with environmental covariate can have benefits to sort of management. So I think that would be a conversation that we'd be welcome to participate in going forward.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:20] Thank you. Any other discussion? And no more hands I believe, so Katrina.

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:06:36] Thank you Vice-Chair. The Council has fully discussed Agenda Item J.1, National Marine Fisheries Service Report and the Council has completed its business on this item. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:47] All right, Thank you very much. Then we will close out this agenda item.

## 2. Pacific Sardine Rebuilding Plan Fishery Management Plan Amendment (FMP) – Final

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Okay, that concludes public comment and takes us to Council action. So which is before us right there. Briana.

**Briana Brady** [00:00:14] Thank you Mr. Chair. I had a question for GC. I don't know when I should ask that?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:20] Right now would be a wonderful time.

**Briana Brady** [00:00:23] Thank you. So I had a question regarding precedent and with the challenges associated with taking Council action on a revised building plan in just one meeting and setting a precedent that that's okay versus doing...having the Council do nothing and setting a precedent that we are okay with NOAA proceeding under a secretarial authority to make decisions. Could GC clarify if there's any precedent with either?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:59] Kathryn.

**Kathryn Kempton** [00:01:00] Thank you for the question. And through the Vice-Chair, we have in the past had situations where a court ordered us to do something in a timeframe that truncated the fulsome participation of the Council in that decision-making process. This is one of those scenarios where this is not the preferred way to follow our COPs, but the reality of the timing requires that if we are going to have Council participation in this decision, that it happen at this meeting as a final action or as final preferred action recommended. So this is....I think if one were to try to ascribe some sort of precedential value to it there would be other thresholds that would prevent that, but just looking at the facts of the situation I would be very comfortable saying that this is unfortunately what is caused by the timeframe that we have before us. It's not an attempt to convert in any way the way we follow our COPs. So non-precedential there. I'm not sure if I answered the full question.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:08] Briana.

**Briana Brady** [00:02:08] Thank you. You did.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:08] Okay, thank you Kathryn. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:02:15] And I appreciate the question Miss Brady. I would just offer, just as your Executive Director, I do not intend to structure future agenda items that operate in this way. So as someone who sets your agenda for you I don't intend for this to be a precedent. Maybe that's worth something too.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:35] Okay, thank you. All right, with that I'll open the floor for discussion. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:02:44] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think I'll address this first to staff. And I'm looking at slide 28 of your staff presentation. And recognizing two points, one, as you point out, environmental conditions will play a key role in time to rebuild from low biomass, all rebuilding timelines have uncertainty, and also in recognition that for Alternatives 3 through 6 you pointed out that the reality expectation is that it would be some time less, likely less than what is identified as the timeframe in that particular slide. I have heard through discussion that Alternative 3 was modeled through the rebuild model and that Alternative 6 is actually a variation of Alternative 3. My question is in the relativity of how you've presented the rebuilding timelines, why is Alternative 6 flagged as a much longer, I mean Tmax as opposed to the other ones that are something less than Tmax?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:11] Jessi.

**Jessi Waller** [00:04:11] Mr. Chair, Miss Kieffer, I will start this off and see if Katrina has anything she would like to add. When we were developing this analysis we are on a rather short timeline, and I think you're right that Alternative 3 was explicitly analyzed in the initial rebuilding plan. For Alternative 6 I think you've heard a lot of really good discussion today on why the T, the time to rebuild might be a lot shorter. I think when we were just developing the analysis there was some uncertainty on our side as staff in our initial assessment and which is why we were comfortable at the time saying it's less than Tmax, but we just didn't put an exact number on it. So but I think you've heard a lot of discussion today on why it might be something closer to what was in Alternative 3. And I don't know if Katrina has anything to add there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:57] Katrina.

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:04:59] Thank you. I would say that Alternative 3 rebuilds in 16 years. Alternative 4 rebuilds, it's modeled to rebuild within 17 years. And so likely it will be close to those timelines. But as Jessi mentioned, since it involves the 5% rate where it's more difficult to know based on the analysis that was completed what that, what the biomass removed would be year to year under this alternative compared to Alternative 5, which has a set ACL. We felt more comfortable noting Tmax rather than a particular year given the uncertainty there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:49] Okay. Sharon.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:05:50] Thank you for that explanation. I just was curious if there was a specific analytical point or the more just the level of uncertainty. So that helps clarify and thank you for that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:01] All right, thank you. All right, who's next? Briana.

**Briana Brady** [00:06:11] Thank you Mr. Chair. I wanted to take a moment to thank Council staff, Jessi and Katrina for all your hard work in putting the rebuilding plan together. You can tell that you put a lot of thought and effort into this. I think it's unfortunate that the Council is revisiting this. As I left September in 2020 feeling relieved that we had come to a reasonable solution to rebuild sardine after a unanimous vote with the Council. So I want to go on and just say that I note that only 1% or less of the northern subpop is actually being harvested right now as well. I think



part of my frustration is from the fact that the Council has taken numerous precautionary steps to help ensure the sustainability of the stock, many of which were felt by the industry but however how we have noticed and witnessed that the primary driver of the stock is the environment. And now we are again in a position of taking an action that is likely not going to have a direct benefit to the stock, but has the potential to disrupt and already hurting industry. So I guess I'll leave it there with those types of remarks and go on to say that I'm supportive of the CPSMTs recommendation. I think they're taking into consideration the needs of the industry while accounting for the resource and what is needed to rebuild a stock. And I have a motion after Council discussion if you're ready.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:09] Thank you Briana. Anyone else? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:08:12] Thanks Chair. I have a question for NMFS I think, and this is going back to understanding the alternatives before us and going back to this concept of the rebuild model and the analysis. And I'm guessing we've been over this before and I just missed it, but I was hoping for a little bit more clarification to have the confidence that what we have before us is enough to make this decision. We heard, we know that five and six are new and Council staff use the word extrapolation, so I was just hoping for a little bit more on how we have enough to actually make this decision and feel confident as a Council that this is going to move forward. I just heard Miss Brady talk about frustration that this is coming back again. And, you know, I understand this is also necessary given the court and all of that, but trying to find the smoothest, fastest way forward and wanting to, I guess, here once again or in a slightly different way to make sure that we have what we need in front of us?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:23] Josh or Kathryn. So Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:09:29] Through the Chair, thank you Miss Ridings. I very much appreciate the question. I can appreciate that that's something that other Council members are probably grappling with on this as well. I can try to answer it and maybe there's more specifics that you'd like to follow-up on, and I don't want to like jump ahead of what you're thinking. Yes, we've been following along with this process. We think Council staff has provided a robust analysis for the Council to make a decision on. Obviously any sort of transmitted action to the agency we will then take our, you know, secondary examination of that rebuilding plan to determine whether or not it's appropriate to approve, disapprove, partially approve, and both under our MSA requirements as well as the decisions from the court and we will obviously be taking that portion of the decision very carefully. I appreciate that maybe there's some concern or questions regarding how this analysis compares to previous analysis. From speaking maybe a little bit off the cuff I think it's fairly apples to apples here. There's a lot that went into the discussion and sort of explanations in the original rebuilding plan that obviously we're not able to bring fully forward for everybody to hear, particularly new folks. But the decision that the Council made previously, yes was based on the rebuild analysis, but it was also based on a lot of other factors and the team outlines those I think pretty well in their statement of the considerations that were made last time. And it appears that the team is, you know, again providing at least in their analysis, and I suspect the AS took some of those things into consideration as well. You know, an example of that is the decision to choose a Ttarget of 14 years previously, even though that wasn't a direct result of the rebuild. It factored in other considerations by the Council and it seems that, you know, the alternatives are

able to do the same thing. I'm not seeing a bright line at the moment between sort of the information the Council had in front of them previously and what they have in front of them now. Obviously it's a unique situation and very much appreciate that, but if there are specifics associated with that, either, you know, maybe myself or Council staff can help. But I don't want to over sort of talk my response here. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:05] Thank you Josh. Corey. Katrina you have something for us? Okay, Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:12:14] Thanks Chair. Thanks Mr. Lindsay for that. I just have a quick follow-up on that. I know that we're in a very weird situation, want to move forward, want to avoid this happening again. If we were to pick an all move forward and then NMFS was to disapprove or do a partial, what would that mean in the context of our timeline and recognizing that you are under also a court timeline?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:58] Kathryn.

**Kathryn Kempton** [00:13:02] Thanks for the question. Through the Vice-Chair. If we were, if NMFS were to disapprove or partially approve, the pathways are very limited for further Council involvement and I'm not sure if that's what the Council member was getting at. But we don't have more time to come back other than to follow the mandates of the MSA with respect to in a partial disapproval there's usually a consultation. That has yet to be defined actually as to what that consultation could entail. But the path is very limited to bring this back to the Council because of the non-precedential nature of the short time period in which we have to engage on this matter. And if I might add, the issue under consultation really drives the conversation going forward.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:51] Okay, thank you Kathryn. Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:13:58] Thank you Mr. Chair. Maybe this is not something I need to clarify, but I just wanted to make sure my reference to disapproving or partially approving was not because it was an active like thing we are considering at that moment. I just want to state our sort of procedural like process. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:18] Good to know Josh. Okay Corey. Anyone else? John North.

**John North** [00:14:27] Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd also like to thank the Council staff for their their work on this. That's a lot of product in a short amount of time, much appreciated. My initial lean on this I guess was towards Alternative 6 since it, you know, wouldn't artificially constrain harvested higher abundances like a fixed catch approach. But and I still think it's a really good option but I think the 2,200 metric ton ACL seems like it could be constraining and so I really appreciate the management teams modified alternative with the 2,800 ACL or ABC and the Ttarget of 17 years. I think that approach strikes a reasonable balance between rebuilding and providing opportunity for the live bait and CPS and whiting fishery. And I think it's consistent with optimum yield and some of the National Standards. And I think based on the corrected catches, you know, it provides I think a 300 metric ton buffer over the highest recent catch so I think that's good. So I guess my lean is towards the Alternative 5.1 and the 17 year Ttarget.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:51] Thank you John. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:15:58] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. I guess I don't know where to start the thoughts, but I think I'm remembering back to September and expressing some frustration that we'd be doing this in one meeting, and maybe not frustration is not the right word, but this is....well I think I don't think I've ever heard anyone call the Council process fulsome before, but Kathryn did earlier and yeah, this is not a fulsome process so I'll say. And yet I have the highest respect for the legal process and respect people's right to litigate and challenge the government's decisions and the Administrative Procedures Act is supposed to enforce rational decision-making but it often has the opposite effect. I think this is.....we have a lot of questions here that it's just I'm trying to avoid saying it's a mess, but it's, I can't avoid saying it's a mess because I hear.....I think Mark Fina is correct in saying that we have a lot of confidence in this analysis, that it's, we should have more confidence that the stock....it's more conservative, our assumptions are more conservative than they were in 2024. But I'm, you know, absent this litigation, we would not be guessing on this stuff. We would just, we would run the rebuilding analysis, and like so John, for example, just mentioned a Ttarget of 17 years, yet again that's assuming that the catch is all northern subpopulation and that Mexico is catching 9.9% of it. So our assumptions that the 2020 assessment were based are now not the best.....almost, you know, out the window based on what we heard on the 2024 assessment. And again the Magnuson Act is also a very solid law that we're lucky to be instructed to make our decisions based on best available science. And if we didn't.....if we weren't here, if we didn't have this litigation we'd be here today with an agenda item talking about next steps on sardine and how to take up the stock structures and how to take up Emsy, which ones we do best, which ones would be best to take up next and what are the Science Centers saying and SSC and the management team and all that and instead we're, yeah we're trying to be productive here, and I think I agree with Briana that we, I think we had a reasonable rebuilding plan to begin with. And it's still reasonable it's just we're, it's not ideal that we're having to do this all based on assumptions that, you know, the evidence in the record clearly shows is just not what our scientists are telling us anymore. So I guess I'll.....I think, yeah, I think a lot of these, you know Alternative 5 modified by the team or six. Six might be more like what we did with groundfish and you know as stocks rebuild your CPU goes up so you want to, you want it to go up with abundance. It makes a lot of sense. I could probably support either, but really like let's open up the discussion we need to have in April about the next steps that we need to take to fix these issues and get back to what, you know, understanding what the science is telling us. So, you know, and again, I think, you know, this is not, this is just my.....I said this earlier during Council staff presentation, but what I think National Standard 1 and National Standard 8 tell us to do is to, you know, achieve similar conservation goals. If we can achieve....if two options look like they're similar in terms of the conservation benefits then pick the one that has the least harm to fishing communities and promotes sustained fishing opportunities. And which one of these does that? I think they're all very similar and in our, in the spirit of those goals at least. But yeah we shouldn't be.....I'm glad to hear Merrick say we won't be doing this again in one process, in one meeting if we can. But it's a long way of saying.....I would, I'll stop with those thoughts and then maybe ask just have a specific request or ask of NMFS and is, you know, would it be possible for whatever the Council puts forward here for you to then ask the Science Centers to run it through the rebuilding analysis? I would love to see the rebuilding analysis based on the 2024 assessment, but if that's not possible even running these, you know, on...I don't think.... again, I don't think it's necessary but I don't, I think it would be a good thing to do. You know, would it be possible, you know, in the proposed

rule phase to ask the Science Centers to run these through the analysis and put it out there, the results in the proposed rule?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:05] Thank you Corey. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:09] Thank you Chair. Yeah I'll put some of my thoughts out there on this. There are two sort of recommended alternatives from the management team, the 5.1 or from the, at least the industry part of the advisory subpanel, 6. And I've been trying to weigh those in my mind and some of the risks associated with those really in the context of I think National Standard 8 right now and the impacts to communities. And as I was reading that, you know people know this, but under 8, communities, it says, "provide for the sustained participation of such communities", and they define sustained participation as continued access to the fishery within the constraints of the condition of the resource. And so I think that has bearing on these two alternatives that treat it differently. My questioning to Mr. Everingham and the others was under Alternative 6 the risk to the communities is at those low levels of abundance with an ACL that's set at an amount that's close or has been exceeded in recent years, so there's a risk to closure if that ACLs approached. And depending on when that happens, if it's catastrophic, or Mr. Everingham explained some of the changes in the seasonality of the catches, but the risk there is borne by the bait fishery because they're the primary user and at low levels of abundance they're taking most of that catch. Under Alternative 5 I think the risk changes is then the bait industry becomes susceptible to the risk that the incidental catches are going to be high because at higher levels of abundance when the ACL is constant, and just assuming, there's a probability that incidental catches might increase and it's not under the control of the bait fishery. Under Alternative 6 they know what they're catching. There's good tracking of the harvest through that and it's possible they can make adjustments. Under Alternative 5, you know the history is the annual catches in the bait fishery are pretty constant and the variation we might see is in the incidental and some of those other areas where sardines are taken. So I guess to get me to supporting Alternative 5 which provides that a little bit higher ACL and a buffer, some rationale or justification on how we would respond to those situations because sardine's environmentally driven, I don't know how big they're going to get in one year or small in the next, but a way that we don't put that bait fishery in the communities, the fisheries dependent on the bait fishery at risk if there are factors outside of their control that could lead to closure. So it's just, you know, what protection do we have there, the risk that the different sectors have to bear? So I'm still weighing through that. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:12] Thank you Pete. Aja Szumylo and then to Briana. So Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:25:18] Thank you Chair. I have a question first on workload for NOAA before I have some comments to make. So my question on workload is if we were to select Alternative 5 for example, ask NOAA staff at the Science Center or wherever the staff is that runs the rebuild analysis to run Alternative 5, but also have on the agenda for the future that we're going to do some bigger evaluation about the fishery, like looking at Emsy, stock structure things, does does running that analysis during the time that you're doing the final rule for this new catch level take staff away from doing the other stuff that we agree is much more important to the overall running of the fishery? So yeah, really it's like, is it the same staff who's doing all this scientific analysis to support either the rebuilding analysis and the new Emsy, the stock structure evaluation and all of that?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:24] Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:26:30] Through the Chair, thank you Miss Szumylo for the question. I'm not sure I'm able to answer the latter part. I guess I would preface any sort of answer to that question with not whether or not we had the staff or the workload capacity versus the necessity to rerun anything through the rebuild and whether or not we would learn anything new or if based on what is being presented in the analytical documents now the rationale from the team and the AS, et cetera, in terms of the rebuilding timelines and the rationale there, that there was a determination that we felt there was a need to do that. And I guess until that time has come then we could explore workload and capacity. It would likely be the same people and take away from other things but I'm not ready to speak that that be a rationale for, you know, either not doing it or for doing it.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:27:27] Thank you. So that's helpful to me with my comments. And yeah, just go back and thank the advisory bodies for having really hard discussions this week and to Council staff who are doing this work and to NOAA staff for their contributions to the work too to doing all of this work really quickly. And I really agree with Briana. I'm disappointed we're here right now. I left fisheries management for a couple of years, and when I left we were in litigation on CPS and I came back and we were still in litigation on CPS. So I...it breaks my heart that we are, when I hear this really big discussion that there are all these other things wrong, going wrong with this fishery that we should be spending our energy on but are still spending our energy on litigation. And to give some context to that. I started I was a CPS, I was in Josh's position in 2018 and we were in litigation I think for a couple of years before that at that point. So it sucks to be here that many years later in the same place and spending resources in the same way and not spending resources on something else. And I echo Corey's comments about our flawed assumptions about catch. And again there's just high dismay that we're not spending time there instead of spending time on answering this litigation. My, the reason why I was asking the questions about workload is because I feel kind of, I feel that the Council is sort of boxed into making a choice around whether or not we will be sued on the choice that we make, or whether or not NOAA will be sued on the choice that we make here. I do not feel free to make a choice that I think makes sense and supports industry in the ways that I want to. I would like to balance industry participation. I'd like to be able.....like I think that we can in groundfish a lot of times make those balanced considerations of, yeah are we seeking conservation and management goals while also supporting the needs of fishing communities? And I don't feel able to do that here because we haven't analyzed Alternative 5 in a certain way, even though I do believe that the record is there to support Alternative 5. And I think Alternative 6 has some strong benefits but, and I would honestly support five at the moment because the truth is I think if we do get to those Emsy considerations, if we do get to the stock structure considerations, it might obliterate anything that we choose today anyways. So I do not want to be here in lawsuit land again. I want to be past it and in a new place and so my choice here will be based on that. And I believe that the record is there to support whatever we choose. But I'm, but where I'm sitting is I want to get all done with this and never do it again. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:30:16] Thank you Aja. Briana.

**Briana Brady** [00:30:21] Thank you Mr. Chair. And thank you Mr. Hassemer for your questions. I guess I would go back to what Mr. Fina spoke to, which was the EFP amounts and where that play comes into. Also I believe he may have also spoken to, but I know the AS discussed it, is that

the industry prefers clean loads. They're not looking to really increase incidental, but it's nice to have that there for those situations. And I think I'll leave it there for now. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:04] Corey Ridings and then Corey.....

**Corey Ridings** [00:31:10] Thanks Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:11] Another Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:31:11] I know it's confusing, as is this agenda item. And I just wanted to share some thoughts just thinking through this. At this point I think we do have some options here. Alt 6 seems like the best one that I'm seeing. I am assuming, and thank you to NMFS and Mr. Lindsay for clarifying this throughout this agenda item that we are moving towards a valid and scientifically robust Emsy. If that is in place, 5.1 or 6 would work in terms of my biggest concerns, which is making sure that we are ensuring conservation at very low levels, which in my mind is the biggest conservation concern around how you manage CPS. Aside from that, we heard from Mr. Everingham about his preference, and I certainly don't want to assume that he speaks for everyone, but appreciate his willingness to come back up and tell us that there are pros and cons to both. And then we heard from the AB that there is a clear preference for Alt 6. And for me thinking of that it is about what happens if we do get more fish in the water and hopefully being able to go back towards a directed fishery and providing more ability there? We also have more the lenses towards an analysis for Alt 6 than 5.1. As we heard from earlier there is stronger analysis regarding the rebuild model. I'm hopeful that regardless of what the Council moves forward with that there will be sufficient analysis and evidence to move forward, but I do see a stronger case for Alternative 6 at this moment. So that increases... that I guess makes me feel more confident in wanting to go with that given the strong direction we heard from our AB and more confidence in the information we have to make the decision.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:33:33] Thank you Corey. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:33:36] Thanks. I know there was a lot of words and what I said before but there was also a question I put out there that we didn't get to. A question for NMFS kind of what along Aja and Corey is saying. I think if you if, you know alter.....you know, I think what again the Magnuson Act tells us to do, if two alternatives have the same conservation performance, which in this case is the same Ttarget or something very similar, pick the one that has the least impact the fishing communities. If what Corey just said, if Alt 6 has that same Ttarget as Alternative 5, then you know, reasonable minds can differ, but you know, then it would say argue for picking Alt 6. What is missing in terms of maybe what Aja is saying is some uncertainty on whether that what that Ttarget would be. I agree with what Oceana telling us it would, you would expect it to be between Alt 3 and Alt 5, which is to me that's the same thing given all the uncertainty, that's same rebuilding target based on all the uncertainty here. So the question to NMFS was, would it be possible to run that alternative through the rebuilding analysis, you know, and publish the results in the proposed rules if that.....I don't want to get too complicated with Councils if then motions, but just run it through the, you know, the analysis. And I think if we had all the time in the world the way to do this and make the record as strong as possible, then you would also base it on the 2024 assessment and you would base it on that new assumptions about how much of the catch is

actually going to be northern subpopulation. And maybe that's....I agree Aja, let's get to that in the next stage. And but in the ideal world that's how you would respond to this, the questions the court has raised. So the question, yeah, and maybe not a direct answer needed, but I don't, you know, I would hope it would be possible if the Council were to go for Alternative 6 for example, then there would be time between now and the proposed rule for the Science Centers to run that through the actual rebuilding analysis.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:35:52] Thank you Corey. Briana Brady.

**Briana Brady** [00:35:57] Thanks Corey. I guess my understanding of Alternative 6 is that it couldn't be run through the analysis. We could ask Annie maybe just because it's a mix, I'm not really sure, versus a constant.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:36:15] Annie Yau could you come up please?

**Annie Yau** [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Chair, and thank you for the question Briana. So I personally haven't used rebuilds to run. Off the top of my head it's probably possible but I don't know definitively right now. I'd have to check the code. Sorry that's maybe less than satisfactory.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:28] Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:00:30] Thanks. Not to answer for you, you check it, but we do this all the time in groundfish and it's the same program you can do 'if thens' and like the groundfish rebuilding plans are based on SPR rates which go up as, you know, they adjust as the.....and you can....so it's basically if biomass is greater than 50 then just take 5% of it. If it's lower than just take 20. It's, we do this all the time, they do this all the time for us in groundfish.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:58] Okay, thanks Corey. Aja did you want a, you had a question for Annie?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:01:04] Yeah, Annie can you come back.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:06] Annie. I'm sorry.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:01:08] Thank you for the commute. Appreciate it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:16] It's part of your cardio program this morning.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:01:21] Thank you. And thank you for that answer about the model too. I'm just curious about like, what does it take to do that? Like time and then knowing that we need to, or that the regulatory side needs to do a proposed and final rulemaking in time for June? Yeah, knowing your workload and the amount of effort it takes to run something like that and draw conclusions from it, can you just describe that for us a little bit?

**Annie Yau** [00:01:49] I'm sorry, when you were commenting I was talking to a colleague, one of the assessment scientists, to verify about the rebuild coding. So I think that is the question related to just running whatever proposed path forward that this Council recommends here? So the.....I

guess I'll start with reminding everyone that, like I think Mr. Lindsay presented this well where you talked about like the need to do it. And one thing I wanted to just mention, because I heard, I've been hearing the word 'extrapolate', and I think one thing I would start with saying is that the the original analysis had a wide range of productivity, starting biomasses, different catch levels, different scenarios, it covers a lot, a wide range. And I, the analysis, the alternatives being presented today are interpolations, interpolations, not extrapolations. Extrapolations think outside the range of results we have. Interpolations being inside the range. So like we have the range and the alternatives being presented are interpolations inside that range, so I think that's something hopefully helpful for this group to hear. To answer your question, the scientists we have who have the expertise to run this are also those who are running right now the update assessments, Pacific sardine and Pacific mackerel. We actually said we could present both at the April meeting, so presenting Pacific mackerel early so that we wouldn't have to have a CPS agenda item in at the June meeting trying to find some efficiencies. So we're already doing that. Those same scientists are also doing the Emsy CalCOFI correlation check that we just mentioned. So we would, and rerunning the rebuild analysis with this scenario, one, it's like it's not like a single run, it's multiple.....I guess like there's a whole set of assumptions. So what's you're starting biomass? What's the productivity? And when you ran the original rebuild analysis we did, like I said, a whole suite of ranges for each of those. So I'm guessing you maybe want that suite of ranges here for whatever option is put forward. So it's more than one run. Each of those runs is, I think last time we'd shoot 2,000 each time and then you want to build a report. Ideally process-wise you have someone look at it, maybe the CPS, a CPS subcommittee do a spot check. Those are all ideal things if we had the time to rerun it. And so I think that, yeah, I think that answers your workload and timing and process questions.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:34] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:04:35] Thank you. And then just one question for....I love interpolation that word is, I like switching the word we're using here. Can we interpolate the impacts of Alternatives 5 and 6 based on what you ran before? Or is it outside, or is it actually an extrapolation in that case?

**Annie Yau** [00:04:59] Alternatives 5 and 6 are interpolations of runs we've already done and the Council staff have done a, you know, and regional office have looked at that so they, yeah I think the information is here for you guys to consider, yeah.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:05:15] Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:17] Okay, thanks Aja. Thank you Annie. Before you leave though.....(laughter).....Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:05:25] Thanks. Oh sorry. Well I think the question is specifically on the need or maybe it's overkill, but in the interpolation right now we have some kind of, maybe it's just to me, but not clear that, you know, even Oceana is saying the Ttarget for Alternative 6 you would expect to be between 3 and 5. But the materials we have say Tmax, because there was uncertainty into it, but so to me that makes sense. It should be between 16, less than 16 or less than 17 years if you interpolated that. So that's the uncertainty that so if you guys are willing to say right now that you



could say it's between 3 and 5 I think that's one thing. You know and maybe it's overkill to then fully rerun it. But so that's kind of the question hanging out there.

**Annie Yau** [00:06:19] Thank you Mr. Chair. And so Mr. Niles I think you're asking whether the team....I'm looking at the table 17 so that this Alternative 6 it says less than T<sub>max</sub> as the years to rebuild. And I think the question I'm getting is does it seem like it's more likely closer to something between Alternative 3 and 5, which are 16 to 17 years. And so Council staff, you know, they had an answer to this and I think they were trying to be, how would I word it like, not overstate assumptions is how I interpreted their response as far as like it's definitely less than 24 and how close it is to 16 to 17 they were not comfortable making that determination in this table. And happy to have him correct me if I misinterpret what they said there. And so but yes, Alternative 6 is a combination of Alternatives 3 and 5 depending on the biomass amount. And so I, yeah, I mean I would think it's closer to something like to 16 to 17 year. How close it is, whether it's a little bit higher is I think the question, yeah.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:48] Okay Corey? Anyone else have a question for Annie? Okay, thank you. All right, further Council discussion? Or Briana Brady.

**Briana Brady** [00:07:57] Thank you. I have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:00] Okay.

**Briana Brady** [00:08:10] Thank you Hayden and Kris. I move the Council adopt Alternative 5-1 as the Final Preferred Alternative, T<sub>target</sub> of 17 years and FMP Amendment text as outlined in Agenda Item J.2.a, Supplemental CPSMT Report 1, November 2024.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:32] Thank you Briana. Is the language on the screen accurate?

**Briana Brady** [00:08:35] Yes. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:36] All right, looking for a second? Seconded by John North. Thank you John. Please speak to your motion as appropriate.

**Briana Brady** [00:08:44] Thank you Mr. Chair. I agree with the CPSMT with choosing Alternative 5-1 and their reasoning in which it would set the ACL at the lesser of 2,800 metric tons or the ABC. And that the ACL of 2,800 metric tons was based on setting a buffer of 300 metric tons above the highest recent seasonal landing. And as the CPSMT explained, under a closed directed fishery this alternative would allow for current landing levels of sardine and live bait and incidental catch in CPS and non-CPS fisheries while setting a catch limit to support rebuilding and long term viability of the stock. Additionally, the comments for this option that it was not run through the rebuild, I believe the rationale provided by the analytical document and discussion by the MT outline where there has been sufficient analysis. More specifically, the Alternatives 4 and 5 dash 1 are very close in scope allowing for rationale, rational decisions to be made. And the rebuilding plan analysis used a 9.9% penalty related to the Mexican catch or Mexican take of the biomass, which adds even more precaution to the rebuilding plan. Also referring to Council staff's analysis of National Standards, this alternative was very in line with those standards. And last, I

agree with the management teams rationale for selecting the Ttarget and I'm okay with a suggested FMP Amendment text. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:22] Thank you Briana. Okay, questions for the motion maker? Discussion on the motion? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:10:33] Thanks Mr. Chair. I have, would like to offer an amendment.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:39] Okay. Please.

**Corey Ridings** [00:10:52] Go ahead? Thank you. Thank you tower of power. I would remove 5-1 and replace with the Number 6.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:15] Okay is that it? No.

**Corey Ridings** [00:11:20] And delete, after the 17 year comma delete, "and FMP amendments text as outlined in Agenda J.2.a, Supplemental CPSMT Report.....perfect. 17 years.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:49] Is that it?

**Corey Ridings** [00:11:50] And then. No, just sorry.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:59] No Okay.

**Corey Ridings** [00:12:00] Based on, excuse me, go back. Sorry about that. Delete. As described in Revised Draft Pacific Sardine Rebuilding Plan, parentheses, J.2, Attachment 1. Draft Pacific Sardine Rebuilding plan.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:42] Corey this is going to be substitute motion instead of an amended motion.

**Corey Ridings** [00:12:49] Oh, I'm sorry about that. Should I withdraw and then offer a substitute?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:06] Chris.

**Chris Oliver** [00:13:06] Yeah I think everyone recognizes it's.....a substitute is a form of amendment so I don't think you need to like withdraw and you can just recognize that it's a substitute motion.

**Corey Ridings** [00:13:20] Thank you. I recognize that this is a substitute motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:23] Okay....(laughter)...

**Corey Ridings** [00:13:31] And tower of power I think I may have said 'proposed', but I don't think that word is actually necessary, as described in Revised Draft Pacific Sardine Rebuilding Plan parentheses J.2, Attachment 1. Thanks, that's it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:03] Thank you. Chris you have a comment?

**Chris Oliver** [00:14:05] No.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:05] Is the language on the screen accurate?

**Corey Ridings** [00:14:10] It is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:11] Looking for a second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Thank you Christa. Please speak to your substitute motion.

**Corey Ridings** [00:14:18] Thanks Chair. Appreciate Miss Brady putting out Alternative 5.1. I just continue to think that six better meets the needs as described by our advisors, also from our conservation public. We heard again that given a valid and scientifically robust Emsy that that meets I think our conservation needs at lower levels, but I think we want to offer opportunity where we can at all levels of abundance. So we have heard hopefully that we will be having more fish in the water. We have other items under sardine that the Council is looking to address and may provide more opportunity moving forward. And so I think that this option better meets the need of our communities and our industry members to potentially allow for more directed catch in the future under the rebuilding plan as we move forward.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:27] Thank you Corey. Questions for the motion maker? Discussion of the motion? Briana Brady.

**Briana Brady** [00:15:36] Thank you. I believe the processes that I state I would be voting against the substitute motion and it would be based on one of the things you said. Hopefully there's more sardine in the water and that's not guaranteed. We could ask the center for an update on what they may have seen this past year. That might be helpful. And then also just the testimony that this motion does not protect our live bait fleet in the lower amounts. So thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:12] Thank you Briana. Did you want to invite someone from the Southwest Science Center who would answer that question?

**Briana Brady** [00:16:21] If that's okay if we could get an update on 2024 survey estimates?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:25] Do we have somebody who could give us that? I'm watching. Annie you're getting your steps in today. Welcome back.

**Annie Yau** [00:16:46] Thank you Mr. Chair. We don't yet have, I have yet to see a biomass estimate from this summer's CPS survey so I don't even have a draft preliminary to be able to share today.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:00] Okay, well thank you. All right, further discussion? Vice-Chair Hassemer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:17:10] Thanks Mr. Chair. I guess I just want to speak in support of the motion. As Miss Riding stated, I like the balance here between the conservation need to rebuild the stock, which is very important, and yet addressing the needs of the fishing community that depend. The communities that depend on sardines I understand there is some risk, that risk exists across all alternatives. What I did hear in the statements though is that the risk is still relatively low at those low levels of abundance. And in the advisory subpanel looking across, you know, the impacts of catches or landings in all of those bins that it occurs that there is a level of comfort with this alternative that it is not going to impact those communities. So I like the balance that's presented here and I would support it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:29] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Anyone else? If not.....Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:18:37] Yeah, and now I'm a bit.....I know we're having a difference in views and which one is, like I said before, we're supposed to pick the alternative that's has.....I would agree that if you do interpolate the information we have there we'd expect both options to rebuild about the same time. So which one is....which one better sustains the fishing participation? And you know this live bait fishery, people said is really, it's supporting the Southern California, like much of the groundfish fishery which folks don't know is probably the most, it is the most valuable sector of the groundfish FMP on the coast so it is definitely important. I'm a little bit, I'm not sure. I hear Briana telling us that five is better for communities. The AS is telling us six so, and again I'm just, I can't get my brain off the fact that all this catch is not going to even be, the science is going to say it's mostly going to be the southern subpopulation. So yeah I'm not sure how I will vote I think either is a reasonable place, but yeah I'm not clear on which one we think is less impactful to fishing communities.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:01] Thank you Corey. Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:20:04] Yeah, Thank you. I'm appreciative of all the conversation and discussion that's gone on so far. I think the discussion around interpolation has been extremely helpful for me because otherwise I was pretty confused about the path going. And I am also appreciative about the conversation around conservation objectives and doing the least harm to industry. I, regardless of either outcome will be voting in support, I'll be supporting this amendment, but I will support the motion if it does not move forward. I'm basing this support on the recommendations from the advisory subpanel. Those are our industry stakeholders and that was their recommendation. So I just wanted people to understand why I was voting for what and weigh-in a bit since I've been pretty quiet on this topic so far today.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:09] Thank you Christa. Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:21:11] Thank you Mr. Chair. I, similar to Christa, I plan to vote in favor of either motion, whichever one goes forward. I do acknowledge, I do like the substitute motion, though I have like a slight preference towards that one. But at the end of the day I'm really looking forward to getting on with some of the other analysis that will support the fishery overall and I'm hopeful that whatever new things to like get us to a better place with everything. So I'm in favor of looking towards the future with all these things. But yeah in the interim plan to support this substitute, but we'll support what comes after that vote too.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:50] Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:21:57] Thank you Chair Pettinger. You know there's merits to both of these alternatives, 5.1 and 6. The benefit of six is it allows increasing harvest, but we're not, I don't see us having any directed harvest until we're rebuilt so what we're really talking about is live bait and EFP's and whatever incidental catch is. I don't think that Alternative 6 is sufficiently protective of those low level activities. It merely provides the benefit of increased harvest should the abundance grow. But again, it's not clear to what extent industry will be able to take advantage of that in the absence of a directed fishery. So I'm going to support Alternative 5.1 because it provides some stability and hopefully the stock will be rebuilt and we'll get back to increased fisheries, but I think Alt 5.1 does what we need to do for now.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:14] We have a parliamentary issue here. We want to make sure we get this right. So Chris maybe I'll turn to you.

**Chris Oliver** [00:23:19] Yeah, I mean there's two ways to treat substitute I guess. You can vote and if it passes it carries. If it fails, you're back to the same motion. Technically you're supposed to vote whether to accept the substitute. Which motion do you want a vote on, the first motion or the substitute motion? So you have to have a vote first as to whether to accept the substitute as a substitute. You may end up in the same exact place either way. I mean if you vote to accept it then you have another vote as to whether to approve it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:01] Okay.

**Chris Oliver** [00:24:02] So if you don't want a choice you end up in the same place. I'm sorry, It's not a joking matter but you end up in the same place. But yes, you have to have a vote as to whether to accept the substitute. Is that....am I getting that right Merrick do you think?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:20] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:24:24] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And thank you Mr. Oliver for that clarity. As we were chatting here in the background what was stimulating our conversation is that some of you have said that you would be willing to vote for either one. And so what that puts us in a situation is which, you have to decide which one do you want to vote on? And as Mr. Oliver outlined as we were huddling in the back here, so your first vote would be to accept or reject this and then you would vote whether you want this to carry the day or not. Hopefully that makes sense.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:57] Is there clarity in that? So if we accept this then we would vote on this one. If we did not want to accept this we would go back to the original basically. So, okay. It's never easy. We'll get through it though. Okay, So what we're do is I'm going call for the question about whether we want accept this as a substitute motion or not and we'll go from there. So with that, I'll call for the question on whether to accept it or not. So all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:25:25] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:27] Opposed no?

**Briana Brady** [00:25:29] No.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:25:29] No.

**John North** [00:25:30] No.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:33] Abstentions?

**Josh Lindsay** [00:25:35] Abstain.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:38] Probably should do a roll call. I mean I think we're.....to be thorough. All right. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:25:46] Okay, thank you Mr. Chairman. I feel like we're doing a lot of new things here over the last couple of meetings. My voting sheets are not set up for this type of structure, so I'm going to call this, "J.2 Acceptance of the Substitute". And so what you're voting on is whether to accept this motion and then you would have a subsequent vote on whether it will carry or not.

**Chris Oliver** [00:26:20] And just to clarify, you accept it it's then open for amendment at that point as well before you do a final vote.

**Merrick Burden** [00:26:34] Is everyone clear on what we're voting on?

**Rebecca Lent** [00:26:37] Thank you. I can't believe we managed to complicate sardines even more. But maybe a question for Mr. Oliver. If you vote 'yes' or 'no' on accepting this amendment to be considered, it doesn't lock you into a 'yes' or 'no' on the next round.

**Chris Oliver** [00:26:54] That's correct. I mean one might assume that it would be two similar votes, but I guess I shouldn't assume that but you're correct.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:07] Okay before I begin are there any other questions about what we're voting on here at the moment? I just want to be sure that everyone knows what they're voting on before you vote. Okay. Starting from the top then. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:27:23] Yes.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:25] Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:27:26] Yes.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:28] David Sones.

**David Sones** [00:27:30] Yes. Yes.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:32] Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:27:34] No.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:36] Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:27:37] Yes.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:41] Josh Lindsay.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:27:43] Abstain.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:44] Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:27:46] Yes.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:48] Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:27:50] Yes.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:52] Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:27:54] Yes.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:56] Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:27:58] Yes.

**Merrick Burden** [00:28:01] Briana Brady.

**Briana Brady** [00:28:03] No.

**Merrick Burden** [00:28:05] Pete Hassemer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:28:06] Yes.

**Merrick Burden** [00:28:09] John North.

**John North** [00:28:11] No.

**Merrick Burden** [00:28:16] And let's see, and before your vote Mr. Chairman, which I don't think we need, we have nine 'yes', three 'no', one 'abstain', so the vote on whether to accept the substitute has passed.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:28:37] Okay. All right, very good. So with that we have a new motion, substitute motion on the floor so open for discussion? Or a vote? I don't see a hand I'm going to, we're going to do it. Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:28:56] Well just to not, to just keep repeating myself I think supportive but on the Ttarget of 17 years, I think if you did the interpolation with all the updated assessment on what the catch would be of a northern subpopulation your Ttarget is much less than 17, but maybe not much less, but we're looking at I think more like 2033 or 2034. But just noting that, you know, voting with I think Aja said let's move on to getting better answers of that, you know, next year. But just voting with us with this just still with the heartburn that our assumptions about catch are off here.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:42] Okay, anyone else? Seeing no hands I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:29:50] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:51] Opposed?

**Briana Brady** [00:29:51] No.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:29:54] No.

**John North** [00:29:54] No.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:55] Abstentions? Okay. All right. I had three 'no's' I believe, right? Okay similar to the last vote so all right, not surprisingly. All right, with that I think I'll turn to our staff to see how we're doing.

**Jessi Waller** [00:30:24] Thank you Mr. Chair. So you have completed two of the three items that you need to tackle today. So we are still looking for some language regarding the FMP Amendment tax, which we have proposed in Supplemental Revised Attachment 2.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:30:40] Okay. So anyone have discussion on that? A motion on that? We're not eating lunch until we get this done.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:31:08] I can float a motion aloud I guess.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:11] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:31:12] I move that the Council adopt the FMP amendment language as....that's all right I'll wait. I move that the Council adopt or approve, yeah whatever.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:35] Speak slowly so they'll get it.



**Aja Szumylo** [00:31:37] Yeah sorry. I move that the Council approve the FMP Amendment language as presented in Supplemental Attachment 2. And I don't know if that's the correct numbering.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:58] Make sure we get that right.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:31:58] I think that covers it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:32:07] Yeah some verification before we have to redo?

**Jessi Waller** [00:32:13] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes it should be Supplemental Revised Attachment 2.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:32:23] Okay, thumbs up over there. So Aja is the language on the screen accurate?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:32:32] Yes it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:32:33] All right, seconded by.....

**Pete Hassemer** [00:32:33] Before you second that I'm sure, you need to specify the consistency with the prior action because what's in the revised revision there, the proposed revision has a blank for P target and ACL and so we specified them in the last motion but as this is written it doesn't put them in there, just process.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:33:11] Jessi.

**Jessi Waller** [00:33:13] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I would take this as given that we had put in as xx to be whatever the Council selected and to insert the respective alternative description, as long as, I would maybe look to Mr. Oliver or Mr. Burden if they are comfortable with this, but I would take this to be we would include it as what you all had just picked as your FPA.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:33:36] I'm seeing head nods so okay. Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer for pointing that out so okay. I need a second. Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Thank you Sharon. Please speak to your motion as appropriate.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:33:57] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, provided that the FMP Amendment language is updated consistent with the previous motion that we just took then I think this covers the action that the Council needs to do here today and won't speak any more to it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:13] Okay, very good. I guess any questions for the motion maker or discussion? Everybody's hungry. Briana Brady.

**Briana Brady** [00:34:21] Thank you Mr. Chair. I guess I just wanted to point out that in my original motion I had language regarding the FMP that was deleted by Miss Ridings, and I was wondering if there was any specific intent in deleting that portion of the motion?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:39] Okay. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:34:41] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Brady. To be totally honest there wasn't intent behind that. Just to have a cleaner substitute motion. So if there was something in there that you felt needed to be added I would welcome that now.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:57] Okay. Thank you Corey. Briana? Okay we're good? All right, seeing no hands I'm hungry so we're going to call for the motion so. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:35:10] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:35:12] Opposed no? Abstentions?

**Josh Lindsay** [00:35:14] Abstain.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:35:16] Josh. Thank you Josh. Okay. All right, the motion passes with one abstention. All right, now I'll turn to Katrina and Jessi to...

**Jessi Waller** [00:35:29] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, you have adopted a Final Preferred Alternative for the Pacific Sardine Rebuilding Plan along with the associated Ttarget and provided guidance in the FMP language. We will be working on transmitting this to the National Marine Fisheries Service and so you have completed your action for today.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:35:46] Okay very good.

### 3. Stock Assessment Prioritization

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] I don't see any public comment here and that has been confirmed. No public comment so will take us into our Council discussion and action. And there it is, adopt the stock assessment priorities for 2026-27 and other guidance as needed. Anyone want to start this discussion? We've got plenty of time.....(laughter)..... Briana Brady.

**Briana Brady** [00:00:39] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Thanks to Council staff for putting forward that joint report with NMFS and for the reports by the advisory bodies. I'm okay with what the SSC is suggesting and can put forward a motion if you'd like.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:54] All right. Let me look around and see if there's any other discussion people want to have before we get to that. I'm not seeing that. Let's go ahead with your motion.

**Briana Brady** [00:01:05] Thanks. I don't believe one's been transmitted to the folks in the back, so if they want to wait a minute or I can read it to them.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:19] Sorry, let's test their typing skills. Just slowly. They're good.

**Briana Brady** [00:01:26] Great. I move the Council adopt the survey methodology review and stock assessment schedule for 26, I guess it would be 2026. Thank you. Dash 2027 in Agenda Item J.3.a, Supplemental SSC Report 1, November 2024.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:24] Give you a second to read that over. And so I followed along with your typing. That looks accurate and complete. Is that right?

**Briana Brady** [00:02:35] Yes. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:37] Great. Is there a second on the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

**Briana Brady** [00:02:43] Thank you. It sounded like there are some workload issues outlined and this would, this schedule will work accordingly and then we can check-in in two years when we need to.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:54] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Josh Lindsay.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:03:09] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm fine with the motion. I just wanted to flag that some of this has been a moving target in terms of conversations with the SSC and our Southwest Fisheries Science Center. I know we put in a suggestion for a path forward. The SSC has suggested an alternative to that. We think that might be doable, but I just want to mention that, you know, we still need to look at resources in terms of accomplishing that, update mackerel in the same year as the full sardine, but happy to report back on that at another date.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:38] Thank you. Further discussion? Seeing none I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:03:47] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:48] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. I'm going to look to Jessi. There hasn't been a lot of discussion here. Anything else you'd like to hear from the group? Wait, let me go to Corey Niles first.

**Corey Niles** [00:04:09] Sorry. Well, Jessi please go first I can follow. I was just going to say, I'm just maybe foreshadowing for the last Item of the day, I think it's nice that, like, there's a mention of two years from now and a mention in the AS Report of this maybe we could do something different for mackerel. Just I think this is just an example of how we could use a CPS-wide place to talk about all of our science needs. And so I just want to note there was those ideas thrown out there and again, the mention of a we can revisit this, but yeah just again foreshadowing what I think we have a broader need for this type of place to talk about priorities for these science and science related ideas.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:55] Thank you. Jessi.

**Jessi Waller** [00:05:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, this takes care of your Council action today. You have adopted your stock assessment and survey priorities for 26-27, which would be to do the integrated survey methodology review for 2026, a benchmark assessment of Pacific sardine in 2027, and an update assessment in 2027. We will work on sending a letter to the Southwest Fisheries Science Center on your recommendations.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:27] All right, thank you. I'll scan the room once more just in case anything came to mind anyone wants to discuss. Not seeing that I'll close this agenda item and for the last time at this meeting I'll send the gavel back to the Chair.